KOSMAS

N° 26.2

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, 1982-1988, and *Czechoslovak and Central European Journal*, Vols. 8-11, (1989-1993).

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).

Editor: Hugh L. Agnew (The George Washington University)

Book Review Editor: Mary Hrabík Šámal (Oakland University)

Manuscript submissions, books for review, and correspondence concerning editorial matters should be sent via email to the editor, Hugh L. Agnew. The email address is KosmasAgnew@gmail.com. In the event that postal correspondence proves necessary, the postal address of the editor is Hugh L. Agnew, Elliott School of International Affairs, The George Washington University, 1957 E St., NW, Suite 401, Washington, DC 20052 USA.

CONTENTS

From the Editor

Hugh L. Agnew

My first duty as the new editor of *Kosmas* must be to apologize to all subscribers and especially to the contributors for the delay in the appearance of this Spring, 2013 issue. As some of you may know, a disagreement between the then-editor, Francis D. Raška, and the Executive Board of SVU led to his decision to resign from the post. *Kosmas* was thus, unfortunately, left rudderless for some time, until I was persuaded to accept the responsibility of the position. It is my goal to return the journal to a regular publication schedule without losing an issue, so in spite of the delay I plan to follow Volume 26, no. 2 (Spring 2013) with Volume 27, no. 1 (Fall 2013) as quickly as possible. To that end *Kosmas* continues to welcome contributions from scholars anywhere in the world.

I would like to thank both my predecessors, Clinton Machann and Francis D. Raška, for the care, effort and time they put into maintaining the existence and quality of *Kosmas.* I can only promise to do my best to maintain the standards they have established, an undertaking whose challenges I have come to appreciate *na vlastní kůži* as I learn the ropes of editing an academic journal from the beginning.

The present volume contains articles and essays reflecting themes that have appeared in the pages of *Kosmas* in earlier issues, embodying interests that unite many of our readers. Bruce Vlk continues his story of Czech and Slovak immigration and emigration, begun in *Kosmas*, Vol. 25, no. 2, by turning from the Czech and Slovak communities of Prince George County, Virginia, to the story of the Czech settlements in Volhynia (from whence some of those Virginia Czechs eventually departed Europe for America). Karolina Slamová presents a valuable study of the Czech exile Igor Hájek, who ended up being a significant bridge linking the English-speaking literary world with Czech culture and vice versa through his contributions to Czech studies in the United Kingdom, his place of refuge after 1968. Thomas G. Masaryk informs two contributions to this issue: in one, Zdeněk David continues his long-running exploration of aspects of the philosophical foundation of Masaryk's thought, and its influence on later figures, by exploring Masaryk's legacy in the thought of Václav Havel. A comparative viewpoint is also taken by Josette Baer in her study of the relationship between Masaryk and the Slovak patriot Svetozár Hurban Vajanský, investigating the roots of their falling-out at the end of the nineteenth century, and locating it in their differing world-views. Finally, the indefatigable Mila Rechcigl shares fascinating details about Czech and Slovak pioneer settlement in the Northwest of the North American continent, a fitting tribute to the region in which the SVU held its 2013 Regional Conference this summer.

Zdeněk Salzmann turns his attention in his essay on the Czech verb to one of the aspects of the Czech language that certainly frustrates foreigners who try to learn it, but also rewards those who persevere with the richness and expressivity of the language through its verb forms. Sylva Simsova shares a fascinating account of her departure from Czechoslovakia in 1949 and the experiences she

and her husband-to-be lived through on their way to their adopted home in Britain. A familiar name to *Kosmas* readers, Tracy Burns adds a chapter from a yet-unpublished novel in which she recounts an experience reflected no doubt in the lives of many first- or second-generation children of immigrants.

Books on a number of themes stretching from fiction through memoir literature to history and politics are reviewed by Tracy Burns, Mary Hrabík Šámal, James W. Peterson, and Robert K. Evanson. Suggestions for books to review, as well as offers to write reviews of received books, may be sent to Mary Hrabík Šámal, who has graciously agreed to continue in the role of Book Review Editor, at maruska48@gmail.com.

ARTICLES

The Economic, Political and Religious Elements of Czech Volhynia[1]

Bruce A. Vlk

Introduction

Volhynia (sometimes spelled Volyn or Volhyn) is an ancient region in northwestern Ukraine bordered by Poland, Belarus, and Russia. Its land area makes up a large portion of the original Slavic settlements in Europe.[2] Over the centuries the territory changed hands numerous times, from Lithuania to Poland to

Map 1: courtesy of Paul Robert Magocsi, *A History of Ukraine: The Land and Its Peoples* (University of Toronto Press, 1996), 352.

Russia to Ukraine today. Volhynia had long been a host of immigrant populations, especially after the abolition of serfdom in the Russian Empire in 1861.[3] Czechs and other peoples from Central Europe would rush into the region during the 1860s and 1870s.

---

[1] This article is dedicated to my grandfather, Václav Vlk, who was born in Volhynia and later escaped the Russian Army to immigrate to America. Special thanks to Jerry J. Skalsky for the use of his family documents to give history a more human perspective.

[2] Slavic people inhabited this area from at least the first millennium BCE. Volhynia is almost at the center of the original Slav homeland. Paul Robert Magocsi, *A History of Ukraine: The Land and Its Peoples* (University of Toronto Press, 1996), 39.

[3] Eva Janská and Dušan Drbohlav, "Re-emigration and integration of Volhynian and "Chernobyl Czechs" in the Czech Republic," *Acta Universitatis Carolinae* 1 (2001): 124.

Longtime enemies Russia and Poland have fought over Volhynia for centuries. After the Third Partition of Poland in 1795, Volhynia was henceforth governed by Russia.[4] Nevertheless the Polish influence remained as there were approximately 100,000 living in the region.[5] The 71,852 square kilometer area included many nationalities, such as Ukrainians, Poles, Germans, Jewish people and many more.[6] The latter half of the 19th century would see an emigration of Czech settlers to add to the already diverse mix.

Reasons for migration

Why did Czechs begin to migrate out of the Czech lands in the second half of the nineteenth century? The primary reason was the lack of economic opportunity in the Austro-Hungarian Empire. Many were frustrated with the lack of affordable land for farming and too few job prospects. [7]

The migration to the Russian Empire was interestingly tied to migration to the United States. Czechs had begun to leave for the U.S., but were halted once the American Civil War broke out.[8] Volhynia became an option during this period because it was closer and culturally similar to the Czech lands.[9] Once the war ended it is interesting to ponder the Czech settlers' fateful choice on whether to start a new life in America or Russia. They made a decision based on the information available to them at the time. Family and friends who had already settled in Volhynia were obviously a strong influence on their decision. Volhynia offered tillable land at a low cost and the opportunity for a new beginning.[10] In addition to the economic opportunities, many young Czech men saw emigration as a way to escape Austrian conscription.[11] The Czar's promise of no Russian conscription and no taxes for five years proved to be powerful incentives.[12]

---

[4] Nada Valášková, Zdeněk and Stanislav Brouček, *Aliens or One's Own People: Czech Immigrants from the Ukraine in the Czech Republic* (Prague: Institute of Ethnology of the Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic, 1997), 11.

[5] Valentyna Nadolska, "Volyn within the Russian Empire: Migratory Processes and Cultural Interaction," in Kimitaka Matsuzato, editor, *Imperiology: From Empirical Knowledge to Discussing the Russian Empire* (Slavic Research Center, Hokkaido University, 2007), 90.

[6] The Czechs were not the first emigrants as Germans had moved there during Catherine II's rule and Balkan Slavs were already there as well. Valášková, 9, 11.

[7] Valášková, 9.

[8] Janská, 124.

[9] Nikolaus Arndt, "Czechs in Volhynia: from the Settlement History, 1862-1947," translation by Irmgard Hein Ellingson, *Federation of East European Family History Societies Journal* 11 (2003): 82.

[10] Janská, 124.

[11] Arndt, 83.

[12] Jan Richter, "Former Czech Settlers as for compensation for their property taken away by USSR," *Radio Prague*, January 24, 2011.

The Russian government regarded the Czechs as more advanced than other ethnic groups and thus prime candidates for assimilation.[13] Additionally, Czar Alexander II was impressed by an exhibition of Czech goods during his visit to Austria, and the Pan-Slav movement of the 1860s encouraged in Czechs pro-Russian feelings.[14]

Austro-Hungarian government officials were concerned about the emigration because they feared unification of Slavs to the east.[15] Czech nationalists had mixed feelings about the migration; while they preferred their brothers to stay in the Czech lands, Russia was viewed as a more favorable option to America where they believed assimilation would occur more quickly.[16]

The Russian Empire encouraged the emigration of Czechs for political reasons, primarily to counter the Catholic Polish element in the territory.[17] The Russian Empire was keenly interested in altering the religious composition of the region. The Czarist government had hoped the Czechs' Hussite traditions would dilute the Catholic population.[18] They hoped the Czechs would eventually convert to Orthodox Christianity and assimilate into Russian culture.[19] The Poles were not the only target of the Russian Empire's societal shuffling: it wanted skilled Czech settlers to offset the Jewish tradesmen and merchants in Volhynia.[20]

Three Czech priests were invited and supported by the government to start a Hussite Church in the settled lands.[21] Unfortunately for the Russian government, each of the three priests had different religious leanings.[22] Additionally, many of the Czech settlers still favored Catholicism, which contributed to the failure of the Russian religious policy.[23] The following excerpt from a Czech-American family account written by Franz (Frank) Skalsky Jr., whose grandfather lived Volhynia, humorously captures the issue:

> As it was the Czech people deceived the Russian government by proclaiming that they were Evangelical and they were not as so many were Catholics who wanted the services conducted in their way of believing and the reformed in their way and so the preachers tried to satisfy both and were unable. When the complaint by both parties aroused the Russian government, the government declared that the Czech people must select only one religion, but not Catholic. During Alexander II, the Reformed had as preacher V. Hrdlička. The Lutheran had Rev. Kaspar and the Hussites had Rev. Saska, who tried to unify all Czechs under Orthodox religion but could not succeed. Those that were Catholics were encouraged by [a]

[13] Arndt, 83.
[14] Arndt, 82-83.
[15] Valášková, 10.
[16] Ibid.
[17] Arndt, 82.
[18] Valášková, 15.
[19] Arndt, 82.
[20] Arndt, 83.
[21] Valášková, 18.
[22] Ibid.
[23] Ibid.

> Polish priest not to give in and the Reformed would not give in either, therefore under Alexander III the Russian government decided to enforce the only one religion that is Orthodox upon them or encourage them to move out. Where upon the government issued a decree which said that the administrator to present it to the people which read that they must leave and move to a designated place. But in the meantime, through a providence of God, a fire broke out in an administrative building and the decree was lost and when the meeting was called, the decree, which had been on the table before, could not be found. Someone through a clever move hid it under some bricks, and therefore it could not be administered.[24]

From the historical account and according to this story, it is clear the Czarist government saw the emigration in political and religious terms, while the Czech settlers were primarily seeking economic opportunity. Skalsky's letter suggests that the settlers were no fools; they did not always bow to the whims of the Russian rulers.

The Volhynian Czechs, 1859-1874

For the most part, the settlers came from Bohemia, but a few came from Moravia and Silesia.[25] While most settlers were poor farmers in search of land, craftsmen and entrepreneurs were also moving to Volhynia for new opportunities.[26]

Major centers of Czech settlement in Volhynia included the cities of Rovno (or Rivne), Dubno, Luts'k, Zhitomir and Ostroh.[27] Czechs settled in the more eastern towns of Malinovka and Mala Zubovshchina were typically grouped with the Volhynian Czechs.[28] Additionally, several thousand Czechs also moved near Kiev.[29] In the larger cities, they built breweries, steel mills and cement factories.[30]

Similar to emigration patterns in the antebellum American South, the first Czech settlers in Russia were filling the farm labor shortage from the abolition of serfdom.[31] After the abolition of slavery, many southern plantations were sold or divided into smaller parcels. Czechs and other European immigrants would soon take advantage of the cheap land. Another interesting parallel to Czechs immigrants in rural America was the fact that the Volhynian Czechs were

---

[24] Franz Skalsky, Jr., Personal family account of his grandfather's time in Volhynia, translated from colloquial Czech (March 1973).
[25] Valášková, 13-15.
[26] Ibid, 13.
[27] Ibid, 16.
[28] Ibid, 17.
[29] Magocsi, 372.
[30] Richter.
[31] Valášková, 10 and Nadolska, 100. This was particularly true in Virginia, see Bruce Vlk, "New Bohemia in the New World: Czech and Slovak Immigration and Assimilation in Prince George County, Virginia," *Kosmas*, 25 (spring 2012).

considered more advanced farmers than the native population.[32] For example, they used crop rotation, animal manure for fertilizer, modern implements and diversification.[33] Many farms in America had become fallow after years of intensive growing of one crop. The importance of Czech hop production cannot be underestimated as the Ukrainians and Russians valued their superior beer.[34] In fact Volhynia became the top-producing region of hops in the entire Russian Empire.[35] In many towns, hop production and breweries formed the basis of economic self-sustainability for the Czechs.

About 15 families came to Volhynia for religious reasons between 1859 and 1861.[36] Czech settlement for economic attainment did not begin until 1862.[37] The early 1860s was a period of fits and starts for Czech emigration, which would not begin in earnest until 1868. The Czarist government cracked down on a Polish rebellion in Russia in 1863, and this drastic measure deterred many potential settlers.[38] On July 10, 1864, the Russian government outlawed Polish persons in the western provinces of Russia from buying property.[39] Many of the Polish nobles living in Russia were forced to sell large tracts of land, initially to German settlers and later to the Czechs.[40] The Russian government's anti-Polish and pro-emigration policies would soon provide opportunities for the Czech settlers.[41]

Figure 1: František Palacký (public domain)

Political events of 1866-1867 proved to be powerful catalysts for larger emigration to Volhynia. Conditions degraded for Czechs in their homeland because of the Austro-Prussian War which caused many to leave for the United States, Canada and the Volhynia region.[42] Accordingly, the Russian constitution of 1867 encouraged free movement within

[32] The German settlers were also considered good farmers, especially in cattle production. Arndt, 84.
[33] Valášková, 16.
[34] Arndt, 84 and Valášková, 17.
[35] Nadolska, 102.
[36] Arndt, 82.
[37] Ibid.
[38] Valášková, 10.
[39] Ibid, 11.
[40] Ibid, 10.
[41] Nadolska, 99.
[42] Arndt, 82.

the empire.[43] Also in 1867, a Czech delegation led by Czech statesmen František Palacký (known as the "Father of the Nation") and František Ladislav Rieger promoted the Volhynian emigration at a Moscow Pan-Slavic exhibition.[44] A number of speeches from Russian officials spoke highly of the Czar's desire for Czech settlers and after the exhibition the Russian government set up the Commission for Leading Czech Emigrants to Russia.[45] An excerpt from the Skalsky account gives a clear portrait of the time:

Figure 2: František Ladislav Rieger (public domain)

> When people in their desperation searched and for livelihood in foreign countries far and near. Then God moved the heart of Alexander II at the convention of Slavonic people in Moscow at Palacký's request that the Czech people should petition the Russian government that they be allowed to replace the Polish nobility, who were exiled to Siberia because of their revolt against Russia, something which also caused the Russian agricultural economy to decline in Polish Russia.[46]

This letter reveals how nomadic Czechs were during the rule of the Austro-Hungarian Empire. Their quest for economic freedom and self-determination led them to take desperate measures such as moving an entire family across borders or oceans. Again, parallels can be drawn between the defeated Polish nobility and the American plantation owners who were forced to sell their lands at bargain prices.

Despite political encouragement, emigration to Volhynia was mostly a private enterprise. In 1866 a man from southern Bohemia named Frantisek Přibyl began actively recruiting Czechs to settle there.[47] He and two Polish land agents established a real estate company to market properties to would-be settlers.[48] They marketed the Volhynian lands with the following arguments: they provided quality land at low prices, closer to home than America, with lower transportation costs, Russian government incentives, and the appeal to Pan-Slavism.[49] To a poor, land-deprived Czech farmer these reasons appeared to be a good deal. Přibyl

[43] Janská, 124.
[44] Valášková, 10.
[45] Ibid, 11.
[46] Skalsky.
[47] Valášková, 12.
[48] Ibid.
[49] Ibid.

published his appeals in the Czech newspaper *Národní listy* in early 1868 and was subsequently arrested by Austrian police.[50] However, he soon left with the first 14 buyers for the town of Rovno in Volhynia.[51] Přibyl and another Czech, Josef Olič, would become the settlers' main representatives with the Russian government.[52] Olič stirred nationalistic feelings by stating: "If we don't buy the Volhynian estates, the Germans will buy them instead."[53]

During this "golden period" of migration, 15,000 Czechs would emigrate to Volhynia between 1868 and 1874.[54] In 1870, a decree was issued that Czech settlers could become Russian citizens without waiting the normal five years and they would be allowed to establish their own schools, churches and local governing bodies.[55] In the towns the settlers started Sokols, Czech-language newspapers, and Comenius Societies.[56] Again, Skalsky captures the era:

> It happened at the time in the year of 1872 that more and more Czech people came to Volhynian Russia; the governor of that province declared that they suffered persecution for their beliefs that they would have freedom, meaning the Hussites. Furthermore they would not pay any taxes or serve in the army up to 20 years; not only those were immigrants from Bohemia, but also those who were born in Russia, would be obliged to serve in the army.[57]

Conditions begin to change

Conditions worsened for the settlers in the late 1880s and 1890s. Migration slowed in the 1880s because land prices in Volhynia increased; Czech-friendly Alexander II was assassinated in 1881.[58] Soon the Russian government clamped down on immigration and passed laws limiting purchase of land from those who were not of the Orthodox faith.[59] Czech teachers were told they must teach the Russian language and the Orthodox faith.[60] In 1885, the Russian Empire outlawed new foreign settlements in Volhynia and two years later outlawed the purchase of land by foreign nationals.[61] These laws coincided with a government policy of Russification within the empire.[62]

---

[50] Ibid, 13.
[51] Ibid.
[52] Ibid, 12.
[53] Ibid, 14.
[54] Arndt, 84.
[55] Valášková, 15.
[56] Magocsi, 372.
[57] Skalsky.
[58] Valášková, 16.
[59] Ibid.
[60] Ibid, 19.
[61] Ibid, 16.
[62] Ibid, 18.

In 1888, after much frustration with the "Hussite" priests, the Czech parishes were discontinued by governmental decree.[63] The situation became even worse in 1889, when Czar Alexander III closed Czech schools and local administrative bodies.[64] The 1890s were a period of cultural decline for the Volhynian Czechs as illiteracy increased.[65]

Despite these difficulties, an 1897 census listed 27,660 Czechs living in the Volhynia region.[66] A Russian government official at the time said that the settlers "enjoy friendly relations with the local peasants, marry into their families, start joint schools, and some have even already converted to Orthodoxy."[67] In fact the same census reported that 66 percent of Volhynian Czechs were of Orthodox faith.[68] Czech ethnographer E. Rychlik said this of them, "Comparing a Czech from Bohemia with a Ukrainian Czech, we see in the latter a completely different, new person, a completely different ethnographic type."[69]

Turn of the century

The settlers' situation did not improve until the turn of the century. In 1903 the Russian Empire declared religious freedom, reversing its prior policy.[70] Slowly Czech culture was able to regain some of its footing in Volhynia and in other parts of the Russian lands.[71] By 1912 the number of Czechs living in Volhynia was estimated to be between 30,000 and 50,000.[72]

In 1914 hostilities began all across Europe. The Great War caused young Czech men to be conscripted into the Russian Army, but the empire also allowed the formation of the Czechoslovak Legion.[73] The famous American diplomat George F. Kennan wrote about the Legion in 1957: "There were numbers of Czechs and Slovaks residing in some of the larger cities, as well as a few Czech colonists in the countryside in Volhynia."[74] In 1917 the Legion was formed out of the *Česká družina*, a military unit in Kiev consisting mostly of Czech settlers in Russian lands.[75] Future Czechoslovak president Tomáš G. Masaryk visited Kiev in this same year to meet with the Ukrainian branch of the Czechoslovak National

[63] Ibid.
[64] Arndt, 83.
[65] Ibid, 84 and Valášková, 19.
[66] Janská, 124.
[67] Nadolska, 102.
[68] Ibid, 103.
[69] Nadolska, 104.
[70] Valášková, 18.
[71] Ibid, 19.
[72] Janská, 124.
[73] Valášková, 19.
[74] George F. Kennan, "The Czechoslovak Legion," *Russian Review* 15 (October 1957): 3.
[75] Ibid, 3-4, Magocsi, 543.

Council.[76] Masaryk saw to it that the Legion could leave the Ukrainian lands in Russia to help fight for Czechoslovak independence.[77]

During the war, Volhynia was occupied by both Austro-Hungarian and German armies, both of which significantly damaged their livelihood and quality of life.[78] At the same time, the Russian Revolution was taking place, and ethnic minorities had to petition to obtain the autonomous status which they once held.[79] War and revolution all but decimated the settlers' dream of developing Volhynia, once a promised land of opportunity.

The following timeline notes major events for Czechs living in Volhynia following World War I:

1921: Volhynia was split into two parts by the Peace Treaty of Riga in 1921, with the western half going to Poland and the eastern half becoming a part of Ukraine under the Soviet Union.[80]

1927: The USSR begins its farm collectivization policy which forced the longtime settlers to enter agricultural cooperatives in eastern Volhynia.[81]

1939: Nazi Germany invades Poland starting World War II, and Volhynia is reunited under the USSR.[82]

1941: Volhynia is occupied by German forces, and collective farming is halted.[83]

1943: The German Army burns the town of Český Malín to the ground in retribution for supposed partisan activities.[84]

1945: More than 4,000 Volhynian Czech soldiers fight in Czechoslovakia, and many stay at war's end.[85]

1945-1947: First major resettlement program begins, led by the Czechoslovak Ministry of Agriculture and the Office for Resettlement, in agreement with the

[76] Ibid, 544.
[77] Ibid.
[78] Valášková, 19.
[79] Magocsi, 536.
[80] Valášková, 20.
[81] Ibid, 22.
[82] Ibid, 24.
[83] Ibid.
[84] Irmgard Hein Ellingson, "Volhynian Legacy," *Federation of East European Family History Societies Journal* 9 (2001): 29.
[85] Valášková, 24.

Soviets.[86] After World War II, approximately 53,000 Czechs left Volhynia and Transcarpathia.[87]

1990-1991: Resettlement program begins for Czechs living near Kiev, Ukraine affected by the Chernobyl disaster.[88] Ukraine declares its independence from the USSR.

2011-present: About 800 Volhynian Czech descendants living in the Czech Republic seek compensation for farms and property confiscated by the former USSR.[89]

Although the Volhynian Czechs were living in the middle of history-making events, the twentieth century was not terribly kind to them. Frequent political upheavals damaged their standard of living, while Russification policies and the natural course of assimilation affected culture. Many would leave for the United States or re-emigrate back to their Bohemian homeland.

[86] Ibid, 25.
[87] Magocsi, 688.
[88] Although Kiev is not in the Volhynia region, this policy would soon apply to the Volhynia Czechs. Valášková, 37.
[89] Richter.

The Exile Literary Critic Igor Hájek and His Contribution to Czech Studies in a Foreign Context

Karolina Slamová

Igor Hájek was born in 1931 in Ostrava in the Czechoslovak Republic. His father, a bank clerk from Hradec Králové, used to take his son for hiking tours in the mountains, and liked taking photographs and painting. Hájek's mother, an energetic Moravian, had a talent for music and was an avid reader of non-fiction and member of the ELK.[1]

After World War II broke out, Hájek's parents divorced. His mother moved to Ústí nad Labem (at that time a part of the occupied border area) together with her second husband, a doctor who was transferred there during the Protectorate of Bohemia and Moravia. As a small schoolboy Hájek stayed with his grandparents in Ostrava and he could not move to north Bohemia to join his mother until the liberation in 1945. In 1950 he passed his secondary school leaving examination and in the autumn he went to the university in Prague.

Separation from his parents during the war, permanent danger and getting used to radical changes helped Igor Hájek to cultivate self-reliance, self-confidence and independent thinking.[2] He was strongly influenced by the modern industrial cities he grew up in, their contemporary architecture and cultural impulses. He always liked hiking; as a child, he wandered through the Beskydy a Jeseníky Mountains. Later he took a fancy to the Českosaské Švýcarsko, deserts in California, and the Lake District in England (the Lancashire Dales and Morecambe Bay). During his studies he read about Wyeth's reproduction *Christina's World* showing farming scenery, which he brought from the United States. He loved art, modern architecture and classical music. Hájek could speak several foreign languages – he absorbed them by reading literary works in their original text or by listening to the radio rather than from textbooks.[3]

University Studies and Early Career in Prague

An interest in jazz, awakened at secondary school, motivated Igor Hájek to study English and Anglo-American culture more deeply. He was admitted to the Philosophical Faculty of Charles University in Prague, where he studied English and American studies and Czech studies from 1950 to 1955, during the tough

[1] ELK – European Literary Club (Evropský literární klub), founded in 1935, published European bestsellers (Čapek, northern authors, etc.). ELK had to stop its activities in 1948; at that time it had about 100,000 members. In 1997 it was reestablished with the intent to follow in the original idea expressed by its founders, the brothers Janda, to bring Czech culture closer to Europe and vice versa.

[2] Two members of the family were imprisoned in Mauthausen; his mother's brother, a young mining engineer, lost his life there.

[3] At grammar school there was compulsory German and optional French, after the war compulsory Russian and optional English. In the third year pupils started to learn Latin, and sometimes Greek was offered as an optional subject.

Stalinist regime. In the press and in literary seminars a hate campaign was led against the poet Jaroslav Seifert and his poem *Píseň o Viktorce [Song of Viktorka]* (Seifert's daughter had to leave the Philosophical Faculty of the Charles University). Students could be expelled from university for indulging in "decadent" jazz and listening to blues musicians such as Louis Armstrong and Ella Fitzgerald. In connection with this, Jan Čulík observes: "Students and teachers were under considerable ideological pressure—the diploma theses topics were chosen with great caution. For that matter, when somebody studied English, the communist regime considered it to be almost subversive activity."[4] Igor Hájek only returned to his native city as a holiday worker; at that time, students spent their summer and winter holiday on socialist construction.[5] His dissertation thesis dealt with the literary work of the eighteenth century Scottish novelist Tobias Smollett.

Hájek's generation of graduates received job assignments from the state. Igor Hájek was assigned to a theatre and literary agency called Dilia,[6] which had a seat in Prague (it was the only agency of its kind in Czechoslovakia).[7] He was responsible for Anglo-American literature and so procured contacts with foreign partners and wrote appraisals on individual works for the publishers. Thus, his position enabled him to influence the literary production of that time to a certain extent, which, from a political point of view, was a hot issue in the 1950s. Anglo-American Literature and students of English in general were assessed with high suspicion. Igor Hájek noted in his memoirs: "Of Western writers, again only

[4] Igor Hájek, *Prokletá i požehnaná*. *Eseje o české literatuře,* (Praha: Dokořán, 2007), p. 185.

[5] Hájek's wife Marcela remembers that it was typical of him to come to shifts in overalls with no missing buttons and boots from which he had cleaned off all the mud.

[6] The agency was established in 1949 and still exists as a citizens' association of authors and copyright owners. Dilia negotiates and concludes license agreements for using works by Czech as well as foreign authors. It focuses mainly on the areas of theater, literature and media. One of Igor Hájek's colleagues was Professor Alena Morávková (a renowned translator from Russian and Ukrainian—she translated Gogol, Dostojevkij and contemporary Russian dramatists and prose writers), who worked in the theater department at that time. She also taught at the Philosophical Faculty of the Charles University and at the Academy of Music and Dramatic Arts. At present she is the head of the Prague Group of the Society of Arts and Science. While Igor Hájek was employed in Dilia, he also cooperated with Eva Kondrysová, a renowned translator of Anglo-American literature (Jane Austen, Saul Bellow, Henry Fielding, John Updike), who also worked as an editor (from 1958) and in the 1960s as the deputy editor of *Světová literatura* [World Literature], which published texts by authors whose books still could not be published at that time. She later made arrangement for translators who could not publish their work after 1968 to translate under somebody else's name.

[7] Igor Hájek's wife, Marcela, also an Anglicist, started teaching English and Russian as a lecturer at the ČVUT (the Czech Technical College); then she worked for Státní pedagogické nakladatelství (the State Pedagogical Press), and after that at the Encyclopedic Institute of the Czech Academy of Sciences; at the same time she also translated (Mark Twain, Harper Lee: *To Kill a Mocking Bird* – together with Igor Hájek).

progressiveness like Howard Fast, who, due to his membership of the U.S. Communist Party, became the greatest American living writer, a pioneer of socialist realism. Hemingway was called decadent, because he allowed himself to be photographed dressed only in shorts and holding a cat in his arms. Such depravity evidently disastrously affected his prose and could in turn infect the reader."[8] Publishing a particular book in Czech translation largely depended on shrewdness of those who recommended it. Jan Čulík explained: "The translated novels needed to be defended by carefully drafted, bogus "literary" essays, printed with the translations, which 'placed the work in the context of the Marxist struggle' and persuaded the censors that the Western author was 'progressive.'"[9] Igor Hájek's other responsibility was to choose books suitable for publishing abroad, and he therefore became acquainted with all Czech and Slovak production (comprising both modern and classical literature). In addition to this, his occupation allowed him incredibly valuable access to western periodicals and books. In comparison with that the department of Anglo-American Studies of the Philosophical Faculty of Charles University could hardly afford to buy ten publications a year at the time.[10] As his knowledge deepened, he started to publish essays on modern British and American literature in various periodicals, and to translate.

In 1963 he left Dilia to become an editorial consultant in the newly founded Center for Publishing and Bookselling (Středisko pro vydávání a knižní obchod) in Prague. The half state-owned organization was subject to the Ministry of Culture, where he was responsible for publishing translated literature. A year later he accepted a post as an editor for *Literární noviny*, the most prestigious intellectual periodical in the country with a circulation of 300,000. At the newspaper he was responsible for foreign literature and worked side by side with such personalities as Milan Jungmann, Antonín J. Liehm, Ludvík Vaculík, as well as his generation fellows Ivan Klíma, Vladimír Karfík and Milan Schulz from 1964 to May 1969, when Dubček's government fell. During the 1960s *Literární noviny* became the platform of fighting for a more independent way of public and artistic expression and as the conditions became more and more liberal with the approaching Prague Spring, it provided increasingly larger space for open exchange of opinions.[11]

Igor Hájek was a member of the Czechoslovak Writers' Union (Svaz československých spisovatelů) from 1965 until it was dissolved in 1970. Simultaneously with work for the newspaper he also wrote for *Světová literatura, Plamen* and *Host do domu.* His long-time friend Josef Škvorecký remembers that

---

[8] Igor Hájek, "Editor, Translator, Critic." *World Literature Today. Formerly Books Abroad.* A literary Quarterly of the University of Oklahoma. A reprint from August 1980, p. 575.
[9] Jan Čulík, "Igor Hájek." *The Independent*, April 27, 1995.
[10] It is clear from Hájek's curriculum vitae of 1977, which is deposited at Glasgow University in the Department of Slavonic Studies.
[11] In February 1968 *Literární noviny* was renamed and, after temporary cancellation, called *Literární listy*; after the August invasion the name changed to *Listy,* and in May 1969 the newspaper was stopped. It did not start to be published again until November 1989.

time in his introduction for the collection of Hájek's essays translated from English to make them accessible for Czech readers: "Then I became an editor for *Světová literatura*, the magazine whose popularity can be understood only by few of those who did not experience the time of editions not responding to the readers' demand, time of censorship, allegories, concealed hints which now creak in the texts written because of them. Igor became one of the early authors of this magazine. The very first report about the beat generation,[12] known only by vague hearsay at that time, was written by him. When the authorities later removed me from *Světová literatura* and Igor became an editor in another conspiratorial centre, *Literární noviny*, I repaid him—when the newspaper was called *Listy* after various interventions by the establishment—by a review of Thornwald's book about detective stories. It was shortly before [the Soviet] military invasion."[13]

Soon after finishing his studies Igor Hájek started his lifelong translation work. His first published translation was *The Pearl* by John Steinbeck (1958), after which he translated books by Charles Beaumont, Graham Greene, John Updike, Harper Lee, Eudora Welty and David Riesman. In 1968 Igor Hájek was awarded a scholarship by Ford's Fund for the translation of Updike's novel *The Centaur*. He also won a reward for his translation of the sociological analysis *The Lonely Crowd* by David Riesman. Hájek was able to travel with his wife on a short holiday to the western world for the first time, on August 21, 1968. Czechoslovakia was occupied by the Warsaw Pact armies a day after their arrival in London, Hájek immediately contacted the *The Times* editorial office where he met Richard Davy,[14] who worked as an editor for the newspaper at that time, and published his commentaries and short essays concerning the current situation under a pen name (later also anonymously, which was then common in *The Times Literary Supplement*). Richard Davy remembers those August days: "He was still in London, when his country was invaded by the Soviet Union and its allies. The morning after, I was sitting in my office in the *Times*, wondering how to get news out of occupied Prague, when Igor walked in carrying an elaborate radio. 'Listen,' he said excitedly, 'I can pick up all the clandestine radio stations in

[12] Jan Čulík in his biographical portrait about Igor Hájek (Hájek, *Prokletá i požehnaná*, p. 186) mentions a political scandal connected with the visit by Allen Ginsberg to Prague in 1965. State Security (StB) got hold of a notebook in which the American poet took critical notes concerning the then communist regime. Antonín Novotný publicly assailed Igor Hájek in his speech as "a man who made a 'wall to a representative of imperialism in Prague.'" However, Hájek's objective literary review—compared to the excited articles about the king of Majáles (a traditional student celebration in May) in other periodicals—was mainly a welcome pretext for another charge against *Literární noviny*.

[13] Hájek *Prokletá i požehnaná*, p. 8.

[14] Richard Davy, an Oxford University graduate, worked for *The Times* for almost thirty years. He was a foreign correspondent in Germany, Washington D.C. and Eastern Europe and he specialized in relations between the East and the West. At present he is a Senior Member at St. Anthony's College in Oxford.

