KOSMAS

N° 24.1

by the Czechoslovak Society of Arts and Sciences (SVU)

KOSMAS ISSN 1056-005X

Kosmas: Czechoslovak and Central European Journal
(Formerly *Kosmas: Journal of Czechoslovak and Central European Studies*, Vols. 1-7, 1982-88, and *Czechoslovak and Central European Journal*, Vols. 8-11, 1989-93).

Kosmas is a peer-reviewed, multidisciplinary journal that focuses on Czech, Slovak, and Central European Studies. It is published bi-annually by the Czechoslovak Society of Arts and Sciences (SVU).

Subscription orders and inquiries and address changes should be sent to Frank Safertal, Subscriptions Editor, at 5529 Whitley Park Terrace, Bethesda, MD 20814, USA Tel: 301-564-9081 Fax: 301-564-9069, E-mail address: <ojsafertal@comcast.net>. Checks should be made out to "SVU." In the US and Canada, an individual one-year subscription to Kosmas is $32.00 ($27.00 for current members of the SVU, $43.00 for libraries and other institutions). In Europe, the rates are $37.00 ($32.00 for SVU members, $48.00 for institutions). For other international subscribers, the rates are $37.00, $32.00, and $48.00, respectively.

Manuscript submissions, books for review, and correspondence concerning editorial matters should be sent to Clinton Machann, Editor, *Kosmas*, Department of English, 4227 TAMU, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX 77843-4227, USA. E-mail address: <c-machann @tamu.edu>. Fax: 979-862-2292. Requirements and stylistic guidelines for manuscript submissions are given on the inside back cover. Please send manuscripts for book reviews or suggestions for books to be reviewed to Mary Hrabík Šámal, Book Review Editor, *Kosmas*, 2130 Babcock, Troy, MI 48084. E-mail address: <maruska@earthlink.net>.

Kosmas website: http://www-english.tamu.edu/pubs/kosmas

Printed by Tops Printing, 2023 S. Texas Avenue, Bryan, TX 77802

CONTENTS

Editor's Notes

In the past our readers have learned much about the foundations of philosophical and political thought in early Czechoslovakia and the ideas of its first president, Tomáš G. Masaryk, from Zdeněk V. David. We are pleased to open this Fall 2010 issue of *Kosmas* with another article by David, one in which he explores Masaryk's ideas about the psychological and philosophical causes of World War I, placing them in the context of the German philosophical tradition and emphasizing "the murderous desire to escape from sickly subjectivism" rather than the economic, political and military issues that are usually stressed in such discussions. David's conclusion that Masaryk's expectation that, after the war, Germany would leave its spiritual isolation and return to humanistic ideals came "one war too early" is especially poignant.

Jaroslav Pánek, another author familiar to readers of *Kosmas*, then offers a survey of humanities scholarship in the Czech Academy of Sciences and Czech universities since the Velvet Revolution (1990-2010). This is a very relevant topic for our journal, which publishes articles on subjects related to history, culture, philosophy, literature and other disciplines in the humanities on a regular basis, but who would have predicted that Pánek would begin his fascinating discussion with an account of Czech Egyptology?

Moving to an international political topic, Petr Anděl analyzes the "asymmetric" structure of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization as a key to understanding "mutual Czech-American military cooperation." Readers may recall an earlier article in which he discusses the implications of NATO enlargement for the former Czechoslovakia (Spring 2007).

In recent issues we have published several studies of individual political and cultural figures of some significance in Czech and Slovak history. Now Josette Baer gives us an "intellectual portrait" of Franko V. Sasinek (1830-1914), Slovak Catholic priest, historian and patriot, who can be compared to the Czech František Palacký. Sasinek was an eccentric man, in some ways old-fashioned in his views, but Baer emphasizes his commitment to Slovak nationalism.

We turn to a literary topic with Laura Ivins-Hulley's "Amorphous Identity in Eva Švankmajerová's *Baradla Cave*." Anyone with an interest in Czech and Slovak surrealism is probably aware of the work of this painter, ceramicist, and writer, the wife of filmmaker and sculptor Frank Švankmajer. Ivins-Hulley offers sociopolitical interpretations of Švankmajerová's 1981 novel but stresses "the fluidity of meaning in the surrealist text and the importance of shared knowledge."

The article with the broadest coverage in this issue is Miloslav Rechcígl's "critical retrospective look" at publications that have been written about the history of Czechs and Slovaks in America. As is widely known, Rechcígl has devoted much of his career to historical and bibliographical studies of Czech and Slovak cultural heritage in America, and we can be sure that this comprehensive survey of historical works will be consulted by researchers in the field for many years to come. I hope that many readers of our journal will pass along Rechcígl's article to children and grandchildren who have an interest in Czech-American and Slovak-American history.

The first essay in this issue is by Ivo K. Feierabend, who takes a look at Mary Heimann's controversial new book, *Czechoslovakia: The State That*

Failed. Feierabend's critical comments can be compared with those of Peter Hruby in his review of the same book, later in this issue, but I want to assure our readers that the critical opinions independently submitted by Feierabend and Hruby were not the result of some sort of collaboration by *Kosmas* contributors or editorial staff.

Kenji Hotta's essay about Hideo Satsuma's *Tales from Czech History* provides a unique perspective on Czech history: Hotta himself is a graduate student at Tokai University in Tokyo who analyzes a popular Czech history book written by a Japanese scholar. (Hotta's professor and dissertation director, Joseph N. Rostinsky, has published in *Kosmas*, as readers may recall.) These men are informed by an implicit comparative Japanese-Czech point of view. Some readers may be surprised to learn that Satsuma's books about the Czechs are "readily available" in Japanese bookstores. Interesting indeed.

Readers who attended the 25th World Congress of the SVU in Tábor, Czech Republic, last June 27-July 2 may very well recall the moving account that Eva Stanovska Jonas gave of her father, the heroic WWII pilot and tragic political figure Vilem Stanovksy (1896-1972) in her presentation there. I am pleased to say that a version of Jonas's memoir appears in this issue, and I should note that the articles by David and Pánek, as well as the essay by Feierabend, also originated in papers delivered at the conference.

This issue also includes Virginia Parobek's interview with Andrew Wachtel, editor of *Writers for an Unbound Europe*, who formerly served in academic positions associated with Slavic studies in the US and is now president of the American University of Central Asia in Bishkek, Kyrgyzstan.

In addition to the review of the Heimann book by Hruby, there are reviews by Tracy Burns, Anthony C. Slaughter, Aurel Braun, and Zdeněk Salzmann. Among the authors and editors covered are Ivan Klíma, Peter Hruby, Mitchell A. Orenstein, Stephen Bloom, Nicole Lindstrom, and Petr Karlík.

I want to thank our new Assistant Editor Sofia Prado, as well as Book Review Editor Mary Hrabík Šámal and Managing Editor David Chroust, for their hard work on this issue.

ARTICLES

Tomáš G. Masaryk on Psychological and Philosophical Causes of World War I[1]

By Zdeněk V. David

T. G. Masaryk's approach to the causes of World War I on the German side appears unusual in its focus on philosophy's effect on psychology.[2] Most interpreters who have sought the causes of World War I have tended to stress, on the German side, political and economic factors rather than philosophical and psychological ones, as Masaryk does. This approach goes as far back as Lenin, who in the 1917 treatise, *Imperialism as the Highest Stage of Capitalism,* combined the political and economic causes, deriving his inspiration to a considerable degree from John A. Hobson's *Imperialism* (1902).[3] Recent scholarship has tended to perpetuate the political and economic approach. The famous interpretation by Fritz Fischer, launched in Germany in 1961 and continuing as a controversy for a quarter century, ascribed the cause of World War I to the desires of Germany's leaders for world power and for perpetuation of the conservative social and political system, which derived from the Prussian tradition.[4] Subsequent research has tended to stress the complexity of political issues and questions of military planning.[5]

At present it has become easier to confront Masaryk's interpretation with the German philosophical scene. The war-time views of German thinkers, which had been difficult to trace, are now being put into circulation. Previously, reference works were generally silent about the writings and attitudes of German philosophers on the war issues during World War I. This appears to be true of the following, discussed later in this paper: Rudolf Eucken, Willy Moog, Paul Natorp, Max Scheler, Heinrich Scholz, Werner Sombart, Ernst Troeltsch, Alfred Weber, Wilhelm Wundt, and Leopold Ziegler. Accounts of their writings and activities during the war are missing in the standard German encyclopedias and biographic dictionaries.[6] The situation, however, has been improving due the unearthing of relevant information, largely thanks to Kurt Flasch and H. Sebastian Luft,[7] although some beginnings were made in that regard by Fritz K. Ringer and Hermann Lübbe.[8]

In this study Masaryk's derivation of German bellicosity will be traced to his explorations of Germany's intellectual, and particularly philosophical, heritage. The results will be related to Masaryk's investigation of Dostoevsky's vision of a reciprocal connection, in the mentality of the modern man, between the subjective violence against the self and the objective violence directed against the others. Finally, the relevance of Masaryk's interpretation will be tested through an examination of the attitudes of German philosophers, at the time of World War I, toward their intellectual tradition.

Psychological Causes

In his initial writings, Masaryk tended to concentrate on man's violence against himself, that is, the question of suicide. In his inaugural dissertation (the so-called *Habilitationschrift*) at the University of Vienna, *Sebevražda hromadným jevem společenským moderní osvěty* (Suicide as a Large-Scale Phenomenon in Modern Culture) in 1881, he traced the root of the increased tendency toward suicides to the growing irreligiosity of the masses.[9] Monothe-

istic religions were not favorable to suicide -- whether Christianity, Judaism, or Islam. The idea of God as a loving Father and protector of the universe, especially of mankind, provided support for humanity in its travails and tribulations. Pantheism, on the other hand, tended to support the trend toward self-destruction; this was true of Buddhist pantheism and also of Stoic pantheism.[10] To highlight the difference in attitude, Masaryk pointed out that Blaise Pascal painted the meaninglessness of human life in even darker colors than Schopenhauer, yet he did not succumb to pessimism. The reason was that, unlike Schopenhauer. Pascal was a theist, and theism was never pessimistic, even if it did not value human life as highly as the Gospels did.[11]

Yet, already at this early stage Masaryk hinted at the suicide-murder syndrome and at the exceptional role that this psychological mechanism played in the mentality of contemporary Germany. He advanced the concept of Titanism, according to which modern man, who denied the existence of God, began to feel powerful and Godlike, and hence also as a master of life and death.[12] In Masaryk's opinion, the condition of irreligiousness was most pronounced in Protestant Germany where, since Kant, scholarship had become clearly anti-Christian. Even German theologians entered the campaign for discrediting traditional Christian orthodoxy. The first manifestation resulting from the new irreligiosity was to look for solace in morbid Romanticism, which sacrificed reason to emotion. A typical fruit of this mentality was Goethe's novel, *The Sorrows of Young Werther*. The most recent German intellectual current was pessimism, expressing modern weariness of life and a theoretical justification of suicide.[14]

Philosophical Causes

Soon after his initial study of the causes of suicide, Masaryk turned specifically to exploring the philosophical roots of the intellectual and moral malaise in Germany's life. He concluded that the subjective approach to knowledge and existence was a curse of the German philosophical tradition. This epistemological and metaphysical asymmetry had serious consequences: the extremes of solipsism and pantheism. In his early work *Pokus o konkrétní logiku* (Essay of Concrete Logic) (1887), Masaryk noted that Kant had reduced philosophy to logic and thus exaggerated his own view of the static condition of the world. Masaryk also noted that Hegel committed the cardinal error by, in effect, turning logic into metaphysics. Moreover, he tried to remedy Kant's static view by his philosophy of development, which seemed to be a brilliant achievement, but unfortunately it lacked (just like Kant's criticism) a psychological sobriety.[15] In *Modern Man and Religion* (1896-98), Masaryk pointed out that the Post-Kantian development of German philosophy revealed the great flaw of subjectivism, whereby Hegel (as well as Fichte) had pushed Kant's view into a logical conclusion with their Absolute Idealism.[16] Much later, Masaryk restated his position in his conversations with Karel Čapek in the 1920s, as follows: Kant set modern philosophy on the wrong path and escaped radical subjectivism by postulating the unknowable thing-in-itself, the noumenon. Fichte overcame Kant's dichotomy by "Absolute Idealism," that is, solipsism. Against this Fichtean extreme, Hegel posited a – presumably comforting -- Objective Idealism, in which the absolute subject was renamed "Objective Spirit," but it was the same thing.[17]

The extreme epistemological and metaphysical self-centeredness of

the classical German idealists (Kant, Fichte, Schelling and Hegel) led to what Masaryk called the "Faust Complex" in German culture.[18] As pointed out earlier, Masaryk referred to this phenomenon as "Titanism," by which the modern man felt himself powerful/Godlike as a master over life and death.[19] He saw in this phenomenon the roots of the modern man's inclination to self-destruction.[20] One way to escape the sense of psychological isolation and despair, resulting from this predicament, was to embrace pantheism. Hegel's pantheism – from the philosophical and sociological viewpoint – was an attempt to overcome "the illusion of individual consciousness" and especially "the illusion of sense perception." These "illusions" were to be ontically negated by "reason" -- not an ordinary reason, but a higher "dialectical" reason, the World Spirit.[21] Taking umbrage under the World Spirit also had the unfortunate consequence of releasing the individual from his sense of personal moral response bility.[22]

In a way, Masaryk preferred Schopenhauer and Nietzsche to the classical German idealists. While the latter interpreted the world process as an unfolding of a universal reason and postulated a number of metaphysical stages and entities that parodied Christian dogmas, Schopenhauer and Nietzsche saw the world process more credibly as the austere unembellished manifestation of a cosmic will. In the end, however, Masaryk also judged them severely. They intensified the despair of individual isolation, which derived from classical idealism, by adding the putative Nihilism of the cosmic will, and the visceral anger, which resulted from their pessimistic outlook.[23]

Schopenhauer's Nihilism sprang, according to Masaryk, from his metaphysical belief in a blind will aiming at nothing in particular. While this belief originated in his radical individualism, its consequence was an attitude of pervasive anger. Schopenhauer's outlook exemplifies an angry pessimism that was born from an excessive concentration on the self.[24]Therefore, the substance of Schopenhauer's pessimism was wrath and fury, aiming at external violence, rather than a suicidal despair.[25] While subjectively pessimism could lead man to a negation of life – in extreme cases to self-destruction, the objective pessimism in extreme cases led to murder. It was a cause of critique, revolt, and defiance. This outwardly directed pessimist anger, in its societal manifestation, could lead to embracing a socialist revolution, as it had done in Karl Marx.[26]

In Nietzsche's case, Masaryk found the same heavy gloom of a pessimistic outlook (as in Schopenhauer), which was ultimately traceable to the subjectivism of the German idealists.[27] As a new interpretation, he attributed the anxiety creating a sense of egotistic isolation in Nietzsche to the influence of Max Stirner (1806-1856).[28] Furthermore, Masaryk advanced the poignant suggestion that Nietzsche experienced a distinct kind of pleasure from suffering.[29] In Nietzsche's case – as in the case of Schopenhauer -- Masaryk was also concerned with the problem of Nihilism.[30] He attributed the roots of Nietzsche's Nihilism not only to a perception of the meaninglessness of the cosmic Will, but also to his rejection of all existing values, which needed to be revised (transvalued). Moreover, Masaryk connected Nietzsche's Nihilism with anarchism and cultural Decadence rather than with the socialist revolutionarism, in which he had seen the principal impact of Schopenhauer's nihilist outlook. In sum, the pessimism and Nihilism of Schopenhauer and Nietzsche, according to Masaryk – like the extreme self-centeredness of the classical Ger-

man idealists -- produced a shaken, even deranged state of mind, which might lead a man to killing himself, or to killing others, and above all to the catastrophe of war. To get rid of one's own life or to deprive somebody else of life was nihilistic: a sudden appearance of nothing, death and nothingness.[31]

Dostoevsky's Paradigm

Masaryk in his later writing stressed the similarity of his views with Dostoevsky's linkage of suicide and murder. However, as he tells us, he was not familiar with Dostoevsky's views when he wrote his first major work on the topic, his treatise on *Suicide* in 1881.[32] Although he learned Russian during his university studies, he began to delve seriously into Russian literature and philosophy only in 1887 when – partly to refresh himself after the controversies about the false Czech manuscripts – he resolved to travel in Russia.[33] He then reached a conclusion about the prominence of Dostoevsky's ideas and art and planned to write a history of Russian philosophy and intellectual life centering on Dostoevsky's thought. In the end his *Russia and Europe* assumed another form, but he planned to append an extensive study of Dostoevsky as a third volume.[34]

Masaryk addressed the theme of Dostoevsky's treatment of suicide in his article "Spisy F. M. Dostojevského" (Writings of F. M. Dostoevsky) which appeared originally in 1892 in the newspaper *Čas*. Masaryk praised Dostoevsky's insight into the problem of self-destruction – coinciding with his own diagnosis – as the consequence of modern atheism which, having deposed God, had set man up onto God's judgment seat. Consequently, Man-God had the right to revise nature and history; he was a law-giver.[35] Masaryk pointed out that the ensuing syndrome of suicide-murder became for Dostoevsky a crucial problem of life. Dostoevsky had discoursed about the "right to murder" in *Crime and Punishment,* and in *The Brothers Karamazov,* and had philosophized about suicide in *The Idiot* and *The Possessed*, as well as in *The Brothers Karamazov* and the article "The Judgment."[36]

Masaryk undertook a pointed analysis of Dostoevsky's paradigm in his major work, *The Social Question*, published originally in 1898. According to Dostoevsky, suicide and murder were twin phenomena, stemming from two kinds of pessimism. While subjective pessimism could lead man to a negation of life – in extreme cases to suicide, objective pessimism in extreme cases led to murder. The latter was pessimistic of critique, revolt, and defiance. This objectively directed pessimism could also be called anarchism or Nihilism. He saw this attitude exhibited in "the poisoned souls" of characters in Dostoevsky's novels, such as Raskolnikov or Ivan Karamazov.[37] In Masaryk's opinion, Dostoevsky in all his writings, novels, and articles had grappled with this double issue in its several forms and variants, as he was driven by the need to understand the psychological, social and metaphysical problem of atheism, which led inwardly to despondency; and outwardly to a revolutionary zeal (oriented toward the committing of murder).[38] Subjective and objective pessimism were in an inverse relationship. There were fewer murders, where there were many suicides, and vice versa. The two were incompatible like melancholy and exaltation, or "like tears and anger." Masaryk summed up Dostoevsky's view thus: "Suicide is a delirium of subjectivism, murder a delirium of objectivism. Both are rooted in egotism: One because he cannot love, the other because he hates."[39]

Masaryk returned to Dostoevsky's paradigm when writing his large treatise, *Russland und Europa,* in 1907 (later known in English as *The Spirit of Russia*). The book was to include a large section on Dostoevsky which, however, was published only after World War I, as *Boje o Boha. Dostojevskij: filozof dějin ruského problému* (Struggles about God. Dostoevsky as a Philosopher of the History of the Russian Question), with chapter nine titled "Murder and Suicide."[40] At the start, Masaryk reiterated that his special interest in Dostoevsky arose because Dostoevsky was concerned by similar problems as he was, particularly in his treatise, *Sebevražda,*[41] — Dostoevsky saw the ultimate outcome of modern atheism in that the atheist kills himself or kills another.[42] Masaryk, however, also noted a certain differentiation that Dostoevsky made between suicide and murder. He more often dealt with murder than with suicide. Only one story, *Něžná,* was entirely devoted to suicide.[43] He treated murder at length in *Crime and Punishment*; more briefly in *The Possessed, The Brothers Karamazov,* and *The Idiot.* Suicide reappeared in *The Possessed* (double), *The Adolescent* (suicide of Kraft), and in *The Brothers Karamazov*, as the death of Smerdiakov.[44]

Suicide and murder were sharply distinguished by Dostoevsky in *The Possessed*. Kirillov considered murder "the lowest manifestation of my free will", while suicide was the "highest manifestation." Verkhovensky, on the contrary, stated that, in order to show his free will, he would kill somebody else, rather than himself.[45] In this connection, Masaryk pointed out – not without a critical undertone – that Dostoevsky regarded the twin phenomenon of murder/suicide too starkly as a logical process.[46] Masaryk was openly critical of Dostoevsky's philosophical formula in *The Brothers Karamazov.* He felt that it was a mere play on words when Dostoevsky equated the suicide of the rich with the murder committed by the poor. According to this comparison, the rich, on their part, isolated themselves in their luxury and thus committed a spiritual suicide. Masaryk saw no equivalence here: the poor murdered really and brutally, the rich killed themselves only "spiritually."[47] Eventually, however, Masaryk endorsed Dostoevsky's views without any reservations. In the preface to a new edition of the *Sebevražda* in 1926, he quoted, expressing approval, long passages from Dostoevsky's *The Possessed* (1871-72) and *The Diary of a Writer* (1876) to the effect that suicide becomes a logical necessity for a man who had lost faith, first, in the immortality of human soul and, second, in the existence of God. Masaryk again noted that he had not known of Dostoevsky's ideas when he wrote his own book originally, but subsequently discovered an amazing coincidence between them and his own.[48]

Dostoevsky and German Philosophy

Considering the role that German philosophy played in Masaryk's interpretation of the roots of modern man's metaphysical despair and predicament, it is rather paradoxical that Masaryk prior to World War I did not try to link the influence of German philosophy in Russia with Dostoevsky's observations on the suicide/murder syndrome in Russia. Although he acknowledged a tremendous impact of German thought on the Russian intelligentsia,[59] he did not trace Dostoevsky's views or the views of his fictional characters to sources of German ideas. Some commentators and historians, however, have sought influences of German philosophy on Dostoevsky's treatment of his characters, and some evidence has been cited concerning his interest in German thinkers,

especially in Kant and Hegel.[50]

While in exile in Siberia, Dostoevsky asked in 1854 for books, including Kant's *Critique of Pure Reason* and works of Hegel, especially his *History of Philosophy.*[51] In November 1854, young baron Aleksander E. Wrangel, who knew Dostoevsky in Siberia, wrote to his father that he and Dostoevsky intended to translate Hegel's *Philosophy*.[52] Apparently the project did not proceed very smoothly since – according to Wrangel – Dostoevsky "did not know German and did not like the language...."[53] According to Dmytro Chyzhevskyi, Dostoevsky gained some knowledge of Hegel through his cooperation with Strakhov in the early 1860s. Appolinaria Suslova reminisced that during their joint travel in Italy, Dostoevsky, in discussing philosophy, attempted to explain to her certain Hegelian ideas, especially the "reality of concept" (Realtät des Begriffs).[54] Likewise, Chyzhevskyi claimed that Dostoevsky was enthusiastic about Herzen's articles from the 1840s on Hegel's philosophy, and still in 1872 recommended them as "the best philosophy not only in Russia—but in Europe."[55]

As for reflections of German thought in Dostoevsky's literary characters, Irena Paperno has claimed that Kant's influence on Dostoevsky remains underestimated, especially the role of antinomies of pure reason, the dilemma of moral and religious truth of practical reason, and the denial of this truth by pure reason. Facing the dilemma of Kant's antinomy of the moral necessity for God's existence and empirical knowledge of God's absence Kirillov in *The Possessed* attempted to resolve it by assuming the role of God: "If there is no God than I am God." Thus, this was another source of Dostoevsky's familiar dictum that suicide was a natural consequence of a Godless universe.[56] As for Hegel, in Kirillov's decision to commit suicide, Hegel's dictum "being and not being is the same" (Sein und Nichtsein ist dasselbe) had been a factor.[57] According to Carr, the Hegelian postulate of thesis and antithesis inspired Dostoevsky's psychological theory, in which "the presence of the "lower" as well as the "higher" element was necessary in order to produce a synthesis...."[58] Paperno saw the influence of Schopenhauer in Kirillov's assertion that a barrier to suicide was the fear of pain; otherwise, virtually all would seek self-destruction.[59]

As for Masaryk, he posited a link between the aberrations of Dostoevsky's characters and the effect of German philosophy on them only in his reflections subsequent to World War I. In his war memoirs, *Světová revoluce za války a ve válce* (subsequently translated into English, as *The Making of a State: Memories and Observations*), he pointed out that the problem of murder was analyzed intensively in Russian literature with Dostoevsky playing a leading role. In his novel, *Crime and Punishment*, Dostoevsky probed the mentality of the young student Razkolnikov who, having his mind confused by European, mainly German, philosophy of superman, ended up by murdering a weak old woman. Another devotee of the philosophy of superman, Ivan Karamazov, insinuated a parricide to his half-brother Smerdiakov. Masaryk further pointed out that it was his interest in Russian intellectual history that had led him to deal with the concept of murder and murderousness when analyzing modern warfare, revolution, and terrorism.[60]

Masaryk on the Role of German Philosophy in World War I

In his war memoirs, Masaryk assigned the responsibility for the out-

break of World War I squarely to the radical nationalism with its roots in German history.[61] He argued that those principal characteristics of the Bismarckian Empire that distinguished the Prussianized Germany from the liberal and democratic West -- theocracy, militarism, amorality – were clearly derived from the German philosophical tradition. The construction of the Prussian state as a theocracy, according to Masaryk, owed much to the secularization of German Lutheran theology. This occurred in the teaching of Hegel, as well as Fichte and Schelling, all of whom were originally trained as theologians.[62] Hegel in particular formulated the principles of Prussian theocracy through his pantheism and his tendency to fantasize, which led to the quasi-divinization of the state. Masaryk further noted that, accordingly, Bismarck and Kaiser Wilhelm constantly referred to God, presumably embodied in the Prussian monarchy.[63]

In Masaryk's opinion, the German idealists were also the progenitors of Prussian militarism, which had already been anticipated by Kant's categorical imperative.[64] After Kant, German philosophy necessarily was mired in pessimism and egoism. An appeal to force – to realize the Pangermanic goals – was sanctified by philosophy, beginning with Kant and then Fichte and Hegel.[65] Hegel himself reacted to the subjectivism of Fichte and Schelling, which had led to moral isolation and bred nihilism and pessimism.[66] In the final analysis, modern militarism of the Prussian type represented an escape from suicidal inclinations.[67] Indeed, Masaryk asserted that Hegel declared not only the infallibility of the state, but also the redemptive value of war and militarism.[68]

Even German artistic culture reflected sharply the image of what Masaryk called "Titanic subjectivism with its egoism and isolationism."[69] Thus the artistic genre of Expressionism was pre-eminently German, representing an aspect of German self-centeredness and was, therefore, vitiated from the start. The Expressionists were nothing else but spokesmen for Kant and the neo-Kantians, or for the subjectivism à la Nietzsche. Masaryk called as a witness the expressionist poet and critic Rudolf Paulsen (1883-1966), who had stated that the poet bears within himself "the finished forms" (a Kantian term) out of which the whole world grows. Masaryk added: "This is subjectivism in all its violent absurdity. Paulsen also correctly states that expressionism was in its essence German."[70] Furthermore, Masaryk asserted that, without exaggerating, it was fair to say that, during the war, German literature was more chauvinistic than any other, in quantity and quality, and that German publicists and journalists drove their people towards war in Berlin, Vienna, and Budapest.[71] Masaryk did find a major exception in music. It was particularly Beethoven, who — in Masaryk's view — was free of Prussian influence. Prussianism, however, prevailed subsequently in Richard Wagner's music.[72]

Masaryk claimed that his perception of a combination of modern tendency to suicide with Prussian militarism in World War I was corroborated by testimony from the German side. His witness was the historian Karl Lamprecht, who already in 1904 had written about the era of "excitability," which both Bismarck and Kaiser Wilhelm exemplified. Masaryk added that in fact "the German superman, the Titan, was a nervous creature," who sought relief from a chronic tension in death or in war, either of which meant an even more acute excitement. While this psychological state might have affected other nations, it was particularly true of the Germans. Masaryk explained that:

> Their philosophers, artists and other active minds pushed sub-

> jectivism and individualism to the point of absurd egomania, with all its moral consequences. Nietzsche's superman, the Darwinian "beast," was to prove a remedy for the inhuman folly of solipsism.

The German philosophers, scientists, historians and politicians, suffered from a spiritual isolation and proclaimed German civilization and culture as the culmination of history. With this arrogant sense of superiority, Prussian Pangermanism asserted its right to expand and to subjugate others by sheer force. Masaryk reemphasized that the Prussian State, its army and its fighting spirit became antidotes to morbid subjectivism.[73]

Although Masaryk recognized the role of the Prussian state and German army in the outbreak of the war, he ascribed the ultimate cause to German intellectuals, especially philosophers, who inspired the Pangermanic dreams. On his return to Prague from exile on December 23, 1918, he referred, this time, to the barbaric exhortations of Theodor Mommsen, Eduard Hartmann, Paul de Lagarde, and their followers against – among other Slavs – the Czech nation.[74] Masaryk added that Lagarde's view of German superiority was also evident in Marx, who held the same demeaning view of the Slav nations as Lagarde or Heinrich Treitschke.[75]

German Philosophers and the War

Let us then look at what German philosophers, as well as theologians, actually wrote about the war during World War I. There was, in fact, a tendency to connect the meaning of the conflict with earlier intellectual development in Germany, at times, strikingly similar to the intellectual paradigms suggested by Masaryk. First of all, there was an emphasis on the intellectual or spiritual causes of the war. Thus, Max Scheler (1874 -1928) philosopher and a pupil of Rudolf Eucken, then an independent scholar, teaching as a private docent at the University of Munich till 1910, wrote in his book *Genius des Krieges und der Deutsche Krieg* (1915) that the meaning of the World War could not be economic or political; it could only be that of a psychological and/or moral cleansing (*Läuterungsinn*).[76] Scheler, also in *Genius des Krieges,* rejected the linking of war with either Marxian economic competition or the Darwinian struggle for existence. For him the war was a purely human institution not connected with search for food or other economic or biological reason. He stated: "(The war) is an indispensable part of the historical process impelling peoples to win their freedom, create cultures, establish values." It rested on the will to power and could not be reduced to a material motive; it was a cause sui generis. Max Weber (1864-1920) and Friedrich Naumann (1860-1919) had advanced similar ideas in the 1890s.[77]

As in Masaryk's paradigm, appeals to Kant and his idealist successors became a standard staple in defining the country's destiny by German scholars after the outbreak of the World War. Rudolf Eucken (1846 - 1926), a philosopher and a professor in Jena since 1874,[78] writing in his book *Die Träger des deutschen Idealismus* (1915), declared that Kant, "for us Germans," had erected a specific idealism which defined the nation's essence. It was an austere and powerful idealism, an idealism of the deed, which found its full development in the external world, but which also among the Germans released an ability to unfold this world in a new way. Thereby the German nation had received an

inward empowerment and became sufficiently strong to defeat both the external and the internal foes. This idealism, which had constantly motivated the Germans had also acquired -- through Kant's liberating deed -- a firm philosophical footing.[79] A philosophy professor in Marburg, Paul Natorp (1854 - 1924), in his book *Deutscher Weltberuf* (1918) appealed to Kant's distinction between culture (*Kultur*) and mere civilization and maintained that the meaning of the war to defend the German *Kultur* against the outbreak of hatred on the part of the British and the nations speaking Romance languages.[80]

Ernst Troeltsch (1865- 1923), Protestant theologian and professor in Berlin (1915),[81] affirmed in his *Deutscher Geist und Westeuropa* (1916) that the foundations of German identity had to be sought in the institutions of Prussia as well as "in the philosophical idealist meaning of the state and history, which extend(ed) all the way to today's idealists from Kant, Fichte, and Hegel."[82] Troeltsch celebrated the spirit of the post-Napoleonic period in relation to the current war. The experience of 1914 resembled that of the year 1813, which in the very depth of the nation's soul ("im tiefen Inneren der Volksseele") had led to a re-thinking and a renewal ("zu einer Neubesinnung und Erneuerung gefuehrt habe"). At that time, it was the spirit of Kant, of romanticism, and of Goethe that endowed the life struggle and the rebirth of the Prussian state with the new form of the Gospel of the German national spirit of freedom ("die neue Form des Evangeliums des deutschnationalen Geistes der Freiheit..."). This spirit engendered the productive individuality and the originality of the metaphysical belief in the divine global destiny of Germandom ("die Urspruenglichkeit des metaphysischen Glaubens an die goettliche Weltbestimmung des Deutschtums"). Troeltsch continued to inventory the contributions of this fabulous era as "the autarky of the state (as 'a closed commercial state'); the rebirth of a subjectivity from a degenerate cult of the self to a free and broad dedication to the national spirit; and the imbibing of the national spirit from the inner stream of the divine essence of the world." Finally, there was the sorting out of the several national characters among themselves (as mirrors of the Godhead), in brief, there arose the self-perception of the inherently creative and free Germandom as against the artificial, derivative, decorative and rationalistic essence of the Romance nations. These were the novel ideas of the era of Kant and his successors.[83]

Werner Sombart (1863- 1941), a sociologist and economist in Berlin (since 1906),[84] maintained that no matter how much they may have differed in their particular views, all the notable German philosophers – Fichte, Schopenhauer, Hegel, Hartmann, Nietzsche – agreed on the cleansing and uplifting effect of war.[85] It was, however, Fichte who was singled out by the German scholars as a symbolic figure of the war effort. Heinrich Scholz (1884-1956), a Protestant theologian and philosopher at the University of Wroclaw since l9l7,[86] claimed in his *Das Wesen des deutschen Geistes* that in Fichte's philosophy the German spirit ascended into the boundless, without losing anything of its German character. In fact, in his exhortations, Fichte revealed the real German essence with a kind of overpowering rapture.[87] Alfred Weber (1868 - 1958), a philosopher of culture, a sociologist, and an economist at the University of Heidelberg since 1907,[88] maintained that Fichte, as "a man of the deed" (*Tatmensch*), was after all the only one whose words could express what the German nation truly felt in the current war.[89] Leopold Ziegler (1881 - 1958), a philosopher and a graduate from University of Heidelberg in 1905,[90]

claimed that in Fichte's *Addresses to the German Nation* one could recognize the gigantic will of a man to create what had not existed – a nation.[91] Willy Moog (1888-1935), a philosopher and later a professor in Greifswald (since 1922), whose scholarly work focused on Kant, Fichte, Hegel and the Hegelian school, published an entire volume in 1917 on Fichte's philosophy of war.[92] Fichte's *Reden an die deutsche Nation* were several times reprinted during the War, including, for instance, an edition by Eucken.[93] Fichte's influence was institutionalized through the formation of the Fichte Society (*Fichtegesellschaft*) in 1916 with its own journal, *Deutsches Volkstum*.[94]

The role of Nietzsche in inspiring German national warlike consciousness was not as systematically emphasized by the German philosophers as the role of the classical idealist. Yet, there were journalistic reports claiming that a typical German soldier carried in his knapsack Nietzsche's *Zarathustra* together with the Bible.[95] Likewise, Sombart celebrated the war of 1914 as Nietzsche's war (*Krieg Nietzsches*). According to Sombart's flowery language, Nietzsche was "the bard and the visionary, who had descended from heaven to deliver us the tidings that from us a son of God would be borne, whom in his manner of speaking, he named the Superman."[96] Sombart also eulogized Nietzsche as a "crown witness" (*Kronzeuge*) for the quintessentially German thinking and values (*für deutschestes Denken und Werten*). Only superficial readers can consider him an opponent of German culture.[97]

At the other side of the ledger, German philosophers tended to deprecate empiricism, realism, and individualism, which they considered typical of West European, especially British, prosaic outlook, and as the reverse of the uplifting German attachment to idealism and metaphysics. Thus the famous Wilhelm Wundt (1832-1920), philosopher and psychologist at the University of Leipzig since 1875,[98] decried "the shallowness" of British ethical theories as well as that of the common sense realism and the empirical epistemology since Locke. Likewise, he denounced the "egotistical utilitarianism" and "pragmatism" of the Anglophone philosophical and social thought.[99] Wundt traced the origin of the English attachment to empiricism and aversion to philosophical generalization all the way back to medieval scholasticism, particularly the teaching of Duns Scotus and William of Ockham.[100]

While admitting that German thinking had been affected to some extent by Locke and Rousseau, Troeltsch considered these contributions marginal at best. They did not serve as the foundation of German intellectual and social development, which had to be sought in the institutions devised by Prussian statesmen like vom Stein and Scharnhorst, as well as in the historical and social theories advanced by Kant, Fichte, and Hegel, and their followers and successors.[101] Sombart denounced the English ethics stressing political individualism, which focused not on collective life ("life per se, supraindividual life"), but – in a mundane way -- on particular lives. He found especially abhorrent the goal of the utilitarians -- the happiness of the greatest number of individuals.[102] Even the rather moderate Friedrich Meinecke (1862-1954), philosopher of history at the University of Berlin since 1914,[103] rejected in 1915 the English and French ideal of a universal humanity, and -- appealing to Fichte -- he forecast that European nations would welcome a German victory, which would encourage the nations' ontic individualities. In other words, a victory of the Entente would usher in homogenizing globalization, a victory of Germany, on the contrary, would favor vigorous nationalisms, promoting a high degree of

differentiation and diversification within humanity.[104]

Challenges to Masaryk's Diagnosis of the German Problem

Influence of German Philosophy in Europe

Masaryk's idea of German philosophy's responsibility for World War I has not gone unchallenged. It could be pointed out that German philosophers were popular not only in Germany, but also in other European countries before World War I. This was especially plausible to argue, in the case of Schopenhauer and Nietzsche, since the setting of their philosophy could be detached from the specifically German historical and social context. It was more difficult to do for the classical German idealists. Even Hegel, however, was popular outside of Germany in the nineteenth century, especially in Italy and Russia. In Italy, Benedetto Croce (1866-1952) and Giovanni Gentile (1875-1944) were fascinated by Hegel's philosophy of history as a rational dialectical process.[105] The appeal of Hegelianism affected almost all the luminaries of Russia's nineteenth-century intellectual firmament, including Petr I. Chaadaev, Ivan V. Kireevskii, Mikhail Bakunin, Vissarion G. Belinskii, Alexander Herzen, Nikolai G. Chernyshevskii, and Georgii V. Plekhanov.[106] In Italy, Hegelianism, however, was diverted into Fascism and in Russia into Marxism, neither of them being directly relevant to the outbreak of World War I.

The metaphysics of a dominant cosmic will was fairly fashionable in most of Europe, although it was initiated by Schopenhauer and Nietzsche.[107] Nietzsche's influence in fact spread throughout the Continent with its appeal of radical individualism and artistic culture.[108] He was particularly popular in France,[109] where, for instance, the famous author, Romain Roland (1866-1944) expressed his great admiration for Nietzsche in the period before World War I.[110] Nietzsche was also important to Andre Gide in France, William Yeats in Ireland, Franz Kafka in Prague, Gabriele d'Annuzio in Italy, and Dmitii Mrezhkovkii in Russia.[111] Nietzsche's West-European influence, however, focused primarily on his esthetics within the movement of artistic Decadence, while his metaphysics of the Superman had little effect outside of Germany.

Subjectivism and Dynamism in French Philosophy

A particularly strong challenge to Masaryk's diagnosis, however, was a trend toward subjectivism and dynamism in French philosophy itself, represented above all by Henri Bergson. Bergson's "élan vital" resembled Schopenhauer's Will to Live and Nietzsche's Will to Power, which in Germany had superceded the cosmic reason of Hegel's Absolute. In addition, Bergson wrote with some enthusiasm about the war as bringing about a moral regeneration of Europe.[112] In an address to the Academy of Moral and Political Sciences in Paris on December 12, 1914, he portrayed the German mentality -- in contrast to his own philosophy of freedom, vitalism, and spontaneity – as believing in "brute force" and as burdened (rather bizarrely from Masaryk's point of view) by a mechanistic and materialistic view of the world.[113] German philosophers, on their part, tried to utilize Bergson for their propaganda purposes. For in-

stance, Kurt Riezler (1882-1955), a diplomat, writing on philosophical subjects,[114] attempted in 1914 to use Scheler's ideas to combine Bergson's philosophy with Nietzsche and Treitschke.[115] In addition, Troeltsch suggested that Bergson, as well as his teacher Emile Boutroux (1845-1921), were in many ways indebted to German philosophy for their idealist metaphysics.[116]

Concerning Bergson, Masaryk noted in his war memoirs that in modern French philosophy a revolt had, indeed, occurred, aimed against abstract intellectualism and positivism. The prime example was Bergson's intuitionism with the concept of a cosmic "élan vital." Masaryk conceded that such an orientation seemed to be affected, more than the French would be willing to admit, by German psychology with its activism and emotionalism from Kant to Nietzsche.[117] During a visit to Paris in 1923, asked by a French newspaperman his opinion of Bergson's philosophy, Masaryk answered diplomatically that Bergson's élan resembled voluntaristic concepts in German philosophy, especially those of Schopenhauer and Nietzsche. Bergson, however, expressed the concept more precisely, as an emotion or volition that opposed intellectualism, positivism, and criticism. Masaryk said he would have expressed the concept differently, namely, as "internal experience." According to Masaryk, Bergson eventually did begin to speak of "internal experience" in his book *Matière et mémoire.*[118] Later in his conversations with Čapek, he expressed himself more critically, saying that Bergson's intuition was close to the concept of revelation, as found in the writings of modern philosophers.[119] For Masaryk, revelation was epistemologically an unacceptable source of real knowledge.

In general, Masaryk admitted that some of the spiritual malaise of modern man affected also other nations, but it was especially acute among the Germans.[120] Only in Germany the murderous desire to escape from sickly subjectivism did prevail and did spark the war conflict in 1914. As mentioned earlier, Masaryk, however, did note some exceptions from suicidal subjectivism and Prussian militarism in German culture. Most importantly, he expected that World War I would also liberate Germany from its old regime. This free Germany would be rid of its previous spiritual isolation, it would overcome the immoral Bismarckianism, and would return to the humanistic ideals, particularly of Herder and Beethoven.[121] One may add in conclusion that Masaryk's optimistic prognosis came one war too early.

NOTES

1. I wish to thank Gergely Kovacs, Jill L. Pokorney, and Brandon Peart for their assistance and helpful comments on this article, which is based on a presentation made at the 25th World Congress of the Czechoslovak Society of Arts and Sciences (SVU) in Tábor, Czech Republic, June 27-July 2, 2010.

2. Masaryk did not consider economic, imperialist, or nationalist causes as crucial; Arne Novák, "Světová revoluce," *Lumír* 53 (1926) in Novák, *Nosiči pochodní; kniha české tradice* (Prague: Literární odbor Umělecké besedy a Kruh českých spisovatelů, 1928), 215.

3. Vladimir I. Lenin, *Imperialism: The Highest Stage of Capitalism*, in Lenin, *Collected Works* (Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1964), 22:185-304; originally published as Lenin, *Imperializm kak noveishii etap kapitalizma* (Petrograd: Zhizn' i znanie, 1917); John Atkinson Hobson, *Imperialism: A*

Study (New York: J. Pott, 1902).

4. Fritz Fischer, *Germany's Aims in the First World War* (New York: Norton, 1967); idem, *War of Illusions: German Policies from 1911 to 1914* (New York: Norton, 1975); idem, *World Power or Decline:The Controversy Over Germany's Aims in the First World War* (New York: Norton, 1974). For a review of the Fischer controversy, see H. W. Koch, ed., *The Origins of the First World War: Great Power Rivalry and German War Aims*, 2d ed. (London: Macmillan, 1984).

5. See, for instance, Mark Hewitson, *Germany and the Causes of the First World War* (Oxford: Berg, 2004); Terence Zuber, *German War Planning, 1891-1914:Sources and Interpretations* (Rochester, NY: Boydell Press, 2004).

6. *Brockhaus Enzyklopädie,* 20 vols. (Wiesbaden: F.A. Brockhaus, 1966-1974); *Deutsche Biographische Enzyklopaedie.* 12 vols. (Munich: K.G. Sauer, 1995–2000); *Neue Deutsche Biographie,* 23 vols. (Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, 1953-2006).

7. Kurt Flasch, *Die geistige Mobilmachung : die deutschen Intellektuellen und der Erste Weltkrieg: ein Versuch* (Berlin: A. Fest, 2000), and H. Sebastian Luft, "Germany's Metaphysical War: Reflections on War by Two Representatives of German Philosophy: Max Scheler and Paul Natorp," in *Themenportal Erster Krieg* (2007), URL: http://www.erster-weltkrieg.clio-online.de/2007/Article=208.

8. Fritz K. Ringer, *The Decline of the German Mandarins: The German Academic Community, 1890-1933* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1969); Hermann Lübbe, *Politische Philosophie in Deutschland: Studien zu ihrer Geschichte* (Basel: B. Schwabe, 1963).

9. Tomáš G. Masaryk, *Sebevražda hromadným jevem společenským moderní osvěty*, Spisy 1 (Prague: Masarykův ústav AV ČR, 2002), 144, 180

10. Ibid., 132.

11. Tomáš G. Masaryk, "Blaise Pascal: jeho život a filosofie" (1883), in Tomáš G. Masaryk, *Přednášky a studie z let 1882-1884*, Spisy 17 (Prague:Masarykův ústav AV ČR, 1998), 86.

12. Tomáš G. Masaryk, *Moderní člověk a náboženství*, Spisy, 8 (Prague: Masarykův ústav AV ČR, 2000), 29. Originally published in 1896-98.

13. Masaryk, *Sebevražda hromadným jevem společenským*, 158-59. Johann Wolfgang von Goethe, *The Sorrows of Young Werther,* trans. Michael Hulse (London: Penguin, 1989).

14. Masaryk, *Pokus o konkrétní logiku; třídění a soustava věd*, Spisy 3 (Prague: Ustay T.G. Masaryka, 2001), 160.

15. Ibid, 221.

16. Masaryk, *Moderní člověk a náboženství*, 54. Jan M. Lochman noted that, for Masaryk, Hegel's dialectic undermined the existence of any permanent truths and values; Lochman, "Masaryk's Quarrel with Marxism," *T.G. Masaryk, 1850-1937*, ed. Stanley Winters et al., 3 vols. (London: Macmillan, 1989-1990), 2:121-122. See also Jan M. Lochman, "Masaryks Auseinandersetzung mit dem Marxismus," in Josef Novák, ed., *On Masaryk: Texts in English and German*, Studien zur österreichischen Philosophie, Bd. 13 (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1988), 231-32.

17. Karel Čapek, *Hovory s T.G. Masarykem*, Spisy 20 (Prague: Československý spisovatel, 1990), 234.

18. Masaryk, *Moderní člověk a náboženství*, 163. See also Zdeněk

Nejedlý, *T.G. Masaryk*, 4 vols. (Prague: Melantrich, 1930-1937); 2d ed., vols. 1-2, Sebrané spisy, 31-32 (Prague: Orbis, 1949-1950), 3:265.

19. Masaryk, *Moderní člověk a náboženství*, 29. On the concept of "Titanism," see, Milan Machovec, *Tomáš G. Masaryk*, 3rd ed. (Prague: Česká expedice, 2000), 150.

20. This was the theme of his first major philosophical work; see Masaryk, *Sebevražda hromadným jevem společenským.*

21. Tomáš G. Masaryk, *Otázka sociální: základy marxismu filosofické a sociologické*, 2 vols., Spisy 9-10 (Prague: Masarykův ústav AV ČR, 2000), 1:44.

22. According to Masaryk, Tolstoy's pantheism partly had its source in Hegel, see Tomáš G. Masaryk, *Rusko a Evropa*, Spisy 13 (Prague: Masarykův ústav AV ČR, 1996), 295.

23. Zdeněk V. David, "Masaryk on Schopenhauer and Nietzsche within the Austrian Philosophical Tradition," *Kosmas: Czechoslovak and Central European Journal,* 23, no. 1 (Fall 2009), 21.

24. Jiří Olšovský, "Masaryk, Nietzsche a počátky diskuse o Nihilism," *Masarykův sborník*, 11-12 (1999-2003), 103; Robert P. Pynsent, "Masaryk and Decadence," in *T.G. Masaryk, 1850-1937*, ed. Stanley Winters et al., 1:72.

25. Tomáš G. Masaryk, *Ideály humanitní: problém malého národa. Demokratism v politice* (Prague: Melantrich, 1968), 41-42 (originally published in 1901-1912); Masaryk, *Sebevražda hromadným jevem společenským*, 63; Paul Selver, *Masaryk: A Biography* (London: M. Joseph, 1940), 68.

26. Masaryk, *Otázka sociální.*, 2:203

27. Emil Ludwig, *Defender of Democracy: Masaryk of Czechoslovakia* (New York: McBride, 1936), 93; Masaryk, *Moderní člověk a náboženství*, 18.

28. Masaryk, *Moderní člověk a náboženství*, 58.

29. He saw the same kind of trait in the personality of Adolf Hitler; see Masaryk, "Masarykova recenze Hitlerovy knihy *Mein Kampf*," in Tomáš G. Masaryk, *Cestou demokracie IV*, Spisy 36 (Prague: Masarykův ústav AV ČR, 1997), 354.

30. Olšovský, "Masaryk, Nietzsche a počátky diskuse o Nihilism," 101-103.

31. Masaryk on the contrary, wished to base his philosophy on rational belief in God and human immortality. Olšovský, "Masaryk, Nietzsche a počátky diskuse o nihilism,"101.

32. Masaryk, *Sebevražda hromadným jevem společenským*, 12.

33. Tomáš G. Masaryk, *Světová revoluce za války a ve válce, 1914-1918*, Spisy 15 (Prague: Masarykův ústav AV ČR, 2005), 459. Ernst L. Radlov, a specialist on Russian religious thought, whom he knew in Vienna, probably intensified Masaryk's interest in Dostoevsky; see Vasil Škrach, "E. Radlow and Th. Masaryk," *Der russische Gedanke: Internationale Zeitschrift für russische Philosophie, Literaturwissenschaft und Kultur*," 1 (1929), 208-09.

34. Masaryk, *Světová revoluce za války a ve válce, 1914-1918*, 459. On the importance which Masaryk attributed to belles lettres for the understanding of intellectual life, see Antonín Měšťan, "Masaryk's Path to Dostoevskii as a Philosopher," in Josef Novák, ed., *On Masaryk*, 225-26.

35. Tomáš G. Masaryk, "Spisy F. M. Dostojevského," *Masarykův*

sborník 2 (1926-1927), 21-33; originally: *Čas* 6 (1892). Recently, Dostoevsky's view of the relationship between atheism and suicide has been analyzed by Irina Paperno, *Suicide as a Cultural Institution in Dostoevsky's Russia* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1997), 143; and Susan K. Morrissey, *Suicide and the Body Politic in Russia* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 3.

36. Masaryk, "Spisy F. M. Dostojevského," 24.

37. Masaryk, *Otázka sociální*, 2:203

38. Ibid., 2:205, note 8.

39. Ibid., 2:205.

40. Chapter 9: "Murder and Suicide," 95-102, in *Boje o Boha: Dostojevskij, filozof dějin ruského problému* in Masaryk, Tomáš G., *Rusko a Evropa III*, Spisy 13 (Prague: Masarykův ústav AV ČR, 1996), 15-152.

41. Masaryk, *Rusko a Evropa III*, 9.

42. Tomáš G. Masaryk, *Rusko a Evropa II*, Spisy 12 (Prague: Masarykův ústav AV ČR, 1996), 95; Masaryk, *Rusko a Evropa III*, 348.

43. Masaryk apparently refers to Dostoevsky's early novel, *Netochka Nezvanova.*

44. Masaryk, *Rusko a Evropa III*, 97.

45. Ibid., 98.

46. Masaryk, *Rusko a Evropa III*, 102. Zola in contrast attributes murder/suicide to passions and dispositions, springing from an atavism or inherited savagery. Masaryk, *Rusko a Evropa III*, 97.

47. Masaryk, *Rusko a Evropa III*, 99.

48. Masaryk, *Sebevražda hromadným jevem,* 12-14.

49. Masaryk, *Rusko a Evropa II*, 374.

50. Ironically, Masaryk's own work on suicide was not appreciated in contemporary Russia. Elena Likhacheva, "O samoubiistve," *Otechestvennye zapiski*, no. 7 (1881), 22 n. 1,referred to Masaryk's *Der Selbstmord* (Vienna, 1881) as a work that has little to offer either by his interpretation (seeing the main reason for suicide in the decline of religion) or in the evidence that he presents.

51. Joseph Frank, *Dostoevsky. The Years of Ordeal, 1850-1859* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1983), 169. See also Edward H. Carr, *Dostoevsky, 1821-1881: A New Biography* (London: Allen and Unwin, 1931), 82.

52. Aleksander E. Wrangel, *Vospominaniia o F.M. Dostoevskom v Siberii* (St. Petersburg, 1912), 66; cited by Joseph Frank, *Dostoevsky*, 171.

53. Wrangel, *Vospominaniia o F.M. Dostoevskom*, 21; cited in Frank, *Dostoevsky*, 171-72.

54. Dmytro Chyzhevskyi, *Hegel bei den Slaven* (Liberec: Stiepel, 1934), 349-50.

55. Ibid., 267.

56. Paperno, *Suicide as a Cultural Institution in Dostoevsky's Russia*, 145. See also Morrissey, *Suicide and the Body Politic in Russia*, 222-23.

57. E. Markov, "Kriticheskie besedy," *Russkaia rech*, 1 (June 1879), 197 n. 6.

58. Carr, *Dostoevsky, 1821-1881,* 255-56.

59. She refers to Schopenhauer's "On Suicide" in *Parerga and Paralipomena* (1851); see Arthur Schopenhauer, *Essays and Aphorisms*, trans. R.J.

Hollingdale (Harmondsworth, Eng.: Penguin Books, 1970), 79. Cited by Paperno, *Suicide as a Cultural Institution in Dostoevsky's Russia*, 143.

60. Masaryk, *Světová revoluce za války a ve válce, 1914-1918*, 290.

61. Masaryk, *Světová revoluce za války a ve válce, 1914-1918*, 413, 415. The passages dealing with the history of German thought were left out from the English translation of the war memoirs, which appeared as Masaryk, *The Making of a State: Memories and Observations, 1914-1918*, ed. Henry W. Steed (New York: George Allen and Unwin, 1927). See also Zwi Batscha, *Eine Philosophie der Demokratie: Thomas G. Masaryks Begründung einer neuzeitlichen Demokratie* (Frankfurt: Surkamp, 1994), 31, 65.

62. Masaryk, *Světová revoluce za války a ve válce, 1914-1918*, 419. See also Ludwig, *Defender of Democracy,* 79.

63. Masaryk, *Světová revoluce za války a ve válce, 1914-1918*, 280, 381.

64. Masaryk, *Světová revoluce za války a ve válce, 1914-1918*, 282. See also Nejedlý, *T.G. Masaryk*, 3:175.

65. Masaryk, *Světová revoluce za války a ve válce, 1914-1918*, 426. Patočka, however, considered simplistic and historically unproven Masaryk's claim that Hegel's absolute Idealism had served the authoritarianism of the Prussian state and that it had provided a justification for the theory and practice of the use of force; Patočka, Jan, *Dvě studie o Masarykovi* (Toronto: Sixty-Eight Publishers, 1980), 59.

66. Masaryk, *Světová revoluce za války a ve válce, 1914-1918*, 282. See also Nejedlý, *T.G. Masaryk*, 3:175.

67. Masaryk, *Světová revoluce za války a ve válce, 1914-1918*, 287.

68. Ibid., 282.

69. "... titanský subjektivismus, jeho egoismus a izolovanost ..." Masaryk, *Světová revoluce za války a ve válce, 1914-1918*, 475. See also William Preston Warren, *Masaryk's Democracy: A Philosophy of Scientific and Moral Culture* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1941) 98-102.

70. Masaryk, *Světová revoluce za války a ve válce, 1914-1918*, 285.

71. Masaryk did acknowledge that there were exceptions among the writers, who embraced pacifism, and names, among others, Eduard Stilgebauer and Fritz Unruh; Masaryk, *Světová revoluce za války a ve válce, 1914-1918*, 285.

72. Ibid., 281.

73. Ibid., 289.

74. "Poselství prezidenta republiky," *Pražské noviny*, 23 December 1918, in Tomáš G. Masaryk, *Cesta demokracie: projevy, články, rozhovory I, 1918-1920*, Spisy 33 (Prague: Masarykův ústav AV ČR, 2003), 25.

75. Masaryk, *Světová revoluce za války a ve válce,* 413, 415. On Masaryk's view of Lagarde's role in the Pangerman movement, see Zdeněk V. David, "T.G. Masaryk a nacionalismus: střety s Paulem Antonem de Lagardem," *Filosofický časopis* 58 (2010), 325-350.

76. Flasch, *Die geistige Mobilmachung*, 135.

77. Roland Stromberg, *Redemption by War: The Intellectuals and 1914* (Lawrence: Regents Press of Kansas, 1982), 79, also 215 n. 37. See also Max Scheler*, Genius des Krieges und der Deutsche Krieg* (Leipzig: Verlag der Weissen Bücher, 1915), 36.

78. Previously, he had served as professor at the University of Basel

since 1871, and had received the Nobel Prize in literature in 1908; *Brockhaus Enzyklopädie,* 5:751.

79. "Uns Deutschen ... den eigentuemlichen Idealismus ausgebildet, auf den unser Wesen angelegt ist." Es "ist ein herber und kraeftiger Idealismus, ein Idealismus der Tat, der die welt um uns voller Verwicklung findet, der aber in uns das Vermoegen entdeckt , eine neue Welt zu enfalten, ... dabei auch eine innere Erhoehung erfaehrt und aus ihr stark genug wird, allen Gegnern draussen und drinnen zu trotzen. Dieser Idealismus, der von alters her in uns Deutschen wirkt, hat durch die Befreiungstat Kants auch einen festen wissenschaftlichen Boden erhalten." Rudolf Eucken, *Die Träger des deutschen Idealismus* (Berlin: Ullstein, 1915), 69. On Hegel's insistence on war as necessary for human progress, see Eucken, *Die Träger des deutschen Idealismus*, 207.

