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From the Editor

Hugh L. Agnew

The volume you hold in your hands represents the emergence from a time of uncertainty and some turbulence for *Kosmas*. As any regular reader knows, the journal experienced an interregnum of editors a few years ago, with the result that the publication of *Kosmas* fell behind the actual calendar. After I stepped into the breach to try to preserve the journal and continue publication, we still failed in bridging that gap. In addition, *Kosmas* and its parent organization, the Society for Arts and Sciences–SVU, were experiencing the same issues that all scholarly journals, whether large or small, richly supported by endowments or surviving on subscriptions, face in an age of rapidly changing technology and delivery systems for information. In the end, the SVU adopted a different method of printing and distributing *Kosmas* that should enable all interested readers to receive the journal conveniently, securely, and regularly without the expenses of printing an uncertain number of hard copies to be distributed via pre-paid subscriptions. The editorial staff of *Kosmas* and the Executive Board of SVU warmly appreciate the continued interest and support for the journal that have been expressed by so many of you.

As we emerge on a new footing, we are starting a new series of *Kosmas*, leaving the title and purposes of the journal unchanged. This volume, therefore, will be numbered as New Series, Volume I, Number 1 (Spring, 2018). We will continue to publish 2 issues per year. New issues of *Kosmas* (and selected back issues) will be available in future at the SVU website in popular eBook formats or as hard copy through a print-on-demand system. For further information about *Kosmas*, including contents of back issues and how to get your copy of the current and future issues, please consult the SVU website at https://www.svu2000.org/publishing/, where you will find links to *Zprávy* (the SVU newsletter), *Kosmas*, and other publications, as well as the link to the Bookstore where they can be ordered.

Despite the challenges of these times, it has been reassuring that *Kosmas* continues to receive inquiries about contributing articles. With its wide-ranging focus, the journal provides a home for varied and diverse sorts of articles, as this issue reflects. The contributions for this number range from scholarly articles with historical focus, to a memoir, and an essay on a major event in Czech history that is also a reflection on “public history” and how it works in our contemporary society. Long-time friend of and contributor to *Kosmas*, Zdeněk V. David, continues his detailed exploration of the sources of T. G. Masaryk’s philosophy and general intellectual outlook, this time tracing the influences of two less familiar philosophers, Friedrich Lange and Henry Lewes. Brothers William and James Peterson (the former a performing musician and musicologist, the latter a political scientist) contribute a detailed analysis of the musical settings of the poems by Rudolf Medek dealing with the Battle of Zborov (July 1-2, 1917, part of the Kerensky Offensive that marked the last gasp of the Imperial Russian army), set against the backdrop of the formation of the Czech-Slovak Legion and its
participation in the First World War on the Eastern front, as well as its attempt to return to the Western front or, when the war ended, to its newly-created homeland.

Daniel Miller explores a fascinating byway of the story of the emergence of independent Czechoslovakia, looking at how the population of the (still relatively rural) northwestern part of the state of Florida might have received news and information about the development of the war, the activities of the Czechoslovak National Committee, and eventual Czechoslovak independence. The second half of Jaroslav Rokoský’s study of the election of Edvard Beneš to succeed Masaryk as President of Czechoslovakia (the first half appeared in _Kosmas_, Vol. 29, No. 1 (Fall, 2015): 1-17), completes his detailed account of the political wheeling and dealing that led to Beneš succeeding his colleague and mentor in 1935. This also closes the “Articles” section of this issue.

Next, _Kosmas_ Associate Editor Mary Hrabík Šámal shares with us the first part of her father’s memoir of his wartime experience with arrest, detention, trial and imprisonment at the hands of the Nazis. We look forward eventually to publishing the remainder of this important source, and of course would be happy to consider other memoir contributions, since preserving these first-hand accounts of historical events is an important service _Kosmas_ can provide to our readers. Hrabík’s memoir is followed by an essay by a newcomer to the pages of _Kosmas_, Kateřina Králově, who reflects on the public history installation erected in Prague in 2017 for the anniversary of the assassination of _Reichsprotector_ Reinhard Heydrich. Finally, Miloslav Rechcigl, Jr., surveys the contribution of US women of Czech/Bohemian/Moravian heritage in the higher professions, continuing his series of genealogical reference pieces.

Four book reviews round out the journal’s contents. As editor, I would like to note that Mila Šašková-Pierce’s contribution was scheduled to appear in the previous issue, but by my error it was left out. I am glad to be able to include it in this volume. We also welcome another newcomer to our pages in David Aitken, while Tracy Burns and Mary Hrabík Šámal will be well-known to our regular readers.

Looking forward to a year filled with anniversary remembrances of the many significant “8s” in Czech, Slovak and Central European history, we hope that the next issue of _Kosmas_ (Fall, 2018) will be able to include some of the rich reflections such moments provide.
The crucial issue in Masaryk’s philosophical teaching was the juxtaposition of idealism and empiricism, which had a seminal effect on his approach to politics. In politics, the monistic ontology of idealism tended to promote collectivism, while the pluralistic assumptions of empiricism favored individualism. Masaryk often expressed his negative view of German Idealist philosophy, and this became one of the main leitmotifs of his teaching. In his ontological preference, he definitely gravitated towards realistic empiricism. This article addresses the roots of Masaryk’s nuanced stance through the seminal influence of Friedrich A. Lange, who helped him reject metaphysical idealism, accept empiricism in a qualified way, and seek a religious dimension in life and existence, which was compatible with empiricism. Thus, he not only helped to orient Masaryk in the problems of ontology, but also pointed the way to an undogmatic yet profound religiosity.

Evidence of Lange’s Influence

Despite its significance, Lange’s impact on Masaryk’s thought has not received the attention it deserves. The crucial source documenting Masaryk’s interest in Lange is a statement in his autobiography of August 25, 1875, found by Jaromir Doležal in the archives of the former Austrian Ministry of Education in Vienna after World War I. Masaryk wrote about his preoccupations while still a secondary school (gymnasium) student in Vienna in 1869: “My favorite task in those days was a Czech translation of Lange’s History of Materialism, which I provided with notes embodying my opinions, such as they were.”


3 Friedrich A. Lange, while rejecting later German Idealism, accepted in a qualified way Kant’s epistemology and with Otto Liebmann he was the founder of the Neo-Kantian tradition, which dominated German philosophy during the second half of the nineteenth century.

4 “Meine lieblingsarbeit war damals eine böhmische übersetzung Lange’s geschichte des materialismus die ich mit noten versah, in denen ich meine unmaszgeblichen ansichten
admission can be, therefore, regarded as the “smoking gun” in the investigation of Lange’s influence on him.

This passage from Masaryk’s autobiography was cited by Paul Selver in his biography of Masaryk (1940) and Jaroslav Opat’s biography of Masaryk contained a brief reference to this episode as well. Opat noted that in his last gymnasium years in Vienna, “Lange’s History of Materialism in Czech translation was among his most favorite readings.” This statement, however, tends to convey a mistaken impression that there was a pre-existing Czech translation of Lange. In actuality, according to the autobiography cited by Doležal, Masaryk was preparing the Czech translation for himself, which attested to a much deeper involvement with the text than even Opat suggests. There are no mentions of Lange in the monographs on Masaryk by Antonie van den Beld (1975), Roman Szporluk (1981), Eva Schmidt-Hartmann (1984), Roland Hoffmann (1988), Zwi Batscha (1994), H. Gordon Skilling (1994), and Milan Machovec (2000), nor in the three-volume collection of articles, T.G.Masaryk, 1850-1937 (1989-1990), edited by Stanley Winters.

Apparently, the first author who called attention to Lange’s role in its own right was Zdenĕk Nejedlý, in the torso of his grand biography of Masaryk. He pointed out the importance of Lange in the formation of Masaryk’s philosophical outlook, based on Masaryk’s 1875 autobiography, and regretted that the volumes of Lange with Masaryk’s annotations have not yet been discovered.

---

10 Ibid., 1: 319.
11 Ibid., 1: 320, n. 51
Nejedlý stressed Masaryk’s translation of Lange’s *History of Materialism* into Czech, while noting that the manuscript of the translation was not extant.\(^\text{12}\) Nejedlý further suggested that Masaryk first became acquainted with eighteenth-century British empiricism through his study of Lange’s work.\(^\text{13}\) Stanislav Polák recognized this episode as one of the seminal events in Masaryk’s intellectual development. In Lange, Masaryk found a delineation between the two approaches to knowledge which preoccupied him in his youth, namely the contrast between the realm of sense perception and that of intellectual speculation and imagination. Lange designated the former (simplistically and inaccurately) as Materialism, and the latter as Idealism.\(^\text{14}\) Polák further showed that Masaryk’s fascination with Lange was a persistent one, which continued for two years (until 1871), leading him to write commentaries on the text and to translate it into Czech.\(^\text{15}\) In addition, Masaryk especially turned students’ attention to Lange’s *Geschichte des Materialismus* in his introductory university lectures to the history of philosophy in 1882.\(^\text{16}\)

Interestingly, it seems that Masaryk himself did not refer conspicuously to Lange in his own writings. He did not mention Lange in *The Meaning of Czech History* [Česká otázka], nor in *An Essay of Concrete Logic* [Pokus o konkrétní logiku], and his name does not come up in *Talks with T. G. Masaryk* [Hovory s T. G. Masarykem], by Karel Čapek.\(^\text{17}\) There are simple references to Lange in *The Foundations of Concrete Logic* [Základové konkretné logiky],\(^\text{18}\) and in a review for the journal *Atheneum* in 1884.\(^\text{19}\) He referred to Lange’s *History of Materialism* in his own first monograph, *Sebevražda hromadným jevem*, a study of suicide.\(^\text{20}\)

\(^{12}\) Nejedlý, *T. G. Masaryk*, 2:281. Nejedlý again referred to Masaryk’s youthful translation of Lange in his list of Masaryk’s translations into Czech, also including texts from Plato and Descartes; ibid., 2:305.
\(^{13}\) Nejedlý, *T. G. Masaryk*, 1:370.
\(^{15}\) Polák, *T. G. Masaryk*, 1:137.
and to Lange’s *Logische Studien* in an article on Hume in the early 1880s.\(^{21}\) In *The Social Question*, Masaryk concerned himself with Lange in the latter’s other capacity as a writer on workers’ movements.\(^{22}\) In *The Spirit of Russia [Rusko a Ėvropa]*, Masaryk mentioned the partial translation into Russian of Lange’s *History of Materialism* by Nikolai N. Strakhov,\(^{23}\) as well as Vladimir S. Solov’ev’s late in life interest in sponsoring a translation of Lange’s entire *History*.\(^{24}\) Found also in *The Spirit of Russia* was the glimmer of a suggestion that Lange provided a common philosophical ground between Masaryk and the Russian populist Nikolai K. Mikhailovskii. Masaryk noted Mikhailovskii’s fascination with Lange’s writings, the reading of which the latter considered essential for the education of Russian youth.\(^{25}\) As for a later period, Masaryk included Lange among the seven German Neo-Kantians whom he identified as the

---


\(^{25}\) In addition to those of Eugene Dühring, see Masaryk, *The Spirit of Russia*, 2: 139; Tomáš G. Masaryk, *Rusko a Ėvropa*, Vol. 2, Spisy 12 (Prague: Masarykův ústav AV ČR, 1996), 133. Mikhailovskii was impressed by Lange’s assertion in the *History of Materialism* that, while the materialist viewpoint was proper for the study of nature, the “ideal” dimension had to figure in the consideration of human problem. See James H. Billington, *Mikhailovsky and Russian Populism* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1958), 69. On the basis of Lange’s Neo-Kantianism, he advanced the doctrine of a “two-sided truth,” according to which the subjective and the objective perceptions were in full harmony. Ibid., 97.
Two Progenitors of Masaryk’s Philosophy

inspirers of revisionist Marxism in late nineteenth-century Russia. While Marx and his successors regarded natural sciences as revolutionary factors, Lange viewed “moral statistics” as the most revolutionary of all the sciences.

Nejedlý recorded an interesting episode that bore on Masaryk’s relation with Lange. According to him, in 1874 the University of Vienna favored Lange over Franz Brentano, who was to become Masaryk’s cherished teacher at the University, for an appointment to a regular philosophy professorship. Brentano, who had been a Catholic priest, nevertheless secured the appointment on January 22, 1874, thanks to the secularist Liberal Ministry in Vienna. However, it seems unlikely that a rivalry between his favorite mentor in Vienna and Lange would cause Masaryk to hesitate to mention Lange’s name. In a broader sense, Nejedlý, in fact, further points out that Masaryk had never felt the need to entertain a disciple’s gratitude toward his mentors, especially where such gratitude would place him under an intellectual or personal obligation. Thus Masaryk likewise avoided mentioning Brentano’s role in stimulating his interest in Hume’s skepticism.

In any case, however, Masaryk’s reticence helps to explain why Lange’s effect on him has been underrepresented, if not entirely overlooked.

Lange’s Influence

Lange opposed two philosophical principles, which he claimed dominated the thinking of humankind from the beginning to the present: materialism and idealism. The former relied on an empirical and rationalist approach and recognized the world of sensory phenomena. Idealism rose above the world of senses to seek allegedly higher truths.

Negative View of Idealism

Lange was a critic of speculative metaphysics and a defender of the view that philosophy should incorporate the findings of the exact sciences. Masaryk could imibe the negative view of Hegel early in his first serious philosophical reading in Vienna in the compendium of Friedrich A. Lange, which represented a survey of Western philosophy. Lange allowed a space for the acceptance of Kant whom he viewed as an advocate of transcendental knowledge. However, he condemned

---

26 In addition to Wilhelm Schuppe, Alois Riehl, Hermann Cohen, Wilhelm Windelband, Heinrich Rickert, and Rudolf Stammler, see Masaryk, The Spirit of Russia, 2: 352.
27 Masaryk, The Spirit of Russia, 2: 532.
28 Nejedlý, T. G. Masaryk, 1: 449.
32 Lange’s Geschichte des Materialismus und Kritik seiner Bedeutung in der Gegenwart.
in no uncertain terms, the use of Kant for the production of metaphysical constructs. He agreed with Otto Liebmann’s *Kant and die Epigonen* (1865) which burdened the heritage of Kant with the *caput mortuum* of “the thing-in-itself” whether embodied in Fichte’s Ego, Schiller’s Absolute, Hegel’s Spirit, or Schopenhauer’s Will. Both Lange and Liebmann are considered precursors, if not founders, of neo-Kantianism. Masaryk derived from this exposure distaste for the mainline of German Idealism on the one hand, and a way of allowing a certain space for ethics, esthetics and religion that went beyond strict empiricism on the other.

In the second volume of his *Geschichte des Materialismus*, which dealt with philosophy after Kant, Lange claimed that Kant’s successors, beginning with Fichte, drew metaphysical conclusions from Kant’s psychology, which he himself sought to avoid. Fichte and Hegel retrogressed in relation to Kant. It was difficult to imagine that such a sober and powerful thinker as Kant would be followed in Germany, a mere twenty-five years after his *Critiques*, with an absurd work, such as Hegel’s *Phaemenologie des Geistes*. Yet it was Kant’s stand that unleashed the subsequent metaphysical Sturm und Drang period. He provided the intellectual nourishment and spawned a philosophical dynasty of eager imitators:

who—like the pharaohs of old—started raising one pyramid after another high into the free air without caring to anchor their constructs in firm ground. During this process, Fichte extracted from Kant’s philosophy its most esoteric aspect—the original synthetic unity of apperceptions—and derived from it his own concept of a creative “Ich.” Schelling from a mundane equation A=A—like from an empty nut—conjured up the entirety of the Universe.

Finally, according to Lange, in these perverse metaphysical architectonics, Hegel declared Being and Non-Being as identical under the jubilant applause of the German university youth, thirsting for new knowledge.

According to Lange, Hegel’s main regress, compared to Kant, was his loss of distinction between the more general perception and the human perception of Being. His whole system was locked within the human thoughts and fantasies about Being. He assigned impressive-sounding names to such thoughts and fantasies that did not actually elicit an understanding of the validity possessed by such appearances and the concepts derived from them. For Hegel, the opposition between Being [Wesen] and Appearance [Schein] became mere differences.

---


36 Ibid., 2: 505.

between the forms of human apprehension—and these differences could be easily erased.  

Lange suggested, as another approach to the original sin [Sündenfall] of German Post-Kantian philosophy, a consideration of the relationship between the Subject and the Object in human cognition. There arose the grand axiom of the unity between the objective and the subjective, or the magic petitio principii about the unity of Thought [Denkens] and Being [Seins]. According to Kant, such a unity occurred only in a particular experience, and then merely as a fusion [Verschmelzung]: it was neither pure thought, nor pure being. Hegel drastically altered that modest and circumscribed relationship; for him, Absolute Thought coincided with Absolute Being.  

Hegel’s metaphysics, according to Lange, ultimately rested on pantheism. The efficaciousness of the pantheistic view rested in the fact that it set out a priori as an axiom the unity of all human minds with the universal Spirit and all other spirits. Pantheism as the dominant method of thinking [Denkweise] not only for Hegel, but also for Schelling’s Naturphilosophie, represented a world view that, while not lacking a certain mystical depth, simultaneously held the danger of the most fantastic mental aberrations. Lange further maintained that Hegel’s influence on the writing of history was at times particularly pernicious.

Limitation of Empiricism and the Issue of Materialism

Aside from the negative view of Idealism, Masaryk not only shared Lange’s preference for empiricism, but also a concern for the epistemological limitation of empiricism. However, Masaryk differed from Lange’s diagnosis of the flaw of empiricism, as well as from Lange’s prescription of a cure in Neo-Kantianism. Although clearly preferring Empiricism of the British and French type to Idealism, Lange nevertheless had a definite sense that ultimately empiricism, was unable to grasp the fullness of reality. His opinion was that empiricism actually denied any existence beyond sensory experience, and thus led to the metaphysics of materialism.

According to Lange, the English philosophers since Francis Bacon, employed a method which was in a particular harmony with an approach of the natural sciences. Hence, unlike the Continent, England had not experienced a significant conflict between philosophy and exact science. The world of phenomena was treated by the important English philosophers in the same manner as by the Continental materialists, although only few, such as Hobbes, would admit to being materialists. Locke in particular sought cover under a subjective approach of

38 Ibid., 2: 522-523.  
39 Ibid., 2: 545-546.  
40 Ibid., 2: 546.  
41 Ibid., 2: 514.  
42 Ibid., 2: 579.
Nevertheless, Lange identified the British empirical thought of Bacon, Hobbes, and Locke as leading to the materialism of French Enlightenment thinkers. Subsequently, John Stuart Mill was added to the series of empiricists who had paved the way for materialism in philosophy. (This line of philosophical development he juxtaposed with the progression from Descartes to Spinoza, Leibniz, Kant and Fichte, and then Schelling and Hegel, of which he also disapproved.) Later, Lange’s sense of the spiritual limits of empiricism led him to speak disrespectfully about the Voltaire-Lockean freedom teaching [Locke-Voltairesche Freiheitslehre].

Space for a Spiritual Dimension

Lange sought the solution of balancing the claims of what he called materialism and idealism through a Neo-Kantian approach. Materialism led to knowledge of nature and its laws; idealism created art, religion, and metaphysics. Hence, Lange felt that the French and British, with their “materialism”, had made much greater advances in science than the Germans with their metaphysics, seeking to apply philosophy to the understanding of nature. There was also an obverse side of both philosophical systems. Materialism led to egoism, Epicureanism, and passive resignation; idealism’s chimerical products of fantasy hindered the development of the human spirit. On the positive side, idealism lifted man above purely personal interests, aroused self-sacrificing readiness and charitable instincts; materialism was a justifiable reaction to excessive idealism. The future called for achieving a balance between knowledge and poetry, empiricism and the transcendental, and a final establishment of political and intellectual freedom where reason and the senses are given their rights, and at the same time spiritual life would be able to flourish.

43 Lange, Geschichte des Materialismus, 2: 593. Attributing irreligious views to Locke, however, was particularly inappropriate; in 1659-62, he was an advocate of High Church Anglicanism, virtually an Anglo-Catholic; see Jacqueline Rose, “John Locke ‘matters indifferent,’ and the Restoration of the Church of England,” Historical Journal, 48 (2005): 601-621.
44 Lange, Geschichte des Materialismus, 1: 203, 2:497. Diderot, according to Lange, advanced Locke’s sensualism into materialism; see Lange, Geschichte des Materialismus, 1: 327.
45 Lange, Geschichte des Materialismus, 1: 331. Lange specified that it was Diderot who converted Lockean sensualism [Lockeschen Sensualismus] into outright materialism; see ibid., 1:327.
47 Lange, Geschichte des Materialismus, 2: 512-513.
48 Lange, Geschichte des Materialismus, 2: 450; The Encyclopedia of Philosophy, ed. Paul Edwards, 4:383. Lange’s non-dogmatic religiosity was also a possible link between Masaryk and Nietzsche (on their relationship see Zdenĕk V. David, “Masaryk on Schopenhauer and Nietzsche within the Austrian Philosophical Tradition,” Kosmas: Czechoslovak and Central European Journal, Vol. 23, no. 1, Fall 2009, 19-36.) Nietzsche
Masaryk, above all, did not agree with Lange’s conviction that empiricism necessarily led to the metaphysics of materialism. Likewise, he was not sympathetic to a new way of enlisting Kantian concepts to rescue empiricism from its epistemological predicament. Thus, he would criticize the attempts to minimize the difference between Kant and the realist Johann F. Herbart, in particular those by Hermann Cohen (1842-1918) in his *Kants Theorie der Erfahrung* in 1871. Masaryk felt that even the Neo-Kantians leaned too much in the direction of Kant. Along these lines, he was particularly harsh in censuring Josef Durdík’s efforts to equate the ideas of Herbart with those of Kant, pointing out that Herbart had himself excoriated Kant in his work on psychology, charging him with transgressions, such as “rashness, trickery, and absurdity.” Instead—as it will become apparent further on in this book—Masaryk would seek a solution to the predicament of the epistemological poverty of empiricism through the recognition of the ontic power of faith and of the ontic power of love.

Nevertheless, Lange helped to establish Masaryk’s basic philosophical matrix, not only by his rejection of German Idealism and endorsement of empiricism, but also by his insistence of augmenting the epistemological range of empiricism by supplying a spiritual dimension. Despite these differences, Masaryk’s primary respect for Lange, as his primordial teacher of philosophy, is clearly indicated by his previously mentioned attempt to translate the latter’s *Geschichte des Materialismus* into Czech. This positive attitude persisted into the maturity of his philosophical life. Thus, much later in his intellectual history of Russia, *Russland und Europa*, published in 1913, he would make a special note of appreciation of Vladimir S. Solov’ev’s intent to translate Lange’s *History of Materialism* into the Russian language.
Linking Lange with George Henry Lewes

Following the discussion of the relationship between Masaryk and Lange, it is essential to point out that in his early pedagogical career at the University of Prague, Masaryk tended to link Lange’s *Geschichte des Materialismus* with the work of George Henry Lewes. While Masaryk was translating Lange’s main work as early as 1869, when studying in German Gymnasium in Vienna, he became familiar with Lewes’ ideas on philosophy of history by 1875, during his subsequent doctoral studies in Vienna. It is most likely that his principal university professor, Franz Brentano called his attention to Lewes’ history. Brentano became familiar with the book during his stay in London in the spring of 1872, and found it remarkable, albeit somewhat superficial. Subsequently, by 1882 Masaryk began recommending to his students in Prague, Lewes’s *Biographical History of Philosophy from Its Origin in Greece down to the Present Day* (1871)—probably in the German edition of 1876—as a fundamental text on the history of philosophy, together—significantly—with Lange’s treatise. Lewes’s history of philosophy was originally published in 1845-1846; the fourth edition came out in 1871, and there were subsequent translations into German and Hungarian. During the first year of his teaching in Prague, in an article “Spisy A. Comta” (The Writings of A. Comte), in the *Atheneum*, in November 1883, Masaryk also listed Lewes positively among the English thinkers, who were receptive to Comte’s ideas. He repeated this commendation in both of his

60 Masaryk, Ž počátku Athenea, 1883-1885, 22.
treatises on “concrete logic,” published in 1885 and 1887 respectively, in which he again referred to Lewes.62

Masaryk shared five important viewpoints with Lewes. First, Masaryk strongly favored Locke’s empiricism,63 while—again together with Lewes—he objected to empiricism (as in the form of Comte’s positivism) for not allowing any scope for ontic reality.64 Second, like Lewes, Masaryk considered Hume’s skepticism to be a fundamental issue at the start of modern philosophy that set its course both in the direction of Idealism and positivism.65 Third, Masaryk shared Lewes’s special liking for Lessing and Goethe,66 whom he tended to include (together with Herder) in the trinity of German thinkers who avoided the philosophical pitfall of radical subjectivism.67 Fourth—at the other side of the ledger—Masaryk agreed with Lewes’s aversion to German idealists from Kant through Fichte, Schelling, and Hegel for their pronounced epistemological and ontic “subjectivism.”68 Fifth, Masaryk shared Lewes’s high opinion of Comte, but also, more tellingly, a regret over Comte’s neglect of psychology as a scientific

---

61 Masaryk, Základové konkrétní logiky: třídění a soustava věd, 105; Masaryk, Pokus o konkrétní logiku; třídění a soustava věd, 139.
62 Masaryk cites Lewes’s dictum: “Our philosophy, if not borrowed is little more than expression of our personality.” See Masaryk, Základové konkrétní logiky: třídění a soustava věd, 156; Masaryk, Pokus o konkrétní logiku; třídění a soustava věd, 196.
65 Lewes, Geschichte der Philosophie von Thales bis Comte, 2: 344-351, 364-368 (on the relation to Kant).
66 Lewes’s article on Lessing in “Lessingiana,” Edinburgh Review (October 1845), 451-470, reveals the highest admiration for Lessing partly as “the least German of all Germans;” see ibid., 453; “Lewis, George Henry,” DNB, 11: 1044; his “Life of Goethe,” appeared in 1855, and it became the standard English work on the subject, DNB, 11: 1045.
68 Lewes, Biographical History of Philosophy from Its Origin in Greece down to the Present Day, x; see also [George Henry Lewis], “Lessingiana,” Edinburgh Review (October 1845), 453. On Kant’s key position in the further development of German Idealism, see Lewes, Geschichte der Philosophie von Thales bis Comte, 2: 579.
discipline. The critique of Comte’s failure to include psychology, in his scale of classification of sciences, points to Lewes’s influence on the formative years of Masaryk’s philosophical career. He voices such a critique pointedly in the two early treatises on “concrete logic” (1885 and 1887).

Overall this early exposure to Lewes’s history of philosophy undoubtedly helped to strengthen Masaryk’s attitude toward German philosophy, particularly his lifelong aversion to German idealism. The importance, which he attributed to Lewes’s views in the initial stages of his academic teaching, is indicated by his highlighting Lewes’s text—together with Lange’s—as an instrument for initiating young adepts to the field of philosophical studies. This can be also taken as a reflection of the crucial role of Lewes’s textbook in reinforcing the role of Lange’s history in forming the very fundamental mindset of Masaryk’s philosophical outlook.

---
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Remembering the Czech Legion and the 1917 Battle of Zborov in the Poetry of Rudolf Medek Set to Music

James W. Peterson and William J. Peterson

Introduction

July 2, 2017, marked the centennial of the Battle of Zborov, and thus it is appropriate to analyze its significance in political history, poetry, and music. Eventually, the July 2 date became not only a national holiday but an important part of Czech political culture and self-definition. The Battle of Zborov, which took place in the western part of modern-day Ukraine, demonstrated the effectiveness of the Czech Legion—or Czechoslovak Legion—on the battlefield. This Czech Legion had developed as a military unit especially in the years 1916 and 1917, drawing on soldiers who had broken away from the Austro-Hungarian troops and drawing on prisoners of Russia, as well. The Czech Legion, having shown its bravery and commitment in the Battle of Zborov, became an official unit fighting with Russia while serving under the Czech-Slovak National Council in Paris. Rudolf Medek, a general in the Czech Legion, wrote a long epic poem titled “Zborov” and published this six-part work in 1918. Ten years later Rudolf Karel and Otakar Jeremiáš set parts of Medek’s poem to music.

The conclusion of the sixth poem provides some of the most notable and memorable lines in the set of six poems:

Brothers, today open the faithful heart!
Do not forget!
And be alive
Through the ages with a holy fire
Of burning and heroic hearts,
Which are white and cold
For you and for your children

---

1 The authors extend grateful thanks to the following colleagues in the Czech Republic and in the USA: Zusana Petraskova (National Library, Prague) for locating essential musical scores in the National Library’s collection and making them available to us; David Beveridge (Prague) for preparing photocopies of scores housed in the National Library’s collection; Hynek Melichar (Olomouc) for his help in locating materials for this project; the Staff of the Honnold Library (Claremont, CA) for their help in locating materials through Inter-Library Loan; Helen Coffey (London) for locating essential materials in the British Library’s collection and making them available to us; James Cassaro (University of Pittsburgh) for locating essential musical scores in the University of Pittsburgh Library’s collection and making them available to us; Stephen Kerber (Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville) for providing us with valuable information about the Library’s collection.; Andrew Greenwood (Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville) for providing us with valuable information about the Library’s collection; Graydon Beeks (Pomona College) for his help in locating materials for this project.
In the unlimited love and sacrifice
At Zborov!

Medek returns to one of the central issues of the epic, namely the Czechs and Slovaks considered as brothers, which first appears in the opening lines of the first poem. The sixth poem is a commemorative text and also a charge to those who will follow, to work actively for the cause that energized the soldiers in the Battle of Zborov.

The Battle of Zborov and the Construction of Memory

Prior to analysis of the military success of the Czech Legion, it is helpful to introduce the analytical concepts that have evolved in an effort to capture the meaning of the enormous losses and sacrifices that persons and nations suffered during the “Great War.” How would “sites of memory” emerge that would make immemorial those events and losses? Could nations successfully knit families, ethnic groups, and the state in a seamless way that would suggest multi-level meaning for the war as it affected their history and being? The Czech Legion victory at Zborov influenced the emergent political culture in the new Czechoslovak state, and thereby it played a critical definitional role in what the state might become. Analysis will also focus on the battle itself, and that conflict is complicated because mainly Czech forces constituted the heart of the Austro-Hungarian units against which the exclusively Czech based Legion was in conflict. So, it was Czech against Czech, for the most part. Particularly significant is the organizational evolution of the Czech Legion, for it moved from a collection of prisoners of war within the Austro-Hungarian military camp to a powerful force that captured the attention of the West and paved the way for the emergence of the nation-state on October 28, 1918.

Sites of Memory

In attempting to come to terms with how the shadows of war extend down through the generations, Jay Winter underscores the importance of the “physical sites where commemorative acts take place.” Following a conflagration such as World War I, survivors are desperately searching for historical meaning that may justify the enormous loss of life. If the family has been touched by the violence, then there may be a need to connect “national history and family history.” The built site will create an emotional intensity that may attach to the historical memory a moral message as well. Thus, the site may have a lasting influence that outlives those who recall first-hand the actual events. With a more specific application to World War I, Winter also refers to the “memory boom” that takes

---

place when individuals and families “struggle against forgetting” in a very defiant way. Inevitably, the “braiding together of family history and national history” from the tragedy of The Great War influenced the ways in which memories of future wars would be preserved. Thus, that first war in which modern technology made possible so much destruction was a formative one in establishing how a site of memory could emerge that would capture hearts and minds for the ensuing century and more.

Annette Becker carries the analysis even further by suggesting that a religious intensity characterized the First World War in ways that escalated into “wartime spirituality.” In addition to its physical destruction, there was a “mystical side to that war” that knit together persons into “sacred unions.” The individual soldiers in the trenches felt these bonds as well, for many converted to a religious faith for the first time. Without regard to the religious beliefs of the deceased, there was a tendency to leave crosses at battlefield burial sites for many unknown soldiers. In addition, remembered events and persons from the war are not really linked to ethnicity or nation. Rather, memories of them are rooted in perceptions that they share in a much broader culture that is based on common wartime experiences rather than bloodlines.

It is no simple matter to construct meaningful sites of memory that are without controversy. Monuments over time can run the risk of either becoming spectacles that overpower the actual memories of the deceased or descending into “museumification” that detracts from the emotional and spiritual origins of the site itself (Rampley 2012, 5-7). In addition, sites may develop “multiple meanings” and ambiguity as populations shift during territorial changes. For example, in 1945, Poland lost territory to the east to the Soviet Union and was compensated with expansion into former German territory in the west. This actually had an impact on memories connected with the Battle of Zborov, for its location was in Polish territory at the time of the battle but in the Ukrainian Republic of the Soviet Union after 1945. Ironically, its meaning was more important to a third set of people in the new Czechoslovakia.

---
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Zborov, Political Culture, and Nation-State Creation

Czechs followed through after the war and actually created a “site of memory” in Old Town Square. In 1922, they had brought to Prague the remains of an unknown Zborov soldier who initially had found his resting place near the battle site. The tomb in Prague then became a “site of national memory” until its destruction by the Nazis in 1941.\(^8\) As such, the meaning of the battle entered the political culture of the newly formed state. Czechs and Slovaks, two groups that had lived separately during the time of the Austrian and Hungarian Empires, became brothers during that battle, and their common sacrifices together became a kind of model for the new nation-state. There was an emotional meaning to the “sanctity of wartime sacrifice.”\(^9\)

Czech political leaders made the decision to utilize the example of the Czech Legion at Zborov as a way of establishing the discipline needed to get the new nation-state off to a positive start. They thereby helped to create the “Zborov myth” that exclusively celebrated the Czech soldiers who had broken away from the Austro-Hungarian Army and become an ally of forces like the Russian on the other side.\(^10\) Another component of the myth entailed references to the Sokols that had prepared Czechs with military style discipline for battles of this sort. Eventually, the Czechs established the July 2 date of the battle as the “Day of the Army” and thus stoked creation of a “usable historical past.” Soldiers who had fought with a religious intensity thus became “creators of national memory.”\(^11\)

However, there was a cost to this exclusive focus on the heroic actions of the Czech Legion at Zborov. Those Czechs who fought on the other side with Vienna did not receive the accolades that were part of this new “site of memory.” The new state also was a multinational one, and other ethnic groups to include the Germans, Hungarians, Poles, and Ruthenians were left out of this effort to build a political culture that would nourish the new nation-state.\(^12\) While the name of Masaryk was firmly tied to these efforts, the role of the Slovaks who had actually fought at Zborov was understated. As the battle became a kind of teaching tool about what the meaning of Czechoslovakia was, the role of minority groups was thus understated or left out. As a result, separate Slovak celebrations included a religious component and mention of Slovak national heroes. There was also for

---
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them no mention of the Battle of White Mountain that bore so much significance for Czechs.\textsuperscript{13}

The Battle of Zborov

What actually happened at the famed Battle of Zborov? The context of the battle is important, for it helps explain why Russia needed this kind of assistance from such forces in their western front battle against the armies of Austria-Hungary and Germany. By the summer of 1917 the Provisional Government in Moscow had displaced the traditional tsarist regime under Nicholas II, and Alexander Kerensky was the new albeit temporary leader of the nation. Further, the Russians had lost 55\% of their troops, including 1.3 million dead. Consequently, Kerensky was looking for a victory by the depleted Russian units and appointed the new General Aleksei A. Brusilov to lead the charge in Ukraine near the city of Lviv (Lemberg). He decided to utilize shock battalions such as the Czecho-Slovak 

\textit{družina} \underbar{under Colonel Václav Troyanovský} to reinforce the weak Russian army.\textsuperscript{14} The Brusilov Offensive eventually commenced on July 2, 1917.\textsuperscript{15}

The Austrian forces ironically relied heavily also on Czech troops. Their 35th Infantry Regiment was from Plzeň (Pilsen) and included 60\% Czech soldiers and 40\% German. Similarly, their 75th Infantry Regiment was from Jindřichův Hradec (Neuhaus) and consisted of 80\% Czech troops and 20\% German. During the battle itself, a number of these Czech fighters for Vienna attached red and white ribbons to their caps and came over to the other side.\textsuperscript{16} There was also later controversy over the question of whether this set of Czech soldiers actually fought very hard, in light of the fact that they faced their own Bohemian and Moravian brothers in the fight. In addition, the 86th Hungarian-Croat Regiment supplemented the two largely Czech units.\textsuperscript{17} On paper, this combined force should have had an advantage, as they faced such a depleted Russian military operation.

However, Austria-Hungary lost the battle primarily because of the tenacity of the Czecho-Slovak shock troops that fought with the Russian military contingent. Forces from the VIIth, VIIIth, and Xth Armies made up the Russian opposition to the forces of Austria-Hungary. Two Finnish divisions also fought in the Russian XIIth Army.\textsuperscript{18} Importantly, as it turned out, there were three Regiments that made up the Czecho-Slovak shock troops that were aligned with the Russians and Finns. Their names all reflected heroic episodes in the Bohemian past. One was named after Jan Hus, the 15th century founder of the Hussite movement that rebelled against Rome and was a forerunner of the Protestant Revolution a century later. A
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second was named after Jiří z Poděbrad who had been a Hussite leader and Bohemian king a few decades after the 1415 immolation and martyrdom of Hus at the hands of Rome. The third bore the name of Jan Žižka z Trocnova who had led the Hussites to a great victory at the Battle of Vitkov Hill in 1421, several years after the martyrdom of Hus. Thus, the Czech units came into the battle under the banner of Bohemian history and as modern day successors to the Hussites. These three Czech regiments divided up into two halves a month before the critical battle, and they got their first chance to show their colors on July 2 at Zborov.