Czechoslovakia.' Thereafter, for several days and nights, he sat in my office monitoring the news that poured out of these stations."[15]

He also kept in touch with W. L. Webb, an editor of *The Guardian*, the British liberal daily, who describes his first meeting with Igor Hájek (he appeared in his uniform of a reserve lieutenant, because he had just come back from his military exercise) in the editorial office of *Literární noviny* in Prague in spring 1968 and subsequent encounters: "After that I called on him regularly when I was in Prague, taken equally with his cautious but well-informed political judgments, his shrewdness as a literary critic (and distinguished translator of modern English and American literature), and with a line in comic lugubriousness which somehow wasn't less funny, only more endearing, when one realized the extent to which it was his strategy for dealing with depression."[16] Later, in England they became friends cemented by their trips to the Lake District, a paradise for nature lovers: "Igor has always been a great walker, and in the early days when he was miserably cooped up on that raw campus with no car, I used to drive him up to the Lake District, as a modest substitute for the wilder peaks of his beloved High Tatras."[17]

Czech Anglicist and Lecturer in Czech Studies in Exile

After returning from London to Prague, Igor Hájek continued his editorial work for a short period before leaving for the United States. His stay was funded by a scholarship and he conducted a number of interviews with writers, literary critics and academic workers. He and John Updike became friends; they kept in touch for many years and from time to time visited each other.

In 1969, when Igor Hájek and his wife landed in Britain on the way back from New York, they had a very important decision to make. They were used to life without family background—Hájek's father and his wife's parents and her older brother were no longer alive, moreover now they were not sure if they would be able to return to their professions in Czechoslovakia. The newspaper *Listy* was stopped, intellectual life was oppressed again: books with Hájek's translations were removed from public libraries in the era of normalization.[18] Hájek thus decided to settle in London for a while and make a living as a freelance journalist.[19]

---

[15] Richard Davy, "Igor Hájek," *The Independent*, April 27, 1995.

[16] The obituary was published in *The Guardian* on April 29,1995 under the title "The Good Soldier of Czech Literature."

[17] W. L. Webb, "The Good Soldier of Czech Literature," *The Guardian,* April 29,1995.

[18] The whole print of Hájek's translation of Updike's novel *On the Farm [Na farmě]*was destroyed and the typesetting distributed.

[19] Marcela Hájková joined specialist publisher Addison-Wesley in London as an editor; she became Senior Editor and worked on audio and audio-video foreign language courses in Linguaphone Institute. (The founder of the world-wide known company was allegedly inspired by Comenius' idea of using all senses in the process of learning, especially his treatise *Ianua linguarum reserata*.) After she retired, she cooperated on two documentaries

Lancaster

In October 1970 Igor Hájek assumed the position of a research worker in the Comenius Centre [Komenského centrum] belonging to a newly established Lancaster University.[20] It was during the economic boom in the 1960s when universities were looking for academic workers; this expansion of the British educational system lasted until the oil crisis in 1973. The head of the Department of Slavonic Studies was Sir Cecil Parrott,[21] who came to Lancaster in 1966 and two years later established the Comenius Centre hoping that it would gradually grow and become a significant research center. This prepared the ground for teaching Czech studies, which were taught in Lancaster for the first time in the academic year 1969/1970. As a professor of central and south-eastern Europe (from 1971), Parrott worked at the new established department[22] for five years until he retired. Zbyněk Zeman became his successor.[23] Igor Hájek taught in Lancaster together with Josef Fronek[24] and Danuše Kňourková,[25] a devoted

called: *Time Stood Still* (hosted by John Tusa, BBC, 1993, about the situation in Prague after 1989, and *Bata-ville—We are not afraid of the future*, 2005, a film by two young women documentary filmmakers about a nostalgic trip of the employees of the closed Baťa factories in Britain to present-day Zlín, reflecting on Baťa's philosophy and the postindustrial world. She has also co-edited the book *Jací jsme* [*What we are like*] by Jan Čulík (Brno: Host, 2007).

[20] Lancaster is a town in the northwest of England with a historically significant port, now the cultural and university center of Lancastershire.

[21] In the first half of the 1960s (1960-1966) Cecil Parrott (1909-1984) served as an ambassador in Czechoslovakia and he took a deep interest in Czech culture (he turned his attention to Slavonic studies as early as 1934, when he became Yugoslav Crown Prince Petr's private tutor). He also translated (his translation of Hašek's *Švejk* will be dealt with in another chapter). In 1977 he published Hašek's biography, *The Bad Bohemian*. The obituary published on June 26 in *The Times* recapitulates: "Parrott's was the driving force behind an excellent Slavonic studies department which flourished in a then new and unproven university and led the way in its field."

[22] In 1970 the department separated from the Russian Studies Department.

[23] Zbyněk Zeman (1928-2011), a Czech historian who lived in Britain from 1948, studied at London and Oxford University; he worked for St. Andrews University and in Amnesty International. After 1989 he returned to Prague.

[24] Josef Fronek, an outstanding lexicographer, is the author of a number of dictionaries. From 1978 he worked for Glasgow University as a lecturer (later as a reader and professor emeritus) in linguistics and phonetics. His life's work is *Velký česko-anglický slovník* (Large Czech-English dictionary) (Praha: Leda, 2000) and *Velký anglicko-český slovník* (Large English-Czech dictionary) (Praha: Leda, 2006). He was awarded a prize for the best dictionary of the year.

[25] Danuše Kňourková came to Britain from Czechoslovakia. Originally she planned to stay for one year and help to establish the Comenius Centre, but after Dubček's fall she did not obey the Czech authorities' summons to return immediately, and, until her death in 1979, she self-sacrificingly worked for the department, where she was responsible for teaching lingustics.

supporter of the center from the very beginning until her untimely death. James D. Naughton joined the department in 1878.[26]

Igor Hájek's first charge in Lancaster was the Czech literature translation project (supported by the Ford Trust). At the same time he had an extensive work load within the framework of teaching Czechoslovak studies. In Britain he fully concentrated on Czech literature and he presented it to the students by comparing Czech authors with British and American ones. Newly introduced courses provided information on Czech and Slovak literary history, seminars focused on modern prose and poetry that had been translated into English. Preparing for lessons was time-consuming, mainly because Czech literature had not been taught in Lancaster before. Besides, there was no modern publication in English on Czech literary history, so it was necessary to use a new edition of the book by František Chudoba from 1924, called *A Short Survey of Czech Literature*.[27] In 1971, Igor Hájek was appointed a lecturer for Czechoslovak studies in the Central and South-Eastern Europe studies department at Lonsdale College at Lancaster University.

An article by Sir Cecil Parrott[28] provided thorough information concerning this department. The author states that Slavonic studies graduates had relatively limited opportunities to find employment. However, with respect to the importance of Central Europe for understanding the historical context of West European society, this knowledge could be useful for a number of other fields of study. Lancaster University tried to comply with these needs by introducing one and two year courses within the framework of other study programs, making it possible for the students to acquire a certain extent of knowledge of the language and culture of a particular Slavonic country. Two countries were selected as the subject of the study—Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia. A new course aiming at presenting the history of the two Slavonic countries on a comparative basis was introduced as well. It was suitable mainly for history and politics students. Besides these supplementary courses, the department also offered a study program focused on Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia and provided the postgraduate study program specialized in East-European studies. The existence of these programs was conditional on there being a sufficient number of students, so it was necessary to motivate potential candidates adequately. Professor Parrott took an actual case when he mentioned an opportunity for western historians. The interpretation of Czech history was subject to varying ideological pressure, which often led to

---

[26] James Duncan Naughton studied in Oxford, where he now teaches Czech and Slovak language and literature. He is a member of St. Edmund Hall College in Oxford, the author of the textbook of Czech language for beginners *Colloquial Czech* (3rd revised edition, London: Routledge, 2011) and the publication *Czech: An Essential Grammar* (London: Routledge, 2005). He has translated Czech authors into English, mainly Bohumil Hrabal (*Městečko, kde se zastavil čas*, 1993, *Dopisy Dubence*, 1998).

[27] František Chudoba, *A Short Survey of Czech Literature,* (London: Kegan, Paul, Trench, Trubner, 1924, reprint New York: Kraus Reprint, 1969).

[28] Published on February 14,1975 in *The Times Higher Education Supplement* under the title "Time to Tear Down the Iron Curtain from European Studies."

biased and distorted views. Understanding Czech culture and traditions would enable a more objective approach as far as European history is concerned.

At that time, the number of those who were interested in Czech studies at the university was about thirty in one year, which was the result of interest in Czechoslovakia after the August invasion.

A mathematics professor, Peter McClintock, described Igor Hájek in his obituary as a competent university teacher and a collegue with a good sense of humour: "In addition to teaching and researching in Sir Cecil Parrot's Comenius Centre, Hájek also served as Dean of Cartmel College (its chief disciplinary officer). His jurisdiction was characterised by insight, firmness and scrupulous fairness, coupled with a wonderful ironic sense of humour that often helped to defuse potentially explosive situations—even when misguided students mouthed Marxist rhetoric at him, failing to appreciate that his Czech background had given him a degree of insight into the nature of such regimes.

Hájek contributed to the life of the community in numerous ways. His proposed solution to the endemic problem of cockroaches in the college kitchens, to engage the services of a tame hedgehog—an absolutely standard and reliable medieval remedy, he explained—did not, alas, find favour. But his seasonal advice on finding, gathering, preserving and preparing wild mushrooms, published in local newspapers, was appreciated by many."[29]

Glasgow

When Margaret Thatcher became the British Prime Minister in 1979, British universities were heavily affected by her policies. Due to a reduction in the number of academic workers by 20 percent, many had to retire prematurely and some workplaces, including the Central and South-Eastern Europe Studies Department at Lonsdale College at Lancaster University, were cancelled. Zbyněk Zeman and James D. Naughton became members of St. Edmund Hall College in Oxford and started teaching Central European history and Czech studies there.

Igor Hájek moved to Glasgow University,[30] to the Department of Slavonic Languages and Literature. From 1984 (after two year's teaching at Berkeley University in California) he worked as a senior lecturer there together with Josef Fronek, who taught linguistics.[31] Igor Hájek was responsible for teaching the following subjects: Czech literature, Czech writers and society, cultural

[29] The obituary was published on May 1, 1995 in the British daily *The Independent*.

[30] Glasgow is the largest Scottish city in the industrial belt of Scotland. It experienced its largest growth in the eighteenth century, during the industrial revolution, when Glasgow became an important port for trade with America and the centre of the cotton and engineering industries. The contemporary city is a cosmopolitan metropolis. Glasgow University was established in 1451 and is the fourth oldest university in Britain (after Oxford, Cambridge and St. Andrews).

[31] The tradition of teaching Czech at Glasgow University goes back to 1948, when Ludvík Soukup, Jan Masaryk's former secretary, was appointed a lecturer in Czech studies and worked for the university until his retirement in 1981.

development in Eastern Europe after 1945, and later he became the head of the department. He continued to build up the extensive Czech studies library which he had partly managed to move from Lancaster to Glasgow (about three thousand volumes; the larger part of the library, about five thousand volumes was moved to the Slavonic Library at the Faculty of Modern Languages at Oxford University).[32]

With the support of the British Academy Igor Hájek participated in the research project "Czech Émigré Publishing in the 1970s." In March 1980 he travelled to Canada and the United States to collect material connected with exile publishing activities. He visited the publishing house 68 Publishers in Toronto and Framar Publishers in Los Angeles, as well as Czech authors living in exile: Josef Škvorecký in Toronto, Arnošt Lustig in Washington, D. C., Jan Beneš in Pacific Grove in California and Czech literature scholars and translators: professor A. J. Liehm, Professor Petr Steiner (University of Pennsylvania), Professor Michael Heim (University of California, Los Angeles), and Professor Markéta Goetz-Stankiewicz (University of British Columbia). Within the framework of the project he also gave lectures at universities in Michigan, Toronto, Pennsylvania, Nebraska, California and Washington.

As a visiting lecturer he taught at universities in the United States in 1977, 1981, 1982 and 1983. At Berkeley in California[33] he largely contributed to improving teaching of the Czech language.[34] In 1992 at Austin University in Texas he became the First Fellow of the newly established Czech Studies Department, which was to a considerable extent supported by contributions by old English-speaking residents, descendants of immigrants who came mostly from Moravia in the nineteenth century. Before he left, The Czech Educational Foundation of Texas awarded him an honorary plaque.[35]

Igor Hájek's Contribution to Czech Studies in the International Context

A great deal of Igor Hájek's time and energy was taken up with paperwork connected to his later position of the head of the Department of Slavonic Languages and Literature.[36] Whenever the department was fighting with lack of money or existential uncertainty, he managed to use tact and a diplomatic

[32] The data adopted from James D. Naughton's text, Bohemistika ve Velké Británii [Czech studies in Great Britain] [www.ucl.cas.cz/edicee/data/sborniky/kongres/SLBI/35.pdf)].

[33] Berkley University had the largest number of Nobel Prize holders (in the area of Slavic Studies, Czesław Miłosz).

[34] In his letter to R. P. Hughes, the head of the Department of Slavonian Languages and Literature, he recommended livening up the lessons by systematic use of current articles from magazines, songs and poetry and recordings (e.g. Karel Čapek's stories), as well as complementing the library with lexicographic publications, e.g. *Slovník spisovné češtiny* [Dictionary of contemporary Czech]; *Anglicko-český slovník* [English-Czech dictionary]; *Příruční slovník naučný* (Desk encyclopedia) etc.

[35] When Igor Hájek died, American compatriots send a bouquet of yellow roses from Texas to the funeral in the Gothic chapel of Glasgow University.

[36] In his work schedule from 1990 Igor Hájek stated that paperwork took up to 45 percent of his time.

approach to prevent conflicts. As an efficient administrator he mainly protected his colleagues from excessive paperwork so that they could devote their time to research work (it was appreciated by a fruitful lexicographer Josef Fronek and English language consultants who cooperated on his dictionaries, John Dunn and Margaret Tejerizo); "Igor was an ideal colleague, the ideal Head of Department"[37] summarized Martin Dewhirst, a specialist in Russian language and culture.

Igor Hájek regularly published his reviews and articles in the *Times Literary Supplement* and the *Scottish Slavonic Review* as well as in professional journals. His participation in several significant world literature encyclopaedias largely contributed to the presentation of Czech culture abroad. For example, he wrote a treatise on Czech literature published in January 1976 by Frederick Ungar in New York under the title *Modern Slavic Literatures*, Volume II, and a number of dictionary entries for *Encyclopaedia of World Literature* published by the same publisher. He also continued in his translation activity—in 1973, *American Review*, no. 17, published Hájek's translation of Philip Roth's *I Always Wanted You to Admire My Fasting*; *or Looking at Kafka*. 68 Publishers in Toronto published his translation of Alan Levy's *Rowboat to Prague* in 1975.[38]

In 1977, Igor Hájek together with his long-time friend Josef Škvorecký started to collect material for a voluminous and unique encyclopaedia of Czech writers, comprising authors living in Czechoslovakia including those whose names disappeared from official publications due to censorship, as well as Czech authors living abroad. Hájek took charge of sending questionnaires to the exiled authors asking them to provide data that could be used for writing individual encyclopaedia entries and eliminating inaccuracies. The dictionary was published by 68 Publishers in Toronto in 1982.[39]

With respect to raising public awareness of Czech culture abroad, Igor Hájek had other merits besides his publication and teaching activities. On March 14, 1989 he submitted a proposal for granting an honorary doctorate for literature to Václav Havel by Glasgow University. He argued that Havel's dramas are very popular in Britain (since the middle of the 1960s Havel's plays were produced in British theatres and presented by the BBC). Hájek also referred to Havel's essays and the fact that his *Letters to Olga* had been published in Britain shortly before. However, he did not live to see the ceremonial occasion when Havel received the honorary doctorate diploma from the rector of the university.[40] Glasgow University was also visited by Bohumil Hrabal and Arnošt Lustig.

---

[37] Condolence from April 1995.

[38] It appeared in a reedition after 1989, along with a highly favourable review in the journal *Tvar* , no. 14.

[39] Jiří Brabec, et al., *Slovník zakázaných autorů*, (Praha: Státní pedagogické nakladatelství, 1991).

[40] Václav Havel received an honorary doctorate from the University of Glasgow on November 7, 1997 during his official visit to Great Britain. (*Britské listy,* October 16, 1997, informed about these events.)

Igor Hájek was succeeded in the Department of Slavonic languages and literature at Glasgow University by Jan Čulík,[41] a Charles University graduate (in Czech and English studies), who already taught Czech literature, history and East European studies from 1978 to 1983. Since 2002 he has been organizing study stays in cooperation with universities in Prague, Brno and Ostrava, where he also gives lectures and leads seminars. Like his predecessors Parrott and Hájek, as the head of the reorganized Czech section of the School of Modern Languages and Cultures at the university he tried to preserve Czech studies in the current difficult economic climate.

After years spent in exile Igor Hájek visited his home country and those colleagues he had lost contact with (Milan Jungmann, Karel Šiktanc, Miroslav Červenka, Vladimír Karfík, Alexandr Stich etc). He met them at meetings organized by the Writers' Union and other events with international participation (for example, the translator Michael Heim from the United States).

In Memoriam

In memory of Igor Hájek a conference named "Slavonic, East and Central European Émigré Literatures: Past, Present—and Future?" was held in Glasgow on November 25 and 26, 1995. Martin Dewhirst in his opening speech appreciated Hájek's deep understanding of history as well as the present state of Central and Eastern Europe. He recalled: "One of the most interesting things about Hájek is that he was not a Czech centric character either before or after his emigration. While in Britain he kept as close an eye on new American literature (he taught for short periods in Austin, Texas, and Berkeley, California) as he did on literary developments and cultural phenomena in his homeland. He had a wonderful ability to convey the beauty and specificity of Czech literature to foreigners and to transmit the originality and peculiarities of British and American writers to his fellow-countrymen. His death just one year prior to retirement has deprived us of a first-rate communicator of both Slavonic and Anglo-Saxon mentalities."[42]

---

[41] Founder and chief editor of the internet daily *Britské listy* (founded, 1996), author of the work *Knihy za ohradou: česká literatura v exilových nakladatelstvích 1971-1989* [Books Beyond the Fence: Czech Literature in Exile Publishing Houses, 1971-1989] (Trizonia: Praha, 1991), four books drawn from articles in *Britské listy*: *...jak Češi myslí* [How Czechs Think] (Chomutov: Milenium Publishing, 1999), *...jak Češi jednají* [How Czechs Behave] (Chomutov: Milenium, 2000), *V hlavních zprávách: Televize. Fakta, která před vámi zatajili* [In Our Main Story: Television: Events They Hide From You] (with Tomáš Pecina; Praha: ISV, 2001) and *Jak Češi bojují: Výbor z Britských listů* [How Czechs Fight: Extracts from *Britské listy*] (with co-authors F. Golgo, Š. Kotrba, R. Mokrý, K. Murphyová, J. Paul, J. Žytek; Praha: Libri, 2003) and the monograph *Jací jsme. Česká společnost v hraném filmu devadesátých a nultých let* [What We're Like: Czech Society in the Cinema of the 90s and 00s] (Brno: Host, 2007).

[42] M. Dewhirts, A. Rigachevskii (eds.) "East and Central European Émigré Literatures: Past, Present – and Future?" *Canadian-American Slavic Studies*, 33, 2-4, (1999): 126.

Only one day before his sudden death in 1995, according to his Glasgow student Elsa Morrison,[43] he was full of energy and spoke about his plans to translate the Renaissance poet John Donne after he retired. A former secondary school teacher, Mrs. Morrison studied Czech in the Department of Slavonic languages and literature at Glasgow University after she retired and now she translates Czech books into English. Igor Hájek's impressive way of teaching is still fresh in her memory.[44]

Jane Dent characterized her teacher as "larger than life." During his lectures his students used to be fascinated by his enthusiasm; Mrs. Dent remembered as he paced the room and transferred them to the world of the writers. He tried to thoroughly depict the time and the atmosphere they lived and worked in. His favourite writers were Ota Pavel, Jaroslav Seifert, Karel Čapek, and Bohumil Hrabal. With respect to Hrabal, he emphasized the so-called "Hrabal language," the author's spiced up artistic style. With Čapek, he mainly focused on *Stories from one pocket [Povídky z jedné kapsy]* and *Stories from the second pocket [Povídky z druhé kapsy]*. The story was the genre which Hájek liked to use in his lessons, because the form makes the author attract the reader within a limited number of pages. For example, when he analyzed Jan Neruda's stories, he pointed out the masterfully depicted atmosphere of Malá Strana. A seminar with Igor Hájek always passed very quickly; during his discussions with students about literary works it was obvious that he really loved his subject. When he spoke about his favorite places in Prague, his attitude showed how proud he was of Czech writers and culture. However, he admitted that he had not felt free before he left Czechoslovakia and that living abroad had broadened his horizons.[45]

Marcela Hájek received letters from a number of students who read of Igor Hájek's death in the British, American and Czech press.

Professor Kirkwood recalled his last discussion with Igor Hájek: "My last conversation with Igor was at lunch, on the day he died. I remember he was asking me with interest about my recent trip to Australia. We compared notes about the retrospective merits of deserts, whether of the Californian or antipodean kind. He reminded me of a recent conversation in which he had advised me to move into Czech crowns, since they were apparently grossly undervalued. I said that I had passed the information on to my son, a foreign exchange dealer in the City. We walked back to the Department together and I last saw him alive outside the door to his office on our corridor in the Hetherington Building. I remember I walked on down the corridor and looked back in response to an afterthought of his to see him unlock his door and finish what he was saying with characteristic smile and ironic shrug of his shoulders. And I said something in response and turned back down the corridor, unaware of the significance of that moment."[46]

---

[43] Personal interview with Elsa Morrison, June 24, 2009.

[44] "…boundless energy (and devotion to his subject and country)," confirms Professor Robert Pynsent in his letter of condolence addressed to Marcela Hájková from April 22, 1995.

[45] Based on a telephone conversation with Jane Dent from January 16, 2010.

[46] Professor Kirkwood: Igor Hájek as a colleague (personal memories), pp. 3-4.

A long-time friend from *Literární noviny,* A. J. Liehm, concluded: "A real comrade…he stayed true to himself even in exile."[47]

Martin Pilař in his article called "Igor Hájek or Contradictions between home and exile reflection on Czech literature [Igor Hájek aneb rozpory mezi domácí a exilovou reflexí české literatury]" summarized Igor Hájek's significance as follows: "In the introduction of this treatise it was stated that exile prose writers who exchange Czech for the language of their new home have become recognized again in their home country. Igor Hájek, a Czech studies scholar who wrote in English, no doubt deserves an honorary place next to generally better known personalities of exile and samizdat Czech literary criticism."[48]

Josef Škvorecký, in the above mentioned introduction, points out that Igor Hájek, as one of few exiled literary critics, maintained an objective approach. He was not influenced by ideological considerations and he presented exile and samizdat as well as officially published literature in such a way that would make it understandable for foreign readers.[49]

Igor Hájek's extensive activity significantly contributed to the presentation of Czech literature in the English speaking environment, and as an exiled literary critic he deserves a significant place in the history of Czech literature. A selection of his essays and reviews were published in Czech translation under the title *Prokletá a požehnaná, eseje o české literatuře [Damned and Blessed: Essays on Czech Literature]* in Prague by Dokořán in 2007. Igor Hájek's views of literature, mainly theatre, are quoted in the academic work *Dějiny české literatury 1945-1989* (Pavel Janoušek a kolektiv) [Czech Literary History: 1945-1989]. This article is not only a life story of a Czech studies scholar who won recognition in exile. It is also about the atmosphere in which he and his generation grew up. It informs us about the history of Czech studies in English-speaking countries, about life lived between two cultures. It tries to encompass a personality who won the respect of his British and American colleagues and whose self-sacrificing work in exile for Czech literature has not been forgotten.

Author's Note: Personal information contained in this article was discussed by the author in London in June 2009 during personal meetings with Marcela Hájek, who later added some additional details and explanations in letter correspondence and during telephone discussions together with photographs. Data concerning Igor Hájek's work are based on materials deposited at Glasgow University, generally accessible newspaper articles and personal memories of Igor Hájek's former colleagues and students.

---

[47] In a letter of condolence from April 25, 1995.

[48] Martin Pilař, *Vrabec v hrsti aneb Kliše v literature* [A Bird in the Hand, or Cliches in Literature], (Praha: Dokořán, 2005), s. 52. (The article was first published in *Britské listy* on June 8, 2001, www.blisty.cz)

[49] Hájek , *Prokletá i požehnaná*, p. 10.

Václav Havel and the Legacy of Tomáš G. Masaryk[1]

Zdeněk V. David

The influence of Masaryk's philosophy on politics did not end with the destruction of the state of Czechoslovakia, which he inspired and which retained a democratic form of government in the interwar period 1918-1938 while its neighbors in central and eastern Europe adopted authoritarianism, if not totalitarianism.[2] After five decades of totalitarian regimes imposed by the National Socialist Germany and the Communist Soviet Union (relieved by a brief respite of the Prague Spring in 1967-1969), Masaryk's political style once again reappeared toward the end of 1989 as the moving spirit of the statehood of Czechoslovakia, and after 1992 of the Czech Republic. The credit for this task of restoration belonged above all to the example and leadership of Václav Havel, who gradually assimilated Masaryk's ideas from early youth through the phase as dissident under the Communist regime to finally assuming the high office which Masaryk had once occupied. This presentation is devoted to a comparative study of the philosophy behind the political views of the two statesmen.

Havel on Masaryk: the Period of Dissent

Havel's intellectual engagement with Masaryk came early in life. In his

---

[1] This article is based on a presentation at the National Convention of the Association for Slavic, East European, and Eurasian Studies in New Orleans on November 17, 2012. I am grateful to John W. Brennan, Katia Esarey, Kathleen Geaney, and Francis Raška for their comments.

[2] On democracy in Czechoslovakia, 1918-1938, see R. J. W. Evans: "For years Czechoslovakia, by contrast with the surrounding states, conducted its affairs in a broadly orderly and stable way. It sustained real parliamentary procedures and an open and multinational cultural life." In "Introduction," *Czechoslovakia in a Nationalist and Fascist Europe, 1918-1948,* ed. Mark Cornwall and Evans (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007), 1. See also Josette Baer, "Imagining Membership: The Conception of Europe in the Political Thought of T. G. Masaryk and Václav Havel," *Studies in East European Thought*, 52 (2000), 204-205; Sharon L. Wolchik, "Czech Republic," *Encyclopedia of U. S. Foreign Relations* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997), 1: 401; Stefan Auer, *Liberal Nationalism in Central Europe* (London; New York: Routledge Curzon, 2004), 107–13. On the Czech side, Eva Broklová has advanced an even more significant claim for modern Czech political culture, as a variant of the American and West European tradition, in contrast to the political cultures prevalent in Central and Eastern Europe, including Germany; see Eva Broklová, *Politická kultura německých aktivistických stran v Československu, 1918–1938* (Prague: Karolinum, 1999-2007); see also reviews by Jan Rataj in *Český časopis historický* 100 (2002): 142–46; and Eagle Glassheim in *Kosmas* 16/1 (Fall 2002): 110–11. Recent revisionist literature does little to alter the image of Masaryk's Czechoslovakia; see Andrea Orzoff, *Battle for the Castle: The Myth of Czechoslovakia in Europe, 1914-1948* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2009); Mary Heimann, *Czechoslovakia: The State That Failed* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009).

interviews with the journalist Karel Hvížďala in the mid-1980s, Havel recalled that, already as a ten-year old, he began reading the works of Masaryk and his followers Karel Čapek and Ferdinand Peroutka in his family's library at home. He considered their writings as his natural intellectual background.[3] Later, Havel reminisced about his impressions of Masaryk, which he derived in his early youth and which accompanied him during his life. He valued Masaryk as a man of great integrity who practiced what he taught. His activities were carried on with great diligence and persistence, which enabled him to achieve desirable results.[4]

As he was growing up, in a discussion group with his student friends while still as a teenager, he viewed himself as Masaryk's disciple in the field of ethics, which he sought to combine with a concept of socialism and with a Hegelian pantheism in metaphysics.[5] In the November-December 1953 issue of a typewritten journal of the same group, young Havel published an article, "Hamletova otázka" [*Hamlet's Questio*n]. There he discussed Masaryk's famous treatise on suicide and agreed that taking one's life expressed a contempt for all of creation, or the entire universe, an attitude, for which a certain brand of modern philosophy was largely responsible.[6] At that time, he considered Masaryk, together with Henri Bergson and Jean-Paul Sartre, the leading modern philosophers.[7] On a more practical level, later he saw the oppositionist activities of Charter 77 as an example of Masaryk's "non-political politics" [*nepolitická politika*]. He used it to express in a semi-metaphoric way the meaning of the dissidents' actions, which could not enter directly into real politics as an arena of power, but which undoubtedly had a political effect.[8]

With the Czechoslovak Communist regime showing signs of a final deterioration in the late 1980s, Havel focused on a revival of interest in Masaryk's teaching in Czechoslovakia. In his message for the seventieth anniversary of Czechoslovakia's independence, broadcast by Radio Free Europe in September 1988, Havel deplored the Communist government's suppression of information about the nation's history. As a result young people knew very little about winning their country's freedom, in particular about Masaryk's enormous work in

---

[3] Václav Havel, *Dálkový výslech,* [1985-86], Václav Havel, *Spisy,* 8 vols. (Prague: Torst, 1999-2007), 4: 717. On his father's admiration for Masaryk, see also John Keane, *Václav Havel: A Political Tragedy in Six Acts* (London: Bloomesbury, 1999), 36.

[4] "150. výročí narození T. G. Masaryka," Hodonín, March 6, 2000, in Václav Havel, *Spisy* 8 vols. (Prague: Trost, 1999-2007), 8: 63.

[5] "Po roce sochařské práce," August 1953, Václav Havel, *Spisy,* 8 vols. (Prague: Torst, 1999-2007), 3: 15.

[6] "Hamletova otázka," in Václav Havel, *Spisy,* 8 vols. (Prague: Torst, 1999-2007), 3: 36.

[7] "Hamletova otázka," 3: 47. About the 5 issues of the typewritten journal *Rozhovory* , published in 1953-54, see Martin C. Putna, *Václav Havel: Duchovní portrét v rámu české kultury 20. století* (Prague: Knihovna V. Havla, 2011), 75.

[8] "Ztráta paměti," Prague, September 13, 1994, in Václav Havel, *Spisy,* 8 vols. (Prague: Torst, 1999-2007), 7: 270. See also Keane, *Václav Havel: A Political Tragedy*, 275-276.

exile during World War I.[9] Havel proclaimed that the time had come to take Masaryk's teaching seriously once again including for instance, his exhortation to small deeds in education and enlightenment in order to overcome the existing apathy under the oppressive regime. In order to propagate again Masaryk's ideas, Havel appealed for republication of important classics of Czech democracy, such as Masaryk's *Světová revoluce* [*The World Revolution*], or Peroutka's *Budování státu* [*The Building of a State*].[10]

In January 1989, Havel brought in Masaryk's teaching in reference to a particularly sensitive issue. In an anonymous letter, a young man confided to Havel his intention to follow the example of the student Jan Palach (1948-1969) who had burned himself to death in a public square in Prague in January 1969 in protest to the Soviet invasion that had terminated the Prague Spring. Havel publicly admonished the unknown writer against such a drastic protest against the regime. He cited Masaryk's view that suicide represented a refusal to act according to the wishes of the Providence and the higher moral ideals that were supra-personal in origin. To act in accordance with the cosmic moral imperative, one could not escape life no matter how noble one's motives might be. Instead, one should assume all burdens and strive for a better life.[11]

After the Velvet Revolution

During the state reconstruction following the Velvet Revolution, Havel tended to cite Masaryk's principles frequently.[12] He focused on three maxims: the ascendancy of ethics in politics; a commitment to Truth; and a global vision. In his first major speech after assuming the presidency of Czechoslovakia in January 1990, Havel addressed the first topic. He reminded his listeners that Masaryk had grounded politics in morality, and argued that the renewed Czechoslovak Republic should follow this approach. Politics should spring from a desire to contribute to the benefit of the community and should not misuse or harm the community's interests.[13]

---

[9] "Pozdrav k 70, výročí vzniku Československa," September 1988, [text intended for a commemorative program by *Svobodná Evropa* October 27, 1988], in Václav Havel, *Spisy,* 8 vols. (Prague: Torst, 1999-2007), 4: 1082.

[10] "Pozdrav k 70, výročí vzniku Československa," 4: 1083-84. Havel's endorsement of Masaryk's *Světová revoluce* contradicts Ernst Gellner's view in his "The Price of Velvet: Thomas Masaryk and Václav Havel," *Czech Sociological Review*, 3 (1995), especially 45.

[11] "Rozhlasová výzva," January 9, 1989, Václav Havel, *Spisy,* 8 vols. (Prague: Torst, 1999-2007), 4: 1107.

[12] According to Whipple: "Havel has cast himself in Masaryk's mold of the intellectual and liberal statesman who guarantees stability by remaining above the domestic political fray." See *After the Velvet Revolution: Václav Havel and the New Leaders of Czechoslovakia Speak Out,* ed. Tim D. Whipple (New York, NY: Freedom House, 1991), 37.

[13] "Novoroční projev," January 1, 1990, Václav Havel, *Spisy,* 8 vols. (Prague: Torst, 1999-2007), 6: 15.

Havel later highlighted Masaryk's emphasis on the relationship between morality and politics in the context of the relation between thought and being. The democratic character of institutions and procedures depended, according to him, on the democratic character of thought and on its moral purpose. In politics, reasoning and discussion had to come before an action. It was these elemental sources of politics that Masaryk also called "the non-political politics" "*nepolitická politika.*" Hence, Masaryk believed in self-help and self-administration, and exhorted citizens to self-confidence, independence, and solidarity. He believed in an open or—what would be called at present—a civil society. Politics grew out of the coexistence among the people themselves; it was not simply what was happening in the parliaments or the governments. What was happening at the top was the culmination of politics, but not its main or, much less, its entire content.[14]

In the second place, among Masaryk's basic political principles, Havel emphasized the commitment to Truth (with a capital "T") as a guiding principle of social and political life. Havel did so, when he delivered his major address on Masaryk during the commemoration of the 140th anniversary of Masaryk's birth in Hodonín on March 7, 1990. He referred to John F. Kennedy's book *Profiles in Courage* to illustrate Masaryk's stamina in taking stands which he held to be true even if they ran against the prevalent public opinion and were almost certain to cause him a loss of popularity. Havel chose two such instances. The first one was Masaryk's challenge to the authenticity of the manuscripts of Zelená Hora and Dvůr Králové [*rukopisy zelenohorský a královédvorský*], which were considered some of the greatest cultural treasures of the Czech nation, stemming from the High Middle Ages. In 1886, Masaryk became convinced that these documents were forgeries, and he joined a campaign to discredit them. He maintained that even a good cause should not be supported by a lie. The second time Masaryk severely challenged public opinion was by arguing in 1899 against the accusation that Leopold Hilsner had committed a Jewish ritual murder. Thus, he met head on a widespread undercurrent of anti-Semitism in Czech society.[15]

The importance of Masaryk's devotion to Truth, according to Havel, rested not only in that he understood what was true, but also in that he had the courage to speak, and act upon, what was true, even if that endangered his professional and political career. His example was especially important in Czechoslovakia after the Velvet Revolution in order to remove the intellectual and moral corruption, which was the heritage of the Communist regime. That system had propagated evident

---

[14] "150. výročí narození T. G. Masaryka," Havel, *Spisy,* 8: 64-65.