80. Paul G. Natorp, *Deutscher Weltberuf, geschichtsphilosophische Richtlinien,* 2 v. in 1 (Jena: E. Diederichs, 1918). Vol. 2: *Die Seele des Deutschen*, 196; also 55-56. See also Lübbe, *Politische Philosophie in Deutschland,* 192.

81. Previously in Bonn (1892), then in Heidelberg (1894); *Deutsche Biographische Enzyclopädie*, 10:91-92.

82. "... in der philosophisch-idealistischen Deutung von Staat und Geschichte, wie sie von Kant, Fichte und Hegel bis zu den heutigen Idealisten sich hinzieht." Ernst Troeltsch, *Deutscher Geist und Westeuropa* (Tuebingen: Mohr, 1925), 93.

83. "Autarkie des Staates als 'geschlossener Handelsstaat', Wiedergeburt der im Selbstkultus entarteten Subjekivitaet zur freien Hingabe an den Nationalgeist, Erfuellung des Nationalgeistes aus dem inneren Zuge des goettlichen Weltwerdens heraus, Anerkennung der Nationalgeister untereinander als des Spiegels der Gottheit, kurz Selbsterfassung des urspruenglich produktiven und freien Germanentums gegenueber dem kuenstlichen, abgeleiteten, dekorativen verstandesmaessigen Wesen des Romanentums: das waren damals die neuen Gedanken." Troeltsch, *Deutscher Geist und Westeuropa*, 33-34.

84. Previously in Wrocław since 1890; *Brockhaus Enzyklopädie,* 17:549.

85. Werner Sombart, *Händler und Helden: Patriotische Besinnungen* (Munich: Duncker und Humblot, 1915), 95.

86. *Neue Deutsche Biographie*, 23:454.

87. "In Fichtes Philosophie steigert sich deutsche Denkart ins Grenzlose; aber sies ist darum nicht weniger deutsch. Im Gegenteil, gerade in jenen Sätzen, die nicht unbedingt gültig sind, offenbart sich das deutsche Wesen in Fichte mit einer Art hin reissender Überkraft." Heinrich Scholz, *Das Wesen des deutschen Geistes* (Berlin: Grote, 1917), 29. Cited by Lübbe, *Politische Philosophie in Deutschland*, 55.

88. Previously (since 1900) he had taught at the University of Berlin, then at the German University in Prague in 1904-1907, where he participated actively in German nationalist politics demanding the division of Bohemia into a German and a Czech part. In 1915, he entered war services and focused on an organization in Berlin that advocated a German dominated Central Europe and its extension into the East. *Deutsche Biographisches Enzyklopädie*, 10:349.

89. "Der einzige, der in Worten dem nachgekommen ist, was wir heu-

te über das deutsche Volk fühlen, ist eben doch der Tatmensch Fichte." Alfred Weber, *Gedanken zur deutschen Sendung* (Berlin: S. Fischer, 1915), 87; cited by Lübbe, *Politische Philosophie in Deutschland*, 207.

90. He then lived as a private scholar in Karlsruhe, and since 1925 in Überlingen am Bodensee; *Deutsche Biographische Enzyklopädie*, 10:656.

91. "In den 'Reden' Fichtes spürt man den ungeheueren Eigensinn eines Mannes, der das erschaffen will, was nirgends ist: das Volk." Leopold Ziegler, *Der deutsche Mensch* (Berlin: S. Fischer, 1915), 10. Cited by Lübbe, *Politische Philosophie in Deutschland*, 207.

92. Willy Moog, *Fichte über den Krieg* (Darmstadt: Falken-Verlag, 1917). See also *Brockhaus Enzyklopädie,* 12:778.

93. Johann G. Fichte, *Fichtes Reden an die deutsche Nation*, ed. Rudolf Eucken (Leipzig: Insel, 1915); Flasch, *Die geistige Mobilmachung,* 71-72.

94. Lübbe, *Politische Philosophie in Deutschland*, 207.

95. Flasch, *Die geistige Mobilmachung,* 72; Novák, "Světová revoluce," *Lumír* 53 (1926) in Novák *Nosiči pochodní; kniha české tradice*, 201.

96. Nietzsche sei "der Sänger und Seher gewesen, der, vom Himmel hoch dahergekommen, uns die Mär verkündet hat, das aus uns der Gottessohn geboren werden soll, den er in seiner Sprache den Übermenschen nannte." Sombart, *Händler und Helden: Patriotische Besinnungen*, 53.

97. Sombart, *Händler und Helden: Patriotische Besinnungen*, 58.

98. Previously, professor in Heidelberg since 1864, and in Zurich in 1874; *Brockhaus Enzyklopädie*, 20:504.

99. Wilhelm Wundt, *Die Nationen und ihre Philosophie: Ein Kapitel zum Weltkrieg*, 2nd ed. (Leipzig: Kröner, 1915), 37-41, 46-49.

100. Ibid., 29.

101. Troeltsch, *Deutscher Geist und Westeuropa*, 93.

102. Sombart, Händler und Helden,19-20, 143-44. For special stress on Fichte and Nietzsche as opponents of English ethical theories, see ibid., 55-56. See also Ringer, *The Decline of the German Mandarins*, 184.

103. Previously at the University of Strasbourg since 1901, and the University of Freiburg in Breisgau since 1906; *Brockhaus Enzyklopädie*, 12:352.

104. Friedrich Meinecke, *Deutsche Kultur und Machtpolitik im englischen Urteil* (Berlin: C. Heymann, 1915), 25-27. On the issue of the splintering of humanity, see also Kurt Riezler, (pseud. J. J. Ruedorffer), *Grundzüge der Weltpolitik in der Gegenwart* (Stuttgart, 1914), 11-12; Ringer, *The Decline of the German Mandarins*, 186.

105. Stromberg, *Redemption by War*, 74, 104, 190.

106. Dmytro Chyzhevs'kyi, *Gegel' v Rossii* (Paris: Dom knigi, 1939), especially, 12-31, 210-226, 260-265; Tomáš G. Masaryk, *The Spirit of Russia: Studies in History, Literature, and Philosophy*, trans. by Eden and Cedar Paul, and W.R. and Z. Lee, 2d ed., 3 vols. (London: Allen & Unwin, 1961-67), 1: 149-150, 217, 222; Boris V. Jakovenko, *Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Hegelianismus in Russland* (Prague: Bartl, 1934).

107. Stromberg, *Redemption by War*, 62.

108. Ibid., 20.

109. Ibid., 60.

110. Romain Rolland, *Mémoires et fragments du Journal* (Paris, A. Michel, 1956), 106-107.

111. Stromberg, *Redemption by War*, 62,102.

112. Stromberg, *Redemption by War*, 2; H. Sebastian Luft, "Germany's Metaphysical War: Reflections on War by Two Representatives of German Philosophy: Max Scheler and Paul Natorp," in *Themenportal Erster Krieg* (2007), URL: http://www.erster-weltkrieg.clio-online.de/2007/Article=208, p. 1n3.

113. Henri Bergson, *The Meaning of the War: Life and Matter in Conflict* (London: Unwin, 1915), 32-33. See also Stromberg, *Redemption by War*, 143.

114. *Neue Deutsche Biographie,* 21:618-19.

115. Flasch, *Die geistige Mobilmachung*, 236, 248. Kurt Riezler, *Grundzüge der Weltpolitik*, xi, 232. See also Ringer, *The Decline of the German Mandarins*, 337-38.

116. Troeltsch, *Deutscher Geist und Westeuropa*, 71.

117. Masaryk, *Světová revoluce: Za války a ve válce, 1914-1918*, 88.

118. "Une heure avec Masaryk," *Nouvelles Littéraires* 2 (1923), in Masaryk, *Cestou demokracie II*, Spisy 34 (Prague: Masarykův ústav AV ČR, 2007), 477. Masaryk referred to Henri Bergson's *Matiére et mémoire: essai sur la relation du corps a l'esprit*, 8th ed. (Paris: F. Alcan, 1912).

119. Čapek, *Hovory s T.G. Masarykem*, 228.

120. Masaryk, *Světová revoluce za války a ve válce, 1914-1918*, 292-293.

121. Ibid., 296.

The Humanities in the Czech Republic after the Velvet Revolution (Academy of Sciences and Universities, 1990-2010)[1]

By Jaroslav Pánek

The answer to the question of which discipline of the humanities cultivated in the Czech Republic has attained the greatest global recognition in the last twenty years is just as simple as it is surprising for the external observer. It is Czech Egyptology. How is that possible? In the case of this field, it seems to be a result of all of the external and internal prerequisites merging in support of this field and leading it to the highest level of international acknowledgement. Yet, at the same time, also many difficulties which obstructed the development of the humanities in the countries of Central and Eastern Europe in the course of the entire twentieth century have appeared here. The first prerequisite for today's success were the outstanding scientific figures that have carried the field for several generations and ensured its heuristic innovation and publication power. The founder of Czech Egyptology František Lexa took advantage of the favourable situation during the First Czechoslovak Republic and introduced Egyptology as an independent field at the Faculty of Arts and Philosophy of Charles University in Prague and along with his student Jaroslav Černý brought it international renown.[2] While the closure of the Czech higher education institutions under the German occupation interrupted this auspicious advancement, the seminar in Egyptology was renewed at the Faculty of Arts and Philosophy in Prague in 1946, forming the institutional basis for the development of the field. In the following decade, when the humanities as a whole had a very hard time, an advantageous external event intervened in favour of Egyptology.

Egypt decided on the construction of the Assuan High Dam and UNESCO called for worldwide action to save the endangered memorials of Nubia. Czech Egyptologists were prepared; the government supported them for prestigious foreign-policy reasons and the Czechoslovak (today Czech) Institute of Egyptology of the Faculty of Arts and Philosophy of Charles University was founded immediately in October 1958. In January 1959, a workplace was established in Cairo and after the completion of the salvage work in Nubia, the Egyptians offered the Czech archaeologists activity in the locality of their own choice. They selected the pyramid field at Abusir near Cairo, where they have held the concession to survey the highest level excavations to this day and where they have attained a number of astounding discoveries. Czech Egyptologists Zbyněk Žába and later Miroslav Verner[3] became big names in world science and the "little field" in the small country reached the highest imaginable ends.

Egyptology became one of the calling cards of the first Czech university and sui generis also a display case of Czech foreign policy regarding the countries of the Third World and particularly regarding Egypt as a significant political and trade partner in the Arab world. Nevertheless, the stupidity of the "normalisation" regime led to its cancellation in 1971 and to attempts to end the excavations in Egypt. This time, however, it was possible to avoid the worst and in the middle of the 1970s a new team of Egyptology was established under the guidance of Miroslav Verner, which today has a base in Pra-

gue and in Cairo and has held the largest of all the concessions in size that have been provided to foreign expeditions in the pyramid fields of Egypt.[4] While Czech Egyptologists do not receive financial means comparable to the teams from the USA, Great Britain, France or Germany, thanks to their results they have no less authority. They contribute to the learning on the key questions of the history of mankind, namely both in the beginnings of Pharaonic Egypt and in the period of the Roman Empire and Early Christianity. Czech Egyptology has thus retained – despite various political upheavals and manifestations of competitive animosity – a relative continuity, institutional base, indispensible financial support and long-term engagement in an international research network. It, however, has established itself mainly as a field which attracts outstanding talents and trains excellent scientific figures.[5]

Although not even Czech Egyptology had a bed made of roses, the majority of humanities fields were developing in far less favourable conditions. Even though it is not possible to imagine that science would have been hermetically sealed after the Communist coup in February 1948 and after the occupation of the Warsaw Pact armies in August 1968, it was affected by numerous negative influences. Not even then, however, was the development linear. For the 1950s, Sovietisation and Stalinisation of the humanities were typical, connected with the exclusion of many eminent scientists from university and academic research. The 1960s were characterised by partial liberalisation and greater openness to the world, but the 1970s again brought a new political fettering of research in the humanities. At that time, it was no longer asserting "pure" Marxist-Leninist ideology but attempting to place such fields as philosophy or modern history in the service of the regime and to deprive the others of any possibility to formulate or manifest nonconformist opinions. The socialist state formally supported the fields of the humanities (labelled then as the "společenské vědy/social sciences"), but through a preliminary censure it prevented such studies from coming out that fundamentally differed from the official ideological line of the ruling party. The closer the examined topic was to the present, the closer the inspection was and thus the clearer the deformations manifested themselves. The further the research issue was from the political interests of the ruling party, the greater the threat was that it would be institutionally liquidated as an "activity unnecessary for a socialist society".[6]

In the 1980s, this system began to fail and the state oversight was losing its effectiveness. On the one hand, centres of informal research and scientific communication were formed, namely both in dissent and in institutions outside of Prague. The most important of them were the Hussite Museum in Tábor, where excellent medieval studies were concentrated, the Museum of J. A. Comenius in Uherské Hradiště, where the Colloquia Comeniana allowed the free discussion of historians, philosophers and theologians; and a series of interdisciplinary conferences of literary scientists, art historians and historians in Plzeň/Pilsen. On the other hand, the conditions at higher education institutions and at the institutes of the Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences partially relaxed so that even there it was possible to establish more intensive international contacts and publish works that were forbidden earlier.[7]

The fall of the Communist regime in November 1989 allowed the implementation of radical changes. It was by far not merely the departure of the most compromised people from the higher education institutions and scientific institutions and the return of those scientists who were decommissioned

for political reasons after 1968. A wide-reaching metamorphosis of the scientific infrastructure also took place. Its most distinctive feature was the strengthening of the higher education institutions and the founding of a number of new universities as well as other public and private higher education institutions where humanities subjects are taught and from whose teachers scientific activity in these fields is required. On the other hand, a reduction of the workplaces of the Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic took place – conditioned by financial restrictions – and the academic workplaces were disadvantaged in the training of young scientists by legislative regulations. A grant system entered the scheme of financing research in the humanities as a new factor; it increased the independence of the enterprising scientists at the institutions but also deepened the fragmentation of the research into a number of partial topics and complicated the resolution of large tasks of a synthetic nature. The individual methods, which are characteristic for the humanities but not the only possible, clearly dominated over the team management of the basic encyclopedias, dictionaries and compendia.

In spite of the mentioned problems, it is necessary to emphasize that the Czech milieu had never before offered the opportunity for so many Czech scientists of the middle and younger generation to receive recognition. Czech scientists had never enjoyed such research and publication freedom since 1938. Never had so many books and articles from the fields of the humanities been issued. (Evidence for this is provided by the field bibliographies growing every year.) There had also never been such open international relations and such intensive cooperation between Czech and foreign scholars as in the past twenty years.

However, the growing number of publications (for instance, there are now around ten thousand per year only in the historical sciences)[8] does not of course say anything about their quality, one of the reasons being that work with computers, just like the utilisation and massive adoption of data from electronic media, considerably accelerated the writing and publishing of texts of all types. What is characteristic for many contemporary authors is hasty writing rather than careful reading and critical assessment of the adopted data as well as of one's own phrases. In the flood of texts issued on an everyday basis, there is a great deal of chaff, which does not bring new knowledge, sometimes not even reproducing correctly the knowledge already proved but as a result of carelessness importing chaos and unnecessary mistakes into it. If it was not possible for an individual to follow all of the production in the humanities even before, it has now become impossible to follow his/her field or her wider chronological or thematic segment in its full extent even for the and began to produce fruits important for European research. Research developed in the main areas of philosophical thought in the diachronic as well as synchronic sense. Its base became along with the university departments of philosophy (especially in Prague and Brno) primarily the Institute of Philosophy of the Academy of Sciences, which grew into the most extensive complex workplace for research of the history of thought in the Czech Republic.[11] The Czech Plato Society (Česká platónská společnost) and its biennial international conference Symposium Platonicum Pragense deserve credit in deepening the knowledge of Ancient philosophy; Patristic and Medieval philosophy was the focus of inter alia the Centre for Patristic, Medieval and Renaissance Texts (Centrum pro práci s patristickými, středověkými a renesančními texty); Czech

hardest-working scholar. This ever more narrows the thematic focus of individual researchers and complicates creative communication between them. Some of the methodological approaches (like historical anthropology or microhistory), unless they are mastered at a higher level, facilitate the atomisation of research and ostensibly "vindicate" it.

The evaluation of such numerous results of research in the humanities will not be easy even after a greater time interval. If we attempt an appraisal view today, it is necessary to select a scale that is entirely independent of the number of published works. The first criterion is the ability to overcome the atomisation of the research and achieve a synthesising mastery of the large themes; the second is the originality of the approach to the topic, which does not repeat the approaches applied in the Czech situation already earlier; and finally the third is the international comparability and integration of the outcomes into the European or global research in the humanities. Considering that the application of these criteria is necessarily marked by the individual approach of the evaluator and his/her professional orientation, I have attempted to increase the objectivity of the view by engaging a number of additional experts into the selection of the most important outcomes. I addressed the deans of the faculties of arts of the universities in the Czech Republic and the directors of the institutes of humanities from Sections 8 (Historical Sciences) and 9 (Other Humanities) of the Academy of Sciences of the CR. Not all of those addressed shared their viewpoints, partially because some – as they said themselves – claimed that the selection was "difficult" or that they did not have anything to offer on behalf of their institution. Even though I did not confine myself to the viewpoints of the institutions addressed, I also express at this point my thanks for the cooperation of the representatives of the faculties of arts in Brno, Opava, Ostrava, Pardubice and Prague, and further the Institute of Archaeology, Institute of Art History, Institute of Ethnology, Institute of History, Masaryk Institute, Institute of Slavonic Studies, Institute for Contemporary History and Institute of the Czech Language of the Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic.[9]

On the information basis which is formed other than through the mentioned opinions, mainly through annual reports,[10] bibliographic synopses, the publications of individual institutions and critical receptions, it is possible to draw a thumbnail sketch of the most important results of the humanities for the last twenty years – obviously with the awareness of two limits. On the one hand, it is clear that there are many more very interesting results than can be listed in this text and on the other hand it is necessary to remember that the long-term value of those most important works will be tested only by a longer time interval.

The "queen" of the humanities, philosophy, was along with religious studies among the fields most affected by the ideological monopoly of the Communist regime. Their liberation from these fetters required mainly intensive translation and commenting on the key classic as well as contemporary works of foreign origin in the 1990s. Nevertheless, the situation slowly changed, Czech philosophy actively engaged in the international discussions

experts were also engaged in the interpretation of modern philosophy, especially the ideological legacy of Hegel and Nietzsche. Building on the work of Jan Patočka (an edition of his Collected Works [Sebrané spisy] is being issued through the care of Ivan Chvatík),[12] the development of phenomenology has continued,[13] but original texts have been created mainly in the areas of post-structuralism and deconstruction (Miroslav Petříček), analytic philosophy and philosophically-oriented logic (Petr Dvořák, Jaroslav Peregrin, Petr Koťátko).[14] A great contribution of the Brno university centre of philosophy has been represented both by an English syntheses of the Czech philosophy in the 20th century (published in the USA in 1994)[15] and a new interdisciplinary concept of the evolutional ontology (Josef Krob, Josef Šmajs).[16]

The renewal of the field of religious studies manifested itself in the publication of a foreign-language yearbook for the philosophy and phenomenology of religion, Focus Pragensis at the Faculty of Arts and Philosophy in Prague (since 2001) but also in several other journals at theological faculties. Worldwide acceptance was gained mainly by the work of psychologist, sociologist and theologian Tomáš Halík on the issue of interfaith dialogue and tolerance, translated into many languages and awarded a number of foreign prizes.[17]

The archaeological part of the collection of historical sciences maintained a certain continuity in the second half of the twentieth century, because its selected theme – particularly Great Moravia as an alleged "first joint state of the Czechs and Slovaks" – was supported also by the Communist regime. Not until after 1989, however, did wider opportunities for international cooperation open in the selection of topics as well as research methods. What changed was the general relation to the archaeological cultural heritage, which is not to be irrevocably damaged by excavations that are not careful, and priority was given to non-invasive methods and sensitive approaches to the research of archaeological sources. Czech non-destructive archaeology applied modern research methods (to the credit of the Institute of Archaeology of the Academy of Sciences in Prague also aerial archaeology) and data processing, which is highly valued in Europe. The number of joint projects (mainly with British universities) on Czech territory increased, among which the project of landscape archaeology Ancient Landscape Reconstruction in Bohemia stands out, but also the number of Czech archaeologists working on foreign excavations has grown.[18]

The field of classical archaeology is not represented only by Egyptology, as mentioned above, but also by research in the Balkans (research of the Greek emporion Pistiros in Bulgaria) and in the Near East (in Lebanon and Syria). Archaeologists from the Faculty of Arts and Philosophy in Prague are through participation in international surveys and foreign expeditions closely connected in the European and global networks, and especially the works of Jan Bouzek, the foremost figure in this field, are highly valued.

Prehistoric and medieval archaeology, which is focused mainly on the Central European area, has a sound foundation in the two institutes of archaeology of the Academy of Sciences (Prague and Brno) and has developed also at several universities and in the foremost museums. It includes a time span from the Palaeolithic until the Slavonic settlement, and in its medieval part it has acquired a significant place within European castle studies (castellology) mainly through a systematic comparative survey of castles, which was initiated

by Tomáš Durdík. A great international reception was achieved not only by the specific results of the individual surveys (especially of the Celtic oppida) but also by the development of new methods like the theory of settlement complexes by Evžen Neustupný.[19] The same is true for the systematic surveys of the remains of prehistoric mammoth hunters, just as of the Great Moravian fortifications and the entire complex of the material culture of the Early Middle Ages. Great Moravian research, which has been conducted in Central European cooperation by the Institute of Archaeology in Brno, is one of the prestigious projects of the Union Académique Internationale (International Academic Union). It is typical for the contemporary boom in Czech archaeology that precisely the excelling archaeologist, a specialist in the Hallstatt period, Natalie Venclová won the 2002 award for European woman-researcher: Prix Evelyne Encelot. The peak work of contemporary Czech archaeology is, however, the eight-volume synthesis, Archeologie pravěkých Čech (The Archaeology of Prehistoric Bohemia), the most extensive and complex treatise so far on the sources and methods, on the questions of prehistoric development and their resolution. It is the capstone of long-term research which – if it is mediated in Western languages at least in an abbreviated form – may substantially influence the view of prehistoric Europe.[20]

The openness to the world and the emergence of a new network of research centres have been considerably reflected in the historical sciences. The cancellation of political and ideological barriers has literally opened the entire historic area and historic time. Suddenly, it became possible to choose any topic and issue any kind of publication entirely freely, to establish contacts with any foreign institute or expert, and if financial means allowed, to research with a few exceptions in any archive in the world and lecture on the quality results of one's research in any interested institution, at any conference or congress.[21] Czech historians appreciated the significance of close contacts with the researchers in Czech Studies all over the world and they provided the relationships with a solid information base in an extensive bio-bibliographic lexicon, *Scholars of Bohemian, Czech and Czechoslovak History Studies*.[22] Dozens of bilateral and multilateral conferences have revealed where the foci of possible international cooperation among Czech historians lie. A number of them have gradually been oriented toward various parts of Europe and the world, with all of the main states of Europe, North and South America coming to the forefront but Asia and Africa—continents as—yet limited by languages to primarily Orientalists—moving rather to the margins of interest.

The need to understand newly the world in historical contexts has led to the emergence of several dozen book publications on the histories of individual states, which nevertheless are – with some exceptions – mostly compilations. It has gradually been shown that truly original results can be brought predominantly in the history of those lands and regions where systematic primary research is concentrated. Original studies have been published on the earlier history of the United States (Institute of History of the ASCR) and Latin America (Centre of Ibero-American Studies at Charles University, but also the Faculty of Arts of Palacký University in Olomouc and the University of Pardubice).[23] Concerning Europe, the research focused on the most important states of Western Europe (Institute of World History, Faculty of Arts and Philosophy, Charles University and Institute of International Studies, Faculty of Social Sciences, Charles University) and the countries of Central and Eastern Europe.

There was already an earlier tradition within historical Slavonic Studies here – primarily in the interest in the Balkans and Russia (Institute of History of the ASCR). Groups of historians in the individual academic and university institutes gradually concentrated on the history of the countries closest to them, so that new institutional and thematic ties emerged with Poland (Opava, Ostrava, Pardubice, Hradec Králové), Germany (Prague, Pilsen, Ústí nad Labem) and Austria (Brno, České Budějovice). In international cooperation, it was possible to overcome the results of the long-term tabooisation of some topics, be they questionable problems or the mastery of the history of neglected regions. Especially the border regions of Silesia and Kłodzko (in German Glatz), in whose thousands of years of history Czechs, Germans and Poles but even Jews have alternated, have become a model of the new treatment of the history of interethnic and intercultural relations in Central Europe. The works of the Czech specialists thus naturally flowed into European comparative research.[24]

The freedom of research made it possible to deal with the age-old desiderata of Czech history. Since the Communist regime allowed the publication of only a part of the relevant information while concealing all the rest, it was not possible in the 1970s and 1980s to issue any wider synoptic or lexical publication based on a truly scientific basis. It held true for the history of the Czech state, the individual lands (even these had been tabooised after the cancellation of the land constitutions) or cities but also the personalities of Czech history. Whereas the publication of the multivolume *Velké dějiny zemí Koruny české* (The Comprehensive History of the Lands of the Bohemian Crown) was undertaken by the private Publishing House "Paseka" in cooperation with historians from various institutions, other tasks were assumed by the Institute of History of the Academy of Sciences. It has gradually begun to publish Biografický slovník českých zemí (A Biographic Dictionary of the Czech Lands) (since 2004),[25] which is going to cover several tens of thousands of entries on personalities connected with this area, *Akademická encyklopedie českých dějin* (Academic Encyclopaedia of Czech History) (since 2009), which is to present in fourteen volumes a detailed explanation of all of the fundamental *realia*;[26] and along with the Institute for Contemporary History it has also issued the condensed one-volume synthesis of national history, A History of the Czech Lands (2009), intended in its English version primarily for the foreign public.[27] Through the care of the Institute of History of the Academy of Sciences and especially Eva Semotanová, also the Czech participation in the international mapping of the historical cities of Europe developed and since 1995 already twenty volumes of the *Historický atlas měst České republiky* (A Historical Atlas of the Cities of the Czech Republic) have been created.[28] In the foreseeable future, the already completed large *Akademický atlas českých dějin* (An Academic Atlas of Czech History) should be issued, which will provide a picture of the development of the Czech state and society while utilising the latest cartographic methods.

The historiography of the past twenty years has expanded significantly in methodology and accepted stimuli principally from the German, French, British and American milieux but has at the same time built upon the best results of earlier authors. The living classics of the field can only now issue their most important works, which stand a test of even the strictest international criteria. In the field of medieval studies, the fundamental work on the Hussite revolution by František Šmahel (founder of the internationally recognised Cen-

tre for Medieval Studies[29]) was issued, and it provided a comprehensive picture of this key period of earlier Czech history.[30] The founder of Czech research on the history of material culture Josef Petráň finished his massive synthesis of this topic and soon developed to the highest level the method of microhistory, on which a number of researchers of the middle and younger generation build today.[31] The outstanding expert of the methods of contemporary European historiography Josef Válka projected the results of his lifelong research into the brilliant synthesis *Dějiny Moravy* (The History of Moravia)[32] and created a base which was built upon by a group of historians from Masaryk University in Brno under the guidance of Jiří Malíř in 2005 with the publication of the editorial series *Země a kultura ve střední Evropě* (Land and Culture in Central Europe). The results of this research definitively confirmed the fact that Czech history cannot be further derived from the view of Prague and its surroundings but that it is necessary to respect adequately all of the territorial, ethnic and cultural components of the Czech historical territory. The historians of the nineteenth century Miroslav Hroch and the late Otto Urban in their monographs published in German elucidated the process of the formation of modern nations in a European comparative perspective and in the specific Czech case.[33] The researcher of modern history Jan Křen presented an extensive synthetic work *Dvě století střední Evropy* (Two Centuries of Central Europe), which proves the necessity of including Czech history in the European, but especially the Central European, context.[34] It is only in these contexts that one of the small states of the Old Continent becomes sufficiently interesting for European and world historiography.[35]

Dozens of older as well as younger researchers have tackled neglected topics and new methods, primarily historical anthropology and microhistory, and published a large number of publications on various levels of which only a small amount has achieved a reception abroad. Whereas the "South Bohemian School of History," led by Václav Bůžek (University of South Bohemia)[36], has focused on the social and cultural history of the aristocrats, burghers and subjects and even the Habsburg imperial court in the Early Modern Period and on the issue of political communication,[37] researchers at the University of Pardubice received international recognition both within gender studies in research on the position of women in history (Milena Lenderová)[38] and by an exceptionally important study on economic history. Credit for overcoming the vacuum in this overlooked field belongs to Petr Vorel, who conceived the history of the money in circulation and financing as one of the keys to a complex interpretation of the economic, cultural and political transformations of Modern Europe. Vorel's original research is arriving today at new knowledge of the relations between continents and civilisations and is becoming a highly effective representative of Czech historiography in the world.[39]

It was possible to renew those directions of research that had been considered undesirable or directly banned until 1989. The largest editorial project of Czech historiography became – to the credit of the reopened Masaryk Institute of the Academy of Sciences – a collected edition of the Works and Correspondence of T. G. Masaryk, one of the few Czechs whose activity had a truly global reception.[40] In terms of formerly tabooised thematic areas, it was in the first place true of church and religious history.[41] Its cultivation became the focus of the Institute of History of the Academy of Sciences, within which in cooperation with the Faculty of Arts and Philosophy of Charles University

the Czech Historical Institute in Rome was founded.[42] The most important results include the publication of a renewed editorial series of Monumenta Vaticana res gestas Bohemicas illustrantia, research on Christianisation at the beginning of history (especially in the formation of the early Central European states), on the relation of the church and state in the Middle Ages and under the Habsburg monarchy, further systematic research of the Baroque religious brotherhoods and the role of religion in Czech society during the Enlightenment and secularisation of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. The peak of these efforts so far is the extensive synthetic work of Czech and German historians, which in an original way has managed the history of all of the churches and religious life in the Czech lands in the twentieth century.[43]

A similar conjuncture is being experienced by the history of the aristocracy in the time span between the Middle Ages and the nineteenth century, the history of modern enterprise (in this regard research at the University of Ostrava stands out),[44] the history of political parties[45] and the issue of the development of the Czech lands within the Habsburg Monarchy. Especially the last-mentioned area of problems eliminates the traditional umbrages and is slowly approaching a realistic evaluation of the conflict situations in Czech history. (In this regard the monographs by Tomáš Knoz on the property confiscations in the critical period around 1620 are exemplary).[46] Research of the history of diplomacy and international relations in the period of the First Czechoslovak Republic and during the Second World War has reached an unprecedented level and is represented by Jindřich Dejmek, Jan Kuklík Jr. and Jan Němeček.[47] All of these topics create a potential for future syntheses but also offer the opportunity of wider international comparison.

A field that was constituted completely anew in the 1990s is contemporary history, which investigates the development roughly from the Second World War to the present. Before 1989, it was so suppressed by political propaganda that it could not develop at all and its institutional base became the Institute of Contemporary History of the Academy of Sciences, founded in Prague in 1993. However, this field gradually found its application also in scientific and pedagogical activities at universities and acquired a specific source basis both in internationally respected collections of dissident archival and library collections (Czechoslovak Documentation Centre, the Libri prohibiti collection and the Library of Václav Havel in Prague) and in the Security Services Archive at the Institute for the Study of Totalitarian Regimes.[48]

Contemporary history appears on the border between strict scientific research and current political interests. In some cases, it is completely just, because the research is placed – as at the Documentation Centre of the Property Transfers of the Cultural Assets of Victims of WWII (Centrum pro dokumentaci majetkových převodů kulturních statků obětí druhé světové války) – in the service of the atonement for injustices to the victims of the Holocaust. In this sense, the mentioned Centre performed significant heuristic and organisational work, which is valued in all of the Euro-American area.[49] On the other hand, however, research on Communism may come under the pressure of political parties and interest groups as shown in the recent battle over the leadership of the Institute for the Study of Totalitarian Regimes. Academic and university research has luckily shown a sufficient power of resistance, withstood political influences and achieved a number of noteworthy results.[50]

From the global perspective, the engagement of Czech historians in

the research of the history of the Communist dictatorship and bipolar world arrangement (Cold War International History Project) in cooperation with the National Security Archive in Washington was significant. In research of the period of the Cold War, in particular the methods of the Sovietisation of Central and Eastern Europe, a special place was taken by the Prague Spring of 1968 and its military suppression with all its consequences for the international political discrediting of Communism. Czech historians, who have issued around twenty volumes of documents in the series Prameny k dějinám československé krize v letech 1967–1970 (Sources on the History of the Czechoslovak Crisis in 1967–70) and a number of monographs, have substantially contributed to the analysis of the power mechanisms of the Soviet Union and the position of its satellites during the Cold War.[51]

The discussions of the forced migrations at the time of WWII and immediately after it also had a considerable international reception; they became the subject of international political disputes and acquired new topicality in the period of ethnic cleansing in the Balkans in the 1990s. Mainly the interpretation of the presidential decrees connected with name of Edvard Beneš agitated the otherwise predominantly calm level of the debates on the relations between the Central European nations and transferred even into the wider Euro -American area, as recently shown also by the book by Mary Heimann.[52] The monumental political biography of President Beneš from the pen of Jindřich Dejmek seems to have become the greatest research enterprise in this controversial field, surpassing in its scope most of the biographies of Czech politicians, of which a considerable number have come out in the last twenty years. The main disadvantage of Dejmek's work remains – as with the majority of historical works – its having been written in the Czech language and hence its inaccessibility to the wider research public in the world.[53]

Within contemporary history, also the subfield of oral history was successfully developed, and its foremost representative Miroslav Vaněk founded the Oral History Centre at the Academy of Sciences and gained international recognition for it. In July 2010 he organised very successfully the 16th Congress of the International Oral History Association (IOHA) in Prague and was elected president of the IOHA. In his publications, Vaněk laid the methodological bases of this research in the Czech Republic[54] and by treating an enormous collection of biographical interviews created the foundation for a comprehensive study of the history of the so-called period of normalisation of the 1970s and 1980s, namely both from the perspective of the dissidents and the political elites and of the "silent majority." One of the starting points of the future comparative studies of the social, political and cultural history in the entire area of Central and Eastern Europe in the period of Communism was thus created.[55] It can be anticipated that these publications will play a large role in the learning about the mental legacy of Communism also in the future.

Art History has its main base with its rich documentation at the Institute of Art History of the Academy of Sciences. At the same time, the field is developing at university workplaces, in galleries and museums, especially at the National Gallery, whose catalogues have the opportunity along with exchange exhibitions to penetrate abroad and influence the knowledge of the Czech cultural heritage there. Art historians have achieved noteworthy results in the modern interpretations of medieval, Renaissance, Mannerist (particularly Rudolphine), Baroque as well as Modern art. Nevertheless, their most im-

portant achievement has been the completion of the monumental work *Dějiny českého výtvarného umění* (A History of Czech Visual Art), which includes the development of all of the manifestations and forms of artistic production from prehistory until 2000. It is an act that is fully comparable to the large art-historical syntheses of other European countries and undoubtedly one of the most valuable results of Czech humanities of the last quarter century. Considering the scope and quality of the collected iconography, this work has become partially accessible even for the foreign professional public.[56]

Linguistics is decidedly tied to national languages, but that does not mean its isolation in the frame of national states -- quite the opposite. Currently, work is continuing on the Atlas Linguarum Europae – A Linguistic Atlas of Europe, whose task is to map the basic language differences within Europe. In this work, about forty national commissions from most of the European states are participating, which will build on research on the individual languages. Czech linguists are capable of bringing a large investment into this project, because in the past years they have attained a mastery of exceptional works which are the starting points both for the study of the development of Czech and for further Europe-wide comparisons.[57]

At the Faculty of Arts and Philosophy in Prague, the monumental *Český národní korpus* (Czech National Corpus) was created under the guidance of František Čermák, which in electronic form documents the state and development of the contemporary Czech language and today already contains more than a billion words, becoming a starting point for the complex synchronic and partially also diachronic research of the Czech language. It is a revolutionary phenomenon in Czech linguistics, because instead of partial and accidental collections of material an enormous amount of evidence and contexts of language practice in written, spoken and historical forms has been amassed here and prepared for various analyses. This base, one of the largest of its type on the planet, has provided not only a number of monographs but also three frequency dictionaries, a grammar and auspiciously also a new large dictionary of Czech is to be created. Lively international interest was aroused by the latest branch of the Czech National Corpus, called InterCorp, i.e. a corpus of approximately twenty translation languages in relation to Czech. The Faculty of Arts and Philosophy in Prague produced also the huge *Slovník české frazeologie a idiomatiky* (Dictionary of Czech Phraseology and Idioms), which provides a relatively complete description of current Czech phraseology and presents tens of thousands of entries with synonyms, examples and translations into four languages.[58] On the other side, the Faculty of Arts and Philosophy in Brno produced the *Encyklopedický slovník češtiny* (Encyclopaedia of the Czech Language), which is a very valuable contribution to the international research on linguistic theory.[59] Like the Czech National Corpus, originally inspired by English publications, also the publication results in the field of theory and phraseology are becoming a subject of international attention and comparative cooperation.

At the Institute of the Czech Language of the Academy of Sciences, the massive five-volume *Český jazykový atlas* (Czech Language Atlas) was created, capping the research conducted by several generations of dialectologists since the 1960s. It is the supreme work describing in cartographic and commented form the geographic diversity of Czech, its lexis, morphology, phonetics and syntax. Considering that it captures the dialectal differentiation

of the Bohemian, Moravian and South-Silesian territory at a time when as a result of migration and the effect of mass broadcast media regional differences are gradually disappearing, it is a very important contribution to the knowledge of Czech language culture.[60]

Whereas outstanding results have been achieved in dialectology and the documentation of the contemporary language, the diachronic research of Czech has mainly dealt with the preparation of lexical works which are still lacking, although more advanced nations have had them available for a longer time already. The large *Staročeský slovník* (Dictionary of Old Czech), which presents the lexis of medieval Czech and which was begun already in 1903 by Jan Gebauer, was issued in printed form so slowly that it was necessary to proceed to an accelerated electronic treatment; unfortunately, the dictionary of Humanistic and Baroque Czech is for the moment not to appear in the foreseeable future. On the other hand, it has been possible to complete the *Slovník jazyka staroslověnského – Lexicon linguae palaeoslovenicae* (Dictionary of Old Church Slavonic), which is an epochal act by the Czech linguistic Slavists,[61] on which through the care of the Institute of Slavonic Studies of the Academy of Sciences the publication of the *Řecko-staroslověnský index – Index verborum graeco-palaeoslovenicus* (Index of Greek-Old Church Slavonic Words) has built since 2008. These works have an essential impact on the global research in the fields of Slavonic and Byzantine Studies. The Interdisciplinary Centre for Research of Old Languages at the Masaryk University in Brno (the leading representative of Classical and Medieval studies is Jana Nechutová[62]) has developed a wide research of Old Greek, Latin and Old Church Slavonic in comparison with modern European languages, which is an internationally recognised contribution in the field of the diachronic linguistics.

The treatment of the changes in Czech as a result of the adoption of loan words from foreign languages, predominantly from English, has also continued. For that matter, also work in the field of English linguistics has achieved valuable results in the preparation of monolingual and bilingual (English-Czech) computer corpora and in the treatment of a grammar of contemporary English on the background of Czech. Although in this direction, Czech science can only follow the general trends of world development, it has been integrating into international events in the field and is capable of providing quality tools for education in today's most important instrument of world communication. Also the linguistic Slavonic and Oriental Studies have achieved generally interesting results, primarily at the Faculty of Arts and Philosophy in Prague, which is proved by the publication of the international journals *Pandanus* for Indology and *Mongolo-Tibetica Pragensia*. Considering the difficult but slowly asserting emancipation of the Roma ethnic group in Europe, the establishment of Roma Studies as a scientific and pedagogical field since 1990 has great importance, in which the globally recognised specialist in linguistics and ethnology Milena Hübschmannová in Prague and the experienced historian Ctibor Nečas in Brno have participated.[63]

Czech literary science, which has its centre at the Institute of Czech Literature of the Academy of Sciences, has achieved two outstanding results in the past few years. It completed the enormous seven-volume *Lexikon české literatury* (Lexicon of Czech Literature), which provides critically assessed materials on the personages, works and institutions of Czech literature; this lexicon is an entirely indispensible aid for any Bohemica research domestically

as well as abroad.[64] At the same time, under the guidance of Pavel Janoušek, a four-volume work on post-war Czech literature was written, being the first attempt at a synthesis of this part of modern cultural history.[65] In no time, however, a new treatment of the Czech literature of the twentieth century began to be created under the guidance of Vladimír Papoušek, conceived on the principle of a synchronic meeting of the texts and metamorphoses of the literary language.[66] Alternative interpretation of the same key phenomena of cultural development can thus be expected. Information on the history of Czech literature reaches foreign interested parties also through summaries in Western languages (last to the credit of Jiří Holý[67]), but the most important new results are published in Czech. All the more important is the activity of the Institute of Czech Literature as the organiser of congresses of foreign Czech scholars (at five-year intervals), who as scientists or translators deal with Czech literature; through them new knowledge is transferred to the world.

Czech scholars have of course also dedicated themselves to foreign literatures, traditionally mainly Slavic. For example, through the care of the Institute of Slavonic Studies of the Academy of Sciences, great attention has been given to Slavic-German literary relations, for whose study the journal Germanoslavica was founded, to the earliest Slavonic monuments on Czech territory (in the first printed edition of the Czech-Church Slavonic homilies by Václav Konzal[68]) and also to the literature of the Russian émigrés in interwar Czechoslovakia.[69] The research of the Brno Institute for Slavonic Studies has focused on literary genology and comparative studies. All of these publications have a considerable impact in both Slavic and German-speaking countries.

Literary English Studies at the Faculty of Arts and Philosophy in Prague, which cooperates with the foremost universities in the United Kingdom, Ireland and the USA, have reached an outstanding level. The eminent theme of Czech research has become the work of William Shakespeare, whose expert Martin Hilský finished a complete translation of Shakespeare's work accompanied by extensive critical studies. The general recognition of this work, honoured also with the award of the Order of the British Empire, is proved by the fact that the Department of Anglophone Literatures and Cultures in Prague has been entrusted with the organisation of the World Shakespeare Congress in 2011. There are also other directions of research of which at least the research of Irish literature, theatre and cultural history at the Centre for Irish Studies in Prague deserves to be mentioned. This centre, which with the support of the Irish government has accumulated one of the largest field libraries on the European continent, has already organised a conference of the International Association for the Study of Irish Literatures IASIL (2005) and the prestigious International James Joyce Symposium (2009). Research is of course ongoing even in Germanic, Romance and Oriental languages, but the success in the highly competitive Anglophone area provides the peak of Czech literary science with a good report.

Ethnology has besides university departments and museums its research base predominantly at the Institute of Ethnology of the Academy of Sciences. The supreme work that was created here in cooperation with the Department of European Ethnology at the Faculty of Arts in Brno is a large three-volume encyclopaedia Lidová kultura (Folk Culture), providing a summary of the knowledge on the ethnography of Bohemia, Moravia and Silesia.[70] Another significant result became the cartographic treatment of selected aspects of folk

culture and the history of settlement (especially also Jewish) on Czech territory. Highly topical research with a considerable international impact is represented by publications on the Czech minorities abroad[71] and especially on the newly forming communities of Roma, Vietnamese and other nationalities in the Czech Republic.[72] It arises from the nature of this discipline that almost all interethnic research has an international impact and is close to the social issue in the time of the great migrational and structural transformations of the settlement of the Old Continent at the turn of the twenty-first century. Hence, also the ethnologists from the Faculty of Arts and Philosophy in Prague – other than further topics (Lusatian Sorbs; the ethnology of law in cooperation with the famous expert Leopold Pospíšil) – significantly participated in the research of Roma settlements in the east of Slovakia, with Milena Hübschmannová deserving credit for her interpretation of the structure of the Roma family.[73]

We will end with musicology, one of the few fields of the humanities that do not encounter greater linguistic and territorial boundaries. The interpretation of the work by Antonín Dvořák, Leoš Janáček, Bohuslav Martinů and recently even Bedřich Smetana, just like the preparation of collected critical editions of their works, has aroused international interest in cooperation already by the subject matter itself. The overall situation of this field has, however, changed in that the obstacles in treating ecclesiastical topics have disappeared and so research could develop on earlier liturgical song, Gregorian choral and vocal polyphony, which is becoming – in conjunction with general church history and the history of musical theatre – one of the keys to the understanding of European spiritual culture.[74]

When looking at the thousands of bibliographic items that accumulate in the bibliography of humanities disciplines every year, the external observer may surrender to a feeling of despair over the ever-deepening atomisation of research. This determination luckily represents only one aspect of the development. The other, more cheerful side of the same coin is the growing attempt for synthetic or encyclopaedic mastery of the growing knowledge. Particularly in archaeology and earlier history, historiography and biographical studies, literary history, the history of art and ethnology, massive multi-volume works have been created, started or even finished in recent years which accumulate the otherwise unmanageable amount of component knowledge into a synoptic and useable form.

The disadvantage of these great works is the fact that they normally remain only in Czech. It has been possible to publish only a few exceptionally important monographs abroad, predominantly in German. Usually only brief overviews, and these are sometimes antiquated or burdened by the compiling approach of the authors, are translated into English. Beside them also individual monographs and articles with entirely new knowledge are issued abroad naturally, but these will with great probability disappear in the flood of specialised books and journal articles in European and American periodicals. One of the paradoxes of the Czech humanities disciplines lies in this antagonism. They are not so weak as not to have anything to offer the world, but they usually do not have enough power to do so in generally understandable languages and so their testimony usually remains much weaker than the impact of works being created abroad. The long-term openness to international cooperation, however, should gradually diminish this paradox at least a little.

NOTES

1. This article originated as a conference address at the 25th World Congress of the Czechoslovak Society of Arts and Sciences (SVU), convened at Tábor, Czech Republic, June 27-July 3, 2010. The text could not have been created in this form without the effective cooperation of colleagues from a number of institutions who provided me with a great deal of factual background information and very valuable commentaries. They are mainly eminent authorities in their fields: Ladislav Bareš, Jiří Beneš, Marie Bláhová, Jakub Čapek, František Čermák, Jan Čermák, Jarmila Gabrielová, Milan Hlavačka, Zdeněk Jirásek, Jiří Kocian, Lubomír Konečný, Lucie Kostrbová, Josef Krob, Martin Kuna, Miroslav Kunštát, Eva Mrhačová, Jiří Mikulec, Jiří Musil, Milan Myška, Jana Nechutová, Ondřej Pilný, Svatava Raková, Eva Semotanová, Ivan Šedivý, Oldřich Tůma, Helena Ulbrechtová, Svatava Urbanová, Jaroslav Vacek, Petr Vorel and František Vrhel. I would like to thank them all greatly for their support.

2. Jan Filipský, ed., *Čeští a slovenští orientalisté, afrikanisté a iberoamerikanisté* (Prague, 1999), 95-97, 297-298.

3. Ibid., 507-509, 542.

4.Miroslav Verner and Viktor Bezdíček, "Egyptologie: Co je zachráněno, to se počítá," in *Národní 3. Revue Akademie věd ČR pro vědu a* umění 2 (2008), 42-46.

5. From the recent publications see Miroslav Bárta and Jaromír Krejčí, eds., *Abusir and Saqqara in the Year 2000* (Prague, 2000); Miroslav Bárta, Filip Coppens and Jaromír Krejčí, eds., *Abusir and Saqqara in the Year 2005* (Prague, 2006); Abusir. *Excavations of the Czech Institute of Egyptology*, vol. 20 (Prague, 2009); Miroslav Verner, Chrám světa: Svatyně, kulty a mysteria starověkého Egypta (Prague, 2010).

6. Colletion of studies in the history of sciences and humanities in post-WWII Czechoslovakia: Blanka Zilynská and Petr Svobodný, eds., *Věda v Československu v letech 1945-1953* (Prague, 1999); Blanka Zilynská and Petr Svobodný, eds., *Česká věda a Pražské jaro* (1963-1970) (Prague, 2001); Antonín Kostlán, ed., *Věda v Československu v období normalizace* (1970-1975) (Prague, 2002).

7. Jiří Kořalka, "Neun Jahrgänge des Husitský Tábor," in Bohemia 33 (1992), 128-138; Josef Válka, "Die Studia Comeniana et historica und die Kolloquien über Comenius in Ungarisch-Brod," in *Bohemia* 33 (1992), 354-361.

8. Cf. the annual bibliography *Bibliografie dějin českých zemí* (1990-2001), ed. by Václava Horčáková et al. and published by the Institute of History, Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic (Prague, 1994-2009); also Václava Horčáková and Kristina Rexová, *Select Bibliography on Czech History: Books and Articles 1990-1999* (Prague, 2000); Václava Horčáková and Kristina Rexová, *Select Bibliography on Czech History: Books and Articles 2000-2004* (Prague, 2005).

9. See note 1.

10. Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic: *Annual Report, 2002 -2009* (Prague, 2003-2010); also annual reports of Universities in the Czech Republic, etc.

11. The scientific production of the academic Institute of Philosophy and other institutions is represented by the central Czech journal of philosophy

Filosofický časopis and dozens of tranlated as well as original books published by the publishing house Filosofia; David Jeřábek and Pavla Toráčová, eds., *Filosofia, nakladatelství Filosofického ústavu AV ČR* (Prague, 2010).

12. Ivan Chvatík, ed., *Myšlení Jana Patočky očima dnešní fenomenologie* (Prague, 2009).

13. Filip Karfík, *Unendlichwerden durch die Endlichkeit: Eine Lektüre der Philosophie Jan Patočkas* (Würzburg, 2008).

14. See e.g. Jaroslav Peregrin, *Meaning and Structure* (Ashgate, 2001).

15. Jiří Gabriel and Lubomír Nový, eds., *Czech Philosophy in the XXth Century* (Washington, 1994).

16. Josef Šmajs and Josef Krob, *Evoluční ontologie* (Brno, 2003); Josef Šmajs, *Filosofie – obrat k Zemi: Evolučně ontologická reflexe přírody, kultury, techniky a lidského poznání* (Prague, 2008).

17. E.g. Tomáš Halík, *Patience with God: The Story of Zacchaeus Continuing in Us* (New York, 2009).

18. The most important achievements of the Prague Institute of Archaeology and other institutions in the field are published and reviewed in two central Czech journals of archaeology *Archeologické rozhledy* and *Památky archeologické*.

19. Evžen Neustupný, *Archaeological Method* (Cambridge, 1993; 2nd edition 2009).

20. *Archeologie pravěkých Čech*, 8 vols. (Prague, 2007-2008).

21. Bohumil Jiroušek, ed., *Česká a československá účast na mezinárodních kongresech historických věd* / Czech and Czechoslovak Participation in International Congresses of Historical Sciences (České Budějovice, 2006).

22. Jaroslav Pánek, *Svatava Raková and Václava Horčáková, Scholars of Bohemian, Czech and Czechoslovak History Studies*, 3 vols. (Prague, 2005); Jaroslav Pánek, "Historiography of the Bohemian/Czech Lands Abroad," in Zdeněk V. David, ed., *Contributions of the Moravian Brethren to America: Selected Papers from the Conference of the Czechoslovak Society of Arts and Sciences, at the Moravian College, Bethlehem, Pennsylvania*, June 8-10, 2007 (New York, 2008), 71-78.

23. E.g. Svatava Raková, *Anglické kolonie v severní Americe v 17. století: Modely politické kultury* (Prague, 1997); Jan Filipský, ed., *Čeští a slovenští orientalisté, afrikanisté a iberoamerikanisté* (Prague, 1999), 239-240, 344-345, 363-366, 396-398.

24. Basic information on Czech historians, their research topics, and institutions can be found in Jaroslav Pánek and Petr Vorel, eds., *Lexikon současných českých historiků* / The Lexicon of Contemporary Czech Historians (Prague, 1999), passim; Jaroslav Pánek, ed., Czech Historiography in the 1990s (Prague, 2001).

25. Pavla Vošahlíková, ed., *Biografický slovník českých zemí.* Fasc. 1-12 (A-D) (Prague, 2004-2009).

26. Jaroslav Pánek, ed., *Akademická encyklopedie českých dějin*, vol. 1 (A-C) (Prague, 2009).

27. Jaroslav Pánek, Oldřich Tůma et al., *A History of the Czech Lands* (Prague, 2009).

28. Eva Semotanová et al., eds., *Historický atlas měst České repub-*

liky, 21 vols. (Prague, 1994-2009).

29. Petr Sommer and Pavel Soukup, eds., *Centre for Medieval Studies – Centrum medievistických studií Akademie věd České republiky a Univerzity Karlovy v Praze při Filosofickém ústavu AV ČR, v.v.i., v Praze: Badatelství, doktorandská výuka, mezinárodní spolupráce 1998-2008* (Prague, 2008).

30. František Šmahel, *Die Hussitische Revolution*, 3 vols. (Hannover, 2002).

31. Josef Petráň et al., *Dějiny hmotné kultury*, vols. I/1-2, II/1-2 (Prague, 1985-1997); Josef Petráň, *Příběh Ouběnic: Mikrohistorie české vesnice* (Prague, 2001); Josef Petráň, *Dvacáté století v Ouběnicích: Soumrak tradičního venkova* (Prague, 2009).

32. Josef Válka, *Dějiny Moravy*, 2 vols. (Vlastivěda moravská, Země a lid, Nová řada 5-6) (Brno, 1991-1996).

33. Otto Urban, *Die tschechische Gesellschaft 1848-1918*, 2 vols. (Vienna, 1994); Miroslav Hroch, *Das Europa der Nationen: Die moderne Nationsbildung im europäischen Vergleich* (Göttingen, 2005).

34. Jan Křen, *Dvě století střední Evropy* (Prague, 2005).

35. Jaroslav Pánek et al., *České dějiny v současné zahraniční historiografii* (IX. sjezd českých historiků. Pardubice 6.-8. září 2006, vol. 3) (Pardubice, 2008).

36. Dagmar Blümlová, ed., *10 let kulturní historie v Historickém ústavu Jihočeské univerzity v Českých Budějovicích* (Pelhřimov, 2001).

37. Václav Bůžek and Dana Štefanová, eds., *Menschen – Handlungen – Strukturen: Historisch-anthropologische Zugangsweisen in den Geschichtswissenschaften* (České Budějovice, 2001); Václav Bůžek and Pavel Král, eds., *Šlechta v habsburské monarchii a císařský dvůr* (1526-1740) (České Budějovice, 2003).

38. Milena Lenderová, Božena Kopičková, Jana Burešová and Eduard Maur, eds., *Žena v českých zemích od středověku do 20. století* (Prague, 2009).

39. Petr Vorel, *Od českého tolaru ke světovému dolaru: Zrození tolaru a jeho cesta v evropském a světovém peněžním oběhu 16.-20. století* (Prague, 2003); Petr Vorel, *Monetary Circulation in Central Europe at the Beginning of the Early Modern Age* (Pardubice, 2006); Petr Vorel, *Stříbro v evropském peněžním oběhu 16.-17. století* (1472-1717) (Prague, 2009).

40. *Spisy T. G. Masaryka*, 25 vols. so far (Prague, 1993-2008) and *Korespondence T. G. Masaryka*, 5 vols. so far (Prague, 2001-2009).

41. Jiří Hanuš, ed., *Ekumenické církevní dějepisectví: Dějiny, analýzy, perspektivy* (Brno, 2003).

42. See *Bolletino dell'Istituto storico ceco di Roma*, vol. 3-6 (Prague, 2002-2008).

43. Martin Schulze Wessel and Martin Zückert, eds., *Handbuch der Religions- und Kirchengeschichte der böhmischen Länder und Tschechiens im 20. Jahrhundert* (Munich, 2009).

44. Milan Myška et al., *Historická encyklopedie podnikatelů Čech, Moravy a Slezska* (Ostrava, 2003).

45. Jiří Malíř, Pavel Marek et al., *Politické strany: Vývoj politických stran a hnutí v českých zemích a v Československu 1861-2004*, 2 vols. (Brno, 2005); Lukáš Fasora, Jiří Hanuš and Jiří Malíř, *Sozial-reformatorisches Denken in den böhmischen Ländern 1848-1918* (Munich, 2010).

46. Tomáš Knoz, *Pobělohorské konfiskace: Moravský průběh, stře-*

doevropské souvislosti, obecné aspekty (Brno, 2006).

47. Jindřich Dejmek, *Československo, jeho sousedé a velmoci ve XX. století (1918-1992)* (Prague, 2002); Jan Kuklík and Jan Němeček, *Proti Benešovi! Česká a slovenská protibenešovská opozice v Londýně 1939-1945* (Prague, 2004); Jan Němeček, *Soumrak a úsvit československé diplomacie* (Prague, 2008).

48. Oldřich Tůma, Jitka Svobodová and Ulrich Mählert, eds., *Vademecum soudobých dějin, Česká republika: Průvodce po archivech, badatelských institucích, knihovnách, sdruženích, muzeích a památnících* / Vademecum Contemporary History, Czech Republic. A Guide to Archives, Research Institutions, Libraries, Associations, Museums and Places of Memory (Prague, 2005).