In the battle itself, the Czecho-Slovak troops moved out first and captured three trenches held by the Austro-Hungarian forces. The Finnish forces followed closely behind the Czechs, while Russian forces never left their own trenches. As a result the Finns captured 1,500 prisoners, while the Czecho-Slovak units took prisoner 62 officers and 3,150 regular soldiers. It was also the case that Czech soldiers from both sides actually met once and talked with one another. This was very similar to the Christmas Truce on the western front in which French and German troops once stopped the firing and played a game of soccer, with the bells from French Catholic churches celebrating Christmas Eve in the background. In the meetings between Czechs, one found his brother and another his father, on the other side! Some of the Czechs on the Russian side clearly were politicized in terms of the future possibility of a Czechoslovak nation-state. Those persons had earlier been imprisoned by the Russians after capture and forced to work in the mines. Their paycheck in the mines was typically 3 rubles, of which they sent 1 to the Czechoslovak National Council in Paris for work on the future nation-state. Agreement with the Russians to serve in the družina on the front against Austria-Hungary made possible their release from the mines as well as from Russian incarceration.

In the short term, there were several implications internationally for Czechs from the outcome of this battle. First, the Russian General Staff soon published a paper on the battle that made clear the heroic contributions of the Czech and Slovak shock troops. This publication made the Czech cause at least a regional one and perhaps an international one. Second, western leaders learned from the battle how the minority groups entrapped within the Austro-Hungarian Empire could be used for the objective of defeating that enemy. Both factors assisted Masaryk and other Czech leaders who were traveling furiously through Europe,
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Russia, and the United States to build a case for the future existence of a nation-state that would bear the name Czechoslovakia.

**The Czech Legion: Formation and Organizational Evolution**

Soldiers who eventually comprised the Czech Legion were initially draftees from Bohemia and Moravia at the beginning of the war. Obviously quite a few of them came from Prague, and many were part of a group that became known as the “Children of Prague.” German troops with bayonets marched them through the streets of Prague and put them on trains for movement to the front. The Czech soldiers sang “Hej, Slovaně” on the march through their capital city but added a verse that questioned why they were fighting against the Russians. In fact, the Czech train cars were sandwiched between cars that were full of Germans who were thus positioned to keep control of them. In the early years of the war, they played a role as reserve troops who heard battle fire for the first time in the distance on September 14, 1914. At one point they retreated to Cracow, Poland, but a later transfer took them to Limanoff where they assisted the Austrian troops in achieving their first victory. However, Russian troops approached their trenches, and many Czechs defected to that side after having read sympathetic leaflets that Russian planes had earlier dropped in their midst.

By March of 1916, approximately 2,300 Czechs and Slovaks formed their own družina in preparation for battle. The Provisional Government in Russia that came to power in March 1917, permitted that group to become a full fighting unit, and two months later the Czechs had recruited another 9,249 prisoners of Russia to become part of their force. Following the Battle of Zborov, Masaryk talked the Russian General Brusilov into making the Czech and Slovak družina into a full-fledged Army Corps that would fight with Russia but technically serve under the Czech-Slovak National Council in Paris. As a result of that changed status for the unit, the Czech Colonel Troyanovský received promotion to the rank of General. Subsequent recruitment of an additional 30,000 Czech and Slovak troops more than justified the decision to upgrade the group into a full Army Corps, and on August 23, that move became possible when formation of a fourth regiment took place. The fourth regiment, like the other three previously discussed, bore the name of a Hussite hero. It was called the Prokop the Great Regiment and named after a famous Hussite Taborite General who won many battles in Germany and Hungary between 1426 and 1434. He had died in 1434 at the Battle of Lipany. All four divisions together were known as the Hussite Division, and that label sealed the emotional connection between the fifteenth and twentieth century Bohemian military heroes.
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There were two other related organizational developments of significance after Zborov. First, just before the battle, the Czecho-Slovak National Council in Paris formed a similarly named component in Russia, and Tomáš Masaryk came to Moscow as its first delegate. That organization bore the name National Czecho-Slovak Council in Russia. This move was of more than symbolic importance, for it meant that the Czechs and Slovak soldiers who fought at Zborov were in part under the authority of their own “recognized government.”

Second, the Bolshevik Revolution of October/November 1917 had an impact on the organization, for the new leaders under Lenin saw fit to rename the organization the Czecho-Slovak National Soviet. Thereby, the new Soviet leaders realigned the Czech Legion in part to serve their own ideology and objectives.

**Links to the Russian Revolution**

In spite of the single-minded actions of the new Bolshevik leadership towards the Czech soldiers in late 1917, the fate of the Czech Legion in that new state was not a simple one. Even during the Kerensky government from March to October/November 1917, there were fears that the Czech example of breaking away from their Austro-Hungarian rulers might encourage smaller Russian nationalities to break away from rule by Moscow. With the charismatic position of Tsar gone from the scene, the glue that stuck those non-Russian nationalities to Moscow began to dissolve.

For example, past conquests had led to inclusion of Central Asian Muslim populations of various sorts, and their commitment to Russia was always an open question. The initial moderate stage of the Russian Revolution was empowering for the Czechs, for it enabled them to move beyond prison to the status of a fighting force. Actually, the Provisional Government leader Kerensky visited the Czech Brigade two days after the victory at Zborov. As Russian troops continued to be dispirited, the Czechs moved forward through participation in fights at Jezerna and Tarnapol.

In late summer and early fall of 1917, the new Czech and Slovak military force operated somewhat independently of the Russian Army. Symbolically, the language of command in that unit was Czech, and this factor prevented over-reliance on orders in Russian from that military command. The weakened Russian Army became even more so after the Bolshevik victory in the fall, and eventually the Leninists permitted the Czechs to board trains for a trip to Vladivostok on their way to the western front in France. While the Czechs traveled all the way through Siberia after that decision, there was an outbreak of disagreement between the Czechs and the new Soviet leadership. Really, the Soviet leaders hoped that the Czecho-Slovak military units would break up after the Peace of Brest-Litovsk.
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Remembering the Czech Legion and the Battle of Zborov

in early March 1918. Further, the new communist leaders then put pressure on the Czechs to join the budding socialist revolution, but Czechs responded that their real enemies were the Germans and Austrians rather than remnants of either the Russian Tsarist sympathizers or the Kerensky-led Liberal Democratic moderates.\(^{35}\)

In reality, the Czech Legion was trapped for about six months after the Bolshevik Revolution in Siberia, and they moved by train east from town to town. As the Russian Civil War continued between the communist-led “reds” and the opposition “whites,” the result of the Czech Legion activities was denial of the railroad to the Bolshevik forces. Thus, the Czechs inadvertently became a factor that contributed to slowing down the inevitable consolidation of the communist victory over that vast landmass. Masaryk technically embraced the principle of non-intervention in the Russian Civil War, and eventually the Czecho-Slovak Legion withdrew from Russia by 1920. Relations between the two new states improved to the point that Czechoslovakia and the Soviet Union signed a commercial agreement in 1922.\(^{36}\)

Rudolf Medek himself pulled some of these events together in his book on the Czechoslovak Anabasis across Siberia. He noted that one significant feature of the victory at Zborov was the fact that Czechs were actually defending the results of the first Russian Revolution against the German ruler Wilhelm II.\(^{37}\) He further notes that the Czech hero of the Battle of Zborov was the one-eyed General Jan Sýrovy. The reference to eyesight is purposeful, as it reminds Czechs of Jan Žižka, the one-eyed Hussite General who led the Czechs to victory at Vitkov Hill in 1421.\(^{38}\) After discussing the later trek of the Czechoslovak Legion across Siberia in the midst of the Bolshevik Revolution and its aftermath, he concludes his book by noting that the chaos on the Russian side taught the Czechs values that assisted them in creating their own state. Foremost among those values were order, tolerance, and of course freedom after three centuries of Habsburg rule!

Links of the Czech Legion to the Western Front in France

The origin of the long Anabasis of the Czech Legion across Siberia was a request by France for an additional group of 30,000 Czech troops to assist them on the western front. Following their victory at Zborov, it was not too difficult to recruit a high number of troops from the Czech prisoners of Russia. In fact, the leadership was able to pull in a full 20,000 troops from the prisons to be added to the 10,000 that had earlier been active on the Zborov front and other battle fields.\(^{39}\) The agreement to transfer the 30,000 troops came in the fall of 1917 after
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Masaryk signed an accord with the French government. Among the Czechs recruited from Russian prisons were many skilled workers who were able to understand quite quickly their new military assignments. Their target was Archangel, then the long ride by ship to the Pacific coast of the United States, a train ride to its east coast, and another voyage over the Atlantic to France. Of course, their arrival in Europe came very late in the game, as the war ended on November 11, 1918. Arrival of the individual Legionnaires back to their new Czechoslovak homeland was often even later. Some arrived as late as the mid or late 1920s. Normally, their home village set aside a day to honor their homecoming, probably with very little understanding of the political and military complexity of their experience since the original march from Prague under German supervision in 1914.

**Publication History of “Zborov”**

It is no surprise that publication of the Medek poem occurred in Siberia rather than in Prague or elsewhere in Bohemia. Rudolf Medek heard about the victory at Zborov while he was with other Czech Legion forces in Siberia, and those troops were soon beginning their long trip across that vast and largely uninhabited land by railroad. The first known publication of *Zborov* in Czech was in 1918, in the Siberian city of Chelyabinsk, a location that was north of Kazakhstan and not such a far distance from Moscow (a signed copy of this edition is housed in the British Library). The Czechoslovak National Assembly in Prague both published and printed the edition, and it appeared in 1918 on the first anniversary of the victory at Zborov. Medek dedicated it to the “memory of the soldiers and martyrs, who in the war laid down their lives for the freedom of the Czechoslovak nation.”

The second location for publication was in Omsk in 1919, further east into Siberia and still close to the border between Russia and Kazakhstan. Later in 1919, there was a third publication in Irkutsk (with a Russian text [accessible through catalog.hathitrust.org]), a city that is well into Siberia and probably 75% of the distance between Moscow and Vladivostok on the Pacific Ocean. It is close to the western shore of the huge Lake Baikal and just north of Mongolia, well into the Asian portion of the Russian state. It is clear that Czech Legion forces carried the poem and had it translated at various posts along their Trans-Siberian trek or Anabasis towards the east coast of Russia.

Finally, in 1919, there was a publication in Prague by the Ministry of National Defense (in Czech) in the Czechoslovak state that had been established in October 1918. Probably, the new Defense Ministry was expecting to build credibility for the military forces that would serve the new nation-state by calling attention to a major victory that preceded the creation of the state by only 15 months. Later publications in Prague took place in 1922 and 1937, and the last publication coincided with the celebration of the twentieth anniversary of the
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victory itself.\(^\text{42}\) Overall, it is not surprising that publications originated in Russia and then moved back into the Prague setting. There was no Czechoslovak state until October 28, 1918, and the Czech Legion was on the move in Russia from 1917 until 1920. Activities of the Czech Legion were in fact spread out into Russia, Ukraine, France, and Italy. Their return to Czechoslovakia was celebrated on an individual basis, but they never fought in the homeland on whose behalf the battles actually took place.

In fact, some of the 1919 publications of *Zborov* were part of a larger work by Medek entitled *Lví srdce (The Lion’s Heart)*, first published in 1919 (Prague: Library of the “Memory of the Resistance”). In *Lví srdce* the set of six poems titled *Zborov* is but one of 19 titles in that 77-page volume (accessible online [kramerius4.nkp.cz]). In *Lví srdce*, the author made a few revisions to the text of *Zborov* that originally appeared in 1918.\(^\text{43}\) (*Zborov* was published independently after 1919, as well: the online catalog of the National Library in Prague lists 15 publications of *Zborov* between 1918 and 1937.)

**Zborov: Summary of the Six Poems**

Exploring literary works by Frantisek Langer and Rudolf Medek in conjunction with the Czechoslovak Legion, Arne Novák characterized Medek as an “eloquent lyric poet who became the rhapsodist of the new Czech militant spirit.”\(^\text{44}\) Medek’s set of 6 poems, *Zborov*, involves a cyclical framework: the first and sixth poems both include these eight lines: “Do not forget! / And be alive / Through the ages with a holy fire / Of burning and heroic hearts, / Which are white and cold / For you and for your children / In the unlimited love and sacrifice / At Zborov!” and Medek closes the set of six poems with these stirring lines. [1-2]

In the first poem, there is an invitation to Czechs and Slovaks who are in fact the “twigs of the restored tree.” The poet reminds his readers of the sacrifices that took place during the battle and how they will live in the future “for the ages.” In the second poem, there is an initial section that contrasts the trenches of the enemy with “our beautiful country,” in the background but far away. He evokes the reality of the three thousand Czech soldiers who fought on that battlefield. Some had been farmers, others had been factory workers, and others had been “students.”

Poems III, IV, and V represent different poetic visions of the battle. In the third poem the troops are preparing for the fight: they are in a kind of dance, knowing that the dance could lead to death. They smile as they go into the battle

\(^{42}\) Ex Libris, 2009.


and sing songs under their own banners. No longer does anxiety dominate, for they have become “stiffened hammers” in the military machine. In the fourth poem, the author focuses on the “family” of soldiers in readiness for the upcoming battle and in relative calm. The boys joke in the trenches, and the old friends “Podmol, Strnak, and Plšek” are in the center of the group. They remember the long trip that brought them to Zborov. There are shots in the distance as the battle approaches again.

The fifth poem represents the battle itself, with the soldiers fiercely engaged with enemy troops on the field of Zborov. The soldiers are infused with the spirit of the “distant hero, the blind leader, the famous fighter”—a reference to Jan Žižka who led the Hussites to victory at Vitkov Hill in 1421. The fifth poem brings, finally, images of death on the field, of the victorious soldiers gathering their strength, and of the post-battle scene in the evening, with the acknowledgment that members of their own group, namely, “Podmol, Strnak, and Plšek,” are among the dead lying on the field.

The set of poems does not, of course, conclude with the battle itself. Medek’s sixth poem, a thirty-line reflection which echoes in many ways the first poem, opens with a reference to the “graves of brothers” on the Zborov plain in the context of a landscape which is alive with a “heroic song.” “With glorious memories every pathway and ridge comes to life.” “The Teutonic hordes pass,” and “the field is ours.” Above the graves of the fallen, “the old Slavic gods celebrate.” Now, in summer “the flaming red poppies grow.” In conclusion, there is a reminder that all the death and sacrifice were “for you and for your children.” The eight concluding lines, which were also embedded in the first poem, now have new meaning and they bring a charge to all who have heard the epic poem: “Do not forget!

Musical Settings of Zborov

The publication history also includes two musical settings of Zborov, one by Rudolf Karel (c. 1927) and one by Otakar Jeremiáš, in 1928. Both publications, which appeared in Prague, include music for men’s voices (four voices [Tenor I and II and Bass I and II]). Rudolf Karel (1880-1945) studied law at Prague University and music at the Prague Conservatory. Karel studied composition with Dvořák (and was his last student in composition). In Russia at the beginning of World War I, he eventually became director of the Irkutsk school of music (Siberia). He joined the troops of the Czech Legion and founded a symphony orchestra (in conjunction with the Legion). His publication titled Zborov consists of a lengthy 250-measure setting of Medek’s third poem. Otakar Jeremiáš (1892-1962) studied at the Prague Conservatory, where his teacher in composition was Vítězslav Novák, in 1909-1910. Among his notable early compositions is the melodrama, Romance o Karle IV (“Romance of Charles IV”) in 1917. After collaborating with his brother, Jaroslav, on concert tours, he returned in 1918 to České Budějovice, and then became the director of the music school there. He worked on the composition of an opera, Bratři Karamazovi (“The Brothers
Karamazov”) in the 1920s and the premiere, in 1928, reanimated the discussion of modernism in music.\textsuperscript{45} Jeremiáš’s setting of Medek’s set of six poems, Zborov, appeared in 1928.

Composers Jeremiáš and Karel succeed in bringing Medek’s poetic lines to new account, through devices and procedures chosen to emphasize themes and statements, and individual words in the poetry. This account will focus on the work by Jeremiáš, who set the entire set of six poems in a 61-page volume that also includes the poetry—printed as poetry in the beginning of the volume—and drawings as well, found throughout the publication. (Commentary on the work by Karel, a setting of the third poem, will be found in Appendix H.) Our account will focus chiefly on the setting by Jeremiáš of the opening and closing poems, which frame the cycle, and on his setting of the third, fourth and fifth poems, which presents—in musical terms—Medek’s characterization of the battle carried out by this particular group of soldiers.

In Jeremiáš’s setting of Poem No. 1, which calls on the “Czech and Slovak children” to hear the poet’s song, the composer emphasizes—through a passionate and increasingly dissonant reiteration of the words—the invitation to listen to his song. The first eight lines of the text are declaimed by the men’s voices with force (“forte” dynamics) and vigor and with great clarity (the text is pronounced unanimously by all voice parts). And he brings emphasis to the line—“listen to my song”—through repetition: the poet or bard becomes passionate and insistent. Jeremiáš continues with this style of declamation for the presentation of the final 8 lines of text, reaching higher levels of intensity through subdivision of vocal forces (chords of up to 6 parts sung by the members of the chorus). In his setting of the concluding phrase—“in the limitless love and sacrifice at Zborov!”—Jeremiáš emphasizes the geographical site, Zborov, by repetition of the word coupled with a transition from full choral sound to a softer level of sound: he brings the first song to a hauntingly hushed final cadence carried exclusively by the basses in the lowest register of the men’s ensemble (evoking Zborov as a somber and faraway site).

Medek’s sixth poem, a thirty-line reflection which echoes in many ways the first poem, opens with a reference to the “graves of brothers” on the Zborov plain in the context of a landscape which is alive with a “heroic song.” The poem is a commemorative text and also a charge to those who will follow. For the introduction of the sixth poem—set to 76 measures of music, in all—Jeremiáš devises a new crystallized style for the presentation of the first portion of the poem, which might be designed to evoke old church-related styles of singing coupled with a harmonic style which is, by comparison to that found in the fifth song (and in the first song), restrained and understated. The composer provides a relatively consonant style to match the reflective frame of mind conveyed by the opening lines of the text (“On the Zborov plain high above the Cecova are the

graves of brothers.”). The composer expands the ensemble for the climactic presentation of the line “The field is ours” through a division of parts a 7-voice sonority with a powerful dynamic range, provided by the four vocal units). Jeremiáš then returns—for the presentation of the lines “During the dark nights / on their mounded grave commemorations / The old Slavic gods celebrate”—to the haunting and restrained style he devised for the beginning passage of the sixth song. And he provides the final eight lines of text—a reiteration of the final eight lines of the first song—with a newly composed musical setting marked “con dolore” (sadly) and “Grave” (gravely) in which he concludes the work with a memorable and noble cadential passage which itself redefines “Zborov” in a new light, by means of a majestic conclusion which, at last, depends on an unambiguous and treasured major triadic construction in a composition that places emphasis on a vocal declamation that brings to mind a hymn-like or sacred musical style.

Jeremiáš presents an adventurous and imaginative setting of the third, fourth, and fifth poems in his volume. The third poem brings to the reader or listener premonitions of the upcoming battle. Medek depends on the opening lines “Our regiments come / One company goes after the other” as a structural element in the 48-line poem: at the outset he focuses on “regiments” (pluk) and in two subsequent passages he offers a variant, using the word “company” (rota). And these lines are offered in conjunction with other images that suggest confidence in the effort (pennants waving and smiles on faces). The poem includes many references to song and to the singing of songs in the context of battle. If resolve and strength are manifest, still the characterization of battle includes the acknowledgement of struggle and even death. The final lines focus on the transformation of the soldiers into confident and powerful individuals who are, presumably ready for the prospect of battle and ready to function successfully—”as stiffened hammers”—within the military operation.

Jeremiáš composes the opening lines of the third poem relying on an ostinato: the opening 24-measure passage is saturated with these lines, sung again and again by the group while new lines will be superimposed above the repeated lines. The melodic subject which accompanies these lines seems, by virtue of its pitch design (a decorated triadic motive), full of anticipation and commitment. The lines “heroic faith” fired up by “love” bring forth a climactic arrival point, with great solidity and resolution, in pure major-mode triadic harmonic language, bringing the first stanza to its conclusion. Jeremiáš opens the second stanza with a potent combination of motives and text lines found in the beginning portions of both the first and second stanzas: “Our regiments come / One company goes after the other.” He expands and perhaps even breaks out of the textural framework for the lines referring to “resilience and strength.” In the final 4 lines of the stanza, the group breaks into song, specifically into a song denoted by lines in quotation marks, essentially a defined text that the soldiers are singing together, in formation and in solidarity. The line of text quoted by Medek at this point in the third poem is “Neumrem na slámě…” (“I will not die in a barn on straw but on the field”). Tenor voices proclaim the quoted line, “Neumrem na
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slámě…,” in a passage which also includes an ostinato two-voice presentation of the lines “One company goes after the other” again and again. The quoted lines belong to an old Czech marching song, “Píseň Slovana” (“Slav’s Song”) the opening line of which is “I am a Slav and I will be a Slav” or (Slovan jsem a Slovan budu) (the authors are indebted to Hynek Melichar for this information). Moreover, Jeremiáš weaves into the texture—into the pitch material of the passage—the melodic motive from the marching song heard at the outset of the second portion of the song (“Šablenka”), the very pitches allied with the text line “Neumrem na slámě,” a motive which is carried vigorously forward by the animated triplet-figure writing that Jeremiáš devises for the lines “One company goes after the other” (the text and melody for “Slovan jsem” and “Šablenka” are printed, as entry no. 26, in a collection titled Od Šumavy-k Tatrám [Prague: Barvitius, 1921]).

Near the end of his setting of Medek’s third stanza, Jeremiáš projects the lines concerning “Heroes / beyond the Carpathians” as a powerful climactic point: the extravagant spread of voices from low to high, in rich 6-voice chords, transforms this into a notable arrival point (marked with a fermata indicating that the flow of music is brought to a halt, at least temporarily). Jeremiáš designs a truly memorable final passage—allied with the last 6 lines of the text—which features ambitious sonorities resulting from 6-voice writing (expanding the range both higher and lower than normal, for the group), culminating in the decisive and glorious final passage that presents the all-important proclamation—in full voice—that the individuals, in formation, have been transformed “into stiffened hammers.”

In his fourth poem, Rudolf Medek focuses on the group of soldiers, in their camp, in readiness for the upcoming battle and yet, in relative calm. In his setting of the fourth poem, Jeremiáš creates a quiet and reflective musical essay. The composer binds the two final stanzas together (lines 25-34 and 35 to 39) with musical means. He provides a luminous setting of lines referring to “evening” (line 25) with extremely soft dynamics within a consonant moment. The “shots” heard from out beyond the camp trigger an interruption. Jeremiáš creates the musical equivalent of “banter” (in conjunction with text lines concerning “joking comrades”) with staccato ostinato motives in the basses coupled with an urgent presentation of lines in the tenor with slightly ominous full-voiced reference to “our fallen brothers” and, not surprisingly, to a dissonant break in the musical continuity. The concluding passage and the beginning of the final five lines (35-39) bring reference to the “quiet night” and to a re-presentation of a musical passage first heard earlier: the composer presents a restrained musical passage—a luminous setting of these final lines of text (soft dynamic level) with up to a 7-voice texture which generates choral richness (tinged with chromaticism). We take a breath and prepare for the memorable presentation of the last line, “Outside it is quiet. It is quiet before the storm…,” a second time, concluding now with a gentle if somewhat unsettling sonic resolution (containing an unstable tritone interval and leaving us “on edge” at the end of the fourth poem). In the remarkable final phrase, the resolution of the song swells in the low-bass register, unveiling a
plaintive chant-like utterance in the top tenor voice combined with a chromatic motive in the bass voice, above a pedal point line from the lowest basses which, at the last minute, becomes an echo of the plaintive tenor motive in our memory. The composer produces, with musical means, an air of anticipation tinged with wariness.

The fifth poem represents the battle itself, with the soldiers fiercely engaged with enemy troops on the field of Zborov, and the fifth poem brings, finally, images death on the field, of the victorious soldiers gathering their strength, and of the post-battle scene in the evening (with the acknowledgement that members of their own group are also among the dead lying on the field). Jeremiáš succeeds in creating, with musical means, an astonishingly powerful depiction of the battle itself. The climactic passage revolves around images in lines 21-58 focusing on the heat of battle, on resolve, on strength, and in the recollection of past struggles. And the passage generates a new level of intensity achieved in part with the employment of 6-7-voice writing (greater vocal expansiveness and power) in a passage marked “Grandioso” (m. 58) and boasting a “fortississimo” (fff) marking (the ensemble pushing the limits of what might be understood as vocal power). The composer now adds a second text and tune in this climactic passage (mm. 58-65), namely “Kdož jste Boží bojovníci” (“The Hussite Chorale”) heard in the bass voices, presenting the well-known text up through “a doufětež v něho” (two lines of text with tune heard together with Medek’s lines, specifically, “Above us rises in the dark smoke / the spirit of a distant hero, the blind leader, the famous fighter” [up through “od Tachova” {39-44}]). Jeremiáš, then, weaves a notable pre-composed chorale into the fabric of the setting of Medek’s fifth poem, at a critical point: the Hussite Chorale—”Kdož jste Boží bojovníci”—is a text and tune of great importance in Czech history and culture. Here is an English translation of the first stanza: “Ye who are God’s warriors and of his law, Request from God help and hope in him, That finally with him always you will have the victory (triumph)” (trans. JWP) (See Appendix I)

The composer finally brings us to the conclusion of the fifth poem—and of the set of three poems focusing on the battle—with a passage that includes, in fact, two sub-sections (mm. 74-90 and mm. 89-124). “Evening approaches,” in the end, ushering in the final concluding passage, providing poignant emphasis on the line “There lie the fallen, gashes in the head” (pp / “Mysterioso”) leading to a delicate yet somewhat dissonant breaking point. After a brief pause, Jeremiáš provides the culminating moment in his memorable composition, in his setting of the last line, “con calore et doloroso,” for the ultimate image of the warriors, at the very end, smiling.

Conclusion

A statement found in the “Declaration of Independence” (1918) explores “ideals of modern democracy” with reference to the wartime struggle and sacrifice that the Czechs had experienced:
We accept and shall adhere to the ideals of modern democracy as they have been ideals of our nation for centuries. We accept the American principles as laid down by President Wilson, the principles of liberated mankind of the actual equality of nations and of governments, deriving all their just power from the consent of the governed. We, the nation of Comenius, cannot but accept those principles expressed in the American Declaration of Independence, the principles of Lincoln and of the Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen. For these principles our nation shed its blood in the memorable Hussite wars five hundred years ago. For these same principles beside her Allies our nation is shedding its blood to-day in Russia, Italy, and France.46

The construction of memory necessarily involved the recollection of Czechs and Slovaks fighting in Russia, Italy, and France, as stated in the document. And the construction of this memory—in 1918—brought into view notable poetry by Rudolf Medek, in Zborov, and by Antonín Horák, in Česká legie (“The Czech Legion”). The poem “The Czech Legion” appeared as part of the published book Osvoboditelům, and the poem bears an inscription with reference to the date October 28, 1918 (Horák, Osvoboditelům [1918]) (“To the Liberators”). Leoš Janáček completed his setting for male chorus of the poem by Horák by November 18, 1918.47 In the text Horák constructs a tale about the Legion soldiers on the Western Front, in the vicinity of the “Chemin des Dames,” laid out in a vast structural framework with two identified sections (“I. Epopej” [Epic poem] and “II. Epitaf padlým” [Epitaph for the fallen]). Janáček’s 70-line text preserves the basic layout of Horák’s 262-line poem within a structure which includes a first section and a second section (Horák’s short “Epitaf”). The composer, taking inspiration from the poet, treats the opening line as a recurring refrain—a kind of reminder to the soldiers of their position at the battlefront in France—and shapes a text that defines in some detail Czech resolve at the battlefront. The concluding lines of the first section of the poem, as set by the composer, focus on the thunderous Parisian tribute to the surviving Czech soldiers. Finally, the Czechs sing their message to family and friends in their homeland in the second and final section. Janáček sets the final 8 lines, the “Epitaf padlým,” as a somber and determined chorus within a chorus—as an almost free-standing section which delivers both a message about sacrifice and a charge, as well: “in the certain hope that the world will not let them [others] die, that it will not let us die, or those who come in the future.”

And the theme of sacrifice is central to the set of poems, Zborov, completed by Rudolf Medek in 1918, as well. Medek’s dedication (Chelyabinsk, Russia, in 1918), “on the first anniversary of the victory at Zborov,” included this inscription: “Dedicated to the memory of the soldiers and martyrs, who in the war laid down their lives for the freedom of the Czechoslovak nation.” Central to Medek’s set of six poems is the battle itself—conceived as a multi-staged

experience for a particular group of soldiers—and the structural design, as a whole, places great emphasis on sacrifice and on the poetic lines that appear in both the first and last poems: “Do not forget! / And be alive / Through the ages with a holy fire / Of burning and heroic hearts, / Which are white and cold / For you and for your children / In the unlimited love and sacrifice / At Zborov!” Jeremiáš succeeds in bringing Medek’s poetic lines to new account. At the end of his setting of the sixth poem, Jeremiáš provides the final eight lines of text—a reiteration of the final eight lines of the first song—with a newly composed musical setting: he concludes the six-composition work with a memorable and noble passage which itself redefines “Zborov” in a new light. Jeremiáš, then, in his setting of the sixth poem, creates a musical language that draws on stylistic issues first explored in the musical setting of the first poem, relying on unanimity of vocal declamation that approaches in many passages an idiomatic hymn-like style. The composer has demonstrated how music can present, represent, and transform the images and ideas found in the poetry within a style that is both flexible and progressive—and “modern.” The working together of poetry and music provides, then, a striking and powerful cultural statement—an eloquent resolve to preserve the advance made in Zborov for future generations.
Appendices

Appendix A

“Hymn of the Czech Legion”

We bring a marching anger and in the heart gunpowder,
Into which we cast a ruddy flame and suddenly fear perishes.
Our fist as from the eagle and wild revenge is in sight,
we hit, we burn happily, where the cloud is most thick.

Whoever is a slave, in order to decay further, however must be quiet,
we raise the downtrodden ideal onto our own shield;
no sacrifice frightens us, we know where our goal is,
our fist cuts it out, even if it is in hell!

Raise the knife above the head, friends, look ahead with eagle’s sight,
lightning flares for our eagle, where the cloud is most thick.
And if everything around us on the field turns into bones,
Then we have only fulfilled the legacy of falcons.
(translated by James W. Peterson)

A number of songs relating to the Czechoslovak Legion were published soon after the War. Prominent among these publications is Charles Atherton’s volume, which appeared in 1921 and included 45 items (both a Czech title and an English title—”Favorite Songs of the Čecho-Slovak Army in Russia”—may be found at the head of this volume). It would not be surprising to find additional songs at this time relating to the Czechoslovak Legion. The 1921 collection, Od Šumavy-k Tatrám!: národní zpěvník československý s nápěvy, includes a song titled “Hymn of the Czech Legion” (No. 161), which describes the strength and determination of the Legion soldiers. The Hymn was particularly symbolic, for it pulled together many of the themes of the greatness of the Legion and its successes. At three points in the Hymn, there are references to the Czech fighters as “eagles.” In contrast, the author has no interest in the plight of the “falcons” which may represent the opposition. Czech soldiers are aiming at “wild revenge,” no doubt against the imprisoning forces of the Habsburg Empire that had dominated the Czech and Moravian peoples since their defeat at the Battle of White Mountain in 1620. Significantly, the Hymn asserts “we raise the downtrodden ideal onto our own shield” (“Hymn of the Czech Legion”). In this way there is a bond forged between the efforts of the Legion and its success in overcoming the humiliations of the Czech past. In the 1921 volume this hymn is but one of two items listed in the “Appendix” and the author of the text and the composer are not identified. The tune for the four-line stanza falls into four phrases (a a’ b a’) displaying an abundance of triadic motives and an emphasis on dotted-rhythm motives.
(common to many national songs) which give the song a spirited character and a confident air.

Appendix B

“Zborov I”

Czech and Slovak children,
sons of the nation
rejuvenated through heroic blood
you all, to whom an otherwise harsh judge granted
to carry the Czech and Slovak name,
you the imperishable and eternally living
twigs of the restored tree,
listen to my song.
Do not forget!
And be alive
for the ages through the holy fire
of warming and heroic hearts,
which pulsed and are now frozen
for you and for your children
in the limitless love and sacrifice
at Zborov!

Appendix C

“Zborov II”

From sea to sea stand the German troops.
From sea to sea are deep underground ramparts,
Trenches, where death sits!
From sea to sea there are streams of wire fortresses, the slavish Austrian caps,
And the Prussian helmets!

Behind us far away lies our beautiful country!
A land through which flows milk and honey.
There a martyred people, overstrained with anxiety, lies in shackles.
Singing the difficult dream of freedom that was given to them!

There live father, mother, and children,
A young and cheerful wife,
Even grandmother—the prophetess who told us about it once years ago:
I, children, will never live to see it,
However, you—you will fight for the bright day that will rise up for our country!
From sea to sea stand the German troops.
Behind them darkness, slavery, death!
Behind them cursed in the dragons’ clutches
Our love sleeps, our whole life sleeps!
Our homeland!

Never has your name been weak,
So strong,
So alive
As on this day!

A heavy and submerged anger,
Implacable,
Smothers us in our soul!
A horrible and mute hatred
Is fixed in our eyes!

You who once walked humbly
Behind your father’s plow
On your native field,
Grateful for the skylark’s song,
For a plate of soup and slice of bread,

You who are quiet in the stifling factories
live through rough and desolate days,
Students, poets, singers, artists, and happy young people have suddenly turned pale.

Even you, who were never saintly,
Boisterous Prague children,
Moravian youth, smart lads from the Tatras-
Three thousand,
Three thousand bold, falcon-like hearts –

You all feel on this day that:
Death is not frightful!
The Battle is beautiful and holy!
The plains will sometime be quiet at Zborov,
Peace, rest, and quiet
Will rule above us!
But eternal life will then be
Given to the humbled nation.
Appendix D

“Zborov III”

Our regiments come.
One company goes behind another company,
the pennants joyfully wave,
bayonets ominously shine.
How a long and evil and unrepentant monster
Through the darkening valley in the period of early evening
Pulls the troops into the foremost witchcraft!
The area roars with a strange, war song!
In it pine and sway the hearts,
cut off with the fire of love
of heroic faith.

One company goes behind another company:
Ours smile,
From singed cheeks joyfully flares eyesight,
into a huge quiet and epic firmness
Breaks out the whole.
From everyone breathes youth and freshness,
Resilience and strength!
They go to death with rhythmic steps,
They go to the dance.
And suddenly everyone,
as if someone in secret commanded their soul,
sings with one and many voices:
“We will not die on the straw in a barn.”

One company goes behind another company:
everyone smiles,
as if beautiful and happy girls
behind every smile and behind every glance
thousands of kisses promise.
Everyone smiles!
On the front lines crack cannon shots,
Gray and rose shrapnel!
Happy, whirling, fairy voices
of heroic battles,
glory and danger,
We, famous soldiers and old brigades,
greet you!
You, into the wind towards the east, far away,
even heroes are there with us beyond the Carpathians,  
so we go into battle with the signing of songs,  
under our own pennants,  
with a boiling over even dedicated spirit!  
Nothing is awful, nothing is far away,  
There are no fears, nor mistakes, nor anxiety.  
For everyone there has been transformation into stiffened hammers.

Appendix E

“Zborov IV”

I see you, brothers,  
as then, so visible, you must live!  
Podmol, Strnad, Plšek,  
old soldiers, friends, eagles!  
In the dusk of the attack they sit in the autumn hole  
under a kettle of tea,  
gray, rough, with the soldiers’ happy joke  
and with a perpetual smile  
on blackened, tenacious faces.  
So together we walk into the “reconnaissance,”  
always smiling, joking!  
Hey, falcons, ravenous boy,  
Hey, boys without apprehension and even blame!  
I see you brothers,  
a clearly quiet and complete strength blazes  
from your burning, lively eyes!  
So you hurry breathlessly,  
From the distant Russian plains  
here, to your own, the days were for you long,  
the trips were unending!  
So you hurry to your own,  
To all who had been left.  
Or ours go into the attack, ours go forward,  
ours are victorious!

Near the evening of the attack. The warm night approaches,  
In a lonely way the rare shots crackle…  
Those are our brothers! Those are our guards!  
And here sits the joking society,  
the entire old and famous company,  
a joke sparkles, one hundred nicknames, songs,  
memories about the nightly wanderings and clashes,  
toward the cowardly enemy,
to the courageous pieces, to the dizzy daring
and to the fallen brothers!