[15] "Výročí narození T. G. Masaryka," Hodonín, March 7, 1990, in Václav Havel, *Spisy,* 8 vols. (Prague: Torst, 1999-2007), 6: 91-92; Jři Kovtun, *Tajuplná vražda. Případ Leopolda Hilsnera* (Prague: Sefer, 1994), 478-489. The reference is to John F. Kennedy, *Profiles in Courage* (New York: Harper, 1956). Havel would refer to Kennedy's book, and to Masaryk's efforts to discredit the forged manuscripts in the same context ten years later, see "Čestný doktorát Michiganské university," Ann Arbor, September 5, 2000 in Václav Havel, *Spisy* 8 vols. (Prague: Trost, 1999-2007), 8: 70-71, 73.

lies and a tolerance of these lies through threats to the careers and even to the freedom of those who did not bear these lies silently. In that sense, Masaryk's political courage was his most important legacy to Czech society. Even though a challenge to public opinion might be superficially viewed as politically imprudent, eventually it is a stand that prevails. Above all, without his willingness to adopt risky stands during World War I, the independent Czechoslovak state would never have come into existence.[16]

Havel took the opportunity to elaborate on Masaryk's concept of truth, when receiving an honorary doctorate degree from the University of Michigan in Ann Arbor on September 5, 2000. He approached the topic by pointing out the difference between truth and information. Currently, an information revolution was taking place and millions, perhaps billions, of messages were flying through the air at a tremendous speed every minute, and Havel acknowledged with satisfaction the presence of Bill Gates, the guru of the electronic communication, in the audience. The difference between truth and information was that truth was not only correct information, but also one which somebody had guaranteed by his existence, reputation, and honor.[17] Havel was not certain how many propositions qualified for the status of such a "truth," but this was undoubtedly the case with Masaryk's assertion of the falsity of the Czech medieval manuscripts. Their counterfeit character was not only proved scientifically, but Masaryk upheld this judgment with his whole being and was not afraid to risk his entire reputation and career. In his case this fearlessness paid off and after he became a generally recognized liberator of the Czech nation, the idea of truth became one of the foundational ideals of the new state.[18] Havel had cited another example of the devotion to Truth in Masaryk's sense in his first address to the United States Congress in February 1990. He referred to Thomas Jefferson who, in the Declaration of Independence, did not just utter phrases, but advanced principles which he and his associates were prepared to establish even at the cost of their own lives.[19]

Thus, Masaryk's belief in truth [*pravda*] did not refer to a wealth of information, but to basic honesty; it was a moral quality, and Havel tied this proposition to his own favorite tenet that thought preceded being, or that idea preceded action. According to Havel, large empires or leagues of nations, which had done some good for humanity in the past, were not distinguished by the manner of their administration or organization, but always were inspired by some idea or ethos – one might even say charisma. Their inhabitants could identify with these values even to the point of making sacrifices to this common political

---

[16] "Výročí narození T. G. Masaryka," Havel, *Spisy,* 6:92-93. For a critical view of Masaryk's and Havel's belief in the prevalence of truth, see Gellner "The Price of Velvet: Thomas Masaryk and Václav Havel," 55.

[17] "Čestný doktorát Michiganské university," Havel, *Spisy*, 8: 71-72.

[18] Ibid., 8:72.

[19] "Kongres USA," Washington, February 21, 1990, in Havel, Václav, *Spisy,* 8 vols. (Prague: Torst, 1999-2007), 6: 72.

entity.[20] Closer to home, Havel reminisced how he and his partners in Charter 77 were not afraid to dream about a regime change, even though many of their "sensible" fellow citizens warned them that such visions were pointless because the existing order was firmly established and was acceptable on both sides of the Iron Curtain. Instead Havel discussed their visions of a new Europe with his fellow prisoners. Then the course of events accelerated and, after the Velvet Revolution, one of his fellow prisoners Jiří Dienstbier could translate their dreams into concrete policy as Czech Minister of Foreign Affairs.[21]

In the third place, among Masaryk's basic political principles, Havel emphasized the international character of Masaryk's legacy. He did so, when he addressed the Council of the Conference on Cooperation and Security in Europe that met in Prague on January 30, 1992. He reminded the audience that Masaryk called the changes resulting from World War I "a world revolution," that, by sweeping away the theocratic regimes [governments based on the divine rights of the monarchs] in Germany, Austria, and Russia, opened up the way to a universal spread of democracy. Havel commented that the downfall of the Soviet Communist camp in Europe could again be called a world revolution. The old order had collapsed and a new democratic one was being built.[22]

During 1993, Havel continued to refer to the international significance of Masaryk's political program. Speaking in Olomouc in March, he called attention to Masaryk's appeal to Czech history to point out that the nation, during its happy periods, championed values recognized by all of mankind, values that were truly human and thus attractive to other nations.[23] In his second speech in Prague on October 28, 1993, Havel dwelt on Masaryk's emphasis on the moral and universally applicable character of politics. For Masaryk, politics, democracy, human rights, and material development were not independent self-contained values, but they were instruments to foster human life that was truly dignified and just and in general had some meaning.[24] As for its universality, Masaryk was convinced that Czech politics required a world character. According to Havel, he wished to say thereby that the best (and really the only) possible national and governmental program was to shape a good human community which respected the universally valid moral and civic principles.[25]

At the other side of the ledger, however, in his speech on the 150th

---

[20] "Evropský parlament," Strasbourg, March 8, 1994, in Václav Havel, *Spisy,* 8 vols. (Prague: Torst, 1999-2007), 7: 226-27.

[21] Parlamentní shromáždění Rady Evropy," Strasbourg, May 10, 1990, Václav Havel, *Spisy,* 8 vols. (Prague: Torst, 1999-2007), 6: 138-139.

[22] "2. Zasedání Rady ministrů KBSE," Prague, January 30, 1992, Václav Havel, *Spisy,* 8 vols. (Prague: Torst, 1999-2007, 6: 633.

[23] "Odhalení pomníku T. G. Masaryka," Olomouc, March 7, 1993, Václav Havel, *Spisy,* 8 vols. (Prague: Torst, 1999-2007), 7: 66.

[24] "Státní svátek České republiky," Prague, October 28, 1993, Václav Havel, *Spisy,* 8 vols. (Prague: Torst, 1999-2007), 7: 152-155.

[25] Ibid., 7: 153.

anniversary of Masaryk's birth in Hodonín on March 7, 2000, Havel reminded his audience that Masaryk was not a pacifist. Despite his stress on humanity and tolerance, as well as on a friendly co-existence among nations, Masaryk resolutely rejected the Tolstoyan principle of non-resistance to evil. He insisted that it was necessary to respond to evil with force, if needed. As a result, he had studied military strategy, created the Czechoslovak legions during the First World War, and built a Czechoslovak army for the defense of freedom and democracy in the interwar period. Havel highlighted that Masaryk not only advocated resistance to evil, but was also ready to apply this maxim in his personal life. Thus he was fearless in the face of threats as when his family was endangered by his campaign against the Habsburg Empire abroad during the First World War, or when he had faced adverse opinion over the manuscripts or the Hilsner affair, which endangered not only his professional career, but also his physical safety. Havel wondered whether his compatriots in the post-Communist era (after 1990) were similarly ready to rise in defense of the freedom that they currently enjoyed.[26]

Nevertheless, in the same speech, Havel did not dwell primarily on the defense of the country's freedom and self-determination, but instead on the requirement of global solidarity. He turned once again to Masaryk's vision of Czechoslovakia's place in the colossal movements of world history, to which the country owed its freedom and self-determination through what he had called a world revolution.[27] Havel pointed out that, while Masaryk was a patriot, nationality as such was not, for him, a philosophical or political objective, or a governing ideal of individuals or communities. He saw national independence or self-determination as a natural consequence of respect for man and his identity, his freedom and his being oneself. Hence Masaryk identified "Czechness" with humanity. Havel noted that, in the year 2000, the adoption of Masaryk's political perspective was particularly relevant when Czech Republic was becoming a member of the European Union.[28]

Along these lines, it was somewhat earlier within this period that Havel entertained a rather forlorn hope to transform Prague into a Mecca radiating moral and humanitarian ideas (according to Masaryk's example) to Europe and the world. As a more modest, scaled down operation in this regard he sponsored the establishment of the Forum 2000 in 1997, which would annually gather in Prague distinguished minds of the world to consider problems crucial to global society.[29]

The Czech Tradition of Democracy and Humanism

As noted earlier, after the establishment of Czechoslovakia, Masaryk often referred to the tradition of democracy and human universality, as evident

---

[26] "150. výročí narození T. G. Masaryka," Havel, *Spisy,* 8: 65-67.
[27] Ibid., 8: 67.
[28] Ibid., 8: 65.
[29] Putna, *Václav Havel: Duchovní portrét*, 303-04.

throughout Czech history.[30] In his first message to the National Assembly on December 22, 1918, he stated: "The creation of our state and its maintenance..., our Reformation and its ideals, the suffering caused to us by the violence of the Counter Reformation instigated by the Habsburgs,…our National Revival guided by the ideas of Humanity and the democracy that arises out of it—the whole fate of our nation is logically tied to the West and its modern democracy."[31] In his third message to the nation as president on March 7, 1920, Masaryk maintained that the new age of humanitarianism, ushered in by the "Great War," had been envisaged by Jan Kollár (1793-1852) and, after him, by Pavel Šafárik (1795-1861) and František Palacký (1798-1876). They all believed in the unity of humanity (*všelidskost*), not as a mere abstraction, but as a reality.[32] In the same year in a letter to the City of Amsterdam, Masaryk emphasized the international outlook pioneered by King George of Poděbrady, the Bohemian Brethren, and especially Jan Amos Komenský (1592-1670).[33] In his introduction to Francis Lützow's *Bohemia: An Historical Sketch* (1919), Masaryk noted the concern of Komenský and George of Poděbrady (1420-1471) with all-human and all-European matters, and quoted Palacký's statement that "the Bohemian Reformation contained in an embryonic state all the modern sciences and institutions." Masaryk also cited the French historian Ernest Denis, that the cause of the Czechs was always related to worldwide issues.[34]

Subsequently, during the 1920s Masaryk repeatedly referred to the champions of world unity in the Czech past. On June 25, 1920, he praised the French Minister to Czechoslovakia, Fernand Couget, for mentioning King George's plans for uniting not just Central Europe, but the entirety of the continent.[35] In October 1922, Masaryk restated to members of the diplomatic corps in Prague the mission of Czechoslovak politics, in which the nation had to remain faithful to its historical tradition, and "labor with all means for the preservation of peace, and perform conscientiously and devotedly the great work for the renewal of Europe, especially Central Europe, to ensure this peace for a long time, if not forever, and

---

[30] Zouhar, Jan, "K filozofickému odkazu T. G. Masaryka," *T.G. Masaryk na přelomu tisíciletí,* Sborník z VIII. ročníku semináÍe, November 15, 2000 (Hodonín: Masarykovo muzeum, 2001), 6.

[31] Tomáš G. Masaryk, *Cesta demokracie* I, Spisy 33 (Prague: Masarykův ústav AV ČR, 2007), 25.

[32] Masaryk, *Cesta demokracie* I, 229.

[33] Letter to the city of Amsterdam, on the occasion of laying the foundation stone for Komensky's memorial, November 14, 1920. Masaryk, *Cesta demokracie* I, 362. See also Dagmar Čapková, "Masaryk a Komenský," *Masarykův sborník* 8 (1993, Prague: Ústav T. G. Masaryka, 1993), 11.

[34]Tomáš G. Masaryk, "Introduction," in Francis Lützow, *Bohemia: An Historical Sketch* (London, 1919): Masaryk, *Cesta demokracie* I, 197.

[35] Masaryk, *Cesta demokracie* I, 287. King George of Poděbrady has, in fact, received recognition as a precursor of the European Union, see, for instance, Achille Elisha, "Introduction," in *Aristide Briand : la paix mondiale et l'Union européenne*, ed. Achille Elisha; pref. René Cassin, 2nd ed. rev. Louvain-la-Neuve: Academia-Bruylant, [2000], 36-41.

thus to gradually realize the noble ideals of human civilization."[36] In 1922, he pointed out that it was George of Poděbrady who launched a program of eternal peace among the nations after the devastation of the Wars of the Bohemian Reformation.[37] On an official visit to France in 1923, Masaryk added Karel Havlíček Borovský (1821-1856) to Josef Dobrovský (1753-1829), Kollár, and Palacký as a champion of the Czech national ideal, aspiring to a unification of mankind.[38] In London, during the same journey, he focused on Komenský's internationalism.[39]

In his war memoirs (1925), Masaryk restated his favorite historical theory that a humanitarian outlook from the Bohemian Reformation returned to the Czech National Awakening, primarily through the influence of Komenský on the German Enlightenment of Leibniz and Herder.[40] During the tentative steps toward a European federation under Briand and Gustav Stresemann in 1927, Masaryk pointed out that Palacký had already correctly grasped that the world was becoming centralized, and no state or nation could live without agreement and cooperation with other states.[41] In 1928, Masaryk credited Palacký with proclaiming the service to humanity as the Czech national program and finding its

---

[36] "Oslava 4. výročí republiky," *Čas*, October 30, 1922, in Masaryk, Tomáš G., *Cesta demokracie II*, Spisy 34 (Prague: Masarykův ústav AV ČR, 2007), 363.

[37] Tomáš G. Masaryk, "The Slavs after the War," *Slavonic Review* 1 (June 1922), 23.

[38] "Präsident Masaryk in Slawischen Institut," *Prager Presse*, October 18, 1923, in Masaryk, Tomáš G., *Cesta demokracie II*, 469. Endorsing Leibniz's concept of the unity of human culture, Havlíček wrote in 1846: "What can be more dignified than the idea of intellectually joining all of humanity into a single nation which would grasp by reason everything in the realm of speech, and would be able to think and communicate in the same purity the truth flowing out of the intellect." Karel Havlíček, "Leibniz a jeho idea," *Česká včela* 13 (1846), n. 55, 218.

[39] "Pan president na londýnské radnici," *Venkov*, October 26, 1923, in Masaryk, *Cesta demokracie II*, 490. See also Miloslav Bednář, "Filosofická východiska a politický význam Masarykova pojetí evropské identity, integrity a integrace," *Masarykův sborník* 10 (1996-98, Prague: Ústav T. G. Masaryka, 2000), 9.

[40] Tomáš G. Masaryk, *Světová revoluce za války a ve válce, 1914-1918*, Spisy 15 (Prague: Masarykův ústav AV ČR, 2005), 391, 396.

[41] "Poselství prezidenta republiky," *Národní osvobození*, June 12, 1927, in Masaryk, Tomáš G., *Cesta demokracie III*, Spisy 35 (Prague: Masarykův ústav AV ČR, 1994), 209-210. On the world centralization, see František Palacký, *Úvahy a projevy* (Prague: Melantrich, 1977), 87-91, 343. Palacký also described the phenomenon in "Předmluva k vlasteneckému čtenářstvu," *Časopis českého musea* 11(1837): 7: "Now then let us spread, cultivate and perfect the various branches of knowledge, and let us bring pure and God-pleasing sacrifices not only on the altar of our homeland, but also humanity. A time has surely begun in the world history, when all local barriers in the intellectual life of individual nations are always further sinking and disappearing, and when a free, constant and rapid exchange of thoughts, ideas, and sentiments occurs among the advanced nations of Europe everywhere, establishing in this manner, although through divers tongues, only one higher literature that is European and at times also universal."

expression particularly in the teaching of the Unity of Brethren.[42]

Havel believed that his message of the united world coincided with the tradition of Czech cultural universalism; first of all, with the political ideals of Masaryk, and beyond—as Masaryk himself had argued—with the ideals of the Bohemian religious Reformation, especially as set forth by Jan Hus (c. 1371-1415), Petr Chelčický (c. 1390-before 1460), George of Poděbrady, and Komenský. On being elected the President of Czechoslovakia on January 1, 1990, Havel explicitly proclaimed his adherence to Masaryk's view of the moral heritage of the Bohemian Reformation, embodied in the principle "not Caesar, but Jesus." The Czechoslovak Republic would revive this principle and spread its introduction as a new element into European and world politics. He emphasized that at certain points in the past his country was the beacon of spiritual enlightenment in Europe, and he saw no reason why it could not happen again. The Czechs would thus pay back for the assistance received from others in the struggles against the totalitarian regimes in the twentieth century.[43]

Havel addressed the historical Czechoslovak role in promotion of international harmony in his speech before the Council of Europe in Strasbourg, May 10, 1990, referring to the relatively well known diplomatic initiative of the Bohemian King George of Poděbrady.[44] Havel spoke of the large embassy, which the Czech ruler had sent to his French counterpart, Louis XI, in 1464 with a proposal to head a League of Peace and convoke all the Christian rulers to conclude a treaty which—on the basis of an obligatory international law—would prevent an internal war among members of the League and link them for mutual defense. As Havel noted, it was not accidental that this first serious proposal for a peaceful unification of Europe originated in Bohemia which, as a crossroads exposed to international conflicts, had a special interest in promoting a European pacification.[45] In his subsequent *Summer Meditations* of 1991 Havel returned to noting the importance of the idea of truth as a moral value in the Bohemian intellectual tradition, which he again attributed to the Czechs' location at the crossroads of Europe where many challenges had existed to their cultural and national identity. He now extended this intellectual tradition, from the period between Jan Hus to Masaryk, forward to Milan R. Štefánik and Jan Patočka, and backward to Sts. Cyril and Methodius.[46]

---

[42] "Humanita, pacifismus a voják," *Naše vojsko*, October 15, 1928, Masaryk, *Cesta demokracie III*, 312.

[43] "Novoroční projev," January 1, 1990, Václav Havel, *Spisy,* 8 vols. (Prague: Torst, 1999-2007), 6: 15.

[44] King George of Poděbrady has, in fact, received recognition as a precursor of the European Union, see. for instance, Elisha, "Introduction," in *Aristide Briand : la paix mondiale et l'Union européenne*, 36-41.

[45] "Parlamentní shromáždění Rady Evropy," Havel, *Spisy*, 6: 156.

[46] He did so without elaborating on the special significance of the two Slav Apostles. Václav Havel, *Letní přemítání* [August 1991], in Václav Havel, *Spisy,* 8 vols. (Prague: Torst, 1999-2007), 6: 542.

Havel chose to dwell particularly on the teaching of Komenský, as a contribution to resolving the problems currently besetting mankind. At a convocation marking the 400th anniversary of the philosopher's birth, Havel noted that Komenský thought in universal terms, or—as it would be said at the end of the twentieth century—in global terms. His approach could also be called ecumenical or pluralistic, inasmuch as it aimed at harmony, agreement, dialogue, and the peaceful resolution of problems.[47] This moral, humanist, and universal approach was vitally necessary to avert the enormous threat to life on this planet. At the threshold of the third millennium, the great revolution of technical civilization was virtually exhausted, and after enormous achievements, humanity stood at the edge of a deep abyss. The problems of current life could not be solved in the old way: by improving what Havel called an engineering relation to the world, by which he meant the application of known natural laws with a technological objective in mind. Instead, the renewal had to proceed "from the inside." Man had to view himself as a unique subject of being, as one who was irreplaceable and responsible for maintaining the miracle of the entire creation. Only such a self-understanding could produce and activate the moral imperatives—inexplicable by scientific methods—which could lead mankind to the necessary systemic changes. In this context, Havel highlighted the global vision of Komenský, whose idea about the reform of the world was based on respect vis-à-vis the individual, on the trust in the qualities of goodness of human beings, and on the conviction that the source of these qualities was faith in the higher meaning of things and in a higher justice.[48]

After the division of Czechoslovakia, Havel reaffirmed the attachment to the universalist Bohemian ideas when assuming the Presidency of the new Czech Republic on February 2, 1993. He emphasized that the new constitution called for maintaining the tradition of Czech statehood of medieval and early modern time, as well as modern Czechoslovak statehood. The keynotes were sounded by a long list of personalities: Cyril and Methodius, Duke Wenceslaus, Charles IV, Jan Hus, George of Poděbrady, Komenský, Palacký, Masaryk, and Patočka. Havel continued:

> This motif is a faith in truth, which is personally guaranteed, therefore, in truth as a moral value, the will for understanding, decency and toleration, respect for man as a unique being and humility in the face of the noble order of creation, a sense of co-responsibility for common concerns of human society, connected with a critical perspective and of course an unshakable will for peace and, as far as possible, non-violent solution of all conflicts.[49]

In 1994, during his reception by Pope Paul John II, Havel commented on the

---

[47] " Konference o J. A. Komenském," Prague, March 23,1992, in Václav Havel, *Spisy,* 8 vols. (Prague: Torst, 1999-2007), 6: 661.
[48] Ibid., 6: 659-660.
[49] "Projev k občanům po inauguraci," Prague, February 2, 1993, Václav Havel, *Spisy,* 8 vols. (Prague: Torst, 1999-2007), 7: 40.

history of Bohemia's promotion of Europe's unity. He pointed out that St. Wenceslaus, the founder of the Czech state of Bohemia, based his policy on agreement and peace with the neighboring states, which was a principle of current importance in the time of European unification. Similarly, the first Czech bishop of Prague, St. Adalbert, devoted his later life to missionary activity within the neighboring nations.[50]

In opening the Forum 2000 in Prague in September 1997, Havel once more took the opportunity to stress the unique position of the country in international relations. Bohemia was often the center of great and ominous European events, in particular the Thirty Years' War, the Munich Crisis, the Communist Coup in 1948, and the invasion of the Warsaw Pact Powers in 1968. These events heralded ominous challenges and warnings for all of Europe, if not the entire world. Prague was a cultural crossroads, where various nationalities left their imprints, such as the Czechs, the Jews, the Germans, the Italians, and others. Hence, the Czech Republic and Prague could be considered particularly suitable places for the gathering of wise men of the world to ponder together on the fate and the future of the common human civilization.[51] As noted earlier, it was Masaryk's notion of Czech historical tradition as a service in the promotion of the cultural and spiritual unity of Europe and humankind that inspired Havel to regard the destination of the Czech Republic, and particularly of the city of Prague, to radiate an inspiration toward unification of the entire planet.

Link to the United States

On a more specific level, Havel shared Masaryk's conviction about the paramount need of their country's friendship with the United States, as the Czech people proceeded on the road toward integration with the rest of humanity on a global scale. Thus, Masaryk never associated with the call of Count Richard Coudenhove-Kalergi for a *Paneuropa*, and later Aristide Briand's European federation in the 1920s and early 1930s, both of which stressed Europe's peculiarity as something that would isolate the continent from the United States, regarded as Europe's potential competitor.[52] Ironically, Masaryk had found himself at the opposite end of the issue in the early 1920s, seeking to fend off American isolationism.[53] On the occasion of Woodrow Wilson's death, he

---

[50] "Návštěva u papeže," Vatican, March 7, 1994, Václav Havel, *Spisy,* 8 vols. (Prague: Torst, 1999-2007), 7: 215-216.

[51] Fórum 2000, Prague, September 4, 1997, in Václav Havel, *Spisy,* 8 vols. (Prague: Torst, 1999-2007), 7: 699-701.

[52] Václav Veber, *Dějiny sjednocené Evropy: od antických počátků do současnosti,* 2nd ed. (Prague: Lidové noviny, 2009), 129; Jacques Bariéty, "Aristide Briand: les raisons d'un oubli," in *Le Plan Briand d'Union fédérale européenne : perspectives nationales et transnationales, avec documents : actes du colloque international tenu à Genève du 19 au 21 septembre 1991* (Bern and New York: Lang, c1998), 10-11.

[53] "Interview pro americký list Boston Advertiser," March 26, 1923, Masaryk, *Cesta demokracie II*, 431.

expressed his deep admiration for the American author of the League of Nations who—like himself—was a believer in "humanitarianism and humanity."[54] In 1929**,** Masaryk openly opposed attempts to keep a United States of Europe at a distance from the United States of America. He maintained that the relations between Europe and America should not remain merely economic and external; they were destined to become moral and cultural. The cultural relationship between Europe and America was constantly deepening. Masaryk was following, as much as possible, American belles lettres and philosophical, historical and sociological literature. In all of these areas America influenced European thought, and the Americans were paying more attention to intellectual developments in Europe.[55] Masaryk repeatedly pointed out that it was particularly World War I, which had brought Europe and the United States closer together. The Americans had crossed the ocean for Europe. "For the first time in history nations of the entire world discovered that they were a single entity."[56] Masaryk reiterated in his statement for the thirteenth anniversary of the creation of Czechoslovakia the effect of the collapse of the three absolutist regimes on the victory of democracy and the consequent tendency toward unification in Europe and worldwide. A linkage with the United States was a part of the process. If voices in the United States called for separation from Europe, the actual course of events belied such an assertion. There were not just common economic interests, but also general civilizational ties.[57]

In a particularly poignant statement broadcast by radio to the United States on George Washington's two hundredth birthday in February 1932, Masaryk referred to the connection of America and Europe during the American Revolution and during World War I as a proof that the United States was a natural continuation and extension of Europe. Europe and America were bound together and they penetrate each other, America was Europeanized and Europe was Americanized. These phenomena were but two aspects of the same process. He himself experienced the process Americanization, learning intensively from the United States, a land for which he felt a high respect.[58] The United States reciprocated Masaryk's fondness: in May 1935 he received a medal from the Woodrow Wilson

---

[54] "Projevy k úmrtí W. Wilsona," February 4, 1924, in Masaryk, *Cesta demokracie III*, 13. On Masaryk's relation with Wilson, see Herbert A. Miller, 'What Woodrow Wilson and America Meant to Czechoslovakia," in Robert J. Kerner, ed., *Czechoslovakia* (Berkeley, Cal.: University of California Press, 1945), 77-87.

[55] "Interview for Cosmopolitan Magazine," May 14, 1929. Masaryk, Tomáš G., *Cesta demokracie IV*, Spisy 36 (Prague: Masarykův ústav AV ČR, 1997), 37.

[56] "Rozmluva prezidenta Masaryka s anglickým novinářem,"October 10, 1929, in Masaryk, *Cesta demokracie IV*, 62.

[57] "Poselství prezidenta republiky," *Lidové noviny*, October 29, 1931, Masaryk, *Cesta demokracie IV*, 223.On Masaryk's fondness of the United States, see also: Peter Bugge, "Longing or Belonging? Czech Perceptions of Europe in the Inter-War Years and Today," *Yearbook of European Studies*, 11: 119.

[58] "T. G. Masaryk o Jiřím Washingtonovi," *Národní osvobození*, February 23, 1932, in Masaryk, *Cesta demokracie IV*, 247.

Foundation "in recognition of his tireless struggle for human rights and against tyrannical oppressors." The citation also pointed out that the independence of Czechoslovakia, which Masaryk originally declared in Washington, D.C., in October 1918, was in agreement with the ideals of President Wilson. Above all, Masaryk maintained the republic, which he had established faithfully to the principles of constitutional and parliamentary democracy; the principles of law, and humanity (valued by all civilized nations); and the principles of freedom of expression, press and conscience.[59]

Although not having a personal family relationship to the United States, Havel fully endorsed Masaryk's insistence on close ties between the two sides of the Atlantic within the framework of a common civilization. At an International Symposium on Masaryk and America in Washington, D.C., in September 2002, Havel stressed that the legacy of his illustrious predecessor contained the precept of a remarkable and multifaceted bond of the Czechs and Slovaks with the Americans.[60] The unveiling of Masaryk's Monument in Washington, D.C. on September 19, 2002, provided Havel with additional occasions to enlarge on the Czech-American friendship. He credited Masaryk with forging an intrinsic relationship that connected the Czech and Slovak nations with the American nation, and which attained to a relationship of direct alliance within the framework of NATO. Havel went on to express a deep gratitude to the United States Congress and the City of Washington for consenting to the location of Masaryk's monument in a very prominent place in the nation's capital.[61] According to Havel, the Masaryk monument in Washington, D.C. was to be a reminder of the ideals which were held in common by the American as well as the Czech and Slovak nations. These included: 1. at a social and political level: human liberty, human rights, lawful state, democratic political system, and a free market economy; 2. at a philosophical level: responsibility of man for the world; and 3. at the ultimate level: Masaryk's teaching on the source of this responsibility in the awareness that "the miracle of the world and of human existence was not merely an accumulation of accidents, but had their creator."[62] At another meeting in Washington at that time, Havel proclaimed that Masaryk's spirit should forever infuse the relations between Czech Republic and the United States, which had just

[59] The citation was signed by Hamilton Fish Armstrong (1893-1973), president of the Foundation. Other recipients of the medal included Viscount Cecil of Chelwood [Lord Robert Cecil, 1864-1958], Colonel Lindbergh, Senator Elihu Root, and the League of Nations; see "Masaryk vyznamenán Wilsonovou medailí," Masaryk, *Cesta demokracie IV*, 444.

[60] "Mezinárodní symposium Prezident Osvoboditel Tomáš Garrigue Masaryk a Amerika," Washington, September 19, 2002, in Václav Havel, *Spisy* 8 vols. (Prague: Trost, 1999-2007), 8: 176.

[61] "Odhalení pomníku T. G.Masaryka," Washington, September 19, 2002, in Václav Havel, *Spisy* 8 vols. (Prague: Trost, 1999-2007), 8: 177-178.

[62] Ibid., 8: 178.

become a political ally and with whom the Czech Republic wished to share a responsibility for the world.[63]

At what was to be one of his last public appearances, Havel, however, felt the need to issue an admonition to his compatriots, while highlighting Masaryk's friendship with the United States, particularly his relationship with Woodrow Wilson on October 5, 2011. During the re-dedication of the restored monument of Woodrow Wilson in Prague, he also took the opportunity to deplore the ingratitude shown by the Czech public in objecting to the installation of an American missile shield on the territory in 2008. He was disappointed by such an act of thanklessness that was causing skepticism about allying with a country that took, but did not give. He hoped that the restored Wilson monument would remind the Czechs that debts were always repaid in advanced societies, and concluded by saying: "I believe that we owe more than one memorial to the United States of America."[64]

Germany and Russia

Havel, like Masaryk, was naturally concerned with the Czechs' large neighbors, the Germans and the Russians. In the case of Germany, it was the issue of militarism and imperialism. Speaking in Prague in February 1995, Havel expressed his belief in a democratic, liberal, and European Germany. He had faith in the sincere efforts of Germany to advance the process of European unification based on the universality of the values of Euro-Atlantic civilization. This process would lead to a Europe which was a continent of peace, freedom, cooperation, security and just relations among states, nations and regions.[65] Havel spoke in a similar vein when—later in the same year—he addressed veteran fighters against Nazi Germany in World War II. He stated that after the Allies had won over Germany, it could be said fifty years later that Germany had also won over Germany, namely, the democratic and liberal Germany over the nationalistic, and subsequently also the Communist, Germany.[66] In another statement, Havel reaffirmed that Germany itself was victorious over its Nazi past in World War Two, and had become an essential part of the democratic and uniting Europe. It had forsaken its nationalist and expansionist past.[67]

Somewhat ironically, Masaryk had presented an assessment of Germany of the 1920s and early 1930s that was strikingly similar to Havel's in the 1990s.

---

[63] "Recepce společnosti Američtí přátelé České republiky," Washington, September 1, 2002, in Václav Havel, *Spisy* 8 vols. (Prague: Trost, 1999-2007), 8: 180.
[64] Václav Havel, "The Legacy of Wilson and Masaryk Today, Part I," *Slovo* (Cedar Rapids, Iowa), 12,2 (2011), 18.
[65] **"**Češi a Němci na cestě k dobrému sousedství," Prague, February 17, 1995, in Václav Havel, *Spisy,* 8 vols. (Prague: Torst, 1999-2007), 7: 373.
[66] Gézskámedaile," Vlaardingen, March 13, 1995," in Václav Havel, *Spisy,* 8 vols. (Prague: Torst, 1999-2007), 7: 379.
[67] "Projev k veteránům druhé světové války," Prague, May 8, 1995, in Václav Havel, *Spisy,* 8 vols. (Prague: Torst, 1999-2007), 7: 464.

Until the very time of Hitler's actual seizure of power, Masaryk continued to cling to the idea that World War I had cured Germany's earlier psychological and political ills and set the country on a healthy political course. Still, in October 1932—merely three months before Hitler's seizure of power—Masaryk stated in an interview with a newspaper correspondent that, having studied Hitler's speeches and his book *Mein Kampf*, he felt that Hitler was a German problem and that the Germans would resolve it correctly. He found it difficult to imagine that they could pronounce his name with the same respect and affection as those of Kant, Goethe, and Beethoven.[68] In an even later interview with the editor of the *Vossische Zeitung*, Werner Hegemann, conducted on December 17, 1932, Masaryk still referred to the great benefit Germany derived from her defeat in World War I as comparable to the benefit accrued to Prussia during the Napoleonic Wars thanks to the defeat in the battle of Jena in 1806, which freed the country from its obsolete political institutions.[69] He stated further that Germany had demonstrated its prowess in fighting against so many opponents in World War I and exhibited a great organizational capability. This gave Masaryk confidence that Germany would overcome all the current social and economic evils.[70] The major difference in this issue between Masaryk and Havel was, of course, that Masaryk saw the German transformation one war too soon.

In the case of Russia, the question for Masaryk and Havel was the issue of belonging to Europe. Paradoxically, Masaryk believed in the essentially European character of Russia and its culture, although he was a decisive opponent of the Communist regime, especially during Lenin's lifetime. He disagreed with the unification project of Count Richard Coudenhove-Kalergi, largely because the latter's *Paneuropa* excluded Russia.[71] Although Masaryk wished to see Russia become democratic and consolidated, in his view, this task had to be performed by the Russians themselves. He firmly opposed any type of interventionist policy

---

[68] "Gespräch mit Masaryk," *Berliner Tagblatt*, October 5, 1932, in Tomáš G. Masaryk, *Cesta demokracie IV*, 308-09.