49. Helena Krejčová and Mario Vlček, *Návraty paměti: Deponáty židovského majetku v Uměleckoprůmyslovém muzeu v Praze* (Prague, 2007); Helena Krejčová and Mario Vlček, *Výkupné za život: Vývozy a nucené dary uměleckých předmětů při emigraci židů z Čech a Moravy v letech 1938-1942 (na příkladu Uměleckoprůmyslového muzea v Praze)* / Lives for Ransom: Exports and Forced Donations of Works of Art during the Emigration of Jews from Bohemia and Moravia 1938-1942 (the Case of the Museum of Decorative Arts in Prague) (Prague, 2009).

50. The scientific production of the Institute for Contemporary History and other institutions in this field is represented by the journal *Soudobé dějiny*, published since 1993; Věra Břeňová, ed., *Soudobé dějiny: Bibliografie 1993-2008* (Prague, 2009).

51. Věra Břeňová and Slavěna Rohlíková, eds., *Czech and Slovak History, 1918-1999: A Bibliography of Select Monographs, Volumes of Essays, and Articles Published from 1990 to 1999* (Prague, 2000); Věra Břeňová and Slavěna Rohlíková, eds., *Czech and Slovak History, 1918-2004: A Bibliography of Select Monographs, Volumes of Essays, and Articles Published from 1990 to 1999* (Prague, 2005); Věra Břeňová, Slavěna Rohlíková and Oldřich Tůma, eds., *Bibliografie českých/československých dějin 1918-1995/2000-2004: Výběr knih, sborníků a článků vydaných v letech 1990-1995/1996-1999*, 3 vols. (Prague, 1997-2005).

52. Mary Heimann, *Czechoslovakia: The State that Failed* (New Haven, 2009).

53. Jindřich Dejmek, *Edvard Beneš: Politická biografie českého demokrata*, 2 vols. (Prague, 2006-2008).

54. Miroslav Vaněk, *Naslouchat hlasům paměti: teoretické a praktické aspekty orální historie* (Prague, 2007).

55. Miroslav Vaněk and Pavel Urbášek, eds., *Vítězové? Poražení? Životopisná interview*, 2 vols. (Prague, 2005); Miroslav Vaněk, ed., *Obyčejní lidé…?! Pohled do života tzv. mlčící většiny: Životopisná vyprávění příslušníků dělnických profesí a inteligence*, 3 vols. (Prague, 2009).

56. *Dějiny českého výtvarného umění*, vols. I/1-2 – VI/1-2 (Prague, 1984-2007).

57. The scientific production in the field of liguistics is represented by the central Czech journals *Časopis pro moderní filologii*, *Linguistica Pragensia*, *Naše řeč*, *Philologica Pragensia*, and *Slovo a slovesnost*.

58. František Čermák, Jiří Hronek, Jaroslav Machač, eds., *Slovník české frazeologie a idiomatiky: Výrazy slovesné*, 2 vols. (Prague, 1994), etc.

Detailed information on contemporary Czech linguists can be found in a comprehensive bio-bibliographical lexicon Jiří Černý, Jan Holeš, *Kdo je kdo v dějinách české ligvistiky* (Prague, 2008).

59. Petr Karlík, Marek Nekula and Jana Pleskalová, *Encyklopedický slovník češtiny* (Prague, 2002).

60. *Český jazykový atlas*, 5 vols. (Prague, 1992-2005).

61. *Slovník jazyka staroslověnského – Lexicon linguae palaeoslovenicae, 52 fasc*. (Prague, 1966–1997).

62. Jana Nechutová, *Die lateinische Literatur des Mittelalters in Böhmen* (Cologne, 2007).

63. Bibliography of Milena Hübschmannová in Jan Filipský, ed., *Čeští a slovenští orientalisté, afrikanisté a iberoamerikanisté* (Prague, 1999), 206-209; Ctibor Nečas, *Holocaust českých Romů* (Prague, 1999).

64. Vladimír Forst, Jiří Opelík and Luboš Merhaut, *Lexikon české literatury: Osobnosti, díla, instituce*, vols. I-IV/1-2 (Prague, 1985-2008).

65. Pavel Janoušek et al., *Dějiny české literatury 1945-1989*, 4 vols. (Prague, 2007-2008). Contributions on history of the Institute of Czech Literature, Academy of Sciences of the CR, and the contemporary Czech literary science in Kateřina Bláhová, Ondřej Sládek, eds*., Ústav pro českou literaturu AV ČR, v.v.i.* (Prague, 2010).

66. Vladimír Papoušek et al., *Dějiny nové moderny: Česká literatura v letech 1905-1923* (Prague, 2010).

67. Jiří Holý, ed., *Writers under Siege: Czech Literature since 1945* (Brighton, 2008).

68. Václav Konzal, ed., *Čtyřicet homilií Řehoře Velikého na evangelia v českocírkevněslovanském překladu*, 2 vols. (Prague, 2005-2006).

69. E.g. Ljubov Běloševská, *Kronika kulturního, vědeckého a společenského života ruské emigrace v Československé republice / Chronika kuľturnoj, naučnoj i obščestvennoj žizni russkoj emigracii v Čechoslovackoj respublike 1919-1929/1930-1939* (Prague, 2000-2001).

70. Stanislav Brouček and Richard Jeřábek, eds., *Lidová kultura: Národopisná encyklopedie Čech, Moravy a Slezska*, 3 vols. (Prague, 2007).

71. *Češi v cizině*, vol. 5-12 (Prague, 1992-2004); Zdeněk Uherek, Petr Lozoviuk and Marta Toncrová, eds., *Bosnia, Bosnian Czechs, and Migratory Bridges* (Prague, 2000), etc. See also two recent monographs: Jaroslav Vaculík, *České menšiny v Evropě a ve světě* (Prague, 2009); Alena Jaklová, *Čecho-americká periodika 19. a 20. století* (Prague, 2010).

72. E.g. Renata Weinerová, *Romanies – In Search of Lost Security?* (Prague, 1994).

73. See note 63.

74. The most representative review of research in the field of musicology is in the journal *Hudební věda*, published by the Institute of Ethnology, Academy of Sciences of the CR.

Enlarged NATO as an Asymmetric Military Alliance: The Key to Understanding Mutual Czech-American Military Cooperation?

By Petr Anděl

Introduction

Without a doubt, Czech membership in North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) has an influence on mutual Czech-American relations. This relationship has a long tradition marked by respect of the Czech people for the American role as the guardian of the free world during the Cold War. This deep respect was reflected in the sincere struggle of the Czech Republic to become a full-fledged member of the North Atlantic Alliance in the 1990s. Since March 12, 1999, when the Czech Republic entered into the NATO Alliance, Czech soldiers have taken part in all key activities of the Alliance including military missions outside the area of the Alliance. In recent years, the Czech Republic and Poland were selected to host military bases with components of American defense against ballistic missiles. Immediately, the Czechs came under diplomatic pressure from the Russian Federation, which strongly opposed the idea. Public opinion in the Czech Republic was divided. Most politicians, except for the communists, supported installation of the defense system, but they lacked the ability to explain this step correctly to the general public. Public opinion questioned the wisdom of allowing the establishment of foreign military bases in peacetime. Many people wondered what the impact on national sovereignty and on Czech relations with the Russian Federation, which is the dominant exporter of crude oil and natural gas to the country, would be. The ensuing public discussion proved to be more politicized and ideological than rational. Some portrayed American plans as evil tactics of American imperialism, whereas others saw these plans as a path to national salvation. This article argues that American motives could be explained rationally. A rational explanation would be most beneficial for mutual Czech-American relations in the long term, alleviating both nations from false accusations and unrealistic expectations. In order to understand Czech-American military cooperation, it is necessary to examine the nature of the NATO, the military alliance connecting the two nations.

Changes in NATO

The North Atlantic Treaty Organization, founded at the beginning of the Cold War, survived not only the end of global bipolarity caused by the power struggle between the United States and the Soviet Union, but, to the surprise of many intellectuals, entered into a new era of its history. The North Atlantic Alliance accepted three new members on March 12, 1999 and thus confirmed deep changes in its mission and character. The Alliance embarked on a new route towards its new mission. Many analysts wondered where this route would lead. In spite of the fact that it is impossible to predict the future with certainty, there is an answer to this question. Based on theories of military alliances, we might suggest that NATO willingly moved down a path towards increased asymmetry in the alliance. As NATO decided to go asymmetric, we can easily estimate its role, function and behavior in future years.

Origins of NATO

Based on traditional theoretical concepts of military alliances developed by Niccolò Machiavelli, Thomas Hobbes, and others, military alliances of two or more states are created in order to face a common threat. As soon as the common enemy is defeated, the alliance normally falls apart. Former allies start to quarrel over the division of the spoils of their strife and animosity develops between them. The fate of the anti-German coalition at the end of the Second World War can only confirm this scenario. In a short time after the declared victory over Nazi Germany, the coalition broke apart and disputes erupted over the post-war reconstruction of Europe. The disputes culminated in the so-called Cold War.

Germany, Europe and the whole world were divided into two spheres if interest, namely Soviet and American. The United States and the Soviet Union were the only two powers that were strengthened by the results of the Second World War and their status was elevated to that of superpower. Traditional European powers nearly lost their strength and indeed lost much of their importance. As a result, the democratic western part of Europe felt vulnerable vis-à-vis the Soviet Union and its expansive foreign policy. The Soviet Union started to expand its political and economic system to Eastern and Central Europe, to all countries that were liberated by the Red Army (renamed the Soviet Army in 1946). Western Europe desperately needed aid from overseas, since it was no longer able to resist increasing pressure from the East. It needed more than the generous economic help provided by the Marshall Plan.

In the face of overwhelming Soviet military superiority, Europe needed credible security guarantees. Without basic security guarantees, the western half of Europe could not have hope to have a prosperous future. Therefore, the Western European Union was created from the initiative of European countries.[1] Remnants of anti-German sentiments can be traced in this treaty as well as in its predecessor, namely the French-British Dunkirk treaty of March 4, 1947. Finally, on April 4, 1949, the North Atlantic Treaty was signed in Washington D.C. and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) was thus established. Emphasizing the notion of common defense, NATO linked the security of Western Europe with that of the United States and Canada.

In Article 1, the North Atlantic Treaty upholds the obligation to promote world peace in accordance with the principles and obligations under the Charter of the United Nations Organization. NATO declared its allegiance to the principles of as well as its sub-ordinance to the United Nations Organization. Due to the fact that the UN Charter agrees to the existence of local defense alliances[2] that under special circumstances can replace the UN military forces, NATO became a supportive organization of the UN.

Article 2 of the North Atlantic Treaty speaks of the promotion of free institutions and economic cooperation among members. Article 3 declares the duty to develop defense capabilities. Article 4 supports mutual consultations among members. Article 5 declares an armed attack on one of the members to be an attack on all member states and declares the duty to take countermeasures. Article 6 defines territory under the protection of the North Atlantic Treaty. Article 7 recognizes the main responsibility of the UN Security Council for global peace. Article 8 prohibits members from entering into treaties contradicting their obligations under the North Atlantic Treaty as well as those that contradict the principles of the UN Charter. Article 9 provides for organiza-

tional structure. Article 10 describes basic conditions of entrance for new members. Article 11 defines the process of ratification of the accession treaties. Article 12 provides for revisions of the North Atlantic Treaty. Article 13 sets conditions for leaving the Alliance. Article 14 provides for the permanent safekeeping of the treaty.[3]

In summary, newly-created NATO became an integral part of the international system based on the principles of the UN, which rejected military power as a legitimate instrument for the solution of international disputes.

NATO during the Cold War

From the outset, NATO reacted to the development of the security threat posed primarily by the Soviet Union and its allies. Up until the Lisbon summit in 1952, the alliance remained more a political association than a military pact. As a reaction to the bloody War in Korea (1950-1953), the alliance underwent a massive buildup of military power. NATO decided to became an effective military counterweight to Soviet military power in Europe. In 1952, NATO membership was enlarged to include Greece and Turkey, mostly due to the strategic location of those two countries. On May 5, 1955, NATO acknowledged the need to incorporate Germany into the common defense of Western Europe and accepted the Federal Republic of Germany (West Germany) as a new member. This step resulted in a decision by the Soviet Union to establish its own military pact in Europe, namely the Warsaw Treaty Organization. By accepting West Germany as a member of the Alliance, NATO substantially stabilized Western Europe and secured the continuation of the American military presence in Europe. The majority of American forces in Europe were stationed in West Germany. Membership of the Federal Republic of Germany in NATO also effectively prevented any military competition among West European nations in the future. This step put en end to the traditional policy of balance of power between Germany and its Western neighbors. In 1982, NATO accepted Spain (which had become democratic after the death of its dictator, Francisco Franco, in 1975) as a new member. Further enlargement would occur after the end of the Cold War.

The State of the Alliance 1987-1988: North Atlantic Assembly Reports issued in 1988 in London[4] in the part written by Karsten Voigt[5] tried to compare the military might of NATO and the Warsaw Pact respectively. This task was extremely difficult due to the asymmetric character of both military pacts as well as their arsenals. According to this report, NATO relied on its traditional technological superiority over the more numerous Soviet conventional military power in Europe. Therefore, the alliance feared most an improvement in Soviet air capabilities as well as Soviet progress in the development of land-to-air missiles. Such weapons could call into question the cornerstone of NATO's military doctrine of technological superiority in Europe, which rested mainly in NATO air capabilities. Based on the data of the 1984 NATO Force Comparisons Report, IISS 1986-87 Military Balance, the Pentagon's editions of Soviet Military Power in 1986 and 1987, and the 1987 UK White Paper on Defense, Karsten Voigt arrived at the conclusion that in spite of numerical superiority of the Warsaw Pact in all important categories of weapons, the military might of both pacts was so great that it made any direct conflict between NATO and the Warsaw Pact very unlikely.[6]

Based on the 1988 report edited by L. Sullivan, J. LeCuyer, and the

Atlantic Council Working Group on Comprehensive Security entitled *Comprehensive Security and Western Prosperity: A Background Report*,[7] it is obvious that NATO evaluated itself very differently with regard to its historic contribution and future perspectives. NATO was also evaluated differently as a military and political organization. Tribute had been paid to NATO's role in bringing stability to Europe. It was stated that, in spite of a clash of political and economical interests, the security of Western Europe depended fully on the United States and all other European interests were dependent on this basic fact. Together with the slow transformation of the great Soviet threat into traditionally less dangerous Russian imperial ambitions, the *Comprehensive Security and Western Prosperity-Background Report* predicted a decrease of consensus within the alliance. In a more secure world, European allies were more likely to question American leadership and supremacy in the alliance. In 1988, it was clear that the alliance had to be reformed in the near future. The report expected an increase of the power of the European members connected with the deepening of the process of European integration. A united Europe had, according to this report, at least theoretically the economic potential to overshadow the United States in some aspects, but the prospect for investment into European defense was to decline continuously in the coming years. Therefore, in its conclusions, the *Comprehensive Security and Western Prosperity- Background Report* stated that NATO will remain a valuable organization in the future, but only under the provision that it will undergo substantial reforms adapting it to changed conditions due to the ending of the Cold War. Intended reforms were to be taken by the year 2007. The most serious threat to the West was seen in the possible success of Gorbachev's economic reforms known as Perestroika. Only this could revive the Soviet threat.

Central and Eastern Europe with its more developed economic and political institutions was seen as a testing ground of the depth and sincerity of Gorbachev's reforms bringing an end to the Cold War. The countries of Central and Eastern Europe had been subjected against their will to Soviet rule and therefore became the main objection of the West against Soviet imperialism.
The Background Report presents clearly the necessity to reform NATO hand in hand with the fact that with the ongoing end of the Cold War, NATO could become more a political than a military organization. In order not to lose its relevance, the alliance had to declare a new mission different from resistance to the slowly vanishing Soviet threat.

NATO after the Cold War

At the end of the Cold War, NATO was a strong military pact, a true counterweight to the impressive Soviet military might in Europe. Alliance structures, military equipment, tactics, training and doctrines were designated to match those of the Soviet Union. The alliance was ready to engage in ultimate combat, the last total battle "of the forces of good and evil", and to fight until (possibly nuclear) Armageddon.

The year 1989 brought several changes connected with the rapid and most surprisingly peaceful fall of the Berlin Wall. The whole Iron Curtain dividing Europe into Western and Eastern Europe fell down. The Eastern bloc collapsed first, shortly after the collapse of communist dictatorships. Agreements were made for the removal of Soviet forces from Central and Eastern European countries and the Warsaw Pact was dissolved by its member at the

end of 1991. The Soviet Union itself collapsed and broke apart. At that moment, the impressive military heavy weight of NATO stood there facing a non-existent enemy, or facing a threat that was much smaller than its capabilities, which had been designed to fight the third world war.

NATO started to adapt to the new conditions. Debates over the future of NATO began during the great debate over the possible reunification of Germany, a country that had been divided by the Cold War. It was determined that Germany could not be unified outside of the NATO framework because even its western neighbors and NATO allies had serious misgivings about Germany's possible future power ambitions.[8] It was deemed that the power of unified Germany was so great that it simply had to be tamed by its NATO membership as well as by the continuing process of European integration. A transparent, cooperative Germany guarded by NATO and melted down by the process of European integration was the only vision that could persuade Germany's western neighbors, namely France and Great Britain, to agree to its reunification. NATO thus proved that it serves not only to protect Europe from outside threats, but also that it protects Europeans from themselves. NATO membership avoids any attempt to renew European power competition connected with the nationalization of defenses, arms races, and a threat to employ military power.

In order to facilitate unification of Germany and reconcile Soviet objections, the NATO summit on July 6 1990 declared that NATO will become a more political rather than military alliance.[9] During the London summit, NATO called for all of the six former Warsaw Pact members -- Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, Romania and the Soviet Union- -- to establish full diplomatic relations with NATO. A year later, American Secretary of State James Baker confirmed the willingness of the United States to promote bilateral relations between NATO members and the countries of Central and Eastern Europe, including the Soviet Union.[10] In accordance with this plan, the North Atlantic Cooperation Council (NACC) was created during the NATO summit in Rome on 7th and 8th November 1991. The aim was to establish cooperation with the countries of Central and Eastern Europe and to organize meetings on the ministerial level at least once a year. After the breakup of the Soviet Union, the NACC included countries from Central Europe to Central Asia. All its members gained the opportunity to consult with NATO members in Brussels as well as with the NATO military command in Mons, Belgium.[11] In order to placate the Soviet Union, the purely defensive role of NATO was stressed in its new strategic conception introduced during the Rome summit.[12]

In 1991, a new Strategic Concept of NATO was accepted.[13] All thoughts concerning NATO's future from the years 1990-1991 began the starting point for the debate inside the new American administration of President Clinton. The debate was mostly an internal debate between the State Department and Department of Defense from the beginning, but was influenced heavily by a strong wish of new European democracies to become members of the alliance. After the breakup of the Soviet Union, this wish turned into increasing political pressure. To both departments it was clear that in the future, NATO would have to approach and cooperate with the East European countries – former members of the Warsaw Pact. The Department of State wanted to integrate East European countries into an international community of democratic countries and, at the same time, cultivate good relations with the Russian

Federation. The Department of Defense concentrated foremost on maintaining the high military capabilities of NATO.

Finally, representatives of both departments created joint working groups and reached a compromise suggesting possible military cooperation with all former members of the Warsaw Pact as well as with all European countries, which were not yet members of NATO. That compromise plan of cooperation with former adversaries gave new life to NATO, a new raison d'être. Planned cooperation comprised activities such as peacekeeping and peace enforcement outside of the NATO area. Due to its task and out of respect to Russia, which might perceive military cooperation of its former satellites with NATO as enemy activity, this plan was named the Peacekeeping Partnership. Soon, the plan was renamed Partnership for Peace. In spite of the fact that the name was nearly harmless and innocent, partnership posed a great challenge for the Alliance. Its new tasks were quite different from its old Cold War mission. Partnership for Peace was introduced during the Brussels NATO summit in January 1994. At this time, the American administration slowly took a position friendly to the idea of NATO enlargement to include the countries of Central and East Europe. However, this topic had to wait until the result of the 1996 Russian presidential elections. The US government was afraid that the prospect of NATO expansion might ruin prospects for democratic reforms in the Russian Federation.[14] After the pro-reform president Yeltsin was reelected, negotiations over NATO enlargement accelerated.

On March 12, 1999 NATO finally accepted the Czech Republic, Poland and Hungary as full-fledged new members. Together with this, NATO started to act militarily to stop what was considered to be genocide against ethnic Albanians in Kosovo. NATO went out of the area of its member states' territory. After a terrorist attack on the United States on September 11, 2001, the North Atlantic Council met to respond to the attack. The North Atlantic Council declared the attack to be one on the United States and all its allies under Article V of the North Atlantic Treaty. NATO therefore joined the American war on international terrorism and belatedly followed the Americans to Afghanistan and Iraq. This was the first time in the history of NATO when Article V was invoked.[15]

During the 2002 Prague summit the alliance invited Bulgaria, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia to start accession talks and, on March 29, 2004, those countries entered the alliance. On April 1, 2009, the Alliance accepted in its third post-Cold War round of enlargement two more Southeast European countries. Albania and Croatia became its new members.
NATO adapted to the changed conditions of the post-Cold War world. It remained relevant to European security. More than that, the nations of Central and Eastern Europe found their security guarantees in this Alliance and most of them were allowed to became members of the Alliance. But they found more than their own security there. They found also responsibility for peace and stability in the globalizing world. They had to support the UN system promoted by the United States more actively against all challenges, including military ones. If they did not want to be in the position of free riders in the Alliance, they had to participate actively in most of the military missions of the Alliance in the Balkans, Afghanistan, and Iraq. They simply had to take part in "out of area" military operations of the alliance.

Disillusions

Some people in Central and Eastern Europe started to compare the old NATO they knew from the times of the Cold War with the alliance they entered and began to question the wisdom of military operations abroad in a time of relative peace. These people were uneasy with the growing activism of enlarged NATO and often questioned if the military actions in question could get out of hand. How would the new NATO act in the near future, how will the alliance develop? What will be its modus operandi? They worried that NATO had shifted from improving the common defense of its member states' territories for the sake of preparedness to conduct low intensity military operations abroad.

As evidence, they can cite the decrease of the real military power of NATO's new countries. Former Warsaw Pact members practically ceased building armies ready to defend their own territories in favor of building light expeditionary forces. The forces they are building could be used only in combination with allied forces of NATO in "out of area" operations. In other words, such forces make sense only in combination with predominantly American real military power. By themselves, these armies are close of having no utility at all. Many more questions arose in the moment when the USA mentioned publicly its desire to install its military bases on the territory of new members, particularly in the Czech Republic and Poland. Is it really a necessary development? Where will the growing asymmetry of power and capabilities among members lead the Alliance? Could such a growing asymmetric Alliance last for long?

It is impossible to predict future events with certainty, but with the basic knowledge of theoretical concepts explaining the creation and function of military alliances, the basic general answers to the prior mentioned questions can be provided. A key to understanding the answer is to examine the new NATO as an asymmetrical military alliance.

Theoretical Framework

In order to examine the changes in NATO during the process of its enlargement to the territory of the former Warsaw Pact, it is necessary to acquaint the reader with theoretical frameworks designed to examine the formation of military alliances. The process of formation of military alliances has been examined since ancient times through the observations of such thinkers as Niccolò Machiavelli (1469-1527), Thomas Hobbes (1588-1679), John Locke (1632-1704), Jean Bodin (1530-1596), and Carl Philip Gottlieb von Clausewitz (1780-1831) up until the present day. The overwhelming model of the creation of military alliances could be labeled as a "public good model" (a model where all participants profit from the alliance), formed by Mancur Olson and Richard Zeckhauser (1966) and further reworked by Jacques van Ypersele de Strihou (1967), Todd Sandler and John Cauley (1975), Sandler (1977), Murdoch and Sandler (1982), and McGuir(1990).[16]

The security achieved in the alliance is seen as a product shared jointly by all members of the alliance. On the basis of the public good model of military alliances, each state willing to enter should be accepted, since the more states included in the alliance, the smaller common defense expenditures are and the smaller are individual member contributions to common defense. According to Sandler and Hartley[17] it is especially convenient for a new mem-

ber to enter into the alliance.

Another theory speaks of membership in an alliance on the basis of limited resources available to particular states and willingness to share defense expenditures just with competent and able partners. This theory compares membership in a military alliance to membership of a social club. Only select members that can offer something to the club are allowed to enter. The club theory of military alliances mainly assumes savings based on decrease of expenditures that originally were deemed to be dedicated to the protection of a common inner border of the alliance with conventional military forces.[18] Even this club theory explained principles of forming as well as enlargement of military alliances only partially. In general, the question of how much can alliance save by accepting a new member, or what quality a new member will add to the alliance has been key in deciding whom to accept as an ally in nearly all traditional models of military alliances.

Symmetric and Asymmetrical alliances

According to James D. Morrow,[19] the majority of known theoretical models of military alliances can be labeled as "capability aggregation" models, or "cumulative" models. This theoretical concept draws on the assumption that states are motivated to form military alliances by the need to accumulate military capabilities. Therefore, all the allies can gain increased security throughout the alliance. Their goals are symmetric in that all desire an increase of their security or an aggregation of military power. The theory of symmetric military alliances presumes a concept in which states attempt to balance their power. We can see that this model is built on the classical realistic perspective of international relations taught by Hans Morgenthau, Kenneth Waltz, and others.[20] Capability aggregation-based military alliances are built around a mutually-shared threat or enemy. Therefore, the alliance is usually functional so long as the original threat is still present.

However, not all alliances are symmetric. An asymmetric military alliance is one where at least one ally gains security from the alliance while the other desires primarily to increase its autonomy in foreign policy. James D. Morrow further developed the original theoretical concept portraying asymmetric military alliances drawn by Michael F. Altfeld.[21] Asymmetric alliance can be perceived as a contract or deal in which one party barters its military might and its own security for the autonomy of the other (usually weaker) ally or allies. The weaker ally subjects its political autonomy to the will of the stronger one and, in addition, usually agrees with the location of troops, military personnel, and installation of military bases of the dominant ally on its territory. In exchange for this decrease of its autonomy, the weaker ally receives security guarantees.

The stronger ally sometimes even diminishes its own security by entering into an alliance with a weak state, but this decrease of its security is compensated by the greater political freedom it will enjoy on the international scene. Morrow holds the opinion that it is easier to form an asymmetric military alliance and, in addition, asymmetric alliances usually last much longer than do symmetric ones.[22] Asymmetrical military alliances are usually formed by growing regional powers in the moment in which their military capabilities significantly grow. But the moment when the forces and capabilities spread more equally in an asymmetric alliance, it is most likely to disband. The great-

est benefit of this theory is that both symmetric and asymmetric military alliances could be described by it.

One of the most well-known aspects of alliance-building since the times of Machiavelli is the fact that the more powerful a state is, the more likely other states will ally with it. Morrow states as a fact that alliances bring significant changes to the policy promoted by its members. This is valid mostly for the entering new members. They have to abandon their old goals and begin to pursue common allied goals instead.

States by themselves have two major tendencies in their attitude toward alliances. They do serve as a counterweight to the power of the opposing alliance, or they bandwagon the alliance if it is successful. NATO by itself could be seen as an asymmetric alliance helping to maintain the balance of power in Europe. There is the phenomenon of free riding that is connected with the mere existence of asymmetric military alliances. Free riding is an attempt to save one's own scarce resources at the expense of other alliance members. That means that each such alliance has to face a partial decrease of quality and efficiency of its forces compared to the raw cumulative total summary of its forces – this is referred to as the "underproduction of military goods". This underproduction of military goods can be reduced by a strong dominant ally that will decide to assume responsibility for military capabilities in exchange for an increase of its own autonomy.

In an asymmetrical military alliance, aside from financing of the military and the composition of military forces, it is especially important to understand the factual role of its members in the alliance. The dominant state usually insists on such composition of military forces of the alliance that will increase its own autonomy, but will not increase the security of its weaker allies.[23] If requirements for greater autonomy of the dominant state collide with the security needs of weaker members, disputes over the composition and structure of forces will appear in the alliance. In comparison, such disputes are less probable in symmetric alliances where all allies seek to increase their security.

Asymmetric military alliances serve also as a tool through which the dominant states try to gain control over the international system. For instance, the United States protects its allies from their neighbors. As compensation, the American authorities impose control over the foreign policy of their allies and use this control to promote American interests in the world. After the end of the Second World War, the United States became the clearest example of the expansion of global hegemony through a network of asymmetric military alliances. The key instruments are NATO and the American alliance with Japan. All the alliances enable the United States to secure American interests. They offer the United States military bases as well as reasons to intervene on behalf of friendly governments.

A good practical basis to examine the enlargement of NATO after the end of the Cold War can be found in the theory of Olson and Zeckhauser[24] claiming that the calculation of expenditures saved on the defense of inner borders (or other costs connected with defense) loses its relevance at the moment when one of the allies owns nuclear weapons. Based on these thoughts, the United States can at least theoretically extend protection via its nuclear umbrella to a nearly infinite number of potential allies without increasing its own military expenditures. Olson and Zeckhauser's theory assumes that the dominant state will require political compensation for its protection on behalf of its new

allies. Such compensation will be greater, based on the probability that an enemy of the alliance could be capable of a retaliatory second strike. This theory illustrates what benefits the United States gains from membership in alliances concerning countries with which the United States does not share common borders, like ANZUS and NATO, etc. The United States benefits from political compensation.

According to Thompson and Zuck,[25] possible disadvantages of such an alliance are an overestimation of its own forces and getting into the so-called territorial trap. The dominant state, in this case, achieves just a short-term adjustment of the international system in exchange for a long-term decrease of its own resources as well as its own security in the future.

Morrow goes even further and examines theoretically possible conflicts inside asymmetric alliances. There are three inherent sources of conflict. One dwells on an attempt of the dominant state to subordinate the weaker one. A conflict of two weaker allies is the second and a quarrel over who will exercise the leadership in the alliance is the third source of potential conflict.

Conclusion

If we apply all the above theoretical knowledge to the process of NATO enlargement, we may claim that NATO changed substantially after the end of the Cold War. NATO reformed, accepted new missions, and underwent three enlargements. Apart from all the activities recorded well in its documents, NATO underwent another, less outspoken transformation. The NATO that accepted its first post-Cold War new members was no more the old Cold War alliance that just reflected on the changes of outer (Soviet) threat. Instead of purely concentrating on its own defense, NATO after the end of the Cold War started actively to shape the European security environment. A purely defensive alliance changed into a tool projecting not only its military power, but also the values of its members beyond its borders. The projection of democracy, free market economics, peace, and stability was deemed necessary in order to stabilize the whole of Europe and its more-or-less distant neighborhoods. More than that, NATO, which was always an asymmetric alliance, decided willingly to move on a theoretical scale more closely to the ideal model of asymmetric military alliances, namely the one with the nearly omnipotent dominant ally that can extend its protection to a nearly limitless number of less powerful states.

The development as well as activities of the new, enlarged NATO are no mystery or disaster, but rather they are predictable on the basis of quite old theories of asymmetrical military alliances from the 1980s, but those are not generally known either to the broader public or to the relevant media which helps to shape public opinion concerning NATO and its activities. In fact, the existence of an asymmetric alliance between powerful and weak states is by itself not a sign of humiliation, but, as can be seen in the example of NATO, could be mutually beneficial to both strong and weak states.

The increased allied activities in the globalizing world the new members have to support in accordance with the North Atlantic Treaty should lead at least theoretically to the strengthening of the UN-based international system, supported most of all by the United States. Knowing that support of the UN system was key to the security of most of the small and less powerful states even prior to NATO, support of allied activities does not appear as a terrible

sacrifice made by the less powerful as a tribute for their security in the Alliance. In it, support of the UN system is one of basic security interests of small states.

Based on the theory of asymmetric alliances, it is possible to estimate that together with the further process of European integration and the possible increase of European power, the states that are in the potential center of power of the EU ---- the old NATO members -- will object to some aspects of American leadership in the Alliance. The new members accepted to the Alliance after the end of the Cold War, on the contrary, are expected to be the most loyal to the dominant ally, since they present the weakest European countries and therefore benefit most from the asymmetry in the Alliance. Therefore, they could be perceived by some of the old EU members as "an American Trojan horse" in the EU. In exchange, the USA might shield those countries from some adverse effects of European integration led by former European powers willing traditionally to solve their problems at the expense of small countries.
Insofar as American attempts to place US military bases on the territory of new member states of the Alliance is concerned, we should expect continuing American pressure to do so. We might also expect voices from both new as well as old members that rather than American military bases, common NATO bases should be placed on the territory of the new members. According to the theories of asymmetric military alliances, common NATO bases are less likely to appear, since the dominant ally has a natural interest to spread only its own military bases as a tool to promote its own interests in the region.

NATO in itself might also soon reach its territorial and operational limits. The alliance relatively easily filled nearly the whole security vacuum created in Europe after the fall of the Eastern bloc. Further expansion to the East would most likely be prevented by the resistance of a determined, nuclear-equipped Russian Federation. In this case, the alliance would probably not risk further enlargement to Ukraine or Georgia.

The out-of-area operations of member states became part of the alliance's new mission. The alliance had to go out of area in order not to lose its relevance, but those operations if long unsuccessful and demanding can ruin the resources of the alliance, respectively of the dominant ally, as well as its willingness to pay the costs involved. It can also bring an end to a consensus in the coalition to conduct those operations. Out-of-area operations of member states like the operations in Afghanistan and Iraq will remain the most controversial of allied activities. To some extent, those operations will be necessary for NATO to remain relevant, but, on the other hand, they can lead the Alliance into the well-known trap of territorial overstretch of its own forces. In any case, a debacle in any of those operations could really harm the Alliance, especially its presently good reputation.

Czech military cooperation with all NATO allies and namely with the United States will continue without any doubt. The Czech Army will definitely continue to take part in missions "out of area". Even the interest to install new American military bases in the Czech Republic is likely to continue in the future. In spite of all ideologically colored debates over those military bases, the final result will reflect both American interest to strengthen control in the region and the power, or weakness, of the Czech Republic. In other words, the weaker the country will be, the more likely it will opt for "buying more security" from the United States, for instance in the form of American military bases

in exchange for a certain "decrease of its sovereignty." The most important fact, regardless on the result of the agreement over military bases, is that mutual cooperation is both beneficial as well as voluntary for both sides. Therefore its particular details and problems should never overshadow the long tradition of friendship between the two nations.

NOTES

1. Western European Union originated from the Brussels Pact, a treaty of collective defense among Belgium, Luxembourg, Netherlands, France and the United Kingdom, signed in March 1948. Brussels pact counted still on the possibility of renewed German threat, but was not aimed primarily against Germany. After Italy and Germany joined the pact, it changed its name to the Western European Union. One of its first missions was to keep eye on the process of rearmament of Germany. Anti-German sentiment soon vanished from the Western European Union. Portugal and Spain joined in 1988 and Greece in 1992.

2. *Charter of the United Nations*, chap. 8, "Regional Arrangements," Article 52-54 (6.6. 2009) at http://www.un.org/aboutun/charter/index.html.

3. Internet document at http://www.nato.int (10.10.2009).

4. Astori Giafranco, Engwirda Maarten, Voigt Karsten, Bouvard L., Bemmelen T. Struick von, and Cartwright John, *The State of the Alliance 1987 -1988: North Atlantic Assembly Reports* (London: Westview Press, 1988).

5. Karsten Voigt was first elected as representative to the German Bundestag in 1976. He worked as a speaker of the SPD party in matters concerning foreign policy and held several key positions in Bundestag from 1983 to 1998. During 1994-1996 he worked as President of the Parliamentary Assembly of NATO, he also worked as a President of NATO's Defense and Security Committee. Since January 1999 he worked as a coordinator of the German-American cooperation at the German Ministry of Foreign Affairs. For the entire time he commanded special respect in matters of foreign policy.

6. Astori Giafranco, Engwirda Maarten, Voigt Karsten, Bouvard L., Bemmelen T. Struick von, and Cartwright John, *The State of the Alliance 1987 -1988*, 68.

7. Sullivan Leonard, Jr, Le Cuyer Jack A., and the Atlantic Council Working Group on Comprehensive Security, *Comprehensive Security and Western Prosperity: A Background Report* (University Press of America, 1988).

8. Art Robert J., "Why Western Europe Needs the United States and NATO," Political Science Quarterly 111, no. 1 (1996), 14.

9. "Declaration on a Transformed North Atlantic Alliance Issued by the Heads of State and Government Participating in the Meeting of the North Atlantic Council" (i.e., "The London Declaration"), London, 6 July 1990, at http://www.nato.int/docu/basictxt/b900706a.htm (1.1.2010).

10. Baker James, "The Euro-Atlantic Architecture: From West to East, Berlin, June 18, 1991," Department of State Dispatch, 24 June 1991, 2:440.

11. Simon Jeffrey, "Does Eastern Europe Belong in NATO?" Orbis 37 (Winter 1993), 21-31.

12. *NATO Handbook* (Brussels, 1995), 237, 242.

13. Accepted by the North Atlantic Council during the meeting in Rome on November 7-8, 1991. More details in: NATO Handbook, 237, 242.

14. James M. Goldgeier, *Not Whether but When: The U.S. Decision to Enlarge NATO* (Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press, 1999), 72, 73.

15. Similarly Australian Prime Minister invoked Article IV of the ANZUS treaty.

16. Olson Mancur and Zeckhauser Richard, "An Economic Theory of Alliances," *Review of Economics and Statistics* 48 (1966), 266-279. Van Ypersele de Strihou Jacques, "Sharing the Defense Burden among Western Allies," *Review of Economics and Statistics* 49 (1967), 527-536. Sandler Todd and John Cauley, "On the Economic Theory of Alliances," *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 19 (1975), 330-348. Sandler Todd, "Impurity of Defense: An Application to the Economics of Alliances," *Kyklos* 30 (1977), 443-460. Murdoch James C. and Sandler Todd, "A Theoretical and Empirical Analysis of NATO," *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 26 (1982), 237-263. McGuire Martin C, "Mixed Public-Private Benefit and Public-Good Supply with Application to the NATO Alliance," *Defense Economics* 1 (1990), 17-35.

17. Hartley Keith and Sandler Todd, "NATO Burden Sharing: Past and Future," *Journal of Peace Research* 36 (1999), 665-680.

18. Murdoch James C. and Sandler Todd, "A Theoretical and Empirical Analysis of NATO," 237-263. Sandler Todd, "Impurity of Defense," 443-460. Sandler Todd and Forbes John F, "Burden Sharing, Strategy, and the Design of NATO," *Economic Inquiry* 18 (1980), 425-444.

19. Morrow James D, "Alliances and Asymmetry: An Alternative to Capability Aggregation Model of Military Alliances," *American Journal of Political Science* 35, no 4. (November 1991), 904-933.

20. Morgenthau Hans J, *Politics among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace*, 5th Ed. (New York: Knopf, 1973). Waltz Kenneth N, *Theory of International Politics* (New York: Random House, 1979).

21. Altfeld Michael F, "The Decision to Ally: A Theory and Test," *Western Political Quarterly* 37 (1984), 523-544.

22. More details on theory of longer duration of asymmetric alliances can be found in: Manus I. Midlarsky, *The Onset of World War* (London: HarperCollins, 1990), 158-168.

23. Morrow James D, "Alliances and Asymmetry: An Alternative to Capability Aggregation Model of Military Alliances," 929.

24. Olson Mancur and Zeckhauser Richard, "An Economic Theory of Alliances," 266-279.

25. Thompson William R. and Gary Zuck, "World Power and the Strategic Trap of Territorial Commitments," *International Studies Quarterly* 30 (1986), 249-267.

Franko V. Sasinek – the Slovak Palacký? Attempt at an Intellectual Portrait.[1]

By Josette Baer

Introduction: Sasinek, the Forgotten Historian

The title of my article refers to the coincidences that happen from time to time in our profession. At the beginning of my research, I found that Sasinek had published countless articles about the history of Hungary and the origins of the Slavs, which immediately reminded me of František Palacký (1798-1876). Richard Marsina and Peter Mulík's collection of studies came out in 2007 and is the only study known to me that assesses the historical, religious and social aspects of Sasinek's works.[2] Matúš Kučera states that Sasinek's contemporaries had compared him to the Czech historian.[3]

Palacký and Sasinek shared an unprecedented talent and passion for history and a lifelong concern for their nations' political liberties. But while Palacký is widely known in the Czech Republic and Europe, Sasinek is less well known, even in his native Slovakia. This can be explained by the distinct development of Slovak historiography.

Slovak historiography emerged in 1919 with the foundation of the Comenius university in Bratislava and developed in three phases:[4] the first was characterised by the perception of Slovak history as a part of the larger Czechoslovak history. Daniel Rapant represented an exception among the first generation of mostly Czech professors, who had to face the difficult task of investigating Slovak history from the perspective of a joint Czech and Slovak history.

The second began in 1953 with the foundation of the Slovak Academy of Sciences and its Department of History that started to undertake serious research on distinct epochs, but was subject to the ideological constraints of Marxism-Leninism. The third phase began in 1989 and represented the third attempt to research Slovak history. This third attempt featured a new direction for Slovak historiography that involved taking up relations with international historiography and enjoyed a new professional framework without any ideological constraints.[5] In regard to the 19th-century epoch of "praise and defense of the Slovaks,"[6] the first historiographical phase accomplished historical descriptions and pinned down topical areas, but failed to fill in the historiographical lacunas, such as critical biographies of historians like Sasinek. He simply became forgotten in the collective memory due to the lack of historiographical research.

The Slovak Academy of Sciences published the works of Ján Palarík (1822-1870) in 1956.[7] Palarík had also been a Catholic priest, but had held liberal and modernist views. A sharp critic of the Catholic clergy and an outspoken defender of civil rights, Palarík had, however, never directly addressed the concept of democracy. Sasinek, by contrast, was a radical conservative; his texts and views were diametrically opposed to the most modest call for modern civil rights. He spoke with contempt about Socialism.[8] His suggestions for how to resolve social misery, brought about by the economic system established by Hungary's nobility in the preceding centuries,[9] did not include political or economic reforms, let alone social or civil rights. Sasinek suggested faith as a cure: the poor should believe in the rightfulness and wisdom of the Church's

leadership, since Socialism would only lead to damnation. The Lord had created poverty and richness – it was not for the people to correct this divine segregation. To him, social mobility was blasphemy and attempts to establish a better life for oneself without the guidance of the Catholic Church was a godless endeavor doomed from the beginning. His outspoken tolerance of the Slovak Lutherans originated in his nationalism, which was language-based. As regards social issues, we could say that Sasinek adhered to the motto "Caritas instead of political rights." Caritas would ascertain the Catholic Church's power, in particular in the conservative countryside.

Making a sharp distinction between social issues and politics, he considered history as the politics of yesterday. I shall try to show on the following pages that Sasinek did not separate history from politics, as Michal Otčenáš holds.[10] On the contrary, I think that Sasinek consulted historical documents to craft his political arguments. He developed from a loyal Catholic monk into a fervent Slovak patriot, equipped with scholarly skills acquired in the seminary. As much as he criticised the Magyars for their assimilation, he did not utter a critical word about the Catholic hierarchy. And yet he insisted on surprisingly modern, objective methods in historical research; the study of sources had to entail linguistic and etymological analysis of the key concepts. Sasinek published in Latin, Slovak, Hungarian, German and Czech and often used the pseudonyms Chvojnicky and Slovákovič, especially in newspaper articles attacking Magyar politicians in a sarcastic and condescending tone. Section I will help us gain a better understanding of Sasinek's key concepts nation and equality of rights; section II focuses on historic rights, an area which Sasinek would abuse to present a distortion of historical facts. For an insight into the political situation in Upper Hungary in the 19th century I refer the reader to the works summarized under note 11.[11]

I. Sasinek's key concepts

I.1. The nation (národ)

> The Slovak sons are sons of the country […] Concerning their language, they are the sons of Slovak parents, who have the god-given right to demand of their sons and daughters that they honour them and keep alive branch and language […] What would those Hungarian "trained pedagogues" say, if somebody suggested talking to a Magyar [student, add. JB] in English, so that he would understand [the concepts of science, add. JB]?[12]

Sasinek's concept of the nation was the traditional one he shared with the majority of the members of the national movement: nationhood was based on Slovak. This originated in Ján Kollár's (1793-1852) idea of Slavonic reciprocity (Slovanská vzájemnost).[13] The importance of language was the great intellectual legacy of the Romantic philosopher Johann Gottfried Herder (1744 -1803). His thought had a crucial influence on the Central European nations and their emerging cultural and national feelings, commonly referred to as national awakenings. Herder had praised the Slavs as a peaceful, hospitable and industrious nation, committed to trade and agriculture and incapable of defending itself against violent enslavery by other nations.[14] Kollár had taken

Herder's call for cultural diversity to a linguistic level and created the idea of Slavonic reciprocity or solidarity. The common descent of all Slavs formed the basis for their development into four tribes or branches: the Russian, the Polish, the Czecho-Slovak and the Illyrian or South-Slavic. Ľudovít Štúr (1815 -1856), the prominent leader of the early Slovak national movement, separated Kollár's Czecho-Slovak tribe into a Czech and a Slovak group, acknowledging the linguistic differences. Adopting Herder's Romantic cultural diversity, which was in fact the claim for tolerance of diversity, Štúr standardised the norms of the Slovak literary language in 1843.[15] He followed the philosopher Hegel (1770-1831) in one important issue: he identified the Slovak nationa- spirit as part of Hegel's universal Weltgeist, which was the ultimate expression of human reason moving towards universal freedom.[16] Yet, adhering here to Herder, Štúr thought of freedom not in terms of a sovereign nation-state, since Romantic thought regarded the state as an artificial construct that denied a nation's spirit and true humanity. Language rights and cultural autonomy, not independent statehood, were the goals of early Romantic Slovak nationalism. In other words: if the Slovaks wanted to be a nation, they had to have a national spirit, a metaphysical and a physical expression of their existence. The physical-materialist expression of the national spirit was the codified written language, which proved their distinct diversity.

Sasinek understood nationhood much in the way Štúr had, and was committed to the Slovaks' natural right to use their language. To forbid Slovak to be spoken was blasphemy and equated to cultural genocide, to use a modern concept. Education was an important issue to him. If the Magyars were serious about building a modern state through scientific and economic progress, they would have to understand the importance of instruction in the mother tongue.

> A Slovak student, ignorant of even the most basic Hungarian word, incapable of properly reading Hungarian, carries in his belt Hungarian school books, of which he has as much understanding as of Arabic, and, coming to school, he listens to a Magyar professor's lecture, which he understands as much as a Chinese would a comedy in a German theatre. […] do these Hungarian "trained pedagogues" know the meaning of a "circulus vitiosus" in education? It means that the Slovak youngster has already to understand Hungarian in order to learn Hungarian […] Is this how "scientific knowledge" should be achieved?[17]

Sasinek's fight against assimilation illustrates not only his nationalism, but also his contempt for liberal values, save for the abolition of serfdom.[18] His conservative perception of the female as perennial seducer was revoltingly misogynist and he was not shy to declare liberalism an ideology that spoiled the nation's sons (sic)! Loss of faith led to betrayal of the nation, psychological and emotional distress and ended in financial fraud and imprisonment.

His essay "Liberál"[19] illustrates his anti-liberalism:

> In our times we often hear one word: liberal. […] The basic principle of the liberals is: I believe and do as I please and

> leave others to believe and do as they please. They are free-thinking [svobodomyseľní] as regards religion; selfish [svevoľní] as regards the way of life; indifferent [ľahostajní] as regards the faith and way of life of others.[20]

Time and again he expressed critique of liberalism in exemplary tales that should teach his fellow Slovaks about the dangers Hungarian liberalism presented to the Slovak nation. These tales are characterized by a sharp and undifferentiated divide in good (national Catholicism, Slovakhood) and evil Hungarian liberalism, cosmopolitanism). Let us have a look at a tale that is typical for Sasinek's anti-liberalism and sexism. The peasant Filip Horák was a brave, dutiful and hard-working man, who despised the pub and went to church. He had not enjoyed higher education, but was naturally intelligent; he could read, write and count. He subscribed to the Catholic News and the Putnik (pilgrim), which informed him about the news in church and community. With the Obzor (Horizon), he improved his agricultural skills, while Hlásnik (Watchman) provided news about domestic affairs and the outer world. One would not find a drop of palinka (brandy) in his house. This brave man was married to the peasant Jozefina, who gave birth to the sons Ondrej and Edmund. Ondrej took after his father; he was modest, faithful and hard working. Jozefina, influenced by the false flattery of an old woman, saw more in Edmund, to whom fate had assigned the future of a real gentleman. Ondrej was his father's son, Mundiček (little Edmund) was hers. She arranged for private lessons to prepare him for higher education. Filip first rejected her suggestion to divide the inheritance, which rightfully belonged to Ondrej as the elder, but she kept insisting until he caved in. With finances secured, Mundiček enrolled in the gymnasium and started to call himself Ödon, greeting people in Hungarian instead of Slovak. Ondrej worked in the fields and grew up under his father's loving care. The village priest was not enthusiastic about Ödon's intellectual gifts and told Filip as much. Jozefina, however, made sure that Ödon enrolled in the law faculty of Pest University. In his letters he kept requesting funds. Also, he called himself Hegyi to conceal his Slovak origins. In the capital, falling into bad company, Ödon became a true liberal: he liked what was good for him and disliked what was not. During the day, he worked as a clerk in the office of the advocate Dr. Hladár; at night, he frequented pubs, drank and wrote political pamphlets about liberal and social issues. In four years he never once visited his parents. When he finally came home at Easter, in middle of the school year, Jozefina happily expected to see the diploma. But Ödon had never graduated. He lied that the diploma would be sent soon. He refused to say his prayers, ate, slept late into the day and read. When the shocked Jozefina tried to talk some sense into his head, there was a knock at the door. The local notary and two gendarmes entered and arrested Ödon, whom they suspected of having counterfeited a cheque made out for one thousand gold ducats at the advocate's office in Pest. Jozefina then understood how badly she had been neglecting Ondrej and his bride Alžbeta and apologised to both. Ödon was transferred to Budapest, tried and sentenced to prison, where he caught a fever. The news about his death arrived with the request of a payment still outstanding. Touched by Ondrej's generous offer to pay for half of the debt, Jozefina paid for the other half and transcribed her widow's pension to Ondrej.
Some days later, they received an official letter from the prison informing them

that Edmund had rediscovered his faith in his last hours. He had begged the priest to extend his apologies to all his family and died in peace.

As simplistic as Sasinek's tale against liberalism was, he was a generous and loyal colleague. Among his fellow narodovci (pioneers of the national awakening) was tolerant of different views, but when addressing the simple people for whom he wrote his religious texts, he was the conservative clergyman the Church expected him to be. In his obituary for Ján Palarík, an outspoken liberal and critic of the Church hierarchy, Sasinek showed his loving respect for the "enfant terrible" of Slovak Catholicism. After a brief and precise summary of Palarík's life and works, he concluded:

> As regards his politics, even though he worked with us on the foundation and management of the Budapest News, he maintained his own highly exclusive views, […] even though he did not approve of some of the steps we had taken while formulating and finalizing the Memorandum, for the sake of the unity and good of the nation he never attacked us loudly or aggressively […] he could fulfill his task of mediating between the nation's various standpoints. That, behold, was our dear Janko Palarík as priest, author and politician being in all these matters a role model of the true Slovak national character.[21]

I. Equality of Rights (Rovnoprávnosť)

> Equality of rights! […] There is no doubt that a two-fold law of nations [právo národu] forms the essence of nationality and language: a) that a nation can develop naturally in its own language and environment; b) that it is run in its own language and surroundings. A nation whose lower and higher education is conducted in a foreign language, in which judicial process is conducted and court sentences are read out in a foreign language, is being directly deprived of its language and national identity, its education and general good, its freedom and character; to such a nation, law, freedom and justice mean nothing.[22]

Sasinek conceived of national identity as a natural thing the Lord had extended to all nations. He subscribed to rational natural law,[23] the idea that human reason was a God-given gift for the believers, and, for the non-believers, a law of nature originating in a sphere beyond human understanding. Sasinek naturally understood rational natural law as a gift from the Lord: all nations should be equal in their right to express their true selves. The nationalities based their defensive demands for cultural rights, that then turned into demands for political equality, on rational natural law, a powerful moral weapon against positive law laid down by the ruling Magyars and Austrians. Practically all claims, the entire "catalogue" – starting with language rights extending to territorial autonomy with local self-government and ending with sovereignty – could be justified through natural law that derived its moral power from a transcendent realm inaccessible to the human reason.

In accordance with rational natural law, Sasinek's political goal was the constitutionally granted use of Slovak in schools and gymnasiums. Yet, the quotation above shows that he wanted more. We think he still adhered to the idea of the okolie and the demands of the memorandum. He saw quite clearly that a nation insisting on equality should also be ruled in its language. This involved the areas of the judiciary and the political institutions, where positive law, set by the Magyars, determined the use of Hungarian. Courts and diets were the foci of social life; they were equally important for national progress. They had to be subject to rational natural law too. Sasinek thus called for the status of language of communication, which the Magyars had to reject. They logically anticipated that the demands for linguistic autonomy would lead to claims for territorial autonomy and eventually result in secession – which the Slovaks did not have in mind. From the Magyar perspective of the Hungarian political nation, the nationalities' language claims formed only the beginning of a longer process towards their projected status of sovereignty. The Magyar elite's own experience in negotiating the Ausgleich, hence Hungary's autonomy from Vienna, convinced them that any concession made to the nationalities would evoke demands that would eventually lead to a substantial loss of territory.

We think that Sasinek would have been content with the status of language of communication for Slovak, which would have boosted the nation's economic and educational progress and enhanced the administrative and diplomatic skills of the urban elite. But we encounter here a contradiction in his thought: how to sustain conservatism and the Church's power under the conditions of economic and social progress? He must have been aware of the fact that development would bring about a critical amount of pluralism and intensified contact with trade partners, of whom the Magyars were the closest. Sasinek does not give us an answer; the following interpretation thus remains speculation.

We think he would have accepted progress unfolding in the clear confinements of the towns and insisted on the Church's leading role in the countryside. He might have undergone a modest correction of his aversion to social mobility, but would most certainly have spoken out for a Slovak Catholic university in Prešporok (Bratislava). The population in the countryside would benefit from the developing towns and send their sons to the seminaries and the university, which would offer higher education in Slovak. Students would not have to enroll at Pest University anymore. After some years, the Slovaks would be aptly prepared for local self-government in their župy.

Not surprisingly, Sasinek never addressed the minority issue, the litmus test of true equality of rights: he failed to elaborate on how to determine what language(s) should be used in the towns with a mixed population of Magyars, Slovaks and Ruthenians, or towns where the Magyars formed the majority.

His dislike of Magyar dominance was the result of his historical research. In his highly critical account of the preparations for the celebration of the Hungarian millennium in 1896, he used historical arguments to prove that 896 was not a historical date. In a sarcastic tone, he described the settlement of the various tribes on the Pannonian plateau in the 10th and 11th centuries and accused the Magyars of having deliberately distorted the historical truth:

> Endlessly, one can hear and read about the millennium that will be celebrated with a Hungarian state exhibition in 1896. But nobody answers the crucial question: who should celebrate this millennium? […] The historical truth doesn't depend […] on declaring as truth that which is generally accepted […] in uneducated circles it can still be heard that the sun is spinning around the earth […] Now, I don't see a nation in Hungary the true voice of history would elevate to celebrate the 1896 millennium […] I would quite openly advise people to keep silent about this anti-historical celebration.[24]

II. Historic Rights

> From these words of Mr. Eötvös follows his subjective opinion that only the Magyars are entitled to historic rights [historické právo] in Hungary, the Slovaks and the other nationalities, since they lacked these rights, would have at their disposal only natural law [prirodzené právo] and the principle of nationality [zásada národnostná] […] upon which to base their demands.[25]

> If the Magyars consider themselves as the ruling nation in Hungary, what version of history do they justify their leading position with? […] The Magyars did not subject the Slovaks, but associated them by agreement [smluvne so sebou spojili]. The Slovaks were socii of the Magyars, not gens subjecta: that is why the Slovaks are as much entitled to Hungarian historic rights as the Magyars.[26]

Sasinek's interpretation of 'historic rights' represents a distortion of historical facts. Let us explain why.

One would expect an exceptionally gifted scholar like him, fluent in Latin and therefore able to read the historical documents of the period, to know the distinction between rational natural law and the historic state rights, a well-known issue in the Monarchy after the failed revolution of 1848. Sasinek read and wrote Czech; he must have known Palacký's draft constitution of 1848 as well as his defence of the historic state rights of the lands of the St. Wenceslas crown.[27]

In the first quote, Sasinek referred to the historic rights the Magyars enjoyed in the kingdom. To convince his readers and stress his point of what historic rights should be, not what they actually were, he intentionally delivered a misinterpretation. Sasinek interpreted the historic state rights as linguistic and cultural rights – which they were not. The historic state rights were constitutional rights originating in the 17th century that granted the lands of the crown of St. Steven autonomy rights when Hungary was fully incorporated into the Habsburg Monarchy in 1699. He was right in stating that the language rights were historical insofar as they were old. Yet, in the context of the Habsburg Empire's nationality policy, historic rights were understood as historic state rights, not language rights. It was a decisive fact that the Slovak župy had never been elevated to the former status of a crown land. The nationalities'

language rights derived from the constitutionally granted freedom of religion adopted under Joseph II. The liturgical language was every national group's own free decision. Sasinek must have known that the language rights regulated the language issue within the kingdom, but never equalled, let alone overruled, the historic state rights, which determined the kingdom's rights and duties in its external relations with the Empire. The language rights had been crafted as an internal right to allow the national groups to express their religious adherence. They were territorially neutral and apolitical in the sense that they did not stipulate a national group's political dominance over its territory. The use of the nationalities' vernaculars had been valid only within and for the group, while Latin had been the language of communication until Hungarian replaced it in the first decades of the 19th century. The language rights were not designed as an external representation of the national groups in their relations with Vienna, as Sasinek pretended.

