



MOBILIZATION AND AUTONOMIZATION STAGES OF MARXIST DISCONTINUITY IN CZECHOSLOVAK GEOGRAPHICAL THOUGHT

René MATLOVIČ^{A*}, Kvetoslava MATLOVIČOVÁ^B

Received: June 19, 2021 | Revised: October 29, 2021 | Accepted: November 17, 2021
Paper No. 21-63/2-609

Abstract

The Marxist discontinuity in geographical thought, which we pointed out in our previous work (Matlovič, Matlovičová 2020), is a specific case. It was caused by geopolitical changes after World War II, when Czechoslovakia came under the influence of the Soviet Union. This led to the onset of the communist regime in 1948 and the subsequent fundamental transformation of the political establishment, the economic system and socio-cultural life, which did not bypass the field of education and science. It was mainly the ideological indoctrination of science and higher education by dialectical and historical materialism of the Soviet type (Marxism-Leninism) and the subordination of education and research to the power interests of the Communist Party. We consider this paper only as an introduction to the study of this issue. Its aim is to identify the initial manifestations of the onset of Marxist discontinuity in Czechoslovak geography, to point out its main actors and at the same time to identify possible convergent and divergent features of this onset in Czech and Slovak geography. As a theoretical and methodological framework for our research, we have decided to base our paper on the Latour-Barnes model of changing scientific discipline.


Key words

Czechoslovak geography, dialectical and historical materialism, geographic thought, marxist discontinuity, sovietisation.


INTRODUCTION

The Marxist discontinuity in geographical thought, which we pointed out in our previous work (Matlovič, Matlovičová 2020), is a specific case. It was caused by geopolitical changes after World War II, when Czechoslovakia came under the influence of the Soviet Union. This led to the onset of the communist regime in 1948 and the subsequent fundamental transformation of the political establishment, the economic system and socio-cultural life, which did not bypass the field

A* Institute of Geography, Slovak Academy of Sciences, Štefánikova 49, 814 73 Bratislava, Slovakia

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8935-6462>
geogmatl@savba.sk (corresponding author)

B University of Prešov, 17. novembra 1, 080 01 Prešov, Slovakia

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9635-4177>
kvetoslava.matlovicova@unipo.sk



of education and science. It was mainly the ideological indoctrination of science and higher education by dialectical and historical materialism of the Soviet type (Marxism-Leninism) and the subordination of education and research to the power interests of the Communist Party. We consider this paper only as an introduction to the study of this issue. Its aim is to identify the initial manifestations of the onset of Marxist discontinuity in Czechoslovak geography, to point out its main actors and at the same time to identify possible convergent and divergent features of this onset in Czech and Slovak geography. As a theoretical and methodological framework for our research, we have decided to base our paper on the Latour-Barnes model of changing scientific discipline.

CURRENT STATE OF THE ISSUE AND ITS CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

In the existing geographic literature of Slovak provenance there are no works that reflect the onset of Marxist discontinuity in Czechoslovak geographical thought. References to this discontinuity are found only in more broadly oriented survey works (Matlovič, Matlovičová 2015, 2020). In the foreign literature, this issue is solidly elaborated in Hungary (Győri 2015, Győri, Gyuris 2012, 2015, Gyuris, Győri 2013). These authors have characterized the sovietization of geography as a discontinuity in Hungarian geographical thought and have applied a postcolonial analytical scheme to its study (Győri, Gyuris 2012). Their approach was criticized by Z. Ginelli (Gyimesi) (2018), who pointed out that this approach, emphasizing the discontinuous nature of sovietization, ignores important continuities and international trends. In his view, it risks leading only to a self-centred case study of political dictatorship (Ginelli 2018, p. 53). Also relevant to our analysis are works on changes in geographic thought in the Soviet Union in the inter- and post-war period (Shaw, Oldfield 2008, Oldfield, and Shaw 2015). In Slovakia, there are well-known studies concerning the Sovietization of historical science (Hudek 2010, 2017). Hudek (2017, p. 339) explains the notion of sovietization of higher education institutions by saying that “the aim of all the changes implemented after 1948 was to imitate as closely as possible the higher education system operating in the Soviet Union”.

We have adopted the Latour-Barnes model of disciplinary change as the basic theoretical and methodological framework for our research, which has been applied in the analysis of the emergence of regional science (Johnston 2006, p. 286). The model distinguishes four processes that characterize the different stages of discontinuity or paradigmatic transition within a scientific discipline. In our research, the first two stages of mobilization and autonomization are relevant. Mobilization presupposes the existence of an individual or initiating group of proponents that draws attention to a new agenda or paradigm. The innovativeness, necessity and superiority of the new paradigm over previously established



approaches is emphasized. Initially informal and gradually formal media - e.g. articles, conference papers, etc. - are used to persuade other colleagues within the community. The next stage is autonomization, in which the promoters of the new paradigm invite other colleagues to adopt, assimilate and further elaborate this concept. The aim is to disseminate the new paradigm as much as possible, which also implies the involvement of students, thus triggering the need for educational reform (Johnston 2006, p. 286-7).

At these two stages, several policy strategies are employed in the paradigmatic change of the discipline of science (Johnston 2006 for a closer look). The politics of denigration is highly assertive and built on a mutual rejection of the paradigm of competing camps, claiming that the competitive/alternative project is inappropriate and lowers the status of the discipline of science. The politics of critique is less assertive than the first strategy and is built on finding the strengths and weaknesses of paradigms in order to prove the superiority of one's project over the competing one. The politics of dismissal is built on the rapid rejection of certain elements of established practices in the scientific discipline that are identified as unviable. This creates a free space for a new paradigm. The policy of silence is used when the rejection of a new paradigm is assumed. The policy of ignoring prevents the wider diffusion of new ideas, which as a consequence leads to the new paradigm not being discussed as an alternative/alternative option. The politics of accommodation pragmatically accepts the new paradigm and incorporates it into the discipline's portfolio. The politics of unity is an expanded version of the previous strategy, emphasizing the commonalities of competing projects and seeking consensus to counter threats from outside the scientific discipline (Johnston 2006 in Matlovič and Matlovičová 2015, p. 20). Another feature of discontinuities in the thought of the scientific discipline is its relation to generational change. New streams of thought are adopted and promoted initially by members of the younger generation. Gradually, as their generation becomes established in the field, they become professors, journal editors, and textbook authors, bringing their way of thinking to the fore (Aitken, Valentine 2006, p. 2).

In our work we focus on the stages of mobilization and autonomization within the onset of Marxist discontinuity in Czechoslovak geographic thought, i.e. in the period from the rise of the communist regime in 1948 to the early 1960s, when the new Marxist paradigm was already fully established. The manifestations of the onset of Marxist discontinuity will be traced through a content and discursive analysis of articles published during the period under study in the two most important geographical periodicals in Czechoslovakia – „*Sborník Československé společnosti zeměpisné*“, published in Prague, and „*Geografický časopis*“, published in Bratislava. In addition, we will highlight the results of key conferences devoted to the reflection on Marxist discontinuity.