Outside it is quiet. The night is warm and tepid.
The ripening harvest waves promisingly,
The bird peeps within the barbarity. And stars flare
above the unkind earth, consumed in blood…
Outside it is quiet. It is quiet before the storm…

Appendix F

“Zborov V”

On that day the sun shined,
in such a way that you would want to jump,
whoop, and thrown your cap high in the air,
with someone madly turn around, dance…

Oh, since morning our work has boomed,
whistling, hissing, burning shots,
above our head, it seems to you, a huge swarm
buzzes them overhead, the mad
world whirls,
and in front of us fumes, smoke, trenches, a cloud,
a black and ominous flank,
a fiery marker, secret stars,
rockets, a flaming apocalyptic
sight,
and again, a happy whirl and dance,
the feast of Balthazar,
when a secret hand writes in the darkness:
a mess, a gush, “fares” …

From sea to sea stand the German troops…
Behind them lies most beautifully the land…
And suddenly – like a strange wave,
like a mountain avalanche in the spring windstorms,
in a lunatic year
all the sweepings from the bloody paths
fly like hawks to the distant prey
three thousand!

They are not those, whom you saw yesterday,
fine and affectionate boys…
Transformation,
Their eyes burn,
everyone is in flames!
Each firmly grips his rifle,
bayonets are colored with human blood.
The sword is fiery above their heads…
And now there are no rifles,
Nor slim and flattering bayonets:
but there are knives
there are bombs---

Above us rises in the dark smoke
the spirit of a distant hero, the blind leader,
the famous fighter,
Heavily falls his mace
On old murderers, on the old cowards
From Tachov.
He does not abandon his children…
In their veins today flows the bandit blood
of our rebel and exacting ancestors,
the voice of history revives in them a fiery spirit,
a sacred appeal of a mythical soothsayer
through an enormous strength fills the heart,
everything that was beautiful and strong and free,
all the best, that gave us our race.
sounds today in them and changes the partitions
into hammers.

Before them is spread out horror and death.
the German troops
flee in blood
to Pomerania.
The roaring work— and the cheerless people’s land
saw a miracle. The battle quieted down.
On the field, where the golden harvest ripened,
A fiery wild growth of the poppies
blossomed into blood.

The battle quieted and ours were victorious.
They sing. They sleep. They dream of loved ones.
Evening approaches. The fires burn,
Above those who are buried the banners fly.
On the field the golden harvest ripens,
There lie the fallen, gashes in the head,
there lie Podmol, Strnad, and even Plšek…
Everyone smiles!

Appendix G

“Zborov VI”

On the Zborov plain
high above the Cecova
are the graves of brothers.
Big expanses of the golden wheat
Ripple all around, the wind blows,
The air hums a heroic song,
With glorious memories
Every pathway and ridge comes to life.
Every language sounds to be there,
The Teutonic hordes pass to be here,
The field is ours!

With smiles on withered lips there lie
One hundred of our brothers!
During the dark nights
On their mounded grave commemorations
The old Slavic gods celebrate.
During the blazing summer
The flaming red poppies grow!
From here sounds the appeal, from here sounds the order
To all, who hesitate, to all, who perish
In the dishonorable thrall!

Brothers, today open the faithful heart!
Do not forget!
And be alive
Through the ages with a holy fire
Of burning and heroic hearts,
Which are white and cold
For you and for your children
In the unlimited love and sacrifice
At Zborov!
(Translated by James W. Peterson)
Appendix H

Commentary on Rudolf Karel’s musical setting of Poem No. 3 by Rudolf Medek

The composition published by Rudolf Karel titled Zborov is, in fact, a setting of Medek’s third poem: Karel provides a 250-measure setting of a 48-line text. His setting is expansive and fantastical, with a number of imaginative procedures including canonic presentation of lines against a backdrop of different lines woven together and subdivided forces for special emphasis of selected text lines, and, importantly, structural use of the pre-existent text and tune “Slovan jsem” (“I am a Slav”). Karel succeeds in devising a rhetorically charged composition that builds effectively to a final climactic passage devoted to the final line, which is the declaration of the transformation of soldiers into strong—and potentially successful—warriors.

Karel composes an expansive passage in which the quoted lines—“I am a Slav”—are heard in middle of the texture (four measures of the melodic material from the pre-composed tune are heard intact). After the passage comes to a halt (marked by a fermata), Karel reconvenes with earlier lines of the stanza gathering insistently in a chordal almost chant-like manner, leading to a second presentation of the quoted lines and tune (here in the top voice, at this point) harmonized with mild chromatic tension (full-ensemble presentation) bringing the song, once again, to a standstill. In the next passage the composer appropriates only the rhythmic motive heard in the “Slovan jsem” tune (in conjunction with a new melody here, allied with text lines concerning “cannon shots and shrapnel” while preserving the rhythmic motive from the “Slovan jsem” tune).

Karel composes music for the last 8 lines which displays imaginative textural effects (4 voices often subdivided) in an extended and majestic passage characterized by insistence (achieved through repetition of text lines) culminating in a rhetorical reexamination of the last word (the passage includes moments of silence [rests] in a passage with adventurous harmonic shaping) and leading ultimately to a heroic presentation of the final word of the last line (full dynamic level [ff] for “vželezo” [iron]) with affirmation of the last word within a final cadential passage (fff) in 7-voice harmony which provides an effective and heroic resolution.

Appendix I

The “Hussite Chorale” and the Czech Legion: a brief commentary

In his setting of Medek’s fifth poem, the composer Jeremiáš adds a text and chorale tune aligned with the Hussites. Evidence suggests that the theme of the Hussites was vitally important to the Legion. As noted above, the four regiments of the Czechoslovak Legion were known as the “Hussite Division.” And the Hussite Chorale was part of the repertoire sung by the Legionnaires in their travels.
at this time. Charles Atherton published a volume of songs of the Czech Legion after the War, in New York. The collection includes 45 songs, among which are found the Hussite Chorale (the fourteenth song in the collection), “America,” and “The Star-Spangled Banner.” According to the preface to the volume, “these songs were sung day after day by the men of the Czecho-Slovak army, both in their camps in Russia, and also on their historic and unforgettable journey across Siberia.” Atherton worked with the Čecho-Slovak army as a YMCA secretary and as accompanist, on the reed organ or harmonium, which went with the troops on the train (preface to the 1921 volume). The volume of army songs was dedicated by Atherton to the troops and to Masaryk: “To these wonderful soldiers, my good friends, whom no one can admire and honor more than I, who had the rare privilege of becoming closely acquainted with them, and to their beloved ‘little father,’ as he is fondly called, T. G. Masaryk, first president of the Čecho-Slovak Republic, this volume is dedicated” (preface).
What the Western Portion of Northwest Florida Knew
About the Birth of Czechoslovakia in 1918:
A Case Study of Information Accessibility in Small-town and Rural America

Daniel E. Miller

The creation of Czechoslovakia, as a result of the First World War, was the culmination of national awakening movements among Czechs and Slovaks that were typical in the nineteenth and early years of the twentieth century in the Balkans and East-Central Europe. Few Americans, in the years from 1914 to 1918, knew much about the historical developments of the many ethnic groups between the Baltic and the Black Sea, but most were aware of some of the events related to the establishment of Czechoslovakia, along with other border changes that took place in Europe in the wake of the First World War. Like many small towns of America that had limited concentrations of Czechs, Slovaks, or other immigrants from the Baltics, East-Central Europe, and the Balkans, the inhabitants of the western portion of Northwest Florida knew only some of the sensational aspects of the state’s creation. Their main source of news was the Pensacola Journal, published in Pensacola, the county seat of Escambia County, Northwest Florida’s largest city and the host of a naval base. The Milton Gazette, from the small city of Milton, which lies less than 25 miles to the east of Pensacola and is the county seat of Santa Rosa County, also was a source of news for some.

Nevertheless, of all the newspapers in the region, the Pensacola Journal was by far the most important. Not only did it have a following in Escambia County but in other parts of Northwest Florida, including Okaloosa County, with its county seat of Crestview and its coastal community of Fort Walton Beach. The Pensacola Journal even had a “Fort Walton Page” that catered specifically to readers in that town. There were other newspapers in the area, but either no copies of them exist, or they contain little or no information about the Czechs and Slovaks.

1 Before vehicular bridges spanned Escambia Bay, the journey between Milton and Pensacola took riders and the newspapers about 30 minutes by train, with several departures each day, but ferry service also cut down the lengthy and contorted overland route. Ironically, it now takes at least 15 minutes longer to make the journey by automobile. The train and ferry no longer exist.

2 The best source of newspapers for the western part of Northwest Florida between 1914 and 1918 is Pace Library at the University of West Florida. In Escambia County, Florida’s westernmost county, there were two important newspapers in Pensacola. The first was the Pensacola Daily News, on the newsstands from 1889 to 1924. At some point in 1908, it became known as the Pensacola Evening News, and then it was called the Pensacola News, from 1909 to 1985. Pace Library’s holdings of the newspaper only begin in 1920. The Pensacola Journal, published between 1895 and 1985, competed with the Pensacola News. Pace Library has issues of the Pensacola Journal between 1914 and 1918, the period this study covers. The Pensacola Journal and the Pensacola News had the same owner beginning in 1924, with the former on arriving on doorsteps in the evening and the latter appearing in the morning. In 1985, the two merged to create the Pensacola News Journal, which continues publication. Since it traces its provenance from the Pensacola Daily News
When it began in August 1914, the war pitted the Entente or Allied Powers, at first Britain, France, Russia, Serbia, and Montenegro, against the principal Central Powers of the Habsburg Monarchy, that is, Austria-Hungary, and Germany. The number of countries on the Allied side increased: just weeks after the war had begun, Japan attacked German holdings in the Pacific; in May 1915, Italy sided with the Allies; in August 1916, Romania attacked Austria-Hungary; and in April 1917, the United States entered the war on the Allied side. The Central Powers expanded to include the Ottoman Empire, at the end of October 1915, and a year later, Bulgaria joined. Countries in other continents entered the fray, giving the war a global character.

Only the most basic news about the war came to the western part of Northwest Florida, particularly before America’s entry into the fray. Aside from coverage of a few major diplomatic events or military conflicts, the newspapers of the region carried stories, all from various wire services, that editors apparently felt might be appealing to readers. The headline of one of the front-page stories of the August 25, 1914 edition of the Milton Gazette read: “Austrians Flee the Servian Army.” The article related the surprise Serbian defeat of the Austrian military, in the first engagement of the war, at the Battle of Cer, which had raged from August 15 to 24. The article referred to documented atrocities on the part of Austro-Hungarian troops. Then, in the Christmas Day issue of 1914, the paper printed news about discontent in the Habsburg Monarchy and the desire, among the population, for peace. The report, based on the observations of a neutral

that began in 1889, the Pensacola News Journal celebrated its 125th anniversary in 2014, a century after the First World War began. The only other newspaper in Pensacola during the First World War was the Colored Citizen (1914-1948), but its content focused strictly on local affairs. Neighboring Santa Rosa County, to the east of Escambia County, only had the Milton Gazette (1910-1952). Situated east of Santa Rosa County is Okaloosa County, and at the time, its seat of government, Crestview, had three newspapers. The Okaloosa News appeared between 1915 and 1918, but Pace Library only has the issues between June and September 1917, in which there are no references to the Czechs and Slovaks. The Pace Library holdings for the Okaloosa News-Journal, which succeeded the Okaloosa News and was published in 1918-1934, only start in 1919. The Okaloosa County Journal had a brief life span, from 1917 to 1918, but Pace Library has only one issue, from November 1917. There were other newspapers in Northwest Florida, such as those in Defuniak Springs (Walton County), Bonifay (Holmes County), Chipley (Washington County), and Panama City (Bay County), but their coverage of international affairs was limited. Given the distance of many Northwest Florida’s Gulf Coast communities from the large population center of Escambia County as well as their relatively small size, with respect to Pensacola, it is likely that they had occasional access to the Pensacola newspapers. For example, the inhabitants of Fort Walton Beach, which had no newspaper of its own until 1946, relied almost exclusively on the newspapers from Pensacola. I appreciate the work of Dean DeBolt of the University of West Florida, University Archives and West Florida History Center, and his staff for helping to identify Pace Library’s holdings of the newspapers in the Pensacola area that are in the Periodical Department and the University Archives and West Florida History Center.

diplomat in Vienna, Austria, noted that “another phase of the situation said to be disquieting to the Austrian government is the report from the Czech part of Bohemia and [the Slovak part of] Hungary that sympathy with the war is rapidly diminishing there.”

The Milton Gazette had a more local flavor than did Pensacola’s. For example, toward the end of the war, one of its front-page stories revealed that Italians had discovered that the Austro-Hungarian army was eating bread that had 32 percent oat flour and the rest a combination of straw, sticks, and ground wood. Immediately under that article was news that a couple was moving into Milton from the Panama City area and a notice that read: “FOR SALE–A good fresh milk cow. Call on or address Silas Holland, Route A, Milton, Fla.”

It seemed that, to the newspaper’s editor, news from abroad, even if it pertained to humanity’s most devastating war to date, was printworthy if it was gripping enough and if it filled any remaining space in the issue.

One news item that involved Slovaks and Czechs in America was about the controversy surrounding Konstantin Dumba (1856-1947), the Austro-Hungarian ambassador to the United States between 1913 and 1915. In August 1915, the British found documents on an American journalist they had arrested because of his ties with German and Austro-Hungarian diplomats. The seized papers revealed that Dumba had attempted to instigate strikes among the workers of the Bethlehem, PA, steel and munitions factories. Many of these were Slovaks, and once word about Dunba appeared in the press, they condemned his actions. On September 13, 1915, a front-page Pensacola Journal headline, with drop heads, read, “Slovak Leagues Condemn Acts of Mr. Dumba. Former Subjects of Austria-Hungary Hold Meetings in Many Cities. Resent Attempt at Interference. Say They Are Loyal to Their New Country Not Austria.” That article, with a dateline from Boston, and two others from Chicago and New York recounted how Slovak and Czech associations soundly condemned Dumba and expressed their loyalty to the United States.

Throughout the war, the Americans and others in the Allied camp knew multinational Austria-Hungary as the “prison of nationalities,” a misconceived notion, since none of the nationalities clamored for independence in the early stages of the hostilities. Only Poles, who had lost their state to Russia, Austria,

---

4 “Austria Ready for Peace Says Report,” Milton Gazette, December 25, 1914, 1. Failing to distinguish between Czechs and Slovaks, like the author of this report, is common for those who are not acquainted with Slavic ethnic groups. As for as the growing lack of support for the war among Czechs and Slovaks, the diplomat’s assessment was correct.

5 “Austrians Devour Sticks, Straw, Hay,” Milton Gazette, June 28, 1918, 1.


7 Austria became Austria-Hungary through the Ausgleich (Compromise) of 1867 with the Hungarians. As a result of the agreement, the Austrian Empire and the Kingdom of
and Prussia, in three partitions during the latter decades of the eighteenth century, thought about recreating their state, but noted Poles could not agree on a single plan for reunification. Furthermore, Poles in the Austrian portion of the Habsburg Monarchy had a large measure of self-government and were the least interested in change. The Czechs also were part of Austria, which was a developing into a democracy and gave each ethnic group the rights to use their own language, have their own schools, publish their own literature, and organize their own political parties. The deputies to the Imperial Reichsrat, Austria’s legislature in Vienna, represented all males over the age of 24 and all the ethnic groups in Austria—the Germans as well as the Slavic Czechs, Poles, Slovenes, and others. The Kingdom of Hungary was different, in part because the development of democracy there lagged behind that of Austria. The Hungarians pursued a policy of Magyarization that encouraged all subjects to speak Hungarian and to assimilate into Hungarian culture. Hungary also had a narrow franchise that favored the ethnic-Hungarian middle and upper classes. As a result, the Romanians of Transylvania, the West-Slavic Slovaks and the East-Slavic Rusyns of so-called Northern Hungary, and the South-Slavic Serbs of the Banat found it nearly impossible to secure adequate representation in the Hungarian Parliament in Budapest, to publish newspapers and books, or to educate their children in anything besides Magyar. Only the Croats had some limited rights, which they often felt were under attack. “A prison of nationalities” might have been a more appropriate moniker for Hungary than Austria, but even ethnic groups in Hungary initially gave little thought to independence or joining another state. What was on the minds of Austro-Hungarian subjects, including some Germans and Hungarians, was that the war would prompt the Monarchy to become more democratic.

Under these circumstances, it is not surprising that the Czechs were mystified when Tomáš Garrigue Masaryk (1850-1937), a Czech with an American wife as Hungary had independent internal administrations and pursued separate internal policies, but they remained unified in matters of diplomacy, defense, and common finances. They shared a monarch, and Franz Joseph (1830-1916, reigned 1848-1916), of the Habsburg dynasty, served as the emperor of Austria and the king of Hungary. Upon his death in 1916, Charles (1887-1922, reigned 1916-1918) became king of Hungary and emperor of Austria. Everything in common was imperial and royal (kaiserlich und königlich), which is why the Austro-Hungarian Army was the k.u.k. Armee, and the Austro-Hungarian Navy was the k.u.k. Kriegsmarine. In 1908, when Austria-Hungary annexed Bosnia-Herzegovina, the province was neither Austrian nor Hungarian but a joint possession that the Imperial and Royal Ministry of Finance administered.

8 The Austrian half of the Monarchy also had some Italians, a small number of Romanians, and a few Slavic Rusyns and Serbo-Croatians. Most of the Rusyns, Serbs, Croats, and Romanians in the Monarchy were in Hungary. Roma (Gypsies), Germans, and Jews were scattered throughout the Monarchy. In 1907, universal manhood suffrage became law in the Austrian half of the Monarchy. Hungary maintained a restricted franchise.

9 The Croats and Hungarians negotiated the Nagodba (Serbo-Croatian: Sporazum; trans.: agreement) in 1868, which gave Croatia judicial, educational, administrative, and linguistic autonomy as well as a legislature, known as the Sabor. The Croats also had a fixed number of 30 Croat representatives in the 413-member Hungarian Parliament in Budapest.
well as a deputy in the Austrian Reichsrat and a professor who had lectured at the University of Chicago in 1902 and 1907, left Austria-Hungary, at the beginning of the war, when he was 64 years old, to begin a struggle to create an independent state. Masaryk’s former student, Edvard Beneš (1884-1948), eventually joined him abroad. Within a short time, they added a third colleague, a Slovak astronomer who had become a French citizen, Milan Rastislav Štefánik (1890-1919), and the notion of Czech independence transformed into the idea of a Czechoslovak state. Masaryk and his associates carried on a propaganda effort aimed at the politicians, diplomats, and inhabitants of the major Allied powers: Britain; France; Russia; Japan; Italy, and the United States. Meanwhile, a select and secret group of politicians in Prague called the Czech Mafia, a name they had adopted because they imitated the intrigue of the Sicilian gangsters, worked with Masaryk to separate the Bohemian Lands from Austria-Hungary. ¹⁰ Other Czechs, mainly the Social Democratic party leaders and their adherents as well as Antonín Švehla (1873-1933) and his supporters in the Agrarian party, prepared for any eventuality, either the continuation of a reformed Austria-Hungary or its demise. With the outbreak of the war, many important Slovak politicians in Hungary were in prison, but most hoped for democratic reforms by the war’s end.

Ultimately, the idea of Czech and Slovak unity gained in popularity at home and abroad. Slovak and Czech leaders in Europe and America opted for union, partly for geopolitical and economic reasons. Furthermore, the Slovaks and Czechs are closely related, and the two West Slavic ethnic groups have mutually intelligible languages. Finally, it was the harsh Treaty of Brest-Litovsk the Central Powers imposed on Bolshevik Russia, on March 3, 1918, that convinced the Slavs in the Habsburg Monarchy that German and Hungarian repression would increase if the Central Powers won the war. In April 1918, Masaryk arrived in the United States, a year after it had entered the war. He visited cities with large Czech and Slovak populations, such as New York, Pittsburgh, Cleveland, and Chicago, and representatives of the two ethnic groups in America negotiated with Masaryk and his associates about the structure of the future state. The most important meeting took place in Pittsburgh. After a parade through the city on Decoration (Memorial) Day, May 31, 1918, Masaryk as well as Czech and Slovak representatives signed the Pittsburgh Pact that pledged to join the two nations in one democratic state that would give broad autonomy to Slovakia. In Pittsburgh were a number of immigrant Rusyns, an East Slavic group, who wanted their homeland to separate from Hungary but knew it could not form a viable state. A Pittsburgh lawyer, Gregory I. Zhatkovich (1886-1967), who had been born in Hungary and who was ethnically Rusyn, met with Masaryk and made arrangements for the Rusyns to receive autonomy in the new Czechoslovak state. The Rusyns confirmed this agreement with a referendum after the war.

¹⁰ Although most of those in the Mafia wanted an independent state, a few in the conservative National Democratic party envisioned that the historic Kingdom of Bohemia would unite with a reformed, democratic Russia under the tsar. Similarly, the Polish National Democrats expected that an enlarged Poland would be associated with a democratized Russia.
The desire to create a state did not mean that the Allies automatically accepted what amounted to the breakup of Austria-Hungary. They listened to Masaryk and Beneš, but they did not recognize the Czechoslovak National Council as an official government, until near the end of the war. For example, Woodrow Wilson (1856-1924; president, 1913-1921), in his January 1918 “Fourteen Points,” did not demand the dissolution of Austria-Hungary, even though he called for the recreation of Poland and the restoration of Serbia, the South Slavic state that had been at the center of the controversy that had inaugurated the war. While in America, Masaryk sought a meeting with Wilson, and he only gained access to the White House through the intervention of his long-time friend, Charles R. Crane (1858-1939), a supporter of Wilson, an amateur student of Slavic and Middle Eastern affairs, and the owner of the Crane Co., which made plumbing fixtures. When they first met in June 1918, Masaryk was unable to gain Wilson’s support for Czechoslovak independence. Masaryk also failed to convince Wilson that the United States should encourage the Japanese to invade Siberia and that America should recognize the Bolshevik government, in an effort to isolate the Germans. The American recognition of the Czechoslovak National Council would have to wait, but the 90,000 soldiers who comprised the Czechoslovak Legions ensured it.

Many Czech and Slovak soldiers in the Austro-Hungarian military who had become prisoners of war in Italy, France, and Russia during battle or because of desertion formed legions that associated with Masaryk’s movement and helped the Allies to defeat the Central Powers. The largest and most famous was in Russia. At least 60,000 (some claim as many as 70,000) Czechs and Slovaks fought the Central Powers in Russia, but they could not continue to do so after the new Bolshevik regime had signed the March 1918 Brest-Litovsk Treaty with the Central Powers. The Germans insisted that the Russians disarm the Czechoslovak Legionnaires, whom they claimed were preventing the former German prisoners of war from returning to Germany and fighting on the Western Front. On May

---

11 Specifically, Wilson wrote that “the peoples of Austria-Hungary, whose place among the nations we wish to see safeguarded and assured, should be accorded the freest opportunity to autonomous development.” In the “Fourteen Points,” Wilson demanded not only the restoration of Serbia but also Montenegro and Romania, all on the allied side. He made no reference to the Romanians in Hungarian Transylvania or to Albania, which had come into existence after the First Balkan War (1912-1913) and which Serbia and Greece then Austria-Hungary and Greece had occupied.


14 Tomáš G. Masaryk, The Making of a State: Memories and Observations, 1914-1918, arranged and Introduction by Henry Wickham Steed (George Allen and Unwin Ltd., 1927;
25, 1918, shortly after Masaryk had arrived in America, a conflict broke out between the Bolsheviks and the Czechoslovak Legion. Masaryk wanted to preserve the uneasy peace between the legionnaires and the Bolsheviks, but the unplanned incident unwillingly drew the Czechs and Slovaks into the Russian civil war and made them heroes to those who opposed communism. Masaryk determined that the best alternative would be to use the Trans-Siberian Railway to get the legionnaires to Vladivostok, the eastern terminus of the railway and a port on the Pacific Coast, in order to transfer them the Western Front in France. Meanwhile, Wilson wanted the legionnaires to stay in Russia and keep open as much of the nearly 5,800-mile long railway as possible, in order to supply the White armies. The situation in Siberia gave Masaryk little choice but to support the legionnaires’ struggle against the Bolsheviks and to comply with Wilson’s wishes, and Masaryk came to recognize that the legionnaires’ successes on the battlefield strengthened the Czechoslovak case for independence in the eyes of Wilson and the Allies.

News regarding the Czech and Slovak legionnaires in Russia reached the Gulf Coast on July 6, 1918, when the Pensacola Journal carried a dispatch, from the previous day, stating that Czechoslovak Legionnaires had defeated the Bolsheviks in Irkutsk, just a few miles to the west of Lake Baikal, and had cleared the Bolsheviks from the region.15 A few days later, on July 12, the newspaper reported that the Czechs and Slovaks had possession of an 850-mile territory east of Novosibirsk, specifically from Tobolsk southward to Semy (then known as Semipalatinsk), and that they controlled the Trans-Siberian Railway from Chelyabinsk, in the southern part of the Urals, to Krasnoyarsk, on the Yenisei River, a distance greater than 2,000 kilometers (1,243 miles). The Czechs and Slovaks thus dominated a major section of Western Siberia.16 Soon afterward, during a four-week period in July-August 1918, the legionnaires gained control of the tunnels before Lake Baikal, and the evacuation of the legionnaires from Western Siberia now proceeded smoothly.

In August 1918, the Americans and Japanese agreed to send soldiers to Russia’s Pacific port of Vladivostok to assist the Czech and Slovak legionnaires’
preparations to depart for Europe. Wilson also provided seven million dollars to fund the venture. On September 1, at Olovyannaya, about 1,200 kilometers (746 miles) east of Irkutsk, the legionnaires, making their way eastward, met with Allied forces, advancing westward, from Vladivostok. One legionnaire, in his memoir, exclaimed: “That meant the strength of the Bolsheviks in Central Siberia was completely broken and the entire railway, from the Urals to Vladivostok, was in our hands!” The path for evacuating the legionnaires was clear, but the operation still involved further military engagements and required a great deal of time. Two days later, on September 3, the United States recognized the Czechoslovak National Council as a de facto government and an ally against Austria-Hungary and Germany. The next day, September 4, 1918, the Pensacola Journal carried the news that Washington had recognized the Czechoslovak National Council, noting the need for “a new alignment of the demands upon Germany and Austria-Hungary at the peace table” and the likelihood that the recognition will provide the Czechoslovak Legionnaires in Russia “with much needed war materials and supplies.”

Another brief mention of the situation in Siberia occurred on October 6, 1918, when a report appeared in the Pensacola Journal that the French General Maurice Janin (1862-1946) had taken command of the Czechoslovak Legionnaires. At its creation, the Czechoslovak Legion in Russia was attached to the Russian army, and after the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk, it came under the French. Janin had been part of the French military mission in Russia before the Bolshevik takeover, and since he was well aware of the situation in the country, his work with the legionnaires was crucial. Janin also had experience with the 10,000 Czech and Slovak legionnaires in France, and although he was the commander-in-chief of all the legionnaires—those in Italy, where there were approximately 20,000 legionnaires, France, and Russia—he concentrated his efforts on the situation in Russia.

It was not until 7 October that an article appeared, in the Pensacola Journal, which explained the origins of the Czechs and Slovaks. Readers learned that there are two branches of Slavs that accounted for 9.5 million out of the 12.5 million
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17 Masaryk, Making of a State, 256.
19 František Václav Krejčí, U sibiřské armády [With the Siberian Army], Knihovna Památníku odboje, no. 24 (Prague: Nákladem Památníku Odboje, 1922), 55.
20 The international recognition of Masaryk’s National Council, as the future government of Czechoslovakia, came gradually. For example, the United Kingdom recognized the National Council in May 1918; France did so in June 1918. Another round of recognitions came in the month before the end of the war, when the Allied powers acknowledged the provisional Czechoslovak government and Masaryk as the head of state.
22 “Leads Czechs,” Pensacola Journal, October 6, 1918, 1. On October 12, 1918, 2, the newspaper published a picture of five soldiers titled “Czecho-Slovak Troops in Italy” that had no additional information in the caption and was not related to an article.
23 On Janin’s role as the commander-in-chief, see Masaryk, Making of a State, 263.
inhabitants in the 50,000-square-mile area they were hoping to make independent from Austria-Hungary, but the article contained no information about the remaining three million people, largely Germans and Hungarians, neither of whom had any interest in becoming part of a Czechoslovak state. The author framed both historical and current events through the distorted lens of wartime propaganda that encouraged a mentality of “us versus them.” The article inaccurately stated that the “Czechoslovaks struggled against German and Magyar violence for one thousand years,” and that the “Hapsburgs [sic.] destroyed the last vestiges of their independence” in the seventeenth century, which was correct for the Kingdom of Bohemia but had nothing to do with Slovakia, which the Hungarians had ruled since the early tenth century. The author explained how Slovaks and Czechs had deserted to fight on the Allied side and that, in Russia, they formed a “second eastern front” against “German and Magyar brutality …Bolshevik treason.”

In late October 1918, the success of the Czechoslovak Legionnaires in Russia again made news along Florida’s Gulf Coast. A brief article in the Pensacola Journal, from a dispatch dated October 20, 1918 in Shanghai, stated that Bolshevik forces that had advanced toward the Russian city of Yekaterinburg, just north of Chelyabinsk, faced defeat at the hands of the Czechoslovak Legionnaires and their White Russian allies. The Bolsheviks lost 1,000 men, three armored

24 “Czechoslovaks,” Pensacola Journal, October 7, 1918, 4. When Czechoslovakia came into existence, it had 54,206 square miles (140,394 square kilometers). Its population, as of 1921, was 13.4 million, of which there were approximately 6.7 million Czechs and 2 million Slovaks. The number is imprecise because the authorities did not distinguish between Czechs and Slovaks. There were 3.1 million Germans throughout Czechoslovakia, mostly in the Bohemian Lands, along with 745,000 Hungarians, and approximately 400,000 Rusyns. Státní úřad statistický, Statistická příručka Republiky československé [Statistical Handbook of the Czechoslovak Republic], vol. 2 (Prague: Státní úřad statistický, 1925), table XIII-7, 362-363.

25 “Austria after the War,” Pensacola Journal, October 11, 1918, 1.
trains, along with 11 locomotives, and 60 machine guns. The Czechs and Slovaks had taken the city earlier, in July 1918, and their approach made history. The Bolsheviks had detained former Tsar Nicholas II (1868-1918; reigned, 1894-1917), his wife, and children in Yekaterinburg, and as the Czechoslovak Legionnaires advanced on the city, unaware of the Romanovs’ presence there, the Bolshevik guard murdered the entire royal family to prevent them from being rescued and becoming a rallying point for the counter-revolutionary forces.

In the late autumn of 1918, as the White armies showed their ineffectiveness against the Bolsheviks, Wilson realized that continuing to support the Whites was futile and finally agreed with Masaryk that the legionnaires should assemble in Vladivostok for evacuation. In 1918, events in Russia made pragmatists of both Masaryk, who ultimately had agreed with Wilson that his legions should resist the Bolsheviks, and now Wilson. The legionnaires’ saga continued. The first legionnaires began their journey, from Vladivostok to Europe, in December 1919, more than a year after the First World War had ended, and it was not until 1920 that the last arrived home. In his memoirs, Masaryk commented that “without our propaganda abroad, without our diplomatic work and the blood of our Legions we should not have achieved our independence.”

Throughout October and into the first half of November 1918, Masaryk carried on his activities in America. He issued the Washington Declaration, on October 18, 1918, that officially announced the creation of Czechoslovakia. No news of Masaryk’s efforts in America appeared in the Pensacola Journal, but two days after the Washington Declaration, it published a report that America had rejected a peace proposal from Austria-Hungary and summarized Wilson’s rationale: “there can be no talk of peace with the Austro-Hungarian government except on a basis of complete liberty for the Czecho-Slovaks and other subject nationalities as free members of the family of nations. The justice of the national aspirations of the Jugo-Slavs has also been recognized and mere autonomy is no longer to be accepted.” On October 26, Masaryk proclaimed the country’s independence, in Philadelphia, at Independence Hall. In Prague, on October 28, unaware of Masaryk’s October 26 announcement, leaders of the Czech National Committee, which several political parties had formed, along with one key Slovak politician, who had arrived in Prague after having been released from a Hungarian prison, also proclaimed Czechoslovak independence and assumed power, based on “an understanding” with Masaryk’s National Council.

27 Kalvoda, “Masaryk in America,” 96 and 98.
28 Masaryk, Making of a State, 265.
29 “Austria’s Peace Proposal Is Not Accepted,” Pensacola Journal, October 20, 1918, 1. The Austro-Hungarian government had sent its peace proposal on 4 October, but Wilson did not respond until October 19.
30 Sbírka zákonů a nařízení [Collection of Laws and Orders], Law 11, October 28, 1918. Although this was the first law of the republic, it was the eleventh that the Revolutionary National Assembly officially adopted after independence.
activists independently issued the Martin Declaration that proclaimed the separation Slovakia from Hungary and the creation of a Czechoslovak state.

On October 21, a week before the declaration of Czechoslovak independence in Prague, the Austrian Reichsrat had formed a National Assembly, had begun taking over administrative offices, and had proclaimed the independence of Austrian-German areas from the Monarchy. On October 29, the Croats declared their independence and then their association with what was to become the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes, later known as Yugoslavia. On October 31, the Aster or Chrysanthemum Revolution took place in Budapest that installed a new government. Charles and his cabinet no longer were in control of the state. On November 3, 1918, with its forces in retreat, the Austro-Hungarian military signed the Armistice of Villa Giusti, near Padua, Italy, concluding hostilities with the Italians and effectively ending the Austro-Hungarian military’s participation in the First World War.\(^{31}\) The *Pensacola Journal* carried the news of the armistice with the Italians on November 5, and the article noted that “Vienna was delirious with joy when it learned that an armistice had been declared. The streets were crowded with men, women and children crying and embracing each other. The general opinion is that food will follow peace.”\(^{32}\) In a nearby article, the newspaper also noted that “the Czech[oslovak] National Committee, with the aid of Czech[oslovak] troops, is disarming German, Austrian and Hungarian troops in Czech towns of Bohemia and Moravia.” The article also stated that the Czechoslovak authorities had occupied several predominantly ethnic-German towns.\(^{33}\) Unfortunately, there was no explanation that Germans, in various areas of the Bohemian Lands, had proclaimed their association with Austria, with the expectation that Wilson’s promise of self-determination would enable them to create a Greater Germany.\(^{34}\)

As the fighting continued on the Western Front, Northwest Florida received news from the trenches. On 5 November 1918, the *Pensacola Journal* published a

\(^{31}\) Hungary technically remained in the war, attempting to hold its territory, until it signed an armistice, on November 13, with the French, in Belgrade.

\(^{32}\) “Austrians Are Joyous over Peace,” *Pensacola Journal*, November 5, 1918, 1. The article noted that “little interest was manifested in the report that Emperor Charles had abdicated,” but Charles had not abdicated, and only on November 11 did he issue a decree (still not technically an abdication) that “the people have taken over the government through their representatives. I will not participate in state affairs.” An image of the document printed for distribution is available at Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Bildarchiv Austria, “Verzichtserklärung Kaiser Karls–Bekanntmachung” [Declaration of Emperor Charles–Announcement], November 11, 1918, at http://www.bildarchivaustria.at/Pages/ImageDetail.aspx?p_iBildID=15827723.

\(^{33}\) “Czechs Are Disarming Austrians in Bohemia,” *Pensacola Journal*, November 5, 1918, 1.

\(^{34}\) For a contemporary historian’s account of the events in the German areas of the Bohemian Lands, shortly after the creation of Czechoslovakia, see Jan Opočenský, *Vznik národních států v říjnu 1918* [The Development of the National State in October 1918], Publikaci archivu Ministerstva zahraničních věcí, řada 1, no. 2, and Politická knihovna, řada 1, kniha 12 (Prague: Nakladatelství “Orbis,” 1927), 195-219.
report from a wire service known as the Newspaper Enterprise Association, Inc., that two American Catholic chaplains, Fr. Józef L. Jaworsky, C.S.Sp. (1881-1962), from Pittsburgh, who ministered to Polish soldiers, and Fr. Alphonse Biskup, O.S.B. (1887-1958) from Oak Park, Illinois, who pastored Czech soldiers and was the first American priest to join as a private in the First World War, had reported that, during their first engagement, Czech immigrants with the American army had fought bravely in France and had captured more Germans than they had sustained losses. In less than a week, on November 11, 1918, the war with Germany ended. Three days later, on November 14, the Revolutionary National Assembly in Prague elected Masaryk president of Czechoslovakia. Shortly afterward, Masaryk departed New York for Europe and arrived in Prague, on December 21, 1918, to a hero’s welcome.

The local newspapers kept the residents of West Florida informed about the peace negotiations that took place for more than seven months, after the signing of the armistice, but the focus was on President Wilson and the American involvement in the process. There were no details about the new or restructured states along the Baltic, in Central Europe, or in the Balkans. On November 19, 1918, shortly after the armistice, the Pensacola Journal included a photograph, on the first page, of the Gothic tower on the Old Town approach to Charles Bridge, which stone masons had built in 1357 and to this day joins the Old Town of Prague to the Lesser Side and the roads to Prague Castle. The caption read: “This beautiful bridge is built over the Modau [sic.] river at Prague, the capital of the Czecho-Slovak republic, the first new nation to arise out of this war.”