In the second quotation, Sasinek created a contradiction. He was right in pointing to the ethnic bias of recent Magyar historiography. But he failed to explain why the Slovaks had never been granted historic state rights in the first place. Why were the Slovak župy, established in the 14th century, never elevated to the status of a crown land? This was the weak point in his argument, but nevertheless a historical fact. He could simply not deliver a scientific explanation for the lack of a Slovak crown land, which must have caused considerable distress to him. If the Slovaks, as he claimed, had had a distinct identity already four hundred years ago when they ruled jointly with the Magyars, why had they not been granted a historical status of their territory equal to the Magyars?

We think that Sasinek must have known the answer – and decided to repress it: in the 14th century, the Hungarian population identified itself primarily as Christian and citizens of the kingdom. Neither a Slovak nor a Magyar national identity existed. Time and again, Sasinek blamed the Magyars for "pushing the nationalities against the wall" – which they did. He portrayed the Slovaks as victims – which they were. But the fact that Slovak national identity had started only with the renaissance of their language around 1830 considerably weakened his argument of a former joint rule of Slovaks and Magyars.

Conclusion

Sasinek was a multi-faceted personality with an iridescent character, who used his considerable skills not always to his advantage. His political goal was the constitutional guarantee of Slovak as a language of communication in the Upper Hungarian župy: schools, gymnasiums, judicial and political institutions should communicate in Slovak. He first used rational natural law to attack the positive laws the Magyars had laid down. Later, he published a deliberate misinterpretation of the "historic rights." He did not comment on this change of mindset from rational natural law to positive law, i.e. the historic state rights. Furthermore, he failed to offer a solution for the towns and areas with mixed population.

Because of censorship, it remains speculation whether he had an independent Slovak nationstate in mind. We think that he would have backed the okolie; he had after all signed the memorandum whose main demand had been the okolie. Such Slovak county ruled directly by Vienna and provided with territorial autonomy and internal self-government could have led, in a second

phase, to the federation of the kingdom. Yet, federation was a liberal idea; to our knowledge, Sasinek did not mention a federation as the solution for the Empire's nationality problem.

Sasinek was an arch-conservative, who regarded his Church as the principal moral leader. His contempt for the Magyars originated in his historical studies, but his methodologies were sometimes identical to those of the Magyars, whom he accused of distorting history. Sasinek did exactly the same in his misinterpretation of the historic rights. His misogynistic contempt for women was anachronistic even in his times. As a clergyman, devoted to scholarship, he demonstrated a disturbing lack of understanding for poverty and misery. He disliked the aristocratic hierarchy, in particular the Slovak aristocrats who had joined the Magyar nobility, but never criticized the Church hierarchy.

He was too intellectual, elitist and eccentric to garner a wide following. We think he was aware of his lonely position within the national movement. His nation's situation was hopeless: the Slovaks would have to endure the ongoing assimilation, but they had one weapon: the continuous intellectual engagement for the national cause.

Was Sasinek the Slovak Palacký? Should or could one call him the father of Slovak politics? Yes, as regards his merits in historiography. No, considering his old-fashioned views about social problems and his conservative anti-liberalism. He deserves respect for his scholarship and life-long commitment to the national cause. The defense of his nation must have caused him to take up the desperate act of distorting the meaning of the historic rights. His eccentricity and increasingly radical nationalism added up to his neglect of reality. He did not care about a discussion of nationality rights and was simply not interested in giving serious thought to the minorities. He was a fervent patriot, who was increasingly losing touch with his own people. This might be a further reason for the general ignorance about him. But he defended Slovak rights with his considerable intellectual gifts and gave the nation a sense of its own past. Let us conclude with a quote from his article "Patriotismus:"

> They [the Magyar patriots, add. JB] perceive the Magyarness of Hungary as the only binding expression of legality, the good of the country and patriotism. […] Our love for our sweet language is the reason why they hate us […] We are not demanding that the Magyar children should learn Slovak; but that in the gymnasiums of Slovakia, Slovak should at least be compulsory, […] so that the Slovak youth could prepare itself for its future participation in the life of the community […] We do not consider patriotism related to the Magyar language as a conditio sine qua non, but as love for the country and the development of the sciences, as love for education and the general good of all citzens.[28]

NOTES

1. I should like to thank SAIA, the Slovak Academic Information Agency, for its generous scholarship that financed my research stay in Bratislava from March to August 2008. Minor parts of this article have been published

in my Revolution, modus Vivendi or sovereignty? The political thought of the Slovak national movement from 1861 to 1914 (Stuttgart: ibidem, 2010). I am indebted to Ludmila Šimková from the Slovak National Library SNK in Martin, who made my research in the newspaper section most efficient. Yannick Hill and Peter Thomas Hill proofread my manuscript. I thank Dušan Kováč for his comments on the first drafts. To avoid confusion, I shall be using the following concepts: "Magyar" refers to the Magyar ethnos in the Hungarian kingdom; "Hungary" to the territory of the lands of the crown of Saint Steven, including the nationalities: the Slovaks, Romanians, Ruthenians and Serbs; "Hungarian" refers to the language spoken by the Magyar ethnos. "Upper Hungary" refers to the territory settled by the Slovaks, roughly today's Slovakia. Note that all translations into English are mine, if not indicated otherwise.

2. Richard Marsina and Peter Mulík, eds., *Franko Víťazoslav Sasinek*. Najvýznamnejší slovenský historik 19. storočia, 1830-1914 (Martin: Matica Slovenská, 2007).

3. Matúš Kučera, "Koncepcia slovenskych dejín v diele F. V. Sasinka," in *Franko Víťazoslav Sasinek*, 9-20 (p. 9).

4. Dušan Kováč, "Popoluška slovenskej historiografii – vlastné dejiny," *Historický časopis* 52, no. 2 (2004): 233-237; 233.

5. Kováč, "Popoluška…," 234

6. Kováč, "Popoluška…," 234.

7. Tibor Pichler, "Ján Palarík a pokus o slovenský liberalizmus," in *Národovci a občania: o slovenskom politickom myšlení v 19. storočí* (Bratislava: Věda, 1998), 77 - 95; Ján Palarík, *Za reč a práva ľudu: kultúrno-politické články*, ed. by Mikuláš Gasparík (Bratislava: Slovenské vydavateľstvo krásnej literatúry, 1956). For an analysis of Palarík's thought see my "Ján Palarík (1822 - 1870): A Slovak Liberal Politician," *Kosmas: Czechoslovak and Central European Journal* 22, no.2 (2009): 29-41; "Montesquieu in Upper Hungary? Jan Palarík's Slovak Constitutionalism and Its Failure," in *Czech and Slovak Culture in International and Global Context*, ed. by Mila Rechcigl (České Budějovice: Halama Publications, 2008). The first translation of Palarík's text "Na dorozumenie" (1861) can be found in my *Preparing Liberty in Central Europe: Political Texts from the Spring of Nations 1848 to the Spring of Prague 1968* (Stuttgart: ibidem, 2006).

8. Franko Sasinek, "Sociálná otázka," *Katolické Noviny* 25 (1894), 10, 77-78; 14, 110-111; 21, 166-167; 22, 174-175; 23, 183-184.

9. For a detailed analysis of the political-economic system in the Hungarian kingdom see Jenö Szücz, "The Three Historical Regions of Europe," *Acta Historica Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 29 (1983), 2-4, 131-184.

10. "František Víťazoslav Sasinek sa snažil poukázať na spoločenské poslanie dejín a striktne oddeľoval históriu od politiky." Michal Otčenáš, "Vedecko-organizačná a bádatelská činnosť F.V. Sasinka," in *Franko Víťazoslav Sasinek*, 21-29 (p. 25).

11. Slovak settlement in the Hungarian kingdom included the following counties (comitatus, župy) adjacent to Galicia in the North and East and Moravia and Lower Austria in the West. The counties are referred to in Hungarian and Slovak: Abauj-Torna – Abovská-Turňanská župa; Arva – Oravská ž.; Bars – Tekovská ž.; Gömör – Gemerská-Malohontská ž.; Hont – Hontianská ž.; Lipto – Liptovská ž.; Nograd – Novohradská ž.; Nyitra – Nitrianská ž.; Poszony – Přesporská (Bratislavská); Saros – Šarišská ž.; Szepes – Spišská

ž.; Turoc – Turčianská ž.; Trencsen – Trenčianská ž.; Ung – Užská ž.; Zemplen – Zemplínská ž.; Zolyom – Zvolenská ž. László Szarka, "The Slovak National Question and Hungarian Nationality Policy before 1918," The Hungarian Quarterly 35 (1994), 136, 98-114 (p. 98-99). See also "Nationalitätenkarte der österreichisch-ungarischen Monarchie nach den Sprachen-, bzw. Konfessionserhebungen vom Jahre 1910," map in the appendix of *Die Völker des Reiches*, vol. 3 in *Die Habsburgermonarchie 1848–1918* (Wien: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1980). For the establishment of the Slovak župy in the first half of the 14th Century see Dušan Kováč, *Dejiny Slovenska* (Praha: Lidové Noviny, 2007), 34, 37, map on p. 37. Recommended for an introduction to the history of Hungary are: L'udovít Holotík, "Die Slovaken," in Die Völker des Reiches, vol. 3 in *Die Habsburgermonarchie 1848–1918*; László Katus, "Die Magyaren" in ibid.; Dušan Kováč, *Slováci, Češi, dějiny* (Bratislava: Academic Electronic Press, 1997); "Memorandum národa slovenského," in *Z prameňov národa: Na pamiatku stodvatsiateho piateho výročia vzniku memoranda slovenského národa z roku 1861* (Martin: Matica slovenská, 1988); Daniel Rapant, *Slovenské povstanie 1848-1849* (Turčiansky Sv. Martin, 1950); Daniel Rapant, *Ilegalná maďarizácia 1790-1840* (Turčiansky Sv. Martin: Matica Slovenská, 1947).

12. Sasinek, "Škola a maďarisácia," *Národnie noviny* 9 (1878), 128, 31. októbra, p. 2, italics by JB.

13. Johann Kollár, *Ueber literarische Wechselseitigkeit zwischen den verschiedenen Stämmen und Mundarten der slawischen Nation* (Pesth: Trattner -Karolyi, 1837). For an English translation of the most important sections of Kollár's text see my *Preparing Liberty*. On Kollár's influence on the Slavic nations, see the excellent collection of essays *Ján Kollár a slovanská vzájomnost': Geneza nacionalizmu v strednej Európe* (Bratislava: Spoločnost' pre dejiny a kulturu strednej a východnej Európy SDKSVE, 2006). On reception and development of Slavic identity see the equally recommendable Andreas Moritsch, ed., *Die slawische Idee* (Bratislava: Slovak Academic Press, 1993).

14. Johann Gottfried Herder, *Outlines of a Philosophy of the History of Man*, transl. by T. Churchill (New York: Bergman Publishers, 1980), 483.

15. For a detailed analysis of the thought of Štúr see my *Slavic Thinkers or the Creation of Polities. Intellectual History and Political Thought in Central Europe and the Balkans, 19th Century* (Washington D.C.: New Academia Publishing, 2007); a shorter and earlier version is "National Emancipation – Not the Making of Slovakia: Ľudovít Štúr's Conception of the Slovak Nation," *Postcommunist Occasional Papers* 1 (2003), 2, at http://www.stfx.ca/pinstitutes/cpcs/studies-in-post-communism/

16. Dmitrii Chizhevskii is still the most informative source on Štúr's reception of Hegel's philosophy, "Hegel bei den Slowaken," in *Hegel bei den Slawen* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1961), 397-411.

17. Sasinek, "Škola a maďarisácia," *Národnie noviny* 9 (1878), 130, 5. novembra, p. 2.

18. Sasinek, "Poddanstvo v Uhorsku," *Kalendár národni* 2 (1894), 130-147. He ended the article declaring Magyarisation to be political serfdom that Hungary's nationalities were subject to.

19. Sasinek, "Liberál," *Katolické noviny* 25 (1894), 6, 45-46; 8, pp. 62 -63; 9, 69-71.

20. Sasinek, "Liberál," 6, 45.

21. Sasinek, "Ján Palarík (Nekrolog)," *Národnie noviny* 1 (1870), 116, 11. decembri, p. 3.

22. Sasinek, "Rovnoprávnosť," *Pestbuďinské vedomosti* 8 (1868), 53, 3. julia, p. 1.

23. "As the origins of the idea of equality of nations and individuals, rational natural law is to be understood as system of rights or justice, which is common to all human beings, since it derives from nature, i.e. the nature of man," at http://www.britannica.com/eb/article-9055045/natural-law, accessed 3 June 2008. "The term natural law designates a system of law that is freely derived from human nature without the need for a legislator to define it. Accordingly, natural law theory assumes that beyond the sphere of positive law there is a higher law from which positive law is deduced andby which it must always be measured" at http://www.lexexakt.de/glossar/naturrecht.php, accessed 3 June 2008.

24. Sasinek, "Millenium," *Národnie noviny* 24 (1893), 77, 1. decembri, p. 2.

25. Sasinek, "Historické právo," *Pestbuďinské vedomosti* 5 (1865), 58, 21. julia, p. 2. Jozef baron Eötvös (1813-1871) was the architect of the Ausgleich and Hungarian minister of education after 1867.

26. Sasinek, "Historické právo," 3.

27. Palacký's most important political texts: "Idea státu Rakouského," first published in *Národ* no. 96, 99, 106 (1865). Also in František Palacký, *Radhost: Sbírka spisúw drobných z oboru řeči a literatury češské, krásowědy, historie a politiky* (Praha: B. Tempsky, 1873). František Palacký, *Geschichte von Böhmen: groesstenteils nach Urkunden und Handschriften* (Prag: Kronberger & Riwac, 1836-1867). 27 Sasinek, "Patriotismus," *Národné noviny* 3 (1872), 121, 10. októbra, p. 1.

Appendix: An Outline of Sasinek's Life

11 December 1830-Born in Uherská Skalica in Northwestern Slovakia. After primary education, he went to gymnasium in Skalica, Szolnok and Pressburg.
1846-Joined the order of the Capuchins. He studied philosophy in Pezinok, Tata and Pressburg, and theology in Scheibbs in lower Austria.
9 October 1853-Ordained as Catholic priest in Raab, today's Györ in Hungary. After leaving the monastery, he was appointed priest of the diocese of Banská Bystrica, a position bishop Štefan Moyses (1797-1869), founder and first chairman of the Matica slovenská, had held before him. Besides his duties as priest, Sasinek held a professorship in dogmatic and taught at the seminary as well as the local gymnasium.
1857-Priest at the diocese in Rača.
1860s-Participated at the national gathering in Martin in 1861 and supported the Memorandum of the Slovak nation. Published regularly on national history, literature and politics in the *Peštbudinské Vedomostí* (Budapest News), the Catholic newspapers *Cyril a Method*, *Katolickej Noviny* (Catholic News) and *Priateľ školy a literatury* (Friends of school and literature).
1863-Foundation of the Matica Slovenská in Martin. Sasinek supervised the organisation's editorial and publishing activities, and founded the educational journal *Slovesnosť* (Grammar) with Andrej L. Radlinsky (1817-1879) in Uherská Skalica.

1865-He was appointed editorial manager of the *Matica*. Together with Radlinsky, he started to write the two volumes of *Archiv starých československých listín, písemností a dejepisných pôvodín pre dejepis a literatúru Slovákov* (Archive of old čechoslovak fragments, texts and historic origins for history and literature of the Slovaks), published in Turčiansky Sväty Martin in 1872-73.
1869-Appointed secretary of the Matica. He edited *Slovenský letopis pre historiu, topografiu, archaeologiu a ethnografiu* (Slovak journal for history, topography, archaeology and ethnography), published in Uherská Skalica from 1876 to 1883. Until his death, Sasinek wrote an extraordinary number of books, essays, articles, poetry, prayer books and collections of religious songs. He contributed to František Ladislav Rieger's *Slovník nauční* with no less than 153 concepts. Here a few titles of his historical works: *Dejiny drievnych národov na území terajšieho Uhorska* (History of the nations living in the Hungarian countryside), 1867, 1878 (2); *Dejiny počiatkov terajšieho Uhorska* (History of the origins of contemporary Hungary), 1868; *Dejiny kráľovstva Uhorského* (History of the Hungarian kingdom), 2 volumes, 1869 and 1871; *Dejepis všeobecný a zvláštny Uhorska svetský a náboženský* (General history with particular attention to the secular and religious history of Hungary), 1871; *Dejepis Slovákov* (History of the Slovaks), Ružomberok, 1895; *Država Velkomoravská* (The Great Moravian state), 1896.
1870-Corresponding member of the Royal Bohemian Society in Prague.
1875-The Hungarian government closed the Matica Slovenska.
1888-92-Editor of the Catholic news *Čech* (The Bohemian). He was expelled from Upper Hungary for his patriotic ideas and lived for some time as spiritual counsellor at the monastery of the Sisters of Mercy in Prague, and later in Algersdorf in Styria.
1901-Lived until his death at the monastery of the Brothers of Mercy in Graz, Austria.
17 November 1914-Sasinek died in Graz. In 1930, his body was transferred to Skalica, where it was buried in the crypt of St. Anne's Church.

Amorphous Identity in Eva Švankmajerová's *Baradla Cave*

By Laura Ivins-Hulley

Throughout her career as a painter, ceramicist and writer, surrealist Eva Švankmajerová preoccupied herself with questions of feminine experience. She negated beauty as a formative value, undermined gendered identity and explored the cavernous in women's bodily experience. These themes – played out in her paintings, ceramic works and poems – come together in in-

herently unstable forms in her 1981 novel, *Baradla Cave* (*Jeskyně Baradla*). Characters shift form mid-sentence; the plot is malleable; and grammatical constructions constantly slide out of logical syntax. Baradla, our ostensible heroine (if Švankmajerová's narrative can truly be said to have one), is woman. She is cave. We explore her labyrinthine geography, finding in her an allegorical subtext that critiques modern conditions and society's construction of the feminine. However, in true surrealist fashion, this allegory is not meant to be exact, nor are we meant to unravel the contradictions in order to find a cohesive, structured critique. Instead, Švankmajerová's surrealist practice begs that we let the reality presented in the novel remain in its unstable condition, and that we focus as much on the performative action of *Baradla* as the words themselves.

In 1970, Švankmajerová and her husband, filmmaker and sculptor Jan Švankmajer, joined the Czechoslovak Surrealist Group, then loosely headed by Vratislav Effenberger. As surrealist poet and critic František Dryje has pointed out, at this time the group was having to reconfigure itself due to both the dismantling of the French group (with whom the Prague surrealists had just formed an affiliation) and the crackdown that ended the Prague Spring.[1] The Czechoslovak Surrealists did have enough time to eke out the inaugural issue of their journal *Analogon*, but it would be another 21 years before the second issue could be released. Many members were unwilling to continue their surrealist activities in such a cultural milieu, some emigrated, and the group was forced underground.[2] So, this is how the Švankmajers found the surrealist group when they met Effenberger in 1970, and while such a situation made it extremely difficult for the surrealists to participate in an international exchange of artistic practice, it proved felicitous for private surrealist research. Through games and experiments (largely designed by Švankmajer), the surrealists explored collectivity and intersubjectivity, two principles that have been central to the surrealist epistemology since Breton penned his First Manifesto in 1924. According to Krzysztof Fijałkowski, during the 1970s and 1980s, "private collective activity – and a small number of samizdat public forums – were the bedrock of the group's identity and practice."[3] Because these experiments and games formed the primary artistic context for Švankmajerová as she wrote *Baradla Cave*, it bears lengthier discussion.

In one of these games, participants were each given an aspect of Karel Teige (a founding member of poetism and surrealism in the interwar period) to tactically interpret. One might have his "childhood," another his "death," and from this prompt, they would construct some artifact such as a collage. Finally, they would all bring their artifacts together to construct a collective interpretation of Karel Teige. What is important about such activity is the interplay between individual creativity and collaboration. Each member of the group worked separately on his or her section, channeling their own unconscious in its construction, and yet "Karel Teige" did not come into being until all of these parts came together to form the whole. And so it is with the Czech and Slovak Surrealist Group. Each member pursues very personal, very intuitive artistic practice, but that practice is not complete until it engages with the shared knowledge of the group as whole. This is why exhibitions from this group almost always feature work from multiple members. It is very rare for a

members to exhibit alone, and even then we find "the organisation of solo exhibition usually also drawing on practical support from group members."[4]

In addition to being emblematic of the sort of collaboration the Czechoslovak Surrealists sought to achieve, the games and experiments represented the means for accessing knowledges that precluded rationality. Surrealist poet and critic František Dryje writes of these activities, "The game is a conscious stimulant, a provocation of extra-rational forms of communication that for the most part take place on the unconscious level and which - at least in the sense of Surrealist poetics - bear witness to the common essence of subjectivity."[5] The game provides a conduit into inner experience, allows inner experience to be represented poetically and tactically, and then shared with others. In one of these experiments – wherein Effenberger asked everyone to write out their "beginnings," which were then randomly distributed to the other members for psychoanalytic interpretation – Švankmajerová explains how the act of painting affects this connection to subjective knowledge. "The moments when a trace of my being is created are not only times of happiness and sadness," she writes, "but moments when I seem to come up against the cause of my presence."[6] Praxis creates a link with subjectivity.

Surrealist activities also seek to break down the line between imagination and reality. This does not mean an altogether dismantling of reality and representation, such as we might see with abstract expressionism, but means, as American surrealist Penelope Rosemont has said, "It insists, rather, on *more* reality, a higher reality."[7] The "higher reality" refers to one that includes those ways of knowing that rationalist, modern society would like to repress. "Based on the dialectical resolution of the contradiction between conscious and unconscious, surrealism indicates a higher, open, and dynamic consciousness, from which no aspect of the real is rejected."[8] This is reminiscent of that existence within the line that characterizes transgression for Michel Foucault, wherein transgression always ruptures the line, but in so doing extends it and subsumes it.[9] Surrealism is such a transgression. It crosses the line of reality set up by society, pushing reality past its own limits, causing it to extend itself and accept the expansion of its boundaries.

The element of Švankmajerová's novel that most obviously transgresses the "reality principle" (as the Czechoslovak Surrealists were apt to call the rationalist suppression of the imaginative aspects of reality)[11] is the character/locality of Baradla herself, who explores the reality of the feminine through her shifting structures. The confusion of Baradla begins with the first pages of the novel. We are introduced to her through Jóstaf's impressions of her. In the first paragraph: "She was silent. He couldn't take his eyes off her." At this point, she has no name. Jóstaf is named before her. The two are walking through the cave, which the narrator begins to describe in the second paragraph through the characterization of Jóstaf: "His voice squeaked, even though normally everyone else's voice in the interconnected corridors of Baradla resounded in a menacing boom, some echoing frequently."[12] We do not know yet to connect the "she" of Jóstaf's affair with the echoing corridors, but Baradla is quickly personified ("She knows just as much now as she did then," the narrator writes, referring still to the cave)[13], and then made into a person with a round figure and broad forehead.[14] In five short pages Švankmajerová has established a narrative characterized by "slippery" identity, by identity that exceeds the boundaries of narrative literature. This excessiveness, though proving

a challenge for the reader, explores the line between objectification and embodiment that has largely characterized female-gendered experience in western societies.

However, Švankmajerová did not begin this exploration in *Baradla Cave*, but has thematized the tensions between objectification and embodiment in her paintings and ceramics since at least the 1960s, even prior to her participation with the Czechoslovak Surrealist Group. In her *Emancipation Cycle* (*Emancipační Cyklus*) – a series of paintings made between 1967-69 – she questions the assumption of art that women's bodies are to be aesthetic and on display. In these paintings, she travesties such canonical paintings as Sandro Botticelli's *The Birth of Venus* by, for example, switching the gender of the figures, disrobing the male, and translating the forms into her pseudo-naïve style. Still, though this series puts the western aesthetic of female display off balance, Švankmajerová expresses skepticism about the possibilities for actual emancipation, writing in her 1976 comments on the *Emancipation Cycle*, "The emancipation of woman is not possible in this civilization…."[15] Furthermore, this series helped her to begin thinking through the physicality of the female body. In what ways is it tied to material, domestic worlds? In what ways has the feminine been asked to allegorize landscapes needing domestication, protection or those waiting to be pilfered by civilization? On her travesty of Édouard Manet's *Luncheon on the Grass* (*Déjeuner sur l'Herbe*) she writes: "Emancipating oneself from illusions: How she wanted to be free, although she had a hole in her abdomen, a hole which can be used as a salt-cellar, a fuel deposit, an oil can."[16] Woman seeks freedom, but because her body is marked by society (marked as "other" and thus as "unknown" and "mysterious" and perhaps even "dangerous"), it must be tamed, repressed and used for utilitarian purposes.

In the figure of Baradla, as with the *Emancipation Cycle* paintings, we find an untaming of gender and domestication, and also a pessimism with regard to possibilities for emancipation. About halfway through the first section of Part 1, the "she" referred to in the narration flickers with the name "Marie."[17] At first we cannot be sure whether this refers to the same "she" we have been calling "Baradla," or whether the narrator has introduced a new character, but when we resume calling her Baradla after a few pages without breaking the line of action and space,[18] the identity of Baradla merges with this woman Marie.[19] Marie lives a domestic life characterized by disorder, filth and a certain childish helplessness. She collapses into a "smelly bed," orders around the furniture (though it is not clear whether they heed her commands), and must be assisted by chambermaids.[20] Marie's domestic life, however, is an object of spectacle for the tourists. Gazing into her windows while pretending to scold their children for doing the same, they find in the dusty chaos of an interned Marie a reaffirmation of their own established morality based on order and cleanliness. According to the narrator, these disapproving mothers are jealous of the chambermaids who assist Marie in getting ready for bed, because they are allowed access to her. "They [the peering tourists] wanted to open all the gates and attack the palace to scold her a little."[21] But they are not allowed in and never find a way to physically transgress Marie's private space. Still, the look is enough to taint it. "The trail of the poisonous slime of their gaze remained in the darkness of the house long after they were already tromping up the cobblestones in the general direction of the Loretto."[22] The mere fact of

being made a spectacle by society denies freedom to the woman. She is "to be looked at" (to borrow from film theorist Laura Mulvey), which opens her actions to moral judgment. Though restricted from complete freedom, Marie nonetheless resists the moral imperative that the social realm outside wishes to impose upon her. "She wanted to explain to people that they have no rights to her, because in fact such rights cannot be derived from obligation, or from boredom, or from biology."[23] Like Švankmajerová in her *Emancipation Cycle*, Marie claims that gender and social structures do not form a basis for such an imposition. Even so, Baradla still finds herself burdened. She is burdened with maintaining herself, and it is difficult to say whether this maintenance comes in the service of society or whether she is protecting herself against society. "But poor Baradla started to explain that she is a cave," writes the narrator. "That she is a structure and at the same time she maintains this structure throughout."[24] Regardless of whom this serves, it takes a harsh toll on Baradla. "That she is preserving a landmark which is threatened with ruin, and because of this she is tired, and because she's tired she drugs herself with alcohol."[25] This leads her to a mental health clinic, which holds no more freedom than any other institutions found in the society represented in Švankmajerová's novel.

However, while the cavernous feminine represents a site of spectacle and usurpation, it can also serve as a source of active investigation for the woman herself. This can perhaps best be illustrated by turning to the moments when the narration slips into first person, an "I" that assumes shifting identifications, but is almost without exception coded as female. The "I" narrator speaks self-reflexively, sharing details of a meta-narrative existence, or relating her exploration of Baradla from the position of a stranger. In the midst of narrating the stories of Jóstaf or Baradla/Marie, the narrator will be prompted to turn against its third-person omniscient position and tell us some fragment from her own subjective history.

> Neither one of Marie's parents cares very much about her.
> I'm rooming at the girl's dormitory.
> I am inhumanly perfect.
> I've been shunted off to a side track of the Nymburk train station. Maybe I won't regret it too much.[26]

These lines rupture the assumed objective narrative position with an ambivalent subjectivity. The narrator expresses both confidence and neglect; she asserts her own perfection but acknowledges that she has been somehow marginalized. This mirrors the scene we find Marie in later, in that Marie expresses self-satisfaction with her domestic habits, but nevertheless has her autonomy removed by the chambermaids who put her in her nightgown and take her cuticle scissors.[27]

Further, at the end of Part 1, the narrator launches into a stream-of-conscious monologue about what it means to be social and what it means to be woman. She opens it with, "The worst thing about it all is that everyone thinks I'm crazy when, rolling my eyes, I sometimes push myself through the wire fence…"[28] Here, she exhibits a marked independence, almost to the point of rebellion, but this turns into a skepticism about the scope of possibilities. "Anyone else in my place would be able to relax somehow, said the lady doctor, but I can't escape myself. I don't want to complain, but it will get even

worse."[29] The long paragraph ends with her wondering whether it would not be better to "just eat some barbiturates and drown them with a good bottle of Whisky."[30] The narrator transgresses – crosses the fence – but still finds herself alienated when all is said and done.

The sort of self-interrogation enacted by the emergent "I" is also taken up by Baradla, and like the "I," Baradla fails to emerge with definite answers. Early in the novel, we find her frustrated with a lack of success. "That evening Baradla did not eat dinner," the narrator tells us. "She'd had no luck with the detailed, systematic study of the non-karst underlying relief and the related hydrography of collecting areas, which had led to the discovery of another, heretofore unknown, gigantic water system, Békebarlang (Cave of Peace), in the autumn of 1952."[31] She searches herself for the answers to her own systems, but finds that much of her self remains unknown. Then, toward the end of the novel, Baradla undergoes a kind of existential crisis, where the woman becomes aware of herself as a cave. Her psychologist is trying to talk with her, "But Baradla noticed nothing. She was too concerned with herself and with the disturbing question of her direct nature. Is she really a cave?"[32] Moreover, if she is, what does this mean? What does it mean for women to take the world into her? To embody the liminal point of entry and exit?

We find this self-interrogation expressed rather literally in a 1987 painting from Švankmajerová, *The Making of a Hole* (*Výroba díry*). Drawn with pastels in a style similar to the crayon pieces contained in the Twisted Spoon edition of *Baradla Cave*, it presents a woman who is looking inward to her own physicality, but as the title intimates, also constructing it. By invoking this artwork, we remind ourselves that Švankmajerová is preoccupied with constructing her own subject position through her works. As a surrealist, she does not pretend objectivity. She is not telling someone else's story, but explores the depths of her own consciousness through the moment of each piece of art. Thus the figures of Baradla and the emergent "I" in *Baradla Cave* represent the author's own negotiation of the femininity asked of her by society.

In addition to the exploration of the tension between objectification and embodiment, Švankmajerová's works often enact what some feminist theorists have conceived as the female's oscillation between subjecthood, subjection and abjection. In the psychoanalytic terms laid out by Freud and reconceived by Lacan, one begins to understand herself as an individual self (as a subject) during this moment of recognition that precipitates entry into language. For both, of course, this is an Oedipal moment characterized by (phallic) loss. The little boy recognizes his mother's lack of penis, and in so doing recognizes himself as other (or, more properly Freudian, recognizes the mother as other), and the little girl recognizes her own lack of penis, again recognizing herself as other.[33] This conception of subjecthood is not only grounded in a masculinist but (as Judith Butler has demonstrated) a heterosexist worldview wherein gender is dichotomized.[34] Here, those gendered female somehow always end up othered. However, in Judith Butler's appropriation of Lacanian psychoanalysis, she foregrounds the necessity of intersubjectivity as a precondition for all individualized subjects. Influenced by Lacan's formulation of the "mirror stage,"[35] Butler points toward the necessity of othering in order to formulate an autonomous identity, and thus toward subjection. For her, "the very notion of reflexivity, as an emergent structure of the subject, is the consequence of a 'turning back on itself,' a repeated self-berateement which

comes to form the misnomer of 'conscience,' and that there is no formation of the subject without a passionate attachment to subjection."[36]

Still, though Butler recuperates the moment of recognition for a non-sexist, non-heterosexist politics, revealing the subjection of all selves to inter-subjectivity and loss, that masculinist worldview of Freud and Lacan remains. The feminine is more often positioned as Other – subjugated – than the masculine. As Cixous and Clément note in *The Newly Born Woman*, the female is an anomaly, and one which must be contained in order to preserve the structures on which the society is founded.[37] They write that "it is *the relations between the Imaginary, the Real, and the Symbolic* that are at stake here."[38] In other words, when the excessive, unsubjugated material of the Imaginary imposes itself upon the Real (as is the case with the hysteric, for Cixous and Clément), then the Symbolic – formulated as those institutions such as language or kinship that foreground culture – would lose footing, fall into the abject. This is precisely what happens in some of Švankmajerová's paintings, as well as in the character of The Specter in *Baradla Cave*. These enact the moment of subjection and the transgression of the norms underlying social structures in a way that becomes not merely Other, but abject.

Two paintings in particular, *Event* (*Událost*, 1977) and *Zlatoust Teacher* (*Pedagožky zlatoústé*, 1988), play out this preoccupation vividly. In *Event*, the occurrence that comprises the topic of the painting is the violent subjection of a female figure. She is bent over, leashed and strangled. Concomitant with her subjection is a loss of her self – literally her body. A space around the rope takes the place of her neck and chest, while all that remains of her limbs is the shadow of a hand on the landscape. Other than her clothing, which outlines the absent presence of her body, the only piece of her that remains intact is her head, tilted upward and open-mouthed, a pose evoking the ambiguity between anguish and ecstasy. We find here a woman contained by an unseen force, losing not only her identity but her physicality in the process. Moreover, *Zlatoust Teacher* represents embodied incompleteness, but the incompleteness is conceived as synecdoche as opposed to absence. The gaping mouth with its irregular teeth stands in for face and head, while the fingertips bleed into the landscape and formations reminiscent of breasts comprise the elbows. Despite these formations at the elbows, the figure retains ambiguity in its gender, and overall it evokes the grotesque. Certainly continuing her career-long preoccupation with undermining the beauty principle[39], such malformation proves a danger to those masculinist structures that conceive femininity through ideals of aesthetics, utility or containment.

The characterization of the Specter, then, is a continuation of these figurations in that she transgresses bodily through her ambiguous, animalistic traits, and yet she is also brought into subjection by the medical institution. First, the narration includes frequent descriptions of the Specter's unconventional physique. Referred to as the "ancestor of normal man,"[40] she is "enormous,"[41] compared to monsters, possesses "something like arms or flippers"[43] and a "moldering, spotted crotch."[44] When referring to parts of her body, the narration frequently includes qualifiers to suggest that it is not quite sure if this really is an arm or mouth, implying that the Specter's body is not something that can ever be fully known. Second, the Specter's pronominal markers shift within the text, thus destabilizing how the text genders her. She is most often designated by variations of "she," but occasionally the text uses

neuter pronouns to refer to her, especially when connected with her malformed traits. For example, in a scene when The Operating Room Nurse is about to attack, Professor Lak "grabbed the Specter by what could be called *its* collar and he and the customers hightailed it out of there."[45] Her body is ambiguous in its dimensions and features, which leads to gender ambiguity. According to Julia Kristeva, "abjection is above all ambiguity."[46] It distinguishes itself from the object (one who has been othered) through its relationship to meaning. For the subject to fully know itself – in order for meaning to be realized – it requires some object to define itself through and against. For example, man knows himself as normal by constructing woman as abnormal. The meaning of the masculine subject as unmarked only occurs by marking the feminine object. However, the abject is the point where meaning fails, and is even the cause of that failure.[47] The Specter is a failure of the meaning of woman. Through her malformed and unknowable body, she undermines principles of beauty and containment, but more importantly, also of definability, that thing so central to rationalist modernity. However, as Kristeva further notes, the abject is also the precondition for culture. It embodies the Imaginary, meaning that it has not yet experienced the separation which creates an individual different from other individuals. It is prior to language and culture in the formulation of its excess.[48] Likewise, the Specter occupies this pre-social space. She is characterized as "the ancestor of modern man,"[49] and her caretakers feel they "must introduce the Specter to all of life's details."[50] Because she is the abject, however, when she is introduced to culture she inspires repulsion in those faced with her, such as Jóstaf, whom she rapes.[51]

Still, there is a way in which the Specter functions to represent social norms. When we first meet her, she apologizes. "Excuse me," she says to the professor, "I didn't mean to startle you."[52] Yet, we find that she is the one who is startled, and the apology is a gesture of deferral. The narration informs us that Professor Lak "discovered" the Specter and brought her back to this unnamed institution, which we later find to be a sanatorium. He guides her in her activities with a paternalism reminiscent of imperialism – "He loved civilization and wanted to save it"[53] – leading her into what he considers an appropriate range of behavior and experience. However, the Specter also participates in her subjection, even requesting it at moments. At one point she asks Professor Lak, "Have you forgotten to tell me I shouldn't smoke?"[54] So, although she represents a transgressive figure, we must recall the earlier words of Švankmajerová when she denies the possibility for female emancipation in our age.[55]

In addition to Švankmajerová's individual concern with issues of womanhood, her novel is deeply embedded in socio-historical context. Repeatedly, surrealists have denied a stylistic foundation to their artistic practice and instead assert it as a way of engaging the world, and we certainly find this attitude among Czechoslovak surrealists. In a written preface to a 1935 exhibit, Teige wrote that "SURREALISM IS NOT AN ARTISTIC SCHOOL," but a set of "tools" to help realize "the revolutionary movement of history."[56] Further, Toyen conceives of surrealism as having a "*moral* basis,"[57] saying that the group was founded because members "shared a community of ethical values." Finally, Jan Švankmajer claimed in one of his interviews: "Surrealism is not an art. . .Surrealism is a journey into the depths of the soul, like alchemy and psychoanalysis. Unlike both of these, however, it is not an individual journey but a collective adventure."[58] These assert a moral imperative to surrealism, one

opposed to the repressive institutions of modern society. As Penelope Rosemont has summed it up:

> In a nutshell, the surrealist argument goes like this: If civilization persists on its disastrous path – denying dreams, degrading language, shackling love, destroying nature, perpetuating racism, glorifying authoritarian institutions (family, church, state, patriarchy, military, the so-called free market), and reducing all that exists to the status of disposable commodities – then surely devastation is in store not only for us but for all life on this planet.[59]

For the French surrealists of the 1920s, of course, the First World War was the main referent for this worldview, causing them to work against bourgeois values, but the post-1968 Czech and Slovak group had a different exigence: totalitarian oppression. This was especially true in the late-1970s and early-1980s, in the midst of that period known as "normalization," when Švankmajerová wrote *Baradla Cave*. Pavla Pečinková characterizes the years between 1969-89 as ones "of deep general demoralisation and economic and spiritual devastation, when a pragmatic, materialistic attitude predominated in a society which had access to only the most miserable consumer goods; when art was confined to a ghetto and forced to react to an absurd reality."[60] The Czechoslovaks tasted freedom in the Prague Spring, only to have it taken away.

From this context emerges the small family that dominates the second half of Švankmajerová's novel: Frau Ludmila, her daughter Milada, and The Stepfather. Throughout *Baradla Cave*, Frau Ludmila is characterized by a resignation lacking bitterness and an adaptability. She accepts her daily rape by the bus as a matter of course, not attempting to resist but thinking that "it was good to know she was going to get home at that late hour as usual."[61] After she finds Jóstaf has impregnated her, she is disappointed that he shows no intention of marrying her, but she goes on with her daily routine anyway, resigning herself to the life she has. "But one can get used to anything," the narration informs us. "She's so apathetic now, what's left for her? How else should she continue?"[62] The narrative tone is generally nonjudgmental, neither condemning nor endorsing Frau Ludmila's malleability. She is an allegory for all those 1970s and 1980s Czechs existing in that gray area between opposition and cooperation, just trying to maintain the routine of their lives.

Milada, on the other hand, was born and raised "underground," so to speak. She has moments of resistance, and even when she does acquiesce, there is an irony to it. Taking over the narration for a moment, she remarks that she "needed to grow, and in order to do this I had to protect myself from my mother."[63] She develops a strategy for resistance, sometimes calling the Stepfather "Daddy" as he requests, and at other times snapping at her mother. "But you haven't read enough," she accuses Frau Ludmila, "otherwise we wouldn't be sitting in this hole right now."[64] Milada remains adaptable like her mother, but instead of just attempting to maintain life as it is, she allegorizes the spirit of opposition that worked against the totalitarian regime when it could.

Finally, Stepfather represents a cowering figure of a person. Under the weight of Frau Ludmila and Milada's orders, he simply hides himself in some

dark cranny, spending so much time there that he develops an affection for his subjection. "But one must either adapt or die, so Stepfather grew to like it under the bed."[65] Like Frau Ludmila, Stepfather resigns himself to the reality in which he lives, but unlike her, his actions are marked by fear. He cannot bring himself to challenge the ladies – his oppressors – and he becomes so used to his prison under the bed that the world outside full of light and people causes him more anxiety than the prospect of being imprisoned for the rest of his life.

Despite the interpretations of *Baradla* developed over the preceding pages, it is important to note the fluidity of meaning in the surrealist text and the importance of shared knowledge. Surrealist Bruno Solařík writes that surrealist collaboration is founded "on a shared conviction that human integrity is neither based on *isolated* ideological action nor on *isolated* creative expression."[66] It is a coming together in order to explore the limits and possibilities of reality. In that sense, *Baradla Cave* can be understood, in many ways, as performatively acting intersubjectivity. The identities within the text, because they slide into one another and allow themselves to be malleable, enact the sharing of identity and the expandability of reality that forms the basis of surrealist art.

NOTES

1. František Dryje, "Formative Meetings," in *EVAŠVANKMAJERJAN: Anima Animus Animation. Between Film and Free Expression*, Eva Švankmajerová and Jan Švankmajer (Prague: Slovart Arbor Vitae Foundation, 1998), 11.

2. František Dryje, "Formative Meetings," 11.

3. Krzysztof Fijałkowski, "Invention, imagination, interpretation: Collective activity in the contemporary Czech and Slovak surrealist group," *Papers of Surrealism* 3 (Spring 2005), http://www.surrealismcentre.ac.uk/papersofsurrealism/index.html.

4. Krzysztof Fijałkowski, "Invention, imagination, interpretation."

5. František Dryje, "Formative Meetings," 13.

6. Eva Švankmajerová and Jan Švankmajer, *EVAŠVANKMAJERJAN: Anima Animus Animation. Between Film and Free Expression* (Prague: Slovart Arbor Vitae Foundation, 1998), 31.

7. Penelope Rosemont, ed., *Surrealist Women: An International Anthology* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1998), xxxiii.

8. Ibid., xxxiii.

9. Michel Foucault, "A Preface to Transgression," in *Language, Counter-Memory, Practice: Selected Essays and Interviews*, ed. Donald F. Bouchard, trans. Donald F. Bouchard and Sherry Simon (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1977), 33-34.

10. Cf. Michael Richardson and Krzysztof Fijałkowski, eds. and trans., *Surrealism against the Current: Tracts and Declarations* (London and Sterling, VA: Pluto Press, 2001).

11. Eva Švankmajerová, *Baradla Cave*, trans. Gwendolyn Albert (Prague: Twisted Spoon Press, 2000), 9.

12. Ibid., 9.

13. Ibid., 11.

14. Ibid., 15.

15. Eva Švankmajerová and Jan Švankmajer, *EVAŠVANKMAJERJAN*, 42.
16. Ibid., 43.
17. Eva Švankmajerová, *Baradla Cave*, 14, 18.
18. Ibid., 23.
19. Although, later in the novel, the identities of Marie and Baradla seem to diverge and become distinct from one another (cf. p. 53). Baradla retains her amorphousness, her slippage between cave and woman, while Marie remains just woman.
20. Eva Švankmajerová, *Baradla Cave*, 22.
21. Ibid., 22.
22. Ibid., 23.
23. Ibid., 21.
24. Ibid., 118.
25. Ibid., 118.
26. Ibid., 14.
27. Ibid., 22.
28. Ibid., 75.
29. Ibid., 75.
30. Ibid., 75.
31. Ibid., 23.
32. Ibid., 119.
33. Sigmund Freud, "Fetishism" in *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud*, trans. James Strachey, Anna Freud, Alex Strachey, and Alan Tyson (Hogwarth Press, 1961), 21:149-57; Jacques Lacan, "The Signification of the Phallus [*Die Bedeutung des Phallus*]" in *Écrits*, trans. Bruce Fink (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 2002), 575 -584.
34. cf. Judith Butler, *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity* (New York: Routledge Classics, 2006).
35. Jacques Lacan, "The Mirror Stage as Formative of the *I* Function: as Revealed in Psychoanalytic Experience," in *Écrits*, trans. Bruce Fink (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 2002) 75-81.
36. Judith Butler, *The Psychic Life of Power: Theories in Subjection* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1997), 67.
37. Helene Cixous and Catherine Clement, *The Newly Born Woman*, trans. Betsy Wing (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1986).
38. Ibid., 9.
39. František Dryje, "Formative Meetings"; Pavla Pečinková, *Contemporary Czech Painting* (New York: Craftman House, 1993); Donna Roberts, "Jan Svankmajer and Eva Svankmajerova: Communicating Vessels" (accompanying art essay, University of Essex, 2007).
40. Eva Švankmajerová, *Baradla Cave*, 50.
41. Ibid., 50.
42. Ibid., 51-52.
43. Ibid., 63.
44. Ibid., 62.
45. Ibid., 56 (emphasis mine).
46. Julia Kristeva, *Powers of Horror: An Essay on Abjection*, trans. Leon S. Roudiez (New York: Columbia University Press, 1982), 9.

47. Ibid., 1-2.
48. Ibid., 10.
49. Eva Švankmajerová, *Baradla Cave*, 50.
50. Ibid., 64.
51. Ibid., 62-63.
52. Ibid., 50.
53. Ibid., 55.
54. Ibid., 53.
55. Eva Švankmajerová and Jan Švankmajer, *EVAŠVANKMAJER-JAN*, 42.
56. Derek Sayer, "Surrealities," in *Central European Avant-Gardes: Exchange and Transformation, 1910-1930*, ed. Timothy O. Benson (Cambridge, MA and London: The MIT Press, 2002), 100.
57. Penelope Rosemont, *Surrealist Women*, 81.
58. Peter Hames, ed., *The Cinema of Jan Švankmajer: Dark Alchemy*, 2nd ed. (London & New York: Wallflower Press, 2008), 112.
59. Penelope Rosemont, *Surrealist Women*, xxxiv.
. Pavla Pečinková, *Contemporary Czech Painting*, 1.
61. Eva Švankmajerová, *Baradla Cave*, 33.
62. Ibid., 70.
63. Ibid., 90.
64. Ibid., 93.
65. Ibid., 100.
66. Bruno Solařík, "The Walking Abyss: Perspectives on Contemporary Czech and Slovak Surrealism," *Papers of Surrealism* 3 (Spring 2005), http://www.surrealismcentre.ac.uk/papersofsurrealism/index.html.

Czech and Slovak American Historiography

Miloslav Rechcígl, Jr.

This is a critical retrospective look at various publications that have been written about the history of Czechs and Slovaks in America. Although the emphasis is on English publications, important Czech and Slovak titles are also covered, including publications in the Czech Republic and Slovakia, and the former Czechoslovakia. The coverage includes not only general histories, but also religious histories, socio-economic histories, cultural histories and publications written by Czechs and Slovaks in America:

Except for a few more recent historical writings, which will be discussed below (under "The Historiography"), there has been very little written in English about the historiography of this area. Several authors have addressed this subject in the Czech or Slovak languages but these reference materials are not readily accessible unless one is knowledgeable of these languages.

At first glance, it appears that relatively little serious scholarship has been devoted to the history of Czechs and Slovaks in the US, although much useful information can be found in the journalistic accounts and reminiscences of early settlers, and lately also in family histories of amateur genealogists. Most of the early writings have been in Czech and Slovak and, to complicate the situation further, they are scattered in various, often obscure, ethnic papers and pamphlets, which are not readily accessible. Nevertheless, a number of serious studies have appeared in English and they will be discussed here.

General Bibliographies on Czechs and Slovaks in America

The best way to approach the subject is to first examine the existing bibliographies relating to Czechs and Slovaks in America. The first known publication of this type was written in 1910 by Thomas Čapek, a well known Czech-American lawyer from New York, who had written a number of histories himself. The publication was entitled *Padesát let českého tisku v Americe* (Fifty Years of Czech Press in America)[1]. Although the author focused primar-

ily on journalism and literary production, the book, nevertheless, includes the listing of the most important references about the life and history of Czech immigrants. Unfortunately, very few of these publications are accessible to the English reader because they were mostly written in Czech.

The first English bibliography, titled *Bohemian (Čech) Bibliography*, was also written by Thomas Čapek, together with his wife Ann Vostrovský Čapek.[2] The book, which was published in 1918, deals primarily about Czechs in the Czechlands and only little attention was given to Czech immigration in America.

The first author who attempted to provide the American reader with a selective list of publications on Czechs and Slovaks in America in English was Joseph S. Rouček, professor of sociology at Queensborough Community College in Bayside, NY, who was of Czech descent. His two bibliographies, *American Slavs: a Bibliography* and *The Immigrant in Fiction and Biography*, published in 1944, comprised separate sections titled "Czechoslovaks."[3] A more recent selection of titles about Czechs and Slovaks in America in world languages was provided by the present author in his "Czechoslovakia and its Arts and Sciences. A Selective Bibliography in Western European Languages."[4]

Leroy F. Psencik's biographical essay "Czech Contributions to the American Culture," published in 1970,[5] has a distinct regional flavor (Texas), although it contains some useful basic references about the Czechs in the US and on Czechoslovakia. The essay was written for a beginner and, as such, it has fulfilled its purpose fairly well.

In 1976, Wayne Charles Miller et al. published *A Comprehensive Bibliography for the Study of American Minorities*, which includes a sizeable section on Czech and Slovak Americans, respectively.[6] Although the bibliography provides a relatively good selection of references, the reader should be mindful of occasional errors. For example, the authorship of the The Czechs and Slovaks in American Banking was mistakenly attributed to Joseph Čada rather than to Thomas Čapek. Similarly, Vojtěch Nevlud was erroneously credited with the editorship of The Czechoslovak Contribution to World Culture, while, in reality, the book was edited by the present author. Elsewhere, we read that Matthew Spinka wrote about "the Czech American" in his *John Amos Comenius: That Incomparable Moravian*. The famed Comenius actually remained in Europe all his life and never set foot on American soil.[7] The bibliography further lists four books on William Paca, one of the signatories of the Declaration of Independence, who was presumed to be of Bohemian descent, although there is no real evidence for this supposition. The book also recommends Thomas Čapek's *Bohemian (Čech) Bibliography*[8] as a useful bibliographic aid on the Czechs in America, even though the referenced publication deals almost exclusively with the Czechs and the Czechlands in European setting.

The most comprehensive bibliography relating to Czechs and Slovaks in America is Esther Jeřábek's *Czechs and Slovaks in North America*.[9] A Bibliography, published under the auspices of the Czechoslovak Society of Arts and Sciences in America (SVU) in 1976. Esther Jeřábek, who was of Czech descent, was a trained librarian, and, as a consequence, her publication has all signs of professional standards. However, in her zeal to compile a comprehensive volume, Jeřàbek was not selective enough and unnecessarily intermingled worthy selections with marginal entries. Also, her classification system is

somewhat ambiguous. For example, under the heading History, she mixes history of Czechs and Slovaks in the US with the history of Czechoslovakia, and even includes general histories about the US, if they were written by Czech or Slovak authors. She also erroneously assumed that all books dealing with the Moravian Church in the US are directly linked to the Moravian province of Czechoslovakia and her inhabitants. The patron of the Moravian Brethren, Count Zinzendorf, was of Saxon origin, rather than of Moravian ancestry. Yet, on the other hand, she omitted to mention important Moravian Brethren, such as John Heckewelder, George Neisser, David Nitschmann or Christian David, who were bona fide Moravians or Bohemians.

A person who is not versed in Czech or Slovak may also find her bibliography a bit overbearing, since Czech and Slovak language materials are listed alphabetically, together with English-language publications, without translation of the titles. Furthermore, references about Czechs and Slovaks are not clearly delineated from writings on other subjects that have been authored by Czechs and Slovaks in America. This again may be somewhat confusing to a person unfamiliar with Czech/Slovak materials.

Still, Jerabek's book, by far, is the best and, in fact, the only single-volume publication covering both Czechs' and Slovaks' migration history in North America. No serious student should undertake the study of their history without first consulting this bibliography.

There also exists a separate Slovak periodic bibliography, bearing the title *Slovak Bibliography Abroad*[10], which contains relatively large sections on American materials, including references to American Slovaks. Two volumes have been published, so far, covering periods 1945-1965 and 1966-1977, respectively, by the Slovak Institute in Cleveland under the authorship of Michael Lacko. Just as in the case of Jeřábek's Bibliography, and even more so in this case, the primary focus seems to be on the literary output of the immigrants, rather than on publications concerned with their ethnic history.

A bibliography about Ruthenians in America can be found in Paul R. Magocsi's book, *Our People. Carpatho-Rusyns and their Descendants in North America*.[11]

For a quick orientation in reference literature about Czechs and Slovaks in America I recommend that the reader consult the present author's recent selective retrospective bibliographies: "Czech Americans: A Selective Bibliography in English," "Slovak Americans: A Selective Bibliography in English"[12] and "Czechs, Slovaks and Ruthenians in the US: A Selective Bibliography."[13]

Bibliographies of Publications Written by Czechs and Slovaks in America

Literary and scholarly production of Czechs and Slovaks in Amer-ica is very extensive and quite varied. We have already alluded to the early efforts (1911) of Thomas Čapek to make an inventory of their journalistic endeavors in his *Padesát let českého tisku v Americe* (Fifty Years of Czech Press in America).[165] The referenced volume covered newspapers, magazines, annuals, calendars, as well as various memorial, and occasional publications and other literary output. This publication was truly a pioneering effort whose historical significance and reference value have not been surpassed by any subsequent work.

A comparable Slovak volume was published some thirty years later by Konstantin Čulen under the title *Slováci v Amerike. Črty z kultúrnych dejín*

(Slovaks in America, Skits from Cultural History)[16]. This is indeed a worthy counterpart of Čapek's Padesát let ceskeho tisku v Americe, containing a wealth of information about the Slovak literary production and periodicals, as well as about their schools. Yet, it is hardly ever cited and virtually unknown in the US. The poorly chosen title and the relative unavailability of the publication (it was published in Slovakia at the outbreak of World War II) were probably responsible for this. Very informative is also his bibliography, "Rukoväť k dejinám slovenskej literatúry v zahraničí" (Guide to History of Slovak Literature Abroad).[17]

The development of the Slovak press is also described in the library thesis of G. L. Yashur, deposited at the Catholic University of America.[18]

A useful retrospective bibliography of Czech and Slovak peri-odical publications abroad, including American newspapers, maga-zines, and calendars, was compiled in Czechoslovakia by F. Štédronský under the title Zahraniční krajanské časopisy a kalendáře do roku 1938 (The Overseas Emigrant Newspapers, Magazines, and Calendars up to 1938).[19]

An exhaustive coverage of the contemporary issued newspapers and magazines by Czechs and Slovaks outside of Czechoslovakia, includ-ing the US and Canada, has been provided by Vojtěch N. Duben in a series of periodically updated bibliographies, the latest being his *Czech and Slovak Press Outside of Czechoslovakia. Its Status* in 1978.[20] A compilation of strictly Slovak periodicals was made by Konstantin Čulen in his *Slovenské časopisy v Amerike* (Slovak Periodicals in America).[21]

Following the return of democracy to Czechoslovakia, several interesting bibliographical works concerning exile periodicals were published in the Czech Republic, namely that of Michal Přibán[22] and the subsequent work of Lucie Formanová, Jiří Gruntorád and Michal Přibán[23], which is its continuation.

Of special interest is the publication of Docent Alena Jaklová, *Čechoamerická periodika 19. století* (Czech American Periodicals of the 19th Century),[24] concerning the periodical press of Czech immigrants in the US, on the basis of historic, anthropological and ethnographic data, from which the author characterizes the social, ideological, cultural and communication aspects of the life of Czech immigrants in the US and in detail delimits the functions of the Czech immigrant press in America.

While it is comparatively easy to keep an almost complete record of periodicals, the task of keeping track of monographic publications is more difficult. Many of the earlier publications in this category were included in *Čapek's Padesát let českého tisku v Americe*[25] and Čulen's *Slováci v Amerike*[26]; however, the coverage is not complete, by any means.

The most comprehensive coverage of monographic literature, to date, can be found in the previously mentioned Jeřábek's publication *Czechs and Slovaks in North America. A Bibliography*[27]. The post-war monographs, authored by Slovaks abroad, have been catalogued by Lacko in his *Slovak Bibliography Abroad*.[28] The latter publication is much broader in scope than Jeřábek's bibliography, covering almost any kind of book written by a Slovak author outside of Czechoslo-vakia, irrespective of the language, subject matter, or place of issue.

Interestingly enough, until recently there was only one distinct bibliography that dealt specifically with fiction and related literary writings. I am

referring to Antonín Kratochvíl's *Bibliografie krásné české literatury, vydané v exilu (únor 1948-květen 1967)* (Bibliography of Czech Creative Literature Published in Exile, February 1948-May 1967).[29] Following the Velvet Revolution a few important publications on this topic appeared in the Czech Republic, namely that of Jan Čulík[30] and Aleš Zach[31]. Vladimír Papoušek also wrote an interesting work about Czech literature in Chicago.[32]

Ludmila Šeflová's *Bibliografie literatury vydané českými a slovenskými autory v zahraničí 1948-1972* (Bibliography of Literature Published by Czech Authors Abroad 1948-1972)[33] covers not only "pure literature" but also other writings of Czech and Slovak authors on Czechoslovak-related topics. The alphabetical arrangement of entries by author and the intermingling of the fiction titles with other subjects make the orientation throughout the volume a bit awkward. The subsequent revised edition in 1993 suffered, unfortunately, from the same weaknesses.[34]

Of similar content is Jiří Gruntorád's *Katalog knih českého exilu 1948-1994*,[35] based on the collection of books in his Libri prohibiti in Prague. Although the monograph was otherwise well prepared, just as was the case with Šeflová's compilation, it was not well mapped out, since the individual entries were listed alphabetically, either by the name of the author or by the first word of the title.