CZECHOSLOVAK GEOGRAPHY BEFORE THE ONSET OF MARXIST DISCONTINUITY

Czechoslovak geography entered the period after the Second World War significantly weakened. In 1945, there were only three workplaces where scientific research and university training of future geography professionals was carried out. These were at the universities of Prague, Brno and Bratislava. The understaffed Institute of Geography of the Slovak Academy of Sciences and Arts in Bratislava was still applied to a small extent. The largest workplace was the Geographical Institute of Charles University in Prague, which was in the post-war years divided into four departments – concerned with anthropogeography (headed by J. Doberský), physical geography (headed by J. Kinský), the geography of Slavic countries (headed by J. Král) and cartography and mathematical geography (headed by B. Šalamon) (Häufner 1967). At the university in Brno the situation was complicated because during the Second World War the leading geographers F. Kolářek, B. Hrudíčka and F. Říkovský were murdered by the nazis. In the post-war period, the Brno Institute of Geography was headed by F. Vitásek. In Bratislava, the head of the Geographical Institute was J. Hromádka. After his departure to Prague in 1946, M. Lukniš took over his role after a short provisional period. The Institute of Geography of the Slovak Academy of Sciences and Arts (*Slovenská akadémia vied a umení*) gradually strengthened the number of staff employed there, in the second half of the 1940s, when D. Polakovič, E. Šimo, J. Hanzlík and E. Mazúr came there. The institute was led externally by J. Hromádka, however it was in fact led by M. Lukniš and later by E. Šimo (Žudel 1993). In 1949, the scientific journal “*Geographia Slovaca*” began to be published at the Institute. In the years 1950-1952 it changed its name to “*Zemepisný zborník SAVU*” and since 1953 it became known as Geographical Journal (GJ) “*Geografický časopis*” (Ira et al. 2020, p. 393) as the most important scientific periodical in Slovak geography. Since the late 1940s and in the 50s, new geographical workplaces were gradually established, which were mainly focused on teacher training (e.g. in Prague, Bratislava, Brno, Pilsen, České Budějovice, Olomouc, Prešov, Banská Bystrica, Nitra). From the previous period, small geographical workplaces at economic universities in Prague and Bratislava have also been preserved. An important platform for geographers was the Czechoslovak Geographical Society “*Československá společnost zeměpisná*”, an institution based in Prague. In 1946 S. Nikolau left the leadership of this institution after he was accused of collaborating with the Nazis and was replaced by J. Pohl - Doberský. Since 1894, the institution has been publishing a scientific journal Proceedings of the Czechoslovak Geographical Society (PCSGS) “*Sborník Československé společnosti zeměpisné*” (Jeleček, Martínek 2007). In Slovakia, Slovak geographical society (*Slovenská zemepisná spoločnosť*) was founded in 1946 as a branch of the *Czechoslovak geographical society*, headed by J. Hromádka (Jeleček, Martínek 2007).



Czechoslovak geographic thought was shaped by the influence of several European schools, whose roots go back to the Berlin centre, where the tradition was started by C. Ritter. The most significant influences on Czechoslovak geographers were the German school (F. Ratzel, A. Penck, F. von Richthofen, A. Hettner), the French school (Vidal de la Blache, J. Brunhes, R. Blanchard, A. Demangeon, E. De Martonne, P. Deffontaine), the Anglo-American school (W.M. Davis, Herbertson), the Polish school (L. Sawicki) and the Serbian school (J. Cvijić). In physical geography, the most developed was geomorphology, whose thinking reflected the geographic cycle theory of W.M. Davis (J. V. Daneš), although geomorphological concepts among Czech geographers also had the geomorphological concepts of A. Penck (V. Dědina), E. De Martonne (J. Moschelesová) and the karst geomorphologist J. Cvijić (J.V. Daneš) (Häufler 1967). The first stage of the development of anthropogeography was associated with the deterministic concept of Ratzel (V. Dvorský) (Häufler 1967). Later, the influence of the American school (J. Moschelesová) and especially the French school of geographical possibilism (J. Král, J. Hromádka) increased (Král, Kondracki 1951, Häufler 1967, Trávníček 1984).

THE ONSET OF SOVIETIZATION OF UNIVERSITIES IN CZECHOSLOVAKIA

The Communist Party took power in Czechoslovakia in February 1948. The main milestone in defining the nature and mission of the educational system in Czechoslovakia was the IX Congress of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia (CPC) in May 1949, during which the main goals of building socialism in the political, economic and cultural spheres were set. The Minister of Education Z. Nejedlý, in his speech at this congress, unambiguously determined that the ideological basis of education in schools in the Czechoslovak Republic is and must be Marxism-Leninism, as the only "scientific doctrine" (Gabzdilová 2018, p. 111). The principle of partisanship, i.e. total identification with and support for the current policy of the Communist Party, came to the fore. This also entailed considerable instability, which was manifested in the cyclical changes of this policy and its consequences for the functioning of universities and science (Hudek 2017).

Academic self-governance in universities has been replaced by a centralist-bureaucratic model of governance. In 1950, a new Higher Education Act was adopted, which brought about significant changes in the organisation of higher education and marked a departure from the pre-Central European system of higher education. Universities were placed under the authority of the State Committee for Higher Education. In 1951, the position of cadre officers was established in the universities, reporting directly to the Ministry and controlling personnel policy in relation to staff and students. In the organizational structure, institutes and seminaries were replaced by departments on the Soviet model. Ideological indoctrina-



nation with Marxism-Leninism began to take place as early as the academic year 1948-49, when lectures in social sciences began to be implemented in all faculties. Among the lecturers on the topic "*our people's democracy on the road to socialism*" was also geographer Jozef Fraňo (Gabzdilová 2018, p. 113). From 1951, ideological indoctrination was provided by Marxist departments, which were established at each university and had their own cabinets at each faculty. Three types of Marxist departments were established in universities - the department of the foundations of Marxism and Leninism, the department of political economy, and the department of dialectical and historical materialism. Taking courses in Marxism-Leninism became compulsory for all university students in Czechoslovakia (Urbášek, Pulec, 2012). The departments of historical and dialectical materialism, where the questions of the struggle against bourgeois ideologies, the questions of the communist revolution and the questions of the nature of scientific laws were elaborated, had a key position in our context (Sirácky 1957, p. 12). Another institution for the promotion of the experiences and results of Soviet science was the Czechoslovak-Soviet Institute, which was founded in 1950 in Prague.

As a result of the onset of Sovietisation of universities in Czechoslovakia, persecutions began, leading to personnel purges among professors and students. Leading geographers were also victims. At Charles University, Jiří Král¹ was made to prematurely retire in 1948, and at the University of Political and Economic Sciences in Prague, J. Hromádka was sent into retirement in 1951 (Matlovič 2018). The emergence of the communist regime also affected the activities of the Czechoslovak Geographical Society. In 1950, its publishing licence was withdrawn. The publishing of the scientific journal was taken over by the publishing house "*Přírodovědecké nakladatelství*" and later in 1952 by the publishing house of the Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences (*Nakladatelstvo Československé akademie věd*). The 1950-1952 volumes were published with a delay. The journal became subject to censorship and propaganda articles on ideological issues began to be printed (Jeřábek, Martínek 2007).

The adoption of the new Higher Education Act resulted in changes in the organisational structure of the departments. The Institute of Geography of Charles University was abolished in 1950 and replaced by the Department of Geography. In 1953 the department was divided into the Department of Economic and Regional Geography and the Department of Cartography and Physical Geography (Häufner 1967). Similar changes occurred in Bratislava, where the institute was replaced in 1950 by the Department of Geography, which was divided into the Department of Physical Geography and the Department of Economic Geography in 1952 (Matlovič

1 According to J. Král's notes preserved in the archives, this was based on a false accusation of collaboration with the Nazis, which he attributed to his two colleagues. In 1966, J. Král was rehabilitated.



2018). Similarly, in Brno, the Institute of Geography disappeared in 1950 and the Department of Geography was established. The training of geography teachers at the faculties of education and their branches was separated from the universities after the 1953 reform into separate professionally oriented colleges, which experienced a rather extensive development. Scientific activity at universities was weakened, following the Soviet model, by the establishment of the Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences (CSAS) in 1952 and the Slovak Academy of Sciences (SAS) in 1953, which incorporated the Institute of Geography of the Slovak Academy of Sciences and Arts. The Department of Economic Geography was established at the Institute of Economics of the CSAS in 1954. The Institute of Geography of the CSAS in Brno with a workplace in Prague was subsequently established by finally merging several departments in 1963 (Jeleček et al. 2006).