Aside

Unfortunately, the article, as printed, is incomplete. Another article appeared in the Pensacola Journal, on the first page of the November 8, 1918 issue, titled “Czecho-Slovaks Call Many to Army Service” that reads:

Amsterdam, Nov. 7—All men liable to military service up to 26 years of age throughout Czecho-Slovakia have been called to the colors, according to a Prague dispatch to the Weser Zeitung of Bremen. It is said that this order includes German-Bohemia. Comments in the Czech press indicate that the mobilization is against Germany.

The CzechoSlovak laws and government decrees include no such order. Word of conscription and the creation of an army in the new CzechoSlovak state may have been a rumor, one of many that abounded in Central Europe as the war was ending and political upheaval approached. In reality, CzechoSlovakia lacked a credible defense force at the time. Before the return of the legionnaires to CzechoSlovakia, the authorities had to rely on the gendarmerie, the Sokol gymnastic society, and the poorly equipped and exhausted Czechs and Slovaks from the former Austro-Hungarian military to maintain order and protect the country’s borders. These were largely ineffective, in May through July 1919, against the communist regime in Hungary, which invaded Slovakia and Ruthenia and established there short-lived communist puppet states. It was not until March 1920 that the National Assembly adopted a law regarding the military and conscription.


from misspelling the Moldau (Czech: Vltava) River and improperly inserting a hyphen in the country’s name, the caption mistakenly identified Czechoslovakia as the first new state to emerge from the war. Nevertheless, the newspaper alerted its readers to the fact that the Slovaks and Czechs had been successful in creating the state they had desired. The news about the Treaty of Versailles in the *Pensacola Journal* contained no mention of Czechoslovakia.

Reports occasionally appeared about the situation in Europe after the armistice, but they occasionally were inaccurate or did not provide enough information for the reader to understand specific events. For example, the *Milton Gazette* reported, on November 22, 1918, that, according to the British diplomat Lord Robert Cecil (1864-1958), the Germans were planning to form a federation of 94 million people, with the former Kaiser Wilhelm II (1859-1941; reigned, 1888-1918) at its head. Many indeed wanted a Greater Germany, not just in Germany but also in Austria, the German parts of Czechoslovakia and Switzerland, and elsewhere, but the claim that a “German-inspired revolution for this purpose...[was] brewing” was an exaggeration. At any rate, the Allies had no intent of permitting such an association from emerging.

Three of the peace treaties ending the First World War—Versailles with Germany (June 28, 1919), St. Germain with Austria (September 10, 1919), and Trianon with Hungary (June 4, 1920)—solidified the creation of Czechoslovakia. On May 7, 1919, the Germans received the draft of the Versailles Treaty, and they protested its harsh conditions and unsuccessfully attempted to alter the text. Many diplomats and politicians feared that the fighting would resume if Germany did not acquiesce and sign the treaty. The *Pensacola Journal* even published a map that showed seven potential routes the invading Allies, including the Poles and Czechoslovaks, would take on their push toward Berlin. The Germans signed,

---

37 The collapse of tsarist Russia in March 1917, the treaty of Brest-Litovsk, and the Russian civil war spawned several Ukrainian states, before the end of the First World War. Even the Austrians had proclaimed a republic before the Czechs and Slovaks.

38 See *Pensacola Journal*, June 29, 1919, 1.

39 “Claim Huns Forming a New Federation,” *Milton Gazette*, November 22, 1918, 1. Furthermore, there was one sentence in the report that stated: “The former Kaiser is reported behind Ebert, Max and Hindenberg.” Without any context, the reader would not have known that the reference likely was to the so-called Ebert-Groener Pact that Friedrich Ebert (1871-1925), the Social Democratic chancellor, struck with Wilhelm Groener (1867-1939), the quartermaster general of the army, to guarantee the loyalty of the military to the new democratic German Weimar Republic. Maximilian von Baden (1867-1929) served as chancellor of Germany, in October and November 1918, and attempted to steer Germany through an armistice, establish a government that had the confidence of the majority parties in the Reichstag, and secure the Kaiser’s abdication, which he arranged and announced on 9 November. Given their role in the German revolution, neither Ebert nor Max von Baden would have had dealings with Wilhelm. At the time of the revolution, Paul von Hindenburg (1847-1934), the chief of the General Staff, had lost confidence in Wilhelm II, did nothing to prevent him from abdicating, and would not have been involved in attempting to reinstall him on the throne.

40 “Seven Roads to a Dictated Peace,” *Pensacola News Journal*, June 17, 1919, 1.
rendering further hostilities unnecessary. Czechoslovakia received only about 120 square miles of German territory known as Hlučínsko, which is northeast of the city of Ostrava. It was a sliver of the Silesian territory that Bohemia had lost to Prussia, during the 1740-1748 War of Austrian Succession. As the negotiations progressed with the Germans, readers of the *Pensacola Journal* could view another map, on the front page of the June 9, 1919 edition, with no explanation or accompanying article, that showed the location of Czechoslovakia, with respect to the other successor states of the Habsburg Monarchy.41

With the peace treaties signed and ratified, politicians in Czechoslovakia were making progress with the task of consolidating the state. The Germans in Czechoslovakia, residing largely in the mountains that outline the western border of the Bohemian Lands, known as the Sudetenland, had hoped that, after the First World War, they would join with Austria and ultimately a greater Germany, under Wilson’s banner of self-determination, but the Allies ignored their claims and prohibited a German-Austrian union or Anschluß. The Sudeten Germans initially refused to participate in Czechoslovak civic life, but in 1920, several German so-called activist parties entered the legislature. In 1926, two German activist parties joined the government, and representatives of one or two of the three strongest German activist parties held ministries, in subsequent cabinets, until the end of the republic. Masaryk remained Czechoslovakia’s president until 1935, when he abdicated because of ill health. Upon Masaryk’s death, in September 1937, the *Pensacola Journal* carried a brief front-page announcement from the Associated Press of his passing.42 Succeeding Masaryk as president was Beneš, who had to contend with not only the continuing economic problems of the Great Depression but also the unyielding demands of the rapidly strengthening fascist Sudeten German party, which enjoyed the financial and political backing of Nazi Germany. The irredentist policies of Germany began to gnaw at the integrity of the Czechoslovak state, and Adolf Hitler (1889-1945) threatened war. In late September 1938, French and British statesmen abandoned Czechoslovakia, during negotiations with Hitler in Munich. They acquiesced to Hitler’s demands and signed the Munich Agreement that partitioned Czechoslovakia, giving the Sudetenland to Germany. Without the collective security that had been the underpinning of the Versailles Order, rump Czechoslovakia fell into the orbit of Nazi Germany.

Throughout its twenty-year history, Czechoslovakia, a multinational state of Czechs, Slovaks, Germans, Rusyns, Hungarians, Poles, Jews, and others, respected minority rights, backed the postwar arrangement in Europe, and supported the League of Nations. As a multiparty state in which no single party ever gained a majority of votes in the parliamentary elections, Czechoslovakia relied on a series of center-left, center-right, and broad coalitions to bridge the gaps that resulted from ethnic, religious, economic, and ideological divisions. The

---

leading politicians cultivated a culture of compromise that enabled Czechoslovakia to be economically prosperous, socially progressive, and democratic. The country’s consociational democracy, a term social scientists also use to describe Belgium, Switzerland, and a number of other deeply divided democratic societies, was imperfect, as is the case with any other democracy, especially when it came to satisfying some of the demands of its minorities. Nevertheless, it thrived. Along with Finland, it was the only successor state of the defunct German, Russian, and Austro-Hungarian multinational empires whose democracy survived throughout the interwar years. 43

America played a role in Czechoslovakia’s creation, and Wilson understood the significance of that accomplishment. When, in 1923, former President Wilson received a delegation from Czechoslovakia that presented him with two albums of photographs of all the locations in Czechoslovakia bearing his name, including the main railway station in Prague, formerly Kaiser-Franz-Josef-Bahnhof, Wilson penned a note of thanks to Masaryk, in which he stated: “I hope that everything goes happily with yourself and the admirable little republic over which you preside. It is a matter of intense pride with me to have had some part in bringing it into the family of nations.” 44

Almost a century before the advent of instant news that is part of the information revolution of today, residents of Florida’s Gulf Coast received some of the basic details about the efforts to create a Czechoslovak state through more than a dozen articles in the Pensacola Journal and even some from the Milton Gazette that came from several wire services. The reporting reflected the bias that the First World War generated, especially when it came to casting the Central Powers and the Bolsheviks in a negative light. It also revealed some of the inaccuracies that resulted from a lack of knowledge about the history of Central Europe, a trend which continues in the American media. The news in the Pensacola Journal and Milton Gazette about the creation of Czechoslovakia was limited, which is not surprising, given the fact that there were no ties, ethnic or otherwise, between the Gulf Coast and what was to become Czechoslovakia. The coverage also was haphazard, focusing on the exploits of the Czech and Slovak legionnaires in Russia and ignoring the activities of Masaryk and the negotiations between Masaryk and President Wilson. For example, Masaryk’s name never appeared in the reports about the Slovaks and Czechs during the war or the treaty negotiations, and the first time that the Pensacola Journal mentioned Masaryk by name was when he died.

Those who regularly and thoroughly read the *Pensacola Journal* during the war years had a fundamental grasp of the determination and ultimately the success of Czechs and Slovaks to separate from the Habsburg Monarchy and to create an independent republic. The newspaper did not contain enough information, however, to give readers a sufficient understanding of the basis of Czechoslovak democracy, including its potential pitfalls. Czechoslovakia was only one of the new, expanded, and recreated states along the Baltic and in East-Central Europe and the Balkans, and coverage of these regions, in the *Pensacola Journal* and the *Milton Gazette*, during the First World War, was no better or worse than it was for the more prominent European states. Even information about the newly minted democratic German Weimar Republic was sparse. If the electorate fears what it does not know, then it seems only logical that, when Americans considered the implications of the Versailles Treaty, with its proposal for the United States to join the League of Nations, fear of the unknown contributed to the spirit of isolationism. In Pensacola and the western portion of Northwestern Florida, as in many American small cities, towns, and rural areas, limited information about world events spawned hesitancy.
After the May 1935 Czechoslovak parliamentary elections, Edvard Beneš (1884-1948), the country’s foreign minister and close associate of the president, Tomáš G. Masaryk (1850-1937), became convinced that he could garner enough votes in the National Assembly to win the presidential election. Masaryk, already 87 years old, was anxious to resign because of health reasons, and although he could not be active in arranging supporters for Beneš, Masaryk delayed any public announcement about his resignation until Beneš was certain of victory. In the meantime, as the Social Democrats, their allies in the National Socialist party, and some of the politicians in the Czechoslovak People’s party lined up behind Beneš, the conservative Republican Party of Agriculturalists and Small Farmers assembled a coalition of parties and politicians to propose an alternative candidate, Bohumil Němec (1873-1966), a noted professor of botany. A third candidate was Karel Kramář (1860-1937), the longtime leader of the National Democrats, which joined two other parties, in 1934, to become the National Unification party. For nearly two weeks, from December 6, when Němec agreed to stand for the presidency, until the election of December 18, each side worked feverishly, behind the scenes, to acquire the requisite number of votes among the deputies and senators. Despite his many detractors, Beneš ultimately emerged as the victor, a testimony to his negotiating skills but also evidence of the divisiveness among his opponents.

The Backroom Political Fight

The candidacy of Němec was an unpleasant surprise for Beneš and his allies. On December 7, Beneš heard the news from the leader of the Social Democrats, Antonín Hampl (1874-1942), who started to prefer the nomination of two coalition candidates. He stressed the need for patience and believed the Republicans were posturing to show that there was opposition to Beneš, but he was certain that Prime Minister Milan Hodža (1878-1944) and the Republicans around him, especially his fellow Slovaks, would vote for Beneš. In response, Beneš told a tongue-tied Hampl that he preferred not to become president:

I do not want to be. Today, I am bound by other commitments to the president.…

The whole affair is so offensive to me that I am fed up with it. I cannot allow

---

1 This article is based on my chapter “Prezidentská volba 1935: agrárníci versus Beneš,” in *Rudolf Beran a jeho doba: Vzestup a pád agrární strany* (Prague: Ústav pro studium totalitních režimů and Vyšehrad, 2011), 175-218. A companion article, titled “Presidential Succession and the Republican Party in the Czechoslovak First Republic: The Prelude to the Presidential Election of 1935,” appeared in the previous issue of *Kosmas*. I wish to thank Daniel E. Miller (University of West Florida, Pensacola) for his assistance in editing this article.
myself to stand against a candidate of the nation, a communist, and [Konrad] Henlein.\(^2\) Tell them that I am too patriotic to do that. After all, I will not at all accept anything like that for international reasons. What would be the reaction abroad? What would the president look like? Next year, Hitler may come here, I do not know what will happen, and I should “play” around like this? This is not what I am going to do.

Hampl explained how the talks had taken place and reasoned that the Republicans really had internal divisions, that Hodža just had assumed the premiership, and that Rudolf Beran (1887-1954), who led the Republican party, “is a new chairman; [and] that [the Republicans] made a mistake prolonging this so much.” Hampl further tried to placate Beneš by saying he “only believes he [Hampl] might help them [Hodža and Beran] a little bit.” Hampl immediately phoned Beran to tell him about his conversation with Beneš.\(^3\)

The next morning, another meeting took place between Hampl and Beneš. Hampl told Beneš, who had calmed down somewhat, that he had talked to Beran, who said that his party had difficulties and that if he had been aware of them, he would not have accepted the post of chairman. Beneš now was running against two candidates, Němec and Kramář, although Hampl also mentioned the rumor that the National Unification party may shift its support to Němec. “I told him where this would lead,” Beneš noted. “Němec cannot accept [the candidacy]. It would mean that both the NC [Czechoslovak National Council] and our allies [in the Czechoslovak National Socialist party] immediately would secede from the NC, [and the] comrades [that is, the Socialists Democrats] could not remain there, with all the other implications. Otherwise, I do not believe that the Republicans have already talked to him and that he has accepted that.”\(^4\)

On December 10, the election battle for presidency came to a head. The socialist parties and the Catholic Czechoslovak People’s party rejected the idea of two coalition candidates and insisted on the sole candidacy of Beneš. František Soukup (1871-1940), a Social Democratic politician and chairman of the Senate, held out the prospect of an aggressive campaign and potential demonstrations but failed to dissuade Němec from running. Soukup believed the National Socialist party was in decline, with no program and only slogans, and its leaders realized it

\(^2\) Konrad Henlein (1898-1945) was the leader of the Sudeten German party (SdP), which became allied with the National Socialist party in Germany.

\(^3\) At that time, Beran was interested in more than just Republican party politics. On 8 December, he held a large hunt in his native town. The wintry weather, which worsened on that day, did not discourage numerous visitors from coming. Those present included the minister of national defense, František Machník (1886-1967), General Jan Syrový (1888-1970), and other public figures. Státní okresní archiv Strakonice, Kronika obce Pracejovice, 1914-1978.

\(^4\) Prague, Archív Ústavu Tomáše Garrigua Masaryka (AÚTGM), Fond EB I, k. 45, sl. R 124/2 (R 94), Vnitropolitické záležitosti, Volba prezidenta–Benešův záznam. The Czechoslovak National Council was a nonpartisan civic organization that had the backing of all Czech and Slovak political parties.
would disintegrate without the candidacy of Beneš, its vice chairman.\(^5\) Antonín Klouda (1871-1961), a National Socialist senator, on behalf of Václav Klofáč (1868-1942), a National Socialist senator and the party’s chairman, also visited Němec. Klouda, like Soukup, lamented that Henlein’s adherents could not be the ones to elect the president. Němec replied that he had accepted his candidacy on condition that most Czech and Slovak parties would back him. To Klouda’s objection that national parties also included the socialists and the Czech People’s party, not just the Republicans and Tradesmen, Němec replied that Hlinka’s Slovak People’s party and the National Unification party also had to be taken into account. Němec said he would abide by the decision of the political parties that supported him. Soukup added that he was not aware of how Henlein’s SdP would vote but that Moscow had instructed the Communists to back Beneš.\(^6\)

A deadlock occurred: neither the socialist candidate, Beneš, nor the bourgeois candidate, Němec, stood the chance of winning the three-fifths majority required in the first round and perhaps even a second round of the presidential election. Kramář formally withdrew his candidacy, and the National Unification Party began shifting its support to Němec, as did Czech the fascists, under the leadership of Radola Gajda (1892-1948). Msgr. Andrej Hlinka (1864-1938), who headed the Slovak Populists, again arrived in Prague to meet Beran and subsequently Černý. Hlinka “was, on his own initiative, fanatically and passionately speaking against the candidacy of socialist party members,” Beran wrote. “He cited socialists as the reason for all the poverty and the desperate position of mankind. He cited examples to demonstrate what socialists caused to the economic burden of our state and spontaneously spoke for the election of the bourgeois candidate.” Hlinka denied the rumor that some members of his party around Jozef Tiso (1887-1947) had agreed, with the socialists, to vote for Beneš. Hlinka told Beran that “in such an event, nobody would take their party seriously; that the party would be laughable and have no weight.” Hlinka met with Tiso, Jozef Sivák (1886-1959), the chief editor of Slovák, the main party newspaper, Štefan Onderčo (1884-1937), a Slovak Populist deputy, and others and asked, “gentlemen, rumor has it that you wish to elect Dr. Beneš, is that true?” Hlinka recounted the conversation: “Tiso answered that they had sympathy for Beneš but that they unconditionally would vote for the candidate I would designate. He [Tiso] declared: ‘If you order to vote for this wood, we will do so.’” Beran noted Hlinka as having said, “Therefore … it is not true that we are disunited. If someone failed to obey, I would be sure that all the consequences befall that person and expel that person from the party.”\(^7\) Hlinka’s resolve appealed to Beran and reassured him that the Republicans could rely on the Slovak Populists.

The talks among the chairs of political parties and the political ministers continued, but the meetings, lasting for several hours, yielded no outcome. Finding it impossible to agree on a single candidate, the politicians decided it was in the interest of the state to preserve the coalition, so the coalition parties would
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5 Kahánek, Zákulisí presidentské volby Dr. Beneše, 38-39.
6 Kahánek, Zákulisí presidentské volby Dr. Beneše, 38-39.
7 Prague, Národní archiv (NA), Fond 44–agrárníci, složka 27, folio 3-7, Beranův záznam.
nominate two candidates. The socialist parties suggested that the individual representatives be free to vote their conscience, instead of having them bound to a candidate the party leaders advocated. In light of the situation, Hodža again suggested that they request President Masaryk to remain in office. The socialists rejected his proposal, and at noon on December 11, Hodža announced his resignation as prime minister. The ministers from the Republican party as well as those from the Bund der Landwirte and the Party of Business and Commerce (also known as the Tradesmen), both close allies of the Republicans, followed suit, which meant the collapse of the entire government.\footnote{The Social Democrat Rudolf Bechyně (1881-1948), under the pseudonym Amicus, later wrote an article on the background of the government’s resignation for the weekly \textit{Přítomnost}, which was under the editorship of Ferdinand Peroutka (1895-1978). See Amicus, “Jedenáctý prosinec 1935,” \textit{Přítomnost}, 30 September 1936, 609-610.}

Under those circumstances, the socialist parties committed to forming a minority coalition government, under the leadership of the Czechoslovak People’s party chairman, Msgr. Jan Šrámek (1870-1956), with the sole aim of arranging the presidential election. Nevertheless, they preferred to preserve the coalition, regardless of which candidate succeeded in the election. They proposed that, if the bourgeois president were elected, the prime minister be from the other political group; likewise, they guaranteed that the office of prime minister would be in the hands of the Republicans, throughout the president’s term in office, should Beneš be elected.\footnote{Prague, NA, Fond 44–agrárníci, složka 27, folio 3-7, Beranův záznam.}

At 3:00 p.m., on December 11, Hodža left for Lány, the presidential residence that lies about 35 kilometers west of Prague, to present his resignation to the president. Josef Schieszl (1876-1970), in the Chancellory of the President, already had explained the situation to Masaryk, having said that the prime minister stepped down because he had failed to arrange what he had desired, that is, the unity of the government coalition with respect to Beneš’s election. He also outlined possible developments. “How many votes for Beneš can you count on?” Masaryk asked. Schieszl analyzed the election mathematics and admitted that one or two votes might determine the election. Masaryk decided to refuse to accept the government’s resignation.\footnote{Gašparíková-Horáková, \textit{U Masarykovcov}, 265-266.}

Beneš disagreed with Masaryk’s decision and believed that the president should have accepted the resignation of the Hodža government.\footnote{Ibid.} The leaders of the socialists and the Czechoslovak People’s party were of the same opinion. The Social Democrats announced that they would not assume the office of prime minister because it would be harmful for appearances abroad. Likewise, they believed that a National Socialist should not be premier if a presidential candidate was from the same party. As prime minister, they proposed Šrámek, who already was considering the post and raised no objections.

The next day, December 12, Beneš, the National Socialists Klofáč and Emil Franke (1880-1939), and the Social Democrats Hampl, Bechyně, and Alfréd
Meissner (1871-1950) met at Šrámek’s office. Šrámek saw the president’s decision as his defeat, while the socialists were depressed and unsure about how to proceed. They were confident that a retreat was undesirable and that they should stay the course. The Social Democrats thought of preparing a manifesto to the nation about the necessity of electing Beneš, who would continue in the tradition of Masaryk, maintain the fight against revising the postwar order, and strive to further peace and democracy. Šrámek and Franke disagreed. Beneš argued that the president’s health made it difficult to request such things as the appointment of a government under Šrámek. Given the president’s condition, even Beneš had to tend to matters through several people. Bechyně persisted and wanted to publish a manifesto the very next day. He was dissatisfied with the abdication taking place as late as Saturday, December 14, because this stood Beneš’s opponents in good stead. Those attending the session agreed that the socialists and the Czechoslovak People’s party should request one more meeting of the ministers and the chairs of the political parties to secure the withdrawal of Němec’s candidacy or guarantee a free vote. Hampl had the task of talking to Vraný and Beran to make the arrangements. After Beneš departed, Šrámek complained that he had exposed himself and that others had disappointed him. The Czechoslovak People’s party club considered what had transpired to be a betrayal, and Šrámek faced difficulties, although he was reassured, once he had obtained the unanimous consent of his party.12

After the meeting, Beneš hurriedly wrote his impressions. “Yes, relying on oneself, but notably being prepared for our victory, believing that we will win, and if we lose, realizing that we need to continue fighting, requesting the post of prime minister, not yielding to the Republicans, and setting the line of battle for the three of us [the National Socialists, Social Democrats, and People’s party] together,” Beneš believed, would lead to success. “If we are aligned,” he noted further, “nothing can happen. I will be in politics for an additional twenty years, I will not give in, I will be patient, [and] in 2-3-5-10 years, we will win.”13

In the afternoon of December 12, Hampl talked to Beran and Vraný, who offered the chairman of Social Democrats the presidential candidacy. Hampl declined. They discussed the possible candidacy of a Slovak, and Hampl suggested his party colleague, Ivan Dérer (1884-1973). A consultancy meeting of the ministers and representatives of the political parties took place in the evening, and those present discussed the formalities of President Masaryk’s resignation. The Republicans conveyed their opinion that the president’s official address should not include a recommendation for Beneš as his successor, a request that Masaryk was to ignore. The politicians concealed all of these negotiations from the public. While journalists knew some details, they only could indicate them in riddles and puzzles. An agreement was in force preventing the press from reporting on the preparations for the presidential election, and the censorship order

even prevented quotations of foreign views. Nevertheless, the individual papers sought ways to tell their readers about the deliberations. For example, an article on the front page of *Lidové listy*, titled “The Heating of Large Halls,” did not include a single mention of Masaryk’s intention to abdicate, but readers learned that, “if a large hall is not being used and is situated in a building where the walls are up to two meters thick and where, because events are happening too quickly, it is impossible to install a steam boiler…and to position radiators…this poses a great challenge for technology…. Yesterday, we talked to an expert who told us that, for example, that Vladislav Hall … can be heated in 48 hours before use.”

**President Masaryk’s Resignation**

At noon on December 14 President Masaryk resigned at Lány. Being overly cautious, Hodža slightly changed the prepared ceremony. Hodža wished that Malypetr, rather than he, sit on the right-hand side of Masaryk to stress the importance of parliament. Through Jan Masaryk (1886-1948), the president’s son and the Czechoslovak minister to the United Kingdom, Hodža requested that the president not ask him for a formal promise that he would guarantee the election of Beneš but noted that he was morally committed to what he had promised on 21 November, that is, to carry out the election with dignity. Everything was finished quickly. Masaryk asked chancellor Šámal to read the resignation document: “The office of the president is hard and responsible, thus requiring full strength. I see that I can no longer keep up, and therefore I resign … I recommend Dr. Beneš as my successor. I worked with him abroad as well as at home and know him. I fully trust that everything will proceed smoothly, and God willing, I will be watching you for a while as you govern.”

Hodža subsequently read the abdication speech for the radio. On the same day, the government advanced a bill through the Chamber of Deputies to award state honors to the first head of the republic, who was to keep his presidential salary and his residence at Lány until the end of his life.

The public took what Masaryk said very seriously, but the Republican party chose to ignore Masaryk’s repeated recommendation that Beneš serve as his successor. The Republicans, who used the statements of the late Antonín Švehla (1870-1933), the highly respected Republican party chairman, in response to everything, forgot that, in 1932, Švehla had said, “believe it: Masaryk still has the greatest political foresight.”

The news about the resignation of the president, who had followed in the footsteps of the lengthy and stable rule of Francis Joseph (1815-1916; reigned 1848-1916), the emperor-king of Austria-Hungary, appeared on the front page of
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14 *Polední Lidové listy*, December 13, 1935. Vladislav Hall, in Prague Castle, is where the 1934 presidential election had taken place.
17 Venkov, January 1, 1935.
Sharing the same page was the announcement of Němec’s candidacy. *Lidové noviny*, the only newspaper to publish the entire abdication speech, commented that the public as well as the Republican politicians had been astonished. According to the paper, the Republicans interpreted Masaryk’s recommendation about Beneš as his successor as a private opinion and they tastelessly placed Němec on a par with the President-Liberator.18

The presidential battle continued: the socialist parties and Czechoslovak People’s party opposed the so-called December Bloc—the Republican party, Tradesmen’s party, National Unification party, and Hlinka’s Slovak People’s party. It later came to light that it was not a solidified grouping but a very fragile alliance. According to František Jan Kroíher (1871-1948), a Republican senator, the December Bloc only existed in the minds of the left-wing and Christian democratic presses as well as the Hrad.19

The Republican Secretariat started to receive inconsistent information. According to one news item, the Hungarians supported Beneš. Karol Sidor (1901-1953), a Slovak Populist who opposed Beneš, doubted the report and decided to contact the Hungarian politicians to learn what they had agreed. The Republicans believed the 15 votes of the Hungarian bloc would go to Němec. Sidor also informed the Republican Secretariat that Ján Líška (1895-1959), a Slovak deputy from Tradesmen’s party, was in favor of Beneš and that Henlein’s SdP would not cast blank ballots.20 Thus, the only thing that was clear, in these dramatic times, was the day of the election—December 18. A unanimous resolution of the political ministers set the date, making it one of the few items on which the coalition parties could agree.

The Communists and Henlein’s Sudeten German Party

The question of the election of Masaryk’s successor emerged in Czechoslovak press. Although the presidential election was to take place only four days after Masaryk’s resignation, the news about it was a demonstration of the exaggerated party spirit of the First Republic. The Republican press asserted that the “nation and people” did not want Beneš, pointing out the dissatisfaction with his presidential candidacy among the one million Republican voters. By contrast, Beneš’s followers, also claiming to represent the best interests of the nation and state, assaulted Němec. The individual papers were agitating for their respective candidates, sharpening controversies, and speculating on the election results.

The Republicans were more concerned about the powerful and influential far left than the far right because it was clear that the 46 communist votes would go to Beneš. The Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, benefitting from the crisis of liberal democracy and under the influence of the developments in neighboring Germany, began to adjust their political strategy. At a time when the party

19 Prague, NA, Fond 44–Agrárníci, složka 35, folio 1, dopis Františka Jana Kroíhera Rudolfovi Beranovi, 27. prosinec 1935.
20 Kahánek, *Zákulisí presidentské volby Dr. Beneše*, 46.
chairman, Klement Gottwald (1896-1953), and his entourage were staying in Moscow for several months, the party was under the leadership of Jan Šverma (1901-1944), who strove to establish cooperation with other left-wing parties. Hence the party toned down its fundamental antagonism regarding the First Republic. The Communists suddenly stressed the necessity of defending national interests, respecting historical traditions of the state, and supporting democracy. This had been something unheard of before, although it paralleled the shift in the Comintern policy toward creating antifascist fronts on the left. Republicans, who were fundamental opponents of Bolshevism, considered the change to be insincere and policy-driven. They still endorsed the opinion that the Communists primarily sought to execute orders of Moscow and defend Soviet interests, rather than to support democracy and national interests. An article in Venkov, “The Irony of Our National History,” pointed out the spinelessness of the Communists, who had voted, in earlier presidential elections, for Alois Muna (1886-1943) and Antonín Janoušek (1877-1941), in 1920, Václav Šturc (1858-1939), in 1927, Gottwald, in 1934, and now would back Beneš.21 The Republicans were displeased with the Communists and were of the opinion that, once an opposition group decided a presidential election or candidacy, another group could well do the same. In this regard, the Republicans saw little difference between Communists and Henlein’s SdP.22

Meanwhile, the socialist parties counted on the Communists, who, in turn, demonstrated their fight against the so-called reactionaries, whose most important representatives were in the Republican party.23 Beneš, whom they also unscrupulously had assaulted until recently, gained their sympathy by having signed a treaty with the Soviet Union, on May 16, 1935, two weeks after the Franco-Soviet Treaty of Mutual Assistance. Beneš held another attraction for the Communists: he promised an amnesty for their sentenced leaders, and he kept his promise. On the date of his abdication, President Masaryk signed the most extensive amnesty in the history of the Czechoslovak Republic, enabling Communist representatives who previously had to grapple with warrants for their arrest to return, in confidence, and vote for Beneš.24

The standpoints of the German parties also caught the eye of political observers, and both groups counted on the votes of German activist parties. The situation seemed to be fairly transparent: 17 German Social Democrats and nine German Christian Socialists were in Beneš’s camp, while the five votes of the Bund der Landwirte would go to Němec. However, the position of the largest German party, the SdP, which wielded 67 votes, still was unclear. Had the Republicans wished to win the votes of Henlein’s party, they would have had to

21 Venkov, December 17, 1935.
22 Kahánek, Zákulísi presidentské volby Dr. Beneše, 26.
24 Zeman, Edvard Beneš, 123-124.
select a candidate other than Němec, whose strong Czech nationalist demeanor did not appeal to either Hlinka’s Slovak People’s party or the SdP.

On December 15, news spread that Hans Neuwirth (1901-1970), a Prague lawyer and SdP deputy, had spoken to Kramář and the Czech fascist Jiří Stříbrný (1880-1955). He reportedly complained that no talks with Henlein’s party had taken place. That evening, the Republicans Kahánek and Vraný met, in the Arco Café, and sometime after 8.00 p.m., they conferred with the SdP deputy Wilhelm Sebekowsky (1906-1981). The SdP had won the 1935 election, but it remained in opposition and had no influence since no other party would cooperate with it. Now, the SdP politicians complained that both the pro-Beneš and anti-Beneš camps courted them, behind the scenes, but both camps refused to form a partnership with them. “They have to radicalize,” Kahánek reasoned, after the meeting with Sebekowsky, because “they cannot be active.”25 Henlein, who had returned to Czechoslovakia from a foreign trip, told the Republicans that the “Germans are willing to go into action in the very first round. They demand nothing. They would like the next president to participate in the German Winter Relief Program [Winterhilfswerk] and to grant an amnesty for political offences. They have no other demands. They will provide more information on Monday [December 16].”26

Beneš also held talks with representatives of Henlein’s party, namely with the moderates Alfred Rosche (1884-1947) and Gustav Peters (1885-1959). The fact that the coalition had failed to agree on a single candidate made both groups count on the SdP’s votes. Furthermore, at the time, Henlein was proclaiming his loyalty to the Czechoslovak state, even when on trips abroad. The British historian R. W. Seton-Watson (1879-1951), who had contributed to the formation of the republic and was one of Masaryk’s closest friends, received a request from Colonel M. Graham Christie (1881-1971), the former British air attaché in Berlin, between 1927 and 1930, encouraging him to influence the Czechoslovak government to accept some of Henlein’s demands.27 In certain quarters, there was talk of negotiating with the SdP to find a compromise.

The Slovak and Czech politicians supporting either Beneš or Němec wanted the SdP members to vote in favor of their candidate but refused to grant the SdP any concessions in return. Despite their assaults on each other in the press, neither side allowed the SdP to become a crucial factor in the presidential election. In the end, neither Beneš nor Němec won the SdP’s votes. Yet, the Republican party faced accusations of colluding with Henlein’s SdP, even though the party’s

---

25 Kahánek, Zákulisí presidentské volby Dr. Beneše, 56.
26 Kahánek, Zákulisí presidentské volby Dr. Beneše, 58.
Executive Committee never discussed any cooperation with Henlein’s party, especially with respect to the presidential election.\textsuperscript{28}

**The Culmination of the Battle**

The votes of the Hungarian Christian Social Union, which constituted the foundations of the Hungarian Bloc, also were relevant. Its leader, János Esterházy (1901-1957), initially had a meeting with Rückl and then with Beneš, who was satisfied with the discussions. They met again, one day before the election, and Beneš promised Esterházy certain concessions.\textsuperscript{29} In the morning of December 16, Alice G. Masaryk (1879-1966), the president’s daughter, visited the minister of the interior, Josef Černý (1885-1971), who told her, at the end of their conversation, that the Republicans adhered to the words of Švehla, his father-in-law and late Republican party chairman, who had said that the president has to die as president.\textsuperscript{30} Meanwhile, the news had reached the Republican Secretariat that Beneš had received the Hungarians the day before and had promised them something were they to support his candidacy.

A greater stir occurred over the fact that Slovenský denník, the central newspaper of Slovak Republicans, had failed to present the anticipated article on the candidacy of Němec and supported Beneš, Masaryk’s choice. This was an unpleasant surprise for the Czech Republicans and was the greatest rift within the Republican party throughout the presidential election. The publisher of the newspaper, just as all the other printed media of the Republican party, was the Českomoravské podniky tiskaĢské a vydavatelské, later renamed Novina. In spite of its financial dependence on the Czech Republicans, Slovenský denník succeeded in maintaining a certain degree of independence, which was apparent on various major issues. This was the work of Rostislav Korčák (1894-1984), the Prague editor and parliamentary reporter of Slovenský denník, who had the support of Hodža.\textsuperscript{31}

The final decision came one day prior to the presidential election. Until then, neither Beneš nor Němec had secured the majority of votes in the National Assembly for their respective candidacies. When representatives of Hlinka’s Slovak People’s party arrived in Prague, they were to meet Němec but apologetically declined to do so. Hlinka, whose morning express train from Ružomberok was delayed, met Rückl at the railroad station and received a letter from the papal nuncio. Hlinka and Rückl left the station, heading straight for the

\textsuperscript{28} Prague, NA, Národní soud, sign. 550-226-1/28.
\textsuperscript{29} Klimek, Boj o Hrad, vol. 2, 466.
\textsuperscript{30} Gašparíková-Horáková, U Masarykovcev, 270.
minister of foreign affairs to hear his presidential program. Beneš stressed to Hlinka that he was not the candidate of a single party or bloc, that he wished Catholics to be united, and that he was in favor of decentralization. Hlinka asked Beneš about his notion of decentralization, notably with respect to the National Assembly, the presidency, and their competences. Beneš, reiterating that he was speaking for himself, stated that the initiative, in this regard, was up to the government but that he would not hamper anything, and on the contrary, he would be supportive of changes. As for the competences, his idea was that the politicians should tackle the issue of Carpatho-Ruthenia as soon as possible. “This is where we will delegate what can be delegated and what will not hamper the unity of the state,” Beneš noted, “and then we will adjust the decentralization of the other territories.” Beneš also said that powers delegated to Bratislava also should be delegated to Brno and Prague, that is, a unified approach to decentralization. Beneš wrote:

The main argument that I explained to him was that, if he [Hlinka] supported me, they—the Slovaks in general—would decide the election. If he supported Němec, then Němec could not win without Henlein, but if he supported me, I would have, with his votes, an absolute majority, in any event. It seems to me that he understood and subsequently agreed, with Hodža, that it will be the Slovaks who will decide the presidential election. This made the greatest impression.

Beneš also told Hlinka that he was in favor of the Slovak Populists joining the government and that all of its financial pains would be resolved. In the end, he told him that he wished that they kept in touch personally and that Hlinka could visit him any time he wished.