By far, the most onerous task is to keep a record of scholarly and scientific works which are not related to the thing "Czechoslovak." The first valiant effort in this area was made by the Czech-language periodical *Tribuna*, which began periodic publishing of a bibliography of scientific and scholarly writings of Czechoslovak exiles under the title "Bibliografie vědeckých prací československých exulantů, cizinců československého původu a cizích studií o československých otázkách, které byly vydány po únoru 1948."[36] Unfortunately, after less than four years, this worthy endeavor was terminated.

There is some coverage of scientific works in Lacko's *Slovak Bibliography Abroad*[37] but the coverage has been limited to only a handful of better known Slovak scientists. Šeflová's bibliography, while covering some scholarly works on non-Czechoslovak topics, completely excludes writings in natural sciences and technology.

As for the Ruthenian literary production, Prof. Paul Robert Magocsi began publishing annotated listings of monographic studies in his *Carpatho-Rusyn Studies. An Annotated Bibliography*, which are presented very well.[38]

Some of the Czech and Slovak American organizations publish various publications, including magazines, newsletters and other pamphlets and even monographs. The Czechoslovak Society of Arts and Sciences (SVU) is probably one of very few such organizations that prepared a more or less complete listing of its studies and other writings.[39]

Bibliographies about Czechoslovakia

It would be unthinkable to consider immigrants from Czechoslo-vakia and its Successor States in isolation, without some reference to their native land. The common heritage, continuous social and cultural contacts and the intermittent rejuvenation and replenishment of the "gene pool" from the recurrent emigration waves preclude that. As any other immigrant group in America, these people must be viewed from the perspective and in the context of various inter-relationships and interactions with their physical, social and cul-

tural environment, new as well as old. It is for these reasons why we are also including in our discussion bibliographies about Czechoslovakia.

Insufficient space does not allow us to discuss numerous bibliographical publications that have been published in Czechoslovakia. The interested reader should consult the present author's *Czechoslovakia in Bibliography: A Bibliography of Bibliographies*[40] which provides a comprehensive listing of such bibliographies, as well as bibliographies on Czechoslovakia, regardless where and in what language they were published.

It is of interest that the first listing in America of the Czechoslovak-related bibliographies was attempted by Robert J. Kerner in his *The Foundations of Slavic Bibliography*.[41] Although the book was written prior to the establishment of Czechoslovakia and at the time when bibliographical services in most of the Slavic Europe had not been fully developed, it filled an important void in its days. Professor Kerner, who was of Czech descent and who was able to read Slavic languages, performed an important service by introducing to the American audience bibliographic publications of then relatively little known Slavic nations of Europe.

The first bibliography dealing with English-language publications on Czechoslovakia was written in 1918 by Thomas Čapek and Anna Vostrovský Čapek under the title *Bohemian (Čech) Bibliography. A Finding List of Writings in English Relating to Bohemia and the Čechs*.[42] The same year, Robert J. Kerner published his scholarly *Slavic Europe. A Selected Bibliography*[43] in the Western European Languages, which contained a separate chapter on the Bohemians (Čechs) and the Slovaks. Two years later, Prof. Besteaux published his *Bibliographie tchèque, contenant un certain nombre d'ouvrages sur la Tchécoslovaquie en langues diverses (à l'eclusion des langues slaves)*,[44] in the French language. For many years, these three bibli-ographies served as a chief source of information on English-language books relating to Czechs and Slovaks and Czechoslovakia, as a whole.

Information about Slovakia can be found in bibliographies of the following authors: Joseph Kotcka,[45] Jozef Kuzmík,[46] Irena Lettrich[47] and Jan Tabacko.[48] In 1969, Matica slovenská released a new listing, entitled *Provizorny súpis americkej krajanskej tlače. (Knihy, brožury, kalendáre) 1886-1947*.[49]

Regarding Ruthenia, the reader should consult the historiographical guide written by Paul R. Magocsi.[50]

For more recent literature, see the bibliographical guides of Paul L. Horecký,[51] Rudolf Šturm,[52] David Short,[53] as well as my own.[54] A selective retrospective bibliography of English publications about the Czechlands also exists. [55]

An updated listing of bibliographies on Czechoslovakia can be found in the present author's *A Classified Guide to Bibliographies Relating to Czech, Slovak and Ruthenian Immigrants in America*.[56]

The Historiography

From the older literature we should bring to the readers' attention an excellent selective bibliography of František Štědronský relating to the historiography of Czech and Slovak America, entitled "Bibliografický přehled prací k dějinám Čechů a Slováků v USA do počátku devadesátých let 19. století" (Bibliographic Overview of Works on the History of Czechs and Slo-

vaks in US until the Beginning of the Nineties of the 19th Century).[57]

In this connection we should also mention the historic bibliography of David L. Brye, *European Immigration and Ethnicity*,[58] which includes information about the Czechoslovak immigration to America. Altogether, it covers 65 papers, of which 37 appeared in American Slovak ethnic periodicals Jednota and Annual Furdek, 18 in the American Slovak magazine Slovakia, 21 in American ethnic Kalendár Jednota and others elsewhere. Among the referenced articles, 56 dealt exclusively with American Slovaks, 7 with American Czechs and 2 with both ethnic groups. It is hard to believe that these statistics reflect the actual status of American research on Czech American immigration to the US and Canada. Brye's emphasis on ethnic materials, which are not always objective, at the expense of scholarly works, further lessens the credibility of his historic bibliography.

As for the Czech American historiography, the following authors dealt with the subject: František Kutnar,[59] Josef V. Polišenský,[60] Karel D. Bicha,[61] Robert Janak,[62] Ivo Barteček[63] and Josef Opatrný.[64] On the Slovak side, Elena Jakešová[65], M. Mark Stolarik,[66] František Bielik[67] and Thomas D. Marzik[68] contributed to the subject.

The comprehensive bibliography of George J. Kovtun, *Czech and Slovak History. An American Bibliography*[69] includes a separate chapter about Czechs and Slovaks in the US and other countries and is an excellent source of reference publications concerning the history of Czechs and Slovaks.[70] A selective listing of English historic works about Czechs and Slovaks, including both general and regional surveys, can be found in the present author's bibliographies relating to American Czechs and Slovaks. The listing of Rechcigl's historic studies and articles on Czechs and Slovaks in America, as well as on Czechoslovak America, in general, is also available.[71]

General Histories

There are a number of publications that deal with the history of Czechs and Slovaks in America, which vary as to their quality, some good, some of passing quality and some inferior. As for the books written by Slovaks in the US or Canada, some of them may suffer from anti-Czech bias and one has to use them with caution.

I shall discuss in this section only the most important publications, omitting popular pamphlets and the like. The first systematic history about the Czechs in America was written by a Czech-American physician and amateur historian, Jan Habenicht in 1910, under the title *Dějiny Čechů amerických* (History of Czechs in America).[72] It was a pioneer work, based on the author's personal visitations to various Czech communities throughout the US and what he learned from individual settlers. As an ardent Catholic, Habenicht put emphasis on Catholic parishes, Catholic priests and Catholic settlers. Although he also included material about the Protestants and even Free Thinkers, he devoted to them much less space than they deserved. The greatest value of this publication is in the inclusion of names of individual settlers and family histories, mentioning places in their native Bohemia or Moravia, from which they emigrated. As a consequence, the book has been of great interest among Czech amateur genealogists since they frequently found information there about their ancestors. The book has been so popular that it was recently translated into English.

Some ten years later, Thomas Čapek, who is sometimes called a "historian of Czech America" published his, now classical, *The Czechs (Bohemians) in America*.[73] Although it is a relatively shorter monograph, in comparison with Habenicht's book, it is unquestionably better organized and better written. It was written as a social and cultural history in which one can find information about the causes that led to Czech emigration, as well as the reason why they settled in particular communities and why they selected their particular employment, about their assimilation, their way of life, philosophical orientation (rationalism, socialism or radicalism), religious thinking and organization (Catholics, Protestants or Free Thinkers), their schools and efforts to maintain their native language, their participation in business and other professions, membership in Fraternal organizations, cultural and communal activities, journalistic work and literary production and the participation in the struggle to establish an independent Czechoslovakia. It is an indispensable book, which has no equal, for anyone who contemplates studying the history of Czechs in America.[74]

Čapek subsequently wrote a similar book in Czech with the title *Naše Amerika* (Our America)[75], in which he expanded some of his findings with more detail and with the addition of statistical data. This book also contains an interesting chapter about memorial and important dates and activities in the history of American Czechs. Besides this monograph, Čapek published a whole series of lesser and smaller studies, such as *Památky Českých Emigrantů v Americe* (Memorials of Czech Immigrants in America),[76] about Augustine Herman, Frederick Philipse, Czechs in New York, etc.

The first history devoted to American Slovaks was a little brochure, *The Slovaks in America*, written, interestingly, by a Czech-American, Thomas Čapek, Jr.[77] On the Slovak side, Konstantin Čulen can probably be considered a "historian of Slovak America," based on his book *Dejiny Slovákov v Amerike* (History of Slovaks in America).The book,[78] which, on the whole, is not as scholarly as that of Čapek's, but it nevertheless filled an important gap and gave Slovaks a foundation on which to build. It has similar content as Čapek's monograph. However, in an effort to prove that Slovaks were in America already in the 16th century, Čulen made a claim that "the first Slovak on American soil was Štefan Parmenius," which was followed by M. Martyna Tybor's full-length chapter[79] about Parmenius and other pioneers, although, as evidenced by scholars, he was of Hungarian ancestry.[80]

In this connection, one should mention that there was also sensational news about two Slovak pioneers, by name of George Mata and John Bogdan, who were supposed to accompany Captain John Smith on his historic voyage to Jamestown, Virginia in 1608, a number of years before the arrival of the Mayflower. This was even published in the *US Congressional Record* (July 5, 1956).[81] This was later refuted by stating that they were actually Poles and later, lo and behold, it was concluded that the mentioned individuals did not even exist.

This is indicative that one should be cautious when using strictly ethnic sources. According to this author's own research, the first Slovak to permanently settle in America was Anton Schmidt, a tinsmith from Bratislava, who settled in Bethlehem, Pennsylvania in 1746.[82]

From the later works we ought to mention a monograph of Kenneth D. Miller, *The Czecho-Slovaks in America*,[83] a paperback by *Arnošt Jan Žižka,*

Kulturní přínosy amerických Čechů (Cultural Contributions of American Czechs),[84] a slim brochure by Francis Dvorník, *Czech Contributions to the Growth of the United States*,[85] a memorial publication of the Czechoslovak National Council of America, *Panorama*,[86] a monograph by Věra Láska, *The Czechs in America*,[87] a sociological study by Joseph Chada, *The Czechs in the United States*,[88] and the recently published monograph by Štěpánka Korytová-Magstadt, *To Reap a Beautiful Harvest: Czech Immigration Beyond the Mississippi, 1850-1900*.[89]

Exclusively, on the Slovak side, mention should be made of the following publications: Jozef Staško's Slovaks in the *United States of America*,[90] M. Martina Tybor's *The Slovaks in America to the End of the Nineteenth Century*,[91] Joseph J. Krajsa's *Slovaks in America: A Bicentennial Study*,[92] and M. Mark Stolarik's study on Slovak migration to America.[93]

On the occasion of the 200th anniversary of the US, the American Slovaks published a memorial-type of publication entitled *Slovaks in America. A Bicentennial Study*,[94] which dealt primarily with various Slovak American organizations, although a few historical surveys were also included. The American Czechs issued a comparable publication earlier under the title *Panorama. A Historical Review of Czechs and Slovaks in the United States*.[95] Both of these publications are written in a popular style, being distinctly "marginal in scholarship," as some reviewers pointed out.

As for the early pioneers in America, the present author had written several studies on American Czechs, Moravians, Slovaks and Jews.[96]

An excellent history on the Ruthenians in America was written by Prof. Paul R. Magocsi, under the title *Our People: Carpatho-Rusyns and their Descendants in North America*.[97]

In the Czech Republic and Slovakia, there are several publications deserving mentioning, namely that of Leoš Šatava, *Migrační procesy a české vystěhovalectví 19. století do USA* (Migration Processes and the Czech Emigration to the US in the 19th Century),[98] *Začiatky českej a slovenskej emigrácie do USA,*[99] *Vysťahovalectvo a život krajanov vo svete*,[100] the study of Josef Polišenský, *Úvod do studia dějin vystěhovalectví do Ameriky I a II* (Introduction to the Study of History of Emigration to America I and II),[101] and a useful pamphlet of Ivan Dubovický, prepared in connection with an exhibit about the Czechs in America.[102]

In 1980, Matica slovenska published a two-volume set *Slováci vo svete* (Slovaks in the World)[103] which includes two sizeable chapters on the Slovaks in the US and the Slovaks in Canada, respectively, that provide a good overview.

I would also like to include here the present author's monograph, *Czechs and Slovaks in America*,[104] which was published in 2005 by the Czechoslovak Society of Arts and Sciences, on the occasion of his 75th birthday.

As for the history of Czechs and Slovaks in Canada, a couple of significant monographs exist, namely *The Czechs and Slovaks in Canada*,[105] written by John Gellner and John Smerek and, more recently, Josef Čermák's book, *It All Began with Prince Rupert*.[106] Joseph M. Kirschbaums's publication, *Slovaks in Canada*,[107] deals exclusively with the Canadian Slovaks.

Mention should also be made of the special issue of the Canadian periodical *Naše Hlasy*, published on the occasion of its 100th anniversary, which was devoted to Czechs and Slovaks in Canada, which contains a lot of

useful information not to be found elsewhere.[108]

Regarding Czechs and Slovaks in Latin America, there are a number of small studies but no comprehensive history has been written so far.[109]

I would also like to bring attention to various Regional Conferences and World Congresses sponsored by the Czechoslovak Society of Arts and Sciences, which, from the very beginning of its founding in 1958, have devoted a substantial part of their program to the subject of Czechs and Slovaks abroad, particularly in the US. The lectures from one of its recent conferences in Cedar Rapids are available in electronic format and can be purchased from the Society.[110] The selected lectures from the SVU Conference in Texas were also published, as were the lectures from the SVU Conference in Bethlehem.[111]

Regional and Local Histories

As listed in my selective bibliographies, referenced earlier, a number of historical publications have been written about Czechs and Slovaks in individual States and various US communities. Many of them are mere journalistic accounts or memorial type publications, written on the occasion of anniversaries of specific localities. Nevertheless, some of them may provide useful information. I shall list here only the significant publications that appeared in book form.

The first and the only single-volume publication that gives a systematic overview of Czech histories in different States is Josef Habenicht's *History of Czechs in America*,[112] which is, in fact, organized according to different States. While some States, such as Missouri, Texas, New York, Pennsylvania, Maryland, Nebraska, Kansas, Iowa, the Dakotas, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Michigan, Illinois and Ohio, were given detailed or adequate coverage, very little, if any, information was provided on other States.

Francis J. Švehla was probably first to write a regional history when he published his *Bohemians in Central Kansas*[113] in 1915. This was followed by a small monograph, *Dějiny Čechů ve Státu South Dakota* (History of Czechs in the State of South Dakota),[114] under the penmanship of Josef A. Dvořák. This pioneering work was later translated to English and in 1980 published by the Czech Heritage Preservation Society.

Next in order came the Czech New York, a year later, which was narrated by Thomas Čapek in his *The Czech (Bohemian) Community of New York*.[115] Interestingly, no other serious study on New York Czechs has been published since then.

One of the earliest and probably the best regional histories was written in 1928 on Nebraska, by Rose Rosický, under the title *Dějiny Čechů v Nebrasce* (History of Czechs in Nebraska),[116] which she later also published in English. An update and sequel to her monograph is the 1947 publication, *Czechs and Nebraska*, edited by Vladimír Kučera and Alfred Nováček.[117]

A somewhat comparable book about Texas was written in 1934 by H. B. Maresh and Estelle Hudson, entitled *Czech Pioneers of the Southwest*.[118] It is not a concise history of Czechs in Texas, but rather a narration about prominent and accomplished Texas families of Czech ancestry, and as such it is a very useful monograph. Four years later, the National Alliance of Czech Catholics in Texas issued their *Naše Dějiny* (Our History).[119] Even though the emphasis is on the Catholic parishes and priests in various parts of Texas, the book, nevertheless, has lots of useful information bearing on the history of the

Texan Czechs. In 1983, Clinton Machann wrote a scholarly historical monograph, entitled *Krásná Amerika. A Study of the Texas Czechs 1851-1939*,[120] which provides a good overview of the Texas Czechs and which, in some ways, reminds one of the classical writings of Thomas Čapek. Besides the referenced publications, there are a number of lesser studies relating to Czech Texans, some of which are listed in the present author's selected bibliographies on Czechs and Slovaks in America. It seems that no other State received as much attention by Czech researchers as Texas.

Interestingly, relatively little attention has been given in English publications to the Czechs in Illinois, in spite of the fact that many Czechs lived there. Apart from Droba's biographical sketches of *Czech and Slovak Leaders in Metropolitan Chicago*,[121] and John J. Reichman's *Czechoslovaks of Chicago. Contributions to History of a National Group*,[122] very little else has been written. The latter is really no systematic history but rather a collection of popular and journalistic accounts of some aspects of the life of Chicago Czechs. In1939, Rudolf Bubeníček published his *Dějiny Čechů v Chicagu* (History of Czechs in Chicago),[123] which, again, is not a systematic historical overview but rather a collection of varied materials about various aspects of the Chicago Czechs. The book is not well organized and it even lacks a table of contents, not to speak about a subject index. Its greatest value lies in the names of the Czech Chicagoans it mentions and their family histories.

With respect to Minnesota, there is an excellent monograph on *German-Bohemians. The Quiet Immigrants*,[124] written by La Vern J. Rippley and Robert J. Paulson, but there is no comparable work on the Minnesota Czechs.

The account of some Iowa Czechs is given in Martha E. Griffith's study *The History of Czechs in Cedar Rapids*[125] and Cyril A. Klimesh's monograph *They Came to This Place: A History of Spillville, Iowa and its Settlers*,[126] but there is no single-volume publication available treating the Iowa Czechs, as a whole.

In 1977, a publication came out about Colorado Czechs and Slovaks, under the title *A History of Czechs and Slovaks in the State of Colorado 1876-1976*[127] by Andrew Kutes and in 1980, historian Karel D. Bícha wrote a slim but authoritative history on *The Czechs in Oklahoma*.[128]

There has been very little information about Louisiana, until the recent release of James Hlaváč's monograph, *A Hidden Impact. The Czechs and Slovaks of Louisiana from the 1720s to Today*.[129] James Hlaváč should be complimented for this pioneering effort; however, his monograph could have used some editing. Besides unnecessarily being too wordy, it could have been better organized and should have also included an index. Among the Czech "movers and shakers" "he devotes a prominent space to Benjamin Latrobe (1764-1820), whom he thought was of Moravian ancestry.While belonging to the Moravian Church, his ancestors were Germans, Dutch and Irish, and not a drop of the Czech blood.[131]

The output of regional histories on American Slovaks in English is also spotty and limited for the most part to Ohio, Michigan, New York, Illinois, Pennsylvania, and Florida. Early on, appeared *Dejiny clevelandských a lakewoodských Slovákov* (History of Cleveland and Lakewood Slovaks)[132] by J. Pankuch, *Úryvky z dejín Slovákov v Mahoning doline* (Fragments of History of Slovaks in Mahoning Valley, Pennsylvania)[133] by M. Salva, *Krátke dejiny lorainských Slovákov* (Brief History of Slovaks in Lorain, OH)[134] and *Dejiny*

detroitských a amerických Sloáýkov (History of Detroit and American Slovaks).[135]

In 1975 Daniel F. Tanzone wrote *Slovak of Yonkers, New York*,[136] in 1985 M. Mark Stolarik wrote *Growing Up in the South Side: Three Generations of Slovaks in Bethlehem, Pennsylvania, 1880-1976*,[137] in 1991 Andrew F. Hudak, Jr. wrote *Slovaks in Florida*,[138] and in 2002 Thomas J. Shelley wrote *Slovaks on the Hudson. Most Holy Trinity Church, Yonkers and the Slovak Catholic Archdiocese of New York, 1894-2000.*[139]

Social and Economic Histories

Although several historical surveys exist in periodic press, there are no authoritative single-volume publications dealing with social history or cultural contributions of Czech Americans or Slovak Americans. Neither are there books that would provide comprehensive overviews of specific sectors, such as religion, society, business, arts and letters, education and scholarship, science and technology and other areas of human endeavor that have bearing on Czech and Slovak Americans. There are, of course, numerous lesser studies on narrower subjects, scattered in a variety of journals which cannot be reviewed here due to lack of space. An interested person should consult the selected bibliographical guides, mentioned earlier.

Beyond that, there are literally hundreds of all sorts of brochures, pamphlets, calendars, anniversary memorial publications and the like, which rarely are catalogued nor kept by the libraries, which may contain useful information on social and cultural history. Interestingly, a large proportion of these publications concern local parishes and the clergy of various denominations.

Having said that, nevertheless, occasionally, a new exhilarating monograph may unexpectedly pop up which may bear on the subject.

An example of the above in the social history area, is Robert Kuták's *The Story of a Bohemian-American Village*.[140] The sociologist Robert L. Škrábánek, in his outstanding *We're Czechs*,[141] describes how a band of Czech farmers, with one foot in America and the other still in the Old Country, led a distinctive and fiercely proud life in Central Texas in the 1920s and 1930s, maintaining "Were Czechs, they're Americans." Ernest Žižka's Czech Cultural Contributions,[142] in spite of its misleading title, deals with social structure and assimilation of Czech immigrants in the US.

Of interest are several Slovak-related publications, such as Howard F. Stein's *An Ethno-Historic Study of Slovak-American Identity*[143] and Gregory C. Ference's *Sixteen Months of Indecision: Slovak American Viewpoints toward Compatriots and the Homeland from 1914 to 1915 as Viewed by the Slovak Language Press*[144] and M. Mark Stolarik's *Immigration and Urbanization 1870-1918*.[145]

The economic history relating to Czechs and Slovaks in America has received very little attention. With reference to industry and trade there is an old publication from 1898, written in Czech, *Česká práce v Americe: Dějiny a popisy česko-amerických závodů průmysloých a obchodních* (Czech Work in America: History and Description of Industrial Plants.)[146] In the area of finance, Thomas Čapek had written in 1920 a small volume on *The Czechs and Slovaks in American Banking*.[147]

Regarding labor, except for a few older papers, no substantial study has been written. Of related interest is the Slovak Academy of Sciences' mono-

graph on *Začiatky českej a slovenskej emigrácie do USA: Česká a slovenská robotnícka emigrácia v období I. Internacionály* (The Beginning of Czech and Slovak Emigration to the US. Emigration of Czech and Slovak Laborers to the US during the 'First Internationale'.)[148]

The situation on Czech or Slovak farms is treated in LeRoy Hodges' *Slavs on the Southern Farms: An Account of Bohemian, Slovak and Polish Agricultural Settlements in Southern States*[149] and Russell Ward Lynch's *Czech Farmers in Oklahoma*.[150]

Of peripheral interest are the Proceedings of the meeting on Czech entrepreneurs and economists, held during "Týden zahraničních Čechů" (Week of Czechs from Abroad)[151], which is really a collection of undocumented speeches.

There are several biographical accounts of some of the business leaders worth mentioning, i.e., Frank J. Vlchek,[152] Michael Bosak,[153] Ray Kroc,[154] Este Lauder,[155] Thomas Baťa,[156] Stephen Roman,[157] and Michael Eisner.[158]

Religious Histories

As mentioned earlier, no single monograph exists concerning the cultural history of Czechs and Slovaks in America. Ernest Žižka's monograph, titled *Czech Cultural Contributions*, is really a misrepresentation because the publication has little to do with culture.

Compared to other areas, religion has been allotted relatively more attention by authors, but many of these writings are limited in scope and are outdated.

In the case of Catholics, the most useful work was Antonín Petr Houšť's publication, *Krátké dějiny a seznam česko-katolických osad ve Spojených Státech* (Brief History and List of Czech Catholic Communities in the USA.),[159] published in Czech in 1890 and as such is not easily accessible. Of smaller scope is *Průvodce v českých katolických osadách v Arcidioecesi St. Paulské ve Spojených Státech Severoamerických* (Guide to Czech Catholic Parishes in the Archdiocese of St. Paul).[160] In addition, several lesser histories exist, including that of Josef Čada, *Czech-American Catholics 1859-1920*,[161] Peter F. Mizera's *Czech Benedictines in America, 1850-1920*,[162] Rev. A. Svrček's *History of the Czech-American Catholic Communities of Texas*[163] and Vladimír Kučera's *Czech Churches in Nebraska*.[164]

Comparable publications about the Slovak Catholics include: Philip A. Hrobak's *Slovak Catholic Parishes and Institutions in the United States and Canada*,[165] František Hrušovský's *Slovenské rehole v Americe* (Slovak Religious Orders in America),[166] and Richard Portasik's *Slovak Franciscans in America*.[167] The Byzantine Rite and Orthodoxy of American Ruthenians are treated by Athanasius Pekar in his *Our Past and Present: Historical Outline of the Byzantine Ruthenian Metropolitan Province*[168] and *American Carpatho-Russian Orthodox Greek Catholics of USA.*,[169] respectively.

The Czech Protestants are generally treated in *Památník českých evanjelických církví ve Spojených Státech* (Souvenir of Czech Protestant Churches in the US)[170] and Václav Kejř's *České evangelické sbory v Americe* (Czech Evangelic Communities in America).[171] There are also separate publications dealing with Baptists (Václav Vojta's *Czechoslovak Baptists*,)[172], Presbyterians (Hilda Schiller *Stalmach's History of the Ministers and Churches of the Southwest Czech Presbytery*)[173] and Christian Sisters Union's *Unity of the*

Brethren in Texas 1855-1966.[174]

A number of excellent histories were devoted to the Moravian Church, including John Taylor Hamilton's *A History of the Church Known as the Moravian Church or Unitas Fratrum or the Unity of the Brethren during the 18th and 19th Centuries*,[175] George Neisser's *A History of the Beginnings of Moravian Work in America*,[176] J. E. Hutton's *A History of the Moravian Church*,[177] Allen W. Schattschneider's *Through Five Hundred Years: A Popular History of the Moravian Church*.[178]

Adelaide L. Fries, who descended from a Moravian Brethren family in Moravia, wrote a number of delightful books on the Moravian Church,[179] many of which have been reprinted, as well as being an editor of the 7-volume *Records of the Moravians in North Carolina*.[180]

Information about the Slovak Protestants can be found in Fedor Ruppeldt's *Slovenskí evanjelíci v Amerike* (Slovak Evangelists in America).[181] There are also two histories on the Slovak Lutherans, namely that of George Dolak's *A History of the Slovak Evangelical Lutheran Church in the United States of America*[182] and the Lutheran Church's publication *A History of the Slovak Zion Synod LCA*.[183]

June Granatir Alexander's scholarly monograph, *The Immigrant Church and Community*,[184] belongs to a somewhat different category, because it covers both Slovak Catholics and Lutherans in one community, namely Pittsburgh during 1880-1915.

With reference to American Jews from Czechoslovakia, there is an excellent monograph by Guido Kisch, entitled *In Search of Freedom: A History of American Jews from Czechoslovakia 1592-1948*.[185]

Apart from general surveys, there are several excellent biographies of religious figures worth mentioning. Among Catholics, one of the oldest such biographies was that of *John Nepomucene Neumann*,[186] the first American male saint, born in Prachatice, Bohemia, written by his nephew. Several other biographies about him appeared,[187] including his own autobiography.[188] Several biographies also exist about American Slovak Saint *Tereza Demjanovich*,[189] of Ruthenian ancestry from Eastern Slovakia. Biographies have also been written about lesser figures, including that on *Monsignor Alois Klein*, *Stefan Furdek* and *Matthew Jankola*.[190]

Excellent biographies exist about the two famed Moravian Missionaries, *David Zeisberger*[191] and *John Heckewelder*,[192] both of whom had their roots in Moravia, who immigrated to America in the midst of the 18th century.

A number of biographies have also been devoted to leading Rabbis of Czech ancestry, of whom *Rabbi Isaac Mayer Wise*[193] was most prominent, being known as the founder of liberal Judaism in the US. Other biographies concerned *Rabbi Max Heller*,[194] *Rabbi Stephen Wise*,[195] and *Rabbi Jung*,[196] all of whom were of Czech ancestry. Several biographies were also written about *Henrietta Szold*,[197] an ardent Zionist of Slovak descent, whose greatest contribution to Jewish life was the creation of the largest Jewish organization in American history, Hadassah Women.

Cultural Histories

Although no full-length comprehensive monograph exists on cultural history of Czech and Slovak Americans, this author recently has written two smaller studies relating to cultural contributions of Slovaks and Moravians.[198]

Several earlier studies also exist.[199]

In music, Jan Lowenbach wrote an excellent albeit brief, study about "Czech Composers and Musicians in America,"[200] which is now outdated. More recently, the SVU published Zdenka E. Fischmann's Essays on Czech Music which includes some information on émigré musicians and music.

Several biographies exist about individual composers and music performers, including Maria Jeritza's Sunlight and Life. A Singer's Life, John C. Tibetts' *Dvořák in America, 1892-1895*,[201] Michael B. Beckermann's *New Worlds of Dvořák: Searching in America for the Composer's Inner Life*[202] and William Everet's *Rudolf Friml*,[203] Artur Schnabel's *Music, Wit and Wisdom: The Autobiography of Artur Schnabel*,[204] John L. Stewart's *Ernst Křenek: The Man and His Music*,[205] Richard Beith's and Graham Melville-Mason's *Rudolf Firkušný*,[206] Stephen Lehmann's *Rudolf Serkin: A Life*,[207] and Susan Hayes Hitchens' *Karel Husa: A Bio-Bibliography*.[209]

In the field of literature, there are a couple of publications of note, i.e., C. J. Hribal's *The Boundaries of Twilight: Czech-Slovak Writing from the New World*[210] and Vera Bořkovec's *Taste of a Lost Homeland. A Bilingual Anthology of Czech and Slovak Exile Poetry Written in America*.[211] In the Czech Republic, Adéla Machanová recently published an interesting monograph, entitled *Exile through the Eyes of Czech Writers: Political Emigration of 1948 and 1968*.[212] Listings of books of Czech and Slovaks authors in America can be found in the above section on "Bibliographies of Publications ...".

There is also a compilation of Slovak American literary figures and publicists, *Predstavitelia slovenskej kultúrnoj tvorby* (Representatives of Slovak Cultural Works),[213] prepared by František Vnuk. A comparable compilation about Czech-American writers, which was included as a separate chapter in Jan Habenicht's *History of Czechs in America*, is quite outdated.[214]

Several single-volume biographies of writers also exist, including Charles Sealsfield[215], Thomas Bell,[216] Franz Werfel,[217] Egon Hostovský,[218] Josef Škvorecký[219] and Arnošt Lustig.[220]

Very little has been written about drama, apart from the recent *Czech and Slovak Theatre Abroad*,[221] edited by Věra Bořkovec, and Vít Hořjš' *Czechoslovak American Puppetry*.[222] There is, however, a delightful autobiography of the Czech-American actress Blanche Yurka's *Bohemian Girl*.[223]

The publications relating to Czech-American or Slovak-American fine arts are practically nonexistent, except for an outdated Jaroslav E. Vojan's article[224] and a few biographies of selected artists. The latter include the following: Leopold Eidlitz,[225] Charles Demuth,[226] Wanda Gag,[227] Albin Polášek,[228] Rudolf Růžička,[229] Koloman Sokol,[230] and Andy Warhol.[231]

Interestingly, very little has also been written on education. Among a few publications that exist, mention should be made of a few Ph.D. Dissertations[232] and of Rechcígl's *Educators with Czechoslovak Roots*,[233] which provides listing of professors in colleges and universities throughout the US and Canada. Thomas Neville Bonner has written a wonderfully crafted and solidly researched account about the life and work of an outstanding educator of Czech ancestry, Abraham Flexner, who is credited with reforming medical education and establishing the Institute of Advanced Study in Princeton, under the title *Iconoclast: Abraham Flexner and a Life of Learning*.[234] The latter also wrote his autobiography.[235] The contributions to education by the Slovak priest Rev Matthew Jankola were treated in a popular book by S. M. Consulea.[236]

In the field of science, the present author wrote an overview relating "Czech Contributions to American Scientific and Technological Thought,"[237] and he also posted a comparable article on the Internet, entitled "Notable American Scientists with Czech and Slovak Roots from Colonial Times to Present,"[238] which includes Slovaks.

The Pulitzer Prize winning author James Thomas Flexner wrote a fascinating historical biography entitled *An American Saga. The Story of Helen Thomas and Simon Flexner*.[239] Simon Flexner, whose father was born in Všeruby, South Bohemia, was the famous medical investigator, discoverer of the "Flexner bacillus" and the "Flexner serum," who became the director of the Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research, now Rockefeller University.

The extraordinary life and work of Dr. Helen Taussig, of Czech ancestry, who discovered the remedy to the "baby blue syndrome" and thus saving thousands of lives of infants, is treated in Joyce Baldwin's popular book *To Heal the Heart of a Child: Helen Taussig, M.D.*[240] and, in addition, an excellent movie exists about her, "American Experience – Partners of the Heart."

Excellent biographies were also written about the Slovak-born medical researcher Joseph Goldberger[241], who found the treatment for pellagra, for which he was nominated five times for the Nobel Prize. Biographies also exist about physical anthropologist Aleš Hrdlička[242] and botanist Bohumil Shimek.[243]

A Festschrift was devoted to the Czech-born mathematician Václav Hlavatý, [244] who provided the mathematical proof for the existence of relativity, as proposed by Albert Einstein. Several publications have also been written about the renowned Brno-born logician Kurt Gödel.[245] Biographical publications have also been written about two prominent physicists of Czech ancestry, a Nobel Prize laureate Walter Kohn[245] and Victor F. Weisskopf.[246]

In the field of history of technology, not much had been written in terms of historical surveys, but there are several biographies about outstanding engineers of Czech descent, including that of Karl Jánský,[247] who founded radio astronomy,[248] Karl Arnstein,[249] known for the design and construction of airships, and Karl Terzaghi,[250] the founder of soil mechanics. There is also a popular publication about Rev. Joseph Murgaš,[251] inventor of wireless information transmission via electromagnetic waves.

With reference to social science scientists and scholars in humanities, biographical publications are also available, including on such personalities as Karl W. Deutsch,[252] Hans Kelsen,[253] Joseph A. Schumpeter,[254] Frank William Taussig,[255] Max Wertheimer,[256] Erich Kahler,[257] Hans Kohn,[258] Otakar Odložilík,[259] Jaroslav J. Pelikán,[260] and René Wellek.[261]

Family Histories and Genealogy

It should be noted that neither Jeřábek nor Lacko gave much attention, if at all, to family histories. While canvassing extensively the Czech/Slovak ethnic press, they did not examine the relevant American county histories, which often abound with useful information about the life of early settlers and accomplishments of pioneer families and individuals of note.

In the last two decades great interest has arisen among the Americans of Czech/Slovak descent, particularly among the Texas Czechs, in the subject of genealogy and family histories. Several useful genealogical guides have been published with focus on American Czechs and Slovaks, covering both the

American and the European information sources.[262] However, there is no publication in existence, as yet, that would list information sources relating to individual family histories. Perhaps this should wait until more family histories have been written.

It is noteworthy that most of the work in this area has been carried out by self-trained genealogists and amateurs. Special mention should be made of the late Albert Bláha, who through personal efforts and under the aegis of the Czech Heritage Society of Texas, established a useful genealogical publication series, *Czech Footprints across the Bluebonnet Fields of Texas*. With somewhat different focus was the work, carried out in Nebraska, by Margie Sobotka, who initiated, in *The Czech Heritage* series, with the assistance of the Eastern Nebraska Genealogical Society, the abstracting of early Czech newspapers, published in Nebraska, to provide vital data on early Czech settlers.

Soon after, the first Czech American genealogy magazine, *Naše Dějiny* (Our History),[263] appeared, coming out every second month under the editorship of Doug Kubíček.[264] Soon several Czech American genealogy societies and clubs were organized in different parts of the US, some of which initiated their own newsletters.

Inasmuch as genealogy is one of my hobbies, I put together a tentative listing of English-language publications dealing with Czech and Slovak genealogy.[264] In addition, I also prepared an Internet genealogy guide under the title *Czechoslovak Genealogy Sites on the Internet*,[265] which received a lot of attention and was posted on the SVU Website.[266]

Organizational and Public Life Histories

As has been the case with other areas, there is no single publication that would provide an authoritative overview of this entire subject.

With respect to Czech and Slovak organizations, in 1933 a useful *Index of Czechoslovak Organizations in the United States*[267] had been written. Numerous publications exist on individual societies and clubs, many of them in Czech or Slovak languages. Nevertheless, several were also written in English. Among the Czech organizations, the following have prepared histories: the Sokol,[268] the Č.S.A.,[269] the Western Bohemian Fraternal Association,[270] the S.P.J.S.T.,[271] the K.J.T.,[272] the Unity of Bohemian Ladies in the USA.,[273] the Czechoslovak National Council of America,[274] the Catholic Central Union,[275] the National Alliance of Czech Catholics in Texas,[276] the Moravian Societies,[277] the Bohemian National Cemetery Associations,[278] the Council of Free Czechoslovakia[279] and the Czechoslovak Society of Arts and Sciences (SVU).[280]

The comparable Slovak listings include: the Slovak League of America,[281] the National Slovak Society,[282] the Slovak Sokols,[283] the First Catholic Slovak Union,[284] the First Catholic Slovak Ladies Union,[285] the Živena Beneficial Society of Slovak Women and Men in the US.[286]

More recently, the individual societies were written up in the already mentioned *Panorama A Historical Review… and Slovaks in America. A Bicentennial Study*.[287]

With respect to public life, there are a couple of small biographical compendia, i.e., Thomas Čapek's *American Czechs in Public Office*[288] and Rechcígl's *US Legislators with Czechoslovak Roots*.[289]

Other than that, a number of single-volume biographies have been

published of prominent individuals of Czech ancestry who served in public life. Several biographies exist about the mayor of Chicago Anton Čermák,[290] the governor of Illinois Henry Horner,[291] the governor of Illinois Otto Kerner,[292] the Supreme Court Justice Louis D. Brandeis,[293] the consul Charles Jonáš,[294] Alice Garrigue Masaryk[295] and the Secretary of State Madeleine Korbel Albright.[296]

We should also mention here publications dealing with the involvement of Czech and Slovak Americans in the struggle for the Czechoslovak independence. They include Charles Pergler's *America in the Struggle for Czechoslovak Independence*,[297] Milan Getting's *Američtí Slováci a vývoj čs. myšlienky*,[298] *The Slovaks and the Pittsburgh Pact*,[299] Vojta Beneš' *Československá Amerika a odboj*,[300] Victor Mamatey's *The United States and East Central Europe, 1914-1918: A Study in Wilsonian Diplomacy and Propaganda*,[301] Joseph E. O'Grady's *The Immigrants' Influence on Wilson's Peace Policies*[302] and M. Mark Stolarik's *The Role of American Slovaks in the Creation of Czecho-Slovakia*.[303]

Biographies

The biographical information about Czechs and Slovaks in America is scattered in a variety of often obscure sources, much of which are not accessible to the general reader.

One of the best older sources of this type of literature is the Czech-American periodical *Amerikán. Národní Kalendář* (American. National Calendar), a yearbook published from 1878 to 1957 by the Chicago Svornost. The reminiscences in *Amerikán* constitute a major body of primary material concerning Czech immigrants in the US.

From the old literature, mention should also be made of Daniel D. Droba's book, *Czech and Slovak Leaders in Metropolitan Chicago*[304] and of John J. Reichmann's publication, *Czechoslovaks of Chicago*,[305] both of which contain useful biographical information about the Chicago Czechs and Slovaks. Thomas Čapek wrote a little brochure about American Czechs in Public Office[306] which includes biographical sketches of a few selected congressmen and state legislators of Czech descent, while Emil T. Pranther published several) biographical sketches of prominent Czech Americans in his booklet *These Help Build America*.[307] Subsequently, this author compiled biographical information on US legislators of Czech and Slovak origin under the title *US Legislators with Czechoslovak Roots from Colonial Times to Present. With Genealogical Lineages*,[308] which was well received.

Rev. Alois J. Mořkovský published a biographical brochure about the Czech priests in Texas, bearing the title *Short Biographies of Czech and Other Priests in Texas*,[309] while Stacy Mikulčák Labaj compiled *Obituaries of the Czech Moravian Brethren in Texas*.[310] Although out of date, useful biographical information can be found in Habenicht's *History of Czechs in America*,[311] as well as in the "American Addenda" of the *Album reprezentantů všech oborů veřejného života československého* (Album of the Representatives in All Fields of the Czechoslovak Life).[312]

In 1970, the Czechoslovak National Council of America in Chicago published a memorial publication *Panorama. A Historical Review of Czechs and Slovaks in the United States of America*,[313] which includes a number of biographies. It should be noted, however, that the editors were not too selective

in their choice of entries so that the publication cannot be considered as representative. A number of prominent personalities are missing. Furthermore, individual biographies have not been prepared evenly so that one gets the impression that their length was based on the amount of donation rather than on the importance of the person. Mention should also be made of the compendium of obituaries of prominent Czechoslovak exiles from since 1948 and beyond, compiled by the Czech journalist Jožka Pejskar, published in five volumes under the title *Poslední pocta* (The Last Honor). Although the compendium is not at all complete and not always representative, the publication, nevertheless, gives a good overview of many important Czech and Slovak personalities in exile.[314]

Of recent times, I would also like to mention my own publication, *Postavy naší Ameriky. Poučné a zábavné čtení ze života zahraničních Čechů* (Personalities of Our America. Informative and Entertaining Reading from the Life of Czechs Abroad).[315] The monograph contains a panorama of sketches of selected personalities whose roots have their origin in the Czech Lands and who attained great success in the US and who, through their activities, influenced the development of their new homeland. The book covers the period from the times of the discovery of the New World to the present. A large number of the included persons will be unknown to most readers since it concerns persons whose Czech ancestry has not been known.

There are also several Slovak-related publications of note in this area. First, František Vnuk authored "*Predstavitelia slovenskej kultúrnej tvorby*" (Representatives of Slovak Cultural Life),[316] followed by biographies of Slovak priests by Joseph J. Krajsa[317], which appeared serially in the Slovak ethnic periodical *Jednota Annual Furdek*, the publication *Slovenskí priekopníci v Amerike* (Slovak Pioneers in America) by Jozef Paučo,[318] brief biographies by František Bielek[319] and transcription of biographies of American Catholic Slovaks from the publication *American Catholic Who's Who*.[320]

Although several useful biographical compendia dealing with specialized subject areas or a particular locality do exist, there is, as yet, no comprehensive authoritative single-volume biographical dictionary available that would give a balanced and representative picture of the important personalities of Czechoslovak ancestry.

Closest comes the biographical dictionary of the Czechoslovak Society of Arts and Sciences which has been periodically issued by the Society since 1966.[321] The lexicon covers a wide spectrum of contemporary Czechs and Slovaks, particularly the intelligentsia, in the United States and Canada, as well as other parts of the world. Useful are also biographies of Czechoslovak scholars and scientists included in some of the SVU Congress Proceedings. Beyond that, SVU also published a listing of professors at the US and Canadian universities.[322]

Mention should also be made of biographical compendia published in the Czech Republic after the 1989 Velvet Revolution. However, one should not consider them too seriously since they were written in a hurry and carelessly by authors who did not live abroad or who spent there only a short time during their few overseas visits.[323]

From the very beginning, the SVU had on its agenda the preparation of an authoritative and representative Who's Who of prominent Czechs and Slovaks abroad. For various organizational reasons this project has not as yet

been realized. It was clear that before such onerous task could be undertaken, one would first need to systematically search through the ethnic and other literature to see what the "universe" is in order to identify and select the representative individuals of note. This was the rationale why the SVU had given the present author the responsibility to undertake a long-term project, to compile an inventory of accomplished Czechs and Slovaks abroad. Having that done, he is now working, in earnest, on the preparation of the "Czech American National Biography."

The ethnic memorial literature and occasional publications commemorating a particular local event or anniversary often contain a wealth of information about important Czech/Slovak personalities in their communities. Much of this information remains to be critically evaluated and, more importantly, it must be recorded before it disappears. Since this type of information hardly ever gets deposited in libraries or archives, it is practically impossible to establish a foolproof bibliographical control of these types of publications.

Publications of this kind invariably also suffer from major defects, i.e., lack of selectivity, uneven coverage, exaggerated claims and "delusions de grandeur." The inclusion and the amount of space allotted to a given biographee is frequently determined by the amount of fiscal donation received from a biographee rather than on the basis of the biographee's relative importance or achievement. This practice, which continues even today, cannot be condoned and should be stopped. If the publishers need financial assistance to defray their publishing costs they should obtain the needed support through advertisement, or other means, but not at the expense of the content and the quality of the publication. Otherwise such publications lose credibility.

The most useful biographical information about the noted Czech and Slovak personalities in Canada can be found in the previously mentioned Josef Čermák's book, *It All Started with Prince Rupert*[324] and in the memorial anniversary issue of *Naše Hlasy*.[325]

Regarding Latin America, there exists a pioneer work by F. C. Štěrba, titled *Češi a Slováci v Latinské Americe* (Czechs and Slovaks in Latin America).[326] Although it comprises only 60 pages, it contains a lot of valuable information which the author assembled and which is not generally known.

Besides biographic compendia and dictionaries, a number of biographies of important Czech American personalities have been published in a variety of sources which will need to be mapped out. Some of them are listed in my bibliography on Czechs, Slovaks and Ruthenians, mentioned earlier. The first systematic attempt to compile such biographies was that of Joseph S. Rouček in his *American Slavs: A Bibliography and The Immigrant in Fiction and Biography*,[327] which includes separate sections about "Czechoslovaks" An updated comprehensive listing of biographies is needed.

The full-length biographies are treated in specific sections above, such as Religious Histories, Cultural Histories, Organizational and Public Life Histories, etc.

Library and Archival Resources

Information sources regarding the library and archival holdings of Czechoslovak materials in the US, including publications on Czech and Slovak immigrants, are rather scarce. Although there are a few general guides one

could consult, until recently, there was not one publication in existence with specific Czechoslovak focus which would provide a comprehensive, up-to-date overview of various libraries and ar-chives specializing in Czech/Slovak materials and which would de-scribe in detail their holdings.

The situation is particularly critical with reference to the holdings of ethnic materials on Czech and Slovak immigrants in America. The presumably authoritative and often cited *Guide to Ethnic Museums, Libraries and Archives in the US*[328] and the *Encyclopedic Dictionary of Ethnic Organizations in the United States*[329] are not only out-of-date but also incomplete and not always reliable. This author tried to establish a contact with a number of institutions listed in the latter publication without much success, much of the correspondence having been returned as "undeliverable." One of the organizations, based in Baltimore, which he could not at first rec-ognize under its listed name "American Czechoslovak Historical Society" should have properly been listed as "Augustine Herman American Czechoslovak Historical Society;" this Society has long been extinct. Another standard reference work, *Ethnic Information Sources of the United States*,[330] which contains a chapter on "Czechoslovakians," gives an odd assortment of five libraries/archives concerned with American Czechs/Slovaks, omitting the University of Chicago's Archives of the Czechs and Slovaks Abroad, which is clearly one of the best collections in America. To be sure, this is already an improvement, considering the fact that the first edition did not mention any relevant libraries at all. The most authoritative publication of all, the *Directory of Special Libraries and Information Centers*,[331] now in its 38th edition, unfortunately contains only a paucity of information regarding ethnic matters.

It is gratifying that Náprstek Museum in Prague, which houses a large library, featuring publications relating to Czech emigration with emphasis on the US, published its detailed catalogue, including their books, pamphlets, brochures, reprints, newspapers, calendars, periodicals with a detailed name and subject index.[332]

During November 22-23, 2003, the SVU organized, jointly with the Embassies of the Czech and Slovak Republics in Washington, DC, a special working conference devoted to the question of preservation of Czech and Slovak archival materials in America. It was a truly joint Czech-Slovak undertaking since the first day of the Conference was held at the Czech Embassy and the second day at the Slovak Embassy, with the Czech Ambassador Martin Palouš and Slovak Ambassador Rastislav Káčer participating.

The Conference was attended by specialists and representatives of the most important archival institutions, both in America and in the Czech and Slovak Republics, which deal with the documentation of Czech and Slovak America or with the relationships between Czechoslovakia and its successor states and America. The importance of the Conference was evident in that Czech and Slovak media reported the proceedings each day and even carried an interview with me, in my capacity as the coordinator of the Conference.

"There are many Czech or Slovak-related archival materials throughout America and we are afraid that they might be destroyed... ninety percent of the material can be found in the basements and attics of individuals and society officers, which gave impetus for the Conference," as I informed the ČTK (Czech Press). I went on to say that often these individuals and society presidents are not aware of the importance of historical documents and their proge-

ny will simply discard them.

One of the purposes of the Conference was to bring this impending danger to the attention of Czech and Slovak ethnic organizations in America (numbering several hundred) and to inspire them to a cooperative effort to preserve these valuable documents for the future. After all, one is dealing with some basic information about the life, struggle and work of the Czechs and Slovaks in America, about the work of Czechoslovak exiles in America, and about the relations between the US and their old homeland, which must be preserved because they are an indispensable part of Czech, Slovak and American culture. These documents are irreplaceable and many exist only in the original.

The United States has truly a great interest in preserving these documents which was manifested by the presence of so many representatives of important American institutions and the fact that the Conference was organized under the auspices of the US Commission for the Preservation of America's Heritage Abroad, with its Chairman Warren L. Miller in attendance. It should be noted that Mr. Miller had been appointed to this function by the President of the US.

The representatives of the Czech Republic, as well as the representatives of the Slovak Republic, have the same interest and many of their archival institutions would welcome receiving these materials. As was pointed out, there is so much material that it cannot be deposited in a single archive. What matters is that the material be deposited in a secure place that is well taken care of and available to the public, regardless of where it is deposited.

This unique Conference, doubtlessly, served its purpose and surpassed even the expectations of the organizers.[333] It was the first time that the most important "players" on both sides of the Atlantic were able to meet. These were not only archivists and scholars, but also government representatives, community leaders and members of various Czech and Slovak ethnic organizations in America. This was the first important step taken for forming a working base for cooperative work toward the single goal of preserving these valuable documents for the future.

Most of those who attended the conference met for the first time and left as good friends. Most of them acquired a lot of new information and have established working linkages with their counterparts in Europe and in America. This was not just a "show-and- tel" type of meeting, as many conferences are, but a working conference in which issues were presented, discussed and solutions sought. To assure follow-up, the Conference attendees agreed upon a future agenda and concrete steps, as was spelled out in the joint Resolution, and appointed a follow-up committee so that the conference recommendations are carried out. The proposed endeavor will require full participation of Czech and Slovak communities in America. Fortunately, mechanism for such cooperation will be facilitated by the recently established umbrella organization, known as "National Heritage Commission."

It was gratifying that within a few months after the Conference, its Proceedings were published, through the courtesy of David Kraft and his Prague Edition (Pražská edice).[334]

Several recommendations of this Conference have been fulfilled already, including the establishment of another umbrella organization, Czech and Slovak American Archival Consortium (CSAAC), whose membership consists

of major institutions that are involved in the preservation of Czech and Slovak materials. The Consortium has its own webpage, "Czech & Slovak American Archivalia," posted on the SVU Website.

The second recommendation of the Conference dealt with the preparation of a tentative listing of the Czech and Slovak archival materials in America. Thanks to SVU, which sponsored a systematic research throughout the US, such compendium has been completed. It was published in two volumes under the title Czechoslovak American Archivalia, through the courtesy of The Czechoslovak Exile Centre at Palacký University.[335] The listing is based on American archival materials and library collections relating to exile and emigration from the territory of the former Czechoslovakia and holdings relating to Czechoslovakia, as such. The first volume includes collections of American Federal archival institutions, university collections, collections in public museums and libraries, and holdings of ethnic and other cultural organizations. The second volume covers personal documents and collections of prominent and less known personalities, immigrants and exile members, who achieved success in public life or in professions. What's needed now is to prepare a comparable compendium of archival materials in the Czech Republic and the Slovak Republic that have bearing on Czech and Slovaks abroad.

A remaining unresolved problem is the financial question: how to assure the preparation of the detailed inventories and their description and how to obtain needed funds to support researchers and students to work in the archives. SVU, which deposited its own archive in the Immigration History Research Center (IHRC) at the University of Minnesota, was the first institution which came forward with a $10,000 donation to the IHRC to assist the Institution with their inventory and to provide assistance to students. This won't obviously resolve the problem but it is a start.

It is encouraging that our "story" does not end here but the progress goes on. On the initiative of Jiří Křesťan and his colleagues at the National Archives in Prague and Milena Secká of Náprstek Museum, a two-day seminar was held in České Budějovice in 1996 on the occasion of the SVU World Congress. The central theme of the seminar was "Czech Archives and Sources Relating to the History of Czechs Abroad." It was a highly successful event, with the participation of the leading archivists and historians from the Czech Republic. Hopefully, this meeting will provide impetus for the preparation of the listing of archival materials in the Czech Republic that have bearing on Czechs abroad. The Proceedings of this Conference were recently published.[336]

Epilogue

In viewing the various publications bearing on the history of Czechs and Slovaks in America, from the standpoint of overall coverage, one can see a number of major gaps on the one hand, and some overlap and duplication on the other. This is altogether not too surprising, considering the fact that most of these publications were instigated by individual authors, based on their own interests and preferences, rather than through a planned institutional effort.

It would be mutually beneficial, in the future, to establish some coordinating mechanism, or at least an information exchange, be-tween various institutions and particularly universities, as well as individual researchers to agree on the future agenda and strategy. This way we might avoid the unnecessary overlap and duplication between different works, while giving more atten-

tion to areas which are currently inadequately covered.

As was pointed out in specific cases above, the individual works published to date are of uneven quality. While some of the studies were unquestionably well prepared, a number of reviewed publications would not meet the minimal professional standards. What is surprising, most of all, is to find also inadequacies and poor scholarship among the standard reference works, published by reputable publishing houses. One gets the distinct impression that some of the authors were not familiar with the Czech/Slovak field and, moreover, that they probably did not inspect the individual books, depending entirely on the secondary sources for their infor-mation.

The earliest writings relating to Czechs and Slo-vaks in America were made by a handful of enthusiasts and patriots, who were trying their best to record and preserve for the future the journalistic and other literary output of their fellow men and women. They did it without any fiscal remuneration and they did not expect any gratitude. It was a true labor of love. It is noteworthy that much of the earlier work was accomplished by individuals who did not have much, if any, formal training, and at the time when the library resources and information services were quite meager, or nonexistent, particularly in the isolated communities, where many of the Czech or Slovak settlers lived. Without their pioneering spirit, much of this information would have been lost permanently. These pioneers clearly deserve our thanks and appre-ciation.

Today, however, we are living in a different era, with ready access to the most sophisticated technological advances. Our overall aspirations remain the same as those of our predecessors; however, our imme-diate tasks, approaches and above all our standards must be neces-sarily different. There is no place for poor scholarship. We must be much more critical, more selective, and we must strive for excel-lence - not just for recognition - aiming for objectivity, accuracy and completeness.

NOTES

1. New York: Bank of Europe, 1911.

2. Published in New York by Fleming H. Revel.

3. Both were published in New York by the Bureau for International Education.

4. Included in Miloslav Rechcígl, Jr., ed., *The Czechoslovak Contribution to World* Culture (The Hague: Mouton & Co., 1964), pp. 555-634.

5. Originally published in *Věstník Čs. národní rady americké,* vol. 58, No.34-36 (1970).

6. Published by New York University.

7. Although Komenský may have been invited to serve as president of the Harvard College, as far as known, he did not accept the invitation and remained his entire life in Europe.

8. *Op. cit.*

9. Esther Jeřábek, *Czechs and Slovaks in North America: A Bibliography* (New York: Czechoslovak Society of Arts and Sciences, 1976). 448 p.

10. Came out in monographic series *Slovak Studies*, vol. 7 and 12, published by Slovak Institute in Cleveland.

11. Published in Toronto in 1985 by Multicultural History Society of Ontario.

12. In Miloslav Rechcígl, Jr., *Czechs and Slovaks in America* (Boulder, CO: East European Monographs, 2005), pp. 17-25.

13. *Ibid.*, pp. 27-34.

14. *Op. cit.*

15. *Op. cit.*

16. Published by Matica slovenská in Turčianský sv. Martin in 1938.

17. Published serially in periodical *Jednota,* beginning July 11, 1962.

18. G.L. Yashur, A Preliminary History of the Slovak Press in America, 1950.

19. Published in 1958 as Bibliografický katalog ČSR – České knihy, Zvláštní sešit 6.

20. Published by SVU in 1978.

21. Published in Cleveland in 1970 by Jednota.

22. České krajanské a exilové noviny a časopisy po roce 1945 (Czech Compatriot and Exile Newspapers and Periodicals after 1945). Published by the Centrum for Czechoslovak Studies at Palacký University at Olomouc in 1995.