After February 1948, the preparation of the reform of higher education according to the Soviet model began. A reform commission was set up to prepare a new study of geography, and the curricula at the individual universities in Prague, Bratislava and Brno were to be gradually harmonised. In the academic year 1949-50, the first two years of students were already studying according to the new curricula. A broader scientific training in physical geography and cartography was prescribed for the professional study of economic geography, and the problems of general economic geography were divided into a number of sub-subjects so that they could be covered in more detail. In 1952, separate lectures on geography of industry, geography of agriculture, population geography and demography were introduced. The geography of settlements was more strongly oriented towards cities and industrial centres. Courses on economic cartography, economic statistics and the history of the national economy were introduced. As Soviet economic geography developed strongly in connection with rayon (regional) planning, lectures and exercises were supplemented by lectures on spatial planning. Textbooks on these subjects were not available in Czechoslovakia, so textbooks by Soviet authors were used. This was the second part of N.N. Baranský's school methodology, which was published in 1954 in an expanded edition. The geography of industry was taught according to P.N. Stepanov's textbook from 1950 and based on Kolosovsky's 1947 concept of territorial-production complexes, the geography of agriculture and geography of settlements were taught according to the manuals of J.G. Sauskhin from 1947 and A.N. Rakitnikov from 1948. An important role was played by scientific works and monographs, which became a model for the research of a particular territory by the Marxist method. Of particular importance was the monograph by I. M. Maergojz on Czechoslovakia from 1954, in which the principles of the Soviet rayon school of regional planning were applied (Korčák 1955, pp. 182-183).

Czechoslovak geography was somewhat isolated in the international context. Contacts with geographic departments in Western countries were severed. Para-



doxically, contacts with Soviet geographers were also initially insufficient. This can be illustrated by the fact that the first Soviet geographer to visit Charles University after the onset of the communist regime was J. Demidovich as late as 1953, and visits by Czechoslovak geographers to the Soviet Union were delayed even more. This meant that Marxist methodology was only slowly applied, especially in economic geography (Häufler 1967).

THE EMERGENCE OF MARXIST DISCONTINUITY IN CZECHOSLOVAK GEOGRAPHY

The emergence of Marxist discontinuity in Czechoslovak geographic thought can be traced through articles in the two most important geographic periodicals published in Czechoslovakia – Proceedings of the Czechoslovak Geographical Society (PCSGS) and Geographical Journal (GJ). In line with the Latour-Barnes model of the disciplinary change, this way of setting the agenda of a new paradigm is typical of the stage of mobilisation and, to some extent, autonomisation. At the same time, this approach allows us to show the differentiated course and pace of the emergence of Marxist discontinuity in the environment of Czech and Slovak geography.

The Mobilizing and Autonomizing Phase of Marxist Discontinuity in Czech Geography and its Actors

The first manifestation of the emergence of Marxist discontinuity in Czechoslovak geographic literature can be considered to be the propaganda article by V. Häufler and M. Střída *Za marxistickou geografii* (For Marxist Geography), which appeared in the main section of articles in PCSGS as early as 1950.² The authors of the article represented the young generation, which at that time was just beginning its academic career. Vlastislav Häufler (1924–1985) has just started as an assistant professor at Charles University in Prague after his studies in 1945–1949. He was one of J. Doberšský's pupils. His whole career was connected with the Charles University of Prague. He habilitated in 1958 and was appointed professor in 1966. He became one of the leading figures of Czechoslovak geography and was head of the Department of Economic and Regional Geography from 1960–1980. Miroslav Střída (1923–2008) also studied at the Faculty of Natural Sciences in Prague in 1945–48. He spent a year at the Sorbonne in Paris and worked as an editor in a natural science publishing house. In 1952–1955 he was an assistant at the Prague University of Economics and Business, then worked at the Department of Economic Geography of the Institute of Economics of the Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences, which in 1963 became

2 After the publishing rights of the Czechoslovak Geographical Society were withdrawn, the publication of the PCSGS was in crisis. For these reasons, the following issues were published with a time delay. The mentioned article was therefore not published until 1951.



part of the newly founded Institute of Geography of the Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences (J. Martínek, M. Martínek 1998). These proponents of Marxist discontinuity already in the introductory part of the article used the discourse of the politics of denigration and decisive detachment from the previous approaches, which is demonstrated by the following position of theirs: *"if we want to put Czechoslovak science at the service of progress and building, we must also understand our tasks in a combative way, step firmly and without hesitation on a new path and relentlessly put an end to what in the past the bourgeois theoreticians and the so-called non-political pure scientists put on our science."* Implicit in this position is a critique of positivism. The authors saw the starting point in a clear orientation towards Soviet geography: *'...to find a common voice with Soviet geographers. Their geographical science, already growing out of socialist roots, shows us unmistakably, even this time, the path we must take...in order to place Czechoslovak geography on the scientific foundations of Marxist thought'* (Häufler, Střída 1950, p. 1). In the next part of the article, the authors applied the discourse of the politics of critique in relation to the various schools of geographical thought in Western countries. The first criticism was directed towards geographical determinism and its misuse for the imperialist aims of Nazi Germany through the living space concept (*Lebensraum*). In criticizing the French anthropogeographical school, the authors were unable to formulate their own arguments, but relied on Soviet geographers. This is illustrated by the statement: *'the French school of anthropogeography, so vividly praised even by some of our geographers, suffers from serious flaws, if we look at it in the light of the facts that emerge from the discussions of the Soviet geographers'* (Häufler, Střída 1950, p. 21). In the next section, they criticized the idealism and subjectivism of geography, reflecting the following view: *.... this applies to bourgeois geography, where there is a chaos in the methods, boundaries and tasks of this science, which has long persisted and which cannot be resolved except by adopting a materialist world view and dialectical method"* (Häufler, Střída 1950, p. 4). The authors also pointed out that the classics of Marxism, such as Marx, Engels, Plekhanov, attached great importance to the study of the geographical environment and its influence on the material existence and economic activity of mankind. The ideas in their works (e.g. *Capital: A Critique of Political Economy*, *Dialectics of Nature*, *The Development of the Monist View of History*) were considered so fundamental that *"they can be regarded as a guiding force for all scientific activity in the field of geography"* (Häufler, Střída 1950, p. 4). Finally, they emphasized the contribution of the works of Lenin and Stalin to the development of geography, formulating the opinion, *"Stalin, with his directives for the building of socialism and now communism, for the reshaping of nature, directly determines the tasks of Soviet geography"* (Häufler, Střída 1950, p. 5). The article goes on to characterise Soviet geography. In an attempt to increase the weight of their argument, the authors help themselves by introducing attempts to reflect Marxism in the other schools



of bourgeois geographies. They mention the Polish geographer S. Nowakowski (1928) and a group of progressive French geographers at the Sorbonne in Paris led by P. George. However, they immediately needed to point out that much greater achievements in this endeavour had been made by the Soviet school of geography (Häufler, Střída 1950, p. 5). Among the concrete achievements of Soviet geography, they mentioned the original conception of Markov, who combined Davis's theory of the geographical cycle with Penck's morphological analysis on the basis of dialectical materialism. The authors did not avoid characterizing the controversies that arose in Soviet geography. These included criticism of the supporters of the concept of geography according to the German geographer A. Hettner in the interwar period and a second wave of criticism by several geographers in the pages of the journal *Voprosy geografii* in 1947 and 1948 for their misunderstanding of the dialectical nature of the evolution of the geographical environment. In the final part of the article, the authors discuss the state of Czechoslovak geography. They invoked the discourse of the politics of dismissal, which is well illustrated by the following statement in relation to the interwar period: *'Czechoslovak geographical science thus proved that it stood with both feet on the idealistic platform of chaotic and impotent bourgeois science, and that together with it, it turned a blind eye to the harsh realities of predatory capitalism and robber imperialism on one hand, and to the deplorable situation of the oppressed masses on the other'* (Häufler, Střída 1950, p. 7). The authors also advocated a personnel purge, as evidenced by the following statement: *'Czechoslovak geography has so far suffered from organisational and ideological deficiencies, the result of the long-standing influence of Western schools. The removal of reactionary factors has brought about a partial recovery...those who today work in leading positions in geography recognise the correctness of the orientation towards progressive Soviet science and the necessity of working by the method of dialectical and historical materialism'* (Häufler, Střída 1950, p. 7).