[69] "President Masaryk in Gespräch," *Vossische Zeitung,* January 22, 1933, in Tomáš G. Masaryk, *Cesta demokracie IV*, 333-34; see also Antoine Mareš, "Masaryk vue par les Francais," in Vladimír Peška, and Antoine Mareš, eds., *Thomas Garrigue Masaryk, européen et humaniste* (Paris : Etudes et documentation internationales : Institut d'études slaves, 1991), 250. The Battle of Jena in October 1806 marked a crushing defeat of the Prussians by Napoleon. The shock caused the Prussian government to seek wide-ranging reforms from 1807 on, and a modernization of the decrepit political structure that had dated to the time of Frederick the Great. The king relied on Karl von Hardenberg and Karl vom Stein. See James J. Sheehan, *German History, 1770-1866* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989), 296-298.

[70] "President Masaryk in Gespräch," *Vossische Zeitung,* January 22, 1933, Masaryk, *Cesta demokracie IV*, 334.

[71] For instance, on the part of the French Foreign Ministry in June 1932, see Badel, Laurence, "Les promoteurs français d'une union éonomique et douanière de l'Europe dans l'entre-deux-guerres," in *Le Plan Briand d'Union fédérale européenne : perspectives nationales et transnationales, avec documents : actes du colloque international tenu à Genève du 19 au 21 septembre 1991*. Bern and New York: Lang, c1998, 25.

there. Beyond that he believed that Russia had been basically European in culture and its foremost intellectual representatives had always been oriented toward the West.[72] It should be a part of Europe.

Masaryk's liking of Russia, together with a distinct interest in other Slav nations did not, of course, go as far as to endorse the idea of Panslavism, which was popular among the Czechs and some other Slavs (especially the Slovaks) in the nineteenth century. With his objective directed toward a unification of Europe as a prelude toward the unification of all of humanity, Masaryk specifically rejected political Panslavism.[73] In particular, the idea of Panslavism as the ascendancy of Slav nations under Russia's leadership was discredited by World War I, which had opened much wider vistas.[74] In any case, according to Masaryk, the Slavs had a cosmopolitan outlook, not a narrowly ethnic one. Thus, Czech intellectual rooting in the Reformation provided a historical connection with the west, especially England; the Poles tended to gravitate intellectually toward France; Russian society also had been open to French language and culture in the eighteenth century; and southern Slavs were influenced by the Italians and the Greeks.[75] In fact, Masaryk suggested that instead of embracing ethnic parochialism, the Slavs may become the catalysts of the coming unity of Europe and of the world. He touched upon this role specifically in his speech at the Slavic Institute in Paris in October 1923 where he stated, "Dostoevsky attributed to the Russians and the Slavs a special ability to penetrate the souls of other nations…. Perhaps he was correct to a certain degree."[76] Masaryk returned to this topic in his message to the First International Congress of Slavicists in Prague in October 1929 when he pointed out, "Slav studies help to unite the Slavs culturally and the mission of the Slavs is to unite all nations: Slavic studies have an all-human mission (*poslání všelidské*)."[77] Although their linguistic kinship was not a matter of politics, special ties among the Slavic nations should be cultivated by non-governmental and academic institutions.[78] Earlier, in 1923, Masaryk had noted, as examples of such organizations, the Slav Institute in Paris and the Chair of Central

[72] Masaryk, *Světová revoluce za války a ve válce, 1914-1918*, 352.
[73] Joukovsky, Arcadie, "T. G. Masaryk et les Slaves d e l'Est," in Peška, and Mareš, eds., *Thomas Garrigue Masaryk, européen et humaniste*, 173; Masaryk, "The Slavs after the War," 18.
[74] "Poválečné problémy Československa," dated July 9, 1932; in Masaryk, Tomáš G., *Cesta demokracie IV*, 293. Perhaps in the Balkans Yugoslavia and Bulgaria might join in a single state. Masaryk had felt already in 1913 that a rapprochement among all the South Slavs would useful. "Thomas G. Masaryk Foresees Peace," *Christian Science Monitor*, March 12, 1926, in Masaryk, *Cesta demokracie III*, 130.
[75] "Präsident Masaryk in Slawischen Institut," *Prager Presse*, October 18, 1923, in Masaryk, Tomáš G., *Cesta demokracie II*, 469.
[76] Präsident Masaryk in Slawischen Institut," *Prager Presse*, October 18, 1923, in Masaryk, *Cesta demokracie II*, 470.
[77] Prezident republiky o slavistice," *Lidové noviny*, October 15, 1929, in Masaryk, Tomáš G., *Cesta demokracie IV*, 66.
[78] "Prezident Masaryk o některých věcech," *Lidové noviny*, April 8, 1928, Masaryk, *Cesta demokracie III*, 272.

European History in the School of Slavonic Studies London, as well as the Ukrainian and Russian universities in Prague.[79]

Although he was no longer faced with a Communist Russia, Havel—contrary to Masaryk—maintained at a NATO meeting in April 1995 that Russia had entirely different historical traditions and lived in another intellectual milieu. It should stay outside the Euro-Atlantic civilizational sphere, although—like all other cultures—it should maintain a peaceful and cooperative relation to Europe as another civilizational sphere.[80] He restated his view that Russia and the Euro-Atlantic civilizational sphere could not merge before the Canadian Parliament in April 1999-2007. The delimitation of Russia was something of a problem when the question was not the boundary of a state, but rather a line of cultural distinctiveness. Russia had some traits similar with the Euro-Atlantic civilization but at the same it was different, just like Africa, Latin America, or the Far East.[81] Ironically, Havel also took pride in having persuaded Boris N. Yeltsin, during the latter's visit to Prague in the mid-1990s, for Russia not to object to the Czech Republic's joining of NATO.[82]

Unsurprisingly, Havel maintained his cautious, even skeptical view of Russia into the post-2000 era of Vladimir Putin's rule. At a Conference of the New European Democracy in Bratislava on May 11, 2001, Havel stressed that Russia lay partly in Europe and it had influenced the rest of Europe intellectually and was in turn influenced by Europe. However, that did not mean that Russia should be simply included in the cultural region that is customarily called the 'West.' It was not because Russia was inferior, but simply because its inclusion would violate the normal structure of the world which was based on distinctly delineated geographic regions and cultural entities. Russia was still in search of its own identity, and this process might take a long time. In this predicament Russia was not alone since other world regions had their own difficult problems.[83] Therefore,

---

[79] The two universities in Prague were the Ukrainian Free University (since 1921), and the Russian Popular University (since 1923), in addition to the Russian Law Faculty (1922). "Poselství prezidenta Masaryka," *Lidové noviny*, October 29, 1923. in Masaryk, *Cesta demokracie II*, 499.

[80] "Konference SHAPEX'95," Mons, April 27, 1995 in Václav Havel, *Spisy,* 8 vols. (Prague: Torst, 1999-2007), 7:459. On the issue of Russia's cultural exclusion from Europe, Havel went along with his compatriot Milan Kundera, with whom he has had otherwise serious disagreements about the direction of dissent; under Communism, see Baer, "Imagining Membership: The Conception of Europe in the Political Thought of T. G. Masaryk and Václav Havel," 212; For a clear statement of Havel's argument with Kundera in 1969, see "Český úděl?" in Václav Havel, *Spisy,* 8 vols. (Prague: Torst, 1999-2007), 3: 888-897.

[81] "Společné zasedání obou komor kanadského parlamentu," Ottawa, April 29, 1999-2007, in Václav Havel, *Spisy,* 8 vols. (Prague: Torst, 1999-2007), 7: 862-63.

[82] See Ladislav Špaček, *Deset let s Václavem Havlem* (Prague: Mladá fronta, 2012), 148-149.

[83] Thus Africa, for instance, had its poverty, famines, and tribal warfare. "Konference Evropské nové demokracie: Vedení a odpovědnost," Bratislava, May 11, 2001, in Václav Havel, *Spisy* 8 vols. (Prague: Trost, 1999-2007), 8: 128-29.

Havel again cautioned that, in particular, it would make no sense to include Russia in NATO. Such a step would violate the salutary principle of grouping nations with the same culture and, if continued consistently, this process would merely produce a redundant replica of the United Nations. Russia had access for cooperative arrangements with western countries through membership in institutions such as Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe or The Council of Europe.[84]

With reading Russia out of the Western civilizational sphere, it is not surprising that Havel likewise did not share the special interest in, and affection for the Slav nations, even in Masaryk's moderate and limited variant. Havel's lack of enthusiasm for the traditional Czech ideal of a Slavic unity or Slavic brotherhood is particularly understandable in the light of the manipulation with this ideological concept by the Czechoslovak Communist regime. On the initiative of mainly Zdeněk Nejedlý, Minister of Education (1945-1946, 1948-1953), the Slavonic Committee (*Slovanský výbor*) in Prague carried on a propaganda campaign stressing the key role of the Slav nations in the advancement of the Communist cause under the leadership of the Soviet Union.[85]

The Nature of the Global Civilization

Havel, like Masaryk, envisaged that the world moved a harmonious coexistence of all humanity on earth. He differed, however, from Masaryk in assuming that this goal required a conversion of humankind to adopting the sense of a semi-mystical "transcendent," a concept which he derived from one of his mentors, the philosopher Jan Patočka.[86] Masaryk more prosaically expected the happy denouement to come with the universal acceptance of the principles of democracy and humanitarianism.

Looking at the concept of "civilization" from the technological and administrative viewpoint, separated from the cultural and religious aspects, Havel was able to maintain that by the end of the twentieth century only a single global civilization was in existence. The planet earth was now interconnected through thousands of economic, commercial, and monetary relations, which constituted an

---

[84] "Konference Evropské nové demokracie: Vedení a odpovědnost," Bratislava, May 11, 2001, in Václav Havel, *Spisy* 8 vols. (Prague: Trost, 1999-2007), 8: 129.

[85] Nejedlý was the moving spirit behind the foundation of the Slav Committee and the holding of All-Slav Congresses in Moscow during World War II since 1942. He continued this activity after the war, especially in 1945-1948, with the establishment of the Slav Committee in Prague in 1945 and holding All-Slav Congresses in Belgrade (1946) and Prague in (1948); see, Jan Petr, "Slovanství Zdeňka Nejedlého," *Zdeněk Nejedlý*, Velké osobnosti Filozofické fakulty Univerzity Karlovy 1, ed. Miloslav Brůžek (Prague: Univerzita Karlova, 1980), 148-149, 155-157.

[86] For the teaching on the transcendent, see Jan Patočka, *Přirozený svět jako filosofický problém,* in his *Fenomenologické spisy,* vol. 1/ *Sebrané spisy,* vol. 6. (Prague: Oikoymenh, 2008), 148-150.

integral system.[87] With the emergence of this single global civilization, it was not possible, according to Havel, to speak about an existing or future clash of civilizations. The threatening conflicts, which were real, should be thought of as occurring among the persisting individual cultures or civilizational spheres [*civilizační okruhy*]—as Havel liked to call them.[88] A simple solution to avert these conflicts lay in the belief that the western values, that is, the idea of democracy, human rights, civil society, and free market would rapidly spread throughout the entire world. It would be naïve, however, to assume that these values would automatically diffuse everywhere. A part of the problem—making the western model unattractive to many—was its incomplete character, its half-heartedness. Havel was firmly convinced that this dimension of democracy (that would render a universal resonance) was nothing else and nothing less than the spiritual dimension as an expression of what connected all cultures, and, properly speaking, all humanity.[89]

Therefore, after the stage of creating a political framework, acceptable to all civilizational spheres, according to Havel, it was necessary to proceed beyond what he called "meta-politics," to another stage, which would fill the existing spiritual void. Humanity within an all-embracing civilization needed to develop a relationship with the transcendent reality in order to fulfill its overarching responsibility in the stewardship of the earth. Coexistence, peaceful life together, and creative cooperation in the contemporary multicultural world had to rest on what was the common starting point and the common ground of all cultures. This source was transcendence, which was infinitely more deeply implanted in human hearts and minds than any political opinions, sympathies, and antipathies.[90]

According to Masaryk, global civilization depended on two pillars, namely democracy and humanitarianism, both of which were products of Western civilization and were entirely adequate to the task of creating an international community. Democracy, according to Masaryk, [91] was not only a political system, but also a thorough implementation of the ideal of liberty and equality in all areas. Its advance against aristocratism was the most important trend in the nineteenth

---

[87] "Cena Indíry Gándhíové," Delhi, February 8, 1994 in Václav Havel, *Spisy,* 8 vols. (Prague: Torst, 1999-2007), 7: 199-200.

[88] "Cena Jacksona H. Ralstona," Stanford, September 29, 1994, Havel, Václav, *Spisy,* 8 vols. Prague: Torst, 1999-2007, 7: 284-285.

[89] Ibid., 7: 288-289.

[90] "Medaile svobody," Philadelphia, July 4, 1994, in Václav Havel, *Spisy,* 8 vols. (Prague: Torst, 1999-2007), 7: 267.

[91] Masaryk also offered this formal definition of democracy as "the form of state, based on the advanced organization of society, on the modern view of the world, on the modern man; democracy arises from a comprehensive view of life and the world, from a new view, a new angle of vision, a new method. Recognizing and putting into effect the equality of all citizens, acknowledging the freedom of every citizen, and adopting a humanitarian principle of fraternity both internally and externally – this is a new departure not only political, but also a moral one." Masaryk, *Světová revoluce za války a ve válce, 1914-1918*, 365; cited also by Alain Soubigou, *Thomas Masaryk* (Paris: Librairie Arthème Fayard, 2002), 267.

and into the twentieth century. The process began with the American and the French Revolutions; all later revolutions (including the American Civil War) were just implementations of the great change.[92] Democracy promoted friendly relations among states and nations, unlike absolutist regimes, such as the Habsburg Monarchy, which tried to maintain control by encouraging national rivalries and hostilities.[93] If democracy was applied in internal politics, its application in external relations should naturally follow.[94] Masaryk contrasted democracy not only with aristocracy, but also with theocracy, which he saw as stemming from the medieval union of state and church, and characterized by deriving the power of the monarchic state from divine rights.[95]

As for the other pillar of international solidarity, that of humanitarianism, Masaryk defined the concept from the moral, as well as political and social points of view in 1923. Morally, it was a sympathy and respect of every human being for every other human being. Politically and socially, it meant freedom and equality not only for all citizens in the state, and also among nations and states.[96] In a further refinement of this idea, the Enlightenment of the seventeenth and eighteenth century embraced humanity as altruism which, according to Masaryk, was a virtual synonym of love for one's neighbor as taught by the Gospels. As with democracy, Masaryk credited the French Revolution with the first application of the humanist program to politics and statecraft.[97] Subsequently, the ideal of human progress was generally applied in Western Europe. Germany, however, went a separate way until World War I. The theocratic state was worshipped in Prussia, which came to dominate the united Germany of Bismarck and Wilhelm II. The humanitarian ideals of Lessing, Herder, Goethe, and Schiller were replaced by Pan-German imperialism.[98] As noted earlier, the result of World War I, however, corrected this anomaly according to Masaryk.

Thus, for Masaryk, as for Havel, the unification of Europe and the world was

---

[92] The process was still continuing; see "Präsident Masaryk über kulturelle Zeitfragen," *Bohemia*, January 30, 1927, in Masaryk, *Cesta demokracie III*, 189.

[93] "28. říjen na Hradě," *Národní osvobození*, October 29, 1926, in Masaryk, *Cesta demokracie III*, 166. In conversation with French reporter, Masaryk called for "democratization" of foreign policy: too much of the prewar spirit and methods left. *L'Intransigeant*, June 28, 1921, in Masaryk, *Cesta demokracie II*, 61.

[94] Masaryk, *Světová revoluce za války a ve válce, 1914-1918*, 295-96.

[95] Masaryk, *Světová revoluce za války a ve válce, 1914-1918,* 295-96; "Das Netz des Glaubens," March 24, 1924, in Masaryk, *Cesta demokracie III*, 24.

[96] "Präsident Masaryk in Slawischen Institut," in Masaryk, *Cesta demokracie II*, 467.

[97] The French parliament declared the right of man, and the revolution proclaimed the program of freedom, fraternity, and equality. "Humanita, pacifismus a voják," *Naše vojsko*, October 15, 1928, Masaryk, *Cesta demokracie III*, 312.

[98] "Präsident Masaryk in Slawischen Institut," in Masaryk, *Cesta demokracie II*, 467. It has been noted that, by the 1920s, Masaryk attributed the origin of the philosophy of humanity more to the French Enlightenment rather than to Herder's ideal of *Humanität*; see, for instance, Arne Novák, "Světová revoluce," *Lumír* 53 (1926) in Novák *Nosiči pochodní; kniha české tradice* (Prague, Literární odbor Umělecké besedy a Kruh českých spisovatelů, 1928), 222-23.

not simply a matter of organization. The task involved not only a need to organize, but also a need to create; namely to replace old regimes and old statesmen with new regime and new political leaders. While economic and political structures were important, the unification also required a fresh intellectual infrastructure.[99] Moreover, for Havel as for Masaryk, the unification of Europe was not a goal in itself, but a part of the unification of the world. Europe was not to unify in order to distinguish itself from the rest of the world, but to advance the unification of the global humankind. For Masaryk, Europe and the United States were the source of the humanitarian and democratic ideology which would unite the countries of the world through the League of Nations. For Havel, the so-called Euro-Atlantic civilizational sphere was to provide the unifying democratic and humanitarian concepts which he defined further as the idea of democracy, human rights, civil society, and a market economy, and which were anchored in the transcendent.[100] This unification would occur through the United Nations, but while embracing the single unifying social and ethical ideology, each cultural sphere would also retain its spirituality, which was distinct from, but harmonious with the spiritualities of the other cultural spheres.[101] Masaryk did not share Havel's enthusiasm for the variety of world spiritualities.

Religious Views

The differences in their outlook as to the place of Western politics and culture as the framework of global civilization reflect, to a large extent, differences in their religious views. In contrast to the quasi-mystical transcendent of Havel, Masaryk believed in an empirically inferred theistic God of the Enlightenment in order to understand the operation of the universe, and in the Gospels of Jesus to provide practical moral guidance. His religious views were deeply affected by his wife Charlotte's Unitarianism, such as outlined in the sermon "Unitarian Christianity," preached by William Ellery Channing (1780-1842) in Baltimore in 1819.[102] Even before Channing, germinating Unitarianism had an important effect on the genesis of the American political system (which Masaryk cherished) due to the religious beliefs of the Founding Fathers, in particularly those of Thomas Jefferson.[103]

Havel balanced his references to Christianity by references to non-Christian religions, like Buddhism. Thus in his New Year message of 1990, he promised to invite both the Pope and Dalai Lama to Prague. His concern with the Dalai Lama,

---

[99] Imperial Germany demonstrated great organizational skills, but without moral guidance, it did not lead to victory. "President Masaryk in Gespräch," *Vossische Zeitung,* January 22, 1933, in Masaryk, *Cesta demokracie IV*, 333-34.
[100] "Cena Jacksona H. Ralstona," Havel, 7:287-88.
[101] "Univerzita George Washingtona," April 22, 1993, in Václav Havel, *Spisy,* 8 vols. (Prague: Torst, 1999-2007), 7: 88; "Cena Indíry Gándhíové," Havel, *Spisy,* 7: 203-204.
[102] On Channing, see *American National Biography* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999-2007), 4: 680-681.
[103] Putna, *Václav Havel: Duchovní potrét*, 56-57.

was not accidental, but rather it related to the theosophic interest of his parents and grandparents, as well as of the student group *Kampakademie* in the 1970s. Later, he enlisted the help from the Dalai Lama in planning the Fórum 2000 and supplied a preface to the Tibetan Book of the Dead.[104] Havel differed from Masaryk's austere Unitarianism that did not value the traditional church rituals. Havel's family saw in old religious rites valuable traces of cosmic insights.[105] His grandfather, Vacslav Havel (1861-1921), was a devotee of the unconventional thinker Anna Pammrová (1860-1945), who sought a third way between ecclesiastical systems and a stern positivism. Her new spirituality encompassed two levels: (1) the higher one of Hermetism (Egyptian, Cabalistic, Indian, Ancient); and (2) the lower one of spiritualism, or the evocation of the spirits.[106] Grandfather Havel published a book *Kniha života* [*The Book of Life*] on theosophy and supported the Theosophic Society; he also participated in spiritualist séances (1914-1916).[107] During his visit to the Pope in March 1994, Havel disclosed the wide range of his religious interests. He told John Paul II that he had the recent opportunities of visiting the sacred sites of various religious faiths: Islam, Buddhism, Hinduism, and Judaism. He said, he always carried away the impression that, at the core of all those faiths, were the ideas of toleration, understanding one's neighbor, and helping one's neighbor—simply said, the idea of good that God expected from human beings.[108]

Masaryk, on the contrary, was not particularly impressed by Oriental spirituality. As for Asian religions, he was concerned with Arthur Schopenhauer's praise of Buddhism, although he disagreed with his assertion that Buddhism was atheistic. According to Masaryk, Buddha taught pantheism, which—in contrast to monotheistic faiths—was a religion of suicide par excellence.[109] If Schopenhauer, in fact, exerted a "religious-like" influence through his praise of mysticism,[110] it was because modern intellectual life was joyless and Schopenhauer's pessimism, spreading in European philosophy, literature, and politics, was symptomatic of this mood.[111] At one point in his student years, Masaryk also took lessons in Arabic, but dropped them on discovering that, as a commoner, he was effectively

---

[104] Ibid., 289-91.
[105] Ibid., 291.
[106] Putna, *Václav Havel: Duchovní potrét*, 32-33; "Anna Pammrová," in Jiří Gabriel and others, eds., *Slovník českých filozofů* (Brno: Masarykova univerzita, 1998), 435.
[107] Putna, *Václav Havel: Duchovní portrét*, 33-35.
[108] "Návštěva u papeže," Vatican March 7, 1994, Václav Havel, *Spisy,* 8 vols. (Prague: Torst, 1999-2007), 7: 217.
[109] Tomáš G. Masaryk, *Sebevražda hromadným jevem společenským moderní osvěty*, Spisy 1 (Prague: Masarykův ústav AV ČR, 2002), 174. Masaryk regretted that Schopenhauer's claim that Buddhism was an atheistic religion, was not clarified in Nisikanta Chattopadhyaya, *Indische Essays* (Zurich, 1883), *Atheneum*, 1 (1883-1884), in Tomáš G. Masaryk, *Z počátků Athenea*, *1883-1885*, Spisy 18, (Prague: Masarykův ústav AV ČR, 2004), 304.
[110] Tomáš G. Masaryk, *Moderní člověk a náboženství*, Spisy, 8 (Prague: Masarykův ústav AV ČR, 2000), 36
[111] Ibid., 29.

barred from entering the diplomatic service of the Habsburg Empire.[112]

Thus, Havel and Masaryk did not fully agree on the source of the spiritual purpose governing the world and humanity. Havel's approach was more ontological, Masaryk's more empirical. However, Havel's ontology was not essentialist, it was based on the Socratic (rather than Platonic) approach to philosophy, which did not envisage reaching hard conceptual realities, but rather envisioned philosophy as a journey of existential questioning, relying on subjective insights to reach the "transcendent." In dispensing with the Platonic-Hegelian intellectual guidelines, Havel was prepared—in the words of Richard Rorty—to substitute groundless hope for theoretical insight. In this sense, although a disciple of Jan Patočka's phenomenology, he approached Masaryk's empiricism.[113]

Masaryk's Significance for the Twenty-First Century

Toward the end of his presidential tenure Havel returned to reaffirming his agreement with most philosophical and, political tenets of Thomas Masaryk, and presented them as a precious legacy from his presidential predecessor to the world of the twenty-first century. At a symposium in Washington, D.C. on September 19, 2002, Havel said that he had to make a small confession. In his youth he had a tendency to look toward philosophers other than Masaryk, who seemed too moralistic and too positivistic. Curiously he started appreciate Masaryk's views as he grew older and more fully when fate had lifted him up to the office, which Masaryk had once occupied. He began to clearly understand Masaryk's message when he was facing the post-communist reality.[114] He found an amazing contemporary relevance of Masaryk's stress on non-political politics, by which Masaryk meant pre-politics [*předpolitiku*] or metapolitics. In other words, Masaryk simply referred to the infrastructure of the civic life in the broad sense of the word, or to the moral order of human behavior and co-existence, which currently was called "civil society," and which preceded—and was more significant than—politics in the proper sense of the word.

Another line of his rapprochement with Masaryk's outlook was Havel's realization that one of the important of Masaryk's tenets was his conviction that the moral order of human behavior had a transcendental origin. Masaryk's courage, as well as his humanity had a religious root, only a metaphysical anchoring explained both. He insisted on viewing social phenomena from the vantage point of eternity. It was difficult to explain human responsibility, human

---

[112] Karel Čapek, *Hovory s T. G. Masarykem*, Spisy 20 (Prague: Československý spisovatel, 1990), 54.

[113] Robert Pirro, "Václav Havel and the Political Uses of Tragedy," *Political Theory*, 30 (2002), 228-229; Rorty, Richard, "The End of Leninism, Havel, and Social Hope," in his *Truth and Progress* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 231, 236, 239.

[114] "Mezinárodní symposium Prezident Osvoboditel Tomáš Garrigue Masaryk a Amerika," Washington, September 19, 2002, in Václav Havel, *Spisy* 8 vols. (Prague: Trost, 1999-2007), 8:174.

conscience, and human experience of moral imperatives, as well as the miracle of the universe, of nature, and of human existence. For an understanding of this context, it was necessary to posit humanity's and the world's relationship to the One, whom we imagine as a bearer of transcendental purpose. Thus, as Havel had suggested in his reflections on the progress of world civilization, this meta-process involved three stages. First, from the transcendental order grew the moral order; second, from the moral order grew the civic order; and third, from the civic order finally the political order. [115]

In his speech on the 150th anniversary of Masaryk's birth on March 7, 2000, Havel had issued a declaration of Masaryk's intellectual legacy to the global society in the twenty-first century. Essentially, he rehearsed the themes, which he had launched in the aftermath of the Velvet Revolution. The message was to live according to Masaryk's precepts by embracing the spirit of humanity, tolerance, decency, openness, discussion, solidarity, kindness, and also firmness. In Havel's view, in order to realize this paramount objective in the future, it was necessary for humankind to also adopt Masaryk's teaching that a moral order, if it was to prevail, required a metaphysical foundation. There was a need to understand that the crisis of current modern society stemmed from the diminution of spirituality at its core by not recognizing the necessity of a religious or a transcendental root of social and political life.[116]

As for Masaryk's intellectual legacy to his own country, Havel regretted in 2006, in the second set of his interviews with Karel Hvížďala, that Masaryk's idea of humanitarianism, which had been the governing concept of Czechoslovakia, was adhered to by elites in the new Czech Republic only formally and ritualistically. Interest in economics and material well-being dominated over intellectual and spiritual values. Before the division of the state in 1992, there was more spirituality (perhaps, thanks to Slovak religiosity). After the division in Bohemia and Moravia a stifling atmosphere spread among the Czechs, one trait of which was a type of anti-spirituality. Everything seemed to tend toward a standard and normality; an ideal of the average, banal—one might even say petit-bourgeois—thinking. Havel blamed this development in large part on the dangerous civilizational trend characteristic of the entire planet.[117] This judgment can be best understood in the light of his earlier Solzhenitsynian teaching on the contemporary spiritual crisis of the global civilization, particularly in its Euro-Atlantic component.[118]

---

[115] "Mezinárodní symposium Prezident Osvoboditel Tomáš Garrigue Masaryk a Amerika," Havel, *Spisy,* 8:174-175; see also "150. výročí narození T. G. Masaryka," Havel, *Spisy*, 8:66-67.

[116] "150. výročí narození T. G. Masaryka," Havel, *Spisy,* 8: 68-69.

[117] "Prosím stručně," in Václav Havel, *Spisy* 8 vols. (Prague: Trost, 1999-2007), 8: 495-496.

[118] "Medaile svobody," Havel, *Spisy,* 7:267; "Cena Jacksona H. Ralstona," Havel, *Spisy,* 7: 288-289. See also Aleksandr I. Solzhenitsyn, *A World Split Apart*, Commencement Address Delivered at Harvard University, June 8, 1978 (New York: Harper and Row, 1978), especially, 19-23, 33-37.

On a personal, even practical level, Havel welcomed the linkage with Masaryk. Asked by Hvížďala about the persistence of very similar messages to his homeland and to the world during his presidency, Havel responded that he was reassured by Ivan Medek—who was his chief of the presidential staff (1993-1998) and also a remote descendant of Masaryk—that also Masaryk said "only one thing" during his entire life.[119] On July 10, 2005, Havel noted with satisfaction that he had just seen a program on television about ranking "The Great Czechs." He was pleased to learn that together with Masaryk they occupied the second and the third place (the first place having been preempted by Emperor and King Charles IV, 1346-1378).[120]

Comparing the intellectual outlooks of Havel and Masaryk, as much as we can distinguish the philosophical differences between the two men, we can also see them linked together in a long historical continuum. If it was Masaryk's place in history to be the initiator of Czech independence, it was Havel's destiny to be its revivifying force. Above all, both of them saw their crucial mission in using their high office to proclaim the ideals of universalism, democracy, and humanitarianism, and to seek a realization of these ideals in the world community. As Madeleine Albright, the former United States Secretary of State, declared in October 2011, saying that Havel in her judgment embodied, "more thoroughly than anyone else, the spirit and character of T. G. Masaryk."[121]

---

[119] "Prosím stručně," in Havel, *Spisy,* 8: 531; Ivan Medek (1925-2010) was the son of Rudolf Medek (1890-1940), the prominent Czech writer, and also a Czechoslovak Army general, and a legionnaire of World War One; see Putna, *Václav Havel: Duchovní potrét,* 279.

[120] Among the first ten winners, Havel was the only living one; "Prosím stručně," in Havel, *Spisy*, 8: 561.

[121] On October 5, 2011, at the unveiling of the restored monument to President Woodrow Wilson in Prague; Madeleine Albright, "The Legacy of Masaryk and Wilson Today, Part II," *Slovo* (Cedar Rapids, Iowa), 12, 2 (2011): 19.

Tomáš G. Masaryk and Svetozár Hurban Vajanský at the Turn of the Twentieth Century: A Czecho-Slovak Friendship?

Josette Baer

Introduction

This interdisciplinary paper aims to contribute to the history of political ideas by adding a small piece of research to the puzzling lacuna of Central Europe's intellectual history.[1] I am interested, in particular, in how political ideas, including ideas about politics from both *the 'West' and Russia, as the main intellectual hubs* in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, were perceived in the Czech lands and Slovakia, and how Czech and Slovak intellectuals applied them to their political situation.

I shall focus on the relationship between Tomáš Garrigue Masaryk (1850-1937), Professor of Philosophy in the Czech section of the Charles University in Prague, and Svetozár Hurban Vajanský (1847-1916), a poet, journalist and leading intellectual of the SNS (*Slovenská Národná Strana*, Slovak National Party), who lived in Turčianský Sväty Martin, today's Martin. Their friendship, or rather, close acquaintance, lasted from 1887 until 1891, when a controversy over Russia's rule in Congress Poland led to a rift between them.

Masaryk and Vajanský were both prolific writers, but in different areas of public life: Masaryk's large *œuvre* consists of newspaper articles, programs of the two small and rather unsuccessful political parties he created, philosophical studies, enquiries into Czech history and Russian literature. Vajanský, "the uncrowned poet laureate of Slovakia,"[2] concentrated his efforts on writing poetry and prose; he despised politics and science, indeed, he hated everything modern. Behind any progressive idea or thought he could not agree with, he immediately presumed—to paraphrase Marx—that the ghosts of socialism, atheism and anarchy were at work. He was a regular contributor to conservative Slovak newspapers and journals, leaving behind a vast number of literary critiques and polemic writings.[3] I shall limit myself to texts and documents that concern the

[1] Note that all translations into English are mine, if not otherwise noted.
[2] Josette Baer, "Svetozár Hurban Vajanský (1847-1916). Messianism, Panslavism and the superiority of art", in *Revolution, modus vivendi or sovereignty? The political thought of the Slovak national movement from 1861 to 1914* (Stuttgart: ibidem, 2010), 151–177; 151.
[3] With the beginning of his editorship in 1898, Vajanský published, until 1900, more than fifty percent of his *œuvre* in the *Národnie Noviny*, amounting to twenty pages in Rizner's bibliography; see Ľudovít Rizner, *Bibliografia písomníctva slovenského na spôsob slovníka od najstarších čias do konca r. 1900* (Martin: Matica Slovenská, 1934), 165–185. I would like to thank Ľudmila Šimková at the Slovak National Library SNK in Martin for her assistance.

relationship between Masaryk and Vajanský. The reader can find more detailed biographical information about them in earlier publications.[4]

The aim of this paper is to shed some light on the personal relationship between Masaryk and Vajanský, which, to some extent, reflects the intellectual atmosphere in the Czech lands and Slovakia in the 1880s and 1890s. Therefore, this paper is an *interdisciplinary enquiry* into the political thought of two leading intellectuals of that brief historical period. Let me now present my method and hypothesis.

Method

My method is interdisciplinary, combining the analysis of political ideas and their origins in political philosophy with *contextual biography*,[5] a particular approach to biographical and historical writing. The *contextual biography* method offers a deeper insight into the historical context, presupposing that a person, along with his/her activities, thoughts and personal impressions, cannot be separated from the historical circumstances he/she was subject to. Ian Kershaw explains the method and its relevance:

> Any attempt to incorporate such themes [technology, demography, prosperity, democratization, ecology, political violence—JB] in a history of twentieth-century Europe *would not by-pass the role of key individuals* who helped to shape the epoch.… *They are neither their prime cause nor their inevitable consequence.* New biographical approaches which recognize this are desirable, even necessary. Their value will be, however, *in using biography as a prism on wider issues of historical understanding and not in a narrow focus on private life and personality*.[6]

Using Masaryk and Vajanský's thoughts about politics as a *prism* to view the historical cross section of the years from 1887 to 1891 will provide the reader with

---

[4] On Masaryk see Josette Baer, *Politik als praktizierte Sittlichkeit. Zum Demokratiebegriff von Thomas G. Masaryk und Václav Havel* (Sinzheim: Pro Universitate, 1998); Baer, "Thomas G. Masaryk—Democracy as Czech Humanism" in *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), 15–42. On Vajanský's conception of history, see Karol Hollý, "Negácia událostnej histórie a historický optimizmus: Historická ideologia Svetozára Hurbana Vajanského (1881–1897)," *Historický časopis 57*, no. 2 (2009): 243–269; and most recently Baer, "Twilight of the Idols in Slovakia—or using Nietzsche's hammer to strengthen the nation," in *Kapitoly z histórie stredoeurópskeho priestoru v 19. a 20. Storočí. Pocta k 70-ročnému jubileu Dušana Kováča* (Bratislava: Historický ústav Slovenskej Akademie Ved SAV, 2011), 64–85.