23. *Exilová periodika. Katalog periodik českého a slovenského exilu a krajanských tisků vydaných po roce 1945* (Exile Periodicals. Catalogue of Periodicals of Czech and Slovak Exile and Compatriot Press Published after 1945) (Prague: Libri prohibiti and Ježek, 1999).

24. *Čechoamerická periodika 19. století* (Czechoslovak Periodicals of the 19th Century). Published by Nadace Universitas Masarykiana and Akademické nakladatelství CERMin Brno, 2006.

25. *Op. cit.*

26. *Op. cit.*

27. *Op. cit*

28. *Op. cit.*

29. Published in the series *Studie Křesťanské akademie v Římě*, No. 14 (1968), pp. 39-62.

30. *Česká literatura v exilových nakladatelstvích, 1971-1989* (Czech Literature of Exile Publishers, 1971-1989) (Praha: Trizonia, 1991).

31. *Kniha a český exil 1948-1990* (Books and the Czech Exile 1948-1990) (Praha: Torst, 1995).

32. Vladimír Papoušek, *Česká literatura v Chicagu* (Olomouc: Votobia, 2001); "Česká literatura v americkém kontextu a otázky literární historie," *Národní kontexty národní kultury*, (České Budějovice: Jihočeská univerzita, 2004), 75-89.

33. Published by *Index* and *Svědectví.*

34. *Knihy českých a slovenských autorů vydané v zahraničí v letech 1948-1978 (Exil). Bibliografie* (Prague: Ústav pro soudobé dějiny AV ČR; Brno: Doplněk, 1993).

35. Published by Primus in Prague in 1995.

36. Volume 6 and 7 published in 1954-1957.

37. *Op. cit.*

38. *Volume 1: 1975-1984* (New York: Garland Publishing, 1968); Volume 2: 1985-1994(New York: East European Monographs, 1998);Volume 3: 1995-1999 (New York: East European Monographs, 2006).

39. Miloslav Rechcígl, Jr., "Publications of the Czechoslovak Society of Arts and Sciences (SVU): Formative Years and Bibliography," *Kosmas* 20,

No. 1 (Fall 2006), pp.83-102.

40. Reprinted from Miloslav Rechcígl, Jr., ed., *Czechoslovakia Past and Present*. , vol. 2, pp. 1693-1801.

41. University of Chicago Press, 1916.

42. Published in Chicago and New York in 1918 by Fleming H. Revel Co. It has 256 pages.

43. Published by the University of Chicago Press.

44. Published in Prague by Cizinecký úřad.

45. *Short Slovakian Bibliography* (Pittsburgh: National News Print, 1935).

46. *Bibliografia kníh v západných rečiach, týkajúcich sa slovenských vecí vydaných od VI. stor. do r. 1953* (Martin: Matica slovenská, 1959); *Doplnky do r. 1955, pokračovanie za r. 1956-1959*(1960).

47. "Slovakia: A Selected List of References with a Brief Historical Survey," M.S. Thesis. Washington, DC: Catholic University of America, 1961.

48. *Prírastky zahraničných slovacík v Národnej knižnici Matice slovenskej, získané v rokoch 1963-1965* (Martin: Matica slovenská, 1969).

49. Published in Martin in 1969.

50. "Historiographical Guide to Subcarpathian Ruthenia," in *Austrian History Yearbook* 1973-74, pp. 201-265.

51. *East Central Europe: A Guide to Basic Publications* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1969).

52. *Czechoslovakia: A Bibliographic Guide* (Washington, DC: US Library of Congress, 1967).

53. David Short, *Czechoslovakia* (Oxford: Clio Press, 1986).

54. Miloslav Rechcígl, Jr., "Czechoslovakia and its Arts and Sciences: A Selective Bibliography in the Western European Languages," in *The Czechoslovak Contribution to World Culture,* pp. 555-634.

55. Miloslav Rechcígl, Jr., *The Czechlands: A Selected Bibliography of References in English*. SVU Information and Reference Series, Bibliographies, No.4, 1999. 43 p.

56. *Kosmas. Journal of Czechoslovak and Central European Studies*, vol. 7, No. 1&2 (Summer/Winter 1988), pp. 198-203.

57. Bratislava: Vydavatel'stvo Slovenskej akadémie vied, 1970, pp. 314-332.

58. Published in Santa Barbara, CA and Oxford, England.

59. "K pramenům a literatuře o počátcích hromadného vystěhovalectví z Čech do zámoří" (Sources and Literature about the Beginning of Mass Emigration from the Czech Lands to Overseas), *Bulletin Komise pro dějiny krajanů, Čechů a Slováků v zahraničí*, 1, 1965, pp. 12-17.

60. Josef V. Polišenský, "America's Western Coast in Czechoslovak Sources," *Ibero-Americana Pragensis* 4 (1970), pp. 268-271; "Prameny a problémy dějin českého a slovenského vystěhovalectví do Latinské Ameriky" (Sources and Problems Relating to History of Czech and Slovak Emigration to Latin America), *Český lid* 68, c. 1 1981, pp. 3-9.; "Problems of Studying the History of Czech Mass Emigration to the Americas," in *Emigration from Northern, Central and Southern Europe: Theoretical and Methodological Principles of Research: International Symposium* (Krakow: Jagielonian University, 1984), pp. 185-194; "Prameny, metody a problémy" (Sources, Methods and Problems), in Josef Polišenský, *Úvod studia dějin*

vystěhovatelství do Ameriky (Praha: Univerzita Karlova, 1992), pp. 47-56.

61. Karel. D. Bícha, "Researching History of the Czechs in America: An Historical View,"a paper delivered at the 9th World Congress of the Czechoslovak Society of Arts and Sciences in America, Cleveland, 1978; "Czech-American Historiography: 1964-1987," *Czechoslovak and Central European Journal* 9, No. 1 & 2 (Summer/Winter 1990), pp. 144-150.

62. Robert Janák, "From Historiography of Czech Texas," *Czechoslovak and Central European Journal* 9, No. 1 & 2 (Summer/ Winter 1990), pp. 134-143.

63. "Výběrová bibliografie československé latinoamerikanistiky k dějinám 19. a 20. století za roky 1960-1987" (Selective Bibliography of Czechoslovak Latin American Studies on History of the 19th and 20th Centuries 1960-1987), in *Latinská Amerika – Dějiny a současnost* (Praha, 1988), pp. 159-292.

64. Josef Opatrný, "Problems in History of Czech Immigration in America in the Second Half of the Nineteenth Century," *Nebraska History* 74, No, 3 and 4 (Fall/Winter 1993), pp. 120-129.

65. Elena Jakešová, "USA.," in *Krajania. Slováci v zahraničí* (Bratislava: Univerzitná knižnica, 1967), pp. 67-82.

66. M. Mark Stolarik, "From Field to Factory: The Historiography of the Slovak Immigration to the United States," *International Migration Rev*. 10 (Spring1976), pp. 81-102; "Books, Pamphlets and Articles Concerned with the Social History of American Slovaks," in *Slovak Studies* 20 (1980), pp. 130-137; "From Field to Factory: The Historiography of the Slovak Immigration to the United States and Canada, 1976-1987," *Ethnic Forum* 8, No. 1 (1988), pp. 23-39; "Slovak Historians in Exile in North America, 1945-1992," *Human Affairs* (Bratislava), 6, No. 1 (1996), pp. 34-44.

67. František Bielik, "Doterajšie výsledky a súčasný stav výskumu slovenského vysťahovalectva a dejín Slovákov vo svete," *Slováci v zahraničí* 3 (1979), pp. 108-117.

68. Thomas D. Marzik, "Stav amerického vedeckého výskumu o slovenskom vystahovalectve a o amerických Slovakoch," *Vystahovatelctvo a život krajanov vo svete* (Martin: Matica slovenská, 1982), pp. 129-137.

69. Published in Washington DC in 1996 by Library of Congress.

70. *Czech Americans: A Selective Bibliography in English, op. cit*.,, pp. 16-19; *Slovak Americans: A Selective Bibliography in English, op. cit*., pp. 28-30.

71. "Rechcígl's Writings Relating to Czechoslovak America," in Miloslav Rechcígl's *Czechs and Slovaks in America, op. cit*., pp. 307-314.

72. Published in St. Louis in 1910 by Hlas.

73. Jan Habenicht, *History of Czechs in America*, translated by Miroslav Koudelka (St. Paul, MN: Czechoslovak Genealogical Society International 1996).

74. Thomas Čapek, *The Czechs (Bohemians) in America* (Houghton Mifflin, 1920; Reprinted New York: Arno Press, 1969).

75. Tomáš Čapek, *Naše Amerika* (Praha: Nákladem Národní rady československé, 1926).

76. Tomáš Čapek, *Památky Českých Emigrantů v Americe* (Omaha: Nákladem Národní Tiskárny, 1907).

77. Published in New York in 1921.

78. Konštantín Čulen, *Dejiny Slovákov v Amerike* (Bratislava: Nakladatel'stvo Slovenskej Ligy v Bratislave, 1942). It was recently translated under the title *History of Slovaks in America* and published in 2007 in St. Paul by the Czechoslovak Genealogical Society Intl..

79. "The Slovak Presence in America up to 1890,"in *Slovaks in America: A Bicentennial Study*, edited by Joseph C. Krajsa (Middletown, PA, 1978), pp.3-22.

80. David B. Quinn and Neil M. Cheshire, ed., *The New Found Land of Stephen Parmenius: The Life and Writings of a Hungarian Poet, Drowned on a Voyage from Newfoundland, 1573* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1972).

81. Philip L. Barbour, "The Identity of the First Poles in America," *William and Mary Quarterly* 21 (January 1964), pp. 77-92.

82. "The First American Settler from Slovakia," *Naše Rodina* 8, No. 3 (September 1996), 100.

83. New York: George H. Doran, 1922.

84. Praha: Tiskem knihtiskàrny Družstvo, 1932. 84 p.

85. Chicago: Benedictine Abbey Press, 1962.

86. *Panorama: A Historical Review of Czechs and Slovaks in the United St*ates (Cicero, IL: Czechoslovak National Council of America, 1971).

87. Věra Làska, *The Czechs in America 1633-1977: A Chronology and Fact Book* (Dobbs Ferry: Oceana Publications, 1978).

88. New York: SVU Press, 1981.

89. Iowa City: Rudi Publications, 1993.

90. Cambridge, MA: Dobrá kniha, 1974.

91. Middletown, PA: Jednota Printery, 1979.

92. Middletown, PA: The Slovak League of America, 1978.

93. "Slovak Migration from Europe to North America 1870-1918," *Slovak Studies* 20 (1980), pp. 5-137.

94. Published in Middletown in 1978 by the Slovak League of America.

95. Published in Cicero in 1970 by the Czechoslovak National Council of America.

96. "In the Footprints of the First Czech Immigrants in America," *Czechoslovak and Central European Journal* 9 (1990), pp. 75-80; "Early Jewish Immigrants in America from the Czech Historic Lands and Slovakia," *Rev. Soc. Hist. Czechoslovak Jews* 3 (1990-91), pp.157-179; "Moravian Brethren from Bohemia, Moravia and Silesia: Their Arrival and Settlement in America," *Bohemia Zeitschrift* 32, No. 1 (1991), pp. 152-165; "In Moravian Footprints in America," *Ročenka: Yearbook of the Czechoslovak Genealogical Society International* 3 (1997-1998), pp. 35-43; *Počátky české emigrace do zemí Latinské a Severni Ameriky* (Brno: Miroslav Nehyba, 1999); "Bohemian and Moravian Pioneers in Colonial America," in *Czech-Americans in Transition,* edited by Clinton Machann, (Austin, TX: Eakin Press, 1999), pp. 18-27.

97. Paul R. Magocsi, *Our People: Carpatho-Rusyns and their Descendants on North America* (Toronto: Multicultural History Society of Ontario, 1989; 4th edition 2005).

98. Published in Prague in 1989 by Charles University.

99. Published in Bratislava in 1970 by the Slovak Academy of Sciences under the editorship of J. Polišenský.

100. Published in Martin in 1982 by Matica slovenská.

101. Josef Polišenský, *Úvod do studia dějin vystěhovalectví do Ameriky* (Praha: Univerzita Karlova, 1992-1996). Vol. 1 is titled *Obecné problémy dějin českého vystěhovalectví do Ameriky 1848-1914* and vol. 2 *Češi a Amerika*.

102. *Češi v Americe: České vystěhovalectví do Ameriky a česko-americké vztahy v průběhu pěti století*.

103. Published in Martin in 1980 by Matica slovenská.

104. Miloslav Rechcígl, Jr., *Czechs and Slovaks in America: Surveys, Essays, Reflections and Personal Insights Relating to History and the Contributions of Czech and Slovak Immigrants in America and their Descendants* (Boulder, CO: East European Monographs and New York: Columbia University Press, 2005). 317 p.

105. John Gellner and John Smerek, *The Czechs and Slovaks in Canada* (Toronto, Ont.: University of Toronto Press, 1968).

106. Josef Čermák, *It All Began with Prince Rupert: The Story of Czechs and Slovaks in Canada* (Luhačovice: Atelier IM Publishing, 2003, 2nd edition 2005).

107. Joseph M. Kirschbaum, *Slovaks in Canada* (Toronto: Canadian Ethnic Press Assoc., 1967).

108. "Contributions of Czechs and Slovaks to Canada," *Naše Hlasy*, 13, no. 21-22 (May 27, 1967), pp. 23-59.

109. Vlastimil Kybal, *Po československých stopách v Latinské Americe* (Praha: Česká akademie věd a umění, 1935); Otakar Odložilík, "Czech Missionaries in New Spain," *The Hispanic American Historical Review* 23 (1945), pp. 428-454; Milič Kybal, "Czechs and Slovaks in Latin America," in *The Czechoslovak Contribution to World Culture.* ed. by Miloslav Rechcígl, Jr. (The Hague: Mouton, 1964), pp. 516-522; Josef Polišenský, "La emigración checoslovaca a América Latina, 1649-1945: Problemas y fuentes," *Jahrbuch fűr Geschichte von Staat, Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft Lateinoamerikas*13 (1976), 56-72; Josef Polišenský, "Poznámky k problematice dějin Latinské Ameriky: k pramenům a literatuře in *Dějiny Latinské Ameriky* (Praha: Svoboda, 1979), pp. 713-766; I. Vasilijev, "Vystěhovalectví Čechů a Slováků do Latinské Ameriky před druhou světovou válkou," *Český lid* 73 (1986), pp. 239-243; Ivo Barteček, "Vystěhovalectví do Latinské Ameriky," *Češi v cizině* 9 (1996), 172-197; Miloslav Rechcígl, Jr., *Počátky české emigrace do zemí Latinské a Severní Ameriky* (Brno: Miroslav Nehyba, 1999).

110. *Selected Papers: 2003 SVU North American Conference, Cedar Rapids, Iowa, 26-28 June 2003.*

111. Clinton Machann, ed.,*Czech-Americans in Transition*. (Austin: Eakin Press, 1999); Zdeněk V. David, ed., *Contributions of the Moravian Brethren to America: Selected Papers from the SVU Conference at Moravian College, Bethlehem, June 8-10, 2007* (New York, 2006).

112. *Op. cit.*

113. Francis J. Švehla, *Bohemians in Central Kansas* (Topeka: Kansas Historical Society, 1915).

114. Published in Tabor, SD, in 1920.

115. Published in New York by America's Making.

116. Růžena Rosickà, *Dějiny Čechů v Nebrasce* (Omaha: Nàkladem

Českého historického klubu v Nebrasce, 1928); Rose Rosicky, *A History of Czechs (Bohemians) in Nebraska* (Omaha: Czech Historical Society of Nebraska, 1929).

117. Vladimír Kučera and Alfred Nováček, ed., *Czechs and Nebraska* (Ord: Quiz Graphic Arts, 1967).

118. Published in Dallas by the South-East Press in 1934.

119. Published in Granger, TX by the periodical Našinec.

120. Published in Austin by Eakin Press.

121. *Op. cit.*

122. Published in Chicago by the Czechoslovak Historical Society in 1937.

123. Published in Chicago by the R. Mejdřich.

124. Published in 1995 in Northfield, MN by St. Olaf College Press.

125. Republished by the Czech Heritage Foundation in 1972, with an update in 1982.

126. Published in 1983 in Sebastopol, CA by the Methodius Press.

127. Published in Denver in 1977.

128. Published in Norman by the University of Oklahoma Press.

129. Published in 2006 in New York by Universe, Inc.

130. "Benjamin Latrobe," in James Hlaváč, *A Hidden Impact* (New York: iUniverse, Inc., 2006), pp. 50-52.

131. See her family tree: http://wc.rootsweb.ancestry.com/cgi-bin/igm.cgi?op=GET&db=:3085698&id=I1099

132. Published in Cleveland in 1930. It was recently translated to English, under the title *History of the Slovaks in Cleveland and Lakewood,* and published in Minneapolis by the Czechoslovak Genealogical Society in 2001.

133. Published in Youngstown, OH in 1936.

134. Published in Lorain, OH in 1936.

135. Published in Detroit in 1948.

136. Published by Jednota Printery in Middletown, PA.

137. Published by Bucknell University.

138. Published in Winter Park, FL by Agency Da Vel.

139. Published in Washington, DC by the Catholic University of America.

140. Published in Louisville, KY by the Standard Printing Co. in 1933. The book was reprinted in New York in 1970.

141. Published in College Station by Texas A&M University in 1988.

142. Published in Chicago in1942 by the Benedictine Abbey Press.

143. Published by Arno Press in 1980.

144. Published in 1995 by the Susquehanna University Press.

145. Published in New York in 1989 by AMS Press, 1989.

146. Published in New York in 1898.

147. Published in New York by Fleming H. Ravell Co. in 1920.

148. Published in Bratislava in 1970.

149. Published in Washington, DC by the Government Printing Office in 1914.

150. Published in Stillwater in 1942 by the Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College.

151. Published in Prague in 1999 by Karolinum.

152. Frank Vlchek, *The Story of My Life*, ed. by Winston Chrislock

(Kent: Kent State University Press, 2005).

153. Konštantí Čulen, *Michal Bosák* (Scranton, PA: Slovenská obrana, 1958).

154. Max Boas and Steve Chain, *Big Mac: The Unauthorized Story of McDonald's* (New York: Dutton, 1976); Paul Westman, *Ray Kroc: Mayor of McDonaldland* (Minneapolis: Dillon Press, 1979); Ray Kroc and Robert Anderson, *Growing It Out: The Making of McDonald's* (New York: St. Martin, 1990).

155. Estée Lauder, *Estée: A Success Story* (New York: Random House, 1985); Leo Israel, *Estée Lauder: Beyond the Magic* (New York, Macmillan, 1985).

156. Thomas J. Baťa and Sonja Sinclair, *Bata: Shoemaker to the World* (Toronto: Stoddart Publishing, 1990).

157. Paul McKay, *The Roman Empire* (Toronto: Key Porter Books, 1990).

158. Joe Flower, *Prince of the Magic Kingdom: Michael Eisner and the Re-Making of Disney* (New York: Wiley, 1993). Kim Masters, *Keys to the Kingdom: The Rise of Michael Eisner and the Fall of Everybody Else* (New York: Harper Paperbacks, 2001).

159. Published in St. Louis in 1890.

160. Published in Chicago in 1910 by Benedictines.

161. Joseph Čada, *Czech-American Catholics 1850-1920* (Lisle, IL: Benedictine Abbey Press, 1964).

162. Peter F. Mizera, *Czech Benedictines in America, 1850-1920* (Lisle, IL: Benedictine Abbey Press, 1964).

163. Rev. V.A. Švrček, trans. and ed., *A History of the Czech-Moravian Catholic Communities of Texas*(Waco, TX: Texian Press, 1974; 2nd printing 1983).

164. Vladimír Kučera, ed., *Czech Churches in Nebraska* (1976).

165. Published in Cleveland in 1955 by the First Catholic Slovak Union.

166. Published in Cleveland by the Slovak Institute in 1955.

167. Published in Pittsburgh in 1966 by the Franciscan Fathers.

168. Published in Pittsburgh by the Byzantine Seminary in 1974.

169. Published in Johnstown, PA in 1963,

170. Published in Chicago in 1900 by *Křesťanský Posel*, under the editorship of Vilém Šiller, Vàlav Průcha and R. M. De Castello.

171. Published in Prague in 1983 by Synodní rada československé církve evangelické.

172. Published in Minneapolis in 1941 by the Baptist Convention in America and Canada.

173. Published in Smithville, TX in 1962 by the Synod of Texas United Presbyterian Church.

174. Published in Taylor, TX by the Unity of Brethren in 1970.

175. Published in Bethlehem, PA in 1900 by the Times Publ. Co.

176. Being a translation of George Neisser's manuscripts. Published in Bethlehem, PA in 1955 by the Archives of the Moravian Church.

177. Published by Biblio Bazaar in 2007.

178. Published in 1990 by the Moravian Church in America

179. *The Moravians in Georgia, 1735-1741* (1905); *The Moravian*

Church: Yesterday and Today (1920); *Some Moravian Heroes* (1936); *Moravian Customs: Our Inheritance* (1936); *The Road to Salem* (1944).

180. *Records of the Moravians in North Carolina*, 7 vols. (N.p., 1922-1943; reprint, Raleigh: State Department of Archives and History, 1968 and 1970). Adelaide L. Fries, *The Road to Salem* (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1944 and 1972).

181. Published in Ružomberok in 1932.

182. Published in St, Louis in 1955 by the Concordia Publishing Co.

183. Published by the Lutheran Church of America in 1977.

184, Published in Pittsburgh in 1987 by the University of Pittsburgh Press.

185. Published in London in 1949 by E. Goldstone.

186. John N. Berger, *Life of Right Reverend John Neumann, D. D.* trans. from German original by Rev. Eugene Grimm (New York: Benzinger Brothers, 1884).

187. Michael Joseph Curley, *Venerable John Neumann, C.S.S.R., Fourth Bishop of Philadelphia* (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America, 1952).; Philip Douglas, *Saint of Philadelphia: the Life of Bishop John Neumann, 1811-1860* (Still River, MA: Ravengate Press, Inc., 1977); Jane F. Hindman, *An Ordinary Saint: The Life of John Neumann* (New York: Arena Lettres, 1977); Robert H. Wilson, *St. John Neumann, 1811-1860, Fourth Bishop of Philadelphia* (Philadelphia: Archdiocese of Philadelphia Institutional Services, 1977).

188. Alfred C. Rush, C.SS.R., and John Cardinal Krol, *The Autobiography of St. John Neumann, C.S.S.R.. Fourth Bishop of Philadelphia* (Boston: Daughters of St. Paul, 1977).

189. Theodore Maynard, *The Better Part: The Life of Tereza Demjanovich* (New York: Macmillan, 1952).; Rene Chambre, *Sister Miriam Teresa, Apostle of Unity* (Mahwah, NJ: 1970); Stefan Blasko, *Miriam Teresa, Faithful in a Little: Demjanovich Roots* (Toronto: Maria Magazine, 1984).

190. John B. Pastorek, *Brainard's Monsignor Klein: A Biography* (Chicago: Bohemian Benedictine Press, 1932); F.A. Hrobak, *The Reverend Stephen Furdek 1855-1915* (Cleveland, 1955); Jozef Paučo, *Šefan Furdek a slovenské pristahovalectvo* (Middletown: Jednota, 1955); Sister Martina M. Tybor, *Jankola Book: Honoring the Centennial of the Birth of Father Matthew Jankola, Slovak-American Priest, Patriot, Educator and Founder of the Sisters of SS. Cyril and Methodius* (Danville, 1972).

191. Edmund de Schweinitz, *Life and Times of David Zeisberger. The Western Pioneer and Apostle of the Indians* (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott, 1870); William H. Rice, *David Zeisberger and His Brown Brethren* (Bethlehem: Moravian Publication Concern, 1908); David Zeisberger, *Schoenbrunn Story: Excerpts from the Diary of the Reverend David Zeisberger, 1772-1777, at Schoenbrunn in the Ohio Country* (Columbus: Ohio Historical Society, 1972).

192. Edward Rondthaler, *Life of John Heckewelder* (Philadelphia: T. Ward, 1847); Paul A.W. Wallace, *Thirty Thousand Miles with John Heckewelder: The Travels of John Heckewelder in Frontier America* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1985).

193. Isaac Mayer Wise, *Reminiscences* (Cincinnati: Leo Wise, 1901); M.B. May, *Isaac Mayer Wise, The Founder of American Judaism.: A Biog-*

raphy (New York: Putnam's, 1916).

194. Barbara S. Malone, *Rabbi Max Heller: Reformer, Zionist, Southerner, 1860-1929* (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 1997).

195. Carl H. Voss, *Rabbi and Minister: The Friendship of Stephen S. Wise and John Haynes Holmes* (New York: Prometheus, 1980); Stephen S. Wise, *The Challenging Years* (New York: Putnam, 1949).

196. Leo Jung, *The Path of a Pioneer: The Autobiography of Leo Jung* (1980).

197. Rose Zeitlin, *Henrietta Szold: A Record of a Life* (New York: Dial Press, 1952); Marwin Lowenthal, *Henrietta Szold: Life and Letters* (New York: Viking Press, 1942); Irving Fineman, *Woman of Valor: The Life of Henrietta Szold, 1860-1945* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1961).

198. "Cultural Contributions of Americans with Roots in Slovakia," *Kosmas* 14, no. 1 (Fall 2000), pp. 95-106; "Contributions of Moravians to America," *Kosmas* 18, no. 2 (Spring 2005), pp. 94-105..

199. J. F. Smetánka, "The Czechoslovak Contribution to America," *The Central European Observer* 12, no. 1 (1935), 389-391' Joseph S. Rouček, "Czechoslovak Americans," in *One America: The History, Contributions, and Present Problems of Our Racial and National Minorities* (New York: Prentice Hall, 1945), pp.145-158; Daniel F. Tanzone, "Slovak Contributions to the American Cultural Mosaic," *Slovakia* 25, 48 (1975), pp. 119-127; Andrew V. Pier, "Our Slovak Heritage in America," in *Slovaks in America* (Middletown: The Slovak League of America, 1978), pp. 79-88.

200. *Musical Quarterly* 29 (1943), pp. 313-328.

201. Published in New York in 1924 by D. Appleton.

202. Published in Pompton Plains, NY in 1993 by Amadeus Press.

203. Published in New York in1999 by W. W. Norton.

204. Published in Champaign by the University of Illinois Press.

205. Published by Wolke Verlag in 2009, a revised edition of his *My Life and Music* (1988).

206. Published by the University of California Press in 1991.

207. Richard Beith and Graham Melville-Mason, *Rudolf Firkušný* (Essex: Dvořák Society, 1999).

208. Published by Oxford University Press in 2002.

209. Published in1991 by Greenwood Press.

210. Published in Minneapolis in 1991 by New Rivers Press.

211. Published by the Czechoslovak Society of Arts and Sciences in 2002.

212. Published in 2008 by VDM Verlag.

213. Published as a part of the 1967 *Literárny almanach Slováka v Amerike*, edited by Josef Paučo.

214. Jan Habenicht, "Nástin literatury česko-americké" in *Dějiny Čechův Amerických*, pp. 736-768.

215. Eduard Castle, *Der grosse Unbekannte: Das Leben von Charles Sealsfield (Karl Postl)* (Vienna: Manutius Presse, 1952); Thomas Ostwald, ed., *Charles Sealsfield-Leben und Werk* (Brunswick: Graff, 1976); Günter Schnitzler, *Erfahrung und Bild: Die dichterische Wirklichkeit des Charles Sealsfield (Karl Postl)* (Freiburg: Rombach, 1988).

216. John F. Berkos, *Thomas Bell: Slovak American Novelist* (Cleveland: Slovak Institute, 1975).

217. Lore B. Foltin, *Franz Werfel 1890-1945* (Pittsburgh, 1961); Peter Stephan Jungk, *A Life Torn by History: Franz Werfel 1980-1945* (London: Weidenfeld & Nicholson, 1990); Peter Stephen Jungk, *Franz Werfel in Prague, Vienna and Hollywood* (1991); Hans Wagener, *Understanding Franz Werfel* (1993).

218. Jiří Pistorius, comp., *Padesát let Egona Hostovského* (New York: Moravian Library, 1958); F. Kaufman, *Polarity našeho věku v díle Egona Hostovského* (Praha, 1973; Praha: EKK, 1993); Rudolf Šturm, ed., *Egon Hostovský: Vzpomínky, studie, dokumenty o jeho díle a osudu* (Toronto: 68 Publishers, 1974); Vladimír Papoušek, *Hostovský* (Praha: H&H, 1996).

219. Sam Solecki, *Prague Blues: The Fiction of Josef Skvorecky*; Paul J. Trenský, *The Fiction of Josef Škvorecký* (1991).

220. Aleš Haman, *Arnošt Lustig* (Praha: H&H, 1995).

221. Published in Boulder CO, 2006 by Easr European Monographs.

222. Published in New York in 1994 by GOH Productions.

223. Published in Athens, GA in 1970 by Ohio University Press.

224. "Československé umění a písemnictví, America," in *World's Fair Memoir of the Czechoslovak Group* (Chicago, 1933), pp. 69-74.

225. Kathryn E. Holliday, *Leopold Eidlitz: Architecture and Idealism in the Gilded Age* (New York: W.W. Norton, 2008).

226. Emily Farnham, *Charles Demuth* (Norman: University of Oklahoma, Press, 1971); Barbara Haskell, *Charles Demuth* (New York: Whitney Museum of American Art, 1987).

227. Wanda Gad, *Growing Pains: Diaries and Drawings for the Year 1908-1917* (New York: Cowan-McCann, 1940; reprint. St. Paul: Minnesota Historical Society, 1984); Alma Olivia Scott, *Wanda Gag: The Story of the Artist* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1949).

228. Ruth Sherwood, *Carving His Own Destiny* (Chicago: R.F. Seymor, 1954); Emily Polášek, *Albin Polàšek* (Winter Park, FL, 1970).

229. *The Engraved and Topographic Work of Rudolph Růžička* (New York: Groller Club, 1948); Rudolph Růžička, *Speaking Reminiscently* (New York: Groller, 1986).

230. Koloman Sokol, *Koloman Sokol* (Bratislava: Slovenské vydavatel'stvo slovenskej kràsnej literatúry. 1963); *Koloman Sokol* (Bratislava: Pallas, 1977).

231. Reiner Crone, *Andy Warhol: Films and Paintings* (New York: Dutton Pictureback, 1971); Stephen Koch, *Stargazer: Andy Warhol's World and his Films*(New York: Praeger, 1973); Patricia S. Smith, *Andy Warhol's Art and Films* (Ann Arbor, MI: UMI Research Press, 1986); Christopher Makos, *Warhol* (New York: American Library, 1989).

232. J.M. Skřivánek, "History of Education of the Czechs of Texas," PhDr. dissertation, Charles University, 1947-48; Rosie A. L. Walker, "A History of Rural Schools of the Czech Communities of Kolín and Libuše," Ph.D. dissertation, Washington University of Louisiana, 1986.

233. Published in Washington, DC in 1980 by the SVU Press.

234. Thomas Neville V. Bonner, *Iconoclast: Abraham Flexner and a Life of Learning* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2002).

235. Abraham Flexner, *I Remember: The Autobiography* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1940).

236. S. M. Consulea, *Contributions of Rev. Matthew Jankola to Slo-*

vak Education in the United States (Danville, PA, 1958).

237. *Kosmas: Czechoslovak and Central European Journal* 12, no. 1 (Summer 1996), pp. 81-99.

238. At http://www.svu2000.org/headlines/b130.htm.

239. Published in Boston in1984 by Little Brown and Co.

240. *To Heal the Heart of a Child: Helen Taussig, M.D.* (1992).

241. Robert P. Parsons, *Trail to Light: A Biography of Joseph Goldberger* (1943); Dian Dincin Buchman, *The Sherlock Holmes of Medicine: Dr. Joseph Goldberger* (New York: Julian Messner, 1969); Alan M. Kraut, *Goldberger's War: The Life and Work of a Public Health Crusader* (2004).

242. Adolph H. Schutz, *Biographical Memoir of Aleš Hrdlička, 1869-1943*, Biographical Memoirs of the National Academy of Sciences 23, no. 12 (1945). Jiří Rychtařík, *Chlapes s arnykou* (České Budějovice: Jihočeské nakladatelství, 1983).

243. Walter Ferdinand Lochwing, *Bohumil Shimek* (Iowa City: University of Iowa, 1956).

244. Banesh Hoffman, ed., *Perspectives in Geometry and Relativity: Essays in Honor of Václav Hlavatý* (Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1966).

245. Hao Wang, *Reflection on Gödel* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1987); John W. Dawson, Jr., *Logical Dilemna: The Life and Work of Kurt Gödel* (1996); John L. Costi and Warner De Paul, *Gödel: A Life of Logic* (Cambridge, MA: Basic Books, 2000); Rebecca Goldstein, *Incompleteness: The Proof and Paradox of Kurt Gödel* (New York: W.W. Norton, 2005).

246. Matthew Schaffler and Peter Weinberger, eds,,*Walter Kohn* (2004).

247. Victor F. Weisskopf, *The Joy of Insight: Passions of Physicist* (1991); *Physics and Society: Essays in Honor of Victor Frederick Weisskopf by the International Community of Physicists* (1998).

248. W.T. Sullivan, ed., *The Early Years of Radio Astronomy: Reflections Fifty Years After Jànský's Discovery* (2005).

249. Dale Topping and Eric Brothers, *When Giants Roamed the Sky: Karl Arnstein and the Rise of Airships from Zeppelin to Goodyea*r (Akron, OH: University of Akron Press, 2000).

250. Richard E. Goodman, *Karl Terzaghi: The Engineer as Artist* (1998).

251. Stephen J. Palickar, *Joseph Murgaš, Priest-Scientist: His Musical Wireless Telegraphy and the First Radio: A Biograph*y (New York, 1950).

252. Richard L. Merritt and Bruce M. Russett, eds., *From National Development to Global Community. Essays in Honor of Karl. W. Deutsch* (London: Allen & Unwin,1981).

253. Salo Engel, *Law, State, and International Legal Order* (1964); Albert A. Ehrenzweig et al., eds., *Essays in Honor of Hans Kelsen Celebrating the 90th Anniversary of his Birth* (1971); Richard Tur and William Twining, *Essays on Kelsen* (Oxford University Press, 1986); Lars Vinx, *Hans Kelsen's Pure Theory of Law and Legality of Legitimacy* (2007).

254. Seymour E. Harris, *Schumpeter, Social Scientist* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1951); Erich Schneider, *Schumpeter: Life and Work of a Great Social Scientist*, (1975); Suzanne Helburn and David Bramshall, eds., *Marx, Schumpeter and Keynes: A Century Celebration of Dissent* (Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe, 1986).

255. *Explorations in Economics: Notes and Essays Contributed in Honor of F. W. Taussig* (New York: McGraw Hill, 1936).

256. D. King and Michael Wertheimer, *Max Wertheimer and Gestalt Theory* (2007).

257. *An Exceptional Friendship: The Correspondence of Thomas Mann and Erich Kahler* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1975).

258. Ken Wolf, "Idea of Nationalism: The Intellectual Development and Historiographical Contribution of Hans Kohn," Ph.D. dissertation, University of Notre Dame, 1972.

259. Peter Brock and G. Gordon Skilling, eds., *Czech Renaissance of the Nineteenth Century: Essays Presented to Otakar Odlozilik in Honor of his Seventieth Birthday* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1970); S. E.Winters, "Odložilík's American Career: The Uneasy Self-exile of a Czech Historian, 1948-1973, " in E. Schmidt-Hartmann and S.B. Winters, eds., *Großbritanien, die USA und die böhmischen Länder 1848-1938* (München 1991).

260. *Orthodoxy and Western Civilization: A Collection of Essays Honoring Jaroslav Pelikán on his Eightieth Birthday* (St. Vladimirs Seminary, 2006).

261. Marti Bucco, *René Wellek,* Twayne US Authors Series, 410 (Boston, 1981); Joseph J. Strelka, ed., *Literary Theory and Criticism: Presented to René Wellek on his Eightieth Birthday* (1984).

262. Olga K. Miller, *Genealogical Research for Czech and Slovak Americans* (Detroit: Gale Research, 1978); Marylin A. Wellauer, *Tracing Your Czech ad Slovak Roots* (Milwaukee, 1980); Albert Bláha, *Czech Genealogist's Handbook* (Houston, 1981; 4th ed., 1986); Jana Tesařová Fast, *Genealogical Research Tracing Czech, Moravian and Slovak Ancestr*y (Cedar Rapids: Czech Fine Arts Foundation, 1984); Daniel M. Schlyter, *A Handbook of Czechoslovak Genealogical Research* (Buffalo Grove, IL: Genealogy Unlimited, 1985); Wlliam Kona, *Slovak Genealogy* (Wilmette, IL: K&K House, 1988); Olivia Milberger and Dora Obsta, *Checking Your Czech Ancestors* (1990); Lisa A. Alzo, *Finding Your Slovak Ancestors* (2005).

263. Published in Hallettsville, Texas, by Old Homestead Publishing during 1982-1989.

264. *Czech and Slovak Genealogy. A Bibliography of Publications in English*, in *SVU Information and Reference Series, A Bibliographies*, no.3, 1996.

265. *SVU Reference and Information Series, Guides to INTERNET*, no.1.

266. Website at http://www.svu2000.org/whatwedo/c5gd1.htm

267. Published in Chicago.

268. American Sokol Union, *Centennial of the Sokol in America, 1865-1965* (Cleveland, 1965); *American Sokol Centennial, 1865-1965* (St. Louis: Sokol St. Louis, 1965).

269. Josef Martínek, *Století Jednoty Č.S.A. 1854-1954* (Chicago: CSA, 1955).

270. *Fifteenth National Convention of the Western Bohemian Fraternal Association: Program* (Cedar Rapids, IA, 1963).

271. Nick A. Morris, *A History of the S.P.J.S.T.: A Texas Chronicle 1897-1980* (Temple: 1984).

272. *Short History of K.J.T.* (La Grange: Katolická jednota texaská, 1973).

273. Anna Machovsky, *Dějiny českých dam ve Spojených Stàtech Severní Ameriky* (New York, 1895).

274. Josef Martínek, *Československá národní rada americká* (Chicago, 1962).

275. Joseph Čada, *The Catholic Central Union: Its Contribution to Fraternalism and American Cosmopolitan Civilization* (Chicago, 1952).

276. Národní svaz českých katolíků v Texasu, *Naše Dějiny* (Granger: Našinec, 1930).

277. *Památník 15-letého výročí slavnosti Útředny moravskýh spolků* (Chicago, 1953).

278. *Semicentennial Jubilee of the Bohemian National Cemetery Association of Chicago, Illinois* (Chicago, 1923): Rudolf Janda, *Sedmdesátipětileté jubileum Českého nàrodního hřbitovav Chicagu, Ill*. (Chicago: R. Mejdřich, 1952).

279. Francis D. Raska,*Fighting Communism from Afar: The Council of Free Czechoslovakia* (Boulder, CO: East European Monographs, 2008).

280. Eva Rechcígl and Miloslav Rechcígl, Jr., *Czechoslovak Society of Arts and Sciences, Inc.,1958-1988* (Washington, DC, 1988); Miloslav Rechcígl, Jr., *On Behalf of their Homeland: Fifty Years of SVU* (Boulder, CO: East European Monographs, 2008).

281. Jozef Paučo, *60 Years of the Slovak League of America* (Middletown, PA: Jednota Press, 1967).

282. Karol Belohlávek, *Pamätnica diamantovému jubileu Národného slovenského spolku v Spojených štàtoch amerických* (Pittsburgh, 1965).

283. *Fiftieth Anniversary of the Slovak Gymnastic Union Sokol in the USA, 1896-1946* (Perth Amboy, NJ, 1946); *Souvenir Book of the Slovak Catholic Golden Jubilee* (Passaic, NJ, 1955).

284. Jozef Paučo, *75 rokov Prvej katolickej slovenskej Jednoty 1890-1965* (Cleveland, 1965).

285. The First Catholic Slovak Ladies Union, *The Golden Jubilee Book in Commemoration of Fifty Years of Loyal Service of the Women of America* (Cleveland, 1942).

286. Pavel Blažek, *Pamätnica k zlatému jubileu Živeny, podporujúceho spolku slovenských žien a mužov v Spojených štátoch amerických* (Pittsburgh: Slavia Ptg. Co., 1941).

287. *Op. cit.*

288. Published 1940 in Omaha, NE by the Czech Historical Society.

289. Published by the SVU in 1987.

290. H.K. Bernard, *Anton the Mayor* (Chicago: Marion Publishing Co., 1933); Alex Gottrfried, *Boss Čermák of Chicago: A Study of Political Leadership* (Seattle: University of Washington Press).

291. Lloyd Lewis, *Henry Horner, A Governor of Illinois: A Tribute* (Chicago: Lakeside Press, 1949); Thomas B. Littlewood, *Horner of Illinois* (Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1969).

292. William E. Barnhart, Eugene Schlickman and Bill Barnhart, *Kerner: The Conflict of Intangible Rights* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1999).

293. Alfred Lief, *Brandeis: The Personal History of the Ideal* (New

York: Stackpole Sons, 1935); Alphons Thomas Mason, *Brandeis: A Free Man's Life* (New York: Viking Press, 1946); Lewis J. Paper, *Brandeis* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1983); Melvin Urofsky, *Louis D. Brandeis*: *A Life* (2009).

294. C. Winston Chrislock, *Charles Jonáš 1840-1896: Czech National Liberal* (Philadelphia: Balch IES Press, 1993).

295. Ruth Crawford Mitchell, *Alice Garrigue Masaryk, 1879-1966* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh, 1980).

296. Thomas Blood, *Madam Secretary: Biography of Madeleine Albright* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1999); Madeleine Albright, *Madam Secretary: A Memoir* (New York: Miramax Books, 2003).

297. Published in Philadelphia in 1926 by Dorrrance.

298. Published in 1933 by the Slovenská Telocvičná Jednota Sokol v Amerike.

299. Published in Chicago in 1934 by the Slovak Catholic Federation of America.

300. Vojta Beneš, Č*eskoslovenská Amerika a odboj* (Praha, 1931).

301. Published in Princeton in 1957 by Princeton University Press.

302. Published in Lexington in 1967 by the University of Kentucky.

303. Published in Rome in 1968 by the Slovak Institute.

304. Published by the Slavonic Club at the Chicago University in 1934.

305. Published by the Czechoslovak Historical Society in Chicago in 1937.

306. Published in Omaha by the Czech Historical Society of Nebraska in 1940.

307. Published in Chicago in 1922 by *Czechoslovak Review*.

308. Published in Washington, DC by SVU Press in 1987.

309. Published in Hallettsville, Texas in 1982.

310. Published by Albert J. Bláha in Houston, Texas in 1986.

311. *Op.cit.*

312. Fr. Sekanina, ed., *Album reprezentantů všech oboru veřejného života československého* (Praha: Umělecké nakladateltsví Josef Zeibrdlich, 1927), pp.1199a-1206a.

313. See pp.187-314.

314. *Poslední pocta* , vol. 1-5 (1982-1994).

315. Published in Prague in 2000 by Pražská edice.

316. Published in the periodical *Literárny almanac Slováka v Amerike* (Middletown, PA: Jednota, 1967), pp. 115-249. *Ibid*. 1968, pp. 148-159; 1969, pp. 179-185.

317. *Jednota Annual Furdek* (1967), pp. 143-191; 7 (1968), pp. 131-169; 8 (1969), pp. 51-72; 9 (1970), pp. 87-106; 10 (1971), pp. 49-58.

318. Published in Cleveland, OH in 1972.

319. Published in the monographic series *Slováci vo svete* (Marrtin: Matica slovenská, 1980), vol. 2, pp. 168-197.

320. Martha M. Kona, *Slovak Americans and Canadians in American Catholic Who's Who, 1911-1981 and Slovak Ethnicity* (Wilmette, IL: K&K House, 1984).

321. Miloslav Rechcigl,Jr., Eva Rechcigl, and Jiri Eichler, comps., *SVU Directory: Organization, Activities, and Biographies of Members*

(Washington, DC: SVU Press, 2003).

322. Miloslav Rechcígl, Jr., *Educators with Czechoslovak Roots. A US and Canadian Roster* (Washington, DC: SVU Press, 1980).

323. One such publication was the monograph of Jiří Mejstřík, *Češi ve světě* (Prague: Euromedia Group, 2000). Another publication of this type was *Svět je plný Čechů*, by J. A. Krystek,which he himself published Brno the same year.

324. *Op. cit*.

325. *Naše Hlasy*, 13, no. 21-22 (May 27, 1967).

326. F.C. Štěrba, *Češi a Slováci v Latinské Americe: Přehled jejich kulturního přínosu* (Washington: Společnost pro vědy a umění, 1962).

327. Published in New York in 1944 by the Bureau for International Education.

328. Prepared by Lubomyr R. Wynar and Lois Buttler and published by Kent University School of Library Science in 1978.

329. Also prepared by Lubomyr Wynar and published by Libraries Unlimited in Littleton, CO.

330. The second edition was published by Gale Research Co., Detroit, Michigan in 1976, under the editorship of Paul Wasserman.

331. Issued by Gale Research Co, in Detroit, Michigan.

332. *Krajanská sbírka Knihovny Náptrstkova muzea: Soupis českých a slovenských krajanských tisků zahraničních a literatury o českém vystěhovalectví*, 3 vols. (Praha: Náprstkovo muzeum, 1994).

333. Successful Archival Conference," *Zprávy SVU*, 46, no. 1 (January-February 2004), pp. 20-22.

334. Miloslav Rechcígl, Jr., ed.,*Czech and Slovak American Archival Materials and Their Preservation: Proceedings of the Working Conference Held at the Czech and Slovak Embassies in Washington, DC* (Prague: Prague Editions, 2004).

335. Miloslav Rechcígl, Jr., *Czechoslovak American Archivalia*, 2 vols. (Olomouc: Repronis, 2004).

336. Miloslav Rechcígl, Jr., ed.,*Czech and Slovak American Archival Materials and Their Preservation*.

ESSAYS

On the Chauvinism Flaw That Failed Mary Heimann's *Czechoslovakia: The State That Failed*

By Ivo K. Feierabend

Among the flaws of Mary Heimann's treatise on Czechoslovakia, none seems more critical than the conceptual deficiency in her work.[1] It persists throughout her narration, blinds her to accurate assessments of Czechoslovak political history, and lends itself to abuse of most things Czechoslovak.

For one, her work is suspect, as one-factor analyses usually are. Social and political reality is multifaceted, not one-dimensional. All of Czechoslovak history is to be explained by Czech or Czechoslovak chauvinism, and this pejorative term is not defined or explicated. The literature of nationalism is absent and neglected. Such an omission hampers serious analysis.

Additionally, her overburdened one factor is wedded to "the narrative fallacy": the construction of a narrative of some 400 pages, on the basis of *post hoc ergo propter hoc.*[2]

That is to say, the alleged Czech chauvinism is said to originate with the Czech and Slovak national revivalists in the 19th century and is supposed to explain events occurring throughout the 20th century, which includes some ten varied and very different regimes: the democratic polity of the First Republic and the Second Republic, the Nazi Protectorate of Bohemia and Moravia as well as the Slovak State, the Third Republic, the terrorist Stalinist totalitarianism and the subsequent period of the "thaw," the regime of communist normalization which followed the Prague Spring of 1968, and the post-Soviet era together with the Velvet Divorce of the Czechs and the Slovaks, the alleged final failure of Czechoslovakia.

Are there not more numerous and proximate causes to be evaluated? Of course, there are. Here, Heimann's disregard of social and political science is her handicap. Democracies and totalitarianisms are at opposite poles of the typology of political systems and require analysis within very different idioms.

Instead, Heimann maintains that there were many alleged 19th-century culprits. The honor of being the seminal chauvinist belongs to Josef Jungmann (1773-1847), who resurrected the Czech language, hence the chauvinist Czech linguistic nationalism. And even more guilty are the chauvinist František Palacký (1798-1876), who inserted into Czech history, the "Hussite tale," offensive to the Hapsburg Catholic sensibility, and at the end of the 19th century and the beginning of the 20th, the worst of the lot, the chauvinist Tomas G. Masaryk (1850-1937), in her characterization, a "brilliant propagandist" (323) and "self appointed spokesman" (322) who, with others, during WWI in exile, invented an artificial state "…ever to be named for the Czechs and the Slovaks" (13).

In her accounting, it included more Germans than Slovaks, plus Hungarians and Ruthenians, and this multi-national state, in her judgment, was untenable, a flaw beyond repair and an unforgivable, imperialist chauvinist sin for which she maligns Masaryk and disparages the Czechoslovaks. Her innuendos make it sufficiently clear that she thinks that Czechoslovakia was an

illegitimate state, and had no right to exist. This categorical opinion induces inappropriate emotions in her text and clouds her attempts at scholarly discussion. She seems relieved by Nazi occupation in March, 1939, which was the end of the Second Republic: "There was no reason to suppose that the state, a failed experiment in multi-nationalism, would ever be restored" (110). She goes on to say:

> Despite the fact that [the Protectorate and the Slovak State] were closely allied to Nazi Germany, at the war's end Czechoslovakia was not only resurrected, but counted on the side of the victorious Allies. *To have pulled off such a stunt for the second time within a generation* [emphasis added] was a remarkable achievement (111).

The *first stunt* was, of course, the creation of Czechoslovakia itself in 1918.

This is what she has to say about the alleged power of Czechoslovak chauvinism:

> …chauvinism is held to have been among the principal causes of instability that led to the Munich Crisis in 1938; made the persecution of Jews and Gypsies not only possible, but energetic; lost the country to Stalinist bigots, and turned it into one of the most hard line states of the Eastern block … [thanks to chauvinism, i.e.] Czechoslovakia could move seamlessly from democracy through Fascism to Socialism, Communism and back again (xx – xxi).

This is a strange historical account that holds that the Czechs caused Munich (rather than Hitler, together with Mussolini, Daladier and Chamberlain) and maintains that the Czechs rather than the Nazis energetically persecuted the Jews. How improbable that the extremely particularistic precept, chauvinism, could bring about the extremely universalistic Marxist Stalinism. It could not. There are better explanations. And, could the profoundly felt tragedies of Munich, the Nazi occupation of 1939, the communist *coup d'état* of 1948, or the Soviet occupation of 1968, be characterized as leading seamlessly to regime changes? With these events, would it not be accurate to argue national traumas? These were well-documented traumas of immense consequences. Heimann discounts such evidence, avoids psychological insight and exhibits no human empathy. Is she serious when she says: "The international community -- represented by Germany, Italy, France and Britain – had intervened at Munich to break Czech domination of the multinational state" (50)? Did not Hitler and Mussolini threaten, rather than represent the international community? Was not the appeasement of Hitler the issue?

The contempt, the offense, the abuse of all things Czechoslovak follows from the pattern of negative, pejorative connotations associated with her invented Czech, or Czechoslovak, chauvinism, which is characterized as egotistical, aggressive, violent, power hungry, authoritarian, fascist and totalitarian, racist, anti-Semitic, as well as devious, treacherous and dishonest; and so, of course, must be its practitioners, the Czechoslovak people and their elites.

Masaryk is introduced as a spy (22) and together he and Beneš, are characterized as seditious conspirators filled with intrigue and propaganda, who misled the Allied statesmen at the Peace Conference in 1919 in Versailles, promising a new Czechoslovakia as a second Switzerland, while, at home, the Sudeten Germans, in her words "…were being lectured by a man [Masaryk] who had himself grown up German and made his career by switching sides" (57). As the President of Czechoslovakia, he excelled "…with his political savvy, use of secret police and wartime training in the art of subterfuge and propaganda" (70). Nowhere in the volume will you find Masaryk to be a civilized human being, commanding a minimum of civic virtue and democratic humanist creed. Her characterization of Masaryk is character assassination.

The trouble with Heimann's thesis of Czech chauvinism is its omnibus ability to disparage not only Czechoslovakia, but any modern nation. To illustrate: Just as in the case of the declared Czech chauvinism, was it not American chauvinism that inspired the seditious enterprise of the American Revolution by the self-appointed few? Benjamin Franklin was well aware of treason: "We must, indeed, all hang together," he told the conspirators, "or most assuredly, we shall all hang separately." And could not Heimann also declare that the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution served as a fig leaf for American chauvinists to engage in ethnic cleansing, genocide of the Indians, slavery and racism? Let us be assured that similar chauvinist stories could be spun for France and Britain, although Heimann doubts that the First Czechoslovak Republic (1918- 1938) "… was worthy to take its place beside France and Britain as one of the democratic and morally advanced countries in the modernworld" (48). France, not just Czechoslovakia, could be moved "seamlessly," *à la* Heimann, through the seventeen constitutions since the Revolution, including Napoleon and Vichy. Nicolas Chauvin, after all, was supposedly a French Napoleonic soldier. English chauvinists ran a multi-national state, oppressing especially brutally the Irish and the many people of their world empire.

To tell negative nationalist tales is easily done because all modern nations are nationalist. They acquired nationalism as their modern, new sense of common identity. Heimann does not tell the reader that all modern nations are nationalist by the very definition of modernity, but she labels Czech and Czechoslovak nationalism as chauvinism whenever it pleases her to smear Czechoslovakia rather than responsibly narrating the country's political history. The derogatory concept is worthless as an explanatory device. There is a proverb in the Czech language that says "if you want to beat a dog, you can always find a stick," and her stick is *chauvinism.*

Nationalism, of course, can be horrendously destructive as was recently the case in the Balkans, and elsewhere. Such nationalism is frequently labeled as ethno-nationalism.

Kecmanovic, in his treatise, *The Mass Psychology of Ethno-Nationalism,* maintains: "Nationalism and aggression are intricately bound and mutually conditioned."[3] However, it is also surmised that extreme nationalism appears only at times of crises and might be just a conduit, not the cause of aggression. Heimann does not contemplate such a possibility although Czechoslovak history is riddled with extreme crises.

More importantly, nationalism can also have a friendly face, when nationalism and democracy are intricately bound in modern, stable democra-

cies, as was the case during the First Czechoslovak Republic (1918-1938). Such nationalism is usually labeled as *civic nationalism*, sometimes as *liberal nationalism* or also as *patriotism,* which reflects more the love of country rather than of its nationals.[4] Democratic nations need the cohesive property of nationalism as any modern nation does and perhaps more so, since democracy demands so much initiative and responsibility from its free citizenry. Civic nationalism can be just as fervent as any other kind. Originally, nationalism and democracy coincided as they did in the United States in 1776. Nationalism gave the people common identity and unity, and democracy gave them the political system.

In political psychology, a triad is said to sustain stable modern democracies: *civic culture,* which consists of the socialized democratic credo; *civility*, which corresponds to the moral virtues of citizenry, such as honesty and tolerance; and *civic nationalism*, the confluence of this democratic culture and nationalism.[5]

Furthermore, democracies institutionalize peaceful conflict resolution. Democracies count ballots, not bullets. Rummel characterizes democracy as a method of non-violence.[6] Barber considers peaceful conflict resolution among the essential traits of democracy.[7] Many authors, over the years, have identified democracy as the least coercive and the freest political system. Additionally, democratic nations never make war on one another. This *pax democratica* thesis, formulated by Kant, was held by President Wilson and Masaryk. In empirical political science, it was pronounced the first (and only) law of international relations.[8]

Hence, civic nationalism, democracy and peace are also intricately bound and mutually conditioned. This is in contra-distinction to aggressive ethno-nationalism. Heimann fails to make this distinction and misleads the reader by using the term "chauvinism," the pejorative version of nationalism. Her crucial error, however, whether inadvertent or calculated, is her omission of any reference to civic nationalism in the history of the Czech and Slovak national awakening. Zdenek V. David's recent study in *Kosmas* cited above*,* "British Liberalism in the Czech National Awakening," appreciates and summarizes such a tradition in the Czech history of the 18th and 19th centuries.[9]

Masaryk, the founding father of Czechoslovakia, in the same sense as the American Founding Fathers, in his writings, in his credo, in his charisma, in the office of the Czechoslovak Presidency, filled to the brim the paradigm of the democratic political culture just outlined. He inspired the Czechoslovak people to follow the democratic example, and they did during the First Republic. He also thought that the Czechoslovaks needed two generations to fully internalize the national democratic spirit. Heimann has nothing to say about his persuasion. Rather, she stains the image of Masaryk and the democratic image of the First Czechoslovak Republic. To do otherwise would have negated her maladroit Czechoslovak chauvinism thesis.

Heimann's discussion of the First Czechoslovak Republic (1918-1938) does not, and cannot, repudiate its democratic character. Instead, she tries to demean it. Czechoslovakia's "brief period of democracy … was seriously flawed from the first" (49). Hers is a litany of false or irrelevant assertions and specious arguments, none able to deny this new democracy on the European continent. She repeatedly criticizes Prague centralism. The neutral term to use would be "unitary form of government," and unitary form as well

as federalism is consistent with democracy. France and Britain, her "civilized democratic examples," had unitary, Paris-centered, and London-centered, governments. In one accusation, she states, "Giving women the vote sounded emancipated. It also doubled Czech voting strength" (66), as if this did not double the strength of all minorities. There are many complaints about Czechoslovak secularism in public affairs, e.g., "elections were to be held on Sundays" (67), the time for Christian worship, and "public instruction was to be conducted so as 'not to be in conflict with scientific research'" (67). Or, yet another lame and an undocumented complaint:

> Presidents were to serve for a maximum of two terms, but a special exception was made for the President of the 1st Republic, even though Masaryk was detested by the Germans and suspected by other nationalities as an unprincipled Czech chauvinist (66).