J. Doberský was involved in the promotion of Soviet geography in his 1951 article "The Achievements of Russian and Soviet Geography". Josef Pohl-Doberský (1888-1967) differed from previous authors by belonging to an older generation. He studied geography and history at the university in Prague in 1909-1914. He worked as a secondary school professor. In 1927 he was habilitated in anthropogeography, in 1937 he was appointed an extraordinary professor and in 1946 a full professor. His career peaked after the Second World War. In 1946 he became a chairman of the Czechoslovak Geographical Society for ten years and in 1950-1952 he was the director of the Geographical Institute of Charles University in Prague. In 1946 he changed his surname from the German Pohl to Doberský, after the village he was from (Dobré near Dobruška in Eastern Bohemia). At the same time, from an agrarian (a member of the Republican Party of Agricultural and Farming People), he became a communist. He played an important role in the political purges that



adversely affected the fate of prof. Jiří Král. He was actively involved in political agitation concerning Soviet geography and the socialist village (Martínek 2012). In the article in question, he used the discourse of the politics of denigration to discredit old Russian geography and to highlight the merits of Soviet geography. This is illustrated by the following statement of his: *'... while Russian geographers during feudalism and capitalism mostly served government policy in the conquest of new colonies and prepared the ground for new military expeditions and imperialist conquests linked to commercial interests in the continuous exploitation of new territories for the benefit of the tsarist court, feudal circles and trading companies, Soviet geographers engaged themselves in the service of the economic and cultural development of the whole society, and geography became a pillar of the economic reconstruction of the Soviet Union'* (Doberský 1951, p. 29). J. Doberský also addressed the theme of the rise of Marxist discontinuity in his lecture in December 1954 on the occasion of the 60th anniversary of the Czechoslovak Geographical Society. He expresses it as follows: *"...our geography has also opened a new period of its development. It is no longer a science for science's sake and a planless creative work, but a science aimed at the concrete tasks of the socialist construction of our republic, guided by the desire to apply to us the virtues of Soviet geography, based on the advanced methods of dialectical and historical materialism"* (Doberský 1955, p. 162).

A flagrant manifestation of the policy of accommodation was in 1953 the of articles on the importance of the works of J.V. Stalin for geography. This is the study by M. Blažek "The importance of the work of J.V. Stalin's "Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR" for Czechoslovak economic geography" and M. Macka's article "The Significance of the Work of J.V. Stalin for Czechoslovak Economic Geography". Miroslav Blažek (1916-1983) belonged to the middle generation. He studied geography in 1934-1939 at the university in Brno. He was a pupil of F. Kolářček. In the early phase of his career, he worked in practice, where he was involved in regional planning and in the issue of the resettlement of the Czech borderland after the expulsion of the Germans. In 1951 he joined the Prague University of Economics and Business, where he was habilitated in 1952 and appointed professor in 1964. In 1967 he moved to the Geographical Institute of the Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences in Brno, where he built up the Department of Economic Geography). Miroslav Macka (1924-1984) belonged to the young generation of emerging geographers. He was a graduate of geography at the university in Brno. After his studies, he worked first at the Faculty of Education in Brno from 1948 and at the Faculty of Natural Sciences from 1953. From 1963 he worked at the Geographical Institute of the Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences in Brno (J. Martínek, M. Martínek 1998). Blažek (1953, p. 1) identified Stalin's fundamental contribution as his thesis that natural and social laws are identical in quality and are the result of objective processes. This implied an imperative to study not only the laws of development of the geographical environment, but also the laws of social development and its



manifestations in the geographical environment. He attributed a cardinal role to the laws of political economy, in particular the laws of the distribution of productive forces in the geographical environment. In the next section, he highlighted the law of proportionality of social development identified by Stalin, which he linked in particular to spatial and regional proportionality. Related to this, according to him, was the need for the application of geographical knowledge in regionalisation and regional (rayon) planning (Blažek (1953, p. 3). M. Macek's article was a reaction to the death of J.V. Stalin and is an example of totally uncritical adoration of this dictator. This is illustrated by the statement in the introduction: *'comrade Stalin's work, in which he brilliantly and creatively develops the basic lessons of the classics of Marxism-Leninism and of his great teacher V. I. Lenin...is the cornerstone and textbook of the Marxist and dialectical method of work and the materialist world view serving as a battle weapon for all scientists, thus also in the field of geography, not only in the Soviet Union, but throughout the world.'* (Macka 1953, p. 65).

In addition to domestic authors, the editors of the PCSGS helped in the promotion of Marxist discontinuity with articles by foreign authors. These were a study by the French geographer J. Tricart *"Geomorphology and Marxism"* from 1952 and an article by the Eastern German geographer Sahne *"Towards a Socialist Theory of Economic Geography"* from 1955.

In addition to the main articles section, several articles were published in the informative section of PCSGS. We can also mention M. Střída's information (1954) on the tasks of geography on the basis of the conclusions of the 10th Congress of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia. According to him, geography was to cooperate in solving the basic problems of the development of the national economy, which were the expansion of the raw material and energy base, the increase in agricultural production, the increase and improvement of the production of consumer goods, the increase in the performance and level of railway and automobile transport, and the consolidation of economy as a condition for raising the standard of living of the population (Střída 1954, p. 216).

Not all Czech authors were such ardent promoters of the new paradigm of dialectical and historical materialism and the sovietization of geography. We can also find authors who kept a certain distance even though they were aware of the necessity to adapt to the new reality. Among them was Jaromír Korčák (1895-1989), who, like Doberský, belonged to the older generation of geographers. He studied geography at the Charles University in 1914-1922 and worked in the State Statistical Office, where he was influenced by A. Boháč and focused on demography. V. Láška inspired him to deal with the use of mathematical methods in geography. In 1951 he joined Charles University, where he was appointed professor and head of the Department of Economic and Regional Geography until 1960. Due to the theoretical and methodological contribution of his works, he is considered to be the founder of the Albertov School of geography (J. Martínek, M. Martínek 1998,



p. 243). J. Korčák (1955), reflecting on the development of economic geography in the post-war decade, drew attention to the pitfalls that resulted from the state of Soviet geography. This is illustrated by his point: *"the methodology of economic geography is still a subject of debate in the Soviet Union, which is carefully followed in our departments of economic geography"*. He was thus responding to Bujanovsky's criticism of the work of Saushkin (Korčák 1955, p. 181).