[5] Simone Lässig "Introduction: Biography in Modern History—Modern Historiography in Biography," in *Biography Between Structure and Agency. Central European Lives In International Historiography* (New York: Berghahn, 2008), 1–26.

[6] Ian Kershaw, "Biography and the historian,", in *Biography Between Structure and Agency,* 27–39; 38; my italics.

a deeper insight into the intellectual atmosphere of their times, in particular as far as relations with Russia and those between Czechs and Slovaks were concerned. The combination of contextual biography, on the one hand, and the analysis of political ideas and their philosophical roots, on the other, is particularly suitable to answering questions such as: *How did Masaryk and Vajanský conceive of their political environment? What political insights did they gain from each other? What ideas or concepts caused their controversy?* As a way of probing their thought, this method can reveal how Masaryk and Vajanský positioned themselves intellectually in regard to their specific political environments.

In this sense, my small piece follows Dušan Kováč's assessment that Masaryk and Vajanský's relationship can be described as "finding and fighting each other" (*zhody a rozpory*): as *pars pro toto* of the often volatile but also close relations between Czech and Slovak intellectuals at the turn of the twentieth century.[7] In that Kováčian *pars pro toto*, I shall focus on the philosophically most interesting currents of thought in the Czech lands and Slovakia, that is, on Masaryk's *Realism* and Vajanský's *Messianism*.

Hypothesis

My hypothesis is based on the following questions. First, what political goals did Masaryk and Vajanský pursue? What political ideas did they use to legitimate their goals? How feasible were their political principles in regard to the political system of the Danubian Monarchy?

The main reason for their controversy was Masaryk's Realism and Vajanský's Messianism.

The historical context in the Czech lands and Slovakia from 1887 to 1891

Masaryk in the Czech lands

When Masaryk was appointed extraordinary professor of philosophy at the newly established Czech part of Charles University in Prague in 1882, Czech politicians had for some time presented an oppositional factor in Austrian politics, with the so-called *Sprachenstreit* (struggle for the language) being a central and dominant issue in Czech-German relations in the decades prior to 1914. Aspirations for Germanization had accompanied a growing German nationalism, but it would be wrong to speak of "national oppression"[8] since the Austrian government had not touched the cultural rights of the Czechs. The language struggle was able to develop because Vienna did not infringe on Czech language rights. Converting the *Bohemian historic state rights* into a language issue, the

[7] Dušan Kováč, "Zhody a rozpory. Vajanský a Masaryk ako pars pro toto," in *Slováci. Česi. Dějiny* (Bratislava: Academic Electronic Press AEP, 1997), 59–63.
[8] Kováč, 51.

Czech claims were political, but were voiced under the guise of language, hence cultural rights. The movement's goal was the dominance of Czech in the Czech lands, a continuation of the demand for the historic state rights, the dominating issue in the 1860s and 1870s, which had led the national movement into a deadlock.[9]

Unlike many Czech intellectuals, Masaryk had been educated at the universities of Vienna and Leipzig. This facet of internationality or European identity did not chime well with the provincial, uncritical, aggressive and often also antisemitic Czech nationalism dominant in Prague. With his approach of *Realism*[10] he tried to inculcate scientific rationalism into the emotional tone of the political debates. He would painfully experience the wrath of the radical nationalists when he, hitherto unknown to the public, joined in the fourth and last phase of the *controversy of the manuscripts* (*boj o rukopisy, Handschriftenstreit*)[11] in 1886.

In 1817 and 1818, manuscripts had been found in Königinhof (*Dvůr Králové*) and Grünberg (*Zelená Hora*), which contained epic and lyric poetry; one poem had allegedly been composed by Libuše, the ancestress of the Premyslid dynasty that had ruled Bohemia in the Middle Ages (ca. 895–1306). The ferocious anti-German tone of the manuscripts had raised immediate suspicions, and Joseph Dobrovský (1753–1829), "the father of Slavonic linguistics," had identified them as forgeries already in 1818. Forgeries were widespread in Europe at the turn of the nineteenth century, the first originating from the Scottish poet James MacPherson (1736–1769), who had published a collection of poems and songs translated allegedly from ancient Gaelic, among them *Ossian*, that seemed to originate in the second century.[12] As expressions of Romantic thought that embraced diversity and rejected the rationalism and universalism of the Enlightenment, forgeries were fabricated to legitimate a grand medieval past of

---

[9] For a detailed analysis of the significance of the historic state rights for Czech politics, see Jan Havránek, "Tschechischer Liberalismus an der Wende vom 19. zum 20. Jahrhundert," in *Ungleiche Nachbarn. Demokratische und nationale Emanzipation bei Deutschen, Tschechen und Slovaken (1815–1914)* (Essen: Klartext, 1993), 65–80; Stanley Z. Pech, "The Czechs in the Imperial parliament in 1848–1849," in *The Czech Renascence of the Nineteenth Century* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1970), 202–214; and Otto Urban, *Česká společnost 1848–1918* (Praha: Svoboda, 1982).

[10] See Eva Schmidt-Hartmann, *Thomas G. Masaryk's Realism* (München: Oldenbourg, 1984). Also recommendable are *Masarykova praktická filosofie. Sborník z přednáškového cyklu* (Praha: Masarykova společnost, 1993); Otakar Funda, *Thomas Garrigue Masaryk. Sein philosophisches, religiöses und politisches Denken* (Bern: Peter Lang, 1978), 115–118.

[11] Excellent on the controversy are Roland J. Hoffmann, *Masaryk und die tschechische Frage* (München: Oldenbourg, 1988), 79–88; Jaroslav Opat, *Filozof a Politik T. G. Masaryk 1882–1893* (Praha: Melantrich, 1988), 136–177; and Milan Otáhal, "Význam bojů o rukopisy," in *Masarykův Sborník VII* (Praha: Academia, 1992), 40–71. Recommendable about the instrumentalization of Czech history by various thinkers and politicians is Miloš Havelka, *Spor o smysl českých dějin 1895–1938* (Praha: Torst, 1995).

[12] Otáhal, 40.

the nations in formation; in this regard, Bohemian fabrications did not differ from their Russian, Bulgarian, Scottish or English counterparts.[13] Sir Isaiah Berlin formulated the most accurate description of Romantic thought:

> Suffering was nobler than pleasure, failure was preferable to worldly success ... martyrdom was sacred no matter in what cause…. Independence, defiance by individuals and groups and nations, pursuit of goals not because they are universal but because they are mine, or those of my people, my culture.[14]

What was unusual in the Czech lands, however, was the vehemence with which the controversy was kept alive for almost a century, separating the nation practically into two camps, the defenders of the manuscripts and the critics. Anybody who dared to doubt the authenticity of the "holy documents of Czech *obrození* nationalism"[15] had to bear the scorn and contempt of the Czech press, led by the dominant *Národní Listy* (*National News*), which used smear campaigns and personal attacks, mostly because of its lack of expertise and scientific arguments. Not only the press, but also experts of serious academic and artistic standing—such as the historian and erstwhile leader of the Old Czechs, František Palacký (1798-1876), and the poet Jan Neruda (1843-1891)—defended the manuscripts as evidence of the great Czech mediaeval past.[16]

Masaryk publicly defended the philologist Jan Gebauer, an adherent of Dobrovský's assessment and a German. He, a few like-minded colleagues from the university, and critical journalists who had taken his side, were publicly scolded as traitors to the national cause. Masaryk was excluded from academic and educational projects he had initiated, such as the foundation of a Czech scientific encyclopedia, modeled on the Encyclopedia Britannica. Intrigues in the academic senate would postpone his tenure until 1896.[17]

A positive result of the controversy, however, was the formation of a small group of critically minded scholars, students, journalists and intellectuals who supported Masaryk. They called themselves the *Realists*, being much more the *nucleus* of a civic movement than a political party; their main tenet was Masaryk's *Realism.* Considering themselves a unifying group that was trying to bridge the gap between the conservative Old Czechs and the progressive Young Czechs, they aimed to create a new style of politics: to use scientific principles in politics to de-emotionalize national issues. In Masaryk's view, Czech nationalism did not have

---

[13] Otáhal, 42.
[14] Isaiah Berlin, "The Apotheosis of the Romantic Will. The Revolt against the Myth of an Ideal World," in *The Proper Study of Mankind. An Anthology of Essays* (London: Pimlico, 1998), 553–580; 560.
[15] "…sakrosankte Dokumente des tschechischen Obrození-Nationalismus;" Hoffmann, 79. On the Czech Renaissance or Awakening [*národní obrození*], see the seminal study by Zdeněk V. David, *Realism, Tolerance and Liberalism in the Czech National Awakening* (Washington D.C.: Woodrow Wilson Press, 2010).
[16] Otáhal, 47ff.
[17] Hoffmann, 88.

much to offer for the future if moral values such as truth, tolerance, critical thought and a humanist-universal consciousness counted less than provincial and semi-educated hooray patriotism based on polemic, lies and forgeries.[18] Masaryk and his adherents would found the *Czech People's Party the Realists* (*Česká strana lidová realistická*—ČSLR) in 1900 and in 1906 the *Czech Progressive Party* (*Česká strana pokroková,* ČSP), for which he would receive a mandate in the *Reichsrat (*Imperial Council*).*

Others would soon follow his first experience of having the public against him, such as the Hilsner affair in 1897.[19] Already in the early 1880s, before the controversy went into its fourth phase, Masaryk felt the need to learn more about Czech culture, Russian literature and, in general, Slavic issues. Acquainted with Slovak students that were meeting in patriotic student circles in Prague, he became increasingly interested in the situation of the Slovaks in Upper Hungary.

Vajanský in Slovakia

Turčianský Sväty Martin was a small town in North Central Slovakia, where Vajanský had lived and worked since 1878. Martin was an important symbol for the Slovak national movement: on June 6 and 7, 1861 it had hosted the national assembly, which had adopted the *memorandum of the Slovak nation*. The *memorandum* consisted of four main demands:[20] first, a constitutional bill of law that granted the individuality of the Slovak nation and the recognition of Slovak as a language of communication; second, the recognition of Slovak national individuality under the name of the Upper Hungarian county, called the *okolie*;

[18] As president, Masaryk would time and again stress, how important education, training and expert knowledge were for a functioning democracy – and what danger semi-educated citizens posed to the democratic procedure: he initiated institutions for continuing education, which was the logical continuation of an enterprise he had started in the 1880s with the journals *Athenäum* and *Naši doba*; see Baer, *Politik als praktizierte Sittlichkeit,* 86–189; Tomáš G. Masaryk, "Několik poznámek k problému vychování dorostlých," in *Cesta demokracie III. Projevy, články, rozhovory 1924–1928* (Praha: Ústav T. G. Masaryka, 1994), 214–217.

[19] The Hilsner affair occurred in 1899 and is a vivid picture of antisemitism in the nineteenth century. Masaryk defended the Jewish homeless vagrant Leopold Hilsner, who had been accused of the alleged ritual murder of a young Czech girl to collect Christian blood to bake the Pessah *matzos.* Hilsner was sentenced to death. Masaryk rejected this 'blood libel' as antisemitic superstition, and consulted criminalists and pathologists. He published the new evidence in *Čas*. His efforts led to a second trial, but Hilsner was sentenced to life in prison. Masaryk was scolded by the press as a "traitor" and "slave of the Jews." Radical student groups disrupted his lectures to such an extent that the university had to give him leave for two weeks. Emperor Karl released Hilsner in the war amnesty of 1916. The girl's brother confessed on his death bed in 1969 that he had murdered his sister in 1899.

[20] "Memorandum národa slovenského," in *Z prameňov národa. Na pamiatku stodvatsiateho piateho výročia vzniku memoranda slovenského národa z roku 1861* (Martin: Matica slovenská, 1988), 257–261.

third, equality and freedom of nations and languages; and fourth, solidarity with all non-Magyar nations which expressed the wish for equality and freedom for the Ruthenians, Romanians, Serbs and Croats.[21] Emperor Franz Josef I had ignored the Slovak demands, but the assembly had created two important institutions: the Slovak newspaper *Peštbudinské vedomosti* (*Budapest news*) and the cultural association *Matica slovenská,* which had started to function in 1863 and would be closed down by the Hungarian government in 1875.

By the summer of 1887, when Vajanský and Masaryk first met, he was a prominent intellectual in *Felvidék*, as the Magyars called the Upper Hungarian region settled by the Slovaks. In 1880, he had published *Tatry a more* (*the Tatra mountains and the Sea*), a collection of poems. The first son of the famous *narodovec* (patriot, national awakener) Jozef Miloslav Hurban (1817–1888)[22] had been educated at German Lutheran schools and studied law at Pest University. His mentor and fellow campaigner for the Slovak cause, Ambro Pietor (1843–1906), had given him a pen name in 1873 that would make him famous: *Vajan* was a mythological god of the ancient Slavs and the adjective *Vajanský* designated the young Hurban as an adherent of Vajan in the sense of Slavophile enthusiasm.

Vajanský considered himself an intellectual leader and entitled to define the nation's spirit. To engage politically in the traditional sense of party politics and negotiations with the government, which Masaryk was trying in Bohemia without the slightest success, was a thankless task; the dire situation of the Slovaks required other measures. The nationality law of 1868 had provided the assimilation by the Magyars, also called magyarization, with constitutional legitimacy. As a direct result of the Austro-Hungarian compromise (*Ausgleich*) of 1867, magyarization was infringing on the cultural and language rights of the non-Magyar nationalities.[23] The discrepancy between constitutional theory and reality affected all non-Magyars, regardless of their constitutional status. The autonomy extended to them was not understood as a collective right, but as an individual one,[24] which inculcated the viewpoint that they were a mere sum of individuals, not national groups. Thus, from the perspective of Hungarian state law, the claims of the Hungarian citizens of Slovak, Ruthenian and Romanian origin were irrelevant.

---

[21] "Memorandum," 258–261.

[22] Hurban, Michal Miloslav Hodža (1811–1870) and the famous Ľudovít Štúr (1815–1856) codified the written Slovak language in 1843, which provided the hitherto disunited national movement with a language of communication.

[23] The *Ausgleich* divided the Empire into *Cis*- and *Transleithania* and granted the Magyars the highest degree of autonomy short of a sovereign nation state. Franz Josef I was the Emperor of Austria and King of Hungary in personal union. Both states had a common foreign policy and diplomacy and shared also the ministries of defence and finance.

[24] Ľudovít Holotík, "Der österreichisch-ungarische Ausgleich und die Slowaken," in *Der österreichisch-ungarische Ausgleich 1867. Materialien (Referate und Diskussion) der internationalen Konferenz in Bratislava 28.8-1.9 1967* (Bratislava: Verlag der Slowakischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1971), 727–745; 742.

The hopes of the *memorandum* generation, the generation of Vajanský's father, had been crushed; the non-Magyar nationalities had to find other means of national survival. To Vajanský, the key to the Slovak nation's spirit had to be found in art and literature. In 1881, he and the poet Jozef Škultéty (1853-1948) founded the *Slovenské pohľady* (*Slovak views*), a journal for poetry, literature, art and politics that exists to this day. In the same year, he was elected secretary of the Slovak women's association *Živena*; appointed general secretary in 1897, he had the powers of an editor-in-chief, deciding what poems, prose and texts should be published in the association's journal that was also called *Živena*.[25] His conservative view of the role of women in society would lead to open conflict with the co-editor Elena Maróthy-Šoltésová (1855-1939).

Vajanský laid all his hopes on Russia; he was personally acquainted with Viktor Ivanovič Lamanskii (1833–1914),[26] who introduced him to Slavophile circles in Moscow and St. Petersburg. Although, from a political perspective, his efforts on behalf of the Slovak nation were close to nil, he was lovingly called *baťko*, the nation's wise grandfather, a martyr who had suffered for his nation in prison. As editor of the conservative *Národnie Noviny* (*National News*) from 1898 until his death, he could publish whatever he liked. The *NN* practically became his house journal. He was elitist and anti-democratic, moody and narcissistic, but he nevertheless had a significant influence on the minds of those Slovak citizens who mistrusted modernity, identifying it with atheism and socialism. Paradoxically,

[25] For detailed information about the Slovak women's association, see Josette Baer, "*Živena*—die helfende weibliche Hand? Zur Lage der Frauen in der Slowakei vor dem I. Weltkrieg," in *Körper. Aspekte der Körperlichkeit in Medizin und Kulturwissenschaften* (Basel: Schwabe, 2012), 147–171. Excellent on gender issues and family relations in nineteenth century Central Europe are the following volumes in alphabetical order: Gabriela Dudeková and kol. (eds.), *Na ceste k modernej žene. Kapitoly z dejín rodových vzťahov na Slovensku* (Bratislava: HU SAV, 2011); Dudeková, "Learning to crawl before we can walk. Gender in historical research (not only) in Slovakia," in *Historiography in Motion. Slovak contributions to the 21st International Congress of Historians* (Bratislava, Banská Bystrica: HU SAV, 2010), 146–167; Johanna Gehmacher and Natascha Vittorelli (eds.), *Wie Frauenbewegung geschrieben wird. Historiographie, Dokumentation, Stellungnahmen, Bibliographien* (Wien: Loecker Erhardt, 2009), 329–349; Edith Saurer, Margareth Lanzinger and Elisabeth Frysak (eds.), *Women's movements. Networks and Debates in postcommunist countries in the 19th and 20th centuries* (Köln: Böhlau, 2006), 179–196.

[26] Lamanskii was a professor for Slavic languages and literature at the university of St. Petersburg and co-founder of the Slavic Literary Fund that supported various individuals and groups in Central Europe and the Balkans with financial means. Lamanskii and his friends helped to finance the education of Vajanský's daughter Olga at the prestigious Smolny Institute for girls in St. Petersburg. On Vajanský's Panslavism that was philosophically identical to the Romantic Panslavism of Štúr, see Jozef Jirásek, "Hurban Vajanský v názoroch na Rusko," *Prúdy 8*, no. 4 (1926): 207–217. On Štúr's political thought, see Tibor Pichler, "Štúrovska romanticko-realisticka koncepcia nacionalizmu," in *Národovci a občania: O slovenskom politickom myšleni v 19. Storoči* (Bratislava: SAV, 1998), 33–74; and Baer, "Ľudovít Štúr – Nationalism and Panslavism in Slovakia," in *Slavic thinkers,* 45–77.

Vajanský, brought up as a Slovak Lutheran, would be most popular with the Slovak Catholics, who, guided by the Catholic clergy, despised modernity, adhered to the then "normal" Catholic antisemitism and rejected enlightened rationalism. The journal *Hlas* (*The Voice*), founded by young progressive Slovaks, who had studied in Prague and were acquainted with Masaryk's *Realism*, embodied the new way of thinking Vajanský considered so dangerous for the soul of the nation.

Vajanský died of a heart attack on August 17, 1916; he had endured three prison sentences, made five trips to Russia, the last one in 1913, and admitted, literally on his death bed, that his adoration and enthusiasm for Russia had been wrong – and that Masaryk had been right in his political judgment of Russian Imperial politics. Vajanský's son Vladimír published hitherto unknown facts in 1926:

> In the summer of 1917… I received a note from my mother; among other things she wrote: "*Vater segnet Erik und seinen Meister*" [Father sends his blessings to Erik and his master]. This was the answer to my German note [to his parents, JB], which I had signed with the pseudonym Erik Hodonínsky…. He considered Masaryk his master.[27]

The friendship and its end, 1887 to 1891

Masaryk's relationship with the Slovaks can be divided into four phases:[28] In the first, from approximately 1880 to 1890, he became acquainted, in correspondence as well as in person, with Slovak intellectuals living in Slovakia, and, in a more systematic fashion, started to meet the young Slovak *intelligentsia* studying in Prague.[29] The peak of this first phase was the foundation of *Hlas* in 1898. The idea to publish a modern and scientific journal, similar to his *Athenaeum*, was his; the young Slovaks Vavro Šrobár (1867-1950), Fedor Houdek

---

[27] Vladimír Hurban, "T. G. Masaryk a Svetozár Hurban Vajanský," *Slovenský denník,* 16. 9. 1926, 1–2. The dying Vajanský must have assumed that Vladimír would have a chance to meet Masaryk, who, in exile since 1914, travelled to Russia in May 1917 to organize the withdrawal of the Czechoslovak troops from Russia to France. Vajanský's blessings sent to his son should be understood as his last wish to reconcile with Masaryk through mediation by Vladimír. Most probably, Vajanský's vanity and his age prevented him from contacting Masaryk directly. It was also difficult to contact Masaryk in those days of war and turmoil. I consider that he was just too stubborn to admit to Masaryk that he had been wrong about Russia all the time, but, dying, he wanted to send a last note to 'his master,' admitting Masaryk's intellectual and political superiority.

[28] Zdeněk Urban, "K Masarykovu vztahu ke Slovensku před první světovou válkou," in *Masaryk a Slovensko (soubor statí)* (Praha: Masarykova společnost a Ústav T. G. Masaryka, 1992), 68-89; 68ff.

[29] On Karel Kálal's efforts for the common state and his relationship with Masaryk see Thomas D. Marzik, "The Slovakophile Relationship of T. G. Masayk and Karel Kálal prior to 1914," in *T. G. Masaryk (1850-1937), Thinker and Politician, vol. I* (University of London: School of Slavonic and East European Studies, 1989), 191–209.

(1877-1953) and Anton Štefánek (1877-1964) formed with *Hlas* a counterpart to the dominant conservative Martinists, led by Vajanský.[30] The second phase lasted from 1898 to the beginning of WWI and was characterized by Masaryk's articles about Slovak culture, politics and economics, although he did not want to get personally involved in Slovak affairs. He was not active in the cultural association *Československá jednota* (Czechoslovak union), nor did he attend the meetings of Czechs and Slovaks in the Luhačovice spa.[31] The third phase was the years of lobbying for the common state from 1914 to 1918 in Great Britain, France and the USA. If the international recognition of Czechoslovakia was the peak of the third phase, the fourth and last phase would be the years of the First Republic, from 1918 to 1938, when the Munich agreement was the first stepping stone for Nazi Germany to carve up Czechoslovakia, incorporate Silesia and the Sudetenlands into the *Reich*, occupy Bohemia and Moravia as *Reichsprotektorat Böhmen und Mähren* and press Slovakia into a pseudo sovereign First Slovak Republic.[32]

Early in 1886, Masaryk was looking for Slovak authors to commission texts for the *Ottův Slovník nauční* about Slovak literature and culture. Introduced to Vajanský by Jaroslav Vlček (1860–1930), he wrote to Vajanský on February 12, 1886:

> I therefore kindly ask you to write, for our scientific dictionary, an article about Slovak literature and, more articles about the Slovak people, biographies of politicians, etc. Your devout Masaryk.[33]

By the summer of 1887, when the Masaryks spent their first of many holidays in Slovakia, the families of Vajanský and Masaryk were friends. Masaryk needed to relax, as the controversy of the manuscripts was reaching its climax.[34] He and Vajanský shared an interest in Russian literature. Masaryk would go on his first trip to Russia in the autumn of 1887, where he would meet Lev Tolstoy, with whom he would have a passionate dispute about violence:

> Our biggest argument was whether one should resist evil. Tolstoy did not understand that this issue involves not only resistance by the use of violent

---

[30] On Masaryk's influence on *Hlas* and the *Hlasists* see Baer, "Vavro Šrobár. Realism and Czechoslovakism," in *Revolution, modus vivendi, or sovereignty?*, *179*–223; 191–201.
[31] Urban, 69.
[32] Excellent on the crucial months from the Munich agreement to the foundation of the First Slovak Republic is Valerián Bystrický, Miroslav Michela, Michal Schwarc a kol. (eds)., *Rozbitie alebo rozpad? Historické reflexie zániku Česko-Slovenska* (Bratislava: Veda, 2010). For a documentation on Czechoslovak foreign policy in the years 1938, 1939 and 1940 see *Československá zahraniční politika v roce 1938* (Praha: Ústav mezinárodních vztahů, 2000); and *Od rozpadu Česko-Slovenska do uznání československé prozatímní vlády 1939-1940* (Praha: Ústav mezinárodních vztahů, 2002).
[33] Jan Rychlík (ed.), *Korespondence TGM – slovenští veřejní činitelé (do r. 1918)* (Praha: Masarykův ústav a Archiv ČR, 2007), 23.
[34] Kováč, 59.

> means, but also the fight against evil on the whole. He refused to accept the difference between defense and assault.[35]

Vajanský wrote to Masaryk on July 10, 1887:

> Our dear doctor! My daughter Vieročka wrote to us that you and your dear wife would be willing to take her to Martin to spend the summer holidays … for the trip I send you 10 gold ducats … more I shall be happy to give you when you come to visit us … Please, be so kind and take her, you or your dear wife, under your fatherly or motherly wings … *Do svidania* Your SHV.[36]

Clouds soon emerged to darken their relations when Masaryk published the article *On the Russian-Polish struggle* (*Ke sporu rusko-polskému*) in *Čas* in 1891. His pro-Polish position and critique of Russia's assimilation policy in then Congress Poland angered Vajanský to such extent that he wrote: "He wrote [referring to Masaryk's article, JB] slovenly, in the tone of those Jewish feuilletons, not only with a complete lack of artistry, but also full of insignificant trivialities."[37]

Masaryk could not be bothered to address Vajanský in person anymore. He wrote to Jaroslav Vlček on the July 22, 1891, pouring out his anger and also emotional hurt, in brief remarks:

---

[35] Karel Čapek, *Rozhovory s TGM* (Praha: Orbis, 1946), 65.

[36] Rychlík, 26. Vajanský's Russian greeting *Do svidania* indicates not only his love for Russia, but also that he and Masaryk had been talking about Russia and her culture and literature.

[37] Urban, 77. Vajanský's antisemitism was as obvious as his love for Russia and his contempt for modernity. Masaryk was certainly no antisemite; his statement should be understood in the context of Vajanský's critique. The best introduction to antisemitism is Steven Beller, *Antisemitism. A Very Short Introduction* (Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press, 2007). An excellent study on antisemitism in Slovakia in the nineteenth century is Petra Rybářová, *Antisemitizmus v Uhorsku v 80. rokoch 19. Storočia* (Bratislava: Pro Historia, 2010). I thank Daniela Kodajová for recommending this study to me. On antisemitism in Bohemia see Alexej Mikulášek, *Antisemitismus v české literatuře 19. a 20. století. Teoreticka a historicka studie* (Praha: Votobia, 2000) and *Antisemitismus v posttotalitni Evrope. Sbornik z Mezinarodniho seminare o antisemitismus v posttotalitni Evrope* (Praha: Nakladátelství Franze Kafky, 1993). I should like to thank Marta Neracher for drawing my attention to these studies. I use the concepts *antisemitic* and *antisemitism* without hyphen, following Shmuel Almog's considerations: the concept *antisemitism* by Wilhelm Marr (1819–1904) was, ever since its coinage, used to describe and evoke the systematic rejection and hatred of the Jewish people. *Antisemitism* as a term was never used to incite racist hatred against people that belong to the group of Semitic languages, such as Arabic, Aramaic, Amharic, Hebrew and some North-African dialects. The hyphen thus blurs the linguistic definition of Semitic languages with the nationalist definition of the Jewish people, serving as an argument to weaken the concept by expanding its alleged target group to people that speak a Semitic language; Shmuel Almog, "What's in a hyphen?" on http://sicsa.huji.ac.il/hyphen.html; accessed May 7, 2013.

> The news of *Čas* about Vajanský's critical comments … hurt me very much … that low-mindedness pains me … I was never emotionally close to him; but went along because of our families' good relations and also because of you and our other dear Slovak friends; but now he certainly said in public what he has in his heart—fine. I only pity Slovakia and its youth … A person who takes money for his activities is no better if he receives it from baťuška [Russian grandfather, the Russian Tsar, JB] or from a Jew—and this person dares to blame me—for simply stating the very facts—please: facts!—of Jewish liberalism?[38]

Masaryk and Vajanský would never meet again. Vajanský's son Vladimír, however, would contact Masaryk in September 1917:

> In his wish to put things right … Vladimír Hurban contacted Masaryk.… V. Hurban was working there as a representative of the Czechoslovak council in Russia. Hurban … asked Masaryk directly, whether there would be any problems, as he was Vajanský's son. Masaryk replied: 'Ach, *hlouposti* [don't be silly, JB]. Sit down and tell me the latest news about your father.[39]

At the national festivities in Martin in August 1926, the new buildings of the *Matica* and Milan R. Štefánik were inaugurated, and also a statue of Vajanský. President Masaryk, always the clever strategist, but also generous and understanding, expressed his reverence for Vajanský to the public in Slovakia, explicitly recognizing the Slovaks as a nation: "This inauguration of the statue of Svetozár Hurban Vajanský is an act of gratitude, but also a program—Slovak literature has been the guardian angel and awakener of the nation."[40]

Conclusion

To spare the reader a lengthy chapter on Masaryk's and Vajanský's political thought, I have summarized their major ideas in the following chart:

Vajanský: Anti-Western attitudes	Masaryk: Western thought
Intellectual outlook: Romanticist	Intellectual outlook: Enlightenment rationalism; Comtean positivism
Nationalism = Messianism	Nationalism = Nation-building
Slavs: Pan-Slavism, Slavic union led by Russia	Slavs: After 1905, Czecho-Slovakism
Social attitudes: Conservative, intelligentsia leads the masses, anti-egalitarian	Social attitudes: Modernist, egalitarian, from 1895 focused on *drobná práce* (small-scale works)
Anti-political, focus on cultural and artistic activities	Apolitical, focus on *drobná práce,* nation-building and state-building (1915-1936)
Religious views: Christian as supported by Russia, unclear whether confessionally	Religious views: tendency to atheism

[38] Rychlík, 35.
[39] Dušan Kováč, "Vajanský a Masaryk," in *Historická revue I*, no. 1 (1990): 8–19; 19.
[40] Kováč, "Vajanský a Masaryk," 18.

Orthodox, Catholic or Protestant	
Preferred political system: Aristocratic; Russia should rule a *union* not a *federation* of all Slavs	Preferred political system: Czecho-Slovak sovereignty and self-determination in a democratic state under the rule of law

Let me now answer my hypothesis:

The main reason for their controversy was Masaryk's Realism and Vajanský's Messianism.

Masaryk and Vajanský fell out with each other so fervently, because they were living on different intellectual planets. While Masaryk was an adherent of the Enlightenment, trained in rationalism and saw life through a Comtean positivist lens, Vajanský was an adherent of Romanticism; to him, the Romanticist view of the soul constituted the Slovak nation. Masaryk thought of facts as facts, while facts did not interest Vajanský; he did not estimate facts as such, but sought an inner sense, a kind of *Hegelian Spirit*, within those facts. He could not understand why Masaryk was so eagerly engaging in politics, since the Austrian absolutism in the Czech lands and the Magyar assimilation in Hungary were rendering void all political efforts. Masaryk, on the other hand, could not understand why Vajanský considered himself the leader of the Slovak nation; his claim for leadership was based on his anti-egalitarian view of the citizens and the panslavist hope for liberation by Russia, attitudes Masaryk found deeply irritating, outdated and amorphous. Vajanský conceived of art and literature as the only true sign of the Slovak national spirit; art and literature were to him evidence of the nation's existence. To Masaryk, Czech nationalism had to cease being a theoretical issue promoted by irrational and antisemitic radicalists; he suggested the daily and unspectacular *small works* as the truest realization of being Czech.

The method of contextual biography combined with the analysis of political thought proved to be suitable to sketch the intellectual atmosphere in Bohemia and Slovakia in the last decades of the nineteenth century.

To conclude, Masaryk was isolated as a politician and thinker in the last decades of the nineteenth century in the Czech lands, while Vajanský was the leader of the conservative Martinists, who claimed the spiritual leadership of the nation. Their thought and the dispute between them can serve as *pars pro toto* for the Czech and Slovak attitudes toward and opinions about nation and political loyalty in Central Europe in the nineteenth century.

Czech Pioneers in the American Northwest

Míloslav Rechcigl, Jr.

Czech settlements in America have generally been associated with big cities, such as Milwaukee, St. Louis, New York, Chicago and Cleveland, as well as the rural Midwest. Nevertheless, individual immigrants from Czech lands have appeared in other areas of the United States, although relatively little is known about them and even less written.

The focus of this essay is the American Northwest. The news that gold had been found in California led to the famous "rush" of gold seekers to the southern part of the Pacific West. The Northern Pacific areas, however, posed no such attraction, at least not initially. The rights in the northwestern region, known, in 1818, as the Oregon Territory, were shared by the US and the Britain. The Oregon Treaty, in 1884, divided the Territory that included Oregon, Washington, Idaho and part of Canada at the 49th parallel, a continuation of the boundary between Canada and the US. The present paper therefore encompasses the mentioned States plus Alaska, Montana and Wyoming, the latter constituting the eastern end of the historic Oregon Country at the Continental Divide.

First Pioneer

The first Bohemian to visit these parts was a noted Czech botanist and explorer Thaddeus Haenke (1761-1817), a native of Chřibská. In 1791 he participated in the Malaspina Expedition from Santiago, Chile, along the West Coast of South and Central America, North America to Alaska. On August 12, 1791, he arrived in Nootka Sound, B.C., where Pedro de Alberni was in charge of the Spanish settlement of Santa Cruz de Nutka. Here Haenke enlarged his collections, classifying specimens according to the Linnaean system. His results form the oldest systematic ordering and cataloguing of the botanical species of present-day western Canada. Haenke was disappointed in his relatively small collection of plants; he could not find many species distinct from those of Europe, but he did discover a great number of conifers which differed from European varieties, and also found that the natives used spruce beer as an effective antiscorbutic. While he was in Nootka Sound Haenke continued his observation of the coastal Indians and recorded some of the music of the local Nootkas. Haenke Island in Yakutat Bay in southeastern Alaska was named in his honor.[1]

[1] *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*. (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1983), Vol. 5 (1801-1820); Eric Hultén, *History of Botanical Exploration in Alaska*. (Lind: Carl Bloms boktryckeri, 1940), p. 297.