Beneš was well prepared for his meeting with Hlinka. The day before, he had a similar conversation, albeit more general, with Tiso, who told him that he controlled a majority of his party and would do his best to have Beneš elected. Beneš knew that, with the votes of Hlinka’s Slovak People’s party, he would not need Republican votes. After his two-hour conversation with Beneš, Hlinka held

---

32 In a letter dated December 14, Hlinka wrote to the papal chamberlain, Jan Jiří Rückl (1900-1938): “I highly appreciate Mr. Beneš. It is not about him. It is about the socialist bloc, with which Hlinka’s Slovak People’s party cannot cooperate because it only inflames the whole of Slovakia.” Prague, Archiv Kanceláře prezidenta republiky, T1002/35, opis přílohy dopisu Rückla Šámalovi, quoted in Klimek, Boj o Hrad, vol. 2, 468.

33 Prague, AUTGM, Fond EB I, k. 45, sl. R 124/2 (R 94), Vnitropolitické záležitosti, Volba prezidenta–Benešův záznam.

34 Kahánek outlined several reasons why some of the Slovak Populists found Beneš appealing. First, Beneš had spoken in favor of an amnesty for Vojtěch Tuka (1880-1946), who had been tried and imprisoned for treason, after he had published his 1928 article about the Martin Declaration of October 1918, the document responsible for having brought Slovakia into Czechoslovakia. Tuka’s article contained the false claim that a secret protocol to the Martin Declaration made Slovakia’s inclusion in Czechoslovakia valid for only ten years. Second, Kahánek stressed that Beneš’s had endeavored to reach a modus vivendi with the Vatican, against the will of Švehla, who, during the 1925 commemoration
meetings not only with his party’s Presidium and parliamentary club but also with Beran. The Republican chairman learned that Hlinka was facing divisions in his party. Most of his party, through the influence of the Church hierarchy, was leaning toward Beneš, rather than Němec. Although he had visited Beneš, Hlinka impressed on Beran that he still had a free hand. His position was difficult but not disadvantageous. He was well aware that his party found itself between two conflicting groups, both vying for its votes, and that the final decision rested with his party. As a result, whoever won the presidency—Němec or Beneš—would be grateful to Hlinka’s Slovak People’s party, thus ensuring that the new president would be sympathetic to the party’s interests, which had not been the case with Masaryk.

In addition, there was the standpoint of the Vatican, which supported Beneš because it appreciated his conciliatory policy toward the Holy See. A multiday Catholic convention that had taken place, in Prague, in June 1935, also left a good impression, although its success was largely due to the French Cardinal Jean Verdier (1864-1940), whose appointment as the papal legate in Prague was an apparent demonstration of the Vatican’s sympathy for Czechoslovakia’s foreign policy. Pope Pius XI (1857-1939; reigned 1922-1939) also appreciated the importance of the convention, a pivotal event of the 1930s for all Catholics in the Czechoslovak Republic, by elevating Prague’s archbishop, Karel Kašpar (1870-1941), to the rank of cardinal. The clear success of the convention further improved the relations Beneš had not only with Catholics in general but specifically with Hlinka’s Slovak People’s party.

At noon, Kahánek had a meeting, at the Zlatá Husa Hotel, with Sidor, who confirmed that Hlinka was hesitant but that the party was inclined to support Beneš’s candidacy. First, Kahánek reported the change in the behavior of Hlinka’s Slovak People’s party to Vraný, who “sat down to a couch, put his hand on his heart, and quietly said: ‘You shouldn’t have told me that!’”

The Old Czech family of Dr. B. Němec,” an article Vraný already had written, included the following text: “such a noble rural family also gave birth to the new president, Prof. Dr. Bohumil Němec.” Elsewhere in the article, Vraný wrote, “a new president of the Czechoslovak Republic grew up from this little village.” This is why the whole issue of Lidový deník, dated on the day of the presidential election, except for a few copies, was destroyed.

On behalf of the Republican leadership, Hodža had the task of meeting with Beneš, who told Hodža:
They [the Republicans] are afraid of me, believing that I would follow the [National Socialist] party line; hence, I am willing to assure Beran and the party and give them my statement that they need not be afraid of anything, that I am and will be also their president, that I am and will be impartial [and] constitutional, that things will go on, just like before, etc. As concerns Němec, there is only one thing I can say: I am free of personal prejudice; there is not and will not be any recrimination. Again, I will make an effort to reach an agreement; occasionally, I simply will have an audience or tea with him.

Hodža replied that, on this basis, some agreement might be reached. Meanwhile, Beran phoned that he was in the midst of meeting Hlinka, who had asked him to invite Hodža to the Slovak Populists’ club so that they might agree on a common approach. “I did not turn a hair,” Beneš wrote. The phone call concerned the preliminary voting in the Slovak Populists’ club, which ended up in favor of Beneš. Hodža revisited the possibility of an agreement “on the basis I had laid down, and asked whether something could be done about Švehla—a declaration, a letter to Mrs. Švehla, or something like that.” Beneš concurred, as soon as he could find an appropriate moment to do so. “We closed the meeting with a conclusion to proceed like that. I felt that the matter was completed. H. [Hodža] also said to me that Ber. [Beran] would come to him immediately, that the talks would be finalized on that basis, and that I should be ready for a meeting with B. [Beran], which would need to be this evening. I had no doubt that the matter was completed.”

Beneš was right. The Republicans’ attempt at preventing his election as president was faltering. Since 3:30 p.m., the anti-Beneš coalition representatives had been waiting in the Secretariat of the Republican party for a delegation of Slovak Populists. The meeting finally took place in the evening, with nine politicians from four political parties: Beran, Černý and Vraný were present, on behalf of the Republican party; Josef Najman (1882-1937) and Rudolf Mlčoch (1880-1948), for the Tradesmen’s party; František Ježek (1890-1969), on behalf of the National Unification Party; and Hlinka, Tiso, and Sidor, for the Slovak Populists. Hlinka said that most of his party had voted for Beneš in a trial election. However, the party is not yet decided and will make up its mind, on election day, at a session to be convened at 9:00 a.m. Hlinka raised objections to Němec for having failed to comply with a wish of a priest at a church in Slovakia where he was a patron, and Hlinka referred to antireligious statements Němec had made in the Revolutionary National Assembly.

In the end, Hlinka said that, if everything is agreed on and the

38 Prague, AÚTGM, Fond EB I, k. 45, sl. R 124/2 (R 94), Vnitropolitické záležitosti, Volba prezidenta–Benešův záznam.
39 Hlinka was referring to Němec’s speech of January 28, 1919, in the Revolutionary National Assembly, during a debate about whether the Theological Faculty should become part of Charles University. Němec said, “we are not saying that there is no God, we didn’t even think of that. We are not saying that it is impossible for people to believe in a supreme being or even in certain rather specific things. That faith, however, is something completely subjective and is something that cannot be proven.” Poslanecká sněmovna Parlamentu České republiky (http://www.psp.cz), Parlamentní knihovna, Národní shromáždění
obstacles Tiso raised are removed, everything will be fine, and all the Slovak Populists will vote for the bourgeois candidate. Beran wrote the following about the meeting:

Hlinka denied nothing of what he had said previously and what was reiterated to him face to face at this meeting. He said that he had made a mistake, [that he had] admitted it, and that he would put everything right. Dr. Tiso said that the presidential election was an opportunity which was not just about the president. It was also about what would follow, and they wanted to ensure that their demands would be met. The candidate who would give more and who would meet more of the demands of the Slovak People’s party would have the votes of all members of the Slovak People’s party in the N [National] A [Assembly]. To the question of which demands he meant, he replied that he meant the fairly well-known demands of the Slovak People’s party. He was complaining of the actions of the Republicans in Slovakia against the Slovak People’s party, and he wanted the representatives of the parties to comment immediately on the demands that he would put forward. The first demand he cited was the “fulfillment of the Pittsburgh Agreement.” The representatives present from the [Republican] party admitted that the Slovak People’s party wanted to use the presidential election as blackmail to the detriment of the state. They saw that the Slovak People’s party wanted to support the candidate who would give more. They agreed to reject those demands categorically. To prevent a denial of the actions of the Slovak People’s party, they requested that the Slovak People’s party put its demands in writing. Representatives of the Slovak People’s party stated that they would confer and would put forward their written proposals on the same day [that is, that night].

The meeting finally decided the future of the election. Once the Republicans saw that Hlinka’s Slovak People’s party, at the last moment, connected the candidacy with various demands that might affect the interests of the state, they decided to discuss the coalition’s candidacy of Beneš. They refused to make a political deal with Hlinka’s Slovak People’s party that would involve the Slovaks voting for Němec to secure their party’s demands, which included, among other things, the establishment of an independent legislative assembly and a reprieve for Tuka. Němec agreed that such demands were unacceptable. He stated that he only had accepted the candidacy on the basis of the approval of most of the Czechoslovak state-building parties; however, in no way might his candidacy be subject to blackmail, by any party, to the detriment of the state. In that event, he said he would withdraw his candidacy. In spite of all the Republicans’ objections to Beneš, it is to their credit that, when they realized Němec’s candidacy was untenable, albeit at the last moment, they withdrew their backing from him. In this way, they did not to weaken the authority of the new president by providing
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41 Kahánek, Zákulisí presidentské volby Dr. Beneše, 110.
ammunition to Beneš’s detractors that the largest party had voted against him. The Republicans immediately began to mitigate the impact of their defeat.

At 9:00 p.m., the talks regarding presidential election of Beneš were largely complete. While Hodža hosted a coalition meeting, Beran and Černý visited Beneš at Černín Palace, the location of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Beran opened the discussion, saying that Černý and he always had been among those striving for a reasonable compromise. Beran said:

> Now that I see that certain parties are visiting both you and us, in an effort to bargain for the presidential election and to benefit from it, at the expense of the state. We have said that we need to agree. This is the case of the Slovak People’s party, which visited me this evening to present its written demands. Furthermore, Henlein’s SdP is demanding promises from both you and us. We loyally told you that some difficulties would occur in our party, and we strove to overcome them by having agreed on a single candidate. We proceeded in a way to make that possible, and now we find that Prof. N. [Němec] is willing to give up his candidacy.

Beneš answered that he always had maintained that the election must be a coalition effort and that those neither supporting nor opposing him should leave the decision up to Henlein. He further stated that he could not and will not be a candidate of the left, the right, or solely of his own party, so he always wished to be the candidate of the Republican party as well. He assured the Republicans that he would be objective, impartial, and proceed strictly according to the constitution. He even did not think that the pre-election struggle should leave any bad aftertaste.\(^{42}\) After Beran and Černý returned from their meeting with Beneš, Kahánek went to Němec to inform him there was no guarantee that most Czech and Slovak parties would support his candidacy. Němec comprehended the situation and withdrew his candidacy. In the late night hours, Beneš became the only candidate of the government coalition.

**Election Day**

On the election day of December 18, 1935, snow fell and then slowly melted. On that dreary morning, deputies and senators came into the appropriately heated Vladislav Hall of Prague Castle to elect a new president of the Czechoslovak Republic. Prior to the election, Beneš had Rückl deliver messages to Hlinka, Tiso, and Esterházy. To prevent any doubts about these politicians in the future, Rückl prepared the message in writing, exactly in line with Beneš’s instructions, and delivered it, in written form. Beneš assured the recipients that his promises still applied, even though the coalition had come to support him as a single candidate.\(^{43}\)

---

\(^{42}\) Prague, AÚTGM, Fond EB I, k. 45, sl. R 124/2 (R 94), Vnitropolitické záležitosti, Volba prezidenta–Benešův záznam.

\(^{43}\) Prague, AÚTGM, Fond EB I, k. 45, sl. R 124/2 (R 94), Vnitropolitické záležitosti, Volba prezidenta–Benešův záznam.
Before the election, Beneš also met with Beran. In the evening, after the meeting, Beran called Beneš to ask whether he could receive Najman, in the morning, for five minutes. Beneš promised to do so and reiterated what he had said to Beran the day before. The leader of Tradesmen promised his loyalty and stated that he had no resolution at the moment and that he was always in favor of a solution that would involve all the Czech and Slovak parties. “The whole conversation was awkward. However, the meeting was concluded calmly, and I reassured him of my impartiality,” Beneš later noted.44

After returning from the meeting with Beneš, Sidor found Beran, at 10:15 a.m., to give him the demands of Hlinka’s Slovak People’s party. He stated that, upon their approval, the Slovak Populists would cast all of its votes in favor of Němec. Beran never replied.45 At 3:00 p.m., the club of deputies and senators of Hlinka’s Slovak People’s party issued a statement that, in the escalated election battle, during which the situation had changed by the hour, insincerity on the part of the bourgeois block candidate had come to light. Therefore, the party, after thorough evaluation and in the interests of the Church, state, and Slovakia, decided to vote, as a whole, for Beneš.46

At 10.37 a.m., Malypetr, the chairman of the Chamber of Deputies, started the session, in the presence of 292 deputies and 144 senators. He began by recalling the personality of Masaryk. Five more electors came in during his speech, but Karel Kramář (1870-1937), who had apologized for being ill, was absent.47 Of the 440 valid ballots cast in the election, one ballot was invalid. At 11:20 a.m., Malypetr announced the result: Beneš won 340 votes, 24 electors voted for Němec, who no longer was running for the presidency, and 76 ballots remained blank. At 12:09 p.m., the newly elected president of the republic, Dr. Edvard Beneš, entered Vladislav Hall, having won the first round with more votes than Masaryk ever had obtained.48

All the Republican deputies and senators voted for Beneš. After the election, Beran explained the Republicans’ course of action, during a visit with Němec, who agreed with the party’s approach. Then Beran dropped into the editorial office of Venkov, where Kahánek offered his resignation, claiming that the party

44 Prague, AÚTGM, Fond EB I, k. 45, sl. R 124/2 (R 94), Vnitropolitické záležitosti, Volba prezidenta–Benešův záznam.
45 Prague, NA, Fond 44–Agrárníci, složka 27, folio 3-7, Beranův záznam.
46 Prague, AÚTGM, Fond EB I, k. 45, sl. R 124/2 (R 94), Vnitropolitické záležitosti, Volba prezidenta, Zpráva ČTK o vyhlášení Klubu poslanců a senátorů Hlinkovy říjové strany ze zasedání 18. prosince 1935 ve 3 hod. odpoledne.
47 Although they had cooperated during the war, Kramář and Masaryk developed an intolerance for each other afterward.
was too encumbered with the presidential election and his involvement in it. Beran refused to accept it. “I wouldn’t like any struggles with the president,” he told Kahánek. “We must support authority, but I wouldn’t like humbleness. That even would be worse.”

After his election, Beneš left for Lány, with Masaryk already awaiting him. The latter had listened to the presidential election on the radio, which broadcasted it between 10:00 a.m. and 1:00 p.m. The president’s closest aides analyzed the election results, but with a completely different approach than those in the Republican Secretariat. Masaryk’s archivist, Anna Gašparíková-Horáková (1896-1987), wrote that they acknowledged a certain degree of fairness in the SdP’s blank ballots. They admired the success of Catholic discipline, which had guaranteed that the German Christian Socialist party, Hungarian Christian Socialist party, and Hlinika’s Slovak People’s party all had voted for Beneš. For his part, Beneš was aware that, without the Catholics’ support, he would not have become president. Three days after the election, Rückl wrote to Beneš that he had delivered the messages as agreed. For the thirty-five-year-old Rückl, the presidential election was a remarkable moment. Rückl wrote that “18 December was the most beautiful day of my life. [It was] the victory of law and justice over lowness and egoism…. The years of cooperation have brought us Catholics absolutely close to you…. It has been an enormous satisfaction for me that Catholics proved themselves so well in this key battle of domestic politics and set an example of constructiveness and reasonable, unselfish statesmanship for the whole world.” Rückl and Šrámek had contributed most to the Czechoslovak Populists’ support of Beneš.

While the left-wing press was publishing buoyant congratulations to the new president, Venkov released an article titled “How the Decision Prior to the Presidential Election Was Made” to explain their position. The article concluded: “In the past, there were different views between us and Dr. Beneš, and sometimes disputes. Yesterday marks the end of them. Every citizen is equally close to the president. The past was one of political battles. The present and the future belong

---

49 At noon, Kahánek and Vraný went for a walk together and analyzed the election. Vraný praised Beran for having acted in the interest of the country as well as the party. However, many failed to be tranquil enough. Vraný was of the opinion that the Beran-Hodža line needed to be maintained, under any circumstances. Kahánek, *Zákulisí presidentské volby Dr. Beneše*, 75.


51 In the letter, he also mentioned that, since December 18, he had been thinking about nothing but the second presidential election. “Because for me, you’ve been elected for 14 years and, in seven years, it will be just a test. Your name and your seven-year presidential term form a program, and I believe that now all of us have to keep in mind, every single day, that our responsibility is not to lose a single vote out of your impressive majority, over the next seven years, and if possible, we should even attract new votes. None of those voting for you must say, in 1942, that we have disappointed them, and I am already sure that they will not say so.” Prague, AÚTGM, Fond EB I, k. 45, sl. R 124/2 (R 94), Vnitropolitické záležitosti, Volba prezidenta–Benešův záznam a Rückl Benešovi, 21. prosinec 1935.
to the state. The president of the republic is not a president of parties or persons but the president of all of us.”

This also was Beran’s view. When his eighteen-year-old son, Rudolf, made sarcastic comments about the new president, Beran resolutely told him: “Look, Dr. Beneš is the president of this state, and you shall respect that, OK?”

The Implication of the Election

Beneš’s victory was a political setback for the Republican party, although Jaroslav Stránský (1884-1973), a National Socialist politician and journalist, aptly pointed out that it was more accurately an accident the Republican party itself had caused, rather than a defeat someone else had inflicted on it. Several reasons account for the party’s failure and Beneš’s success. First, there was disunity among the bourgeois parties. The Czechoslovak People’s party, under Šrámek, clearly supported Beneš. In the end, the crucial factor that turned the scales, on the eve of the election, was the vague stance of Hlinka’s Slovak People’s party.

Second, the Republican party was disunited, with certain Republicans, such as Udržal, tending to support Beneš, while others favored Němec. Beran was undecided. Another factor was Hodža’s Slovak wing of the party, which leaned toward Beneš and had 17 seats. The Beran-Hodža-Vraný triumvirate regarded Korčák’s rogue stance in Slovenský denník as characteristic of the confusion among the Republicans. Prime Minister Hodža told Korčák, at their next meeting in early 1936, that his action in having supported Beneš over Němec “was caustic but good.” Beran, during a phone conversation with Korčák, in late January, reproached him for having severely hurt the Republican party, but that settled the matter. Vraný, however, no longer talked to Korčák.

Third, the Republican party was remarkably unprepared, with no coherent plan of action. They proceeded with abandon, not at all admitting the possibility of losing. This was an unflattering display of the Republican leaders’ lack of abilities, especially considering Švehla’s usual admonition that the party must be prepared for any political eventuality. The party’s reliance on the Slovak Populists proved too risky. As a result, this serious challenge for the legislature ended differently than what the most powerful political party had wished. Fourth, the papacy remembered Beneš for having reached a modus vivendi with the Vatican as well as for his complimentary comments about Catholicism during the Catholic convention. Not only did the Vatican secure Šrámek’s support for Beneš, but Papal Chamberlain Rückl also persuaded Hlinka of the benefits of Beneš’s candidacy.

Venkov, December 19, 1935.


Jaroslav Stránský, Po presidentské volbě (Prague: Svaz národního osvobození, 1936), 15.

Prague, AUTGM, Fond EB I, k. 45, sl. R 124/2 (R 94), Vnitropolitické záležitosti, Volba prezidenta, Záznam Rostislava Korčáka o vystoupení Slovenského deníku při volbě prezidenta republiky v roce 1935.
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Saverio Ritter (1884-1951), the papal nuncio in Prague, and the domestic Church hierarchy gave Beneš also was significant. Fifth, the promises that Beneš made to the Communists, Hlinka’s Slovak People’s party, and the Hungarian Bloc, principally Esterházy and his party, won him the backing of all three parties. Sixth, Beneš’s diplomatic skills brought him rewards. He consistently and relentlessly pursued his objective; for example, he skillfully engaged influential nonpolitical organizations for the benefit of his election. Although the Republicans reproached him for lack of domestic political experience, he navigated the domestic political backroom scene with ease.

Of numerous comments of that time, the most appropriate was likely that of the writer and journalist František Xaver Šalda (1867-1937):

Beneš’s art of diplomacy prevailed–this is the naked truth of the matter. [He was skilled in] the art of elucidating a problem by elucidating it anew and turning the spotlight on it for all stakeholders. This and nothing else temporarily put together the Slovak People’s party and the Communists, the Social Democrats and the Catholics, as well as many of the Republicans and the National Socialists. On the orders of Moscow, the Communists elected Beneš, and on the order of Rome, the Slovak People’s party elected him. No doubt, some of them did it while gritting their teeth; some of them had to smile while swallowing a bitter pill.  

At a time when Czechoslovakia had to deal with urgent economic and administrative issues and when foreign policy challenges were increasingly serious, the political battle for Masaryk’s successor affected the cooperation among coalition parties. Although the government coalition survived, battles among the parties persisted with a new intensity. While Prime Minister Hodža strove to emphasize that there were no winners and losers, that the coalition was still solid and able to work, and that nothing had changed, the election process undermined mutual trust. The presidential election brought about at least three new difficulties for the coalition. First, by demonstrating its willingness, on 10 December, to go into opposition during the conflict, the Republican party presented itself to the public, for the first time, as a party that was not as indispensable for building ruling coalitions as it had been in the past. It was just like any other party that could find itself in opposition. Second, Šrámek’s wing in the Czechoslovak People’s party strengthened its position, enabling the party to embark on more intense cooperation with socialists in the coalition and to wage a more aggressive struggle against the Republican party. Third, the fact that the Communists became involved in the battle for presidency had a substantial impact on political developments after the Second World War. In 1945, the political foundation of the new people’s democracy became the National Front. Under the baton of the Communist party came all of the political parties that had supported
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the candidacy of Beneš. Meanwhile, the democratic parties of the anti-Beneš camp lost their right to exist. Open political competition was unacceptable. The National Front governed and permitted no opposition. The presidential election of 1935 was not the best testimonial to Czechoslovak democracy. In many respects, all the political machinations did not match the dignity one normally associates with the election of the head of state. “Strange nation!” one of the German national politicians said of the election. “You must always scuffle to get to the bone first, in order to subsequently unify.”

The Republican party saw the presidential election through the lens of its own power: it wished to strengthen its position and weaken that of socialist parties and the People’s party. Moreover, the Republicans thought that Masaryk’s resignation marked the end of the Hrad’s influence on Czechoslovak politics. Although the Republican party did not consider Beneš to be a personality commensurate with Masaryk, the party eventually decided, after complicated talks, to abandon Němec and to support Beneš, whom Masaryk had advanced as his favorite. However, Beneš never forgot the Republicans’ opposition to his candidacy for president of the republic. With his tacit consent, after the Second World War, Czechoslovakia rejected the restoration of the First Republic’s largest party because of its supposed collaboration with the Nazi Germany.

59 Stránský, Po presidentské volbě, 54.
Martin Hrabík (1904-1992) was born in a small southern Bohemian village between Klatovy and Domažlice. From his teenage years on, he was active in the Republican Party of Smallholders and Peasants, commonly referred to as the Agrarian Party. It was the single largest political party in inter-war Czechoslovakia. In 1935, he became the secretary-general of its youth section, Dorost, which had about 100,000 members and was the largest organization of its kind in inter-war Czechoslovakia.

At the 1938 Munich Conference, to which Czechoslovakia was not invited, France and the United Kingdom abandoned their Little Entente ally and acquiesced in Hitler’s demands for the Sudetenland. Czechoslovakia thus lost its well-fortified northern and western border region along with substantial territory and some of its well-developed industry.

Not willing to let his country go to war against Germany alone, President Edvard Beneš resigned and went into exile. All Czech political parties were dissolved. A new government was formed for the country now known as Czechoslovakia. Two new groupings, the Party of National Unity and the Party of Labor, managed political life. Hrabík, as one of the two representatives of the youth, became a member of the former Party’s presidium. A year later, Hitler forced the Czechoslovak President Emil Hácha to sign an agreement which placed Bohemia and Moravia under the protection of the Third Reich. The next day, German forces occupied the Czech Lands. The leadership of the National Unity Party, Hrabík among them, visited President Hácha to protest the creation of the Protectorate and resigned. Then, a new formation, Národní souručenství, replaced the two parties. Hrabík, no longer in public life, started his underground anti-Nazi activities at this time.

Memoir: Part I: From Arrest to Pre-trial detention (1940-1942)

Martin Hrabík

At the crack of dawn, the Gestapo rang the doorbell

They came at five in the morning on May 28, 1940. I heard nothing. My wife Mařenka¹ woke up immediately and went to investigate. “Who is it?” she asked. “Telegram! Telegram!” She unlocked the door but kept the chain on. Through the crack, she saw two men and heard: “Geheime Staatspolizei!” She slammed the door shut, ran to the bedroom and woke me up saying: “The Gestapo is here!” Meanwhile, the two men were loudly kicking and banging on the door.

Our apartment in a building, owned by the former Prague councilman Kočí, was located on the corner of Jakubská and Templová Streets. I peered through a

¹ Marie Hrabíková (1913-2008), née Pohorská, was called Mařenka by family and friends.
crack in the curtain. On Templová Street, a third man was guarding the entrance to our building. A car was parked nearby.

The banging and the noise in the hall was getting louder and louder. I opened the door. The Gestapo agents were angry that my wife had slammed the door in their faces. One of them spoke Czech fluently. My quick-witted wife answered them: “I did not believe you. You first announced that you were delivering a telegram.” Perhaps, my wife’s condition mollified them. She was in the last stages of pregnancy—a week later, our daughter, Maruška, was born.

The unwelcome interlopers asked me to get dressed and to come with them. The Gestapo needed me to clarify some minor detail. The behavior of one of the men belied this benign request. His eyes never left me; he kept one hand in his pocket and followed my every step. He went with me to the bathroom, the bedroom and the wardrobe. I was worried because in my pocket I had a small notebook with addresses and phone numbers. The Gestapo, I knew, would consider all entries in my address book as suspects. I was much relieved when I managed to discard the notebook without being noticed.

They did not search the apartment. Obviously, they were in a hurry. In the doorway, as we were leaving, I remembered that I did not have a handkerchief. One of them declared: “You will be home in an hour. You won’t need your handkerchief.” (I returned five years later.)

We reached the Gestapo Prague headquarters, Petschek Palace, or Petschkárna as it was now commonly called, in a few minutes as it was in the neighborhood. They led me to the Hausvater. I saw many of my friends and acquaintances and knew exactly what was up. All assembled here were the leaders of an underground resistance group of young Czech political activists that we organized in a secret meeting in the forest around Jíloviště shortly after the beginning of the Protectorate.

Dr. Jaromír Lukavský, a youth leader of the National Democrat Party, stood in front of me in the line at the receiving table. The Hausvater ordered him to empty his pockets. Jaromír did not do so quickly enough to please the official, who, with a mighty slap and curse, hurried him along. I was next; I quickly took off my wristwatch, emptied my pockets and avoided a similar welcome. This was merely the introduction to the Petschkárna. Then with kicks, blows and curses, they chased us into a larger room.

We were all present except Jaroslav Bořkovec from the National Democrats. The Gestapo did not discover him at home during its morning raid. They found him later. As they brought him among us, he saw me and shouted a greeting: “Nazdar, Martine!” This so infuriated the Gestapo agents present there that they ordered him to keep on squatting with his hands extended. When he could no longer continue, they beat and kicked him viciously. They ordered the rest of us to watch, with our hands extended, the torture of the hapless Jaroslav Bořkovec.

Finally, they stood us facing the wall, again with our arms extended. If anybody’s hands dropped down or knees gave way, he was beaten or ordered to do squats. If this induction procedure was intended to shock the detained victims, it most certainly succeeded. I have to admit that my fingers were so stiff that the
Gestapo technician could not get an imprint. This so angered him that he hit my hand with all his might. How my fingerprints in the files of Third Reich’s criminals turned out, I did not know then and to this day still do not know.

**Pankrác Prison**

This sad day ended in Prague’s Pankrác Prison where they transported us in the evening. The Gestapo guards’ welcome there magnified our fear and terror. After taking off our outer garments, we were forced to run through the Pankrác Gestapo detail’s gauntlet as they yelled at, beat and cursed us.

I was relieved when, finally, a guard threw me into a cell. Per regulations, its occupant, an older man, stood up and at attention announced his full name. Unfortunately, some forty years later, I just cannot remember the name of my first cellmate. A few moments later, the lights went off. The cell had only one bed which was suspended from the wall. I lay down on the cement floor and in an instant fell into a profound sleep. Only the next day, did I receive a paillasse and blanket, as well as supper.

Activities in all prisons of the world begin early in the morning. Pankrác was no exception. The investigation unit was especially busy. The Gestapo mill in Petschek Palace was grinding exceedingly fast. Its Pankrác division received every day a precise list of who should be brought in for interrogation and who could be transported with whom, so that accomplices would not have the opportunity to conspire with each other and agree on their stories.

The day after my arrest, I was not scheduled for an interview. I was assigned to a work detail whose task was to shave the unfortunate individuals who were to be interrogated that day. Selection for this job was simple; we were asked who shaved with a razor. If we had answered positively, the next day, the guards took us from our cells, gave each of us a razor with a dull blade and lined us up in rows. I was unlucky with my first client. The prisoner subjected to my blade had delicate skin and coarse hair. After I had made several passes at his cheeks, he was squealing and bleeding. The guard was screaming: “Schnell! Schnell!” And I could do nothing to help: I had not chosen the victim for my shaving efforts nor had this victim chosen me. The next morning when he saw me, he could not contain himself. “For God’s sake, brother,” he whispered pleadingly, “Please, choose someone else. I have very delicate skin.” The guard yelled again. I quickly skipped my yesterday’s victim and shaved another prisoner.

After the outdoor exercise, I had the opportunity to get know my cellmate better. All I recall, now some forty years later, is that he was a long serving non-commissioned officer detained for illegal activity with another group. They had distributed anti-Nazi handbills.

The next morning, they threw a frightened beat-up older man into our cell—a cell meant to hold one inmate. Our new fellow prisoner was a member of a Břevnov Communist Party cell. At first, in great pain both from the blows and bitter disappointment that he had suffered, he did not trust us. Eventually, he showed us his back, fully covered with bleeding wounds. He had betrayed
nothing! Finally, the Gestapo confronted him with his fellow conspirator, a highly placed member of his Party, who betrayed him and advised him to stop denying everything.

The normal routines at the Pankrác prison, as opposed to the dread and terror of the previous day in Petschkarna, calmed me and let me take stock of my situation. That my accomplices in the meeting in the Jiloviste woods did not know anything about my other underground activities was a plus. It was also in my favor that I had not initiated this secret meeting, or I was not the leader of this underground organization; however, I was undeniably the representative of the Agrarian Party in the leadership of this group. In the Pankrác registry of suspects, I had been entered as “Martin Hrabík, official of the Provincial Association of Domestic Animals Husbandry.” This routine administrative entry, one that not even the Gestapo could forego, was to my advantage—certainly much better than any political office that I ever had held.

After the Munich Conference, the political party system had been simplified. Only two political parties emerged: the Party of National Unity led by the chairman of the Agrarian Party, Rudolf Beran, and the Party of Labor headed by Antonín Hampl, the chairman of the Social Democratic Party. Upon President Hácha’s return from Berlin, the country under the aegis of the Third Reich became Germany’s Protectorate. All previous political parties ended their activities. A single new formation, Narodní souručenství, replaced them. I did not participate in this organization. More accurately, although I had been an official of the Agrarian youth section from February 1930, I was not automatically employed by the Narodní souručenství as were many of the former Czech political parties’ staff members. Adolf Hrubý, a former member of Parliament, found me employment in an agriculture-related organization. In this manner, I had a way to earn my livelihood and found a cover for my developing underground activities.

The young Gestapo official, Dr. Weiss, who interrogated me, spoke excellent Czech, and to my great surprise, he never hit me. Occasionally, he glanced into the files on his desk. From the questions he asked, I could tell that he was consulting
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2 Rudolf Beran (1887-1954), the chairman of the Agrarian Party, served as Czechoslovakia’s Prime Minister from January 1, 1939 to March 15 of that year when the Protectorate of Bohemia and Moravia was established. He held the same office in the Protectorate until April 27, 1939 when he resigned. Afterwards, he maintained contacts with the Protectorate officials and at the same time supported the anti-Nazi underground. The Gestapo arrested him in May 1941. He was tried and sentenced to ten years of imprisonment, which was later changed to house arrest. After the War, the Communist-led government charged him with collaboration with the Nazis and sentenced him to 20 years at hard labor. He died in prison.

3 Adolf Hrubý (1899-1956) was an Agrarian member of Parliament during the first Czechoslovak Republic. During the Protectorate, he became the chairman of the Narodní souručenství and the minister of agriculture. While pretending to be loyal to the occupiers, he sought to protect the interest of the Czech agriculturalists and the countryside. The Nazis arrested him in May 1945. The next year, the Communist-led government tried him for treason and sentenced him to life imprisonment.
the statements of my accomplices and trying to reconstruct our activities. The opportunity arose, in spite of the official’s constant presence, to communicate with my wife. Immediately after my arrest, that very day, my wife, Mařenka, sought Dr. Weiss out. She asked for a visit to find out what arrangements I had made for the imminent birth of our child.\footnote{Mařenka waited until official business hours and went to Prime Minister Beran to inform him of her husband’s arrest. Upon learning that she intended to go to the Gestapo’s Prague headquarters next, Beran told her: “Madame, I beseech you do not go there! Please, do not go anywhere!” The nine-months pregnant Mařenka went directly from his office to the Petschek Palace. Under the pretext that her husband alone had made all the arrangements for her imminent confinement, she asked to speak to him.} After Maruška had been born, Dr. Weiss allowed another visit of several minutes. While holding our little daughter, I managed to smuggle a message into her blanket. I thereby instructed my wife to bring tobacco, wrapping papers and flint rather than cigarettes and especially to ask for permission to take my dirty laundry to do at home.\footnote{The prisoners wrote messages on the dirty laundry with ink pencils. The messages became visible when wet.} Because the prisons were overcrowded, the Gestapo, for reasons of hygiene, allowed this departure from its normal practices. During these and other visits, my wife slowly learned to understand the looks, the gestures and that whole invisible and inaudible language of those constrained. In my way through the Protectorate’s and the Third Reich’s penal institutions, I so mastered prison practices and rules that, except the last month of the war, I had constant, although at times interrupted, contact with my wife.

During my tenth interrogation after trying unsuccessfully to get me to admit to any illegal activity, Dr. Weiss figuratively put the knife to my throat. “You keep on denying everything,” he said. “That leaves me no alternative than to send you for a severe interrogation. You know how it goes. You have a weak constitution, and you will not survive it.” For a while, I was speechless and very frightened. I could feel the cold sweat on my forehead. Then, gathering up my courage, I bet my life on one card and said: “I am innocent, but I will have to subject myself to this, so you will believe me.”

On the basis of my accomplices’ testimony, Weiss did not consider me the initiator or the main organizer of our conspiracy. The idea to organize an underground group of the Czech youth originated with the young Social Democrats. The Gestapo discovered this conspiracy in Pilsen shortly after the 1940 New Year. Before the Gestapo managed gradually to arrest them all, the young Social Democrats informed us that, if detained, we were to blame Václav Holub for initiating this group. Meanwhile, Holub had managed to escape abroad. Our organization did not have the opportunity to develop fully since it was liquidated at the end of May 1940. Its disappearance certainly weakened the underground, but this loss cannot be compared to the cruel ones that followed the assassination of Heydrich. After my interviews, Dr. Weiss told my wife that I would be home by Christmas. Since the Gestapo did not consider me to be an
important member of the underground, Dr. Weiss ended my interrogations and ordered me placed into a communal cell.

I found the unlikely and remarkable ensemble in my communal cell interesting company. Some like me were prisoners of the Gestapo: Dr. Truhlář, the head of the Sokol organization, Colonel Hruška, Captain Divina, a government official from Slovakia (whose name I have forgotten) and three prison guards from České Budějovice. We shared the cell with the cream of our country’s criminals, who fell under the jurisdiction of the regular police. Stránsky was a notorious safe-cracker and Skokan, a thief of international renown. The police often took Stránsky out of the cell for interviews. Skokan declared that he could not share the tales of his exploits with us. He did not trust Truhlář, who was a judge by profession.

After my Gestapo interrogations, the stay in this cell was beneficial and instructive for me. We shared stories about our experiences. Skokan evaluated European prisons thus: “In France, you can buy food and wine from the outside; in Spain, not only that, but also you can arrange for women to visit you; in Switzerland, there is cleanliness, strictness and order, as well as enough to eat; in Greece, everything can be bought; in Yugoslavia and Poland, you get all that plus beatings.” Colonel Hruška had been the commander of the military police in Belgrade during World War I. One of his duties had been the control of prostitution. He related an overheard dispute between two prostitutes as one sought to establish superiority over the other: “That whore called me ‘a whore.’ She has a bastard with an ordinary civilian while I have a brat with an Austrian soldier.” Captain Divina, who was an intelligence officer, taught me how to make a “cundr” to light a cigarette without matches and how to write messages in invisible ink.