The differentiation of Czechoslovak geographers' attitudes towards the Marxist discontinuity is well illustrated by the content of the papers and discussions at the first scientific conference held in Czechoslovakia after the communist regime took power. It was a conference of geography researchers held on 8-10 October 1953 at the chateau in Liblice near Mělník. It was attended by 62 experts. It was the first opportunity to reflect on the sovietization of Czechoslovak geography and the onset of Marxist discontinuity in geographical thought. The main papers were delivered mostly by representatives of the older generation. They mostly limited themselves to paying attention to the achievements of Soviet geographers within the framework of the issues discussed. This was the character of the papers by B. Horák and M. Stadtler on historical geography, F. Vitásek on physical geography and J. Krejčí on the application of geographers in practice. J. Korčák (1954, p. 44) in his report on regional geography reflected the works of Soviet geographers, especially N. N. Baransky and J. G. Saushkin, and accepted dialectical materialism as the methodological basis for regional geography. J. Hromádka was rather restrained in his report on economic geography, which provoked a reaction among some participants as if he had used the discourse of the politics of ignorance. This is evident from his opinion: *"it is to the credit of Soviet geographers that the theoretical side comes to the fore in comparison with previous practice. Discussions are coming up, opinions are being refined. The development of geography is entering a new phase. I conclude that we have neither the space nor the time to discuss these issues here. Other meetings are needed to focus on this issue alone..."* (Hromádka 1954, p. 34). Hromádka went on to reflect on the debates in contemporary Soviet geography³, stressing the need for close collaboration between physical geography and anthropogeography, thus defending Saushkin. It should be noted that Hromádka did not respect the new norm and continued to use the term anthropogeography. In another part of his paper he even suggested that the French school of geography should be followed, which illustrates his point: *"the works of economic geography are governed by the same principles as the whole of geography. I conclude that the principles laid down by De Martonne and Brunhes suit us best"* (Hromádka 1954, p. 35), which was in stark

3 These were apparently discussions about which Czechoslovak geographers had information from the periodical *Za marxistickou geografii. Výběr z diskuse sovětských zeměpisců*, published in 1951 by the natural science section of the Czechoslovak-Soviet Institute. It was a selection of translations of the above mentioned discussions, which also concerned the reflection of French geography by Soviet geographers (Hanzlík 1952, p. 158).



contrast to the advocated orientation towards Soviet geography. Hromádka also pointed out in his report that the older generation of Czechoslovak geographers had been shaped initially by the German school of geography, had subsequently encountered the French school of geography as well as the American school, and had also been inspired by Polish and Serbian geography (Hromádka 1954, p. 34). During the discussion, several participants reacted critically to his paper - V. Häufler for his methodological aspect, M. Blažek for the fact that he evaluated the given questions from the positions of bourgeois science, J. Doberský, for his lack of mention of dialectical and historical materialism, and for Hromádka's overemphasis on the French anthropogeographical school. Doberský considered it necessary to rely on the experience of Soviet geographers as models for Czechoslovak economic geography. In his reply to Doberský, Hromádka stated that even Soviet geography had not discarded everything that came from the pre-revolutionary era, and pointed out that Russian translations of important French geographical works had been published in the Soviet Union, and in his approach, he was merely following Soviet models. In response to the discussion, a Slovak geographer A. Šíma shared Hromádka's view of the tasks of economic geography and pointed out that the different views of Hromádka Blažek were rooted in different orientations to the various currents in Soviet geography. Šíma was inclined to N.N. Baransky's conception, thus considering it correct to study the natural environment in economic geography from an economic point of view (Hromádka 1954, pp. 36-39). Already from this discussion certain differences in the acceptance of the Marxist discontinuity between geographers from the Czech regions and geographers whose careers were connected with Slovakia emerge.

Mobilization and Autonomization Phase of Marxist Discontinuity in Slovak Geography and its Actors

Compared to the Czech countries, the onset of Marxist discontinuity in Slovakia was delayed. To some extent, this was related to the leading persons who determined the strategic formation of Slovak geography and were not among the ardent protagonists of this change. The authority of Jan Hromádka (1886-1968), who educated the first generation of Slovak geographers, played a special role here. Hromádka began studying geography at the university in Prague in 1910-1914, where he was shaped by V. Švambera, J.V. Daneš and V. Dvorský. After his studies were interrupted by World War I, he completed his studies with Prof. F. Štůla at the Comenius University in Bratislava in 1926. In 1930 he habilitated and began teaching at Comenius University as a private associate professor. In 1931-1932 he completed a study stay at the Sorbonne in Paris, which greatly influenced his orientation towards the French school of regional geography. In 1938-1946 he was a professor at the University of Bratislava, where he was the director of the Institute



of Geography at a university in 1939-1946, while he also headed the Institute of Geography of the Slovak Academy of Sciences and Arts (SAVU). In 1946 he went to Prague to the University College of Business, but he continued to lecture in Bratislava until 1948. In 1951 he was forced to retire for ideological reasons. His career was reactivated in 1954-1956, when he worked at the Department of Economic Geography of the Institute of Economics of the Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences. During his Slovak tenure he educated several leading geographers. He habilitated M. Lukniš for physical geography in 1946 and A. Šíma for economic geography in 1950 (Matlovič 2018). Michal Lukniš (1916-1986) studied geography in Bratislava in 1938-1942. After his studies, he worked as an assistant to prof. Hromádka at a university in Bratislava. In 1946 he was habilitated and in 1956 he was appointed professor. In 1952-1960 he was the head of the Department of Physical Geography. Under the influence of Hromádka, Lukniš initially devoted himself to regional geography. In the early 1950s he transferred the focus of his research activities to geomorphology. It was the more pronounced inclination towards physical geography that was the strategy of many geographers who did not want to explicitly submit to the onset of Marxist discontinuity. Lukniš eventually returned to regional geography after 1974, when he moved to the newly established Department of Regional Geography. Anton Šíma (1908-1976) graduated from the university in Bratislava in 1943. He worked as a secondary school teacher in Banská Bystrica and Bratislava. In 1946 he began teaching at the College of Commerce in Bratislava and in 1952-1958 he was head of the Department of Economic Geography at Comenius University in Bratislava. His research was mainly devoted to the geography of tourism, the development of which was not favoured after the emergence of the new communist regime. In 1958 he was reassigned to the job of a librarian and from 1959 onwards he taught at secondary schools (Lukniš 1976).

The delay in the emergence of Marxist discontinuity in Slovakia was due to a number of factors. The Communist Party did not enjoy as much support here as in Czech part of state⁴. The first wave of purges hit the universities less intensely, not least because the Slovak academic community was still small in number and interconnected by relations of state solidarity. The communists relied on non-violent persuasion of the scientific community to apply the principles of Marxism-Leninism. The latter tried to adopt, at least formally, dialectical and historical materialism (Hudek 2017). At the Institute of Geography Slovak Academy of Sciences and Arts, research activities came to attention in 1950, when the Institute's research plan for 1951 was criticized by I. Kuhn from the Slovak Planning Office. He reproached it for not addressing the current needs of society and recommended that the Institute's staff should take models from the work of Soviet geographers and familiarise

4 Elections in 1946 in Slovakia were won by the Democratic Party, unlike in the Czechia, where the Communist Party dominated.



themselves with the correct methodology. The Institute modified the plan, abandoned the preparation of a map of Slovakia's tourism and instead included the elaboration of an economic geography of Slovakia based on the work of the Soviet geographer N.N. Baransky. In the end, this plan was not implemented because, paradoxically, the Slovak Planning Office did not make the necessary data available to the Institute (Žudel 1993).

The situation at the universities changed after the Hungarian Revolution of 1956, when the so-called working intelligentsia was suspected of supporting liberalisation efforts and opposition sentiments. The Communist party authorities pushed for the restoration of a strict class principle, which was intended to purge universities and research institutions of politically unreliable people. Instead of professional aspects, political and ideological criteria came to the fore. In 1957-1958, another wave of personnel purges began, directed against the pre-revolutionary intelligentsia, which was to be replaced by a new generation of workers educated in the socialist spirit (Hudek 2017, pp. 350-351). These processes led to the fact that the former head of the Department of Economic Geography at Comenius University in Bratislava, A. Šíma, had to leave and was replaced by K. Ivanička. A number of other workers were forced to leave, some of whom found employment at the Academy of Sciences, where conditions were more tolerant, especially in relation to religious people.