Oregon

The first Czechs settled in the state of Oregon in 1852, when Louis Fleischner (1826-1896),[2] accompanied by his younger brother Jacob (1832-1910), moved there. Two years later, Joseph Francl (1824-1875) of Svojsice, Bohemia, travelled through Oregon on his trip to California, in search for gold. He kept a highly compelling journal which was published under the title *The Overland Journey of Joseph Francl the first Bohemian to Cross the Plains to the California Gold Field.* It is full of interesting characters, encounters with Native Americans, descriptive passages of the wildlife and terrain, and an easy enjoyable read.[3]

In 1856, John J. Philipi (1856-1928) came to America, locating temporarily in Portland, Oregon; his family eventually settled in Lewiston, Idaho. Herman Bories (1820-1901) and his wife Rosa (nee Freiman) (1825-1911), both from Bohemia, resided in Portland since 1861, where their son Frederick was born two years later. According to the 1880 census he was a teacher. He also served as rabbi and, as such, he held the rabbinical post in Portland. Josef Schiedler (b. 1840), a native of Bohemia, and his family originally immigrated to Milwaukee, Wiconsin, but in 1874 moved to Marion, Oregon, where their son Adolph was born in June the following year. He and his wife Katherine Saures had nine children, six of whom were born in Oregon.

By 1876, Theresia (Hiederer) Kloetsch (1839-1894), of Bohemia, resided with her husband Jacob Kloetsch and their children in Marion, Oregon, because in December of that year their son John H. Kloetsch was born there, in a place called Sublimity. The family had nine children, of whom seven were born at St Anna, Calumet, where they originally resided. In 1877, Wenceslaus Kahut (1849-1943), from Strakonice, Bohemia was married in Gervais, Oregon. In 1879, Joseph Bouška (1856-1934), of Kladno, Bohemia journeyed to Oregon City, Oregon and operated for the Portland flour milling company for five years. He later moved to Bridgeport, Washington.

Of all these people, Louis Fleischner (1827-1896), a native of Lhotka, Bohemia, who became a leading merchant of Portland, distinguished himself most. He immigrated to America in 1842, having first resided in Philadelphia, where he was employed by a horse and cattle dealer for five years. From there he went to Drakeville, David County, Iowa, where he ran a store. In 1852, heeding the call of the West, he crossed the plains with an ox team, heading for Oregon. The land immigrants of this year experienced unusual hardships. Disease killed all of their cattle, while many of the immigrants perished from the cholera. After weary months of suffering Fleischner arrived in Albany, Oregon, where he embarked in the mercantile business, and for the following seven years did a very successful

---

[2] Alfred Apsler, *Northwest Pioneer; the Story of Louis Fleischner*, (New York: Farrar, Straus and Cudahy / Jewish Publication Society), 1960; H. W. Scott, *History of Portland, Oregon*. (Syracuse, NY: D. Mason & Co., 1890), pp. 553-555.

[3] Joseph Francl, *The Overland Journey of Joseph Francl the first Bohemian to cross the plains to the California gold fields*. Introduction by Richard Brautigan. Illustrations by Patricia Oberhaus. (San Francisco: William P. Wreden), 1968.

business. In 1859 he sold out and for one year conducted a store at the Oro Fino mines. In the fall of that year he took a stock of goods to Lewiston, Idaho, arriving on the first steamboat landing there. He remained there until 1863, when he came to Portland, where he eventually established the firm of L. Fleischner & Co. which was very successful. In 1869 he sold out and soon thereafter, under the same firm name, embarked in the wholesale dry goods business. The firm ranked among the first in the State and outside of San Francisco unexcelled on the coast. He was associated with his brother Jacob, and when they both retired, Jacob's two sons, Isaac Newton and Marcus took over, since Lewis was unmarried.

In addition to his eminently successful business career, Louis Fleischner was very active in Portland's political and civic affairs. In 1870 his personal popularity and the confidence he inspired among the people led to his nomination and election to the post of State Treasurer, which he held for five years. His life-long love for a childhood sweetheart, which resolved in her marriage to another man and her premature death due to lack of adequate medical facilities, inspired him to erect a hospital in his native village in Bohemia. He was also president of the First Hebrew Benevolent Association of Portland and one of the most active members of Congregation Beth Israel. He also built the first elaborate synagogue in Oregon.[4]

Another individual of note was Joseph Polivka (b. 1850), a Bohemian native, who sailed for America in the spring of 1880, landing at New York. From there, after three months, he came to Portland. Since 1883, he had engaged in business dealing in and importing fine woolens, under the name of Joseph Polivka & Co. He built up a good business, being then one of the leading tailors of the northwest, making large importations of fine woolens, while the work of the tailoring department was unsurpassed. He had indeed the only exclusive tailoring establishment of the city and catered only to the highest class trade. He also made extensive investments in stocks in many private business concerns and corporations and was recognized as a man of sound judgment, keen discrimination and unfaltering enterprise. Prominent in Masonic circles, Polivka had attained the thirty-second degree of the Scottish Rite and was a member of the Mystic Shrine since first crossing the sands of the desert in February, 1899. [5]

Three towns in Oregon have had substantial presence of Czech immigrants, namely: Scio, Scappoose, and Malin.[6] Scio is one of the oldest towns in Oregon, with a mild climate, rich farm soil, and a gentle landscape, reminding one of Bohemia. A group of Czechs, led by Joe Young Jr. from Kansas, arrived there in 1898, searching for suitable land to start a Czech community, just at the time when large tracts of farmland became available for sale.

Scappoose features Havlik Road, named after the first Czech settler in this town, John Havlik, who purchased farmland there in 1905. He became a successful

---

[4] H.W. Scott, op. cit.

[5] Joseph Gaston, *Portland, Oregon, Its History and Builders: In Connection with the Antecedent Explorations, Discoveries, and Movements of the Pioneers that Selected the Site for the Great City of the Pacific*. (Chicago-Portland: The S. J. Clarke Publishing Co., 1911), Vol. 3, pp. 163-164.

[6] Lida O'Donnell, "Czech Footprints in Oregon," *Czech Dialogue*, 9-10, 2009.

farmer and store owner, and the part of town, where he lived, used to be called Havliksville. The third town, Malin, located on land that was once covered by Tule Lake, was founded and named by members of the Czech Colonization Club in 1910. It got its name from Louis A. Kalina (1880-1967), a merchant, who brought his family to Oregon, being one of the Czech Club, with headquarters in Omaha, Nebraska. Kalina was mayor of Malin for 27 of the town's first 28 years of existence.[7]

Washington

The first Czech to come to the State of Washington was Francis Xavier Richter (1837-1910), a native of Frýdlant, Bohemia, who, in 1862, moved to Lewiston, Washington from Texas and Arizona, where he first immigrated.[8] In the spring of 1875, Joseph Francl (1824-1875) walked from Placerville, California to Portland, Oregon. That's 600 miles of walking. He then turned right at the Columbia River and walked up to the Blue Mountains in the State of Washington, where his son lived.[9]

In 1875, Anton Hylák (1837-1907) from Bohemia brought his family to Lewis Co., Washington and settled near the city of Chehalis. He was the owner of a water power saw and grist mill and became extensive producer of lumber and flour. He also raised Hereford cattle and Norman Percheron horses. The family originally immigrated to Iowa around 1867.[10]

In 1876, John Jelínek (b. 1888), from Tábor, Bohemia, moved from Wisconsin to Seattle, Washington, via the Union Pacific Railway and steamer; he was brought to the US by his parents in 1863. Finding little employment on the Sound, he went on foot to Pierce City, Idaho, a distance of over five hundred miles, where he worked in the placer mines. Later, he was located on the Clearwater, after which we find him employed at Texas Ferry on the Snake. From there, he went to the Yakima River, Washington and did timber work for the Northern Pacific. After this, he worked at various places along the Northern Pacific, and did bridgework until 1882, the year in which he selected a homestead and timber culture, in Douglas County, Washington. After staking this claim, he worked a year more on the Northern Pacific, then came to his land and started improving it.[11]

The most prominent Czech immigrant in Washington State was Jacob Furth (1840-1914), who arrived there with his family from California in 1882. A native of

---

[7] *Settling of Southern Klamath County by Czech Colonization Club*. (Merrill, Oregon, 1985).
[8] "Francis Xavier Richter (1837-1910)," in: *Osoyoos Museum & District Archives*, Osoyoos, BC, Canada.
[9] Joseph Francl, *op. cit.*
[10] William Farrand Prosser, *A History of the Puget Sound Country, Its Resources, Its Commerce and Its People*. (New York – Chicago: the Lewis Publishing Co., 1903), vol. 2, pp. 537-538.
[11] Richard F. Steele, *An Illustrated History of The Big Bend Country, embracing Lincoln, Douglas, Adams and Franklin Counties, State of Washington*. (Spokane, Washington: Western Historical Publishing Co., 1904), Vol. 2, p. 732.

Švihov, Bohemia, Jacob Furth played a pivotal role in the development of Seattle's public transportation and electric power infrastructure, and he was also the founder of Seattle National Bank. As the agent for the utilities firm Stone and Furth, he consolidated the city's random independent streetcar lines into Seattle Electric. He was a member of Seattle's first synagogue, Ohaveth Sholum, and Temple de Hirsch. He was not only a key developer but a public spirited one: During the crisis of the Great Fire of 1889 and at other times Furth put the city before his own business interests. One of Furth's first business ventures in Seattle was to rescue from bankruptcy the privately owned firm that operated the Spring Hill water system, which supplied water to city hoses, spigots, and fire hydrants. Furth recruited his banking colleague Bailey Gatzert, and John Leary, founder of the Seattle *Post-Intelligencer*, to bail out Spring Hill. They built a pumping station on Lake Washington and made the system viable. Initially, and in part, rescuing Spring Hill was a matter of public service, but Furth's sound financial sense soon turned it into a profitable venture.[12]

In 1884, Joseph Bouška (1856-1934), of Bohemia came to Cheney, Washington from Portland, Oregon, having originally immigrated to Wisconsin in 1866. After that he came to Cheney and was engaged with ex-Governor George E. Cole as head miller of the Cheney flour mill. Two years later, we find him in Pine City, Washington, as lessee of the mill owned by A. J. Smith, which he operated for one year. He handled other mills in the vicinity and later came to Sprague in the same business. In 1888, he was appointed head miller and sawyer at the Nespelim Indian sub-agency and had charge for three and one half years. He then went to Ritzville and took an interest in the milling plant, owned by J. G. Stevens, Adams Company Bank, and W. E. Blackmer, where he remained for one and a half years. Selling out, he came to Bridgeport, Washington and operated a flour mill there for seven years. In 1901, he resigned his position and moved to his ranch near Port Columbia. Later, he sold this property and removed to Bridgeport where he opened a general merchandise establishment, also handling furniture. He became one of the leading men in the town of Bridgeport.[13]

Idaho

As for the State of Idaho, the mentioned Louis Fleischner (1829-1890,) from Podlesí (Vogelsang), Bohemia, lived in Lewiston, Idaho, from 1859 till 1863, where he arrived on the first steamboat landing in that place. He then removed to Portland, Oregon. In 1876, John Jelinek came here on foot from Seattle, Washington. In 1885, John J. Philipi (1856-1928), a native of Prague, operated a first class tailor shop in Lewiston, Idaho, having moved there from Portland. This Lewiston pioneer served conspicuously through the Nez Perce Indian War. He enlisted in the cavalry of the US Army, and shortly afterward the troop was ordered to Fort Lapwai, Idaho, to take part in the Indian War of 1877. Philipi was in the battle of White Bird. After

[12] William Farrand Prosser, *op. cit*., Vol. 2, pp. 568-569.
[13] Richard F. Steele, *op. cit*., Vol. 2, p. 683.

his enlistment period was over, he brought his family to Lewiston where he remained until his death. With his wife, the Czech born Fannie Podany, they had four children. The large family also included Philipi's three brothers and his wife's four sisters.[14]

In 1898, Wencel W. Papesh (1877-1963), from Bohemia, came to Wardner, Idaho, having originally immigrated with his parents to Minnesota in 1881. In 1906 he established a butcher shop at Kellogg and put forth every effort to build up a substantial trade. His careful management and integrity constituted the strong features of a growing success and in 1907 he was also able to establish a market at Wardner. From the beginning his business grew rapidly and assumed very substantial proportions. In 1909 he became one of the organizers of the First State Bank of Kellogg and was elected to the vice presidency, while in 1910 he was chosen president of the bank. In July of the same year the Papesh Meat Company was incorporated. He was also the president of the Wallace Meat Co. which conducted both a wholesale and retail trade and had the finest shop in northwestern Idaho. Papesh also acquired extensive real estate interests, being connected with the Cowles Papesh Investment Co., which owned the best business site in Kellogg. Papesh was one of the first city councilmen of Kellogg, filling that position when the city was incorporated. [15]

Montana

In 1863, Joseph Horský, Sr. (1806-1900), a native of Borovnice, near Kostelec na Orlicí, moved to Helena, Montana. He brought his family to Linn Co., Iowa in 1856. In 1859, he travelled with his sons to Pike's Peak, where gold had been found, but returned three months later to Iowa. Soon thereafter he moved with his family to a claim he had taken in Washington Co., Nebraska. In 1863 he moved to Helena, Montana where he died in January 1900; his descendants still live there.

His son, Joseph Horský, Jr. (1842-1930), a real estate dealer at Helena, Montana, was a native of Kostelec nad Orlicí, Bohemia. He immigrated with his parents to this country, settling in Johnson County, Iowa, near the city of Cedar Rapids. He attended school in Iowa and Nebraska, his parents having moved from the former state to the latter, and then was engaged in farm work. In 1862, Horský went to Colorado and engaged in quartz mining, continuing there until January 1864. At that time he returned to Omaha for his brother John and together they started for Montana, arriving in Virginia City on August 27, 1865, when he came to Helena, and from that time he had given his attention to the real estate business, having considerable property in Helena and also large ranching and stock interests. His brother John Horský (1838-1924), also from Kostelec nad Orlicí, came to Helena in the spring of 1865, where he turned his attention to the brewing business.

---

[14] An *Illustrated History of Northern Idaho, Embracing Nez Perce, Idaho, Latah, Kootenai and Shoshone Counties*, (Western Historical Publishing Company, 1903).

[15] James H. Hawley. *History of Idaho: The Gem of the Mountains*. (Chicago: The S. J. Clarke Publishing Company, 1920), Vol. 4, pp. 414-15.

They built the first brewery in the city, the Helena Brewery. Joseph Horský continued successfully in the brewing business until 1891 when he sold out and retired from active life. During his residence there he had all along been more or less interested in mines and mining, having done much to develop these interests in Montana. [16]

Joseph Horský Sr.'s great-grandson, Charles Antone Horsky (March 22, 1910–August 20, 1997), whom I knew personally, served as the Advisor on National Capital affairs under Presidents Kennedy and Johnson, and was a partner at a major and prestigious law firm. In his role at the White House and thereafter, he helped pave the way for home rule of the District of Columbia at a time when much of the city's governance was controlled by the U.S. Congress. Horsky was born in Helena, Montana to Joseph T. Horsky and Margaret Bowden. His father was a state district judge in Montana. His mother was the daughter of English immigrants and died when he was 10 years old. Horsky grew up in Helena, and graduated from the University of Washington where he worked in a garage parking cars. At the suggestion of his political science professor, he applied to Harvard Law School. Horsky said at the time that he didn't know where Harvard was. He was accepted and later was elected President of the *Law Review*, and graduated in 1934. The Supreme Court Justice Felix Frankfurter, then a professor at Harvard and early mentor to Horsky, assigned him to clerk for Judge A. N. Hand on the 2nd circuit in New York. Horsky worked with Judge Hand on various cases, including several patent cases. After a year, Judge Hand recommended that Horsky work for Stanley Reed, the new Solicitor General. Horsky went on to serve in the Solicitor General's office from 1935-37 before moving to Covington, Burling, Rublee, Acheson & Shorb (later Covington & Burling), a leading law firm in the District of Columbia; he rose to be a partner and worked there on and off for nearly forty years.[17]

In 1864, Henry Schrammeck (1852-1913), from Bohemia, came overland to Montana in pioneer days, reaching the territory, as a boy of twelve. He was brought to America when he was one year old. He became a rancher. In addition to buying and selling livestock, Schrammeck operated a threshing machine, repaired ox carts, and made ox yokes.[18]

In 1866, Louis Gans (1840-1904), a native of Neustadtl, Bohemia, established a merchandise business in Helena, Montana, having immigrated to America in 1857 and settling first in California, then Portland and from there in Boise City, OK. In 1867, Louis Gans formed a partnership with Henry Klein in Helena, Montana,

---

[16] Joaquin Miller, *An Illustrated History of the State of Montana Containing a History of the State of Montana from the Earliest Period of the Discovery to the Present Time, Together With Glimpses of its Auspicious Future, Illustrations and Full-Page Portraits of Some of it*. (Chicago: The Lewis Publishing Co., 1894).

[17] "Charles A. Horsky, Esquire." Interview by Thomas S. Williamson and Carol Elder Bruce. The Historical Society of the District of Columbia Circuit - Oral History Project 1996; "Legends in the Law: A Conversation with Charles A. Horsky." Interview by Theodore Fischer. Bar Report. Web. 21 July 2010; Molotsky, Irvin. "Charles A. Horsky, 87, Dies - Left Imprint on U.S. Capital," *The New York Times*, 24 August 1997. Web. 21 July 2010.

[18] "Henry Schrammeck & Clara Birch Schrammeck," in: www.Schrammeck.com

specializing in men's clothing and furnishings. Branch stores were eventually opened in Butte and in Fort Benton. Since 1872, Gans made his headquarters in New York as buyer for the numerous stores of Gans & Klein. There he became one of the founders of the Montefiore Home and director of Mount Sinai Hospital and President of Beth-El Congregation. When he died, he left $500,000 in gifts.[19]

Wenzel Charles Rinda (1845-1919), a native of Vienna, of Bohemian parents, came to Helena, Montana in 1867. He originally resided in Dubuque Iowa, where his parents immigrated in 1853. He was one of the discoverers of the Jay Gould Mine and other mining properties.[20]

In 1872, James Wenzel Prelát (1832-1899) from Bohemia came to Montana. By 1875, Jacob Ornstein (1831-1883), a native of Bohemia, and his family resided in Butte, Montana, where they moved from Utah. They had six children, all born in Salt Lake City. Both Jacob and his wife died in Butte. In 1883, Adolph Heller (1846-1910) became one of the largest cattle dealers in Montana with a ranch at Prairie Dog Creek and another in nearby Goose Creek, Wyoming.

In 1887, Anton Hasher, from Bohemia, came to Billings, Montana, and six months later he removed to Marysville, Montana, where he opened in 1892 a boot and shoe store. Hasher kept a complete line of stylish and reliable goods, also made shoes to order and did general repairing.[21]

In 1889, Joseph J. Pokarney (1855-1946) and his wife Mary, from Dobřív, Bohemia, moved to Montana, after immigrating to US in 1881. By 1890, Anton Nedvěd (1865-1938) from Bohemia resided in Butte, Silverhew Co., Montana. Joseph and František Mareš, two brothers from Žamberk, Bohemia, came to Montana; they were butchers by trade.

Wyoming

In 1854, the earlier mentioned Joseph Francl (1824-1875), of Bohemia, travelled through Wyoming, stopping at Fort Laramie, on his way to California.[22] In 1868, Mary Roth (1844-1902), of Bohemia, married Edwin Stephen Whittier in Benton, Wyoming, who, during 1880 Census, resided in Evanston, Uinta, Wyoming. The latter was a lawyer and served as postmaster and receiver of Evanston.

In 1869, Frances Fischl (1852-1925), from Bohemia, was married to Achille Baer in Cheyenne, Wyoming. They had 7 sons and 2 daughters. Achille Baer (1831-1900) operated butcher shops in the frontier towns of Cheyenne in Wyoming Territory and Red Jacket, Michigan, before moving his family to Denver, Colorado. Their grandson Max Baer became a Heavyweight Champion of the World.[23]

---

[19] "Half a Million in Gifts. Obituary of Louis Gans," *New York Times*, February 18, 1904.
[20] Joaquin Miller, *op. cit.*
[21] *Ibid.*
[22] Joseph Francl, *op. cit.*
[23] Nat Fleischer, *Max Baer -The Glamour Boy of the Ring*. (New York: Press of C. J. O'Brien, Inc.,1941).

In 1884, Josef Emanuel Scholz (1855-1941) immigrated to Ashley, Wyoming. In 1890, George Rezac (b. 1873), a native of Milwaukee, Wisconsin, of Bohemian ancestry, came to Rock Springs, Wyoming, where he became a stenographer in the Union Pacific railroad offices and remained there for 11 years; he previously lived in Nebraska. Subsequently he removed to Idaho.[24] In 1891, Elizabeth Killian (1866-1922), of Bohemia, married Nicholas Kappes in Rock Springs, Wyoming. They had 5 children, all born there. She also died in Rock Springs. In 1896, Alexander Arthur Mashek (1868-1940), of Bohemia, married Grace Clare Ryder in Lusk, Wyoming and they had 7 children. Prior to 1906, Adolph Jankovský (1863-1930), from Prague, Bohemia resided in Casper and then in Cheyenne, Wyoming, having come there from Iowa where he originally immigrated; in 1906 he moved to Colorado.

Another Czech pioneer worth mentioning in Wyoming, although we don't know for sure when he moved there, was James Mattas. He was born in Bohemia, around 1855, and immigrated to the US at an early age. He grew up in California but heard the call of the northwest and settled in Rawlins, Wyoming, where he became an important saddle maker. He married Mattie in 1881 and they had a son named Frank, who worked for his father at Mattas Saddlery and eventually took over the business. His "rare vintage Wyoming saddles," which are now considered antique, are occasionally being sold on Internet.[25]

Alaska

Thaddeus Haenke (1761-1817), a native of Chřibská, Bohemia, was a physician, botanist, chemist and explorer. In 1791 he participated in the Malaspina Expedition from Santiago, Chile, along the West Coast of South and Central America, North America to Alaska.[26] Haenke Island in Yakutat Bay in southeastern Alaska was named in his honor. In 1878, Heinrich Klutschak (1848-1890), of Prague, artist, adventurer and explorer, took part in Frederick Schwatka's Expedition to Alaska and the northern Polar regions, as a draftsman and surveyor.[27] In 1895, Bedřich and Edward Mareš, from Bohemia, reportedly, went to Alaska and found gold there.

In 1897, Frances Sedlacek, later known as Fannie Quigley (1870-1844), a native of Wahoo, Nebraska, of Czech parents, at the age of twenty-seven, followed the stampede to the Klondike, Alaska. There she developed the knack of being the first on the scene of a new gold strike. She hiked in dragging her sled laden with a tent, Yukon stove, and supplies, and hanging out her shingle for "Meals." Far from Dawson, her efforts earned top dollar and her nickname, "Fannie the Hike." She also had her own free miner's certificate. Fannie staked a claim in August 1900 on a

---

[24] Hiram T. French, *History of Idaho*. (Chicago and New York: The Lewis Publishing Co.,1914), Vol. 3, p. 972.

[25] "The Legacy of the Wyoming Stock Saddle" in: http://www.oldwestsaddles.com/

[26] Eric Hultén, *History of Botanical Exploration in Alaska*. (Lind: Carl Bloms boktryckeri), 1940, p. 297.

[27] Heinrich W. Klutschak, *Overland to Starvation Cove: With the Inuit in Search of Franklin, 1878-1880*. (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1993).

stampede to Clear Creek, a tributary of the Stewart River, 125 miles from Dawson, where she must have also met the dapper Angus McKenzie. They were married on October 1, 1900, just a few days after her return to Dawson. In January, 1903, Fannie left Angus and the Klondike and set off on an 800 mile hike down the Yukon to Rampart. From Rampart she followed the stampede to the Tanana, and was soon in the town of Chena. In August, 1906, Fannie struck out for the new Kantishna diggings, recently discovered by Joe Quigley, and others. It was the beginning of Fannie's pursuit of mining, and her hopes for a profit from her years of effort.

She staked her share of mining claims, and mined them, and although she never shot an animal until she arrived in Kantishna, her prowess as a hunter became legendary throughout the Alaskan territory. She swore, used foul and gruff language, and wore rough men's clothing. Her drinking habits were legendary. Unable and unwilling to adapt to civilization, she preferred the life in the open. She was there to greet Bradford Washburn when he descended from his successful summit climb on Denali in 1942, just as she had greeted the successful Denali climbing party of Hudson Stuck thirty years before. She died alone in her cabin in the summer of 1944. [28]

British Columbia and Northwest Territories, Canada

Thaddeus Haenke (1761-1817), botanist, physician and explorer, mentioned earlier, arrived with the Malaspina expedition, on August 12, 1791, in Nootka Sound, B.C., where Pedro de Alberni was in charge of the Spanish settlement of Santa Cruz de Nutka. Here Haenke enlarged his collections, classifying specimens according to the Linnaean system. His results form the oldest systematic ordering and cataloguing of the botanical species of present-day western Canada. Haenke was disappointed in his relatively small collection of plants; he could not find many species distinct from those of Europe, but he did discover a great number of conifers which differed from European varieties, and also found that the natives used spruce beer as an effective antiscorbutic. While he was in Nootka Sound Haenke continued his observation of the coastal Indians and recorded some of the music of the local Nootkas.[29]

Francis Xavier Richter (1837-1910), apart from his ventures in the State of Washington, later he became a pioneer settler, miner and rancher in British Columbia, Canada, after settling in the Similkameen Country of the Southern Interior of British Columbia in 1864. He had five daughters and six sons. [30]

---

[28] Jane G. Haigh, *Searching for Fannie Quigley: A Wilderness Life in the Shadow of Mount McKinley*, (Swallow Press/ Ohio State University Press, 2007).

[29] *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*. (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1983), Vol. 5 (1801-1820).

[30] T. W. Paterson, *Encyclopedia of Ghost Towns and Mining Camps of British Columbia*: Volume 2*, The Similkameen, Boundary and Okanagan*, (Langley, B.C.: Sunfire Publications), 1981.

His youngest son, Frank Richter, Jr. (1910-1977), born in Keremeos, BC, was a cattle rancher and fruit grower. He became a Canadian politician, who served as a Member of the Legislative Assembly and Minister of Agriculture and Minister of Mines in the Social Credit government of W.A.C. Bennett in the province of British Columbia. He represented the riding of Similkameen from 1953 to 1966 and its successor riding Boundary-Similkameen from 1966 to 1975. He died at Brentwood Bay at the age of 77.

In 1872, Bohuslav Kroupa (1838-1912), of Prague, Bohemia, illustrator, traveler, author and lecturer, traveled with Commission of Sanford Fleming through Canada. He knew the Northwest and the American cowboy and Indian as intimately as any native. He illustrated the publication *From Ocean to Ocean; Sanford Fleming's Expedition through Canada*.[31]

In 1930s, Jan "Eskimo" Welzl (1868-1948), the immensely popular Czech traveler, adventurer, hunter, gold-digger, and Eskimo chief, of Zábřeh, Moravia, lived among Eskimos in Yukon Territory. He describes his adventures in his humorous and highly entertaining book *Thirty Years in The Golden North.* He traveled by wagon across the wilds of Siberia, then on a whaling ship up to the Arctic Circle. He became a successful trader, with headquarters in a commodious cave on the rocky coast of New Siberia, an island in the Arctic Ocean, where he lived for more than thirty years. We learn about his life among Eskimos and gold miners and how he was stormbound in a blizzard without food for days, his perilous experiences, and how he was finally voted chief on the island, with power of life and death. He died in Dawson City, Yukon's capitol in 1948.[32]

Epilogue

The Czech pioneers in the American Northwest were all rugged individuals, who lived under the most adverse conditions, yet they persevered and, against all odds, hailed impressive accomplishments, proving again the old Czech saying: "*Češi se nikdy ve světě neztratí*" (Czechs won't ever get lost in the entire world).

[31] His experiences of travel and of life among the Indians he stored in an English publication, *An Artist's Tour in North and Central America and the Sandwich Islands*. (London: Ward and Downey, 1890).

[32] Jan Welzl, *Thirty Years in the Golden North*. (London: G. Allen & Unwin, 1941).

ESSAYS

On The Rich Variety of Czech Verb Forms

Zdeněk Salzmann

In an earlier issue of *Kosmas* (24:2, pp. 92-97) I dealt with the great many means of deriving diminutive and augmentative nouns in Czech and I pointed out that the language even derives diminutive adjectives, adverbs, and verbs. In this article I discuss another remarkable characteristic of the Czech language—the rich variety of its verb forms serving to represent the aspect (*slovesný vid*) and the particular nature of the verbal action (*Aktionsart* in German). And I should state at the outset that it would test the reader's patience if I were to cover exhaustively the numerous prefixal modifications of Czech verbs and give examples of all of them. Then, too, in giving English equivalents of the Czech forms, I am not listing all or even most of the senses, but only the most common ones. This article therefore should be viewed only as a good representative sampling of the different means by which native speakers of Czech can derive and express—with great linguistic economy—the many highly specific varieties of verbal action.

Aspect

The category of aspect is based on the contrast between the perfectivity and imperfectivity of the verbal action. Perfective verb forms express an action that is complete (whole) or concluded. For example, *uvařit* (from *vařit*) means "to prepare by cooking (until done)," *pokrýt* (from *krýt*) means "to cover (completely)," *nakreslit* (from *kreslit*) means "to draw up (sketch)," and *přiběhnout* (from *běhat*) means "to come running."

Imperfective verb forms express that an action has not been completed or concluded. For example, *vařit* means "to cook," *ležet* means "to lie (to be prostrate)," *kreslit* means"to draw," and *běhat* means "to run, to be running."

Some Czech grammars also mention biaspectual verbs (*obouvidová slovesa*).

According to the context in which these verbs occur, they may be perfective or imperfective, as for example, *obětovat* "to sacrifice," *jmenovat* "to name," and *absolvovat* "to complete (a course, for example)." In the sentence *Maďaři s oblibou jmenovali Slovensko Horní země* ("The Hungarians liked to call Slovakia the Upper Country"), the verb form *jmenovali* is imperfective, whereas in the sentence *Můj strýček umí jmenovat každý strom* ("My uncle is able to name every tree"), the verb form *jmenovat* is perfective.

Multiplicity of the verbal action

According to the extent a verbal action is repeated (or not repeated), speakers of Czech have the option to express a single or a multiple action, and in the case of the latter they have three choices available to them—iterative action, frequentative action, and distributive action.

Examples of a single verbal action are the forms *koupit* "to buy," *nahrát* (from *hrát*) "to record," and *vykřiknout* (from *křiknout* from *křičet*) "to cry out."

Examples of iterative verb forms are *kupovat* (from the perfective form *koupit*) "to be buying" and *vodit* (from the imperfective form *vést)* "to be leading (as a child by the hand)."

Examples of frequentative verb forms are *sedávat* (from *sedat*) "to be in the habit of sitting" and (*pes*) *štěkával* "(the dog) would be barking." The frequentative action of these verbs can be intensified by doubling the suffix *–va*. In the two examples used above such doubling would yield *sedávávat* and *štěkávával*."

Distributive verb forms emphasize that in a repeated action the subject(s) or object(s) has (have) been exhausted. These particular forms can be exemplified by the verbs *posedět* (from *sedět*) "to remain sitting for awhile" and *skoupit* (from *koupit*) "to buy up."

What should be noticed in the examples above as well as those below is that what in Czech is conveyed by a mere prefix or suffix frequently requires a whole phrase in English to offer a reasonably adequate equivalent.

How diversified the course of the verbal action can be

Here I am dealing with categories that are lexically meaningful rather than grammatical. What can be expressed by speakers of Czech are (1) the different phases of the verbal action (its beginning, completion, or some limitation), (2) the temporal extent of the verbal action (momentary or lasting), (3) the measure of the verbal action (large or small), (4) the size or strength of the verbal action (diminutive or intensive), and (5) the effect of the verbal action (causative).

Here are examples of each of these five classes: (1) *vykopnout* (from *kopnout*) "to kick off," *dopsat* (from *psát*) "to finish writing," and *proběhnout se* (from *běhat*) "to go for a jog"; (2) *píchnout* (from *píchat*) "to prick (once)" and *sedět* "to be sitting"; (3) *popoletět* (from *letět*) "to fly a little farther" and *nasmát se* (from *smát se*) "to have a good laugh"; (4) *pospat si* (from *spát*) "to sleep to one's content" and *navařit* (from *vařit*) "to prepare (by cooking) a lot of food"; and (5) *rozplakat* (from *plakat*) "to move (someone) to tears" and *posadit* (from *sedět*) "to seat (someone)." All the cited forms are derived from the basic verbs by means of prefixes except for the verb form *píchnout* (under 2).

Deriving verb forms by prefixes

This is the most productive and frequent method of verb derivation, with many of the prefixes being the same as prepositions. The list of these prefixes is as follows: *do-*, *na-*, *nad(e)-*, *o(b[e])-*, *od(e)-*, *po-*, *pod(e)-*, *pro-*, *pře-*, *před(e)-*, *při-*, *roz(e)-*, *s(e)-* or *s(ou)-*, *u-*, *v(e)-*, *vy-*, *vz(e)*, *z(e)-*, and *za-*. Of these, only *roz(e)-*, *vy-*, and *vz(e)-* occur only as prefixes and not as prepositions. To keep the length of this paper manageable, only a few examples for each prefix are given below.

Prefix *do-* most commonly endows the basic verb with the sense of completing an activity or reaching a limit or goal: *dozpívat* (from *zpívat*) "to finish one's singing," *donutit* (from *nutit*) "to compel (someone to do something)," and *došít* (from *šít*) "to finish sewing."

Prefix *na-* gives most of the time the action of the basic verb a direction toward the surface of something or an indication of a measure, completion, or compensation: *nalepit* (from *lepit*) "to glue on," *namířit* (from *mířit*) "to take an aim," *nalomit* (from *lomit*) "to partially break," *nalovit* (from *lovit*) "to bag or catch a quantity of (fish, for example)," *nabrousit* (from *brousit*) "to sharpen up," and *napracovat* (from *pracovat*) "to make up (for example a missed day) by working."