She contends: "There were at least two serious problems …" (48). The first serious problem turns out to be "… vigorous promotion of a heretic [Jan Hus] … as the visible symbol of Czech/Czechoslovak nationalism..."(49).Freedom of religion is not in question, just the opposite. She complains, "Masaryk wanted a complete separation of church and state" (67) which, in America, is celebrated in the First Amendment of the Bill of Rights. Nonetheless, the schemer, Masaryk wanted to "undermine the traditional Catholic parties, further diminish the power of Hungarians and Germans and quash any talk of Slovak autonomy" (67). How the quashing would happen is not clear. However, the doctrine of the First Amendment takes the blame for oppressing Czechoslovak minorities. How improbable.

The second serious problem of the First Republic had to do with the Czechoslovaks concealing their authoritarianism:

> … behind the many overlapping and sometimes conflicting meanings that had attached to the word 'democracy' … democracy could mean a 'liberal state with democratic government', an 'egalitarian community of citizens', a 'state dedicated to social justice and equality of economic opportunity' or 'something else entirely' … the term 'democracy' was deliberately left hazy … The coexistence of a variety of uses of the term left it flexible, ultimately allowing the Czech electorate marching down the authoritarian road . . .(49).

The authoritarian road would apparently lead all the way to fascism and communism. She specifically mentions "people's democracy," and all this "in order to protect the abstraction called 'the nation'" (49).

If you accuse the Czechoslovaks of such a devious concealment of authoritarianism, the same concealment of authoritarianism applies to the entire tradition of Western democratic thought together with Locke, Rousseau, Madison, Bentham, J.S. Mill, T.H. Green and, indeed, Masaryk. The terms of democratic discourse do overlap and they are contradictory, conflicting and overlapping by definition. Democracy is not a dogma. Political dogma is incompatible with an open society. Heimann should be reminded of Madison's

argument in the Federalist No. 10, where the principle of popular sovereignty collides with the tyranny of the majority. Or, using her example, unlimited freedom of the "liberal state" indeed may conflict and endanger the equality of the "egalitarian community of citizens" and vice versa. The varied meanings of the term democracy do not conceal authoritarianism; they reveal and affirm the meaning of democracy.[10]

Nonetheless, Heimann insists that the fascist spirit "… was largely concealed [during the First Republic] until Czech nationalists were finally given the opportunity to create a state in their own image" (49), the Second Czechoslovak Republic (October 1938-March 1939).

> The Second Republic shows us what Slovak, Ruthene and Czech variations on the contemporary European themes of anti-Semitism and Fascism looked like at the time, and hints how they might have developed had Germany and the Second World War not intervened. It also introduces us to a number of totalitarian tricks and techniques … (87).

Again, she is wrong. The Second Republic was never fascist and the Nazi Protectorate (1939-1945) remained the hated Nazi occupation. Just one indicator should suffice to make the point. During one period of the Second Republic and also the Protectorate, five out of nine cabinet ministers in the Czech government were Free Masons, an association proscribed and persecuted by the Nazis and the fascists.[11] These governments considered it their duty (and they were successful) in keeping the Czech fascists out of the governments. Also, they curtailed the activities of the fascist Slovak separatists, as well as those of Ruthenia. Furthermore, the Beran government during the Second Republic and the Eliáš government under the Nazi Protectorate occupation withstood the extreme Nazi pressure and could report with pride that they were able "to become the only territory under Nazi influence that did not "issue anti-Semitic legislation,"[12] the infamous Nuremberg race laws. The Second Republic was not a fascist state, because there was no *Il Duce,* no power monopoly of one party, no violence, no police state. Disregarding the typology of political systems, Heimann's fascist label serves no better purpose than again to vilify.[13]

The First Republic was not on its way to fascism as Heimann thinks, but followed the democratic path fortified by nationalism: civic nationalism, i.e., where the focus of identity is not just on language, culture, high or low, but on civic culture and civility. And this is the important lesson in the legacy of the First Republic, for both the Czechs and the Slovaks. If such a lesson were indeed heeded in the post-communist era, Czechoslovakia did not fail. There are two short maverick statements in Heimann's Chapter 3 that deal with the First Republic that support this conclusion very curiously, and most inconsistently. She admits: "Czechoslovakia, indeed, retained its own increasingly idiosyncratic version of parliamentary democracy. . . "(50) and she adds: "*Had the First Czechoslovak Republic been less Czech-chauvinist and less Prague-centered, it would have gone authoritarian and even fascist. . . "* [emphasis added] (50).

So, it was Czech chauvinism and Prague centralism that protected Czechoslovak democracy (but the term must be corrected from chauvinism to

civic nationalism). In a later passage, she elaborates on the same thought: ". . .the problem of Czechoslovak nationalities[would] melt away. . . [provided] *the central government in Prague took seriously its primary task of promoting Czech interests, encouraging the growth of a resolutely Czecho-Slovak nation and insisting upon loyalty to the state…"*[italics added] (63). And so it is, after all, the criticized alleged Czech chauvinism, the promotion of Czech interests and that of the Czechoslovak nation and its state, that really mattered in securing Czechoslovak democracy and resolving the minority conflicts.

It is mind-boggling to read this admission of the Czechoslovak democratic virtues and the prospect of a successful democratic Czechoslovak state. And, of course, it shatters her chauvinism thesis. Had she pursued the wisdom revealed in these two passages in her volume she would not have denigrated the Czechoslovak people and besmirched the founding fathers and Masaryk. It could have been a better book rather than the scholarly inadequate and distasteful book that it is. A better title for her *Czechoslovakia: The State that Failed* would have been *Czechoslovakia: Paradise Lost.* This due to Hitler and the Sudeten German Nazis in 1938-1939, as well as Stalin and the communists in 1948. It was not that Machiavelli's *virtu* was lacking in Czechoslovakia, the *fortuna* was.

Perhaps this essay ends too soon and too abruptly. Seven out of eleven chapters are not commented on. Perhaps this would have been the place where a discerning reader, in disillusionment, would have quit reading as well. Time is too valuable and reading this opus, one gets the feeling that one is learning too much about Heimann and too little about Czechoslovakia. And such a reader might well wonder why the Yale University Press published a work that cannot be taken seriously.

NOTES

1. Mary Heimann, *Czechoslovakia: The State That Failed* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009). This essay originated as an address at the 25th World Congress of the Czechoslovak Society of Arts and Sciences (SVU) in Tábor, Czech Republic, June 27-July 2, 2010.

2. This Latin phrase translates as: "After this, therefore on account of it." This fallacy consists of assuming something has caused something else merely because it has preceded it. See for the Slovak Republic and the Protectorate, Niall Ferguson, "Complexity and Collapse: Empires on the Edge of Chaos," *Foreign Affairs* 89, no. 2 (March/April 2010), 18-32.

3. See for example, Yall Tamir, *Liberal Nationalism* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993) and Lea Greenfeld, *Nationalism: Five Roads to Modernity* (Cambridge, Mass.: 1992).

4. See for example, Gabriel A. Almond and Sydney Verba, *The Civic Culture: Political Attitudes in Five Nations* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1963) and Martina Klicperová-Baker, Ivo K. Feierabend, et al., *Demokratická kultura v České republice: Občanská kultura, étos a vlastenectví ze srovnávacího pohledu* (Praha: Academia, 2007).

5. Rudolph J. Rummel, *Power Kills: Democracy as a Method of Non-Violence* (New Brunswick, N.J.: Transaction Publishers, 1997).

6. David J. Barber, *The Book of Democracy* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1995).

7. See for example, Bruce Russett, *Grasping the Democratic Peace* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993).

8. Zdenek V. David, *Kosmas: Czechoslovak and Central Europe Journal* 23, no. 2 (Spring 2009), 1-28.

9. It is appropriate at this point to warn the reader that Heimann's *Czechoslovakia: The State that Failed* is a history by innuendos. It is filled with misleading insinuations, half explained, implied, or not at all explained, or false statements and specious arguments. The specious argument just discussed--"the squeezing of authoritarianism out of democracy"-- is just one example among others. "Jan Hus vs. Jan Nepomuk" suggests a non-existent Masaryk *Kulturkampf* à la Bismarck (never mentioning Bismarck). Heimann reports Masaryk as saying, "The press of the world is largely managed or financed by Jews" (327), which may well conjure up "The Protocols of the Elders of Zion," rather than fully discussing Masaryk fighting anti-Semitism in the Hilsner case. As concerns the energetic, injurious and successful Magyarization of the Slovak nationality (1886), Heimann explains, "... the Hungarians took an approach that more closely resembled the American idea of the melting pot" (16). Accusing the Second Republic of institutionalizing "forced labor camps" helps her pin the false fascist label on Czechoslovakia, but she does not tell the reader that these were the equivalent of FDR's New Deal's CCC (Civilian Conservation Corps) to fight unemployment. The discussion of the First Republic tells you very little above and beyond the innuendos of the nationalist domination of the Czechs and the Czechoslovaks. Pages are wasted on such topics as discussing the techniques of census taking or the images on Czechoslovak stamps, rather than discussing the Czechoslovak political system, its processes, political parties, extensive social legislation, land reform or the grass roots democracy of the Czechoslovak cooperative movement, reportedly one of the most extensive in the world. Of course, the crowning innuendo above all the rest is to parade Czech and the Czechoslovak nationalism as chauvinism with its myriad of derogatory meanings.

10. The five cabinet ministers were: Eliáš, Feierabend, Kapras, Klumpar, and Šádek. The Free Masons gathered together the Czechoslovak elites, including prominent Jews. As a precaution, the Masons disbanded during the Second Republic and destroyed their files. See Ladislav K. Feierabend, *Politické vzpomínky* (Brno: Atlantis, 1994), 1:171.

11. Ibid., 179.

12. The post-Munich Czechoslovakia lost a third of its territory, found itself at the mercy of the Nazi Reich and faced extreme economic, social, military, national and international crises. One can hardly imagine a better-suited regime for these difficult times. This polity of "authoritarian democracy" was an exemplar of a crisis political system. The government of Agrarians and Social Democrats (Beran and Hampl, reminiscent of the "red-green coalition" of the First Republic) acted as an efficient "damage control team" within the pervasive sense of national unity in the mournful emergency situation. See Ivo K. Feierabend, "The Second Czechoslovak Republic, September, 1938-March, 1939: A Study in Political Change," in *Czechoslovakia: Past and Present*, ed. Miloslav Rechcigl, Jr. (The Hague: Mouton, 1968), 65-75. See also Jan Gebhart and Jan Kuklík, *Druhá Republika 1938-1939: Svár democracie a totality v politickém, společenském a kulturním životě* (Praha: Paseka, 2004).

Czech History Told by the Japanese

By Kenji Hotta

Monogatari - Cheko no rekishi: the title of this Japanese paperback may be translated as "Tales from Czech History."[1] The author, Hideto Satsuma, professor of management at Meiji University in Tokyo, is one of several Japanese scholars who happened to study at Charles University in Prague, and later became an enthusiastic propagators of the Czech Republic in Japan. In l99l, he published a book entitled *Royal Privilege and Nobility: The Czech Middle Ages* (Tokyo), and in 1998 the Japanese publishing company Gendai Shokan issued his *Heretics of Prague. Religious Reform in the Medieval Czech Lands.* As the titles of the two publications indicate, the author is especially interested in the Czech Middle Ages. This explains why he tends to spend very little time on the description of the later historical periods. Since Satsuma is not a professional historian, the reader should not expect to find an original interpretation of the Czech past in his narrative. What the reader will find in his books instead, is the author's real admiration of the things Czech. "Though the present Czech Republic is small, her past is great": this is what Satsuma seems to be saying to the reader with whom he wishes to share his various impressions and knowledge about the small European country that "abounds in forests, hills and historical sites," as the subtitle of the book claims.

Satsuma's description of Czech history begins with the Moravian Empire. Unlike some Czech and foreign revisionist historians, he does not question the authenticity of this first "Czech Commonwealth," and presents the existence of the Great Moravian culture as an established fact. Indeed, it is good to know that the archeological findings in Moravia and the linguistic analyses of some Moravian historical texts, done by such famous scholars as František Dvornik and Horace Lunt from Harvard University, have been taken seriously and that the revisionist attempts at debunking the Czech cultural canon have been ignored. That said, it is clear that Satsuma's narrative is not aimed at destroying or altering the standard description of the Czech historical events. This fact, by itself, can be considered as an accomplishment of a sort, considering the present post-modern and post-structural attempts at deconstructing the very meaning of meanings. However Satsuma's choice of historical topics is peculiar, rather idiosyncratic, one may say, and at times almost provocative, as seen from the perspective of recent historical research on the Moravian-Bohemian historical coexistence.

Satsuma emphasizes the Moravian contribution to the European cultural heritage in general, and to the Slavic cultural development, in particular. The religious mission of the two Byzantine brothers, Constantine and Methodius, in Moravia is described within the political context of ninth-century Europe. The territorial ambitions of the neighboring states as well as the impact of the Christian Latin rite that had been incomprehensible to the Slavic Moravians are presented as the major reason for the decision of Rastislav, the Moravian ruler, to look for a safer ally in the remote and flourishing Byzantine Empire. The relationship of the two Empires seems to have been culturally and economically productive, as the remaining but rather sparse historical evidence indicates. Due primarily to their contact with the Byzantine intellectual world,

the Moravians were the first Slavic people having their own alphabet (*glagolitsa)* as well as their own codified literary language, known as Old Church Slavonic. It was this language that was recognized by the Church as one of the tongues in which the Bible could be written and preached, the other permitted languages being Hebrew, Greek, and Latin.

However, the acme of the cultural and political development in Moravia was of a relatively short duration. The internal political disputes and gradual suppression of the Byzantine religious rite replaced the social conditions favorable to the predominantly Greek cultural influence. With the political instability of Great Moravia came also its cultural decline and strategic vulnerability. The beginning of the tenth century marks the continuous deterioration of the prosperous Moravian Empire. From now on, the country becomes either a vassal state or a colonized territory of the Asiatic and European invaders. The tenth century stands for the economic and cultural stagnation and gradual dissipation of the Moravian political might. Whatever remained of the Moravian civilization might have been transferred, up to a certain degree, to the neighboring Bohemia and to the Bulgarian Empire of Czar Boris.

The reader may conclude that so far there is nothing new about Satsuma's historical narrative. And yet, that would not be entirely correct. Satsuma presents, as it were, some "extra" information in addition to the conventionalized, rather normative description of the Czech past. It is especially his explanation of the famous Znojmo Rotunda of Saint Catherine, built in the Romanesque style of the tenth century. This national treasure is said to have originated in 1134. However, some scholars believe that the Rotunda of Saint Catherine is much older and may be in fact connected with the existence of the Moravian Empire. Be that as it may, the Znojmo Rotunda remains one of the most controversial historical monuments in the Czech Republic. As the author mentions, the frescoes preserved in this church building depict what appears to be the whole line of the Przemyslide Moravian rulers of the Mojmir dynasty. The Moravian king is shown to wear the legendary *feather crown,* i.e., the actual Moravian royal crown, embellished with jewels and peacock feathers, that does not seem to exist any longer. What is truly surprising in the Rotunda of Saint Catherine is the very depiction of the Moravian royal rulers. This is in fact the crux of the historical problem that has exceeded the bounds of the canonized narrative about the Moravian Empire. According to the official interpretation, purported by some historians mostly of the Bohemian provenance, the Rotunda frescoes have nothing to do with the rulers of the Moravian Empire. This is why the issue of the *feather crown* is no issue at all, and ought to be deleted from any historical description pertaining to the Czech past. To what extent this approach may be referred to as "biased" is an open question that no current historians seem to be willing to answer.

Being aware of the contentious nature of the Znojmo Rotunda problem, Satsuma seems to be treading very carefully around some historical issues that divide Czech and Moravian historians. Instead, he concentrates on the historical accomplishments of the Przemyslide dynasty. He mentions Saint Václav (Wenceslas) and Beatified Anežka, and their respective merits and the concrete results of their Christian faith: the erection of new churches and monasteries, all of them of the Roman Catholic denomination with Latin as the language of the religious rite, and the construction of new royal towns. Interestingly enough, Satsuma also mentions the role that the Przemyslide rulers

played in the incessant Germanization of the Bohemian kingdom. Through marriages with German nobility, the Przemyslides brought to Bohemia as well as Moravia not only German gentry, but also craftsmen, skilled workers, and farmers. In this way, the Slavic character of Bohemian and Moravian towns and villages was substantially altered and the perennial historical problem with the German population in the Czech lands seems to have been born.

Chapter 3 of Satsuma's book is devoted to the enlightened rule of Charles IV, the king of the Czech Lands and the Emperor of the Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation. Not only the Charles Bridge in Prague, but a great number of exquisite buildings were built in Prague and in other Bohemian and Moravian royal towns in order to demonstrate the political might and the cultural advancement of the Luxemburg dynasty to which Charles IV by birth had belonged. For reasons readily understandable to the reader, Satsuma concentrates especially on the historical function of the University of Prague (Charles University, founded in 1348) where he happened to study as an exchange student in l986. He mentions the vibrant intellectual exchange between the University of Prague and other important academic institutions of continental Europe and England. He points out that the international atmosphere of the University in Prague created the most favorable conditions also for the economic development of the Bohemian kingdom. Renowned scholars, artists, and architects flocked to Prague and even to other Bohemian and Moravian towns where they helped create the landscape representative of the prosperous state.

In his narrative, Satsuma dwells on the importance of the historical document, known as the Golden Bulla (*Zlatá bula*) that stands for the crucial legal document of the Holy Roman Empire (first ratified in 1356 in the German city Nuremburg). The law in principle states how the future emperor of the Empire ought to be elected from among the candidates to the highest post. In the Golden Bulla, the Czech king is granted an exceptional status in the Empire because it is only he, the Czech king, who needs no approval from the emperor to reign over the Czech Lands. As a result, the exceptional position of the Czech king made the Czech kingdom the most important and, at the same time, the most independent state within the Holy Roman Empire. The Bulla also commands that the imperial nobles ("kurfirst"), entitled to elect the emperor, speak three official languages of the empire: German, Italian, and Czech. This consequently signifies that the rule of Charles IV represented the unprecedented growth and refinement of the Czech language, regardless of the fact that the *lingua franca* of the period was the Latin vernacular of the Roman Catholic Church.

Since Satsuma devotes the whole chapter to the rule of Charles IV, it is regrettable that he omits to mention also the emperor's literary achievements. Among the European rulers, Charles IV was one of the most educated monarchs. On the model of such classical autobiographies as Saint Augustine's *Confessions* and Cicero's *De Officiis*, Charles IV composed in Latin his significant manuscript *Vita Caroli* (The Life of Charles). As is commonly known, he also supported the artistic and scientific endeavors of the period, and thus made Prague the center of learning in fourteenth-century Europe. All this must be well known to Satsuma, who focuses in his historical narrative predominantly on political issues and occasionally on some architectural and musical accomplishments. However, as a rule, he leaves the literary and other artistic achievements out of his text. The information omitted from Satsuma' s narrative indi-

cates to what extent the author's interest in the Czech history also represents the stereotyped Japanese view of the Czech lands as the place of beautiful architecture and music, and devoid of any philosophical thought. It may come as a kind of disappointment because Tokyo is one of the great cities in the world where the Czech visual arts (paintings by Alfons Mucha, František Kupka and others) are often exhibited and enjoy a great popularity among the educated Japanese people.

Chapter 4 starts with the rather conventionalized story of Jan Hus and the complex historical events contributing to the religious reformation, as advocated by John Wycliffe, the English theologian whose teachings had aroused at the University of Prague a great excitement among the students and some teachers. Satsuma tries to explain to what degree the Church criticism was of a private nature, and to what extent the sermons of Jan Hus against the excesses and corruption of the clergy, might have been profitably supported by the Czech ruling class. Sometimes Satsuma's arguments seem to be more speculative than factual. Nevertheless, he tackles some important historical issues that might become an interesting point of departure for further scholarly investigations.

Though he briefly mentions the period of the Hussite wars, Satsuma makes an abrupt ending to his interpretation of the revolutionary Hussite period, and addresses instead the question of the historical significance of the Hussite events for the development of the Czech national movement in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. The music of Bedřich Smetana (his symphonic cycle *Má vlast*) as well as the establishment of the Czechoslovak Church in l9l8 (Československá husitská církev) are presented as examples of the unebbing influence of the heroic Czech past upon the later national awakening. Satsuma also emphasizes that in the nineties of the last century, the Roman Catholic Church indeed apologized for the martyrdom of Jan Hus (he was burnt at stake in l415 in the German town of Konstantz) and thus attempted to normalize the strained relationship between the Roman Catholic Church and the current Czech government.

The Chapter Five of Satsuma's Czech history is entitled "The Prosperity of the Nobles (*Kizokutachi no eiga*, in Japanese)." The author selected the Moravian family of the Pernsteins as the major representatives of the prosperous Czech nobility. The story begins in the small town of Nedvědice (Moravia) where the imposing Gothic castle of the Pernsteins was built in the thirteenth century. The author mentions not only the legendary foundation of the Pernsteins' residence, but also some factual information about the Pernsteins' service to the Crown and the consequential rewards. Vilém II is introduced in the book as an example of the prosperous and independent noble who chiefly through his zeal and managerial prowess managed to amass an enormous property. He had his castle built in Pardubice, and raised carp in artificially made ponds. According to Satsuma, this is how Vilém II happened to become very rich.

The anecdotal aspect of the historical narrative in this chapter appears to be the author's explanation of the frequency of German names of the medieval Czech castles. As Satsuma says, it used to be a fashion in the thirteenth century Bohemia and Moravia to give castles German names because the nobles believed that the German name would bring good luck and prosperity to the locality and as well as to the noble family. The reader may suspect that

there must have been a more practical reason why the Czech nobility would name their estates in German. The answer that comes to mind is the process of Germanization that was taking place in the Czech kingdom and that was gradually intensifying in the sixteenth century, following the Lutheran religious reforms in Germany.

The aftermath of the Hussite wars was nothing short of disastrous for the Czech lands. During turbulent years of fighting, foreign trade almost ceased to exist and business activities in general nearly reached a point of the total collapse. The economic situation in Prague was especially acute, and was equally reflected in the scholarly decline of the University of Prague. The number of academic disciplines was severely limited, and so was the enrollment of students. The Renaissance, so prolific in other parts of Europe, arrived after a considerable delay in Bohemia and Moravia. The critical momentum of substantial improvement in the quality of life may be delineated by historical events in neighboring Germany. Luther's religious revolt and the consequent commotion in society induced many students and businessmen to return to the Czech lands where they could continue their studies and trade. This is the time of Jiří Melantrich (born Jiřík Černý in Rožárovice) graduated from the University of Prague (1534).

Satsuma devotes almost all of Chapter 6 to the publishing business of Melantrich. In the text there are interspersed also pieces of information about the Renaissance architecture in Prague, about the new Jesuit college established in Olomouc, and about the social function of the Bible in the daily life of the Czech people. As Melantrich and others believed, the Bible could be considered as a useful compendium of moral rules and social norms that were especially needed for the daily life of the masses. Therefore, the text of the Bible was often published and sold especially among the Czech Protestants whose religious convictions demanded that the personal interpretation of the Bible text was of the utmost importance. Moreover, Melantrich also spent a lot of effort on putting out reasonably priced textbooks that the students could use at the university instead of copying professors' lectures. In short, the publishing house of Melantrich contributed in a remarkable way to the intellectually enlightening atmosphere in Bohemia and Moravia.

The end of Chapter 6 deals with the approaching attacks of the Ottoman Turks against the Holy Roman Empire and the defense of the imperial borders by Emperor Ferdinand. The following chapter introduces the age of Rudolf II, the most peculiar and capricious sovereign who settled in Prague, from where he ruled the vast Empire. Despite continuing religious conflicts, Rudolf II allowed in his realm religious freedom that also included the presence of the Jewish worship in the Czech lands. Since he was a fervent collector of the arts and of all sorts of bizarre artifacts, he managed to accumulate a priceless amount of artistic objects that ended up in Vienna during the seventeenth century after the catastrophic Battle of the White Mountain, where the destiny of the future Czech nation was unexpectedly decided.

The beginning of the religious Thirty Years' War, triggered by the political events in Prague (1618-1648), left the Czech lands economically and culturally plundered and in political disarray. The time of enforced Reformation, authorized by the Habsburg rulers and carried out by the Jesuit order, enormously changed the ethnic landscape of the country. Foreign Catholic nobles acquired vast properties, confiscated from the Czech Protestant nobility,

and brought to Bohemia and Moravia not only different languages (especially Spanish, Italian, and German), but also different cultures and moral values. The indigenous population of Bohemia and Moravia retreated into their ethnic enclaves and the linguistically incomprehensible gentry possessed most of the arable land and forests. The peasant had to live the life of a serf. The new Baroque age arrived in the Czech lands. Later Czech historians referred to it as the Dark Age (Temno).

The reader can detect a feeling of empathy on the part of the author who quite openly sides with the Czechs against the foreign invaders. Satsuma mentions the wrong doings of the victorious Habsburg forces, and the patriotic attempts of some Czech Catholic clergy (e.g.,Bohuslav Balbin, the enlightened Czech Jesuit) to save the Czech nation in the turbulent sea of the rapidly progressing Germanization. He again mentions the situation at the University of Prague, and talks about the Edict of Sopron (now in Hungary) by which the Jesuit Clementinum and the University of Prague were combined in order to form the new institution of learning, controled by the Jesuit Order.

Satsuma refers to the period between the seventeenth and nineteenth centuries as the time of Darkness (Temno) in Czech history. Needless to say, this interpretation of the Czech past is not commonly accepted. As a matter of fact, some historical facts portrayed in the book seem to contradict the author's classification of these three hundred years of history as the time of the Czech nation's Darkness. For one thing, the age of Baroque brings to the Czech lands not only new architecture (Italian, Spanish, and German architectual styles), but also the new thought that ultimately culminated in the Age of Enlightenment without which the Czech national awakening would not have been possible. Being indebted to the liberating thought of the Age of Rationality, the Czech intellectuals managed through their modest efforts to further cultivate the Czech language and prepare the people for the national movement in the centuries to come.

Chapter 8 of the book may come as a surprise because it is entitled "Mozart and Prague." Though Mozart's trips to Prague have been thoroughly documented and described, the Austrian composer does not seem to have left any significant imprint on the history of the Czech people. It is more likely that Satsuma, like some Czech propagators of the tourist industry, has adapted the image of Mozart for his own literary purposes. In other words, the Japanese who might want to read the book would find the story about Mozart and Prague appealing, inspiring the reader to visit the city where Mozart had felt so much "at home." Indeed, one can hardly find any sensible reason why Mozart should be included in Satsuma's book except for the fact that the positive image of Mozart casts a positive image upon Prague. One cannot but wonder whether Prague is still in the grip of the old rivalry with Vienna. Since Vienna claims to be Mozart's city, why shouldn't Prague?

For Satsuma, the eighteenth century in the Czech lands represents a combination of the Habsburg enlightened rule and the despotic exploitation of the Czech peasant. In contrast to the nobility's sumptuous residences, the Czech peasants lived in poverty, toiling in their masters' fields as serfs. The discontent of the peasant masses culmintaed in the uprising of 1775 when thousands of men and women gathered in Prague, demanding better living conditions. The initial slow pace of industrialization taking place in Bohemia and Moravia was making land more expensive. The Czech peasants could not

sustain their livelihood. Moreover, the influx of foreign workers and businessmen made the peasants‘ situation even worse, as they kept intruding upon the traditional life of the Czech country people. The Empire kept expanding and thus absorbing different nationalities, languages, traditions, and religions: this is why the issue of the coexistence was debated by the government, and finally formulated in the edict called *Pragmatische Sanction* (Pragmatic Sanction).

Satsuma mentions not only the imperial territorial conquests, but also the defeats. For instance, Maria Theresia lost Silesia (the part of which used to belong to the Czech kingdom) to Prussia. The consequences of the territorial loss had serious repercussions also in Bohemia and Moravia because now the Prussian military presence was in the dangerous proximity of the Czech kingdom's border. However, the events, highlighted in Satsuma's narrative about the eighteenth century in the Czech lands, are immanently connected with the reign of Josef II. By the stretch of imagination, this is also the Age of Mozart and the beginning of the Czech national awakening.

Although some of the political and economic reforms, advocated by Josef II, were welcome and practically implemented in the Czech lands, not all of them had the expected positive impact upon the society. A case in point is the abolition of the monastries. Once the gates of the monastries were closed and the monks and priests dispersed within the borders of the Empire, some schools and hospitals, administered by the Church Orders became short of staff and had to be closed down. The people who worked in the monastries or were employed in the Church schools and hospitals became jobless. Who could rejoice were the nobles and the young bourgeoisie who had been enviously eyeing the Church property for many years as a possible future acquisition. In order to prevent the rich from getting excessively powerful, Josef II imposed taxes on the nobility, and allowed freedom of worship. As a result, the religious liberation brought to the Czech lands many Jews whose business presented new opportunities for the local inhabitants and new taxes for the emperor's costly reforms. And yet, the enlightened policy of Josef II had only one explicit aim, namely the unification of the ethnically manifold empire through the German language. The process of Germanization was thus intensified, and the national aspirations of some Czech patriots suppressed.

Satsuma reminds the reader that the situation was not after all as bad as it may appear. For in 1775, the University of Vienna opened its Czech language studies and a few years later (in 1792), the University of Prague followed suit to the dismay of the German-speaking Prague citizens. However, the Czech language was taught only in connection with the practical purposes of the medical and theological studies at the university so that the graduates could communicate with their Czech clients who could not understand German. On the whole, the trend of *Landespatriotismus*, inaugurated by the social reforms of Josef II could not be stopped. Emulating Vienna for too obvious reasons of political competition, Prague opened in 1783 the Nostitz Theater (Stavovské divadlo), and thus provided the stage for the first world performance of Mozart's *Don Giovanni.* As often repeated, in Prague, Mozart enjoyed a great success. At this point, Satsuma reminds the reader that the Czechs are known to be great musicians, and names Josef Mysliveček (Il divino boemo), Jiří Antonín Benda and his brother František Benda, and Jan Václav A. Stamitz as examples. He also mentions the Mannheim School of Music where the Sta-

mitz family members played such a prominent role. Chapter 8 is thus concluded, and so is the eighteenth century in the Czech lands.

One may only regret that Satsuma does not include in the eighteenth-century narrative a remarkable personality such as Václav Matěj Kramerius, Czech writer, journalist and publisher of the *Prague Post Newspaper* (1789) who had contributed a great deal to the Czech national revival. Neither does he mention Josef Dobrovský, whose language studies had a significant influence on further Czech and Slavic language research. What is almost unpardonable is the fact that Satsuma does not even touch the problem of total devastation of the imperial gallery and library in Prague during the eighties of the enlightened century. Priceless artistic objects (e.g., the torso of Illioneus from the imperial collection of Rudolf II, now exhibited in the Glyptothek Museum in Munich, Germany) were auctioned for a penny and later resold to European monarchs and museums. Something similar happened to the imperial library in Prague, which was partially auctioned in 1789, and partially possessed by the Prague merchants who wrapped their goods in the priceless historical texts. One can wonder to what extent the Habsburg enlightenment might have been destructive for the preservation of the historical past in the Czech lands, all the reforms of Josef II notwithstanding. One problem with Chapter 8 is seen in its very title. Satsuma promises to talk about *Mozart and Prague* as if Mozart had been in some ways instrumental in the shaping the historical development in the Czech lands. The fact is that he was not.

The nineteenth century is covered in Chapter 9. It is the time of the Czech national revival that stands for the prelude to the foundation of the Czech independent statehood. At the beginning of his narrative, Satsuma returns again to the eighteenth century in order to portray the progressing industrialization in the Czech lands. As an example, he talks at length about the Prague Industrial Exhibit that took place in the Clementinum in 1791 at the time of the coronation of Leopold II. He does not fail to point out that it was the first exhibit of this kind in Europe. Satsuma mentions especially the importance of agricultural machines, used for the production of sugar (from sugar beets, *cukrová řepa*), the so-called *Bohemian White Gold.* But it was not the Czechs who controlled the industrial production, as Satsuma reminds the reader. The Germans were the owners and the labor was mostly Czech, though German and Polish workers also filled the ranks of the future proletariat movement.

The political scene in nineteenth-century Bohemia and Moravia is described mostly in terms of insolvable problem of the language issue between the Czech- and German-speaking populations. Although Czech intellectuals made enormous strides in resurrecting the Czech literary language, it took them several more decades before achieving equal status of the Czech and German languages in the society. In their endeavor, they were sometimes helped by the so-called "historical Bohemian and Moravian nobility," representing in the Empire above all the conservative political forces. Satsuma notes that one of the leading families whose members often served in various government positions and tried to solve the Czech-German issue in the monarchy, was the Thun -Hohensteins. For instance, in l845, Joseph Mathias Thun-Hohenstein published in German the pamphlet *Slavismus in Boehmen* (The Slavic Movement in Bohemia). This pamphlet preceded the revolutionary events of 1848.

Satsuma does not mention the 1848 revolution in Prague nor the Sla-

vonic Congress that took place there. He barely mentions the political activity of F.L.Rieger and the political radicalization of the Young Czech Party that demanded for the Czechs the same rights as those the Hungarians received in 1867 when the Dual-Empire (Austria-Hungary) came into existence. Instead, he mentions the coronation of Franz Josef I, who became the new Emperor at the age of eighteen. However, he also describes the opening of the 1891 Industrial Exhibit in Prague where new machinery was to be admired: steam-powered machines, electric gadgets and much more that attracted many foreign visitors. It was also the time when the Slavic identity of the Czechs was emphasized and contrasted with the German foreign element. The Emperor also visited the Exhibit despite his anti-Czech sentiment.

In the chapter nothing is said about Czech literature and music. Nothing is said about the significant role the Czech writers, poets, and musicians played in the process of the national awakening. The music of Dvořák and Smetana is well known in Japan, and so is the novel *Babička* (in Japanese translation: Obaasan; English: Granny) by Božena Němcová. The *fin de siècle* illustrations with Czech and Slavic national themes, authored by Alfons Mucha, have been exhibited in Japan more than twice. In other words, the Japanese public interested in Czech culture is familiar with some examples of the Czech cultural heritage. That is why it is a pity that Satsuma does not devote at least some space in his "tales" to the meritorious function of the Czech literati, musicians, and artists in the emancipation of the Czech nation from the Habsburg yoke.

The final Chapter 10 covers the turbulent events of the twentieth century, particularly as reflected in Czechoslovakia. Satsuma seems to be even more selective in his choice of narrative motifs in this part of his text. He mentions the birth of the new republic (October 28, 1918) and T. G. Masaryk, the first president. But he says almost nothing about Masaryk's life and academic or political achievements. Since Satsuma has so far told his stories mostly about the Czechs, he now tries to elucidate the Slovak dilemma. He talks about the Hungarian suppression and the creation of the literary Slovak language, based on Bernolák's model. Then, Satsuma mentions the economic crisis of 1930 and its impact on the Sudeten Germans (three millions of them remaining in Czechoslovakia) as well as on the Slovaks. The 1938 Munich Agreement is presented without any comment, and the proclamation of the Slovak State in 1939 follows. What might have happened during World War II in the Czech lands is indicated as if in shorthand. At the end of the war, President Eduard Beneš returned to Prague from exile in London, and new laws against the Sudeten Germans collaborating with the Nazi Germans were passed: German industry and business were nationalized, and the property of the Sudeten Germans was confiscated. Then followed the *odsun*, expulsion of the German population from the Czech lands. Satsuma stresses that in 1989, at the time of the Velvet Revolution in Prague, the Czechs apologized to the Germans for the expulsion, and the Germans apologized for the atrocities committed during the war in the German Protectorate of Bohemia and Moravia.

Satsuma then describes the Jewish problem in the Czech lands. He traces the arrival of the first Jewish people from the Mediterranean area approximately in the eleventh century. Since Jews were involved mostly in business and money lending, they were welcome in Prague and other Czech towns. However, they were ostracized in society, and persecuted. Satsuma claims that

in spite of all the difficulties the Jews encountered in the Czech lands, their life there was much better and safer than in Germany or France. For the Czech kings as well as for the Habsburg emperors, the Jews were a convenient source of state revenue because they were heavily taxed so that they might be allowed to practice their religion and keep their schools opened. Josef II was an especially benevolent monarch, and he demanded that Jews and gentiles should have equal rights to engage in business and enter the university. And yet, some Jews decide to convert to the official Roman Catholic Church in order to improve their chances in the advancement of professional positions in the conservative society. This is also why the Jewish population in the Czech lands identified especially with the German language and culture. At the end of his narrative about the Jewish people in Bohemia and Moravia, Satsuma mentions Franz Kafka and Max Brod as the major representatives of the Prague Jews. However, he also points out that such world-famous Jewish personalities as Sigmund Freud and Gustav Mahler were also born in the land that is now called the Czech Republic.

In the last few pages of the book, Satsuma explains to the reader how to study the Czech language in the Czech Republic. At this point, his personal experience becomes useful. He advises those who may want to master the Czech language where to study and how to get scholarships. This pragmatic facet of the book's conclusion suggests that Satsuma's *tales* from the Czech past were composed for and aimed at the young Japanese reader whose interest would be especially in the pre-modern period. This may explain why so little space is devoted to the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, despite the fact they are immanently connected with the present independence of the Czech nation. Be that as it may, Satsuma's books on the Czech historical topics have their indisputable merit in spite of some shortcomings. They are readily available in Japanese bookstores and thus accessible for the Japanese of all age groups who may wish to know more about the small land in Europe, the name of which they have heard pronounced in connection with Smetana, Dvořák, Janáček, Martinů, Mahler, Jan Hus, Komenský, Němcová, Hašek, Čapek, Milan Kundera, Alfons Mucha, František Kupka and many others who have made even the life of some Japanese people more enjoyable and meaningful.

NOTES

1. Tokyo: Chuokoron-shinsha, 2006.

PERSONAL MEMOIR

General of Air Force Vilem Stanovsky

By Eva Stenovska Jonas

This is the tragic story of a hero who spent all his life fighting for a free Czechoslovakia and paid the highest price for it at Arras and Verdun, in Dachau, Mirov, and Leopoldov.

I present a testimony to the absurd, malicious, and inhumane treatment by the socialist state, under the Marxist doctrine, of a heroic patriot who dedicated his life to service to his nation and the ideals and norms set for it by its founder Tomas Garrigue Masaryk, a great admirer of the United States and its constitution.

My father was an aviator. At the onset of World War I, he joined the Czechoslovak Legion in Paris and as a member of the "Rota Nazdar" fought the major battles of the war. Inspired by Milan Rastislav Stefanik, he became an aviator and returned to the front as a pilot. He was twice seriously wounded.

After the war he returned to his homeland, the newly established Czechoslovakia, and became manager of the first military airport and director of two aviation schools. There he trained pilots for the new Czechoslovak Air Force and quickly moved up the ranks. Rated as one of the best Czech pilots of the time, he was selected in 1926 to perform a promotional flight through three continents with the Czechoslovak airplane Aero. This ambitious project nearly ended in disaster when he had to make an emergency landing in Southern Portugal during the flight from Africa. While visiting Portugal three years ago, I traveled to the site of the emergency landing near Lagos. When I saw the rocky shore with numerous grooves and craters, some 20 to 30 feet deep, among which the plane must have landed on its nose, I understood the incredible precision that was necessary, along with a great share of luck. Precision, self discipline and loyalty were his strongest personal qualities. Like most of the Czechs of his generation, he was completely devoted to the new country and its president. When the president died in 1937, he was among those who stood guard by his coffin in the St. Vitus Cathedral. Because of the growing Nazi threat, Czechoslovakia started to mobilize soon thereafter. My father was among the organizers. We hardly saw him at home. We went alone for a summer vacation while he was inspecting defense bunkers along the borders between Czechoslovakia and Germany. Then came Munich, and in March 1939 Hitler marched triumphantly to the Prague Castle and declared a Protectorate over the Czech Lands.

The well prepared Czechoslovak Army was dissolved. The underground was established immediately. Along with generals Vicherek and Kaspar Paty my father organized the exodus of Czech pilots through Poland to Britain, in the hope that they would join the Royal Air Force. He was planning to follow them later. However, the Gestapo arrested him in December 1939 and he was held in their prisons and the concentration camp Dachau, for the rest of the war.

Those who did not get involved in the resistance, and especially those who collaborated with the Nazis, lived much more comfortably.

After the war, liberated Czechoslovakia returned to a quasi-

democracy. The well prepared KGB organized the Czech communists who were already represented in the government. In February 1948, a coup was organized and Czechoslovakia became one of the most devoted satellites of the USSR for the next 40 years. My father was devastated, furious and scared. He refused to accept the changes brought by the Communist society. He refused to be called "comrade" and insisted on being called by his title. He refused to join any pro-Soviet organizations. He was then a General of the Air Force, but also the Secretary of Civil Aviation. The Communists would have liked to dismiss him, or better arrest him, but they needed his special expertise. They decided to watch him by stationing a Secret Service car with three men next to our house day and night. They would follow him wherever he went. When we went on vacation, skiing, they would stay in the room next door and eat at the neighboring table in the resort. He was extremely frustrated, scared and was planning to leave the country. His surveillance started immediately in 1948 and in fact the first report on his pro-Western attitude was documented already in November 1947, *i.e.* well before the Coup, as I found out from the files in the Archives of the State Security only three years ago.

First he planned to use a small plane and leave only with the family, but he hesitated to take that route because it would have meant landing just behind the border in Germany and he knew that a long period of uncertainty in refugee camps would follow. He calculated that, because of his prominent role in aviation, he would have an opportunity to find someone among the Czech pilots, most of whom were trained by him in the aviation school, who would be able to escape with us to the West. Making contacts with those pilots was extremely dangerous and difficult. And many of the pilots, especially those who fought in the Royal Air Force during the war, had been fired or imprisoned and some disappeared without a trace. After their dismissal from the Air Force as "undesirable Western elements" he managed to hire several of them for the Airlines, claiming that there were no other well trained pilots available.

Having barely recovered from the concentration camp hardships and contemplating my mother's fragile nervous system, he hesitated to take her into potentially more stressful conditions. She suffered from anxiety and a breakdown when she witnessed the horrific treatment of many of her friends by the Communist authorities, the murder of Jan Masaryk and the suicide attempt of Prokop Drtina. She died of undiagnosed pneumonia 6 months after the coup. Her unexpected death delayed our plans.

Despite the Secret Service surveillance, we tried to leave the country several times, but strange coincidences repeatedly prevented our escape.

"The tail," as he called the three men who were stationed in front of our house, made him increasingly more scared. He kept his planning activities very secret, even from my brother and especially from me. But I knew he was pursuing his plan carefully. My brother was soon expelled from the Law School and in the spring of 1949, after having participated in an anti-Communist "counter revolution"organized by university students and the Boy Scouts, he was imprisoned. My father was trying to have him released by contacting several of his "colleagues" from Dachau – then prominent Communist officials. No one was willing or able to help except a man who was then the Chief of Police and a former pilot. In exchange for Jan's release he demanded a signature of cooperation. After months of secret preparation our escape was almost ready. Faced with an unthinkable choice, *i.e.* leaving his only son in

prison and leaving the country only with me to save his life, or sign a promise of cooperation, in desperation and after hesitation my father agreed to sign. I am sure that no cooperation materialized. He knew we would be leaving the country soon. His name was not included in any of the lists of "cooperators," unlike that of Jan, who was forced into cooperation after our father's arrest in 1952 and provided damaging testimony against his father and his only sister. Our escapes took long preparations and constant readiness. We each had a small luggage packed with the most essential things and documents. The bag traveled with me to our summer cottage at Stankovsky Lake immediately after my brother's release. When I returned to school in the fall the bag would be permanently deposited with a family friend in Stepanska 16. Then, after being notified I would go there directly from school, take my bag and travel to wherever I would be told.

During one such escape, which later became the most serious offense during his trial, we were supposed to travel separately to Brandys nad Labem, a small town east of Prague. I would go by bus; my brother would travel by train and my father by car, after he would successfully shed off his "tail." To achieve that he would arrange several appointments in the high rise buildings with more than one exit, and would pick up our car at a safe place. Then he would drive to Brandys to a large open field, where a plane piloted by his co-conspirator, Mr. Kautsky, was supposed to land and pick us all up. There were other people in the group, namely the family of Chancellor Smutny. However, before my father left one of his scheduled appointments, he contacted Mr Kautsky who told him that the escape had to be cancelled. He stated technical reasons: the navigator of the plane could not come because he was called to be interrogated by the Secret Service. After informing Chancellor Smutny, my father drove to Brandys, where I was waiting at a friend's house not far from the field. Disillusioned and scared, we returned home to Prague. Three days later we heard in the news that a "pirate," Mr. Kautsky, escaped to the West with our plane and landed in Germany. We were betrayed and left behind and in increasing danger. My father was blamed for the escape because he should have fired all unreliable pilots and dismissed Mr. Kautsky.

He systematically looked for other safe opportunities, but they became scarcer every month as more Western pilots were fired or imprisoned. The surveillance continued. He would meet with his potential conspirators in places where the Secret Service could not follow him, like his doctor's office.

Finally another possibility for escape was ready. Arranged with the help of the British Ambassador, Mr. Skelton, it was planned for Christmas Eve 1950, in hope that the "tail" would go home to celebrate the holiday. Indeed it looked OK all afternoon, because the car with the three agents was not standing next to our house as usual. We had our small luggage ready in the garage and were working on preparations for our Christmas dinner. The plan was that we would leave the garage door slightly open and a bypassing car driven by the pilot would stop; he would ring the bell three times, and we would come down and leave with him for the closest field South of Prague, where a plane would wait and take us to the West. Half an hour before the planned pickup time, after I already opened the garage door, the doorbell rang -- but only once. My father was resting on a sofa. He became nervous and asked me to go down and find out who was at the garden gate. When I came to the gate, a man in a long trench coat showed me his ID, the State Security, and asked to see a woman

who had lived in the basement of our house since the war, when she and her mother lost their apartment during an air raid. I promised to find out and later reported that she was not at home.

When I returned to the house and reported it to my father, he said that he could not believe that the State Security would be looking for a common secretary and that it was only a plot, to gain access to the house. He was in shock and could not even get up. He asked me to go down and close the garage door. The pilot knew that he could stop and pick us up only if the garage door were open. If something went wrong on our end, the door would remain closed. And so the last chance that we would escape to the West by plane passed by.

A close friend from Dachau, a young lawyer from Brno, Mr. Milos Vitek, who testified at the Nurenberg Trials after the war, conspired with my father's help in the first escape of three airplanes which landed in Erlangen in 1948. From time to time my father kept in touch with his mother and sister, the pediatrician Sylva Vitkova.

During one of those encounters he told her about the "tail" and his fears that a case was being prepared against him by blaming him for the repeated escape to the West by pilots under his supervision. He feared that Kautsky, who betrayed him, would not be careful and would talk about the planned escape of our family.

Sylva later contacted him and offered help with a safe escape. She introduced him to Prof. Zdenek Kleisner, who then introduced him to agent Pavel, whom they both said was an agent from the West. Only much later we found out that Kleisner was romantically involved with her and used her to get in touch with "elements to be destroyed." Pavel was an undercover agent of the State Security but had to be somehow connected to Radio Free Europe. My father was extremely careful and before he agreed to work on the preparations of our escape with him, he requested that Radio Free Europe would broadcast a certain message on a given day at an exact time. The message was broadcasted exactly as he requested.

From then on he met repeatedly with Pavel while as we now know from the Archives of the States Security all those meetings were registered by the Secret Service. In October 1952 the preparations were completed.

We were supposed to cross the border near Nyrsko in Southern Bohemia on three consecutive days. My father was supposed to arrive there on October 24, my brother on the 25th and my husband and I on the 26th. We were all supposed to be met there by an agent, who would guide us across the border.

On the 24th my father took the train to Nyrsko. The agents were already traveling with him on the train and when he got off, he was immediately arrested, brought back to Prague and jailed. On the same day around midnight we were awakened in our home by about a dozen mob-like strangers who gained entry with my father's keys and walked around the house making lists of possessions to be confiscated. The bizarre scene did not somehow register with me until much later. I was only able to comprehend that clearly something went wrong and that my father was in the hands of the State Security machinery and that his life was in ultimate danger. They ordered us to get dressed and took us to their Headquarters at Bartolomejska to be interrogated.

I pledged to myself that I would under no circumstance admit to our plans to

leave the country, because that could only increase my father's peril.

During the following two days and nights I was screamed at and had to lie on a wooden board on my back while a sharp light was aimed at my eyes all the time. Repeatedly I would be interrogated. My brother and my husband were kept in neighboring cells and interrogated as well. A sad fact which later caused my father a lot of pain, and contributed decisively to the evidence against him was that my brother did not withstand the pressure. He broke down and confessed to our repeated attempts to escape to the West. The only thing I cared about was my father's fate and the fact that he ended up this way because of us. In earlier years, he could have just stayed safely in the West when on official trips. But it never even crossed his mind to abandon his children, and therefore he came back repeatedly. His supervisors knew that and therefore authorized his trips while making sure that my brother and I would be watched, while he was abroad. There were many others who abandoned their families under such circumstances.

We were let go and a long period of preparation for his trial started. We did not know what went wrong when he was arrested during his escape and felt that someone must have betrayed him.

A few weeks later I decided that the only way to find out might be by contacting Sylva. One day I took a train to Brno, about 150 miles east of Prague. I went to the residence of her mother, the only address I knew. The old lady was very friendly and told me to come back in the evening. When I came back I was told that Sylva would meet me only at the train station an hour later. When we met I asked her what went wrong. She said that she was astonished to find out that my father was captured during the escape and said she had no idea who could have betrayed him. Yet I had a strange feeling that she knew much more. Then she said that she would like to help me and my husband to leave the country. That made me very angry and I told her that I was not planning to go anywhere because I had to stay in the country and help my father. I left immediately. That was the last time I saw her. I returned to Prague with a strong feeling that she and her friend Mr. Kleisner played a major role in what looked more and more like a staged escape. My suspicion proved valid when neither she nor Kleisner appeared as witnesses at the trial. Among the documents which I found three years ago at the Archives of the Secret Service was an "operational file" memorandum to the effect that her identity should not be revealed because of her value in luring other dangerous elements into "criminal activity" in order that they could be easily dealt with. In her file there were three other cases where she served as the "trustworthy contact." Two of them were medical doctors, her colleagues from Brno.

During the following eighteen months my father was kept at Pankrac, Ruzyne and Kapucinska -- the three Prague jails where brutal interrogations of "enemies of the state" took place. The Chief Prosecutor and interrogator wrote repeatedly in his reports and comments about his lack of cooperation and stubbornness.

Incidentally, the Prosecutor Mr. Alois Drevikovsky was also the Chief Prosecutor in the Trial of Dr. Milada Horakova, who was the first woman executed by a "judicial murder" in modern European history.

False witnesses, along with those already sentenced and jailed, were produced and interrogations where my father would have to stand for 48 hours until he collapsed and even after that the beastly famous Dr Sommer in Ruzyne

examined him and declared that the interrogations could continue. Eventually he confessed to whatever they already knew from testimony of witnesses, including my brother's.

During the time when he was at Pankrac I would prepare packages of food and bring them every week to the Police headquarters. They accepted them, yet later I found out that he never received any of them.

Sylva's mother begged me repeatedly to never tell Milos about his sister's involvement in my father's arrest, claiming that it would have broken his heart. She would deny it for a long time herself, later blaming only Kleisner for everything. Much later, when confronted with the facts by my father, she wrote heart-breaking letters of apology.

June 1954 the main trial took place at the High Military Court. The courtroom was dark, full of strange people, and in the center stood my father. He was pale, motionless and stared in front of him. He never looked in the direction where we were standing. I did not recognize any of the witnesses. In fact all the witnesses who logically should have been there -- *i.e.* Sylva, Kleisner, agent Pavel, my brother and I with my husband -- were excluded. We were there only as observers. We thought that we were excluded as not important elements. But from the operational files of the trial I now know that the decision to keep Sylva "uncovered" along with my brother's cooperation made it impossible to present us as witnesses and therefore we were spared prosecution which might have brought a jail term of two to three years.

From the record of the trial I read that the judge declared the trial closed to the public. Evidently I had to leave and therefore do not remember anything further. Later, outside the courtroom Dr. Tureckova , the ex oficio lawyer, informed me that despite being sentenced for treason which should have brought a death sentence, the sentence was reduced to 17 years, because of my father's poor health resulting from his detention in Dachau during the war.

Soon after the trial my father was sent to Mirov, a prison in Moravia. About three months later we were granted a 1/2 hour visit, the only time that we would be allowed to see him

My brother worked as a truck driver and took me and my little daughter Olinka along to Mirov. After registration we were taken to a waiting room with a small, blocked window in one wall. After a while the window was opened and behind stood our father. We were not allowed to go close. We greeted him and he looked at us as if he could not recognize us. We talked to him, but he only stared at us. I showed him Olinka, his first grandchild, but he did not react. Only after about twenty minutes he started to talk and ask questions. But soon thereafter the visit was over, and the guard took him away.

It was all so senseless and unreal.

His uncompromising attitude and unwillingness to cooperate with the interrogators, guards and officials of the prisons repeatedly caused him more hardship and punishment.

In the high security prison in Kapucinska, where he was held before the trial, he managed to persuade a somewhat friendly guard to take out messages for me and another prisoner, Mr. John, a witness at his trial. This subversion was discovered several months after the trial and resulted in new, repeated interrogations and severe punishment.

When serving his sentence at Mirov, he wrote a letter to President

Antonin Zapotocky, a "colleague" from Dachau, complaining about the inhumane and brutal treatment he was receiving at these detention facilities and stated that he received better treatment by the Nazis than by the executors of "socialist justice." He felt terrible pain that members of his own nation, for which he sacrificed so much of his life during the two world wars, treated him and those like him as criminals.

That again caused him even more hardship.

During those years my brother and I were treated like black sheep, not allowed to study or travel, and we could only work in substandard jobs.

He was released in 1960 when the general amnesty of all political prisoners took place.

As part of his sentence, his citizenship was annulled, his property confiscated and his pension suspended. He was eligible for a minimum "social security benefit" totaling 300 crowns a month. With his health seriously impaired from long imprisonment, the only job he could get was manual employment in a small workshop which manufactured wooden pegs.

Over the next decade he repeatedly challenged his sentence in courts and gradually received his citizen's rights and his original pension. Finally he initiated a challenge to his entire case by claiming that it was an entrapment orchestrated by the Secret Service.

When my husband and I decided to leave the country in 1968 for the sake and better future for our children, I tried to persuade my father to join us in exile. He refused, stating that he had to finish his legal challenge to the state, that he felt too old and that he wanted to remain in the country and protect our family house for my children, in case we would like to come back. Later, he was never allowed to visit us in the US.

The legal proceedings took three more years and became more complicated as the regime reversed into a "normalized" socialist state. But in June 1972, the court decision read that he had been sentenced and imprisoned illegally, and was awarded compensation -- about $4 for each day of lost freedom. He was already very ill and had no time left to use the money.

He died a month later, yet he no doubt died with great satisfaction that he had achieved his goal.

His funeral was a quiet demonstration of friends, mostly ex-convicts, as well as other undesirable elements. No Czech official attended. Only the French Ambassador, Mr. Vimont, was present to participate in the farewell to one of the handful of the Czech bearers of the Order of the Commandeur de la Legion d'Honeur (besides the two Presidents Masaryk and Benes).

During my first visit to Prague after the Velvet Revolution, I was allowed to visit our house for 15 minutes and received my father's documents, which enabled me to write this story. I also found out from his lawyer that the annulment of the "criminal record" never took place and requested that it would be submitted to the highest military court in this historic city Tabor, where we are meeting now. The decision of the court, which stated full annulment on November 24, 1992, describes clearly all the tragic events – the surveillance since 1948, his entrapment and then endless interrogations and repeated punishment.

As testimony in one of the earlier challenges, which my father initiated, dated October 13, 1971 the chief interrogator Mr. Alois Drevikovsky stated:

> I was handling the more serious cases and have to state that the criminals were usually stubborn. I was the oldest and most experienced among the interrogators … General Stanovsky behaved stubbornly and posed himself as an enemy of the interrogators. He refused to answer questions and ignored the interrogation process. It is true that we executed night interrogations. I also admit that when Stanovsky was occasionally falling asleep, I would sharpen my voice. I also placed a glass of water on my desk to be able to pour water on him, in case he would fall asleep. But I never used it.

It is in sharp contrast to how my father described his interrogations -- as stated earlier.

In the same paragraph Drevikovsky stated: "My interrogation tactics were always humane. I was able to approach people and in that way was successful. With regards to Eva Stanovska -- we could not force her in any way into confession -- she is the kin of General Stanovsky." This could have been a fitting introduction to my presentation today, but I am not sure how many people in the audience would have known then who was Mr. Drevikovsky, the Chief Prosecutor of the brutal early fifties.

President Vaclav Havel decorated Vilem Stanovsky with the Order of the White Lion in memoriam in 2000. His other orders and medals are listed in numerous publications, most recently in Otto Janka, General Stanovsky letec a gentleman.[1]

In a way I am grateful that my father is not around today because I know how desperate, disillusioned and furious he would be at the fact that the KSC still exists twenty years after the "end of the Communist era." As I described earlier, he provided testimony that the Communist regime was more inhumane than the Nazi one.

It took me many years to gain enough strength and courage to put together this testimony. And only after a visit to the Archives of the Secret Service three years ago I could connect all the bizarre facts. I know a friend (and there are most likely others) who is still in so much pain, after her father's life had been destroyed by the "socialist justice" that when I encouraged her to go to the Archives of the Secret Service she told me that she had no strength to do so and just wanted to forget.