In the Geographical Journal (GJ) "Geografický časopis", during the period of our study, no article was published in the main section of research articles which explicitly promoted the emergence of Marxist discontinuity and whose diction could be compared with the works of the ardent promoters of Marxism in Czech geography. The first article published in the main section that reflected the works of Soviet geography was E. Šimo's 1952 article on the great plan for the transformation of nature in the Soviet Union and the participation of Soviet geographers in its implementation. In 1955 an article written by the Hungarian geographer T. Mendöl was published, concerning the current state of geography in Hungary. There is only a modest mention in it of the need for adequate time for Hungarian geographers to adopt Marxism-Leninism and to apply it in their works, a change that has not yet been completed (Mendöl 1955, p. 130). In 1958, an article by K. Ivanička on the subject, methods and development directions of industrial geography was published. In it, Ivanička (1958, p. 27) only mentions in passing the conclusions of the XXth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. He admits the need to use the results of bourgeois geography and gives a fairly balanced overview of the developmental directions of industrial geography in the individual countries without a strong emphasis on Soviet geography. The article is characterized by factuality and does not contain a propagandistic vocabulary as found in the articles of the aforementioned Czech geographers (Ivanička 1958). In 1960, in the main studies section of the GJ, there appeared a balance article on the development of



Slovak geography over the last 15 years. It is interesting that no author signed it, but it was published as editorial material. By comparing it with other articles published in that period (Ivanička 1962, 1963), it is possible to see the handwriting of K. Ivanička behind it. Ivanička (1962) appreciated the contribution of J. Hromádka to the development of Slovak geography. However, he criticized the generation of his pupils working at universities for persisting in the positions of the ideology of positivism. He blamed them for their isolation from political events and real life. In his view, they were at odds with the new reality and were actively preventing the reconstruction of geography on the basis of Marxism-Leninism. This attitude of theirs was manifested in the undefined geography graduates who only became acquainted with the new problems of our society in practice. According to him, this situation persisted until 1954, when it began to change gradually thanks to the merit of the young generation. His following opinion shows that at the beginning of the 1960s he considered the transformation of Slovak geography to be already complete: *"The concept of the old positivist school began to clash with the new current of progressive, Marxist-oriented geography, represented by young economic geographers. The intense ideological struggle lasted for several years, with the result that the external effect of the work done in economic geography is less than in physical geography. The ideological struggle in economic geography was on the whole confined to the universities. In fact, it has already been decided. Today in Slovakia, we have a healthy core of ideologically mature economic geographers, which is a guarantee that the development of economic geography will go in the right direction"* (Kolektív 1960). Similar conclusions can be found in another article by K. Ivanička (1963, p. 15), where he criticized geographical determinism for its connection with social Darwinism and for its use to mask the political and economic expansion of imperial powers. In addition, Ivanička also rejected geographical nihilism for completely underestimating the impact of the geographical environment on society. He took a lenient attitude towards geographical Possibilism and the French school, in which one can identify influences mediated by J. Hromádka. He identified the inclination of geographical possibilism towards positivism as a problematic aspect, for which he eventually also dismissed it as unscientific. For these reasons, he recommended paying attention to the Marxist view (Ivanička 1963, p. 16).

In the informative section of the GJ several articles appeared in this period - e.g. on the promotion of geographical knowledge in the Soviet Union (Martinka 1951), on the results of Soviet geography in individual disciplines (Kurpelová 1952, Dub 1953, Bučko 1954), on the views of Soviet geographers on new directions in French geography (Hanzlík 1952), on the tasks of the Soviet Geographical Society on the basis of the conclusions of the XIXth International Geographical Society (Hanzlík 1952), on the role of the Soviet Geographical Society in the development of geography. Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (translation of the original article by E. Šimo from 1953), the results and findings of a study tour in the



Soviet Union (Hanzlík 1958a), and the development of economic geography in the Soviet Geographical Society over the last 40 years (Hanzlík 1958b). These articles are written in a factual style without propagandistic ballast. In 1957, an extract from a paper by E. Hruška was published with the topic on the tasks of economic geography in the Second Five-Year Plan of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, which he delivered at a conference in March 1956 at the Economic Institute of the Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences in Prague. Hruška (1957, p. 50), drawing on Soviet experience, drew attention to the key role of economic geography in raising the scientific level of spatial plans for the deployment of productive forces.

An important conference on theoretical issues of geography was held in Bratislava in June 1961. It essentially completed the stage of the domestication of dialectical and historical materialism in Slovak geography. This is evident from the wording of the final resolution: *'Czechoslovak geography essentially overcame geographical determinism, which relied in its philosophical conception on mechanical materialism... what differed from geographical determinism was the geographical school, which, on the philosophical foundations of positivism, rejected the older theses on the conception of geography and oriented itself towards detailed territorial research. This school unnaturally separated science from social events. In the inter-war period, there were also views that overestimated the study of form, especially in so-called anthropogeography. Czechoslovak geography successfully overcame even these false conceptions. Soviet geography played an important role in this development'* (Kolektív 1963, p. 223).

In Slovakia, Koloman Ivanička (1929-2014) was most prominently involved in the emergence of Marxist discontinuity, who studied at the Comenius University in Bratislava in 1949-1952 and later at the University of Warsaw in 1952-1954 under prof. S. Leszczycki. He completed his doctoral studies at Charles University in Prague under prof. J. Korčák in 1959. In 1960 he was habilitated, in 1964 he was appointed an extraordinary professor and in 1975 a full professor. His career culminated in 1958-1974, when he was head of the Department of Economic Geography at Comenius University and in 1969-1970 he was a visiting professor at the University of Kent in the USA. However, his rapid career and contacts with American geography caused him problems in the workplace, where he no longer held a leading position from the mid-1970s onwards. In 1993, he went from Comenius University and in the following years built new departments at Matej Bel University in Banská Bystrica and other universities and institutions that focused on strategic planning and global studies. Within the Institute of Geography of the Slovak Academy of Sciences, the onset of Marxist discontinuity was reflected in particular by two staff members who seemed to have been tasked with this task because of their management functions at the time. Ján Hanzlík (1925-1995), who graduated in geography at the university in Bratislava. In 1949, while still a student, he joined the Institute of Geography of the Slovak Academy of Sciences and Arts, where he headed the Department of Economic Geography from 1953 to 1963. Eduard Šimo



(1923-?), who graduated in geography and history at the university in Bratislava in 1946, was another employee of this institute. In 1948 he joined the Institute of Geography, where he worked until 1953. In 1949-1952 he was the deputy administrative director of the Institute. From 1954 he worked at the Institute of Hydrology and Hydraulics of the Slovak Academy of Sciences.

FROM ANTHROPOGEOGRAPHY THROUGH SOCIETAL GEOGRAPHY TO ECONOMIC GEOGRAPHY

The rejection of anthropogeography was a significant manifestation of the onset of Marxist discontinuity. In 1949, at Charles University and in the following years at other institutions, the term ceased to be used. This was mentioned by Häufler and Střída (1950), who stated *"...in the last year, on the basis of the Soviet understanding of geography, it was possible to proceed in our country to the liquidation of anthropogeography as a bourgeois science of human society in a geographical environment and to lay the foundations of societal geography"*. (Häufler, Střída 1950, p. 8.). According to them, societal geography (in Czech *"společenská geografie"*) differs from anthropogeography in content and method. In terms of content, it concentrates on the study of the distribution of the productive forces, i.e. the means of production and people, and also examines the interventions by which society alters the geographical environment. In terms of method, it differs by moving away from examining from various idealistic perspectives to the materialistic foundations of society (Häufler, Střída 1950, p. 8). On May 31, 1950, a meeting of the working collective of societal geography at Charles University in Prague was held. Its members were the staff of the I. Department (for societal geography) of the Institute of Geography of Charles University. The subject of the meeting was the solution of current problems, especially the application of Marxism-Leninism methods in societal geography. The collective consisted of J. Doberský, O. Vrána, V. Häufler, O. Čepek, J. Dosedla, J. Kolář, V. Letošník and M. Střída (Doberský 1951). However, the term societal geography did not catch on. The term economic geography became more prominent. In a balance article published in the GJ in 1960, behind which the manuscript of K. Ivanička can be identified, was this development reflected as follows: *"Since 1948, a contradiction between the old conception of geography and the new requirements of practice and teaching has been formed. This was especially true of anthropogeography, which in its methodology, its approach to the problems studied, and its overall focus was still linked to the interwar period. Most anthropogeographers were unfamiliar with dialectical materialism and political economy. Soviet geographical works came to us in insufficient quantity and were studied mostly superficially.... Anthropogeography, both in its form and content, became an obstacle to further development. It did not study the distribution of productive forces, in which it often saw the main moments of the development of society, but on the other hand it paid too*



much attention to the effect of the environment on society. Its difference from the conception of the subject of study by economic geography, which already in form focused on the main moments of society's life, i.e. on production and, depending on the productive forces and states of production, on other problems in the field of superstructure, was becoming more and more obvious. For these reasons, in the people's democratic countries, following the example of the USSR, both the term anthropogeography and its focus began to be abandoned, and the main emphasis was given to economic geography, understood primarily as the geography of production" (Redakcia 1960, p. 81-2).