Prefix *nad*(*e*)- gives the verb a directional meaning upward or indicates that the verbal action occurs to a great or unusual extent: *nadřadit* (from *řadit*) "to place (something) above (something else)," *nadjet* (from *jet*) "to overtake or to catch up by shortcutting," *nadcenit* (from *cenit*) "to overrate," *nadnést* (from *nést*) "to lift up," and *nadehnat* (from *hnát*) "to drive nearer (for example, a deer toward a hunter)."

Prefix *o*(*b[e]*)- relates for the most part to the surface of an object, to a small extent of an action, to a change in direction, to provide with something, and to several other specific semantic modifications: *omýt* (from *mýt*) "to wash down (for example, a wall)," *oloupat* (from loupat) "to peel (completely)," *opentlit* (from *pentlit* [obsolete]) "to finish decorating with ribbons," *obohatit* (from *bohatit* [obsolete]) "to enrich," *obnosit* (from *nosit*) "to wear out (clothes)," obkreslit (from *kreslit*) "to copy from a drawing," and *obehrát* (from *hrát*) "to wear out (for example, a record by playing it too frequently)."

Prefix *od(e)-* signifies in most cases a motion away from something, taking away from a whole, and completion of an action: *odcestovat* (from *cestovat*) "to travel away," *odlít* (from *lít*) "to pour off," *odepsat* (from *psát*) "to write off," *odhlasovat* (from *hlasovat*) "to decide by a vote," and *odpískat* (from *pískat*) "to blow the whistle (on a foul in football, for example)."

Prefix *po-* usually signifies the act of covering a surface, the acquisition of a characteristic, or a small measure of an action: *pomalovat* (from *malovat*) "to cover with drawing(s)," *pocukrovat* (from *cukrovat*) "to sprinkle with sugar," *poněmčit* (from *němčit*) "to cause to acquire German characteristics," *poskakovat* (from *skákat*) "to hop and skip (as children do)," and *postřílet* (from *střílet*) "to gun down (many)."

Prefix *pod(e)-* signifies a downward direction or lower position, a small measure of an action, or an assessment (usually unpleasant) of an action: *podlepit* (from *lepit*) "to mount (on something)," *podnapít se* (from *napít se*) "to get tipsy," *podplatit* (from *platit*) "to bribe, to buy off," and *podepsat* (from *psát*) "to sign (something)."

Prefix *pro-* signifies in most cases a penetration of something, an intensive completion of an action, and several other specific modifications of an action: *prokopnout* (from *kopnout*) "to kick a hole in," *propít* (from *pít*) "to drink away, to spend (usually money) by drinking," *promeškat* (from *meškat*) "to let something

go by," *prostrčit* (from *strčit*) "to stick something through," and *prosypat* (from *sypat*) "to finish pouring a loose granular material between layers (of something)."

Prefix *pře-* signifies for the most part a motion over or across something, an accomplishment of an action from beginning to end, something done in excess, and a few other specific meanings: *přeplavat* (from *plavat*) "to swim across," *přezpívat* (from *zpívat*) "to sing all the way through, to sing over again," *přepsat* (from *psát*) "to rewrite," *přechválit* (from *chválit*) "to overpraise," and *přetlumočit* (from *tlumočit*) "to translate."

Prefix *před(e)-* signifies a forward direction of an action, as in *předejít* (from *jít*) "to precede," *předcvičit* (from *cvičit*) "to demonstrate an exercise," *předpovědět* (from *povědět*) "to foretell," and *předplatit* (from *platit*) "to take out a subscription."

Prefix *při-* signifies especially spatial closeness, a small measure of an action, and several other specific meanings: *přicestovat* (from *cestovat*) "to arrive," *přivolat* (from *volat*) "to call in, to call over," *přibalit* (from *balit*) "to enclose, to add to (a package)," *přibrzdit* (from *brzdit*) "to lightly put on the brakes," *přinutit* (from *nutit*) "to force someone to do something," and *připít* (from *pít*) "in a company, to offer a drink to someone's health."

Prefix *roz(e)-* signifies in most cases the direction of an action to different sides or to the beginning or completion of an action: *rozlít* (from *lít*) "to spill," *rozestavět* (from *stavět*) "to begin to build but not finish something," *rozšlapat* (from *šlapat*) "to trample (completely) underfoot," and *rozkrájet* (from *krájet*) "to cut up."

Prefix *s(e)-* or *s(ou)-* signifies a direction away from the surface, a small or a large measure of action, and several other varieties of action: *setřást* (from *třást*) "to shake off," *smočit* (from *močit*) "to moisten," *sjezdit* (from *jezdit*) "to traverse," *spolykat* (from *polykat*) "to swallow up," *shořet* (from *hořet*) "to burn up," and *souviset* (from *viset*) "to be connected (with)."

Prefix *u-* signifies mainly a movement from a place, a measure of an action, and several other specific meanings: *uplavat* (from *plavat*) "to float away, to cover (a distance) by swimming," *ukrojit* (from *krojit*) "to slice off," *uskočit* (from *skočit*) "to jump aside," *ušlapat* (from *šlapat*) "to trample down (or to death)," *ustlat* (from *stlát*) " to make a bed," *ubrečet se* (from *brečet*) "to become tired from constant crying (weeping)," and *umlít* (from *mlít*) "to grind up (for example, coffee beans)."

Prefix *v(e)-* expresses the direction of the action inward: *vnést* (from *nést*) "to carry in," *vetkat* (from *tkát*) "to weave in," and *vlákat* (from *lákat*) "to entice or lure into."

Prefix *vy-* most frequently expresses a movement forward or from inside out but also several other specific meanings: *vycestovat* (from *cestovat*) "to go abroad (out of the country)," *vykleštit* (from *kleštit*) "to castrate (referring to a specific instance of action)," *vyžebrat* (from *žebrat*) "to obtain by begging," *vykouřit* (from *kouřit*) "to finish smoking (for example, a cigar)," *vyspat se* (from *spát*) "to finish sleeping long and well," *vyžehlit* (from *žehlit*) "to thoroughly press or iron (one instance)," and *vyhladovět* (from *hladovět*) "to starve out."

Prefix *vz(e)-* signifies a movement upward or the beginning of an action: *vzrůst* (from *růst*) "to grow, to increase)" and *vzklíčit* (from *klíčit*) "to germinate."

Prefix *z(e)-* endows the basic verb with a variety of senses: *zdivočet* (from *divočet*) "to have become wild," *zcestovat* (from *cestovat*) "to travel through," *zbourat* (from *bourat*) "to completely demolish," *zestárnout* (from *stárnout*) "to become old," and *znelíbit se* (from *nelíbit se*) "to make oneself disliked."

Prefix *za-* frequently expresses some direction of an action, a measure of an action, and several other specific senses: *zaletět* (from *letět)* "to fly in(to)," *zahvízdat* (from *hvízdat*) "to give a whistle," *zaplnit* (from *plnit*) "to fill up, to fill in," *zakouřit si* (from *kouřit*) "to have a smoke," *zaplatit* (from *platit*) "to finish paying for, *zarámovat* (from *rámovat*) "to frame up," *zaškrtit* (from *škrtit*) "to choke to death, and *zašpinit* (from *špinit*) "to dirty up.

Doubled prefixes

Some prefixes may occur before verb forms already prefixed. These additional word-initial prefixes are in practice limited to *na-*, *po-*, *při-*, *vy-*, and *z-*.

Prefix *na-* signifies a large measure of action, and the verb is followed by the reflexive morpheme *se*, as in *napřemýšlet se* (from *přemýšlet* from *myslet*) "to think often and a great deal."

Prefix *po-* signifies a small measure of action or a gradual course, as in *popojet* (from *pojet* from *jet*) "to drive a little farther," *pozhasínat* (from z*hasnout*) "to gradually turn off lights," and *povyrůst* (from *růst*) "to grow a little."

Prefix *při-* gives the prefixed verb form the meaning of a small measure or of additional performance of action, as in *přivychovat* (from *vychovat* from *chovat*) "to bring up still a bit more" and *přivydělat si* (from *vydělat si*) "to earn a bit of extra money."

Prefix *vy-* usually precedes the prefix *na-* and endows the prefixed verb with some positive assessment of action, as in *vynachválit* (from *nachválit* from *chválit*) "to praise excessively and often."

And the prefix *z(e)-* gives the already prefixed verb form the sense of fullness or completion, as in *zpřelámat* (from *přelámat* from *lámat*) "to break completely into pieces."

Conclusion

This brief account of the many means by which Czech is able to express the nature of a verbal action with considerable specificity gives evidence of how rich the repertory of derived verbs in Czech actually is. And it should be added for those interested in historical linguistics that Old Czech already had its aspectual system well developed. This richness of derivable verb forms is of great advantage for native speakers of Czech but, on the other hand, presents great difficulties for foreigners who strive to be fluent in the language.

The following works were consulted in preparing this contribution: *Encyklopedický slovník češtiny* (Praha: Nakladatelství Lidové noviny, 2002), *Mluvnice češtiny 1: Fonetika, fonologie, morfonologie a morfemika, tvoření slov* (Praha: Academia, 1986), Šmilauer, Vladimír: *Novočeské tvoření slov* (Praha: Státní pedagogické nakladatelství, 1971).

Refugee Experience 1949-1950

Sylva Simsova

The Decision to go into Exile

My father, Karel Maiwald, was an optimist, hoping in the year following the February 1948 coup that Britain would not allow Czechoslovakia to lose its political independence. Two of his letters to the Czech emigré Social Democrats, signed with his cover name Olšinský, have been kept in the British Library. In them he urged that letters, drawing attention to the situation in Czechoslovakia, be written to Western personalities.

In September 1949, when I returned from a lovely holiday with Karel, my parents told me that we had to leave the country as soon as possible, since my father's name was on the list of Social Democrats earmarked for arrest. My shock at hearing this news was lessened by the offer that Karel could leave with us, provided his parents agreed. My father promised them—in view of our age—that he would look after him as his own son, even if we never married.

Nobody except my grandfather and a handful of my parents' friends were allowed to know. Our passage across the border was arranged by my father's assistant, Stanislav Koutník. We burned documents, gave away our favorite books, packed a small case each for the journey and set off.

The Journey across the Border

Our guide split us into two groups: I was with my parents, Karel with Stanislav. When we arrived in Plzeň, he told us that Karel and Stanislav were already in Germany. However, for us there would be a wait of two or three days. In adventure stories such situations are always easy but the reality is different. We had to avoid looking suspicious or meeting someone who would recognise us. The guide met us briefly every day, only to tell us to wait another day. Then, when conditions at the border had eased, we set off on our journey towards Šumava.

The zone along the border was out of bounds, but our guide had a permit. We were stopped at a roadblock on our way to Tachov but his permit was in order and we were allowed to proceed without being searched. At seven in the evening near Tachov we left the car, ran quickly across a field and disappeared in the woods. We walked through the dark woods until seven in the morning. The guide left us as we neared the stone marking the border.

In the Czech Interior Ministry archive I have found a document about my arrest warrant, together with a record of my grandfather's interrogation who said during questioning that we had gone to a wedding in Moravia. Grandfather was apparently well treated but he was subsequently forced to vacate our flat and go to live with his sister in his birthplace.

Karel's mother was also interrogated. She broke into tears, complaining that her son—such a good boy—had all of a sudden "run away with a girl." Since

Karel was very young they believed her and took no further action against her. To spare his parents from prosecution Karel in exile began using a pseudonym which has stuck to this day. We believe that the StB (Czechoslovak secret police) had indeed failed to notice that Karel Janovický and Bohuš Šimsa were one and the same person.

Refugee Camps in Germany

In the second half of October 1949 there were three kinds of refugee camps in the American zone in West Germany. First, there were American holding camps nicknamed "golden cages" where the American secret service questioned some of the new arrivals who were mostly political VIPs. They were well treated and given enough food and comfort, except that they were not allowed to go outside until the interrogation was over. Second, there were refugee camps run by the International Refugee Organisation (IRO) which gave screened refugees the chance to emigrate free of charge and leave Germany, provided they arrived in West Germany before October 15, 1949. The accommodation, food and hygiene in the IRO camps were often inadequate but still better than in the German camps. The third type of camp was under German administration. It received refugees who failed the political screening and those who—like ourselves—crossed the border after October 15,1949. Most people held in the German camps had little prospect of leaving Germany unless they had relations or friends abroad. The accommodation, food and hygiene in the camps under the German administration were a grade below those in the IRO camps, especially during the early years after the war.

The American official who took charge of us from the German border police assumed my father was a communist and—instead of VIP treatment—sent us straight on to the German refugee camp at Cham.

The Refugee Camp at Cham

My mother writes in her memoirs:

> There were between 30 and 40 of us in one room. Our hut was wholly occupied by Hungarians, mostly complete families. The beds—a bed meant a hard narrow bunk with a thin straw mattress plus a blanket—were divided by a very narrow aisle. I couldn't get used to taking my clothes off in front of so many people, and so I slept half dressed, in a blouse. At Cham we mostly took walks in the woods. Inside one could only sit on one's bed in a noisy stuffy room.
> Hygiene was terrible. Watching from the woods, we could see rats sneaking into the kitchen. It was something of a shock to start our exile like this. There was nobody to talk to. Those who offered a friendly face were spies working for the Americans or Czechoslovak communists or both. We had to be very careful; the Americans did not intend to help us and the communists could only hurt us. It was a salutary lesson for the future, since a similar situation was to be a feature of all our future camps.

> We were also penniless. We stopped smoking at once, as the American cigarettes we had brought from home were a hard currency. It was a camp for hopeless *cases, waiting for a miracle. We knew we would have to be screened, in order to obtain the status of political refugees and to be able emigrate to another country.*

Meeting with Karel and Stanislav at the IRO Transit Camp in Munich

Karel and Stanislav had crossed the border one day before the critical date of October 15. As a result they were eligible for the IRO. After our own arrival in Germany it took us several weeks before we could find them. My father decided we should, off our own bat, go to Munich and try to get our political screening done. And then, a miracle, father bumped into Karel on a street in Munich.

In Munich we discovered the Amerika Haus library. Munich as such at that time was an empty plain that had been cleared of the effects of the air raids. In the centre a building which had survived the raids remained where the American authorities housed a library. Its purpose was to make available to the Germans the culture that the Nazis had proscribed. We spent all our time there, learning about the new world that awaited us. The building was clean, people were polite, toilets hygienic. We were back in civilization.

But we only spent a short time at the transit camp. Standa and Karel were sent on to Ludwigsburg, myself and my parents to Nuremberg.

The Refugee Camp Valka

Our family was one of the first Czech families to be sent to the camp Valka near Nuremberg in December 1949. The place consisted of wooden huts with broken windows. We went from one empty hut to another, scavenging wood to repair the room that was assigned to us. There was not much food, but no hunger. It was very cold. The refugees were free to roam but there was no work and few had any money to spend on travel to town. Weighing on our mind most of all was the realisation that we had come under German administration where refugees had little hope of emigrating, unless friends abroad could arrange it for them.

Life in the camp was harsh. The stoker in the shower block was beaten up for renting out peep holes during ladies' showers. There was a lot of drinking at the end of the week, soon resulting in a fight with knives which the German mounted police rushed in with great gusto to quell. I remember sitting with my parents on a table jammed against the door while outside in the corridor a bunch of drunken Slovaks shouted that we were hiding some woman from them.

My mother writes about life at Valka:

> We were each issued an enameled bowl, a spoon, knife and cup. In the morning we got what was described as coffee—dirty greyish dishwater. We soon preferred to make our own tea, using the little stove. Food was not great—everything in just the one bowl, but hunger had taught us to be glad of it. To be able to cook for ourselves at all, I went scavenging at the rubbish heap where those leaving the

> camp had thrown away whatever they could not carry. I even found a white porcelain teapot, a bit battered but a wonderful luxury for us.
> In England things were still rationed but friends whom I had met at a Scout camp in Wales years earlier sent us the occasional parcel. I was then able to sell the coffee and some of the tea, usually straight to the postmaster at the German post office, and buy some fringe benefits for ourselves such as milk and curd cheese.
> We had not expected to find ourselves without any means of support for so long. We did get some pocket money from the German camp administration, but it just about stretched to covering our extensive world-wide correspondence regarding our emigration applications.

The School and Puppet Theater at Valka

Soon after arriving at Valka I met the man running the primary school and he took me on as a volunteer assistant teacher, though I had no qualifications as such. I looked after the 8 to 14 year-olds.

When I started teaching at the primary school we moved to the school block. We had a small living room with the barest of furniture, hard beds with straw mattresses, a table and chairs; a small iron stove heated the room beautifully, as long as there was fuel to burn. Our neighbours in the school block were decent people.

Various charities supplied us with notebooks and pencils, but there were not enough books. The classrooms were equipped with benches and a blackboard. Heating was provided by a little iron stove and the walls were made of wood. It was freezing cold. In the afternoons at the school there were language courses for the grown-ups, with my parents doing the teaching.

Every Saturday we prepared a puppet show. I stitched the glove puppets, a carpenter built the stage, an electrician put in the lighting and Karel and I wrote most of the plays, some were written by the older children. The manuscripts have survived and have been deposited, together with several of the puppets, at the National Archive at Chodovec in Prague. The Sunday matinées were life's bright points at Valka not only for the children but also for the adults who created the theater.

The Scouts at Valka

At the time I arrived in Valka there was a group of Scouts who had not passed their political screening. We devoted ourselves to working with the 'rovers'—Scouts in their student years. Their numbers gradually grew as new refugees kept crossing the border and were sent to camps under German administration. We introduced a daily routine for our mutual pleasure, the same as at a Scout camp: early morning warm up followed by poetry reading, in the afternoon games and discussion. On top of that we circulated a 'kecák'—a diary with debates written in it. The book has survived and I will deposit it in the National Archive one day.

Examinations in Exile

Secondary school youngsters had a special problem: after fleeing from their country they had no chance of completing their education and, when looking for a job, they had no secondary education certificate. The Czech exile university at the IRO camp in Ludwigsburg made it possible for students like myself, who had their seventh grade school report with them, to gain the school certificate. There were about eight of us who had travelled to Ludwigsburg from various refugee camps to sit the examination. The exam commission consisted of people who were teaching at the university, plus students from the top years.

The proceedings were improvised. English was an outright farce—I did manage the written part of it, but I had no experience of spoken English since we did French at school before. As I entered the room I said "Good evening." The examiners asked me something which I did not quite understand, and so they asked me in Czech if I knew an English author. I mulled it over and said "William Shakespeare." I got second grade for English on the certificate and eventually travelled to England with a 'Summa cum laude testimonium maturitatis Universitatum Masarykianum Ludwigsburgiense.'

Wedding and Departure for Ludwigsburg

In May 1950 Karel and I were married so that we could be together and not be split apart by emigration. The IRO in its struggle to clear out its refugee camps was sending single males to the Australian bush to shoot rabbits. As a married man, Karel would not be obliged to go. Under new Czechoslovak laws we had come of age at 18. Therefore, Karel did not need his parents' permission to marry. In Germany, however, the rule was still 21 so we had a hectic and nerve-racking time persuading German officials to recognise the change of law in Czechoslovakia. In the end my father pointed out to the official at the town hall in Nuremberg that if we remained in Germany, unemployment would rise by two more souls. It helped.

The wedding took place on a Monday at 8 a.m. followed by our immediate departure by train for Ludwigsburg where we arrived just minutes before the end of IRO camp office hours. Karel got out of the transport to Australia by a hair's breadth, but I had nowhere to sleep. The IRO headquarters informed me they had no bed for me and the men's room where Karel was billeted was out of bounds for me as a woman. I was saved by the Scouts who let me sleep in their clubroom. The clubroom could not be locked and was next to the canteen where a lot of drinking went on. I used totem poles to bar the door and spent a few days like that. We were then helped by a couple of newlyweds who let us move in with them.

Departure for Britain

The goal of our own emigration had been Britain from the start. My parents met as students in Welwyn Garden City and looked upon Britain as their second home. After many disappointments, we finally got offers at the end of May 1950.

In June, Karel got a job at the IRO warehouse in Ludwigsburg and later on I started work as a secretary at the IRO health centre there. Our earnings were laughably low, but better than nothing—we had money for correspondence, toothpaste and other basics needs. Karel then got a letter from the Surrey College of Music informing him that he had been awarded a two-year scholarship. It was only to cover the school fees, but it was a great scoop.

My parents left for Britain in October, a year after leaving home. Father had an offer from Manchester University for two months with pay under the refugee rehabilitation scheme for university professors. He then succeeded in getting a contract at Cambridge University.

Our own departure for England in December 1950 was dramatic. It almost amounted to a second escape. We pretended to want to go to New Zealand and thanks to some friends we managed to get a guarantee for that country. In fact it was only a cover so that the IRO would not send us elsewhere. In the meantime we negotiated privately and in secret for a passage to Britain. When we finally got clearance we said nothing to anybody, nor did we collect our wages. We just left hoping that anybody wanting to hurt us would send their denunciation to the New Zealand diplomatic mission and not to the British authorities.

In the refugee camps we learned to keep on the alert. We did not trust anybody. Even in Britain afterwards we avoided Czechs whom we did not know and were careful with those whom we did know. We also felt insecure in our dealings with the British authorities. Before getting a visa we had to sign a promise that we would not stay in Britain. My parents did not have this problem. When I queried it I was told: "Your problem is that you are young and will multiply. Britain is an island." It took us four years before we managed to get permission to stay.

After the fall of communism and with permission to revisit our country restored, we have had to ponder the question of our identity. We are very grateful that fate has made it possible for us to return after 40 years, but we belong neither there nor here. We are totally rootless—what in sociology comes under the heading 'marginal man.' It is a universal identity and it has its advantages. We try to be a bridge between two worlds.

Voyage through the Map: Thanksgiving

Tracy A. Burns

Yes, it was before I graduated with a bachelor's degree in theater—Smith College, if you have to know. Those days, Thanksgivings meant my Slovak grandparents' home in a gray, smoke-choked New Jersey factory town. Our holiday dinners had a way of ending in arguments, but this year—1988—it was going to be different: not because it was my quiet Czech grandmother's (who lived so far away in Iowa) first November holiday with us, all the way from Iowa: with us meant with me, my parents and Slovak grandparents, Great Aunt Helen, Aunt Jane and my mother's cousin, whom I called "uncle." It was going to be different because this year I was bringing good news, sure to please everyone.

Right.

When Grandfather, seated at the head of the table, asked me in his gravelly voice, "What's new?" as he did every year, even though I knew very well that he wasn't at all interested in the answer, I couldn't wait. Of course, I noticed that he already had red circles under his eyes and I could smell alcohol on his breath. He must have gotten drunk on the whisky he hid in the basement, next to the spot where Grandmother hung clothes to dry. The same basement whose bar was dominated by a dingy and torn wall map of Czechoslovakia. Twenty years ago the American Slovak Association had given it to my grandfather.

What timing. As soon as my Slovak grandmother brought the plate of turkey into the dining room, I announced: "Učím se česky! I'm learning Czech!" first in enthusiastic Czech and then in English.

Why did I expect smiles and praise? Only my Czech grandmother cracked a smile. My Slovak grandmother slammed the turkey down with such force that the entire table shook while Grandfather looked as if I'd announced the beginning of the Third World War. My "uncle" mumbled something about English being the international language. He would. No one argued with him. After all, we all knew that his plane had been shot down over the land of his ancestors, over Czechoslovakia. Since then he has been convinced that all of Europe had betrayed him. He never travelled to another continent again.

"My sme Slováci!"[1] my Slovak grandmother said in a voice with would have pleased the founder of the Slovak language, Ľudovít Štúr. The way she looked me in the eye made me cringe.

I redirected my gaze on the white candles that were dripping wax onto the candlesticks and lace tablecloth. Luckily, my mentally retarded Aunt Jane, who was very spoiled and loud, was soundly asleep in her room upstairs, bedridden with a case of a bad flu. I didn't want her bringing her transistor radio to the table, blaring a Yankees game, or insisting on playing five-card stud during dinner. If she didn't get her way, she cried. And how did she cry!

"Wir alle müssen Gott und Franz Joseph danken, dass wir Österreicher sind!"[2] shouted my Great Aunt Helen, as usual wearing her New York Yankees

---

[1] "We are Slovaks!"

[2] "We all have to thank God and Franz Joseph that we are Austrian!"

cap. She insisted on wearing it even during dinner. I knew very well that she believed in two gods—the New York Yankees and Austro-Hungarian Emperor Franz Joseph. She added, "Habe ich euch von dem Tag erzählt, als ich den Kaiser auf eigene Augen gesehen habe? Ich…"[3] I was used to her blurting out phrases in German, though I didn't understand the language at all.

"Yes, a thousand times, yes!" shouted my grandfather and then drank whisky from a glass I had seen at his side on numerous occasions—it advertised the local branch of the American Slovak Association in the nearby town of Metuchen.

"Forget all about Europe!" my "uncle" spoke up, as he hit the table with his calloused fist.

My Czech grandmother's face was crimson with rage. She turned toward me and spoke in Czech, her tone strict. "Neposlouchej ty blbce!"[4] I was very proud I understood that she had said, "Don't listen to these idiots!"

"Stop it already. For God's sake, it's Thanksgiving. We're all hungry. The turkey's on the table. Carve it, Dad, and let's eat."

This time it was my mother. She would be the one to try to make peace out of another holiday ridden with arguments. A theater director, she was convinced that life was a stage play, which she alone wrote and directed.

"And don't anyone forget that we are all Americans! Isn't that right, Bob?" She turned to my father, who mumbled something and nodded. Meek and quiet, he was on his third Budweiser.

Aunt Jane yelled downstairs that she wanted some French fries. Oh, no, I thought, making a face. What if she comes downstairs and caused trouble? Boy, how Grandfather would yell at her while Grandmother would just sit there quietly, trying to ignore the situation. No one downstairs paid attention to her request, preferring to forget she was there at all.

"We had to learn Hungarian when we were young," my Slovak grandmother recalled. "And my best friend was a young Jew. What was her name? I've forgotten. I often wonder if she survived."

Then such a telling pause before she continued: "We always wanted to go back there, didn't we, Juraj?"

She looked at my grandfather, who stood above the turkey with a carving knife in one shaking hand. "Too much work, too little time," he mumbled. "And don't forget Communism!" But I knew very well the real reason they had never returned to that village in eastern Slovakia, where they both had lived until age seventeen. They were afraid to fly.

"I never got back to 'Zlatá Praha,' my Golden Prague," my Czech grandmother said. That regret in her voice! After all, she had emigrated to America when she was only ten years old.

"You should study Slovak, not Czech," my Slovak grandmother scolded me while my grandfather passed out pieces of turkey. I didn't comment. I didn't want to take part in this argument.

"Proč ne česky?"[5] My Czech grandmother reacted.

---

[3] "Did I ever tell you about the time I saw Franz Joseph with my own eyes?"
[4] "Don't listen to those idiots!"
[5] "Why not Czech?"

"Pretože je viacej Slovenka než Česka! Je napoly Slovenka!"[6]

"That's no reason…"

"We are all American! *American!*" My mother shouted.

"Who needs Europe?"

"Österreicher!"[7]

"Drž hubu!"[8] My grandfather said, with a mouth full of turkey.

"American! American!"

"Češi!"[9] Was that my Czech grandmother raising her voice? I had never heard her do that before.

"Slováci!"[10]

"American!"

"Es lebe Franz Joseph!"[11]

"We are all American! American!"

That's when I couldn't keep quiet any longer. "Czech! Slovak! It's one country, and we are one family!"

From upstairs Jane's pleading voice could be heard again. "Give me French fries! Immediately!" The sound of her whining only made me more angry. I threw my napkin onto the table and ran to my favorite room in the house—the dark and humid basement, a big dimly lit place, crammed with many things because my grandfather had never thrown anything away for sixty years.

Soon I found myself standing in front of the wall map of Czechoslovakia. For a moment I gazed at what appeared to be a coffee stain on Břeclav, at the Czech and Slovak border. Then with one finger I traced the path from a small village under the Vihorlat mountains to a small village in the Spiš region in eastern Slovakia, through Poprad, the Tatra and Fatra mountains, to Martin, across the river Váh and the White Carpathians to Uherské Hradiště and Brno, across the Bohemian Moravian highlands, to Týnce nad Sázavou and along the Vltava River, up to the biggest dot on the map. My Czech grandmother called it "Zlatá Praha" or "Golden Prague." It was as if each dot on the map held some secret, a sense of mystery which irresistably attracted me. How I longed to travel to that faraway country and see it with my own eyes! Maybe I would even meet some kind relative who would be glad that I understood—at least a little—Czech. That would sure be a change from these Thanksgiving dinners. But I knew that because of Communism it would remain nothing but a dream.

[This is the first chapter from my unpublished novel, *Voyage Through the Map*. Helen does, indeed, travel to Czechoslovakia and even moves there. Her journey takes her from Prague to Bratislava to eastern Slovakia as well as to Scotland, Washington D.C. and Vermont, while she searches for a sense of belonging, a home and a sense of family. Her journey takes her from Prague's Old

[6] "Because she's more Slovak than Czech! She's one-half Slovak!"
[7] "Austrians!"
[8] "Shut up!"
[9] "Czechs!"
[10] "Slovaks!"
[11] "Long Live Franz Joseph!"

Town Square, where she walks helplessly after her drunken landlord has kicked her out because she doesn't have more money to give him and to the Theatre Around the Corner, where she experiences the magic of the Czech language. Afraid of heights, she also hikes 2,000 meters above ground over slippery rocks in a downpour and takes care of her favorite Slovak author's grave in Bratislava, all this as she continually seeks her own personal and national identity and sense of purpose.]

BOOK REVIEWS

Procházková, Petra, *Freshta*. Trans. Julia Sherwood. London: Stork Press, 2012. ISBN: 978-0-9571326-4-1, 323 pp.

Music is playing on Afghan radio after being banned for such a long time, the U.S. flag is flying from the American embassy in Kabul for the first time in 13 years, a woman is elected deputy Prime Minister of the country. Yet the new world opening up in Afghanistan with the American presence shortly after 9/11 is one to which not all can adapt and one to which not all want to adapt. Afghan tradition and customs run contrary to the Western-style developments that took place when America was hunting for Osama bin Laden following the terrorist attacks.

Freshta, the first novel of Czech journalist and humanitarian aid worker Petra Procházková, translated into English by Julia Sherwood, conveys the captivating and painful journey of one Afghan family trying to come to grips with the reality of newly-found freedoms. In this new world women are encouraged to go to school and find their own self-identity, but the men in their families insist on continuing to dictate their lives. Aiming to bring peace, the foreign forces stationed there also bring a new kind of turmoil to lives so firmly rooted in Afghan manners and mentality. Reality is far from rosy, despite all the changes instigated by international troops. People sleep on battered mattresses, there are strict curfews, children play outside where bombs could fall at any moment, and no one has a telephone.

The narrator, Herra, is an outsider, part Russian and part Tajik, though she has lived in Afghanistan for 12 years, married to an Afghan who is proud of her yet cannot allow himself to let her develop her own self-identity. Unlike the Afghan characters, Herra is highly educated—she has a degree in law and speaks Russian, English and Dari. She met her husband, Nazir, while living in Moscow, where she grew up and became set in Western ways. She is also an outcast because her husband's family is ashamed of her for not giving them children. Her husband is also ashamed of her for not being a virgin on their wedding night. After Nazir found out, he exclaimed, "Do you know what you have done to me? Do you know who I am now? … I am no longer an Afghan. I am no longer a man" (308).

Exposed to Western life while working for the Americans at a women's center, Herra realizes that Americans mean well but are not making an effort to understand or respect the Afghan mentality or to learn the Dari language. The name Herra recalls the Greek deity Hera, who was married to Zeus, king of the gods. Ironically, Hera was portrayed as a virgin and is the goddess of women and marriage, a wife par excellence. The protagonist Herra is a feminist, much more independent and educated than most Afghan women. She is certainly no role model for the perfect Afghan wife. She fell in love with her husband when she was impressed with his passport, yet remained devoted to him and his grandfather, mother, father, sister, brother-in-law and their five children.

The novel is named after Freshta, Herra's sister-in-law, who does things that Herra could never accomplish. For example, at the beginning of the novel, Freshta

gives birth to her fifth child; Herra will never have children. At the end, Freshta leaves the country with an American-Polish soldier, after her husband has taken away all her children. Herra, as is so poignantly illustrated at the end, can never leave. She feels too much of a sense of responsibility toward her friend, the 14-year old Mad, who is physically impaired but extremely intelligent. Herra proves that she is the true mother, staying in Afghanistan due to her motherly affection for Mad.

Mad was given to Herra and her husband by Herra's friend because she knew they would be the only people who would not give him away. The boy is said to resemble an alien and a monster. Like Herra, he is an outsider. Both possess a fierce sense of responsibility toward their surrogate family, and they are almost inseparable. Notably, Mad views Freshta as a sort of goddess, comparing her to Miriam who gave birth to Isis as a virgin, again alluding to the contrast with Herra—her inability to have children and her loss of virginity before her wedding night. Yet, ironically it is Herra whose name recalls a deity.

Perhaps the most memorable scene occurs when Nazir brings home a VHS tape of the terrorist attacks on the Twin Towers. His family's reaction is totally different than that in the West. Grandpa does not understand why Americans get so worked up about "only" almost 3,000 dead, and Uncle Amin states that a mere two buildings were destroyed. During wartime in Afghanistan, millions have lost their lives, and much of the country has been devastated. Nazir's mother argues that the World Trade Center buildings were ugly, anyway. Freshta even fancies Osama bin Laden, calling him a proud man. Procházková by no means approves of this family's reaction, yet she does not judge at all. She merely tells the story, giving both the Western and Afghan viewpoints on the disaster.

Readers become familiar with Afghan customs and traditions and come to understand the reality of Afghan life. At her wedding Herra had to frown because when a woman smiles it means that she desires all men. Women are not allowed to leave the house when their husbands are away. When unexpected guests arrive at the household, the women have to hide in the closet. Strangers are never told the names of wives, sisters or mothers. Only relatives can address the females by name. The children go to the husband if a woman gets a divorce. Afghan women sleep with only one man during their lives. When Herra and her husband go on an errand to deliver a package to a friend of an American soldier, Nazir notices his wife shaking hands with a black man and taking off her headscarf in front of strangers, so he hits her and calls her vulgar names. The novel does not make readers sympathetic toward this oppressive culture—far from it.