My greatest surprise during my days in Pankrác was when I was put into the work detail sent to bundle the papers found in the Petschek Palace so that they could be recycled. In addition to business papers and the personal correspondence of the Petschek staff, there was also the content of the library. Someone in the Petschek circle collected valuable ecclesiastical and religious books, as well as bibliophile volumes. We tried to save some by bringing them to our cells, but it was all for naught. Every day one of us was ordered into a transport to Germany to be tried or put into a concentration camp.

The wife of Dr. Navara, the physician of the Pankrác Prison when it had been in Czech hands, became our benefactor. During walks in her garden, which was next to the garage, where we were bundling the paper, she would pass food to us. We were hungry and very grateful to her.

The idyll in the communal cell did not last long. The Gestapo was arresting people at great speed. In the summer of 1940, I found myself being transported to Terezín. The Hausvater returned the clothing, watches and money we had when we were arrested. We left around noon in a small truck with a driver and two armed guards. Inexplicably, we stopped in a small alley immediately behind the Municipal House. Both guards, for some unfathomable reason, left us and walked to the end of the street. We were parked directly behind the small bar that
chauffeurs and taxi drivers frequented. It was the height of the noon rush hour. I was dressed in civilian clothes, had money in my pockets and was just around the corner from my apartment in Templová Street. It occurred to me that I could get lost in the mid-day crowd, jump into a nearby taxi or tram and disappear. Not for one instant, did I think of hiding in my own apartment. That was the first place where they would look for me. When I did not act on my first instinct, I began to have doubts. What would happen to my family? To my comrades who were in this truck with me? I lost the only opportunity to escape that I had had in my five years of imprisonment; it became the frequent subject of my daydreams without end. I imagined how with the aid of friends about whom my accomplices knew nothing I would make my way to Slovakia and then abroad.

Terezín

A few minutes later, the guards came back and, without any further incident, brought us to the gate of the small fortress in Terezín. We were counted and placed into the care of its warden: Jökel, known to the prisoners as Pind’a. He was a strapping and handsome man, who wasted no time introducing us to his cruelty.

For a long time, Terezín had not been used as a fortress. Already under Austria-Hungary, some parts had served as a special jail. The assassin of Archduke Franz Ferdinand d’Este had been imprisoned there. During the first Republic, it housed prisoners who had committed particularly serious and heinous crimes. The rooms could be easily converted into a concentration camp: bunk beds, an elementary toilet and washroom were all that was needed.

Every morning began with an inspection. My first conflict usually occurred then: the guard was rarely happy with how I had made my bed. Muster followed. Quite often, we were punished by having to hop across the entire courtyard with our arms extended. After that, we were chosen for various tasks. I was put into the work detail supervised by the civilian guard Froněk, a former Czech prison employee, whom the Nazis had appropriated along with the fortress. Other details constructed new cells, cleaned the canals which surrounded the fortress, or performed various maintenance tasks.

My wife found out in Petschárna that I had been transported to Terezín, and my friend Mauer offered to drive her there. Mauer was among those who spared no effort and used every opportunity to help. When they arrived in Terezín, Mařenka got out of the car in front of the prison and walked to the gate while Mauer waited further down the road. Pind’a was standing at the entrance. When my wife ran into him, she asked if she could speak with the warden. “That is I,” he answered. “What do you want?” She asked for permission to visit me. “Your husband is not here,” he lied. By pure chance, my work detail was just entering the fortress, and my wife pointed to me marching in Froněk’s group. The warden,
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6 Heinrich Jöckel (1918-1946), the Gestapo commander of the Terezín Prison, was executed for war crimes in 1946.
taken aback, said: “I must ask how he worked. He called Froněk. After apparently receiving a positive report, Pinďa allowed the visit.

It took place in the prison office, and a clerk, a Czech political prisoner, served as interpreter. We knew that this prisoner had this advantageous office job because he spoke German very well and his offense was not considered very serious. We also were aware that our guards did not understand Czech. Therefore, I started to ask my wife about matters that had nothing to do with family. The translator became afraid and reprimanded me: “Talk about something that I can translate.” Because he could be trusted, I replied: “Just make up something!” My wife and I were able to exchange much information, but what was happening outside the prison gates turned out to be much more important for me.

Figure 1: Martin Hrabík with Mařenka on their wedding day, and a page from the memoir
While waiting, Mauer discovered that Froněk, the guard who supervised my work detail, owned a dog. He started a conversation admiring the dog. Could he purchase it? Or where could he buy a dog like this one? He asked for permission to stop at Froněk’s home to discuss this on his way back. My wife’s visit did not last long. Afterward, they drove to Froněk’s place. Mauer went in alone and arranged with Froněk for me to meet with my wife outside the fortress. Mauer, the director of a Prague margarine factory, had means, but the rewards he gave Froněk for his services were disproportionate to the risks if the Gestapo discovered this activity. Froněk’s assistance was very valuable for me. While working in Froněk’s strawberry field, I met twice with my wife; moreover, I was able to confer with my co-worker Václav Mach and through him send a message to Chairman Beran that the Gestapo was assiduously gathering evidence against him. Most urgently, I also warned Mach. The Gestapo arrested Beran on May 7, 1941. Mach and Mauer were detained later for other underground activity and executed.

I was not able to avail myself of Froněk’s help for a long time as I was taken to Prague for more interrogations and then transported to Nazi Germany; however, I was able to procure Froněk’s services for some of my fellow prisoners, especially Dr. Jaroslav Pecháček.7 Later, my friend, Dr. Vladimir Salač, a Prague attorney, also found Froněk very useful. When Mauer and my wife discovered that Froněk was a nimrod, they invited him in November 1940 to the last hunt of the season on the territory that I had rented for that purpose in my native village, Vilov. Organized by my best friend and Vilov native, Václav Kocian, the hunt numbered Salač among the guests. Later, Froněk became an important contact for him. He helped Salač to keep his wife Běta and son Ivan alive while they were interned in Terezín along with other Jewish women who had Christian husbands.

Let me describe in a nutshell, what I saw and lived through during my 1940 summer stay in Terezín. I was among the first after being interrogated by the Gestapo, who was were sent there to reduce the overcrowding in the Pankrác Prison, but I did not live there long enough so that I could accurately relate the full scope of the camp administrators’ cruelty and inhumanity. The Gestapo guards had obviously been well trained for their task and had had plenty of opportunity to perfect their prison and camp know-how since Hitler’s rise to power.

From the time they had taken over Terezín, the Gestapo had interned there a group of German Jews from the area around Litoměřice, who were not political prisoners. Jews usually did not participate directly in the resistance because the situation in the Protectorate made it too risky both for them and the underground group. The group was housed in a large cell called Gasperíkova. From the days of Austria-Hungary on, murderers had been kept there. Now, the German authorities had packed the Jewish unfortunates into this cell. Every day during the muster, the Stubenalteste had to report the number of prisoners. The camp administrators demeaned the Jews by requiring that they answer the roll call with the number of
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7 Jaroslav Pecháček (1911-1997) a lawyer and Populist Party activist, served as Vice Prime Minister Jan Šrámek’s chef de cabinet after World War II. In his post-1948 exile, he worked for Radio Free Europe and was the chief of its Munich Czech section from 1965 to 1977.
inmates and followed by the words: “stinking Jews.” If an individual had only one Jewish parent, he had to report as a “half-Jew.”

We witnessed the desperate efforts of our comrade Luka, who was part of the leadership of the young Social Democrats, not to be identified as a “half-Jew” and have to stay in the Gasperíkova with the Jewish contingent. In the evening, he tried to sneak with us into our quarters. This did not work. The guards in Gasparikova did not have the correct prisoner count. They came to our cell and dragged Luka back, all the while beating and kicking him. This inhumane system pushed him where he did not want to be and did not belong.

Toward the end of my stay, I witnessed the arrival of another group of Jews to the small fortress. At this time, the Nazi press had whipped up anger at the United States for its entry into the war. The guards, with Pind’a in the forefront, took their anger out most brutally on their innocent Jewish victims.

We were mustered, and then the Jewish transport was lined up into columns. The guards ordered the Jews to squat and then hop with their arms extended to a finishing line that the administrators had determined. The younger Jews, who won this race, were then required to beat their old and sick co-coreligionists to hurry them along. The guards were utterly indifferent to the old men writhing in pain from heart attacks and to the bleeding human victims. Never throughout the entire war, had I seen anything so horrible! This, of course, was before Terezín became the collection camp for Jews to be murdered in the gas ovens. Devastated by shame and pity, we were forced to watch this terrible spectacle. Whenever one of us displeased a Nazi guard, we were ordered to perform an endless number of squats. So, this desperate orgy also ended with heart attacks among the non-Jewish prisoners.

I had my own run-in with Pind’a. One day, out of the blue, he ordered me to dig a hole with a hoe and to throw the dirt out with a shovel. It was a hot and humid day. Rivulets of sweat poured down my forehead, stung my eyes and ran down my cheeks as Pind’a, riding crop in hand, stood above me. When the hole was so deep that it reached up to my eyes, he mercifully ordered me to crawl out. He slapped and kicked me before ordering me to jog back to the building.

I also had an adventure with a younger guard, Fricek. We, in Fronĕk’s work detail, had become so comfortable and careless that we used to bring cigarettes back for our friends in the camp. All of a sudden, a search was announced. Fricek was in charge. He pulled a dozen men out of line and started a strip search. Suddenly, he grew bored and asked: “Does anyone wish to declare that he has something forbidden on him?” I stepped out and handed Fricek a package of cigarettes. The trick worked! He did not even search me. Fricek praised me and apologized that he, nevertheless, had to punish me. Then, he ordered that I be deprived of supper and locked in the “hole” for two hours, but he did not search me! Two hours later, he took me back to the communal cell. I had nine other packages of cigarettes hidden on my body. Those cigarettes were so much more delicious because daring had procured them.

I had no idea why in the middle of August rather than taking my place in the detail that worked outside the prison I was transported back to Pankrác. The next
day, I was sent to be interrogated in Petschkárna. I had many offenses against the Third Reich on my conscience and wondered what had been betrayed. I did not have to wait long. The Hausvater, as usual, began the introductory procedures by pinning a ribbon on each the detainee’s sleeve. It indicated the category of his alleged offense. Previously, he had always given me a green ribbon; now I received one that was white with a red stripe. I was frightened. The recipients of this ribbon were suspected of espionage and contact with foreign powers.

Another Gestapo agent increased my fear. He brought among us a badly beaten Karel Kraus, a native of my southern Bohemian region. Because Kraus spoke German, I had recommended him to Major Josef Bartík as a candidate for service in the army’s counterintelligence division. He had not visited me in the course of his service, but he did come to see me at the beginning of the Protectorate. He had an offer, he told me, to work for the French intelligence service. I tried to dissuade him warning him that war was imminent, and under those circumstances, this activity was deadly. I suggested that he apply for employment with the city of Prague and offered to go with him to see the mayor, Dr. Otakar Klapka, whom I knew. We went on foot from my office to Wenceslas Square. Just to make conversation, I asked him what he had learned in the intelligence service. For example, did he know how to send coded messages? At the town hall, they took his application, but there was no immediate job available. Now, Kraus was sitting near me in the Gestapo waiting room.

I was led into officer Fleischer’s antechamber. (I don’t know if that was his real name.) A young man in uniform was guarding me. He let me stand there and paid no attention to me while he sat at a small table writing a letter. So preoccupied was he that he did not notice that I had slowly approached the open window. Since seeing the wounded Kraus, I was frightened to death. I resolved to end my life by jumping from a high floor of the Petschek Palace. Then, I noticed that the fence directly underneath the window had massive metal tips. That saved me! What if I only wounded myself? This was the first and only time that I ever wanted to take my own life.

Before I could ponder further, I was called in. To my great surprise, Fleischer was not alone; Anna Volmanová was with him. After the fall of Poland, she had sought me out to inform me that she received news from Dr. Ferdinand Kahánek, an editor, and Jiří Bertl, a National Democrat youth leader. They had sought refuge in Bucharest. Both were without funds. In Poland, they had been engaged in anti-Nazi radio broadcasts. Kahánek had hoped that he would receive
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8 Josef Bartík (1897-1968), the Czechoslovak army’s counterintelligence chief, was one of the eleven indispensable officers that František Moravec, the army’s chief intelligence officer, took with him to Great Britain as he fled by plane just hours before the Nazis marched into Prague. In 1937, Bartík had recruited Hrabík to work for him.

9 Otakar Klapka (1891-1941), a lawyer and a politician had held a number of administrative posts. His last office was mayor of Prague. He was one of the organizers of domestic resistance to the Nazis.

10 Ferdinand Kahánek (1896-1940) had fled abroad. He had worked in the agrarian press from the 1930s. Associate editor of Venkov, the official Party organ, was his last post.
help from the Romanian Agrarian leader Iuliu Maniu, whom the ruling fascist Iron Guard in the interim had pushed aside. He, too, now was without means. Volmanová, the daughter of a wealthy industrialist, was Bertl’s lover. Since her parents did not approve of this relationship, Volmanová could not hope that they would finance her lover abroad. I was not fond of Kahánek, but Volmanová demanded a speedy solution. I turned to my friend Adolf Hrubý, a former member of Parliament, who at that time was the chairman of the Národní souručenství. We met in a social club on Na Příkopce Street, and he gave me ten thousand crowns for Kahánek. What happened to that money, I never found out. I only know that Bertl contacted Volmanová using an industrial courier, a lady who regularly traveled to Romania. The Gestapo followed her. They not only discovered Kahánek’s and Bertl’s activities, but also Volmanová’s. They arrested her, interrogated her harshly, and she finally told them that I had given her the money.

The dramatic confrontation that I expected did not occur. As I entered the room, Volmanová jumped up and declared: “I told the officer that you had given me the ten thousand crowns.” Now, Fleischer jumped up, raised his hand to Volmanová and proceeded to call her every name in the book. From me, he only wanted confirmation that I had given her the money. He was not particularly interested from where the money came. This was my easiest Gestapo interrogation! I didn’t even want to think about how I had felt before the interview. A new desire for life began to throb through my veins, and I was so very happy that I had not succumbed to fear and depression.

My interrogation in Prague ended. Two days later, I was transported back to Terezín and within a week taken to Dresden where I was to face an investigating judge.

Now, I must digress for a few words of explanation. The Gestapo, in spite of its brutal and violent interrogation methods, sought to maintain the appearance of a judicial system. By giving the indictments a semblance of legal norms, the investigating judge justified the Gestapo’s finding of guilt. The most important trials took place before the Senate of the Peoples’ Court in Berlin. The Nazis established branches of this Court in all the countries that they conquered.

**Pre-trial detention: Dresden, Zwickau and Plauen**

On a damp and cold mid-September day, we were put into a truck, which had benches and a canvas roof, and left Terezín for Dresden. My fellow passengers were carefully chosen prisoners so that they did not include any accomplices. We arrived in Dresden by evening and were delivered to the prison on Mathildenstrasse. Everything there was old—even our guard. Correct in all things, he demanded that the cells be orderly and cleanliness be maintained throughout, but he did not yell at us or beat us. After the agitated and emotional stay in Terezín and Pankrác, so full of tears, fears and injustices, life in Mathildenstrasse was calm: all business was taken care of during the day, and the evenings were peaceful and quiet. Although prisoners were not allowed to speak to each other, a
word here and there passed without reprimand or punishment. Slowly but permanently, a change in appetite occurred. In the Protectorate, the provisions that my wife brought during her visits and which Froněk passed on to me supplemented the meager prison diet. Now in Germany, watery soups and other food reduced to a minimum resulted in hunger, which lasted two years, i.e., until I was assigned to an outside work detail after my trial. There was time to think aplenty here. My thoughts often turned to the web that Dr. Weiss was spinning, but life in the Mathildenstrasse went on uneventfully without any interrogations. A month later, I was taken to another prison, one located in Saxony’s Zwickau. For me, this penitentiary meant no improvement with one exception. Something that no one had thought of: the clock in the tower of a nearby church chimed the time for breakfast, morning exercise, lunch, supper and Bedruhe.

A nearly overwhelming desire to smoke asserted itself along with the hunger. (Only very late in life was I finally successful in breaking this habit.) In the Mathildenstrasse and Zwickau prisons, I had no tobacco, although I did have the wherewithal for making a “cundr” and a few German marks that the thieves and safe-crackers in Pankrác had sewn into my clothing. They took advantage of the fact that my civilian clothing, wallet and tobacco pouch had been returned to me before my transport. I was able to avail myself of these “professionals’” charitable ingeniousness only in the Plauen prison (Saxony), where the authorities transferred me shortly before Christmas.

My good fortune was that my wife did not let the Gestapo brush her off. When she discovered that I was no longer in Terezín, she asked my investigatory judge in Dresden to permit a visit. Before he allowed this, I was already in Plauen. She came right after the New Year, at the very threshold of 1941. The warden supervised the visit and demanded that we speak German. MaĜenka quickly asked whether she could give me something to eat and unwrapped the koblihy. I stopped talking and had wolfed down several of them before the warden’s harsh and lying words stopped me: “as if he didn’t get enough to eat here.” My wife’s pleas were in vain; he did not let her give me anything then and there, nor did he let me keep anything for later. MaĜenka was truly audacious. She convinced the guard who was escorting her out of the prison that food would spoil. Under that pretext, she told him to keep the intended gifts and besieged him to try to share them with me. He promised that he would try, and he did. One night while he was on night watch, he opened my cell door and gave me some food and a pouch of tobacco and cigarette papers. That nearly was my undoing! I was in a small county jail, where the floors took turns going outside for our morning exercise. The coast was clear; there was no one in our corridor, so I thought. I rolled a cigarette and proceeded to blow the smoke out of the window. Alas, I had forgotten how quickly the smoke would color the crisp autumn air. A guard stationed beneath the window noticed the wisps curling out of the window. He raced upstairs, flung the door open and yelled: “Who gave you matches?” I stood there—petrified and speechless. After a while, the guard shrugged his shoulders and left. I expected to
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11 Koblihy are a Czech type of donuts. They are usually filled with jam.
be sent to the warden and an investigation, but nothing happened. A kind and benevolent guard, whom I did not know, had discovered my “crime.”

In the spring, I was transferred back to Dresden. This time I was sent to a new prison on Moritz Böhrstrasse. The guards put me into a cell already occupied by a young man. He introduced himself: “I am Chaplain Andritzki of the Hochkirche.” He was a Lusatian Sorb. My scant knowledge of the fate of this branch of the Slav family was about to be improved. Andritzki welcomed me most cordially and heartily in a mixture of German, Sorbian and Polish. He spoke no Czech. He had not been in prison for a long time. On a small shelf, he had three peeled potatoes. They were smiling at me. The chaplain noticed how hungrily I was staring at them. He walked over to the shelf and handed me the potatoes saying: “I have been in prison only for three weeks. I am not as starved as you. Here, take them.”

We quickly became fast friends. Andritzki told me about his life and how a Nazi agent provocateur landed him in jail. One of Saxony’s peculiarities was that while most of the population was Protestant the monarchs were Catholic. My cellmate was a minister of the Protestant Hochkirche. He served as a spiritual guide for the young Lusatian Sorbs who left the villages for the city. The young men went there to learn trades and the young women went to enter domestic service. Chaplain Andritzki held Bible study classes for them. In the group of Christian young men, there was one who kept asking him cunning questions until he had ensnared Andritzki.

My life was good in the company of this devout and patriotic minister. An infestation of bed bugs was the scourge of this new prison. One of the ironies of our fate was that the old prison was clean, but in the new one whenever the lights were turned off, the bed bugs viciously and mercilessly set upon us. Before going to bed, we caught as many as we could in the folds of the beds and killed them. The next morning, we presented them as booty to our guards, who just indifferently shrugged their shoulders. We always prayed before going to sleep. We did so for so long that I felt ashamed of myself—of my superficiality and sinfulness. The devotion and fraternity of this young minister impressed and attracted me.

Suddenly, I received a summons to appear before Investigating Judge Preussner. He asked me several questions and then concentrated on the ten thousand crowns that I had given to Volmanová to send to Kahánek and Bertl in Romania. I did not know that the judge had called me after the arrest of my long-term chief, Rudolf Beran, the chairman of the Republican Party. The judge was preparing Beran’s trial and wanted to include in Beran’s crimes against the Third Reich his guess that Beran had given me the funds. Kahánek, with whom I was not on good terms, had certainly asked Bertl to instruct Volmanová to go to Beran, but that would have been very difficult for her. Beran then, I knew, did not receive people whom he did not know. Nor did I go to Beran; I approached Adolf Hrubý. The judge wanted to break me and was very thorough. During my second interrogation, he confronted me with Kraus. The Gestapo had tortured Kraus into admitting that I had procured him his job with the Czechoslovak intelligence service. Finally, during his interrogations, Kraus remembered that on the way to
the Prague town hall I had asked him about his duties and if he knew how to send and decipher coded messages. Kraus repeated our conversation. Preussner was convinced that I was Beran’s liaison with the resistance abroad. He kept asking about the source of the funds. I insisted that I had sent them from my own savings and for humanitarian reasons. In a tight spot, I turned to the judge and said: “Obviously, my question had to do with Mr. Kraus’s occupation. If he had worked for Baťa, I would have asked him something else.” The judge grabbed my file, angrily threw it on the desk and ordered that I be deprived of three suppers. Neither the judge nor the guards beat us; they preferred other punishments.

My pre-trial interrogations ended. Before I was transported to Gollnow in Pomerania, I had the opportunity to exchange a few quiet words with Dr. Klapka, who was being transferred to Berlin for his trial. Later, he was executed as was Kraus.

**Gollnow**

I do not remember much about the journey from Dresden to Gollnow, where I was taken in the summer of 1941. In Germany, we were transported in separate wagons of regular trains. The public paid little attention to us. Some images from the trip, however, do remain in my memory: the gloomy Pomeranian countryside, the plain with birch and aspen groves, the panorama of the port city of Stettin and the sea. I had never seen the sea before, although Mařenka, when she was single, often spent her vacation there. Like many other Czechoslovak tourists, she loved the Adriatic.

After my sessions with the investigating judge were finished, I had certain privileges. I could receive a periodical of my choice, if someone paid for the subscription. Mařenka arranged that a Prague newspaper was sent to me. *Die Leichturm*, the heavily censored prison periodical, I got for free. I could borrow books from the prison library; unfortunately, I could not choose them; the books were randomly distributed. Also, I was allowed to write home one letter a month.

The prison in Gollnow was old. It had neither running water nor flushing toilets in the cells. Water was brought in pitchers for drinking and buckets for washing the floor. Instead of a toilet bowl, a special chamber pot was provided. A Kalfaktor, an odd job man, emptied it daily. He was a German criminal, sentenced for a minor crime, who helped the guards. One of his duties was shaving his fellow inmates once a week. Soon enough, I became aware that the Kalfaktor wanted to establish contact with me. While the guard was distracted, he whispered: “Do you have tobacco?” After I had signaled with my eyes that I indeed did have tobacco, he continued: “Do you have money?” I nodded, and he proceeded: “If you give me money while I shave you, I will give you bread.” Because I was alone in my cell meant for one prisoner, I was finally able to dig out of my clothing the money that my wife had smuggled to me and my fellow prisoners in Pankrac had sewn in to the shoulder pads. I passed the money to the Kalfaktor when he was shaving me, distributing food and the assigned work, or collecting the finished tasks. (For work, I was given French military saddles to rip
apart and make piles of the salvageable pieces. It was a monotonous and boring task.) In return for the money, the Kalfaktor would give me a slice of bread, which was wrapped in the prison newspaper and inserted into the chamber pot that had been carefully rinsed in carbide. I paid two to five marks for each slice of bread; the delivery was sparse and irregular. During the three-quarters of a year that I spent in the Gollnow prison, I was able to get rid of all the money I had. It would have been impossible to make use of it after my trial when I would be in an inmate’s uniform. In all the prisons, especially in the early 1940s, cruel and pervasive hunger reigned. We often dreamed of bread...its perfume...a slice...

From June 1940 on, I sensed from the newspapers and the overheard conversations of our guards the growing tension between the Third Reich and the Soviet Union. War between the former allies seemed imminent. Hitler finally gave the order for the attack on June 22, 1941. On that day from sunrise to sunset, we heard military marches on the P.A. system, as well as announcements of the fall of enemy cities and other captured Wehrmacht booty. This prison had many Czech inmates. (During our outdoor exercise hour, I had caught a glimpse of the Sokol leader Dr. Truhlář and the Agrarian Member of Parliament Leopold Slíva.) In the first hours and days, we were elated that the new war had brought the Nazis a potential and powerful enemy. As the radio broadcast told of further German advances, the guards’ windows, from the warden to that of the corridor guards, were flung open. The guards did not stop the prisoners from also opening their windows. Both sides listened in suspense: we were sad, and the guards were happy and merry. With the Nazi victories, the guards became more and more indulgent, and our debates grew more and more fiery. The victories so intoxicated the guards that they did not notice that the prisoners were sending messages in Morse code over the heating ducts and plumbing pipes. A prisoner, an aviation expert, who had frequently visited Russia as part of a military mission, took the floor. While it was true that the Russians had more airplanes than the Germans, he explained, the latter’s were quick and very up-to-date and the former’s, slow and obsolete, veritable sitting ducks in the sky. He concluded that the panicky retreat of the Russian forces was real and not an invention of German propaganda. This statement, despite the strict prison rules requiring silence, caused such commotion and noise that even the guards noticed. They immediately ordered: “Bedruhe!”

The next morning during our exercise hour, I met a fellow prisoner who told me: “I live above that defeatist. All night long, I stamped my feet directly over his head so that he could not sleep.” I replied: “And you, brother, how did you sleep?” He half opened his mouth and did not come up with an answer. I do not know if he got the point of my question.

Being alone in my cell was conducive to reflection. The cold and damp fall and winter in this Baltic region did not inspire optimism, but at the same time did not call forth the terror that the torture and brutality that the Gestapo interrogations engendered. If one knew how to read between the lines, the newspapers, although censored, gave one some hope. My wife managed to visit me twice in Gollnow and bring me some news. Information about what was happening at home, although fragmentary, was vital to me. What the Gestapo had
managed to pry out using intimidation, threats and torture was unpleasant, but it did not constitute a capital offense, not even under Nazi law. Up to now, the matters in which I had participated and often had had a leading role had not been betrayed.

I became apprehensive, however, when Mařenka informed me that the Klatovy Gestapo had arrested Vašek and his Kdyně underground group.¹² Many of my friends and acquaintances, such as Karel Vilimec, a secondary school principal, were among those detained. The group had bought out a run of automatic pistols from a local munitions factory. Then, they boxed and hid the weapons to be used against the occupiers when the time was propitious. I financed this venture. From personal experience with the German police, I knew that the interrogator nearly always could take an innocent remark and find in it a contradiction to a co-defendant’s testimony. Fortunately, nobody betrayed the boxes full of pistols, and the Gestapo never discovered them on its own.

My stay in Gollnow was coming to an end. The relative mildness of the weather had surprised me. I ascribed this moderate climate to the proximity of the Baltic Sea and the flat terrain that I had observed from the train as I was being transported there. We did not see the countryside from the prison or during our Freistunde. The colors of autumn seemed to me as a messenger of a time that preceded death, the days of yellowing and falling leaves. Often, Josef Svatopluk Machar’s verse from his melancholic poem, “Kde by měly květů růžě” resonated in my soul. The yellow leaves swished and swirled...

I was rudely awakened from my reverie. In January, I received the summons to appear in court on February 11, 1942. I was part of a group charged with the capital offense of having contact with foreign enemies, i.e. espionage. Dr. Emil Schneeberger, a Prague attorney, Dr. Zdeněk Maloch, the director of the coal industry in the Protectorate, Emilie Obertelová, a clerical employee of the Belgian Consulate in Prague, Jan Lazanský, the director of a gas company in Pilsen and Anna Volmanová, the daughter of an industrialist, were my co-defendants. All belonged to the National Democrat Party. I knew none of them and had had no contact with any of them, except for Volmanová. I have already described the brief meeting that I had had with her, as well as with Kraus.

[To be continued.]

Translated and edited by Mary Hrabík Šámal

¹² Prison officials monitored all prison visits. When no translator was available, the prisoner and his visitor were required to speak German. Mařenka merely informed her husband that Vašek was sick and that several of his friends had caught the same disease. Martin understood that this reference was to the arrest of his very good friend Václav Kocian and the Kdyně underground group.
Some time ago, taking my routine walk home, I noticed a striking picture on the side of a tram: a German officer with a target and “Death-head” written over his face. This is the Czech title for a recent Hollywood movie, “HHhH,” about the assassination of Reinhard Heydrich, Hitler’s right-hand man and the main architect of the Holocaust. The banner next to a local supermarket had been changed to the same poster, bearing an additional slogan in Czech “The greater the evil, the greater the heroes” along with the hashtag #CzechsAreNotSissies. So once I saw an announcement for the forthcoming open air installation “Operation Anthropoid,” the code name for Heydrich’s assassination, I felt like I had to see this. I was wondering how a (hi)story full of conspiracy, fear and suffering, interrupted by isolated acts of heroism and betrayal, would be presented.

This year Prague was full of Operation Anthropoid. An escape game is currently being offered in Czech and English; for 50 Euros you can quickly become a resistance fighter. Its ratings on TripAdvisor are great. The plot goes as follows: You find yourself in an old-fashioned flat where the Czech underground is operating. Its owner was just arrested by the Gestapo, and your team has the unique chance to wipe out traces of his resistance activities (issuing false IDs for Jews) with Nazi perpetrators on your doorsteps. But if you are seeking for more complexity, you can go on a Prague tour focusing on Operation Anthropoid with an all-inclusive 200-page guide book released by one of the most prominent Czech publishing houses in 2016. And if you wish to
experience this on the silver screen, you still have a chance to see two feature-length films (“Anthropoid” 2016, “HHhH” 2017). Many claim that the latter cannot be compared with the skillful writing of Laurent Binet, the French author of this award-winning story reprinted in Czech for the 75th anniversary. Binet, who used to live in Prague for several years, claims that Heydrich’s assassination represents “the most blasphemous anti-Nazi action in the history of World War II,” keeping his sympathies for the young hero-assassins. These were two British parachutists of Czech and Slovak nationality. Binet also admits he would never be able to do such a thing.

Much of the writing published in the Czech Republic in the past two years has centered not so much on Heydrich as on the local parachutists and their aid givers. Unlike Binet, and contrary to what I learned at school and to what we can read in English Wikipedia, the Czech version of it newly identifies both of them as Czechs. Jaroslav Čvančara, author of Anthropoid: The Czechoslovak Patriots’ Story, recently spoke fiercely to media outlets about the Czechs’ “national revenge” against the Nazi Reich. Even to the point of asserting that “no other Hitler-driven nation in Europe has ever dared to carry out such an act.” Wow! Did two Czech (or maybe Czechoslovak) refugees actually and singlehandedly prepare and conduct this plan? And wait, what about the Warsaw uprising in Poland, the destruction of the Gorgopotamos bridge in Greece, the Battle of Sutjeska and Yugoslav, Greek, Polish, Soviet and French partisans in general? Čvančara goes on to accuse current Europe of a declining patriotism. Unfortunately, another attitude may have been observed in Czech public discourse on the “refugee crisis”: either steep xenophobia or, after two years, indifference.

Therefore, I was pleasantly surprised to see people standing around next to a farmers’ market and reading the exhibition banners on Operation Anthropoid on a hot summer day outside the city center in Prague: Young and old, male and
female, singles, couples and families, locals and tourists. Many stopped by to have a look, and I started to ask them about their objectives. The installation (in both Czech and English) focused mainly on the “Czech events”: assassination, resistance, reprisals, including personal histories and many photographs. Czech patriotism and Czechs were often mentioned, but surprisingly never the Jews, never the Holocaust. As for the locals, they hardly ever go to a museum exhibition as they said, but if they are exposed to history in the streets, they eagerly read about it—or at least have a glimpse. And this looked familiar, something they knew from school.

A young couple from France, driven to Prague by Binet’s novel, were sorry to find only a few accessible sites. A Czech visitor, having seen the film, also read the piece and recalled reading some articles and hearing a broadcast about Operation Anthropoid on the radio. A young woman from Russia, a camera slung over her shoulder, was able to understand that this was about the Czechs and World War II. An elderly lady who knew about the installation from the local newspaper wanted to see it for herself. Once there, she seemed overwhelmed by feelings, “sadness” as she expressed it, for so many young people who had lost their lives. She asked herself if today, in our world, we would still be able to find such heroes. As for the foreign tourists, they were left wondering what message the curators wanted to mediate. To be honest, I was too. Is it the readiness to fight, the heroism, the victimhood—perhaps even all of them? What is the purpose of such an act, and who are the enemies? Are they about to come and occupy us, the Czechs, again? In any case, the thought of the urgency to be prepared to strike against possibly another intruder makes me feel uneasy. Yet, perhaps in retrospect, some of us started to think: Who is framing the message to us and why?
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Notable Czech-American Women in Higher Professions

Miloslav Rechcigl, Jr.

This is a follow-up on the previous study dealing with the pioneer Czech American women which clearly demonstrate that American women of Czech ancestry, starting soon after their arrival in America, have played a significant role in the US history. They, generally, exhibited an independent spirit and a nonconforming role.¹

This particular paper focuses on notable Czech-American women in higher professions, specifically such prestigious professions as law and medicine, and various fields of the humanities and sciences, as well as entrepreneurship. In the nineteenth century women rarely had careers and most professions refused entry to women. In the middle of the nineteenth century it was virtually impossible for women to become doctors, lawyers, engineers, architects, bankers or entrepreneurs. In those days, they did not even admit women to institutions of higher learning. As this study demonstrates, this all changed, once the colleges and universities opened their door to women.

I. Professions

The higher and more prestigious gainful professions, such as medicine and law, were not open to women until the end of the nineteenth century.²

A. Law

As Phoebe Couzins stated at the founding meeting of the Alumnae Association of the Women’s Legal Education Society in 1895, “Man has been trying to do the housekeeping in the Temple of Justice for years all by himself, with the result of cobwebs all over the place.... It needs women’s wit, women’s fairness and women’s sense of right and righteousness to put the legal fabric in order and repair.”³ On the brink of the twentieth century, the situation for women aspiring to be lawyers remained discouraging. In 1880, after a decade of one-by-one victories, there were only about 200 women lawyers. By 1910, with the

² Elizabeth Smyth, Sandra Acker, Paula Bourne, and Alison Prentice; Penina Migdal Glazer and Miriam Slater, Challenging Professions: Historical and Contemporary Perspectives on Women's Professional Work: Unequal Colleagues: The Entrance of Women into the Professions, 1890-1940 (Douglass Series on Women's Lives and the Meaning of Gender); Barbara, J. Harris, Beyond Her Sphere: Women and the Professions in American History,
population exploding, there were only 559, less than 1 percent of the vastly expanded legal profession.\(^4\)

Despite their meager numbers, there were several women lawyers of Czech ancestry among them, some of whom attained high distinction. A case in point is Emilie M. Bullowa (1869-1942), a native of New York, NY, whose father was a Czech immigrant. Since both of her parents died before she turned twenty, and, as the eldest of eleven children—some of whom were ill and required nursing—she took charge of her brothers and sisters. In doing so, she postponed her own legal career, not entering law school until each sibling was established in school. This sacrifice for her family foreshadowed a lifetime of selfless devotion to those in need. In 1900, Bullowa graduated from the Law College of New York University and was admitted to the Bar. In that same year, she and her brother Ferdinand opened their own law office in New York called Bullowa and Bullowa, specializing in admiralty law. The firm dealt with the maritime legal affairs of foreign shipping lines. After Ferdinand died in 1919, Emilie continued practicing until her retirement in 1941.

Emilie M. Bullowa earned a reputation for being a great trial lawyer. Lawyers and others admired her ability to convince judges and juries of her cases. In 1919, she established a new point in the law of libel. Her colleagues, as well as many judges, respected her attitude as a woman in a field then dominated by men: She took pride in being a lawyer, rather than in being a female lawyer. From 1916 until 1922, Bullowa was president of the Women Lawyers Association of New York City. When she helped to take the organization to a national level in 1922, she was elected president of the now-named National Association of Women Lawyers. She became a member of the platform committee of the Women’s Democratic Union in 1924 and served as chair of various committees of the American Bar Association. She was also a member of the committee on citizenship of the New York County Lawyers Association, a position which led to her being selected as a judge in an essay contest on the United States Constitution sponsored by the New York Times. In addition, Bullowa was affiliated with the New York Medical College and Hospital for Women, first as a member of its board of directors and then, from 1921 until her death in 1942, as its president.