Members of the older generation, however, perceived these developments somewhat differently. This is well represented by the opinion of J. Hromádka, presented at the conference in 1953 in Liblice: *"...economic geography has reached the same position in anthropogeography as geomorphology has reached in physical geography. Most recently, it has even claimed a superior position, seeking to take over other branches of general anthropogeography as well as regional geography into its field"* (Hromádka 1954, p. 31).

CONCLUSION

In our paper we have pointed out the manifestations of the emergence of Marxist discontinuity in Czechoslovak geographic thought. As a theoretical-methodological framework for our investigation, we applied the Latour-Barnes model of the disciplinary change. On the basis of content and discursive analysis of texts published in the two most important geographical periodicals, *Sborník Československé společnosti zeměpisné* and *Geografický časopis*, we found differences in the course of the mobilization and autonomization stages of the Marxist discontinuity in Czech and Slovak geography. In Czech geography, the onset occurred practically immediately after the onset of the communist regime in 1948. This is evidenced by the rejection of anthropogeography at Charles University in 1949 and a series of propaganda articles published in the most important Czech geographical periodical. The leading participants of this phase were predominantly members of the young generation of Czech geographers - V. Häufler, M. Macka, M. Střída. From the older generation, J. Pohl - Doberský and from the middle generation M. Blažek were more prominent. In Slovakia, the onset of Marxist discontinuity was delayed, which was related to the influence of several factors. One of them was the great authority of J. Hromádka, who educated the first generation of Slovak geographers. Hromádka did not show much effort to accept the new paradigm, which resulted in his gradual marginalisation. Most of his pupils either only formally tried to register the onset of the sovietization of Slovak geography, or preferred to focus on physical geography, which was not affected by the ideological indoctrination of Marxism. After the tightening of the personnel policy and the purges at Slovak universities in 1957-1958, Marxism managed to take root in Slovak geography as well, and



K. Ivanička, as a representative of the rising generation of geographers, was the one who contributed most to this. However, discursive analysis of the texts shows that even he did not use such a militant and propagandistic vocabulary as his Czech counterparts at the beginning of the 1950s. The onset of Marxist discontinuity led to the rejection of anthropogeography and its replacement by economic geography, whose main task was to investigate the distribution of productive forces within the conceptual framework of dialectical and historical materialism. Applications of economic geography in regional and spatial planning were also developed.

Acknowledgement

The paper was elaborated within the VEGA project No.2/0024/21 „Relationships of Paradigms in Slovak Geographical Thought: Competition, Indifference or Cooperation ?“

REFERENCES

- AITKEN, S., VALENTINE, G., eds. (2006). *Approaches to Human Geography*. 1. Vyd. London: SAGE. 349 s. ISBN 978-0-7619-4263-4.
- BLAŽEK, M. (1953). Význam práce J.V. Stalina „Ekonomické problémy socializmu v SSSR“ pro československou hospodářskou geografii. *Sborník Československé společnosti zeměpisné*, 58, 1, 1-6.
- BUČKO, Š. (1954). Výskum erózie pôdy v SSSR. *Geografický časopis*, 6, 1-2, 87-90.
- CONNELLY, J. (2008). *Zotročená univerzita. Sovětizace vysokého školství ve východním Německu, v českých zemích a v Polsku v letech 1945-1956*. Praha: Karolinum. 498 s.
- CONNELLY, J. (2000). *Captive University: The Sovietization of East German, Czech, and Polish Higher Education, 1945-1956*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- DOBERSKÝ, J. (1951). Úspěchy ruské a sovětské geografie. *Sborník Československé společnosti zeměpisné*, 56, 1-2, 27-44.
- DOBERSKÝ, J. (1955). Význam Československé společnosti zeměpisné pro vývoj našeho zeměpisu. *Sborník Československé společnosti zeměpisné*, 60, 3, 159-170.
- DUB, O. (1953). O smere vývoja sovietskej hydrológie. *Geografický časopis*, 5, 1-2, 83-84.
- GABZDILOVÁ, S. (2018). *Ako sme študovali v totalite*. Prešov: Universum, 143 s. ISBN 978-80-89946-05-1.
- GINELLI, Z. (2018). Critical Remarks on the “Sovietization” of Hungarian Human Geography. In Hîncu, A., Karady, V., eds. *Social Sciences in the Other Europe since 1945*. Budapest: Pasts, Inc., Center for Historical Studies, Central European University. pp. 52-89.
- GYŐRI, R. (2015). Communist Geography Instead of Nationalist Geography: The New Cadres and the Case of Sándor Radó. *Hungarian Cultural Studies*. e-Journal of the American Hungarian Educators Association, 8: <http://ahea.pitt.edu> DOI: 10.5195/ahea.2015.222



- GYŐRI, R., GYURIS, F. (2012). The Sovietisation of Hungarian Geography, 1945-1960. *Mitteilungen der Österreichischen Geographischen Gesellschaft*, 154. Jg. (Jahresband), s. 107–128.
- GYŐRI, R., GYURIS, F. (2015). Knowledge and Power in Sovietized Hungarian Geography. In Meusburger, P., Gregory, D., Suarsana, L., eds. *Geographies of Knowledge and Power* (Knowledge and Space; 7). Dordrecht: Springer., pp. 203-233.
- GYURIS, F., GYŐRI, R. (2013). Sovietized science at the service of "socialist national economy". The example of Hungarian geography, 1945–1960. *Berichte. Geographie und Landeskunde*, 87, 1, 7–24.
- HANZLÍK, J. (1952). Názory sovietskych geografov na nové smery vo francúzskej geografii. *Geografický časopis*, 4, 3-4, 156-160.
- HANZLÍK, J. (1957). Pracovná porada o problémoch hospodárskej geografie v ČR. *Geografický časopis*, 9, 1, 46-49.
- HANZLÍK, J. (1958). Zpráva o študijnej ceste v SSSR. *Geografický časopis*, 10, 3, 228-234.
- HANZLÍK, J. (1958). Ekonomická geografia v Geografickej spoločnosti SSSR za 40 rokov sovietskej vlády. *Geografický časopis*, 10, 4, 294-299.
- HANZLÍK, J., MAZÚR, E. (1955). VI. sjazd československých zemepiscov v Smoleniciach. *Geografický časopis*, 7, 3-4, 230-237.
- HÄUFLER, V. (1967). *Dějiny geografie na Univerzitě Karlově 1348-1967*, Univerzita Karlova, Praha.
- HÄUFLER, V., STRÍDA, M. (1950). Za marxistickou geografii (diskuse o problémech zeměpisu). *Sborník Československé společnosti zeměpisné*, 55, 1-2, 180-186.
- HROMÁDKA, J. (1954). Hospodářský zeměpis. Pracovní konference vědeckých pracovníků v Liblicích 1953. Referáty a diskuse. *Sborník Československé společnosti zeměpisné*, 59, 1, příloha, s. 31-39.
- HRUŠKA, E. (1957). O niektorých naliehavých úlohách hospodárskej geografie v druhom päťročnom pláne v ČSR. *Geografický časopis*, 9, 1, 50-53.
- HUDEK, A. (2010). *Najpolitickejšia veda: slovenská historiografia v rokoch 1948-1968*. Bratislava: Historický ústav SAV.
- HUDEK, A. (2017). Sovietizácia pracovísk historickej vedy na Univerzite Komenského v 50. rokoch. In Slobodník, M., Glossová, M., eds. *95 rokov Filozofickej fakulty UK. Pohľad do dejín inštitúcie a jej akademickej obce*. Bratislava: Univerzita Komenského, s. 338-354.
- IRA, V., ĎURIŠOVÁ, E., ŠUŠKA, P. (2020). Geografický časopis: sedemdesiat rokov formovania geografického myslenia na Slovensku. *Geografický časopis*, 72, 4, 391-416.
- IVANIČKA, K. (1956). Zpráva o založení Slovenskej zemepisnej spoločnosti pri SAV, odboru Československej spoločnosti zemepisnej pri ČSAV. *Geografický časopis*, 8, 2-3, 142-143.
- IVANIČKA, K. (1958). Predmet, metódy a vývinové smery geografie priemyslu. *Geografický časopis*, 10, 1, 27-40.