Current events in Afghanistan are interspersed with family trials and tribulations, providing the book with a strong historical background that allows the reader to understand the advances and setbacks of the country's rocky political history. Here Procházková demonstrates her remarkable journalistic skills. It is clear that she has traveled to Afghanistan many times and profoundly understands the people. Her ability to show the sad plight of the people, especially women, is remarkable.

Hrabalesque moments are scattered throughout the book, too, as black humor and the grotesque that punctuate Bohumil Hrabal's work adds to a somber theme. One scene is reminiscent of a moment in Hrabal's novella *Too Loud a Solitude*,

when the gypsy Manča dances after returning from the outhouse, flinging the feces from her skirt onto the onlookers.

After Nazir throws all of Herra's Russian books down the toilet hole in the outhouse, Grandpa fishes them out with a pole attached to a rag and pair of pliers, but the books fling feces onto his face as the ceiling of the structure is lower than the rod. Grandpa's biggest battle with feces occurred when fishing out *The History of Russia*, alluding to the former Russian presence on Afghan soil and Afghans' rejection of Russian manners and customs:

The most terrible incident occurred as the old man fought to rescue the *History of Russia*, a thick volume by Zaichkin and Pochkayev, which for some mysterious reason got stuck to the pliers and wouldn't drop out even after the rod had collided with the hut's wooden roof. Instead it started swaying wildly, smashing its sludge-soaked pages right into Grandpa's face (109).

Such moments add a welcome dose of humor, readying readers to take on more serious topics, such as Qais physically beating his wife Freshta, threatening to kill his daughter because she had a cutout of an American actor in a swimsuit and finally taking away all of Freshta's children.

Readers become absorbed in Afghan life but need no background in Afghan history to understand the book and follow its events. The pace of the book is fast with twists and turns, as well as stunning revelations. Captivating flashbacks are interspersed with an otherwise chronological plot line. The language is by no means terse or concise, but poetic, conjuring up distinctive colorful imagery and vivid descriptions that allow readers to comprehend reality in early twenty-first century Afghanistan. For example, Procházková describes the physically challenged Mad when Herra was first introduced to him:

> Apparently it was a child. At least its height suggested something like a child. Its little legs were incredibly short and thin with absurdly tiny feet that wouldn't have supported a ballet dancer. The little body was quite compact, without any unnecessary shapes or folds, reminiscent of a giant egg… (22).

Readers do not merely follow gripping events but care deeply about the characters from feminist Grandpa to 14-year old Roshangal who is afraid to take off her burka at a girls' school and feels so many limitations imposed by her violent father. This book focuses on the personal changes in the family but also exposes the political changes in the country.

Readers begin to understand the difference between trying to change a country and imposing change upon a country and realize the importance of respecting a country's culture and understanding its history. Drastic change breeds tumultuous times. Readers notice how each character adapts or fails to adapt to the new ways dictated by society. It is a treacherous and heart-wrenching journey full of growing pains and terrible revelations, but it is a journey that each character must make, regardless of the consequences. Readers do not merely enjoy reading this book—they live through it, feeling each moment of joy and despair in this stunning canvas of captivating words.

Tracy A. Burns, Prague

Július Satinský. *Expedície*: *1973-82*. (Expeditions: 1973-82). Bratislava: Slovart, Edition Ryba, 2011. ISBN: 978-80-556-0490-9. 163 pp.

Július Satinský's *Expedície* does more than describe six hiking adventures from 1973-1982. It documents the 1970s in former Communist Czechoslovakia, when the country was in the midst of the rigid normalization period. What make these travelogues so compelling are the ways in which the late author employs a unique sense of humor, depictions of colorful, vibrant characters and graphics that range from handwritten maps on lined notebook paper to a ticket for the Schwarzenberg mausoleum. In these writings, which previously had only appeared as illegal, unofficial literature called *samizdat*, it is nature that reigns supreme, not Communist ideology. Satinský's demanding trips include four within Slovakia, one to southern Bohemia and another to the daunting Swiss Alps. On the Slovak trips, he was accompanied by friends—writers Vlado Bednár and Tomáš Janovic in addition to botanist and professor Karol Mičieta and theatre director Peter Oravec. The two outings outside of Slovakia were with family members.

Like so many Czechs and Slovaks, this revered actor and comedian escaped to nature in order to avoid the severe reality of totalitarian life. Nature, not Communist ideology, sets down the law, as Satinský writes: "Nature knew we were here and let it be known that she was our ruler and we had to get through the ordeals she set us" (11). The author shows a great respect for nature and depicts it as both kind and harsh. Nature is particularly terrifying when the avid hiker gets lost in the Swiss Alps. On Friday the Thirteenth he fights off a downpour riddled with thunder, lightning and hail. Satinský calls his experience in the Alps a "life-threatening adventure" (141). He describes these mountains as "beautiful—but rough, wild" (146).

Nature almost becomes a character unto itself as it helps shape Satinský's personal identity. There are many moments when Satinský and his companions are bewitched by nature's beauty. "At night the moon shines down on us, and the meadows are beautiful. To sleep outside under the stars when it is clear out – that is the greatest joy I know!" (14). Or take another example:

> When the sun popped up over the meadow across from me, 300,000 butterflies with a 4:30 a.m. departure time immediately take off from somewhere. They were all snow-white. A fox barked, birds jockeyed for position in their nests, twittering, scrabbling, rustling; in the distance, through binoculars, I saw a deer get up from the grass in a clearing (43).

Clearly, nature inspires and captivates, giving him and his companions a strength and sense of hope that otherwise they would not have been able to find during such deplorable times.

The well-known comedian also injects witty humor into his diaries. One scene stands out: he is naked and drunk in a hotel and has just come out of the bathroom:

> When I came out of the bathroom, I got a terrible shock. Ahead of me was a long corridor, a never-ending row of numbered rooms, but I didn't know *my room number*. I stood there naked, drunk, completely helpless with a shoulder bag in my hand…. It was a long time before a man walked by—the waiter who had saved my life…(48).

Satinský goes on to describe how he asked the waiter to go to reception to find out what room he was in. Thinking it was a joke, the hotel employee refused. At long last, Satinský convinced the man to do as he requested. Another moment when the author employs wit concerns his description of a muddy, disgusting footpath he and his companions had to trudge along. He called it, "the Adolph Hitler Trail" (141).

To be sure, the people Satinský meets on his excursions are unforgettable. There's Jan Húska, whose wife is a maid of an American millionaire on Wall Street. She visited the States in 1967 and defected, taking Húska's son with her but leaving her husband behind. She never wants to come back to Slovakia, he asserts. The 59-year old abandoned Húska shows the hiking group pornographic magazines and has a framed photo of two naked girls from *Playboy* in his home. The description of Mrs. Pejková, who has only one tooth, hits the bullseye: She "looked like the most lifelike ghost in the PEKLO fairground—she even had flashing eyes" (38). Another memorable figure is a retired detective who served in Žilina during the First Republic and had prostitutes on his beat. Two women in their seventies have to travel on foot to a height of 900 meters to rake hay. Then there is "Uncle" Kelčík. He is afraid to get married, worrying that if he does so, his nine grandchildren will never speak to him again.

The poor conditions of services under Communism are a dominant feature of the book. In Jahodník, for instance, the recreation center is filthy, and the pub reeks. In fact, many of the pubs that are described in the book are disgusting. In one case, Satinský had to sleep in dirty bedsheets and in another the narrator calls having hot water something "unbelievable." They find a filthy pool in Vajgar. The line for laundry is wet in one hotel room, so the hikers' clothes do not dry. The caretaker of one accommodation is rude and drunk. Sometimes they find themselves without electricity. The popular soft drink under Communism, Kofola, also makes an appearance as do Communist youth pioneer camps. At the Jindřichův Hradec station, the group discovers that the train they want only runs once a day, showing how bad transportation schedules were.

Historical events from the World War II era are still very real in 1970s Slovakia. There are many reminders of the partisan uprising against the Nazis as more and more new monuments to that episode are going up during the normalization years. Satinský and his friends meet former partisans and a former SS officer.

Compelling graphics pieced together by the Slovart publishing house give the book an added appeal and dynamism. There are coffee stains on an accompanying pull-out map, never before published photos of Satinský and his entourage, statistics stating how many kilometers the groups traveled each day and where they slept. Satinský's drawings and doodles are also on display. A picture of a

crumpled joker playing card adorns the bottom of one page. Another is dominated by a handwritten notice announcing the death of a friend.

Satinský and his friends alternate as narrators of the episodes, a technique that provides various perspectives of their adventures. The style of writing is concise, bolstered with many statistics, though these numbers by no means hinder the staccato flow of the text. Reading between the lines lets a fundamentally sparse text speak volumes. This book is by no means philosophical or introspective. Writing in a diary format, though, makes it personal and allows the reader a certain intimacy with the narrators.

Expedície is more than a series of travelogues. It is a document of the terrible era in which Satinský lived and shows how people survived the harsh realities of the time by putting their faith in nature. Complemented by unique humor and witty descriptions plus brilliant graphics, the diaries can be considered one of the must-reads in contemporary Slovak literature. The book proves that Satinský is not only one of the greatest comedians and actors of his era, but also one of its most talented authors.

Tracy A. Burns, Prague

Mellner, Dušan. *Žilina a Svojdomov: Moderná architektúra a urbanizmus mesta (1918-1948)/ Žilina and Svojdomov:Modern Architecture and Urbanism of the City (1918-1948*). Self published, 2010. ISBN 978-80-970620-7-1. n.p.

Art historians and travel writers have recently discovered Czechoslovak architecture of the first half of the past century. Accordingly they have started to pay attention to the country's cutting edge cubist, rondocubist and functionalist buildings and its city planning efforts. The focus has been on structures in Prague and Brno. Some, such as Mies van der Rohe's Tugendhat villa in Brno, have gained iconic stature, but little is known about other functionalist buildings and urban planning elsewhere in the former Czechoslovakia, especially Slovakia. The book under review seeks to remedy this omission.

Dušan Mellner in his *Žilina a Svojdomov: Moderná architektúra a urbanizmus mesta(1918-1948)/ Žilina and Svojdomov: Modern Architecture and Urbanism of the City (1918-1948*) describes the extensive renewal of the city in the late 1920s and the 1930s, "the era of the avant-garde and of the beginnings of functionalism"(34). His book shows that "Žilina became one of the main centers from which modern Slovak architecture originated" (34). The author, an academically trained architect, addresses three distinct facets of Žilina's development: the urban plans selected in 1929; the modern buildings erected in the city during the late 1920s and 1930s; and the planned community of Svojdomov.

After World War I, the Žilina town fathers understood that their medieval town needed to transform itself into a modern city. Not wanting to allow haphazard growth, they solicited bids from architects for the city's future expansion. The proposal, they stipulated, should take into account Žilina's rapidly increasing industrialization and urbanization, as well as the fact that it was located

on the Košice-Bohumín rail line. Architect Josef Peňáz's project won the competition. His proposal projected the city's growth while it took into account its location in a basin surrounded by mountains at the confluence of three rivers (Váh, Kysuca and Rajčanka). Besides its sensitivity to Žilina's natural surroundings, the plan carefully preserved the town's historical and commercial center and made provisions for residential and industrial districts, as well as for green spaces. Peňáz also planned for access to transportation and communication without endangering cultural, commercial or residential areas. In this section of his book, the author also describes the submissions of the two architects who were runners up in the contest: Bohuslav Fuchs and Vladimír Zakrejs.

The 1930s were also a period of extensive construction during which Žilina became, in the words of the author: "one of the main centers of modern Slovak architecture ... It was the epoch of the avant-garde and the ascendency of functionalism." (34) Modern private and public buildings then erected now dot the city. Undoubtedly, the most notable functionalist structure in Žilina is Peter Behrens' Neolog synagogue that now enjoys world-wide fame. Architect Michal Maxmillián Scheer is responsible for the remarkable financial palace, as well as several commercial and residential buildings. Bohuslav Fuchs, Fridrich Weinwurm and Michal Milan Harminc, among other architects, are responsible for functionalist structures throughout Žilina.

The shortage of private housing led to the creation of the co-operative Svojdomov at the beginning of the 1930s. The co-operative bought parcels and commissioned architects to build a neighborhood of family residences according to the then modern housing criteria. Svojdomov holds the distinction of being one of the first planned functionalist communities in the world. Under the leadership of Štefan Mellner, the chairman of the Svojdomov co-operative, a residential community of single or duplex dwellings was built according to plans of architects Michal Maxmillián Scheer and Július Stein**.** A total of forty-eight houses were constructed. All had flat roofs, gardens and other functionalist earmarks. The Svojdomov community also included a store and a Protestant church across from which the city built a primary school.

Another project to build a similar housing community was undertaken after World War II. It was to house the employees of the Drevoúnia plant. A total of eleven family houses and three apartment buildings were constructed.

An English résumé supplements the book's Slovak text, and explanations in both languages accompany most of the illustrations. Unfortunately, the English translation leaves much to be desired. The author has also included biographical sketches of the architects whose work the volume features, as well as a bibliography. The omission of an index is regrettable. The work has copious black and white photos and architectural blueprints of floor plans and elevations. The value and uniqueness of this book resides in this meticulous and intelligent pictorial documentation of the functionalist style in this Slovak city.

In brief, *Žilina a Svojdomov: Moderná architektúra a urbanizmus mesta* is truly an original contribution to scholarship on architecture in Slovakia.

Mary Hrabík Šámal, Troy, Michigan

Bischof, Günter, Karner, Stefan, and Ruggenthaler, Peter, eds. *The Prague Spring and the Warsaw Pact Invasion of Czechoslovakia in 1968.* Lanham: Lexington Books, 2010. ISBN 978-0-7391-4304-9. 510 pp.

Many events were held to commemorate the fortieth anniversary of the Prague Spring in 2008. A notable one took place in New Orleans under the sponsorship of the University of New Orleans, Center Austria. A major result of that conference was the compiling of a book entitled *The Prague Spring and the Warsaw Pact Invasion of Czechoslovakia in 1968*. Its editors, Günter Bischof, Stefan Karner, and Peter Ruggenthaler, have done a masterful job of inviting meaningful chapters and of putting the edition together in an organized and readable way.

Following a pair of excellent introductory chapters that frame the critical components of the Prague Spring period in their historical and political dimensions, the editors proceed to offer a series of chapters that outline the key events themselves. Individual authors address such important issues as the nature of the reforms, the characteristics of the decision-making process within the Soviet Politburo, and the relationship between Moscow and Prague after the August invasion.

A third section considers the response in several key nations. Many in the West were clearly surprised by the rapid halt to the Czechoslovak reforms and nearly paralyzed in developing policy responses. In that sense, the slow reactions of the leadership in the United States, the United Kingdom, and France were very similar. The book devotes two chapters to the America position. The first spends most of its time on the American preoccupation with the war in Vietnam. Here I do wish that the author had linked this discussion more firmly to the impotent American response to the Warsaw Pact invasion. The other American chapter deals with the Johnson Administration's reaction to the Czechoslovak crisis. This section of the book also considers the position and activities of the euro-communists in France and Italy. While the Prague Spring reforms inspired them to call for more rapid change in their countries' political systems, the ruthless end to these reforms in a still-communist dominated country encouraged them to pursue transformation from within rather than attacks from without. The outreach of West Germany's Willy Brandt to his eastern neighbors is one of the more intriguing chapters in this part of the book.

Several features of *The Prague Spring and the Warsaw Pact Invasion of Czechoslovakia in 1968* make this fine manuscript a contribution to our general understanding of this too brief period of reform in Central European history. Archives of both CPSU's Central Committee and Politburo minutes became available after July 2006, and many of these are very revealing about the Soviet inner decision-making process at the time, as well as about Czechoslovak leadership deliberations. For example, Soviet documents demonstrate how much confidence Brezhnev had in "Our Sasha" at the beginning of the reform year when Antonín Novotný passed the baton to Alexander Dubček. Subsequently, the Soviet leader was willing to give the Czechoslovak leader a relatively free rein during much of the year. At the same time, Brezhnev was a pragmatic leader, who realized the need to mediate among the hardliners in the Soviet Union, as well as

in East Germany. Therefore, when the time came, he was decisive about the need to invade and quite willing to accept the consequences.

The formerly secret Czechoslovak documents are equally revealing. For instance, there has always been controversy about the role of President Ludvík Svoboda in this crisis year. He had portrayed his own role as one of focusing on saving the nation. When after the invasion all the Czechoslovak leaders flew to Prague under duress, some depicted him as the strong leader who held up while Dubček collapsed. In these newly revealed documents, it becomes clear that he was not the great supporter of his First Secretary but actually had hoped and pushed for Dubček's resignation.

The book also offers an insightful treatment of Willy Brandt's *Ostpolitik*. Some have downplayed the role of this foreign policy in Soviet considerations about the military intervention, but material presented here underlines the nervousness that Walter Ulbricht and other East German leaders felt. They feared that Czechoslovakia could link up with West Germany, this powerful western neighbor, and thus further weaken the position of East Germany. While there are numerous other revealing episodes outlined in the book, the ones highlighted here contribute to revised thinking about the process of change during the Prague Spring.

The exclusive attention of the authors in this volume is on the roots and expression of the Prague Spring and the motivation for the Warsaw Pact Invasion; nevertheless, this work helps put into context the challenges to the rule of Moscow within the Communist Bloc for a period of more than thirty years. East Germans, Poles, and Hungarians had all pushed for moderation of the centralized pattern of communist rule in the 1950s, while Poles again in both the 1970s and early 1980s would manifest very different kinds of reform movements.

Moreover, the Prague Spring and ensuing Warsaw Pact invasion was a microcosm of the broader regional changes that affected the Soviet Bloc a little more than twenty years later and the Arab world more than forty years later. There is irony in the fact that commemorations of the Prague Spring in 2008 took place just before the outbreak of the Arab Spring. And there are other parallels between the various revolutionary events as well. The self-immolation of Jan Palach in Prague after the Soviet invasion is a kind of harbinger of the similar event in Tunisia that set off the upheaval in the Arab world in 2011. In addition, the rise of television in the 1950s and 1960s made the changes and repression in Czechoslovakia more immediate than were comparable events during either the Second World War or the Korean War. Similarly, the availability of round-the-clock news coverage twenty years later and of social media four decades later had an impact on the pace of change. Further, in retrospect, the Prague Spring was indeed part of a four decade period of widely separated challenges to Soviet authority. One can detect a thread of continuity among all the challenges from those of Tito in 1948 to those emanating from the minds of Polish Solidarity catalysts in 1980-1981. In that sense, the forty year Cold War era represented a slow motion series of challenges to authoritarianism and totalitarianism that was replicated on a much faster scale in the communist world in 1989-91 and within a time frame of incredible speed in the Arab world of 2011-2013 and probably

beyond. The central reality beneath all of these transformational periods is the uncertainty of what comes after the revolution. While the Prague Spring bore fruit two decades later and generated clearly democratic processes, at the moment it is unclear what kind of fruit the Arab Spring will produce and whether their future will reflect the democratic roots of the explosion.

James W. Peterson, Valdosta, Georgia

McDermott, Kevin and Stibbe, Matthew (eds.), *Stalinist Terror in Eastern Europe: Elite Purges and Mass Repression*. Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 2010. ISBN-10: 0719089026 ISBN-13: 9780719089022. 235 pp.

This excellent collection, edited by Soviet and Czech specialist Kevin McDermott and Germanist Matthew Stibbe, proves that it will be a long time before we exhaust the need for further exploration of Stalinist terror. In their introduction the editors present various reasons for the need for a book such as theirs, including the sheer scale of the terror and its lasting impact on eastern and central Europe and (like the horror of Nazism) what motivates people to choose evil over good.

The editors define "Stalinist terror" as "the conscious effort by communist leaderships to crush civil society and its autonomous institutions primarily by means of mass arrests, forced labor, relocation of suspect peoples, police brutality and judicial and non-judicial executions, the overall aim being to entrench the parties' monopoly of power by eliminating alternative sources of authority and allegiance" (3). The book also treats non-violent forms of terror. The various chapters present thorough overviews of their respective cases, including the identities of targeted groups and prominent individuals, details of the terror process and its perpetrators, and examination of the exogenous and endogenous forces that drove the terror. One of the great strengths of the book is that the authors also tie the focal period of the study—1948-1956—to earlier times, including the violence and chaos of the war years, and, in some instances, the origins and evolution of a country's communist movement. The book clearly was designed to maximize the comparability of its cases, and most of the important questions one can pose about the subject are explored with great effectiveness in the editors' introduction.

In addressing the debate as to the motives behind Stalinist terror, McDermott and Stibbe naturally emphasize the exogenous side Stalin's strategic goals, the involvement of Soviet agents in the various terror campaigns, and external challenges to Soviet power and security, such as the intensification of the Cold War and the split with Tito in 1948. However, the two editors and the writers of the case studies also give attention to internal factors like intraparty rivalries, domestic drives for a monopoly of power, and how the turbulent era that preceded communization of the region reinforced the Party leaders' ideological rigidity and their conviction that violence was essential to the seizure of power and regime survival. Domestic resistance reinforced this conviction during the first phase of communist rule, most notably in Hungary and Poland.

However, some of the case studies reveal a totalitarian impulse that long preceded the post-war struggle for power, providing support for those scholars who regard terror and repression as essential elements of communist rule. All of the chapters show the part that Marxist-Leninist ideology played in the selection of victims (mainly the urban bourgeoisie, kulaks, and religious institutions). In some countries ethnic cleavages were important, such as the selection of eleven Jews as defendants in the notorious "Slánský trial" of 1952, and the later attack on Slovak "national communists," both in Czechoslovakia: the Slánský case is treated in the introduction and in McDermott's fine chapter on Czechoslovakia. The two Czechoslovak cases were consistent with Stalin's insistence that allied regimes root out "Zionism" and "Titoism," respectively—the origin and the 1954 trial rested partly in the first, and some of the defendants had been under arrest since 1950—but the top leaders of the Communist Party (KSČ) closely monitored the trials and specified the sentences of the accused. Many of the victims of terror, however, were selected largely for considerations of power and security rather than ideology or ethnicity: politicians from rival political parties, for example, were murdered or incarcerated in prisons or labor camps to eliminate organized opposition. One reason for Romanian collectivization of agriculture was to expel Serbs and Germans from the Banat in response to rising tensions with Yugoslavia.

An additional strength of the book is the attention given to popular responses to the political trials. McDermott, who has written extensively on this subject, presents evidence that while the Slánský trial created fear among the citizenry, it also undermined public confidence in the regime, including among the Party faithful, many of whom were dismayed by the regime's apparent incompetence in security matters, or instead doubted the veracity of the trial. McDermott concludes that the political trials masked genuine problems (for instance, in the economy), reduced the regime's legitimacy, and helped contribute to its eventual demise. He also notes that the Czech archives contradict the popular belief that the scope of the Czechoslovak terror was uniquely high among the satellite states: it was horrific but very much in the mainstream in terms of per capita victimization.

With this journal's readership in mind, and facing space limitations, I will continue to focus my attention on central Europe. Editor Stibbe's chapter on East Germany identifies aspects of terror shared with neighboring countries: the interplay between Soviet security concerns and internal factionalism and ideological disputes; the involvement of Soviet "advisors"; targeting of social democrats, left and right "deviationists," Titoists, Trotskyites, and advocates of a special path to socialism, many of whom were doomed by fatuous interpretations of their past experiences (such as the Spanish Civil War); ideological fanaticism within the leadership; the impact of external events like the Berlin blockade; and the widespread fear in the ruling SED that resulted from massive party purges. The DDR differed from most other cases in lacking a major trial of important Party functionaries. Stibbe speculates that East German leaders, and perhaps the Kremlin as well, were afraid of the impact of such a trial on the communist parties in both Germanies.

Łukasz Kamiński's study of Poland traces the massive repression in Soviet-controlled territory following the Pact with Nazi Germany in 1939 and the

infamous 1943 Katyń massacre, which Stibbe notes was aimed at weakening postwar opposition, did not occur solely in Katyń, and affected more than the military. A similar motivation underlay Stalin's decision to withhold aid to the rebels while the Nazis crushed the Warsaw uprising of the late summer of 1944. Another traumatic event was the expulsion in 1947 of 140,000 ethnic Ukrainians, an action that destroyed the last remnants of Ukrainian anti-regime resistance. Kamiński also observes that Polish civil society resurged after the War, and with it strong resistance among ethnic Poles and repression in response. However, despite the incarceration of more than a half-million peasants between 1948 and 1956, the leadership finally abandoned the goal of agricultural collectivization. Another interesting element in the Polish experience was the absence of a major trial of communist leaders, a distinction shared with the DDR. Kamiński examines all the proffered explanations but leaves the question open.

László Borhi's chapter on Hungary provides a thorough description of the operations of the Party leadership and State Security (AVH) in the terror process. Especially interesting is his discussion of the many political show trials, the most famous of which was that of former Minister of Interior László Rajk in September 1949. Borhi writes that Party leader Mátyás Rákosi and several colleagues were bent on unmasking spies and saboteurs who they imagined infested the Party and society at large. The trial planted pervasive fear in the Party and produced a ripple effect on other communist regimes. In his chapter on Czechoslovakia, Kevin McDermott notes that the trial of Rajk, with its uncovering of an alleged international conspiracy including prominent Czechoslovak officials, helped set the stage for the Slánský trial three years later. Demands from Rákosi to President Klement Gottwald to unmask the plotters led Gottwald to seek help from Moscow, and eventually Slánský, like Rajk a major architect of the terror and a Jew, was tagged as the "Czechoslovak Rajk."

Borhi gives a number of statistics that underline the shocking sweep of Stalinist terror in Hungary. I will supplement his figures with findings derived from the archives of State Security and presented at the Prague conference on "Communist Crimes" in 2010, shortly after his chapter was written, to dramatize the mass terror Borhi so ably describes. Between 1946 and 1956, roughly 43,000 people were arrested for political crimes and 1,000 executed; between 1948 and 1956 some 350,000 members were purged from the Communist Party, of whom 150,000 were imprisoned and 2,000 executed; in 1953 the AVH possessed files on 1.2 million people in a society with roughly 5 million adults; and prior to the amnesty following Stalin's death in March 1953, some 55,000 people were interned in concentration camps, and approximately 700,000 people had been apprehended in Budapest, 98,000 of whom were branded as spies or saboteurs and 5,000 of whom were executed. The amnesty led to the release of 748,000 people, 40,000 of them from prisons, internment camps, and forced relocation. Arrests soared again after the suppression of the Hungarian revolution in the fall of 1956. (The conference reports can be found online at http://www.communistcrimes.org/en.) As Borhi recounts, the terror was also notable for the high degree of repression of the Catholic Church, the military officer corps, and the political police. Remarkably, the egregious nature of the Hungarian terror eventually drew criticism from—of all people—Stalin and Beria!

Especially valuable is Igor Caşu's study of Moldavia, a case seldom treated in English. Approximately 86,000 people in all Soviet-occupied ethnic Romanian territories were deported, incarcerated, or sentenced to forced labor in 1940 and 1941 prior to the June Nazi invasion, and another 32,000 immediately thereafter. A famine in 1946-1947, worsened by senseless grain requisitions in the midst of a severe drought, led to 150,000 and 200,000 deaths. Throughout the postwar Stalinist period people from a wide range of demographic groups were targeted, including nationalists, non-communist politicians, and genuine collaborators, as well as some 35,050 "kulaks" and other peasants sent to distant labor camps during the collectivization of 1949-1950. All of this occurred in a region with barely two million people.

Shifting to the Balkans, the Yugoslav case is particularly interesting in light of Tito's break with Stalin in 1948 and eventual role as a leader in the nonaligned movement, and his heretical socialist innovations subsumed under the term "self-management," all of which won him a degree of respect in the West. It may be easy to forget that his policies of terror prior to and during the War, which were aimed at an eventual seizure of power, were comparable in viciousness to other cases of communist terror in east-central Europe. This record is related in the chapter written by Jerca Vodušek Starič. Tito's movement executed "deviationists" in the late 1930s, and after the liberation in 1945 the Yugoslav army liquidated over 200,000 military personnel and civilians who had been delivered into its arms by Britain. Croats constituted a large percentage of the victims. The new regime penetrated all levels of social organization with secret police agents; targeted other political parties, the urban bourgeoisie and their offspring, and kulaks; and conducted show trials of political, economic, and religious leaders and members of the intelligentsia. After his split with Stalin, Tito's terror actually became worse and added to the previous mix those communists suspected of being sympathetic to the Soviet side in the dispute. For reasons both domestic and foreign, he halted much of the physical terror in 1955 but maintained a tightly ruled dictatorship over a society riddled with informants.

It is unfortunate that space limitations do not allow discussions of the four remaining chapters, all worthy of greater attention: Aldis Purs's study of the Baltic republics; Dennis Deletant's chapter on Romania; Robert C. Austin's treatment of Albania; and Jordan Baev's examination of Bulgaria. This is not quite a perfect book, in that the Index is insufficient and the Slovaks are given little attention. One might also wish that Byelorussia and Ukraine had been included. Nonetheless, anyone wanting to explore the latest research on Stalinist terror in east-central Europe should consult this volume.

Robert K. Evanson, Seattle, Washington

Contributors

Josette Baer is a Professor in the Department of Philosophy of the University of Zurich, who specializes in the intellectual history of the Slavic peoples as well as political theory, theory of democracy and contextual biography. She has published, among other works, *Slavic Thinkers or the Creation of Polities: Intellectual History and Political Thought in Central Europe and the Balkans, 19th Century*. Her current research involves a monograph on Slovak intellectual history.

Tracy A. Burns is a creative writer, journalist, proofreader and editor living in the Czech Republic. She publishes in Czech, Slovak, and English. Her writings in English have appeared in *The Washington Post* and *Kosmas*, among others. Her work in Czech has been published in *Reflex, Literární noviny, Listy*, and numerous other periodicals. Her articles in Slovak have been printed in the daily *SME*.

Zdeněk V. David is Senior Scholar at the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars in Washington, DC. His publications include two monographs, *Finding the Middle Way: The Utraquists' Liberal Challenge to Rome and Luther* and the recent *Realism, Tolerance and Liberalism in the Czech National Awakening: Legacies of the Bohemian Reformation*. He is currently working on a manuscript exploring the philosophical background of Thomas G. Masaryk's political views.

Robert K. Evanson is an emeritus Associate Professor of Political Science at the University of Missouri, Kansas City. His areas of specialization are the fields of international relations and the politics and foreign policy of Eastern and Central Europe. He has published and presented papers widely on Czechoslovak, Czech and East European issues including studies of political repression, relationships between regime and workers under Communism, and issues of the economy and democratic transition.

James W. Peterson is Professor and Head of the Political Science department at Valdosta State University in Georgia, USA. He has published many works on Czechoslovak, Czech and Slovak political leadership including military issues, and his present research concerns the post-1989 Czech communist party and Czech politics regarding NATO and EU membership. He is editor of the biannual *Czech and Slovak History Newsletter*, for the membership of the Czechoslovak Studies Association.

Miloslav Rechcigl, Jr. is one of the founders and past President of many years of the Czechoslovak Society of Arts and Sciences (SVU). He is a native of Mladá Boleslav, Czechoslovakia, who has lived in the US since 1950. In addition to enjoying a complete professional career as a biochemist, nutritionist and cancer researcher, he is an authority on immigration history from the territory of the former Czechoslovakia. He was instrumental in establishing the National Heritage

Commission toward the preservation of Czech and Slovak cultural heritage in America. Among his many publications on Czech and Slovak topics are *The Czechoslovak Contribution to World Culture* (1964), *Czechoslovakia Past and Present* (1968), *Postavy naší Ameriky* (2000), *Czech American Historic Sites, Monuments and Memorials* (2004), *Czechoslovak American Archivalia* (2004), *Czech and Slovaks in America* (2005), and *On Behalf of Their Homeland: Fifty Years of SVU* (2008).

Zdeněk Salzmann is a linguistic anthropologist and professor emeritus from the University of Massachusetts at Amherst. His latest book, *Linguistic Anthropoogy: a Short Introduction*, is about to appear in Prague.

Karolina Slamová is a senior lecturer in the Languages Department of the Technical University of Ostrava in the Czech Republic. She teaches Czech and English, and is working on a book length study of the career of Igor Hájek, from which this contribution is drawn.

Sylva Simsova, after the events narrated in her contribution, settled in North London, where she and her husband Karel Janovický raised their two children and pursued their careers, he as a musician and composer, and she as a librarian. She was for many years with the School of Librarianship and Information Sciences at the Polytechnic of North London (later the University of North London and now part of the London Metropolitan University). She published many works on librarianship, as well as research reports on the library needs of London's increasingly diverse population.

Mary Hrabík Šámal, *Kosmas* Book Review Editor, teaches at Oakland University in Rochester, Michigan. While her writings on Czech, Slovak and East European politics, women and culture have appeared on both sides of the Atlantic, she has maintained an active interest in Czechoslovak agrarianism, which was the topic of her doctoral dissertation. Šámal has also published translations into English from Czech and other languages.

Bruce A. Vlk is a researcher at the University of Virginia Darden School of Business. He has published articles in public administration, history and politics. In addition to SVU, Vlk is a member of the Virginia Czech/Slovak Heritage Society and the Virginia Social Science Association. He was recently awarded a grant from the Virginia Foundation for the Humanities to document the folk life traditions of the Czech- and Slovak-American community in Virginia. In the summer of 1998, he studied Czech history and politics at Charles University in Prague during his undergraduate studies at George Mason University. He has a master's degree in public administration from James Madison University.

Advice to Prospective Authors

Kosmas is an interdisciplinary journal devoted primarily to publishing scholarly research in all relevant fields on topics related to Czech, Slovak, or Central European affairs in general; memoirs or creative writing may also occasionally be published. Manuscripts submitted for review should normally be no longer than 25-30 pages, double spaced, with one-inch margins. Book reviews should be from 500-700 words, and should be formatted after the example of reviews printed here.

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 may be submitted in Microsoft Word format (.doc or .docx) or, if the author does not use Microsoft Word, in Rich Text format (.rtf). Authors should pay careful attention to diacritical marks for words not in the English language. Manuscripts should be submitted via email to the editorial address KosmasAgnew@gmail.com. Electronic submission is preferred. Contributions should be double-spaced for the entire text, including block quotations and notes. Book titles and non-English words should be formatted in *italic* font. Use notes (footnotes or endnotes) and not a "Works Cited" form for references. Transliterations of the Cyrillic alphabet should follow Library of Congress guidelines. Submissions will be edited to conform to standard academic spelling and usage in American English. For all other matters of style, the current edition of the *Chicago Manual of Style* should be consulted.