She never turned away clients who were unable to pay. In her later years, she mainly focused on contract and surrogate cases, in order to help those who could not afford legal aid. After World War I, she inherited a chateau in France, which she gave to the French War Relief; she also adopted several French orphans. During World War II, she donated a mobile kitchen unit to the British War Relief Society in New York and once again adopted children, this time British.\(^5\)


Chronologically and in prominence, Susan Brandeis Gilbert (1893-1975), a native of Louisville, KY, would likely be considered the second most accomplished American woman lawyer of Bohemian ancestry. She was a daughter of the Supreme Court Justice Louis Brandeis, whose father immigrated to America from Bohemia in 1848. She studied at Bryn Mawr College and University of Chicago Law School and was admitted to the New York Bar in 1921. She was appointed special assistant to the United States attorney in New York City. She prosecuted the Trenton Pottery antitrust suit. Shortly thereafter, she went into private practice with Samuel Rosenman. She was the second woman member of the New York State Board of Regents appointed by Governor Herbert Lehman, serving in that post from 1935 to 1949. She was also an active member of the Bar Association of New York City, Hadassah, the Women’s City Club and the Democratic Party. When Brandeis University was founded in Waltham, Massachusetts, in 1949, Susan and her husband Jacob Gilbert were deeply involved in its development. She became the honorary national president of its National Women’s Committee, was made fellow of the University in 1952, and was awarded a doctor of humane letters in 1963.

Two other significant women lawyers of Czech extraction in this period were Ella Payer and Marie Mazáč, both practicing in Chicago. Ella O. Payer (1897-1981), Chicago native, received her law training from the Chicago Law School in 1917 and a diploma from the American Conservatory of Music in 1929. She was law clerk for Hon. Otto Kerner (1919-21), assistant attorney for the Novak and Steiskal State Bank (1925-31) and assistant trust officer for the Madison Square State Bank (1931-33). She then practiced law. Her office was located in Chicago on Madison Street.

Marie K. Mazáč (1906-1990), who was born in Bohemia, came to the US with her parents in 1910. She obtained her education at Northwestern University School of Commerce and the John Marshall Law School. She was secretary for Carroll L. Bragg organization for 5 years, practiced law for five years and since 1932 was secretary for Joseph G. Černý, Mayor of Cicero. She was a member of the Women’s City Club of Chicago, Women’s Bar Association of Illinois, the Chicago Bar Association, and the Bohemian Lawyers Association of Chicago. Her office was located in Cicero, Illinois.

Justine W. Polier (1903-1987), b. Portland, Oregon, of Moravian ancestry, was not only an accomplished lawyer but she also excelled as a judge. She attended Bryn Mawr, Radcliffe, Barnard, and then Yale Law School. Polier was appointed to the Domestic Relations Court in Manhattan by Fiorello La Guardia,
the first judicial appointment in New York State to elevate a woman above the rank of magistrate. An outspoken activist and a “fighting judge,” for 38 years she used her position on the Family Court bench to fight for the rights of the poor and disempowered. She strove to implement juvenile justice law as treatment, not punishment, making her court the center of a community network that encompassed psychiatric services, economic aid, teachers, placement agencies, and families. She did not resign her judgeship until 1973. After that, she directed the Juvenile Justice Division of the Children’s Defense Fund.9

Nanette Dembitz (1913-1989), b. Washington, DC, was another woman of Bohemian ancestry who held one of the first judicial posts as a woman. She obtained her legal education and training at the Columbia University. She became General Counsel of New York Civil Liberties Union (1955-67) and special counsel for Legal Aid Society. From 1967-81, she served as Judge of the Family Court in New York. She was a magnificent judge according to her peers. She took strong stands on issues related to children. She insisted that counseling on contraceptives be given to teen-age girls who appeared in her court. She tried to direct youths released from detention centers to halfway houses. She also advocated earlier placement of infants for adoption, rather than sending them to temporary foster homes.10

Among cotemporary women lawyers of Bohemian ancestry, Maria L. Marcus, Nina S. Appel and Aurelia Gross rank high.

Maria Marcus, née Lenhoff, born in 1933 in Vienna, Austria, of Bohemian ancestry was the daughter of Arthur Lenhoff. She came with her parents to America in 1938. She received her B.A. degree from Oberlin College and her J.D. degree from Yale University. She was Attorney General of New York State (1967-78) and Chief of the Litigation Bureau (1976-78), arguing cases in federal courts, including several before the United States Supreme Court. She was Associate Counsel at the NAACP’s national office (1961-67) and participated in Supreme Court cases that dismantled segregation statutes throughout the South.

In 1978 she joined the Fordham University where she became McLaughlin Professor of Law. She is Fellow, New York Bar Foundation and was Vice-President, Association of the Bar of the City of New York, 1995-96. Her principal subjects included: Corporate and White-Collar Crime, Criminal Justice, Discovery. She is the author of Learning Together: Justice Marshall’s Desegregation Opinions (1992).11

Nina S. Appel, who was born in Prague, Czechoslovakia in 1936, did her undergraduate work at Cornell University, where she was a member in her junior year of Phi Beta Kappa and Psi Chi, the psychology honorary society. She graduated from Columbia as a Stone Scholar. Over the years, she has served as a member of numerous commissions and boards. She has served as a member of the

---

9 Joyce Antler, “Polier, Justine Wise,” in: Jewish Women in America, pp. 1089-1091.
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ABA Council on Legal Education and Admission to the Bar, the accrediting agency for all ABA-approved law schools; she chaired the section during the Centennial Year 1992-1993. She also continued her long-standing relationship with the administrative office of the Illinois courts and has participated as a professor-reporter in many annual programs for the Illinois judiciary. Appel served as Dean of the Law School from 1983-2004. In the middle of 2004, Appel assumed the title of Dean Emerita, the first time such title has been awarded in the long history of the University. She remains a full-time member of the faculty and administration of the law school. Her new responsibilities involve development and alumni activities with the goal of furthering the law school’s strategic plan.12

Among the younger accomplished lawyers of Czech ancestry, Ariela Gross (born in 1965) ranks high. She is a daughter of Nobel Prize-winning physicist David J. Gross. She is a legal scholar and historian. She received her B.A. from Harvard University, her J.D. from Stanford Law School and her Ph.D. in history from Stanford University. She received a Guggenheim Fellowship, a Frederick J. Burkhardt Fellowship of the American Council of Learned Societies, and an NEH Huntington Library Long-Term Fellowship to support her current research for What Blood Won’t Tell.

Gross joined the University of Southern California Law faculty in 1996, where she now holds Professorship in Law and History. Her research and writing focus on race and slavery in the United States. She teaches Contracts, History of American Law, and Race and Gender in the Law. Professor Gross is the author of What Blood Won’t Tell: A History of Race on Trial in America, which has won several awards, including the 2009 J. Willard Hurst Prize for the best book in socio-legal history from the Law and Society Association; the 2009 Lillian Smith Book Award for the best book on the South from the Southern Regional Council; and the American Political Association’s prize for the best book on Race, Ethnicity, and Politics. Gross also is the author of Double Character: Slavery and Mastery in the Antebellum Southern Courtroom (2000) and numerous law review articles and book chapters. She is the co-author of several history textbooks, including America Past & Present (8th ed. 2008).13

B. Medicine

Although women seemed to fare better in medicine than in law, it was not until the nineteenth and twentieth centuries that they were accepted as full-fledged medical practitioners. They were initially trained in special women’s medical schools, which were first opened in 1850s, because regular medical schools would not admit them. In the East, a group of wealthy women offered half a million dollars to Harvard if they would accept women into their medical school. Harvard turned them down, but Johns Hopkins University in Baltimore, Maryland,
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13 For her biographical data see: http://lawweb.usc.edu/contact/contactInfo.cfm?detailID=219
accepted the conditions and built a new medical school in 1893. Soon after other medical schools withdrew their objections to the admittance of women so that separate medical colleges for women became less necessary. During this so-called ‘Gilded Age,’ the number of women doctors rose from a 2,423 in 1880 to more than 7,000 by 1900.14

Among the first women practitioners of Czech ancestry were Frances A. Ring, Anna Frances Novák and Rosina Řehořová Wistein, all in Chicago. Frances A. Ring (1862-1948), who was born in Horažďovice, Bohemia, studied medicine at Harvey Medical Coll. She was associate physician at the Juvenile Court. She was a pioneer woman physician in Chicago, who witnessed the catastrophe of the Chicago fire. She belonged to a number of organizations, including American Medical Association, Illinois Medical Society, Chicago Medical Society and Women Medical Society.15

Anna Frances Novák (born 1864), a native of Mlečice, near Zbiroh, Bohemia, was brought to the US by her parents in 1867 at the age of three. She received her medical training at Bennet Medical School and is believed to be the first Czech woman to graduate from a medical college in Chicago. She was in general medical practice s. 1895. Her office was located in the Bohemian Pilsen district of Chicago.16

Rosina Řehořová Wištein (1867-1937), a native of Hluboká, Bohemia, was trained as obstetrician at University of Illinois. She practiced in Chicago and was connected with the Mary Thompson Hospital. She was most loyal in bringing cases to the hospital and in building up the dispensary. On leaving Chicago she went to Cedar Rapids, Iowa, where she opened a practice, confining her work entirely to internal medicine, doing no surgery or obstetrics. She held a teaching position at University of Illinois and was presumed to be the first Czech woman in US to hold a teaching position at a university. She was very active in the Czech liberation movement, gained support from universities and other influential people. Drexel University College of Medicine has her autobiography in their Archives.17

There were several other women physicians of Czech extraction in Chicago, including Mary R. Legátová, Josephine Petruš, Otilie Železny Baumrucker and Georgiana Dvořák Theobald. Mary R. Legátová was born in Stará Huť, Bohemia, and came to Chicago with her parents at an early age, where she completed her primary education. After she got married, she began studying medicine at the Illinois University, receiving her M.D. degree in 1908. During World War I she did voluntary work for which she received special recognition by the US
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17 Archives and Special Collections, Drexel University College of Medicine, 2900 West Queen Lane, Philadelphia, PA 19129.
Congress. Subsequently she practiced medicine in Chicago. She was a member of numerous organizations including the Bohemian Medical Society.\textsuperscript{18}

Josephine Petrů, née Kratocka who was born in Radenín, Bohemia, in 1877, studied obstetrics under the guidance of the famous professor Vladimír Rubeška at Prague University and passed her examinations with the highest honors. She practiced obstetrics in Chicago upon her arrival in 1908. She belonged to the State Board of Health of Illinois and to various fraternal organizations.\textsuperscript{19}

Ottilie Železná Baumrucker (1880-1964), a native of Dobropůl, Bohemia, came to Chicago with her parents in 1885. She received her M.D. in 1908 from the Rush Medical College of the University of Chicago and was in medical practice since then. She was on the attending medical staff of the Women’s and Children Hospital since 1918. She was president of the Bohemian Women’s Clubs and a member of various other organizations.\textsuperscript{20}

Walburga L. Kacin (1881-1968), was born in Chicago, of Czech ancestry. She first studied fine arts at the Armour Institute of Technology and music at the music school and received a teaching diploma. At the same time, she also studied medicine and received her medical degree from Loyola University in 1912. From 1914-16, she was employed as assistant at the Mary Thompson Hospital and since 1916-18 she was a resident physician and from 1918-21 she held the position of the chief physician. In 1912 she removed her practice to Chicago, where she remained. She was a member of AMA, the Chicago Medical Society and a number of other scientific and cultural organizations.\textsuperscript{21}

Georgiana Dvořák Theobald (1884-1971) was born in Chicago, of Czech parents. She was trained as ophthalmologist at the College of Physicians and Surgeons in Chicago. In 1915 she joined the staff of the Illinois Eye and Ear Infirmary, the institution with which she remained affiliated during her entire career. She was also on the staff of the Hospital of St. Anthony de Padua. In 1919-20 she was also in service of American Red Cross of the US Army, making a trip to Siberia and Europe. In 1938 she was elected President of Chicago Ophthalmological Society. She was a Fellow of AMA, and a member of the Chicago Ophthalmological Society, the American Academy of Ophthalmology, the Chicago Medical Society, Illinois State Medical Society and the Medical Women’s Club. In 1957 she was a recipient of the Howe medal. Her office was located in Oak Park IL.\textsuperscript{22}

Sarah Vasen (1870-1944), a native of Quincy, IL, of Bohemian ancestry on her mother’s side, was considered a true pioneer physician. After completing high school, around 1890, Sarah crossed the Mississippi to attend what would become

\textsuperscript{18} Album representantů všech oborů veřejného života československého, p. 1202a.

\textsuperscript{19} John J. Reichman, op. cit., p. 91.


\textsuperscript{21} Album representantů všech oborů veřejného života československého, 1201a.

the University of Iowa Medical School in Keokuk, the first co-educational medical school in the country. She specialized in obstetrics and gynecology. Unlike the intense years of training doctors now undergo, in the 1890’s imparting all the known medical knowledge of the day took students only three, six-month-long academic years!

She became resident obstetrician at the Blessing Hospital in Quincy. In 1898 she moved to Philadelphia and became superintendent in obstetrics for the Jewish Maternity Home in the city. In 1900 she returned to Quincy and set up a private practice. In 1904 she removed to Los Angeles, CA and in 1905 was associated with the Kaspare Cohn Hospital where she became superintendent. In 1910, she decided to pen her own practice, offering her services gratis on maternity cases to the poor. In 1912, after she got married, she gave up her practice.23

Olga Sadilek Šťastný (1878-1952), a native of Wilber, NE of Czech ancestry, was another pioneer physician, being the first and, at her time, the only Czech woman physician in Nebraska. She was the daughter of well-known Czech pioneers of Wilber, Frank J. and Theresa Jurka Sadilek. After her physician-husband, Dr. Charles Šťastný, prematurely died in 1906, she decided to study medicine and in 1913 graduated from the College of Medicine, University of Nebraska. During 1913 and part of 1914 she took a post-graduate course in Boston, as House Physician of the New England Hospital for Women and Children and began to practice in Omaha in 1914. During the World War (1917) she organized a tag day for the Franco-Serbian Relief Hospital, and $10,000 was collected for that purpose. In that year she organized a Department of Americanization of the Woman’s Division of the State Council of Defense. Her Five-Minute speech on Americanization was accepted by the National Council of Defense and sent to other States as a model. She also was active in Bohemian National Alliance work. In November 1918, she organized a tag day for the benefit of the American Women’s Hospitals serving in France, where $5,000 was collected, enough to establish one dispensary. In December 1918, she sailed to join Unit No. 1 of the above-mentioned hospital at Luzancy, France, for reconstruction work. In July 1919, she left for Czechoslovakia, at the request of Dr. Alice Masaryk, daughter of the president of Czechoslovakia, to teach medical social service and hygiene in the Social Service Training School organized by Dr. Masaryk, with the help of the American Young Women’s Christian Association. She made a survey of the nursing situation in Prague, and as a result the American Red Cross organized a training school for nurses under the direction of the American trained workers. She established a baby clinic and feeding station in Praha VII, one of the poor sections of the city and used it as a teaching center for her students. In October 1919, she was transferred to the Young Men’s Christian Association, where she was given full charge of the Health Department and did much good work in that direction, so that it spread to civilian classes all over the country. This work was constructive, reports showing what was being carried on.

in many places. In December 1921, Dr. Šťastný returned to Omaha on sick leave and in September, 1922, returned again to Europe, planning a course of postgraduate work in Prague and Berlin, but a few months later was called to Athens, Greece, by the American Women’s Hospitals and sent to Smyrna, to work among the deported Christians from Turkey and Asia Minor. She was made Director of the Quarantine Station on Macronissi Island, through which station ten thousand refugees passed monthly. Pest ships from the Black Sea ports discharged their human cargoes on this barren island during the exodus of the Christian population from Anatolia. Dr. Šťastný lived with these outcasts, who suffered from typhus and small-pox, and served them personally for six months. She was decorated with the Cross of St. George by the Greek Government, for this work. She contracted malaria in Greece and left in the fall of 1923. During that year and 1924 she gave many lectures all over the United States. In 1924, having returned to Omaha, she was elected a delegate to the International Medical Women’s Conference in London, in July, and in the fall of that year she returned to Omaha, engaging in her practice. She was elected President of Medical Women’s National Association (1930-31) and National Treasurer (1934-37). She was decorated Medaille de Reconnaissance, France, Cross of St. George (Greece), Nogochi medal (1931), and received special citation for service with Czechoslovak army.

Naomi Deutsch (1890-1983), b. Brno, Moravia, was a leader in the field of public health nursing. She was the second child of Rabbi Dr. Gotthard and Hermine (Bacher) Deutsch. With her parents, her brother Herman, and her sister Edith, she immigrated to Cincinnati, Ohio, where her brothers Eberhard and Zola were born. She graduated from Walnut Hills High School in 1908 and from the Jewish Hospital School of Nursing in 1912. From 1912 to 1916, she worked at Irene Kauffman Settlement House in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. In 1916, she enrolled at New York City’s Columbia University Teachers College, receiving a B.S. degree in 1921. From 1917 to 1924, she worked at the Henry Street Settlement, serving as supervisor, field director, and acting director. She applied for military service in World War I but was refused because of her place of birth. She also was a member of the American Red Cross Nursing Services (badge number 36,776). Deutsch was the director of the San Francisco Visiting Nurse Association from 1925 to 1934 and began public speaking engagements as early as 1926. She became a lecturer in public health nursing at the University of California, Berkeley, in 1933 and in 1934 was appointed assistant professor and assumed full charge of the public health nursing course. She was invited to the White House Conference on Child Health and Protection in February 1931 and to the 1940 Conference on Children in a Democracy. In 1935, Deutsch accepted the position of organizing and directing the Public Health Unit of the U.S. Department of Labor’s Federal Children’s Bureau in Washington, D.C. She became a staff member of the Pan American Sanitation Bureau in 1943. As principal nurse consultant, she collaborated in the development of health programs in the
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Caribbean and Central America and traveled extensively in the region. Returning to Columbia University Teachers College, she served as an associate in research in nursing education (1945–1946) and part-time instructor (1946–1950). Deutsch was affiliated with numerous professional organizations during her career, among them the National League of Nursing Education, the California State Conference of Social Work, the American Nurses Association, the American Association of Social Workers, the National Conference of Social Workers, and Delta Omega. She served at various times on the boards of the California State Nurses Association and the National Organization of Public Health Nursing, as president of the California State Organization for Public Health Nursing and the Social Workers Alliance of San Francisco, and on the governing council of the American Public Health Association. She was also a member of the National League of Women Voters and worked with Planned Parenthood, staying active with these groups well into retirement. She remained in New York City until 1973, when she moved to New Orleans, Louisiana, to share an apartment with her sister, who was in frail health. Deutsch died on November 26, 1983.

There was also a noted early woman physician of Bohemian ancestry in New York. Her name was Edith Buyer (1894-1960), born in New York City, who specialized in psychiatry. She studied in Vienna and University of Lausanne and the Sorbonne, before receiving her medical degree from Johns Hopkins University in 1918. She was a psychiatrist and medical supervisor for the Board of Education in New Rochelle, NY for many years. She had been with the New Rochelle School System since 1927. She was also on the staffs of New Rochelle Hospital and the Vanderbilt Clinic of the Columbia-Presbyterian Medical Center in NYC. From 1930-34 she had a special appointment as an assistant in psychiatry at Columbia University. During World War II she was a Navy medical officer at the WAVES Training School in the Bronx. After release from active duty as lieutenant commander she continued to participate in the Naval Reserve as medical officer of a men’s unit.

The most prominent female physician and medical authority of Bohemian descent was Helen Brooke Taussig (1898-1986), a native of Cambridge, MA, a daughter of the famed Harvard economist Frank W. Taussig. She graduated from Cambridge School for Girls in 1917. She then studied for two years at Radcliffe, before earning a bachelor’s degree from the University of California, Berkeley in 1921. Subsequently she studied at both Harvard Medical School and Boston University before pursuing her postgraduate cardiac research at Johns Hopkins University. She served as an Archibald Fellow in Medicine at Johns Hopkins and worked at the heart station from 1927 until 1928. From 1928 until 1930, she interned in pediatrics at the Johns Hopkins Hospital. In 1930, Edwards Park appointed Taussig physician-in-charge of the Harriet Lane Cardiac Clinic, a position she held until 1963. She also served on the faculty of the school of medicine from 1930 until 1963, when she became professor emeritus of pediatrics.
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In 1964, Taussig received the Medal of Freedom from President Lyndon Johnson, and in 1965 she became the first female president of the American Heart Association. Johns Hopkins University named the ‘Helen B. Taussig Children’s Pediatric Cardiac Center’ after her, and in 2005 the School of Medicine named one of its four colleges in her honor.

Frances Anna Hellebrandt (1901-1992), a native of Chicago of Czech ancestry, was also an accomplished physician and medical researcher. She was a woman pioneer in exercise physiology, physical medicine and rehabilitation. Her love of scientific inquiry led to national acclaim for her many contributions to the study of the physiological mechanisms that control and regulate movement. Much of her research was focused on the use of “muscle overload theory,” a principle currently applied in physical medicine to elicit normal movement patterns in patients with neurological disorders.

Dr. Hellebrandt attended Farragut School and Harrison Technical High School. Her father was an emigrant from Czechoslovakia, a physician “who learned his English from Gray’s Anatomy.” As an undergraduate at UW-Madison, she was enrolled in physical education, a program that sparked her interest in the study of movement. Facing deficiencies in the liberal arts, balanced by A’s in biology, she was determined to take all the science courses she could.

She was an undergraduate assistant in the anatomy department from 1925 to 1928. She completed the bachelor’s degree in physical education in 1928, became an instructor in physiology the following year, and because she had excelled in all the sciences, she completed the Medical Degree in 1929. Post-graduate and specialty training were received at the University of Minnesota (polio), Northwestern University and Mayo Clinic (P. M. & R.), and at Children’s Rehabilitation Center in Baltimore (Cerebral Palsy). Additional study and research in exercise physiology was with the Clinic for Sportsmen, Department of Internal Medicine, Charles University, Prague, Czechoslovakia.

After serving a general internship at the State of Wisconsin General Hospital, she joined the faculty of the Medical School and assumed responsibility for the exercise physiology laboratory. She was an assistant professor of physiology from 1930 to 1936 when she was promoted to associate professor. From 1942 to 1944 she held the titles of associate professor of physical medicine and research
associate in physiology. In 1944, she left UW-Madison to become professor of physical medicine and director of the Baruch Center of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation at the Medical College of Virginia. In 1951, at the University of Illinois, she was professor and head of the Department of Physical Medicine, and chief, physical medicine and rehabilitation, Research and Educational Hospitals until 1955 when she retired. In 1957, Dr. Hellebrandt was invited to return to UW-Madison as a visiting lecturer in the area of motor development. The following year, she was a WARF research professor, and subsequently, professor of medicine and education as an Easter Seals research professor. It was at this time that she established the Motor Learning Research Laboratory, designing the space to be reclaimed from a balcony, which overlooked the gymnasium in Lathrop Hall. She again built ties with the Anatomy Department and the Medical School and directed this lab until 1964 when she again retired. She died at the age of 91.27

Of about the same age as Frances A. Hellebrandt was Angeline Šimeček (1903-1977), born in Wilber, NE, of Czech parents. She received her medical training at the University of Nebraska College of Medicine. She became a physician on the obstetrical and gynecological department of the New York Infirmary for Women and Children and Miserecordia Memorial Hospital. In 1939, she was appointed Medical Director for F. C. Schrafft’s.

Irene Hitchman (née Link) (1908-1986), b. Hohenems, Vorarlberg, Austria, of Czechoslovak ancestry, was a psychiatrist trained at the University of Innsbruck. She immigrated to the US in 1940 and became associated with Springfield State Hospital, MD (1941-62), becoming a psychiatric physician (1947), director of psychiatric education and training (1953), and clinical director (1954). Subsequently she became Director of hospital inspection and licensure at the Maryland State Department of Mental Hygiene (1962-68) and then deputy commissioner (1969-74). She was a specialist in the institutional care and drug rehabilitation treatment of such mental and nervous illnesses as schizophrenia and delirium tremens.28

Ruth Pick (1913-2003), b. Karlovy Vary, studied medicine at the University in Prague, receiving her medical degree in 1938. There she also met her future husband Alfred (Fred) Pick who also became a physician. The couple married in 1938 but the Jewish newlyweds suddenly found their world crumbling when they were sent to Nazi concentration camps from 1942 to 1945. They miraculously survived the Holocaust. In 1949, Fred and Ruth came to the United States and began to do work at Michael Reese Hospital under the leadership of Dr Louis Katz. Beginning as a Research Fellow, there began a career for Ruth, during which she collaborated with many key scientists and was an integral part of the research leading to our current understanding of atherosclerosis and interstitial

heart disease. She was active in the American Heart Association as a fellow but was also exceedingly active in the development of the strong Chicago Branch; she served on the Board of the Chicago Heart Association, served on its Executive Committee, and acted as its President between 1985 and 1986. She also was an Established Investigator of the American Heart Association for nearly a decade.  

Among the contemporaries, Suzanne Oparil, born in 1941 in Elmira, NY of Czech ancestry, deserves special mention. She is Professor of Medicine and of Physiology and Biophysics at the University of Alabama School of Medicine in Birmingham, where she holds the title of Director of the Vascular Biology and Hypertension Program. Dr. Oparil received her medical degree from Columbia University College of Physicians and Surgeons in New York, where she was first in her class. She completed her residency at Columbia Presbyterian Hospital and a fellowship at the Massachusetts General Hospital in Boston. A past-President of the American Heart Association, Dr. Oparil was the first woman past-President of the American Federation for Medical Research.

Dr. Oparil has a career interest in the fundamental mechanisms of cardiovascular disease and in using the information to develop novel treatments. Her research spans the gamut from molecular and cellular studies to the whole animal to clinical trials. She has made a number of discoveries that have major clinical impact: 1) The observation that angiotensin-converting enzyme (ACE), a biological catalyst responsible for generating a hypertension producing hormone, is involved in many forms of vascular disease. This work has led to the development of the ACE inhibitors, the most commonly used class of drugs for the treatment of high blood pressure and heart failure. 2) Identification of endothelin as the major mediator of pulmonary hypertension and pulmonary vascular disease. This has led to the development of a class of drugs that provide hope for patients with pulmonary hypertension, a previously untreatable disorder. 3) Definition of novel pathways by which blood vessels are protected from injury by estrogens. This research, carried out in rodent models, has given important clues about how female sex hormones protect the blood vessels and has yielded tantalizing targets for future gene therapy.

Dr. Oparil was honored with the Founder’s Award of the Southern Society for Clinical Investigation, the Lifetime Achievement Award from the Consortium for Southeastern Hypertension Control, and the Irving Page-Alva Bradley Lifetime Achievement Award of the American Heart Association-High Blood Pressure Research Council. She is author and coauthor of more than 1,000 abstracts, book chapters, and journal articles in Circulation, New England Journal of Medicine, and American Journal of Hypertension, among others.  

---
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A. The Humanities

History

Adelaide Lisetta Fries (1871–1949), b. Salem, NC, was of Moravian ancestry. She was the foremost scholar of the history and genealogy of the Moravians in the southern United States. She made important contributions to the field as archivist, translator, author and editor.

In 1911, the Provincial Elders’ Conference of the Moravian Church in America, Southern Province, appointed Fries as archivist of the Southern Province, and granted her the use of a warehouse in Salem as repository and office. She immediately began collecting, organizing, translating and publishing records, a work that continued until her death. The result of her labors was the monumental *Records of the Moravians in North Carolina* (1922-1954): Volume I (1752-1771), 1922; Volume II (1752-1775), 1925; Volume III (1776-1779), 1926. Fries was never satisfied that the warehouse was a safe repository, and over the years her friends and supporters raised enough money to convert the former office of the business manager of the Salem community into a fireproof repository. The archives moved into the new building in 1942.

One of Fries’ best-known monographs is *The Road to Salem* (1944), an account of the life of Anna Catharina (Antes) Ernst (1726-1816). Written in the first person, the book is based on Ernst’s autobiography and on the diaries and records kept by leaders of the Moravian Church in Georgia, Pennsylvania, and North Carolina. Another well-known book, *The Moravians in Georgia*, has entered the public domain and is available online. Forsyth County was revised and updated in 1949, and a further revision and update was issued in 1976.31

Alice Kessler-Harris (1941-), b. Leicester, England, of Czech and Hungarian ancestry, is an authority on labor history and women’s history. Alice Kessler-Harris attended school in Cardiff, Wales, at the Birchgrove School and then Cardiff High School for Girls. She completed her secondary schooling in Trenton, New Jersey. Her father was a shoe designer; her mother died when she was only forty years old. Kessler-Harris counts as her earliest and most significant childhood influences her refugee status and “foreign” parentage. Alice Kessler-Harris attended Goucher College, receiving a bachelor’s degree cum laude in 1961. Kessler-Harris then attended Rutgers University, earning a master’s degree in history in 1963 and a Ph.D. in 1968. She has been awarded honorary degrees from Goucher College and the Uppsala University in Sweden. Kessler-Harris’s first academic appointment was at Hofstra University, where she was assistant professor from 1968 to 1974, associate professor from 1974 to 1981, and professor from 1981 to 1988. While at Hofstra, Kessler-Harris was co-director of

---

the Center for the Study of Work and Leisure from 1976 to 1988, and she held visiting faculty positions at Sarah Lawrence College, the University of Warwick, and Binghamton University, the State University of New York. In 1988 she accepted a position as professor of history at Temple University, and in 1990 she left Temple to accept the position as professor of history at Rutgers University. From 1990 to 1995 she was also director of women’s studies at Rutgers.

Alice Kessler-Harris is the author or editor of ten books, author of twenty-five scholarly articles, and author of another twenty-five essays and miscellaneous pieces. She also held contracts for two additional books, Gender Ideology in Social Policy, published by Oxford University Press, and Gender and Culture: Reviewing the Historical Paradigm, published by the University of North Carolina Press. Out to Work: A History of Wage-Earning Women in the United States was awarded the Philip Taft Prize for the Best Book in Labor History in 1982 and has been excerpted in three subsequent texts. One of her most recent works is a collection of essays in honor of Gerda Lerner that she edited with Linda Kerber and Kathryn Kish Sklar. Several reviewers have argued that this collection defines the state of the art of women’s history in the United States today.  

Archeology

Helen Henrietta Tanzer (1876-1961), born in New York, NY, of Bohemian ancestry, was a daughter of the New York lawyer Arnold Tanzer. She received her A.B. from Barnard College in 1903 and studied at the American School of Classical Studies in Rome from 1906 to 1907. During World War I, she served as the Assistant Director of the Division of Foreign Language Publications for the Commission on Public Information from 1917-1918. In Belgium after the war she worked for the official information service and edited the Belgian Bulletin. In the United States, she served as an honorary attaché to the Belgian Embassy, and in 1919, she was named to the Chevalier Order of Leopold II. Tanzer studied Archaeology under Dr. David Moore Robinson at the Johns Hopkins University and received her Ph.D. in 1929. She taught Latin and Greek at Hunter College and Brooklyn College. Her scholarship focused on ancient Roman culture. Tanzer translated ancient texts, edited collections for classroom use, and published two books, The Villas of Pliny the Younger (1924), and The Common People of Pompeii (1939). She retired from teaching in 1937. During her career, she developed a personal collection of over 1,000 ancient Greco-Roman artifacts. In 1939, she donated her collection to the Johns Hopkins University Archaeological Museum (now the Archaeological Collection), which was then under the direction of her former advisor, Dr. Robinson. Tanzer died on December 23, 1961, in Washington, DC.


Languages and Literature

English

Marjorie Perloff (née Gabriele Mintz) (1931-), born in Vienna, Austria, of Moravian ancestry, immigrated to the United States with her family in 1938. She attended Oberlin College and Barnard College and received her B.A. degree magna cum laude in 1953. She then attended the Catholic University, receiving her M.A. degree in 1956 and Ph.D. in English in 1965. She was a member of the faculty of Catholic University (1966-71), becoming assistant professor (1966), associate professor (1969), and then professor of English. She then joined the faculty of the University of Maryland, Baltimore (1971-76), as associate professor (1971) and full professor (1973). Since 1976 she held the position of Florence R. Scott Professor of English at the University of South California, Los Angeles. In 1986, she came to Stanford University, where she is the Sadie D. Patek Professor Emerita of Humanities in the English Department. Currently, she is a Scholar-in-Residence at the University of Southern California. A prominent literary critic, she is best known for her work on contemporary American poetry, and, in particular poetry associated with the avant-garde. She is the author of twelve books, including Differentials: Poetry, Poetics, Pedagogy, The Vienna Paradox: A Memoir, Poetry On and Off the Page: Essays for Emergent Occasions, Wittgenstein’s Ladder: Poetic Language and the Strangeness of the Ordinary, Radical Artifice: Writing Poetry in the Age of Media, Poetic License: Studies in the Modernist and Postmodernist Lyric, The Futurist Moment: Avant-Garde, Avant Guerre, and the Language of Rupture

Bridget Gellert Lyons (1932-), born in Prague, Czechoslovakia, is a literary scholar, educated at Oxford University and Columbia University. She has been associated with Rutgers University, New Brunswick (s. 1965), becoming full professor of English in 1978. She is a specialist on sixteenth and seventeenth century Renaissance English literature and on Shakespeare. She is the author of Voices of Melancholy: Studies in Literary Treatments of Melancholy in Renaissance England (1975) and Reading in an Age of Theory (1999).

Doris Leonora Eder (1936-), born in Teplice, Czechoslovakia, is a Hunter College educated literary scholar. She was first associated with the Ohio State University (1966-70) and then with the University of Rochester, where she had risen from assistant to associate professor of English (1970-77). Subsequently she was appointed dean of faculty at Schenectady Co. Community College (1977-78), then dean of Keene State College (1978-82) and finally dean of the School of Arts and Sciences at the University of New Mexico (1982). She is a specialist on modern and contemporary American, British and European literatures.


34 International Biographical Dictionary of Central European émigrés, 1933-1945, p. 897.
Germanic Languages

Charlotte H. Clark (1910-2001), b. Brno, Moravia, was a language specialist, trained at the Charles University in Prague. After coming to the US, she taught at the University of Hartford (1960-76), where she rose from assistant professor of German to full professorship and department head (1973-76).

Lore Barbara Foltin (1913-1974), b. Vienna, Austria, was a literary scholar educated at the German University of Prague. She was associated with the University of Pittsburgh since 1949 and as associate professor of Germanic languages and literatures since 1961. Her interests were Franz Werfel, Rilke and Schnitzler. She was the author of *Franz Werfel 1890-1945* (1961) and a co-editor of *Paths to German Poetry: An Introductory Anthology* (1969).

Hanna (née Fischl) Spencer (1913-2014), born in Kladno, Czechoslovakia, was educated at University of Prague. In 1939 she succeeded in escaping from Nazi Czechoslovakia and immigrated to Canada. She has been associated with the University of Western Ontario since 1959, becoming professor of German in 1977. She is the author of a mesmerizing autobiography, *Hanna’s Diary 1938-1941, Czechoslovakia to Canada* (2005).

Wilma Iggers, nee Abeles (1921-), b. Miřkov, Czechoslovakia. She immigrated to Canada in 1938 and to the US in 1950. She received her B.A. and M.A. degrees at McMaster University in 1942 and 1943, respectively, and Ph.D. at the University of Chicago in 1952. As a newly married couple, she and her husband, George Iggers, went to the American South where they taught in two historic Black colleges and were involved in the civil rights movement. Initially, she taught and did research in German and Czech literature but gradually switched to history. Wilma Iggers’ most recent positions were Professor of German at Canisius College, Buffalo (1965-1991), since then Professor Emerita. Her interests have been in Jewish social and cultural history, Karl Kraus, and Jaroslav Seifert. She is the author of *Karl Kraus: A Viennese Critic of the Twentieth Century* (1967), *Die Juden in Böhmen und Mähren* (1986), *The Jews of Bohemia and Moravia: A Historical Reader* (1993) and *Women of Prague: Ethnic Diversity and Social Change from the Eighteenth Century to the Present* (1996). Together with her husband, they wrote their joint autobiography, under the title *Two Lives in Uncertain Times: Facing the Challenges of the 20th Century as Scholars and Citizens* (2006).

Doris Cohn (née Zucker) (1924-), b. Vienna, Austria, of Bohemian ancestry, emigrated to the US in 1939. She is a literary scholar who received her training at Radcliffe College and Stanford University. She first taught at Indiana University (1964-71) and since 1971 she has held the position of professor of German at Harvard University. She is now Ernest Bernbaum Professor of Literature. She is an authority on European romanticism, the modern novel, and nineteenth and twentieth-century German literature. She has taught and conducted research in Berlin, Freiburg, and Vienna. Her book *Karl Kraus: A Viennese Critic of the Twentieth Century* (1967) has become a standard reference work on Kraus and his literary circle. She has also written on Romantic literature, modernism, and Jews in Central Europe. Her latest book, *Women of Prague: Ethnic Diversity and Social Change from the Eighteenth Century to the Present* (1996), is a comprehensive study of the lives and works of Jewish women in Bohemia and Moravia.

---

twentieth century German literature. She won the Modern Language Association of America’s Aldo and Jeanne Scaglione Prize for Comparative Literature Studies.