- IVANIČKA, K. (1962). K niektorým ideovým problémom rozvoja slovenskej geografie. In *Sborník II, 1960, Univerzita Komenského v Bratislave*. Bratislava: Slovenské pedagogické nakladateľstvo, s. 395-398.
- IVANIČKA, K. (1963). Ekonomická geografia. In Ivanička, K., ed. *Teoretické problémy geografie. Acta Geologica et Geographica Universitatis Comenianae, Geographica*, č. 3, Bratislava: SPN, s. 11-27.
- JELEČEK, L., CHROMÝ, P., MARTÍNEK, J. (2006). Vývoj geografie na Univerzitě Karlově v kontextu české geografie od poloviny 19. století. *Geografie – Sborník České geografické společnosti*, 111, 4, 343-367.
- JELEČEK, L., MARTÍNEK, J. (2007). Nástin dějin České geografické společnosti. *Klaudyán*, 4, 2, 42-48.
- JOHNSTON, R. (2006). The politics of changing human geography's agenda: textbooks and the representation of increasing diversity. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 31, 3, 286-303.
- KOLEKTÍV. (1963). Rezolúcia vedeckej konferencie o teoretických problémoch geografie. In Ivanička, K., ed.: *Teoretické problémy geografie. Acta Geologica et Geographica Universitatis Comenianae, Geographica*, č. 3, Bratislava: SPN, s. 223-229.
- KORČÁK, J. (1954). Regionální zeměpis. Pracovní konference vědeckých pracovníků v Liblicích 1953. Referáty a diskuse. *Sborník Československé společnosti zeměpisné*, 59, 1, příloha, s. 39-50.
- KORČÁK, J. (1955). Deset let československé hospodářské geografie. *Sborník Československé společnosti zeměpisné*, 60, 3, 180-186.
- KRÁL, J., KONDRACKI, J. (1951). West Slav Geographers, In G. Taylor (red.), *Geography in the Twentieth Century*, Methuen, London, 116-127.
- KURPELOVÁ, M. (1952). Stav, význam a úlohy sovietskej fenológie. *Geografický časopis*, 4, 3-4, 155-156.
- LUKNIŠ, M. (1976). Za docentom RNDr. Antonom Šímom. *Geografický časopis*, 28, 3, 248-249.
- MACKA, M. (1953). Význam díla J.V. Stalina pro geografii. *Sborník Československé společnosti zeměpisné*, 58, 2, 65-69.
- MARTÍNEK, J., MARTÍNEK, M. (1998). *Kdo byl kdo. Naši cestovatelé a geografové*. Praha: Libri. 509 s. ISBN 80-85983-50-8.
- MARTÍNEK, J. (2012). Geograf z Orlických hor Josef Pohl-Doberský. In *Orlické hory a Podorlicko: sborník vlastivědných prací : přírodou, dějinami, současností*, sv. 19, 201-206.
- MARTINKA, J. (1951). Propagácia geografických vedomostí v SSSR. *Zemepisný sborník SAVU*, roč. 3, 187-189.
- MATLEY, I.M. (1966). The Marxist Approach to the Geographical Environment. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 56, 1, 97-111, DOI: 10.1111/j.1467-8306.1966.tb00546.



- MATLOVIČ, R.; MATLOVIČOVÁ, K. (2015). *Geografické myslenie*. Prešov: Fakulta humanitných a prírodných vied Prešovskej univerzity., 321 p.
- MATLOVIČ, R.; MATLOVIČOVÁ, K. (2020). First and second order discontinuities in world geographical thought and their primary reception in Slovak geography. *Folia Geographica*, 62, 1, 52-76.
- MENDÖL, T. (1955). Terajší stav zemepisu v Maďarsku. *Geografický časopis*, 7, 3-4, 129-133.
- NOWAKOWSKI, S. (1928, *Marksizm a geografia gospodarcza*, Biblioteka Ruchu Prawnego, Ekonomicznego i Socjologicznego, t. 12, Poznań.
- OLDFIELD, J.D., SHAW, D. J.B. (2015). A Russian geographical tradition? The contested canon of Russian and Soviet geography, 1884-1953. *Journal of Historical Geography*, 49, 75-84.
- REDAKCIA. (1960). Vývoj geografie na Slovensku za 15 rokov slobodnej ČSR. *Geografický časopis*, 12, 2, 81-85.
- SANKE, H. (1955). K socialistické theorii hospodárske geografie. *Sborník Československé společnosti zeměpisné*, 60, 1, 51-55.
- SAUSHKIN, Y. G. (1976). *Ekonomická geografia. História, teória, metódy, prax*. Bratislava: Univerzita Komenského, Prírodovedecká fakulta. 216 p.
- SIRÁCKY, A. (1957). Desať rokov slovenskej vedy a kultúry 1945-1955. In Vietor, M. red. *Univerzita Komenského v Bratislave 1945-1955*. Bratislava: Rektorát Univerzity Komenského, s. 5-29.
- SHAW, D.J.B., OLDFIELD, J.D. (2007). Landscape science: a Russian geographical tradition, *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 97, 1, 111-126.
- SHAW, D.J.B., OLDFIELD, J.D. (2008). Totalitarianism and geography: L.S. Berg and the defence of an academic discipline in the age of Stalin. *Political Geography*, 27, 1, 96-112. ISSN 0962-6298
- STRÍDA, M. (1954). X. sjezd KSČ a nové úkoly geografie. *Sborník Československé společnosti zeměpisné*, 59, 2, 212-216.
- ŠIMO, E. (1952). Velký plán premeny prírody v SSSR a účasť sovietskych geografov na jeho uskutočňovaní. *Geografický časopis*, 4, 1-2, 103-107.
- ŠIMO, E. (1953). Úlohy Zemepisnej spoločnosti SSSR vyplývajúce z uznesení XIX. sjazdu KSSS. *Geografický časopis*, 5, 3-4, 267-274.
- TRÁVNÍČEK, D. (1984). *Dějiny geografie mezi oběma světovými válkami*, PF UJEP, Brno.
- TRICART, J. (1952). Geomorfologie a marxizmus. *Sborník Československé společnosti zeměpisné*, 57, 1, 40-49.
- URBÁŠEK, P., PULEC, J. (2012). *Vysokoškolský vzdělávací systém v letech 1945-1969*. Olomouc: Univerzita Palackého. 433 p.
- ŽUDEL, J. (1993). Dejiny Zemepisného ústavu Slovenskej akadémie vied a umení v r. 1943-1953. *Geografický časopis*, 45, 4, 309-216.