NOTES

1. Otto Janka, *General Stanovský: letec a gentleman* (Prague: Militia, 1997). Also see *Vilém Stanovský: Na českém letadle ve světě* (Prague: F. Topič, 1927. Many other sources can be found on the Internet.

INTERVIEW

Interview with Professor Andrew B. Wachtel, Editor of Writers for an Unbound Europe

By Virginia Parobek

By the time you are reading this, Professor Andrew Wachtel will have officially been sworn in as the new president of the American University of Central Asia in Bishkek, Kyrgyzstan. Previous to this appointment however, he was a fixture of sorts in the Slavic languages and literatures department at Northwestern University in Illinois. A wearer of many hats, Wachtel was Dean of the Graduate School at NWU since 2004 and he used to direct the Center for Comparative and International Studies among many other university appointments.

He studied history and literature as an undergraduate at Harvard and received his graduate and post-graduate degrees from UC-Berkeley. Fluent in Russian, French, as well as the South Slavic languages, Wachtel has reading capabilities in many others. He is an unusual Slavic scholar in that he has two specialties: Russian and South Slavic languages and literatures. His peers at NWU feel he has been central in the development of the Slavic department into one of the very strongest in the nation.

A prolific writer, he has authored or edited over ten books and over fifty articles on Slavic titles, with more forthcoming. For his work in areas related to US foreign policy, he was elected to the NY-based Council on Foreign Relations in 2001.

Andrew Wachtel has served as the editor of WUE since its inception in 1991. WUE, a series run by the NWU press which publishes English translations of contemporary eastern European works, has put dozens of important literary texts from middle-european writers into Western hands, a great service for the struggling writers of former communist countries. "As editor, I endeavor to identify and publish the most interesting contemporary poetry and prose from central and eastern Europe." The collapse of communism, however, has more or less diminished Western interest in literature from that area: "For in the absence of political relevance, neither reader nor publishers find any reason to be concerned with their work."

However, Writers for an Unbound Europe marches on and plans for new titles are in the works. Professor Wachtel will keep his NWU faculty appointment, as well as the editorship of WUE.

The following short interview was conducted online with last-minute details confirmed over libations at the Ritz-Carlton Hotel in downtown Chicago in July 2010. Hear what Andrew Wachtel has to say about such Czech and Slovak literary luminaries as Bohumil Hrabal, Pavel Vilikovsky and Petra Hulova.

VP. Have you been with UE since its inception in 1991?

AW. I was the founding editor of the series, the first books of which were published in 1993, I believe. Prior to that Northwestern University Press had al-

ready published a number of authors from Central Europe, but there was no coherent series and, to my knowledge, all the books came from Hungary, Czechoslovakia (actually they were all Czech), and Poland.

VP. What have you yourself translated for the UE series?

AW. I translated The Voice, a book of poetry by a wonderful Russian poet named Anzhelina Polonskaya, which came out in 2004, The Second Book by the young Bosnian prose writer Muharem Bazdulj (I was the co-translator of this volume, along with Nikola Petković and Oleg Andrić), which we published in 2005, and in 2009 my translations of short stories by the great Slovenian prose writer Drago Jančar came out in the series under the title The Prophecy and Other Stories.

VP. How many current titles are there and from how many countries (the website gives about 50 titles from 22 countries)?

AW. I have not counted recently, but there are indeed more than 50 titles, although a few are no longer available (the rights having reverted to the authors). As for countries, we have published writing from every country in Eastern Europe with the exceptions of Belarus, Moldova, and Latvia. And I believe that in one of our anthologies (the one devoted to women's writing) there are stories by writers from those countries as well (though maybe not Belarus).

VP. Do you have a favorite project from your years with UE?

AW. A number of them. I was very proud to commission and publish the translation of Meša Selimović's novel *Death and the Dervish*, which has also turned into our all-time best seller (more than 5000 copies since its publication). In general, though, I have been happiest about those projects that have afforded the possibility of allowing young writers to have their first publication in English—these include Bazdulj, already mentioned above, Goce Smilevski from Macedonia, and Petra Hulova, all of whom were under 30 when we published their books and all of whom can, to some extent with our help, look forward to big literary careers.

VP. Do you have any favorite CZ or SK writers?

AW. Of the classic Czechs, my favorite is Hrabal. That is why I was thrilled to publish the first volume of his late autobiographical trilogy, *In-House Weddings* in the truly brilliant translation of Tony Liman. The next volume of the trilogy should come out later this year, and we look forward to bringing out the final one when Tony is finished translating it, probably sometime in 2012. Among younger writers and more recent works, I like Jachim Topol's *Sister* a great deal. And of course I think that Hulova's book that we recently published is spectacular.

VP. What was it like to work with (Slovak) Pavel Vilikovsky on his *Ever Green Is...*

AW. I did not work directly with Vilikovsky [see next question below], though I did get the chance to meet him when I was in Slovakia subsequent to the publication of his book. I found him to be a bit reserved, but in the end we had a nice substantive conversation.

VP. How do you go about selecting translators? For instance, how did Charles Sabatos (who did a nice job) get selected to translate *Ever Green Is...*

AW. As we do not have enough money to pay translators a reasonable fee, it is usually the case that translators come to us with projects on which they are working and which they would like to place. Oftentimes, our willingness to publish makes it easier for them to get translation grants from either the countries of origin of the books or the NEH. By now, I know many of the best translators and sometimes I can get them to be willing to work on projects for us if they feel that the projects are worthwhile. In the case of Sabatos, he approached us and asked whether we would be interested. When I saw what a great job he was doing (I particularly loved the use of English and American to mimic the interplay of Czech and Slovak in the original), we were enthusiastic and asked him to submit the translation, which he did. Oftentimes, we get graduate students who have fallen in love with the work of a particular author and for whom translation is paying a debt (metaphorically, I hope) to someone whose work has inspired them.

VP. Has the collapse of communism dulled Western interest in Eastern European literature?

AW. For sure. During the Cold War era, East European literature was perceived, rightly or wrongly, as having political valence. This made it attractive to readers and hence to publishers. Now, these books have to sell purely on their own merits, and most publishing houses are not willing to take a chance on that. Readers, for their part, can pick and choose from literature from any part of the world, and they have no particular reason anymore to look at/for literature from Eastern Europe.

VP. How did you first hear of Petra Hulova and how did you select Alex Zucker as translator?

AW. One of my Czech friends and books scouts (I have them in many countries), told me that Hulova was a writer to watch. We contacted her directly and she referred us to her agent (a Dutchman by the name of Edgar de Bruin). He was willing to sell us the rights if we could find a translator. I knew of Alex Zucker's work from his translation of Topol and we contacted him to see whether he might be interested. As it happened, he could get a Czech grant to

cover his work, so everything worked out perfectly.

VP. Do you feel that post-communist Eastern European lit confronts the new realities they face 20 years later?

AW. I am not sure that this is a meaningful question because I don't think that there is a single set of "new realities." Many literary works confront new realities of a variety of kinds. Let's take the Hulova novel. On the surface, it pretty clearly does not confront any specific East European new reality since the whole thing takes place in Mongolia. And yet, a new reality is that in a globalized world, Mongolia and exists and one might want to think about whether and to what extent the problems of gender and development in Mongolia have anything to do with similar problems in Eastern Europe (assuming that you think, as I do, that the novel is really about Mongolia; that is, the characters are not Czechs in disguise). Of course, other writers confront more obvious realities, including issues of memory, history, and so forth. Still others attempt to describe contemporary social reality, while many just write what they want without worrying about such things. All of those are healthy trends in a part of the world where literature was once expected to exist only as a commentary on immediate reality (pro or contra).

VP. What titles lie ahead for UE?

AW. Hard to say for the long term as it is unclear how much longer the series can last. The books really don't sell well enough to justify their existence and a new press director is being appointed as we speak. That person will decide whether to put more resources into the series (both in terms of marketing the books and looking more aggressively for grant support to help make it pay) or he/she will kill it. In the short-term, we have the other two volumes of the Hrabal on tap, a wonderful novel by the late great Estonian writer Jaan Kross, and an excellent novel called *Ruta Tannenbaum* by the Bosnian/Croatian Miljenko Jergović. Beyond that, we'll see.

BOOK REVIEWS

Peter Hruby. *Dangerous Dreamers: The Australian Anti – democratic Left and Czechoslovak Agents.* New York and Bloomington: Universe, Inc., 2010. 387 pp. ISBN-1-4401-7499-5.

Professor Peter Hruby's *Dangerous Dreamers* is an important work for it highlights communist subversion in Australia from 1945 to the fall of international communism in 1989. He exposes the infiltration of Soviet and Czechoslovak agents and the collusion of writers, academics, intellectuals, unionists and journalists in the attempts to subvert democratic freedoms in Australia.

The author, a native of Czechoslovakia, has lived in exile for many years while lecturing in universities, studying and writing on totalitarianism. He draws from a vast repository of information, including Czechoslovak state

security archives, Australian Security Intelligence Organization and U.S. security agencies.

I grew up in the Australian post-war period when Communist cells dominated the coal mining, waterfront and railways unions. In 1949, I remember listening with my family to the news about the coalminers strike. The miners' leaders were trying to incite a Marxist revolution across Australia. This led to Labor Prime Minister Ben Chifley to intervene with the use of the military, an action that remains unprecedented in Australian political history to this day. It was a severe interim setback for the communists.

The author tells how the Soviet bloc set up a variety of reciprocal tours for artists, writers, union leaders, etc., The idea was to spread what Phillip Roth called "a poesy of totalitarianism," songs of brotherly love, peace, justice and a better tomorrow under international communism. I attended a meeting of the Fabian Society in the 1950's. Among the guests were Soviet diplomats, left wing Indonesian students and union officials. The gathering ended in an alcoholic stupor. On a lighter *note*, when one union official was offered a study trip to Moscow, he declined, saying that he heard that the cold would "freeze the balls off a brass monkey" and he could not understand the language with "all those f-ng squares and triangles"!

According to Professor Hruby, no one is certain what caused the failure of communism in Australia. It was possibly due to the inaction of the communists themselves at the crucial time. The political orientation of the labor movement was a key issue. After World War II, some eighty per cent of Australian workers belonged to an association or a union; however, most of these organizations were moderate or somewhat right wing. This combined with growing prosperity of the country became a moderating influence. The surveillance methods of intelligence services also had improved. No doubt the surge of immigrants from Eastern European countries with horror stories to relate, such as the invasions of Hungary and Czechoslovakia, had also played a role. Of course, the Australian psyche of resentment of authority and the love of personal freedom needs to be taken into consideration. Perhaps, the old adage, "better to play with the devil you know, than the devil you don't," explains the communists' failure.

Professor Hruby's book is certainly one the most comprehensive studies of communism in Australia. It will be a valuable asset for researchers and students of Australian history and politics for years to come.

Anthony C. Slaughter

Mitchell A. Orenstein, Stephen Bloom and Nicole Lindstrom, eds. *Transnational Actors in Central and East European Transitions.* Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburg Press, 2008. 260 pp. ISBN 13:978-0-8229-5994-6.

During the past two decades, scholars in transition studies have described and analyzed the profound transformation of multiple states in Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union. These studies have ranged from the pedestrian to the perceptive, but even the best do not claim that they have exhausted all the analytical possibilities. Consequently new approaches can only be welcomed, provided that they are rigorous, coherent and comprehensive. Granted that these are difficult criteria, but they are necessary if something meaningful is to be added to the large existing literature. A collective work may even have some advantages here since it can bring multiple dimensions and wide ranging skills to a work. This task is however made more difficult by the risk that too often such collections might be disjointed and lack the discipline of a unifying theme.

This work avoids many of the traps and offers considerable promise in its attempt to meld theory and empirical study. It does have a unifying theme: namely, the claim that in the case of the post Communist states there is a quadruple transition where in the fourth area transnational actors have exuded a powerful influence in such transitions. It is the collective contention of the editors and contributors that transitional actors turned out to be "the dark matter that held the various aspects of the transition together." They further contend that it was also important to appreciate the integration of newly independent states to an international system of complex interdependence.

What exactly are these important transnational actors? The editors and the contributors wisely choose a broad definition that includes any intergovernmental organizations, (international) nongovernmental organizations, foundations, state bodies, associations, and private enterprises, as long as they act on policies in a transnational space. Thus, we have everything from the International Monetary Fund all the way to controversial foundations like the Soros. The various authors do make efforts to ensure that they are not merely throwing everything into the proverbial analytic soup for that would diminish the necessary rigor of analysis. The standard is that the transnational actors need to be relevant to the process and transnational state.

Though the various contributors come with different approaches and perspectives to the task, there is a tendency throughout much of this work to tweak skeptically the realist assessment and to invest considerable hope in constructivist analysis. It is, of course, perfectly acceptable to tweak skeptically any approach, and realists are certainly used to this. It is another matter, however, to suggest that realism and realists are irrevocably wedded to a state-centric, post-Wesphalia world where non-state actors are irrelevant or at best of little influence. This is inaccurate and unhelpful. Besides are we speaking of Hans Morgenthau, Raymond Aron, Robert Strausz-Hupé or some other specific realist or neo-realist?

In *Transnational Actors in Central and East European Transitions.,* there is moreover too little skepticism at times when it comes to the constructivist approach. Nicole Lindstrom seems to put considerable faith in the ideational constructivist claims without paying sufficient heed to the limitations of such an approach. At times, we also see some excess of jargon as in the

case of the Vachubova chapter, which otherwise does contain much interesting material. Some other chapters, such as David Ost's on Poland's national reactions to transnational pressure, are very solid and acutely perceptive.

Overall this is a worthwhile contribution to the literature. Though perceptive analysts have recognized that transnational actors have always exerted influence on post-communist transitions, this collective work's emphasis on a "quadruple transition" challenges us to think more carefully and probatively about such actors. Therefore, this book should considerably benefit scholars, students and policy makers who are interested in transition studies.

Aurel Braun

Mary Heimann, *Czechoslovakia: The State That Failed*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2009. XXII & 406 pp. ISBN 978-0-300-14147-4.

Mary Heimann became interested in Czechoslovakia while teaching a course on twentieth century international relations. Educated at Vassar College and at Oxford University, Heimann, who is married to a Czech, has acquired British citizenship and teaches at Strathclyde University in Scotland. In preparation for writing *Czechoslovakia: The State that Failed*, she learned Czech and spent two years in her target country doing archival research.

Several German and American reviewers have resolutely rebuked Heimann's audacious and revisionist contention that the Czechoslovak state had to fail. On the blurb of the book, her publisher, Yale University Press, claims that this work "is the definitive political history of Czechoslovakia." The work has provoked an almost unanimous outcry from offended Czechs.

My first impressions of *Czechoslovakia: The State that Failed* were very positive. Introductory pages of information about place names and their pronunciation in various languages seemed to attest to Heimann's attempt to study seriously and objectively the complicated situation of several often competing countries and nationalities in the same territory. However, my disappointment with her book began soon enough.

The main problem of the book, as I see it, lies in Mary Heimann's treatment of the concepts, nationality and nation. For her, they are something mythical or mystical based on a shared language and culture. She considers them deeply malevolent. Even the term nation is almost always written with an inverted single comma as 'nation.' According to Heimann, "the unreformed, unrepentant force in the region" (324) is not communism, but nationalism, which "ended in the creation, and twice in the destruction, of a state called Czechoslovakia. It also led its peoples into authoritarianism, demagoguery and created millions unnecessary suffering. It is time to abandon the Whig interpretation of Czechoslovak history" (324).

Czechoslovakia: The State that Failed aims to disprove the generally held contention that Czechoslovakia, a country with deeply held democratic beliefs, was twice betrayed: in 1938 and 1968. Heimann states:

> The present work tells a different story, one in which Czech and Slovak chauvinism is held to have been among the principal causes of the instability that led to the Munich Crisis in 1938; made the persecution of Jews and Gypsies not only possible but energetic; lost the country to Stalin's bigots; and turned it into one of the most hard line states of the Eastern bloc for all but the briefest interlude in the 1960s….The case of Czechoslovakia…shows how nationalism, even in a democratic country , could move seamlessly from democracy through Fascism to Socialism, Communism and back again. Above all, it offers a warning as to how easily a nationalistic outlook—together with belonging to a victim country—can lead perfectly ordinary, decent people from liberal democracy to the police state. (xx-xxi)

The author demonstrates an imperfect grasp of the history of Central Europe in general and the Czech and Slovak lands in particular. She asserts that:

> Czechoslovakia/Czecho-Slovakia had been brought into existence in 1918 because self-appointed spokesmen for a mystical entity calling itself the 'Czech' (and later the 'Czecho-Slovak') nation had spent the First World War exploiting fears and fanning hatred of an equally vaguely defined group known as 'the Germans'…. (322)

In her book, Heimann skews the history of the Czechoslovak state by taking it out of its historical and international context and by describing it with great selectivity and hyperbole.

The creation of Czechoslovakia is part and parcel of the national awakening in central Europe, a potent force in the continent's 19th and early 20th century history. The author also does not sufficiently take into account the desire of the victors of World War I to break up the empires of the vanquished. The same disregard for international factors is present in her assessment of the infamous 1938 Munich conference, which she describes thus: "the international community--represented by Germany, Italy, France and Britain – had intervened … to break Czech domination of the multinational state" (50). Heimann does not consider Hitler's aggressive designs central to this debacle.

Nazi Germany, she claims, had no influence on the post-Munich the second Czechoslovak Republic. According to Heimann, this government acting independently in little less than one half year managed to turn Czechoslovakia into "a frankly authoritarian state" (87). Writing about President Emil Hácha's meeting with Hitler on March 15,1939, the author states: "Contrary to the impressions given by most accounts that the meeting was intended to belittle and humiliate Hácha…the president was received with full honours (106)." For this extraordinary assertion, she cite one source, a secondary one at that, and its author is "Anon.," i.e., "anonymous." Hitler, as as well known, made the Czechoslovak delegation wait until midnight and then threatened them with national annihilation if Hácha did not sign the agreement, which placed Bohemia and Moravia under the protection of the Reich. For this action, Heimann places Hácha among the "most prominent German and Czech war criminals" (343). Of the Slovak Republic and the Protectorate, Heimann writes as if they both had been truly independent states and had no record of underground activities:

> Despite the fact that both polities were closely allied to Nazi Germany, at the war's end Czechoslovakia was not only resurrected, but counted on the side of the victorious Allies. To have pulled off such a stunt for the second time within a generation was a remarkable achievement…(111)

The author blames post-World War II communist fate of Czechoslovakia on its leaders' nationalism: "But unlike other Soviet satellites of Central and Eastern Europe," she writes, "the Czechoslovak 'People's' Democracy was neither forced to go communist nor to ally itself with the Soviet Union. It did both voluntarily, acting in what looked to the political leadership of the day

to be national self-interest" (150). Here again Heimann chooses not to evaluate contextual factors, such as the Soviet pressures and subversion. Nor does she consider relevant the existence of genuine differences among the politicians of the post-WWII government. She asserts:

> …ministers in the National Front government had worked together—Communist and non-Communists alike—to incite mob vengeance, establish people's courts, abolish the right of appeal and carry out summary executions, often based on retrospectively defined crimes and usually with a clear presumption of guilt. (171)

There are also serious problems with the treatment of Communist and Soviet dominated Czechoslovakia. Heimann claims that in the immediate post-World War II period Czechoslovakia was "the only European state to vote Communists into power… (323)" In 1946 the communists received 38 per cent of the popular vote; they were not voted into power but had to share in it--crucial difference in my opinion. Disappointed Communists' efforts to replace the brutal face of "socialism" with a more human one began in mid-fifties, not only in the sixties, as she asserts. Heimann misrepresents the building of monstrous monuments to Stalin and Gottwald as genuine "debt of gratitude ... by the Czech and Slovak people to their Soviet liberators from Nazism" (p. 213), instead of just as subservient actions of the local dictators. She also falsely claims that Communist reforms of 1963 and 1968 were "flattering idealized Czech and Slovak self-portraits ... as the 'vanguard' of socialist society" (212).

To present her view of Czechoslovakia, Heimann denigrates persons associated with that country's history and questions whether its politics were ever democratic. Moreover; she also adopts a derisive tone toward all things Czech and uses intemperate and often offensive language.

Her assessment of Antonín Dvořák provides a telling illustration. Of the world-famous Czech composer, whom the Minister of Culture during the Communist era, Zdeněk Nejedlý, denounced as a "cosmopolitan," Heimann writes:

> These were the years of growing Czech as well as German nationalism in Austria in which Austrian Slav, Antonín Dvořák ... who might otherwise have been condemned forever to playing polkas, mazurkas and marches in his village band ... built his career by writing a mixture of Czech nationalistic pieces…and pieces composed for state occasions…(16)

There is no recognition of Dvořák's nine symphonies, including his famous New World Symphony, or of his having been called to the United States to lead American orchestras and help create local classical music. Here, as in too many other sections of the book, Heimann ignores the broader context: much of 19th and early 20th century classical music was based on folk musical themes. One has only to recall the works of Bela Bartok, Jean Sibelius and the Americans: Aaron Copeland and George Gershwin.

The author reserves particular contempt for Thomas Garrigue Masaryk and Edvard Beneš, whose

role in the founding of Czechoslovakia, she ascribes to their being

"brilliant propagandist" (323). She presents Masaryk as an opportunist and shifty character, who changed both his original name (from Masarik to Masaryk) and his nationality. She feels sorry for poor "Bohemian Germans , who had just lost more men, proportionately, in the war than any other ethnic German group in Europe ... being lectured by a man who had himself grown up as German and made his career by switching sides" (57). She also asserts that "Masaryk was detested by the Germans and suspected by the other nationalities as an unprincipled Czech chauvinist" (66). She provides no citation for this sweeping conclusion that is particularly surprising in that neither her text nor bibliography provide any evidence that she has consulted any sources written in German. (For that matter, Heimann also seems not to have used any Russian source materials.) Masaryk's revelation to Beneš "that he had 'already started' working against Austria-Hungary," she calls a "nationalist legend" (22).

Heimann holds Masaryk's writings in low esteem as her very choice of words in the following citation indicate: ""Masaryk, who had been circulating his latest propagandist tract (a pamphlet entitled *The New Europe: The Slav Standpoint* which ran to seventy-four pages and was presumptuously signed 'Thomas Masaryk, President of the Czecho-Slovak Republic'"… (37). She does not quote from any of Masaryk's books, widely acclaimed as important and original studies. Only in a footnote does she mentions Masaryk's insistence that the supposedly ancient Czech manuscripts were a fraud and his audacious defense of a poor Jew, Leopold Hilsner, who was accused of a ritual murder of a young Czech women, the two *causes célèbres,* that made the Prague professor well known throughout the world. She suspects Masaryk's motives. For example of his attempts to institute a separation of church and state, she says without citing any references that he "wanted ... to undermine the traditional Catholic parties, further diminish the power of the Hungarians and Germans and quash any talk of Slovak autonomy" (67).

Beneš is also treated not as a statesman. When "on 28 May 1939, American President Franklin D. Roosevelt ... made the friendly gesture of inviting him to lunch", which signified a change in the US relationship to the until then unrecognized Czechoslovak government in exile, Beneš "can scarcely have risen from the table before he began rattling off cables to the Czech and Slovak missions all over the world" (122), claiming that it meant eventual recognition of the government. On the next page, the undiplomatic description of Dr. Beneš's understandable action so much pleased Mary Heimann that she repeats it once more: "As soon as war was declared, Beneš knew exactly what to do. First, he rattled off cables of sympathy and solidarity to the premiers and foreign secretaries of Britain, France and Poland ... Czechoslovak army abroad ... should be set up immediately." When in 1938, after the Munich appeasement of Hitler, Beneš resigned as president, he quite accurately predicted future developments, as she admits, quoting him: "Poland will be the first to be hit.... France will suffer terribly for having betrayed us, wait for that.... Chamberlain will live to see the consequences of his appeasement.... Hitler will attack them all" (94), but instead of admiring his perspicacity, she claims to know that "he prophesied with malicious satisfaction" (94).

Alexander Dubček is also ascribed base motives. Heimann states:

> Although Alexander Dubček, the very symbol of the Prague

> Spring, is usually portrayed as a deeply and sincerely convinced "liberal", the pattern of his rise to power – first within the KSS and then within the KSC – suggests that he used popular resentments to establish his own power base within the Presidium rather than adopting "reformist' positions from conviction. (231)

She chooses to ignore that since Dubček had taken over the reins of the Slovak Communist Party in 1963 Slovakia had widely enlarged the freedom of the press. It was so ahead in this regard that Czech reformers were allowed to publish in Slovakia, when they could not do so in Brno or Prague.

Heimann contends that the democratic character of the first Republic was a sham. She makes much of the ethnic composition of the Czechoslovak state and of the way nationalities were counted. She states:

> "while pointing to the constitutional rights accorded to the minorities, they [Czechs] did not volunteer the information that the German minority was substantially larger than the Slovak population…Nor did they make plain that the official 'nationality' figures could be massaged to suit political exigencies…" (50)

Heimann accurately points out that when Czechoslovakia was established there were a half million more Germans than Slovaks in its territory, but this is not a rebuttal of the proposition that Czechs and Slovaks counted together made up two-thirds of the population. She also disputes the 1921 and 1930 Czechoslovak census figures for Germans and Hungarians. Unlike the Austro-Hungarian census of 1910 that used "the language of daily use" to determine nationality, the Czechoslovak censuses employed "mother tongue" as its criterion. The author improbably argues that: "By failing to take account of people who ceased to speak Czech or Slovak when they left the nursery, who were raised in bi-lingual…homes, or who normally used German or Hungarian at school, university or work, the new phrasing was calculated to inflate the number of speakers of 'Czechoslovak'" (65).

According to Heimann:

> Czechs could legitimately assure their Western friends that any citizen, regardless of nationality, was free to participate in Czechoslovak elections; they did not usually add that— regardless of the election results— the same Czech five political parties would club together, across the Left-Right political divisions, to keep other nationalities out of government. (50)

"A number of highly questionable practices,'' she elaborates, "were used to ensure that political control was centered in Prague and that the overwhelming majority of the non-Czechs were excluded from power" (50). Among these suspect actions, Heimann includes women suffrage: "Giving women the right to vote sounded emancipated, but it also doubled Czech voting strength" (66).

Heimann's contention that non- Czechs were excluded from power is an exaggeration. Slovaks were represented in the government in two ways. The Social Democrats and Agrarians, two of the important *parti gouvermentale*, received substantial support not only in the Czech lands, but also in Slovakia. Also the Slovak Populists, who were the main exponents of autonomy and later separatism, were part of the government coalition in 1929. More importantly, the German Christian Socialists, Social Democrats, Agrarians did enter the government in 1926. The last two remained in the cabinet until the end of the first Republic. One cannot conclude as the author does that "whatever the people did and however they voted, the same old gang would remain in charge" (77).

In the second edition of her book, Mary Heimann will be busy correcting not only the false history in her book; but also its many factual errors. I will mention only a random few. Masaryk's mother was not a "German cook" (21), but a Moravian who spoke German. Hitler had not "served in the Habsburg army in the First World War" (119), but an Austrian who volunteered for the German army. In spite of her insistence that "On 1 September 1939, the German army ... attacked Poland from the west, while the Soviet Union attacked the country from the east" (123), Stalin waited for quite a few days before attacking. He did so only after the Polish army was practically defeated. The rest of Poland's division is also very much mixed up. The camps in the post-World War II period that the Czechoslovak government used to house the German expellees were not, as Heimann implies, concentration camps, such as the Nazi ones. There are also copious problems with those small pesky details. For instance; Jiří Pelikán is twice named wrongly "Jaroslav."

There are other problems with the failed book. I think that what was discussed here sufficiently proves that, in spite of wide, though not sufficient investigation, and some chapters of factual narrative, Mary Heimann has a very long way to make this work "the definitive political history of Czechoslovakia."

Peter Hruby

Ivan Klíma. *Moje Šílené Století (My Insane Century)*. Prague: Academia, 2009. ISBN: 978-80-200-1697-3.

The first volume of Ivan Klíma's autobiography, *My Insane Century (Moje Šílené Století)*, which covers Klíma's early childhood in the 1930s through his expulsion from the Communist Party in the 1960s, magnifies historical events in Czechoslovakia as they are intertwined with and colored by the author's personal experiences. By combining his personal history with the bigger picture, he is able to provide significant documentation of the eras in which he lived. Klíma's personal stories bring readers very close to the events, creating a sort of intimacy. While he recounts his early memories with a precision and vividness that is to be admired, there is a certain detachment to his writing, as it is clear that he is looking back on the events from a distance. Readers also learn how fate played its role on forming Klíma's identity and how being Jewish played a part in it, too. For example, before World War II, his family had planned to emigrate to England but didn't because his grandmother couldn't get a visa.

Each chapter is punctuated by quotations and excerpts from the author's diary. More objective accounts of the eras follow each chapter concerning his personal history, and these temporarily interrupt the intimacy that Klíma had built up between readers and himself. Though they interrupt the chronological account, they are noteworthy. In these essays, he writes about the communist parties in Russia and Czechoslovakia and about fear and revolution, for example. Fear, he writes, can cause people to become informers and collaborators and can cause people to vote for candidates they do not like. Revolution, such as the Bolshevik Revolution, can destroy countries. He also takes up the theme of art in countries that are not democratic, addressing the views of Adolf Hitler, Karl Marx, Vladimir Lenin and Joseph Stalin, for example. The book ends at a suitable place - when he is expelled from the Party after a 14-year membership. This experience marks the end of an era in Klíma's life as he becomes a dissident after the crushing of the 1968 Prague Spring.

His descriptions are poignant and vivid, drawing readers into the story, though he is writing with a sort of detachment, as if telling a tale without reliving it. He recalls nearly four years spent in Terezín, the Nazi holding camp for Czech Jews; he describes his father recounting the horrors of his imprisonment during the early 1950s. He writes about his first trip outside a socialist country – an excursion to Germany to see his play *The Castle (Zámek)*. He also expounds upon his protest during the fourth Congress of Writers' Union in 1967. His narration about how he got fired from the weekly *Květy* and about his work for the publishing house Československý spisovatel also elaborates upon the time periods in which they occurred.

All these experiences show the personal impact the events of the eras had on the author. The quotations, diary excerpts and essays about the historical periods give the book a depth that accents the chronological tales. Quotations are taken from the newspaper clipping about the 1946 public hanging of the Nazi official, Karl Hermann Frank, responsible for the extermination of Lidice and Ležáky, as well as from transcripts of the Rudolf Slánský show trial. Convicted of a trumpeted up charge of being part of a Titoite-Trostkyite-Zionist conspiracy, Rudolf Slánský, General Secretary of the Communist Party and eleven others were executed while three others were sentenced to life im-

prisonment. Other citations come from the Communist newspaper *Rudé právo*, from the often courageous *Literární noviny* and from the poetry of Czech poet Jan Skácel. All these enhance the importance of the times and give the reader a better sense of the world in which Klíma lived.

The great detail with which his early memories are described makes the events vivid for the readers. For example, his sixth birthday on September 14, 1937 marked the death of Czechoslovak democratic president Tomáš Garrigue Masaryk, who passed away at the presidential summer home in Lány. Klíma describes how his Mom promised him *žloutkové věnečky*, a uniquely Czech pastry similar to choux pastries: "Even today I can see her walking through the door with the plate of *věnečky* and crying, sobbing loudly as tears stream down her beautiful cheeks, and I don't understand why she is crying when it is my birthday" (15). In another section he describes a conversation between his grandmother and his aunt when he heard the word Jew for the first time and had no idea what it meant (16).

Perhaps most enthralling are his memories from his time in Terezín, where his entire family – himself, his brother, his parents, his grandparents and his aunt were interned. Yet none of them were killed. Even today Klíma is not certain why, though he mentions in the book that it was probably because his father was sent there to repair motors and was responsible for the electricity in the camp. Also, his father went with the first transfer, and the Nazis had promised that no one from this first group would be killed – if one can believe the Nazis would keep a promise.

Through Klíma readers envision the horrendous conditions of the camp. He writes how prisoners were sometimes forced to stand all day in the rain; he had no paper or books. Yet he also recalls that he made his first best friend, named Ariel, at the camp. In a touching scene, when Ariel says goodbye as he is going to the transport to Poland, he gives Klíma his photograph. (After the war, when Klíma's classmate Milena died, he cannot fathom how someone can die during peacetime.)

Curiously enough, it was while interned at Terezín that Klíma first wanted to become a writer. Later, almost his entire life would be focused on writing. After high school Klíma set out to make a living as a writer, though he clearly did not approve of promoting propaganda. While forging book reviews, he had to praise bad authors. Similarly, when sent on an assignment to an agricultural brigade by *Mladá fronta*, Klíma expounded upon the horrendous conditions there, trying to give an honest view of the reality he had witnessed. *Mladá fronta* chided him and told him he had to praise the camp. "So I received my first lesson about what you may and what you may not write a report about if you want to be published" (223).

When his father returns from prison, where he was incarcerated for sabotage he did not commit, blamed for motors that didn't work, Klíma is eager to write about the injustice brought upon his father and the horrendous conditions under which his father had to live. "Everything my father told me broke my heart. If that kind of thing did happen, if innocent people were put on trial and even executed, that was criminal. 'I am going to try to write about it,' I suggested" (226). His father, though, convinced him not to, warning him of the harsh repercussions that would follow. His father's tales of his imprisonment in the early 1950s highlight the harsh Stalinization and purges that often targeted Jews.

Klíma's hardships only seemed to strengthen his moral view as he didn't succumb to the political thinking of the times. He was fired from the weekly *Květy* for writing about Karel Čapek. "It is a sad testimony to the willful blindness of the past years that we tried to mutilate the work of one of the men the rest of the world envied us having" (308). Finally, he was expelled from the Communist Party for speaking out against the new censorship law at the Fourth Congress of the Writers' Union.

When describing the early 1960s, Klíma portrays a time period that was more open, resulting in a new wave of literature being published. He experienced this openness first-hand as an author and as an editor with Československý spisovatel. For example, the year 1963 marked the publication of Czech writer Ladislav Fuk's *Theodore Mundstock*, of writer and feuilletonist Ludvík Vaculík's *Bustling House (Rušný dům)* and of Alexander Kliment's *Marie* as well as of Klíma's first novel called *The Hour of Silence (Hodina ticha)*. Also, during those years, Klíma met Karel Čapek's widow, actress and writer Olga Scheinpflugová; the illustrator, puppet maker, film director and film animator Jiří Trnka; fiction writer and screenwriter Jan Otčenásek; and French writer and philosopher Jean Paul-Sartre.

Klíma's first trip outside of a socialist country is also telling as he recalls: "The moment the train came to the tidy station at Schirding, it was as if I had suddenly entered another world. I saw no border guards anywhere, no decrepit buildings anywhere, just a drinks' vendor running up and down the platform offering beer or Coca-Cola" (474, 475).

The devices Klíma uses are intriguing as well. During the parts relating to his early childhood, Klíma utilizes the "unreliable" narrator – a device exemplified by his not knowing why his mother is weeping on his birthday and his not understanding what a Jew is. Yet it is significant that, in his later years, Klíma passes judgment on the terrible reality of World War II and Nazi rule and on the crimes of Stalinist Communism.

The conclusion, though only a page and a half, provides some powerful insights into Klíma's tenure as a Communist and his reaction to his expulsion. "But by then I already knew for certain that in the name of some vague future goals the Party had deprived people of their freedom, arrogated all power, destroyed political life, fabricated history, made a mockery out of the election process, transformed a free country into a colony" (516).

Yet I wonder why he did not leave the Communist Party of his own volition if he was aware of the Communist Party's failure as a political ideology. Throughout the book I asked why Klíma doesn't give up his membership as he describes horrendous situations brought about by totalitarian life. Was he weary of being "excluded" as he had experienced as a Jewish child? Did he have something to gain as an intellectual from the membership? Certainly, it gave him the chance to publish his articles and book. Was publishing so important as to sacrifice what he believed in? Perhaps his knowledge of the devastating effects of Communism is why, though bitter that the Party had kicked him out, he felt a sort of freedom when he was expelled (516).

To be sure, Klíma would find that his hardships and experiences during his youth and early adulthood had prepared him well for a life stripped of freedom, a life in which he was cast as an outsider and enemy of the regime, narrated in the enticing second volume of his autobiography.

Tracy A. Burns

Ivan Klíma. *Moje Šílené Století II (My Insane Century II).* Prague: Academia, 2010. ISBN: 978-80-200-1854-0.

The second volume of Ivan Klíma's autobiography, *My Insane Century II (Moje Šílené Století II*), picks up where the first volume left off - the summer of 1967. There is no introduction or preface describing the preceding years. The continuation proceeds in a chronological order, as did the first volume. The sequel focuses on Klíma's personal experiences meshed with historical events in Czechoslovakia. As he did with the first volume, Klíma succeeds in allowing readers to experience the trials and tribulations of the times. Furthermore, just like in the first volume, readers feel a sort of intimacy with the narrator as he recounts events from midpoint through 1967 to December of 1989, although the style is calm and journalistic, cold and detached. Nevertheless, readers almost experience the end of Prague Spring, police harassment, interrogations and house searches, the world of *samizdat* literature and the Velvet Revolution, among other highlights.

The structure of the book is the same as that of the first volume. Essays about various facets of the eras follow each chapter about his life and add a more objective approach, as well as provide intriguing information. As with the first volume, each chapter is punctuated by quotations. In the second volume these cite famous philosophers and famous writers, as well as the Communist newspaper *Rudé právo*, to name a few. The author's diary excerpts help give a strong voice to both the historical and personal through descriptions of events, his thoughts and anecdotes. The diary plays a more substantial role in the second volume. Ironic anecdotes also add to the powerful impression made by this work of art. The conclusion, though, doesn't do the book justice.

One example of Klíma's ability to combine the vast historical picture with his personal experience in the second volume takes place when the Soviet tanks crush the Prague Spring in August of 1968. For Klíma, it couldn't have come at a more inopportune time. He finds himself stuck in England with his mistress, Olga, while his wife and son are on vacation in Israel. His daughter, though, was left in Prague with her grandparents. As the tanks make their way to the Czechoslovak radio headquarters and the first deaths are announced, Klíma remarks on his dilemma: "In a foreign country with a woman I didn't know well and back at home a foreign army" (48).

Finally, after many frustrating attempts, he gets through to his wife, and they both agree that they have to return because they have a daughter and parents back home. Also, Klíma feels he would be betraying his friends if he didn't go back. "Everything in my life started to break down, I should do something significant, but I was seized by a feeling of helplessness. I recall only gazing absently at the piles of old newspapers and magazines--which surrounded me like a fortress wall" (51).

In mid-September he returns. Klíma describes how his country greeted him. "Our country welcomed us with its gloomy border region and gloomy weather. It was raining and mist billowed above the unmown meadows. To add to our woes, the wheel of a truck in front of us flicked up a stone, which shattered our windshield, and all the glass spilled out" (60). Perhaps it was a prophetic homecoming.

While Klíma insists that not returning to Czechoslovakia would mean betraying his friends, his attitude changes when he and his wife are discussing his invitation to teach Czech and Czech literature at the University of Michigan for a year. He argues that many of his friends have left the country, and the others don't consider it betrayal. If he and his wife aren't allowed to return, he says, they will be relieved to be out of their native land.

Other historical moments brought into perspective by his personal experience include lining up to see Jan Palach's coffin in the Karolinum during January of 1969. (The student Palach had set fire to himself on Wenceslas Square as a protest against the rigid normalization tactics of the regime.) Klíma also describes Jan Patočka's funeral . The philosopher Patočka, one of the very first Charter '77 spokespersons, died March 13, 1977, after spending the day being harshly interrogated about the manifesto by the StB, the secret police.

In addition, Klíma gives a stirring portrayal of the StB harassment, including the interrogations and house searches. The regime certainly more than makes life difficult for him. Near the beginning of the book, he is expelled from the Communist Party for the second time; his passport is taken away; he is expelled from the Journalists' Union. Throughout his life story, it is a strug-

gle to keep his writers' insurance, and at one point he could lose his pension if he doesn't find a job. Because the law states that that he could lose 90 percent of his honorarium from foreign publications of his works and foreign performances of his plays, someone has to come to Prague to give him the money.

Furthermore, Klíma is not able to survive only as a writer. He has to take a number of manual jobs throughout the Communist era. He works as a street sweeper, messenger, assistant surveyor and nurse. After sweeping the streets for a few hours, he describes how he would spend the next few hours in a pub with his colleagues, listening to anecdotes. He is also followed, and his house is watched. The police at times turn off his phone and often call him in for interrogations.

Klíma's dialogues in his diary describing these interrogations show the absurdity of the situation and illustrate how the police are playing a game with him and trying to manipulate him. For example, on one occasion he is interrogated because he has co-written a petition to the Czechoslovak President General Ludvík Svoboda, asking him to grant amnesty to political prisoners, among other things. He nicknames one of the interrogators "Nezval" after poet Vítězslav Nezval, who became a strong supporter of the Communist regime after showing great talent as a surrealist. The other interrogator is called "the blond one." Part of the dialogue goes like this, with "Nezval" speaking first:

> 'So you are writing something. For your bottom drawer or for someone in particular?'
> 'I'm writing for myself.'
> 'But you wrote something only recently.'
> 'I wrote a novel. *A Summer Affair*.'
> 'And what's to become of that? Is it for the drawer? Or will it be published somewhere?'
> 'It will be published in Switzerland.'
> 'So, you do have links with the outside world, since you could send a novel there.'
> 'I sent it by mail.'
> 'But you have a link to some publisher, don't you?'
> 'I acted entirely in terms of the contract.'
> 'What contract?'
> 'Dilia handled it. That's the official agency.'
> "The blond one behind me spoke up as if he knew about these things.
> 'Yes, you have a contract with a Swiss publisher, valid under Swiss law. It is interesting that you, a citizen of Czechoslovakia, have a contract valid under Swiss law.'
> 'It was Dilia's lawyers who handled the contract.'
> 'People who were lawyers then. How much do the Swiss pay you?'
> 'The same as they pay authors all over the world.' (153-154)

The absurd dialogue continues as the police question him about various matters.

The police's harassment takes other forms as well. Because of his anti-socialist stance, Klíma is informed that his daughter Nanda can't continue her studies after elementary school and should take a job in a factory. In part because he feels there is a chance that she could continue her studies, he doesn't

sign Charter 77. His prediction was right. She then is allowed to go on to the next academic level.

Klíma's diary excerpts bring the historical situation to light as well. He not only describes interrogations but other snippets from life, too. For example, he writes about going to the film "Calamity":

> I went to see Věra Chytilová's film 'Calamity'. In line at the box office some woman in her fifties was in front of me, plainly dressed, most likely from out of town. She asked the woman standing next to her: Excuse me, what exactly does calamity mean?
>
> The woman answered: Calamity, that is simply some great misfortune.
> The woman from out of town thanked her: I see, thank you, you're very kind.
> I couldn't resist: Madam, calamity, calamity's everything that's around us. The life we live.
> The woman from out of town smiled at me: I see, thank you, you're very kind. (305-306)

Through Klíma's writing, readers also enter the world of *samizdat* literature, as the author describes how texts are typewritten and copied several times before being distributed among friends. When putting together the monthly *samizdat Obsah*, he even describes how one of the messengers turned out to be an informer.

It is significant to note Klíma's attitude toward the times. Despite his frustrating life, Klíma remains an optimist. A student from Frýdek-Místek visits him and admits that he wants to flee the country. The school's administration is causing him problems because he said he agreed with Charter 77. Klíma tells young man that there are many decent people in Czechoslovakia and that everything will change for the better someday. He insists that he told the student what he really believed.

To be sure, poignant anecdotes crop up throughout the work. In one of them, during the 1980s, the Secret Police break up a large gathering at a villa in Hanspaulka, where the guests, many of them banned by the regime, had been invited to watch a film about former First Secretary of the Communist Party Alexander Dubček, who brought many liberal reforms to the country during the Prague Spring. When the police arrest the group, Klíma's wife, Helena, breaks out in song as a sort of protest. Similarly, when some members of the group are gathered in the police station's waiting room, one of the women starts to sing. When the host complains that all the open-faced sandwiches will rot and that those arrested are hungry, the police escort the host back to the villa to pick up the sandwiches and then bring them back to the police station.

Klíma's description of the Velvet Revolution is poignant as well. While Klíma stayed home writing on November 17, he did attend many student demonstrations and found himself on stage at the National Theatre's New Stage during the actors' strike. He recalls, "I remember that feeling of when, after almost two decades, I could walk on stage and discover to my amazement, that the people in the audience were applauding before I'd even said one word. It was all so unexpected, so unreal even" (356).

The essays that follow each chapter momentarily take readers out of the subjective world of Klíma's personal life and readers enter a more objective world formed by writings commenting on the time periods. For example, Klíma takes up the theme of solidarity and writes about the Polish movement with that name. He also considers the differences among the dictatorships under Maximilien de Robespierre, Adolf Hitler, Vladimir Lenin and Joseph Stalin. The essays about the Communist era are similar to the chapters about normalization in Milan Šimečka's *The Restoration of Order* in that they provide documentation about the eras. Yet they are more philosophical than Šimečka's portrayal of life under the regime's harsh normalization of the 1970s, probing deeper into the heart of society. In some ways, it is disconcerting for readers to come across an essay after being consumed by Klíma's personal experiences, yet they do give the book an intriguing structure.

The Ivan Klíma of the second volume is a different person than that in the first. Here he is a mature, courageous man who knows the odds he is playing with, knows how to handle police interrogations and how to survive police harassment. He is a flawed hero because he writes openly about cheating on his wife and admits he didn't sign Charter 77 at least in part because of fear for his daughter. Also, he had remained a member of the Communist Party for 14 years. In the first volume, the author was naïve, not truly knowing where he belongs in Communist society, unable to find his own personal identity. Here, he has accepted his role as an outcast and enemy of the regime and takes up important positions in underground society. He is willing to bear responsibility for his actions, while in the first volume he was meeker, unable to totally understand the society around him, always asking questions but never knowing the answers.

Even though this autobiography is in Czech, the two volumes are not just significant for those who remember life under Communism. Just the opposite. The second volume especially gives readers who didn't experience the totalitarian regime a solid sense of the trials and tribulations that an outsider from the regime struggled through. Hopefully, both volumes will be translated into English. Everyone interested in Czechoslovak history could benefit from reading this impressive work as well.

In a sense both volumes compose a sort of the nonfiction version of Bohumil Hrabal's *I Served the King of England*, which documents the history of Czechoslovakia, especially during the Nazi and Communist eras, via the construction of a fictional plot.

The conclusion, though, not even one full page in length, leaves a lot to be desired. It is noteworthy that Klíma comes to a revelation. "Gradually I came to understand that there is that Freedom of external conditions and there is an inner freedom, or more exactly: a person may act unfreely even under conditions of Freedom and he can act freely even under conditions where there is no Freedom" (362). He also describes how, after the fall of Communism, he was offered various functions in organizations but refused them in order to devote time to his writing.

Yet Klíma leaves a lot of unanswered questions. How did he adjust to this newly found freedom psychologically in 1989? Was he ever nostalgic for his time as a dissident? Has he been satisfied with the way the country has developed democratically? Did he have any illusions about freedom, any expectations that were not realized? The questions go on and on. Instead of ending

on such an abrupt note, he could have ended with the promise that he is preparing a third volume ranging from the years 1989 through 2009. A third volume would be yet another book by Klíma that, like this one, would be impossible to put down.

Tracy A. Burns

Petr Karlík, Marek Nekula, and Jana Pleskalová, eds. Encyklopedický slovník češtiny. Praha: Nakladatelství Lidové noviny, 2002. 604 pp. ISBN 80-7106-484-X.

Czech scholars have always been active and productive in linguistics, and their interest in languages is well documented by the attention given to their mother tongue. Since 1935, besides other works they have produced two multivolume dictionaries of Standard Czech, five volumes of a Czech linguistic atlas, several etymological dictionaries of Czech, and three detailed grammatical descriptions of the language. Also, since 1917, the Institute for the Czech Language of the Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic has published the periodical *Naše řeč* (currently in its 93rd year), devoted to the study and refinement of the Czech language.

One particular approach to the description of Czech, original in its conception, was the preparation of an encyclopedic dictionary of the Czech language, published in 2002 and here reviewed. Its more than a thousand entries, running in length from single paragraphs to several double-column pages of fine print, cover all aspects of the Czech language, as well as many topics of general linguistics. And to insure expert coverage, 65 specialists were asked to contribute entries. To illustrate the comprehensive nature of the work, here are a few selected topical domains, some with examples of the entries offered: language origins, specialized fields of language study (psycholinguistics, neurolinguistics, mathematical linguistics, and feminist linguistics), linguistic classifications (Indo-European languages, satem languages), enclaves of the Czech language, historical linguistics (Proto-Czech, Czech of the Hussite period), etymology, language change (assimilation, calques), borrowing (phraseological borrowings, Slovakisms), onomastics (honorific toponymy), language acquisition (universal grammar), speech disorders (aphasia, stuttering), phonetics (palatalization, schwa), phonology (ablaut), morphology (morph, elative), syntax (deep structure, binding theory), semantics (sememe), language use (macaronic, diglossia, cliché), language variety (dialect, slang), dialectology (a full 12 pages dealing with the dialects of Czech), poetic or literary use of language (euphony, irony, litotes), orthography, linguistic anthropology (ethnography of communication, competence vs. performance), and sociolinguistics.

Because the Czechs do not have at their disposal any comparable reference book, the editors decided that to limit coverage to only one methodological direction or school would be unwise. Consequently some of the entries introduce not one, but several theoretical conceptions and interpretations of the described phenomena.

The controversial issues in the history of Czech linguistics are handled informatively and fairly. One such issue, accorded a long discussion, concerns purism. In the history of Czech, purism was a defensive posture directed primarily against Germanisms. The first warnings against the use of loanwords from German occurred as early as 1412 in the writings of Jan Hus, the religious reformer. During the 1930s, the purist practices of the editor of *Naše řeč* were considered so extreme that they gave rise to the well-known publication *Spisovná čeština a jazyková kultura* by members of the Prague Linguistic Circle. In it they argued that many of the so-called Germanisms in Czech are in fact Europeanisms, and insisted that the vague notion of "the

spirit of Czech" as the criterion of correctness should be replaced by, and a language should be judged on, how effectively it serves its users in the fields of science, technology, literature, and business, as well as in everyday contacts.

Other interesting entries concern the ideological pressures from the Soviet Union, especially on the members of the Prague School, after World War II. The first Soviet linguistic theory was Marrism in the late 1940s, but this did not last long because it was officially discarded by one of the Soviet linguists over Stalin's signature in 1950. A period of Marxist linguistics followed, but not all members of the Prague Linguistic Circle succumbed to it: the main point of disagreement was the Prague School's belief in the immanent evolution of languages. However, linguistics was slowly returning to its pre-war rationality long before the Velvet Revolution of 1989.

Among the very useful features of this dictionary are the bibliographies that follow most of the entries. These include not only references to numerous Czech articles, but also to works published in German, English, French, and Russian. A detailed subject index guides the user through the riches of this book. In short, this encyclopedic dictionary is a valuable and comprehensive source of information on the Czech language and the linguistic and socio-cultural contexts in which it has existed and should be viewed.

Zdeněk Salzmann

Contributors

Petr Anděl is an assistant professor at Charles University in Prague (Faculty of Social Sciences, Department of American Studies) and also an assistant professor at the Metropolitan University in Prague (program of Anglophone Studies and the Center for Security Studies).

Josette Baer, PD Ph.D., is a lecturer in political theory, with a focus on Central and Eastern European intellectual history, at the University of Zurich, Switzerland. She is the author of *Slavic Thinkers*, *Preparing Liberty in Central Europe* and *Politik als praktizierte Sittlichkeit* and has published widely in peer-reviewed journals, such as *Democratisation*, *KOSMAS*, *East European Thought* and *Swiss Political Science Review*.

Aurel Braun is professor of international relations and political science at the University of Toronto, as well as the chair of the International Centre for Human Rights and Democratic Development, Montreal, Canada. *NATO-Russia Relations in the 21st Century* is the latest of his numerous publications.

Tracy A. Burns, a resident of Prague for sixteen years, has much experience as a journalist, creative writer, proofreader and editor. She publishes articles in Czech, Slovak and English. Her works in Czech have appeared in three dailies, in Reflex, in Respekt, in Literární noviny and in numerous other publications. Her writings in Slovak have been published in the daily *SME* and the former bi -weekly *Mosty*. Her articles in English have been printed in *The Washington Post*, *The Prague Post*, *Czech Business Weekly*, *Prague Leaders Magazine* and *Kosmas*. Her articles have also appeared on the Internet pages of Czech Radio.

Zdeněk V. David is trained as a historian (Ph.D. Harvard, 1960) and is currently librarian emeritus and Senior Scholar at the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars in Washington D.C. With the late Robert A. Kann, he is coauthor of *The Peoples of the Eastern Hasburg Lands, 15* 26-1918 (1984). In 2003, he published a monograph, *Finding the Middle Way: The Utraquists' Liberal Challenge to Rome and Luther*, and his new book, *Realism, Tolerance, and Liberalism in the Czech National Awakening*, was published in 2010.

Ivo K. Feierabend is professor emeritus of Political Science, San Diego State University. He received his PhD (1960) from Yale University. He is the author or co-author of scores of articles; his recent book (Academia, 2007) *Demokraticá kultura v České republice*, was co-authored with M. Klicperová-Baker. In 1966, together with Rosalind Lorwin Feierabend, he was awarded the Socio-Psychological Prize of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, for their comprehensive cross-national analysis of political violence and aggression.

Kenji Hotta is a PhD student in the field of Civilization Studies at Tokai University in Tokyo, Japan. His dissertation, directed by Professor Joseph Rostinsky, deals with the comparative study of the semiotic and cognitive function of sport in contemporary Czech and Japanese societies. Recently he spent sev-

eral months in the Czech Republic studying the Czech language and conducting research.

Laura Ivins-Hulley is a doctoral candidate in the Department of Communication and Culture at Indiana University. She has previously published on Jan Švankmajer in the journal *Animation Studies* and is the editor of *The Wig: Journal of Experimental Scholarship*. Her dissertation focuses on Czech and Slovak surrealism.

Eva Stanovska Jonas was Librarian of the Museum of Comparative Zoology at Harvard University before her retirement in 1999. She was educated in general zoology and library science at Charles University in Prague.

Jaroslav Pánek (born January 23, 1947, Prague), studied history, archive science and Slavonic studies at the Charles University in Prague. He was research fellow at the Institute of History, Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic from 1976 to 1993, director of the Institute from 1998 to 2005, full professor at the Philosophical Faculty of Charles University Prague from 1996, prorector of Charles University from 1997 to 2000, vice-president of the Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic from 2005, president of the Association of Historians of the Czech Republic from 1996 to 2002, and the president of the Czech National Committee of Historians from 2002. He has published twenty books and ca. four-hundred scholarly articles in Europe, Asia, America and Australia, especially on Early Modern history of Central Europe and history of historiography.

Virginia Parobek of Lancastar, Ohio is a member of the Cleveland chapter of SVU. She has a BA in Comparative Literature from Ohio University and has been a member of the National Book Critics Circle since 1996. Parobek was the past secretary of the Slovak Institute of Cleveland and has published Slavic articles and reviews widely.

Miloslav Rechcígl is one of the founders and Past President (1974-78, 1994-2006) of SVU. He is an authority on immigration history from the territory of former Czechoslovakia. He was instrumental in establishing the National Heritage Commision toward the preservation of the Czech and Slovak cultural heritage in America. Among his many publications are *The Cechoslovak Contribution to World Culture* (1964), *Czechoslovakia Past and Present* (1968), *Postavy naši Ameriky* (2000), *Czech American Historic Sites, Monuments and Memorials* (2004), *Czechoslovak American Archivalia* (2004), *Czechs and Slovaks in America* (2005) and, most recently, *On Behalf of their Homeland: Fifty Years of SVU* (2008).

Zdenek Salzmann is professor emeritus of anthropology at the University of Massachusetts at Amherst. He came from Prague (then Czechoslovakia) in 1947. Since then he has been a guest professor at Yale University and five European universities. Among his 360 publications are books, monographs, articles, book reviews, and poetry. At present, at the age of 82, Salzmann is an adjunct professor at Northern Arizona University in Flagstaff.

Anthony C. Slaughter worked in the newspaper and printing industry before returning to full time study in 1974 under a Commonwealth training grant. He attended Curtin University (Australia) where he obtained two tertiary qualifications. He lectured in Australian and British history at Fremantle and Perth Technical Colleges. Later he worked as a librarian attached to the Technical Education Division of Western Australia.

Advice to Contributors

Kosmas is devoted primarily to scholarly research in all relevant academic disciplines within the humanities, arts, and sciences; memoirs or creative writing may be published in some cases. Ordinarily, manuscripts should be no longer than 25-30 pages, double-spaced. Book reviews should be 500-700 words in length. Manuscripts will not be returned unless postage is enclosed.

Manuscripts may be submitted in English, Slovak, Czech, French, or German, but an English translation must accompany any manuscript in a language other than English. *Kosmas* publishes only in English.

Manuscripts should be prepared in Microsoft Word with careful attention to diacritical markings. Each author should submit two paper copies of the manuscript along with a copy on a computer diskette. The entire text should be double-spaced, including block quotations and notes. Book titles and non-English words should appear in italics. Endnotes should be used rather than the "Works Cited" format. Transliterations of Cyrillic should follow the Library of Congress method. For all additional matters of style, the current edition of the *Chicago Manual of Style* should be consulted.