Marketa Goetz-Stankiewicz (1927-), b. Liberec, Czechoslovakia, is a literary scholar educated at the University of Toronto. She has held the position of Professor of German and comparative literature and head of the department at the University of British Columbia where she is now Professor Emerita. She has contributed some thirty essays on German, Comparative, Czech and Polish literature to books and periodicals, has written introductions to plays and theatre programs, and several of her essays have been reprinted in collections of literary criticism or translated and reprinted in other languages. In 1972 and 1992 she was awarded UBC Excellence in teaching awards; in 1988 she received the order of the Ordo Scriptores Bohemici in Prague; in 1992 she was awarded the Boeschenstein medal of the CAUTG. She is the author of The Silenced Theatre: Czech Playwrights Without a Stage (1979) and editor of Drama Contemporary: Czechoslovakia (1985), The Vaněk Plays: Four Authors One Character (1987) and Good-Bye, Samizdat: Twenty Years of Czechoslovak Underground Writing (1992), and co-editor of Critical Essays on Václav Havel (1999).

Charlotte M. Craig (1929-), b. Ostrava, Czechoslovakia, is a German language and literature educator who has held the position of professor of German at Kutztown State University of Pennsylvania since 1974. She received her B.A. from the University of Puget Sound, her M.A. from the University of Arizona, and her Ph.D. from Rutgers University. She has previously taught at the University of Kansas, George Washington University, and Schiller International University, Heidelberg, Germany. In addition to numerous articles in professional journals, she is the author of Christoph Martin Wieland as the Originator of the Modern Travesty in German Literature, and she is General Editor of the series The Enlightenment: German and Interdisciplinary Studies.

Romance Languages

Jiřina Anna Sztacho (1910-1984), b. Hradec Králové, Bohemia, was a literary scholar who received her training at Charles University, University of Paris and Columbia University. She was associated with the Bronx Community College since 1960. In 1965 she became professor of French and during 1964-71 she served as a department head. She was a specialist on modern French literature, philosophy, ethics and morals.

Ludmila Ondrujová Velinský (1905-1998), b. Bzenec, Moravia, studied psychology and French at Masaryk University. In 1959 she became professor of French at the Southeast Missouri State College and, later, she taught at the Northern Illinois University at DeKalb, IL. She was a specialist on French literature and the teaching methods of modern languages. She is the author of From the Gloom of Today to New Greatness of Man: Itinerary by Henri Michaux, Builder of New Poetry (1977).
Notable Czech-American Women in Higher Professions

Olga Bernal (1929-2002), born in Czechoslovakia, was deported to Auschwitz at the age of 14; she was the sole survivor of her family. After the war, she received her doctorate in French Literature at Columbia University and subsequently taught at Vassar College and SUNY Buffalo. She published several books with Gallimard in France. In 1980, she moved to the south of France and dedicated herself entirely to the creation of sculpture. Her radiant presence will continue to cast its light upon the lives of her friends and admirers.

Eva Dubská Kushner (1929-), b. Prague, Czechoslovakia, is a noted scholar in the fields of Comparative and French Literature, as well as in Renaissance, Canadian and Quebec literature. Eva Dubská lived in France, 1939-1945, then returned briefly to Czechoslovakia after World War II, before coming to Canada. She received her university education at McGill University. Her teaching career began in 1952; and in the 1950’s she was a Lecturer at various institutions, including McGill, and University College London. In 1961 she began teaching at Carleton University, achieving the position of Full Professor (French and Comparative Literature) in 1969. She joined McGill University in 1976 as Professor of French and Comparative Literature and as Director of the Department of French Language and Literature. Professor Kushner was named President of Victoria University in 1987; she served two terms there until 1994, continuing to teach, as well as acting as the Director of the Northrop Frye Centre, 1988-1994. Becoming Professor Emerita of French Literature in 1994, she maintained an active teaching and writing career, as well as attending and delivering papers at a number of international conferences. Eva Kushner works in comparative literature, Renaissance studies, contemporary French literature, and Québec poetry at Victoria College, University of Toronto. Her books in these fields include the following collaborative works: *Théorie littéraire. Problèmes et perspectives* (1989), *Histoire des poétiques* (1997), *L’Avènement de l’esprit nouveau, 1400-80* (1988), and *Crises et essors nouveaux, 1560-1610* (2000). Professor Kushner was named an Officer of the Royal Order of Canada in 1997.36

Eva Maria Stadler (1931-), b. Prague, Czechoslovakia, is a Columbia University trained literary scholar. Since 1968, she has been associated with Fordham University, where she has been professor of French and comparative literature and chair of the division of humanities (1973). She is a specialist on literature of the eighteenth century, the novel and theory of narration, prose, fiction and film.

**Slavic Languages**

Maria Němcová Banerjee (1937-), b. Prague, Czechoslovakia, is a Harvard University trained literary scholar. She has been with Smith College since 1964, serving as associate professor of Russian literature since 1972. She is a specialist on 19th and 20th century Russian, esp. Dostoevsky and symbolism, Pushkin, Russian and European realism in the novel. She is the author of *Terminal

---


Elena Sokol (1943-), b. Chicago, is of Czech ancestry. She was educated at the University of Colorado and at the University of California at Berkeley. She now holds the position of professor and chair in the department of Russian studies, as well as chair of the Cultural Area Studies program, College of Wooster, OH. Her areas of expertise include Russian and Czech literature, language, and culture. A second-generation Czech American, Sokol is also an authority on life in Russia and the Czech Republic today. She also teaches courses in comparative literature and women’s studies. Currently, she is working on a book about contemporary Czech women writers. The author of Russian Poetry for Children, Sokol has conducted abundant research experience in the former Soviet Union. She has also served as resident director of study abroad programs in Leningrad, Moscow, and Krasnodar; as well as in Olomouc, Czech Republic.

Bronislava Volková (1946-), b. Děčín, Czechoslovakia, is a Charles University trained philologist with the focus on Slavic and general linguistics. She first taught at the University of Virginia (1980-82), and then at Indiana University, where she now holds the position of professor of Slavic languages and literatures. Her research interests include Semiotics, emotive language and Czech literature. She also writes poetry. She is the author of The Courage of the Rainbow: Selected Poems (1993), A Feminist’s Semiotic Odyssey Through Czech Literature (1997), Motáky do uší pěny / Prison Notes Smuggled into the Ears of Seafoam (1995), Transformations / Proměny (2001), Entering Light/Vstup do světla (2002), A Certain Absence / Jistá Nepřítomnost Up the Devil’s Back: A Bilingual Anthology of 20th-Century Czech Poetry (2008)

Oriental Languages


Linguistics

Elizabeth Closs Traugott (1939-), b. Bristol, England, of Bohemian ancestry, is a granddaughter of Robert Priebsch (1866-1935), an eminent Bohemian art critic and successful novelist. A linguist, she was educated at the University of California at Berkeley (Ph.D. 1964). She is Professor Emerita of Linguistics and

**B. Social Sciences**

**Economics**

There were four prominent American women economists of Bohemian ancestry: Elizabeth Brandeis Raushenbush, Jean Atherton Flexner, Ilse Mintz and Marianne A. Farber. Elizabeth Brandeis Raushenbush (1896-1980) was a native of Boston, MA, being a daughter of the Supreme Court Justice Louis Brandeis, whose father immigrated to America from Bohemia in the revolutionary year 1848. She was an economics professor who used her scholarly understanding of labor issues as a public advocate. Raushenbush received her B.A. from Radcliffe College in 1918 and her Ph.D. in Economics from the University of Wisconsin, Madison in 1928. She taught in the Economics Department at the University of Wisconsin for over 40 years. As an academic, Raushenbush studied the economic, sociological, and political implications of unregulated working conditions. She used her research to argue the importance of minimum wage levels, child labor laws, and legislation to protect the wellbeing of the injured and unemployed. Her greatest achievement as an advocate was leading the successful fight for the implementation of unemployment insurance in Wisconsin. The resulting law, called the ‘Groves Bill,’ was fashioned after a model law that she had developed. It was the first law of its kind in the United States, providing the foundation for the Social Security Act of the New Deal.37

Jean Atherton Flexner (1899-1989), was born in Louisville, KY, of Bohemian ancestry. She was a daughter of famed education reformer Abraham Flexner,
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whose father was a Czech immigrant from Všeruby, Bohemia. She received her training in economics at Brookings Institute. As labor economist, Bureau of Labor Statistics, US Department of Labor (1945-), she wrote numerous bulletins on such topics as Some Aspects, the British Workers Control Movement (1922), The Work of an Industrial Hygiene Division in a State Department of Labor, Management Relations in Scandinavia, Consumer Cooperatives, Consumer Cooperatives in the United States. Recent developments, Cooperative Housing in the United States and co-authored the book The American Federation of Labor: Policies and Prospects (1933). She was also the author of the Memoir of the Flexner Family.

Ilse Mintz, née Schüller (1904-1978) was born in Vienna, Austria, of a Moravian father. She was a University of Vienna trained economist, who immigrated to US in 1940. She was with Columbia University (1948), attaining full professorship in 1968. Subsequently she served as adjunct professor at the Catholic University of America (1969-71). She was a specialist on international economics and business cycles and carried out research on the relationship between fluctuation on American export and freight import demand. She was the author of numerous books, including Trade Balances during Business Cycles (1959), American Exports during Business Cycles, 1879-1958 (1962), Dating Postwar Business Cycles (1964), Cyclical Fluctuations in the Exports of the United States since 1879 (1967), Dating Postwar Business Cycles: Methods and their Application to Western Germany (1969). Deterioration in the Quality of Foreign Bonds Issued in the United States,1920-1930 (1970). Her US Import Quotas: Costs and Consequences (1973) addressed the problem of non-tariff barriers in international trade in the US, emphasizing that transitory assistance to suffering industries is cheaper and more efficient than protective quotas.38

Marianne A. Ferber, née Abeles (1923-), b. Miřkov, Czechoslovakia, immigrated to Canada in 1938 and to the US in 1944. Ferber received her B.A. at McMaster University in Hamilton, Canada in 1944 and her M.A. and Ph.D. at the University of Chicago in 1946 and 1954, respectively. She was employed as economist by Standard Oil in New Jersey and also lectured at Hunter College. Since 1954 she was a member of the University of Illinois’ department of economics at Urbana, first as lecturer, then assistant professor (1971), associate professor (1974) and full professor (1979). She is an American feminist economist and the author of many books and articles on the subject of women’s work, the family, and the construction of gender. She is most noted for her work as coeditor with Julie Nelson of Beyond Economic Man: Feminist Theory and Economics and her book The Economics of Women, Men and Work, co-authored with Francine Blau and Anne Winkler. Highly regarded for her role as a central figure in the development of feminist economics, Ferber has written a great deal to expand the literature on women’s presence in relation to the economy. She was one of the first people to confront Gary Becker’s work on economics and the family.38

---

Ferber is a Professor Emerita of economics and former head of women’s studies (from 1979–1983 and 1991–1993) at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. From 1993-1995, she was the Horner Distinguished Visiting Professor at Radcliffe College. She has served as a professor of economics at the University of Illinois for 38 years. In the 1970s, she was a member of the Committee on the Status of Women in the Economics Profession. Later, she became a founding member of the International Association for Feminist Economics (IAFFE) and in 1995 and 1996 served as IAFFE’s president. Also, she was the president of the Midwest Economic Association and received the McMaster University 1996 Distinguished Alumni Award for the Arts.39

Psychology

There were several American women psychologists with Czech roots of note, the earliest being Hildegard Nagel (1886-1985). She was born in St. Louis, MO, as the daughter of Louis Brandeis’ sister Fanny, whose father was an immigrant from Bohemia. She was raised in St. Louis and her early years were marked by the death of her brother Alfred and the suicide of her mother. Following her graduation from Bennett College in Millbrook, New York, she worked with a psychoanalyst at Johns Hopkins University in Baltimore, where she met her lifelong friend, Ellen Thayer, a magazine editor. A student of Carl Jung and Gerhard Adler, Hildegard Nagel spent most of her professional life as a psychiatric social worker in New York City. She was a member of the C.G. Jung Foundation for Analytical Psychology and served as president of the Analytical Psychology Club of New York (APCNY). An editor, translator, and writer, Hildegard Nagel helped to disseminate Jungian ideas in this country, publishing a critique of Jung’s essay, “Answer to Job,” as well as other papers delivered to the APCNY.40

Magda Blondau Arnold (1903-2002), a native of Moravská Třebová, Moravia, was also a noted psychologist. The University of Toronto trained psychologist, she started her career with Bryn Mawr College (1948-50) and then Barat College of the Sacred Heart (1950-52). Subsequently she became professor of psychology and director of the experimental division at Loyola University (1952-72) and then professor of psychology and director of the Social science division at Spring Hill College (1972).

She was a pioneering figure of twentieth century emotions research whose path breaking and comprehensive theory of emotion is an ambitious fusion of research in cognition, motivation, neuroscience, and personality. Contributors’ reviews and critiques of Arnold’s work offer a panorama of twentieth century emotion science, revealing where progress has been made, particularly in understanding appraisal processes, and highlighting issues that emotions

39 Ibid., p. 293.
researchers continue to especially grapple with questions concerning emotion and value, optimal human functioning, and the complexity of affective and motivational pathways in the brain.

Because of her interest in personality psychology, Magda Arnold became a leader in the revival of the psychology of emotion, long neglected while behaviorism was the prevailing paradigm. Arnold’s life story is no less complex and inspiring than her multifaceted view of human emotion. She was a woman in a field substantially dominated by men, a devout Roman Catholic at a time when the scientific objectivity of Catholic scholars was questioned, and an immigrant, first to Canada and then the U.S., whose early life had provided her with no advantages and little opportunity.41

Marie Jahoda (1907-2001), a native of Vienna, Austria, of Bohemian ancestry, was also an extraordinary psychologist. She was trained as a teacher and psychologist in her home city. In 1937, after a period of imprisonment by the Austro-fascist regime, Jahoda fled Austria, staying in England during World War II. In 1946 she arrived in the United States. During her time there, she worked as a professor of social psychology at the New York University and a researcher for the American Jewish Committee and Columbia University. She contributed significantly to the analysis of the Authoritarian Personality. Between 1958 and 1965, at what is now Brunel University, she was involved in establishing Psychology degree programs including the unique four-year, “thin-sandwich” degree. Jahoda founded the Research Center of Human Relations and was recruited by the University of Sussex in 1965, where she became Professor of Social Psychology. Later at Sussex University she became consultant, and then Visiting Professor, at the Science Policy Research Unit.

In 1958 she developed the theory of Ideal Mental Health. Through her work Jahoda identified five categories which she said were vital to feelings of well-being. These were: time structure, social contact, collective effort or purpose, social identity or status, and regular activity. She maintained that the unemployed were deprived of all five, and that this accounted for much of the reported mental ill-health among unemployed people. In the 1980s, when unemployment levels were again high, this approach was rather influential, and her Marienthal studies attracted renewed interest: she made many presentations on this topic in Europe. She was at that time working at the Science Policy Research Unit, where she had also contributed substantially to the Unit’s work on innovation and futuristic studies.42


Vera Dreiser (1908-1998), b. New York, NY, of Bohemian ancestry, rebelled against her mother’s strict Catholicism and left the Church. She did graduate work at New York University, receiving the Ed. D. degree in 1944. In 1939 she was married to Alfred E. Scott, a newspaperman. She became a psychologist and practiced successfully in New York from 1947 through 1961, when she became administrator of the psychiatric unit at the California Inst. for Women, where she worked with prisoners until her retirement in 1972. In 1973 she went to Terre Haute to research a book on her famous uncle Theodore Dreiser, which she published in 1976 under the title My Uncle Theodore.43

Erna Mary Furman, née Popper (1926-2002), a native of Vienna, of Czech ancestry, was an American child psychoanalyst, psychologist and teacher. She was educated at the Academy of Commerce in Prague and as a little girl went to Montessori nursery school in Vienna. When the Germans arrived on March 13, 1938 she visited the gymnasium, and suddenly most of the children yelled ‘Get out of here, you Jew.’ In 1938, after Germany’s annexation of Austria, when she was twelve years old, her family having Czech citizenship fled to Czechoslovakia to escape the Nazis. Unfortunately, this move provided only temporary safety. In spring 1939 her father left for Belgium and England. They were to meet again only at the end of the summer of ‘46.

Four years later, in October 1942, she and her mother were sent to the Theresienstadt concentration camp, Terezín, near Prague. While living there she was put twice on the list for being transported to Auschwitz and both times she managed to have her name removed. In January 1943 she asked the Jewish Elder to take her out of the transport. Edelstein took her out of the transport because her mother had died that morning and she had acquired a different status by her mother’s death.

She came to Terezín from Prague in October 1942 and left in May 1945 (when the Russians took over Terezín). From age 16 to almost 19 years, she worked the entire time as a ‘Betreuerin’ (caregiver) in a children’s home (L 318). The L 318 was one of the orphan houses in the ghetto. Later in 1945 in Olešovice—in the Přemysl Pitter Children’s Rehabilitation Center, situated in a castle of baron von Ringhoffer not far from Prague—she was a tutor for a group of children who survived Terezín and other camps.

Erna Furman’s Terezín drawings were displayed at the Friedl Dicker-Brandeis’s exhibit series in Japan in April-October 2002. They were included in the exhibit and on display for the first time, the drawings and diaries of Erna Furman, “a survivor of Terezín and pupil of Friedl.” Her materials were in a special corner of the exhibition, called “Erna’s Room.” She and Friedl Dicker-Brandeis had been close friends when they were both interned in the ghetto of Terezín during the Second World War.


Erna Furman was a graduate of the Child Therapy Training Program offered by Anna Freud in Hampstead following World War II. She became a child psychoanalyst, a licensed psychologist, and a teacher and immigrated to the United States with the help of Anny Katan in the 1950s.

She married Robert Furman, had two daughters, Lydia and Tanya, and lived in Cleveland, Ohio with her husband. Both were prominent and respected psychoanalysts. Erna Furman specialized in children and how children process grief. Of particular importance was her evidence that children as young as three essentially process grief no differently than adults and her insistence that children not be misled or deceived when a parent dies. She wrote: “In all bereavement, it is extraordinarily important that all of the realities of the death be known and appreciated by the survivor, particularly the cause of the death.”

She practiced at the Hanna Perkins Center for Child Development and also saw patients in her Cleveland Heights home. She was a prolific writer; over the years she received extensive accolades for her contributions to psychoanalysis. She was made an honorary member of the American Psychoanalytic Association in 1999.44

Sociology

Carolyn Zelený (1909-1998), born in Minneapolis, of Czech ancestry, was a Yale University trained sociologist. She was associated with Wilson College, Chambersburg (1953), where she rose to the rank of full professor of sociology (1961). She was a specialist on intergroup relations, immigration policy and adjustment of immigrants in US. She was the author of American Immigration Policy: A Reappraisal (1950) and Relations between the Spanish-Americans and Anglo-Americans in New Mexico (1974). Wilson College established a special Carolyn Zeleny Prize to be awarded in honor of Professor Emerita of Sociology Carolyn Zelený to a sociology student in the junior or senior class based on academic excellence and/or community service.

Beate Salz (1913-2006), b. Heidelberg, Germany, of Bohemian ancestry, emigrated to US in 1936 and was trained as sociologist and economist at New School for Social Research, NY. She was associated with the University of North Carolina (1952-53); University of Chicago (1953-54); University of Puerto Rico, Rio Pedras (1954), becoming professor of sociology and anthropology (1963-), also department chair (1961-67). She investigated the impact of industrialization and modernization on the cultures and societies of Latin America and the Caribbean. She was the author of The Human Element in Industrialization: A Hypothetical Study of Ecuadorean Indians (1955).

Jarmila L.A. Horna (1930-), b. Levice, Czech., is a sociologist, trained at Charles University. She is now Professor Emerita of Sociology at the University

of Calgary, Alberta, Canada. She is a specialist on sociology of family and sociology of leisure.

**Anthropology**

Ruth Leah Bunzel (1898-1990), born in New York of Bohemian ancestry, is an anthropologist of note. She was the youngest of four children and lived on the Upper East Side of Manhattan with her parents, Jonas and Hattie Bernheim. Her father died when Ruth was ten years old, and she was raised by her mother, who had inherited money from her family’s Cuban tobacco-importing business. Ruth’s mother raised the children in a Jewish household that was largely acculturated to American ways. The family spoke English at home, but Ruth’s mother encouraged Ruth to study German at Barnard College. Ruth, however, changed her major because of the political atmosphere surrounding World War I and received a B.A. in European history from Barnard in 1918.

Talking about the choices that bright young people confronted in the 1920s, Bunzel wrote that some went to Paris seeking freedom, some aligned with radical workers and sold the *Daily Worker* on street corners, and others turned to anthropology to “find some answers to the ambiguities and contradictions of our age and the general enigma of human life.” She saw anthropology as a means to understand not only others but also ourselves.

Having taken a course with Prof. Boas in College, Bunzel succeeded Esther Goldfrank as his secretary and editorial assistant at Columbia University in 1922. In 1924, she accompanied anthropologist Ruth Benedict to western New Mexico and east-central Arizona to study the Zuni people, and followed Prof. Boas’s suggestion to give up typing and begin her own research on a topic that interested him, the artist’s relationship to work. Critical of ethnographers who often ignored women as subjects in their fieldwork, Bunzel felt that “society consisted of more than old men with long memories.” She was drawn to the Zuni because women were the potters and had considerable societal power.

Bunzel began graduate study in anthropology at Columbia University. In 1929, she received her Ph.D. with the publication of a landmark book on the artistic process, *The Pueblo Potter*. Rather than focusing on the objects of art, Bunzel was the first anthropologist to analyze artists’ feelings, their relationship to their work, and the process of creativity. To understand how artists work within the confines of traditional styles, Bunzel apprenticed herself to Zuni potters, and among them she became a respected, skilled potter.

Visiting the Zunis intermittently between 1924 and 1929, Bunzel was a sensitive fieldworker, respecting local factionalism and esoteric ceremonies. Bunzel’s focus on the individual and the degree of aesthetic freedom an individual had in a given culture influenced her writing on Zuni kachina (ancestral spirit) cults and mythology, ceremonialism and religion, and poetry. A prolific scholar, she also contributed an understanding of Zuni cosmology and social organization by producing important work on Zuni values, language, culture, and personality. Deeply influenced by Boas and Ruth Benedict, Bunzel’s work, in turn, provided
much of the material for Benedict’s synthesis of Zuni in Patterns of Culture. In addition to the Zuni, Bunzel wrote about the Hopi, Acoma, San Ildefonso, and San Felipe Pueblo Indians of the southwestern United States.

Bunzel was one of the first American anthropologists to work in Guatemala, and she published a monograph on the Chichicastenango community in highland Guatemala in 1952. Reflecting both her interest in culture and personality studies and the neo-Freudian influence of psychoanalyst Karen Horney, she also wrote a comparative study on alcoholism in Chamula in Chiapas, Mexico, and in Chichicastenango. Her research, supported by a Guggenheim Fellowship (1930–1932), looked at psychological factors that led to different patterns of drinking in two communities. She also focused on the role alcohol played in the Indians’ subjugation and how haciendas profited by keeping Indians in debt. Her study on alcoholism was the first anthropological writing on this subject.

Bunzel went to Spain to perfect her Spanish and to gain background information for her southwestern Indian studies and was there when the Spanish Revolution broke out. During World War II, from 1942 to 1945, Bunzel worked for the Office of War Information in New York and London. From 1946 to 1951, Bunzel participated in the Research in Contemporary Cultures Project, directed by Ruth Benedict, which specialized in Chinese cultures. She participated in seminars led by Abraham Kardiner (1936 and 1937) held at the New York Psychoanalytic Institute and Columbia University, which influenced her postwar national character study.

Bunzel taught sporadically at Columbia University throughout the 1930s, but she became an adjunct professor in 1954 until her retirement in 1972. She then spent two years as a visiting professor at Bennington College. Bunzel earned a modest living teaching and felt she had never obtained full-time work because she was a woman. Others have attributed her marginal position, in part, to hostility between Boas and Ralph Linton, who became chair of the anthropology department at Columbia.

Throughout the 1950s and 1960s, she worked with other colleagues against the proliferation of nuclear weapons. Bunzel was a private person with several lifelong relationships, mostly with female colleagues. She lived much of her life on Perry Street in Greenwich Village, never leaving New York and Columbia University for long periods, except to do field research. She died in 1990 of cardiac arrest. Her detailed fieldwork and writing are known for their great sensitivity and quality and remain an enduring legacy of her anthropological accomplishmen.

Miroslava Pražák (1957–), a native of Czechoslovakia, is a promising anthropologist who was educated in the Czech Republic and in Pakistan, the U.S., and Australia. She received her B.A. from Smith College and M.Phil. and Ph.D. from Yale and a postdoctoral training from the Australian National University. She has taught at Yale University, Australian National University, the University


**Management**

Lotte Bailyn (née Lazarsfeld) (1930-), a native of Vienna, of Moravian ancestry, is the daughter of two noted social scientists, Paul Lazarsfeld and Maria Jahoda. She is a Professor of Management at MIT’s Sloan School of Management and Co-Director of the MIT Workplace Center. In her work she has set out the hypothesis that by challenging the assumptions in which current work practices are embedded, it is possible to meet the goals of both business productivity and employees’ family and community concerns, and to do so in ways that are equitable for men and women. In her new fully revised book, *Breaking the Mold: Redesigning Work for Productive and Satisfying Lives* (2006), Bailyn argues that industries will fail in an intensely competitive world unless they take into account the changing nature of the professional workforce—including the influx of women and the consequent lifestyle changes for both sexes. Earlier, in *Beyond Work-Family Balance: Advancing Gender Equity and Workplace Performance* (2002), of which she is a co-author, she and her colleagues contend that work and personal life are complementary, even synergistic, rather than adversarial. They show that by challenging the assumptions in which current work practices are embedded, the goals of both business productivity and employees’ family and community concerns can be met in ways that are equitable for men and women.46

**C. Natural Sciences**

Of the various women of Czech ancestry who entered the field of science, two, above all, head the list: Gerty R. T. Cori and Gertrude E.Perlmann. Gerty Theresa Radnitz Cori (1896-1957), from Prague, Czechoslovakia, shared with her husband Carl, the Nobel Prize in physiology and medicine. Their work was described as one of the most brilliant achievements in modern biochemistry and one responsible for a new conception of how hormones and enzymes cooperate.47

47 *Nobel Lectures, Physiology or Medicine 1942-1962*, (Amsterdam: Elsevier Publishing
She was the oldest of three daughters of Martha and Otto Radnitz, manager of a sugar refinery. The family was Jewish, and she was educated by private tutors. At age sixteen and influenced by her uncle, who was a professor of pediatrics at the University of Prague, Cori decided to study medicine. She graduated with a medical doctor’s degree in 1920. When she was attending medical school, she met Carl Ferdinand Cori, a fellow student. They both shared many common outdoor activities and they both had a curious interest in laboratory research. They were married on August 5, 1920, following graduation, with her converting from Judaism to Catholicism. They subsequently accepted positions at the University of Vienna and decided to pursue careers in medical research, rather than medical practice.

In 1922, they both immigrated to the United States to pursue medical research at the State Institute for the Study of Malignant Diseases (now the Roswell Park Memorial Institute), in Buffalo, New York. Her husband became an assistant pathologist and she was appointed as an assistant biochemist. While at Roswell, Mr. and Mrs. Cori were discouraged from working together, but did so anyway, devoting their efforts to how energy is produced and transmitted in the human body. Specializing in biochemistry, they began studying how sugar glucose is metabolized. The Coris published fifty papers jointly while at Roswell, with either researcher’s name appearing first, depending on who had done the bulk of the research for a given paper. Gerty Cori also published eleven articles as single author. In 1929, they proposed the theory that bears their name and later won them the Nobel Prize. The Cori cycle is their explanation for the movement of energy in the body—from muscle, to the liver, and back to muscle. They both became United States citizens in 1928 and, in 1936 they had their only child, Carl Thomas.

The Coris left Roswell after publishing their work on carbohydrate metabolism. They moved to St. Louis, Missouri in 1931, where Carl had been offered the chair of the Pharmacology Department at Washington University School of Medicine. Despite her research, Gerty was only offered a position as a research assistant. She was promoted to a full professor when Carl was made head of the biochemistry department in 1947, the same year she received the Nobel Prize in Medicine and Physiology with her husband and Dr. Houssay of Argentina. She was the third woman to receive this prestigious award and became the first Jewish-American woman to receive such an honor. In 1952, President Harry S. Truman named her to the National Science Board of the National Science Foundation.

Dr. Gerty Cori received many honors and awards during her life, and among them were The Midwest Award of the American Chemical Society, in 1946; the Squibb Award in endocrinology, in 1947; the Garvan Medal and the Women’s National Press Award in 1948; the Sugar Research Prize of the National Academy of Sciences in 1950 the Borden Foundation Award for outstanding medical research in 1950. She shared with her husband, Carl, the Squibb and the American Company, 1964).
Gertrude Erika Perlmann (1912-1974, a native of Liberec, Czechoslovakia, was another outstanding woman figure in biochemistry. In 1931, she commenced study at the German University of Prague, and five years later, in 1936, she earned her D.Sc. degree. When Hitler invaded Czechoslovakia in 1938, Perlmann fled to Denmark, where she worked under the protein chemist K. Linderstrøm-Lang as well as F. Lipmann at the Biological Laboratory of the Carlsburg Foundation and Carlsburg Laboratory in Copenhagen. However, the advent of World War II forced her continued migration, and she sought refuge in the United States.

Perlmann conducted research at the Harvard Medical School from 1939 through 1941, when she became a research fellow in medicine at the Massachusetts General Hospital. Her pathological investigations on proteins in bodily fluids utilizing boundary electrophoresis, a new research technique, impressed Lewis G. Longsworth sufficiently to prompt him to arrange a visiting investigator position at the Rockefeller Institute with an Advanced Medical Fellowship of the Commonwealth Fund in 1945. Perlmann remained there for the rest of her career, rising to the ranks of assistant in 1947, associate in 1951, assistant professor in 1957, associate professor the next year, and full professor in 1973, the year before her death.

Perlmann commenced her investigations of phosphate-containing proteins by studying egg albumin with electrophoresis. She succeeded in removing all phosphate from the protein, the first time this had been accomplished without hydrolysis of peptide bonds. She then proceeded to apply phosphoesterases to the proteolytic enzyme pepsin, only to discover that the removal of phosphate had little to no effect on the protein’s activities or its structural properties. This discovery fueled Perlmann’s long-term focus on pepsin and pepsinogen, its inactive precursor, as she applied every available experimental technique to transform the structure and chemistry of these proteins in order to track any resulting changes in biological functions.

Besides studying pepsin, Perlmann also investigated phosvitin, a phosphoglycoprotein in egg yolks that she found to contain more than 50 percent phosphoserine. Perlmann discovered that the chemical structure of phosvitin differed significantly from other proteins. Among these differences, the most interesting was the fact that phosvitin could form complexes with divalent metal ions.

Perlmann published extensively in her career, and in presenting her with the 1965 Garvan Medal, the American Chemical Society specifically applauded “her work on the effect of chemical modifications on structural and enzymatic...

---

properties of proteins presented in her publications with lucidity and economy of words.” Perlmann remained active in her field up until her death on September 9, 1974, in New York City.

Gertrud Kornfeld (1891–1955), b. Prague, Bohemia, had every expectation of becoming a great scientist. Her life epitomizes both the successes and frustrations of women scientists in academia in the first half of the twentieth century. She was the first woman scientist to receive an academic appointment in chemistry at the University of Berlin when she obtained the ‘venia legendi’ to lecture in physical chemistry at the University (Privatdozent). Indeed, she was the first woman lecturer in chemistry at any university in Germany.

The daughter of an industrial merchant in Bohemia, Gertrud Kornfeld received an excellent education, first at a German school for girls, then at a gymnasium for boys, where she passed the Austrian ‘Abitur’, the prerequisite for university entry. From 1910 until 1915 she studied chemistry, physical chemistry and physics at the German University in Prague. In 1915 she completed her Ph.D. thesis at the German University and was appointed assistant to her mentor Viktor Rothmund.

Because Kornfeld and her family were German-speaking, with the establishment of the Czechoslovak Republic in 1918 she left Prague and moved to Germany. As a former assistant of Viktor Rothmund, she very soon received a position as assistant to the famous Max Bodenstein (1871–1942) at the Technical College in Hannover, where she remained from 1919 until 1923. When Max Bodenstein was appointed professor at the University of Berlin in 1923, Gertrud Kornfeld followed him as an assistant at the university’s Institute for Physical Chemistry. In 1928 she became a lecturer in physical chemistry at the University of Berlin—the first woman in this field. She also retained her position as assistant. Gertrud Kornfeld liked to teach and served as advisor to several doctoral candidates under the direction of Bodenstein.

In the autumn of 1933, when the Nazi laws cost Gertrud Kornfeld her positions as lecturer and assistant, she immediately left for Great Britain. Thanks to the support of the newly established Academic Assistance Council, Gertrud Kornfeld received several grants, first at the University of Birmingham, then at the University in Vienna. But as a woman scientist she was unable to attain the relatively high position she had held in Germany. In 1937, with the help of the American Federation of University Women she was granted a visitor’s visa to the United States, enabling her to search for an academic position in that country. She finally became a researcher at the Kodak Company in Rochester, New York, where she worked until her death on July 4, 1955.

Despite having to change her life and scientific career three times, Gertrud Kornfeld managed to work in science throughout her life, first at universities and later in the laboratory of a large industrial trust.49

Herta Regina Leng (1903-1997), b. Vienna, of Bohemian ancestry, was a University of Vienna trained physicist. She was associated with Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute at Troy, NY since 1943, becoming full professor of physics in 1966. She had the distinction of being the first woman named full professor at Rensselaer.

Herta Taussig Freitag (1908-2000), b. Vienna, Aust., of Bohemian ancestry, studied at University of Vienna in 1934 and received her MA (1948) and PhD (1953) degrees from Columbia University. After the invasion of Austria on 11 March 1938, life became very difficult for the Taussig family. Her father, who as editor of Die Neue Freie Presse had written several editorials warning of the dangers of Nazism, was dismissed from his post. Months later, Herta Taussig was granted immigration to England where she had jobs as a housemaid, governess, waitress and finally as a teacher, before obtaining the visa which took her to the United States in 1944. Her mathematics career was thus rescued, although effectively suspended for six years. She taught at a school in upstate New York from 1944 to 1948 and there met Arthur Freitag, whom she married in 1950. In 1948 she moved to Hollins College, where her career progressed from instructor to full professor and departmental chairman, until her formal retirement in 1971. She was best known for her work on the Fibonacci numbers. During her years at Hollins College, and throughout her even longer period of retirement, she received many awards. She was the first woman to become President of the Virginia, Maryland, and District of Columbia Section of the Mathematical Association of America. Her lectures, always meticulously crafted and beautifully illustrated in her inimitably artistic calligraphy, were delivered so enthusiastically and yet so modestly, as if she feared that her personality might take any of the glory or attention away from Mathematics. One of her most inspired remarks concerns mathematicians’ fondness for generalizing results.\footnote{50}

Olga Taussky-Todd (1906-1995), b. Olomouc, Czechoslovakia, was an eminent Czech-American mathematician. She worked first in algebraic number theory, with a doctorate from the University of Vienna supervised by Philipp Furtwängler. During that time in Vienna she also attended the meetings of the Vienna Circle. Later, she started to use matrices to analyze vibrations of airplanes during World War II, at the National Physical Laboratory in the United Kingdom. She became the torchbearer for matrix theory. In 1938 she married another mathematician, John Todd.

In 1945 the Todds immigrated to the United States and worked for the National Bureau of Standards. In 1957 they joined the faculty of California Institute of Technology in Pasadena, California. She was a Fellow of the AAAS, a Noether Lecturer and a recipient of the Austrian Cross of Honor for Science and Art.\footnote{51}


\footnote{51} “Olga Taussky-Todd, Autobiographical Essay,” in *Mathematical People, Profiles and
D. University Administrations

Kathryn Newell Adams (1876-1966), b. Prague, Bohemia, was one of the first women of Czech extraction to attain a high administrative position at a university. She was educated at Oberlin College (BA ‘98), Radcliffe College (BA ‘99) and did her graduate work at Columbia University and studied at Oxford, England. Starting as a teacher of English at Fargo College, Fargo, ND, she subsequently became professor of English and Dean of women at Huron College, Huron, South Dakota. She then spent four years, 1909-1913, as Dean of Women at Beloit College in Wisconsin. After a year of traveling, she was appointed to the position of Dean of Women at Yankton College, Yankton, South Dakota. In 1921, she took a position at Constantinople Women’s College in Constantinople, Turkey, where three years later she was inaugurated as President.  

Millicent Carey McIntosh (1898-2001), b. Baltimore, MD, of Moravian ancestry, became President of Barnard College, Columbia University (1952-62). A distinguished educator and advocate for women who led Barnard College for 15 years, McIntosh was graduated from the Bryn Mawr School in Baltimore, and went on to earn a degree in English magna cum laude from Bryn Mawr College. She studied at Newnham College, Cambridge, and earned her Ph.D. in English from Johns Hopkins. McIntosh took her first job in higher education in 1926 when she joined Bryn Mawr as an instructor of English and became dean of freshmen in 1928. In 1930, she was named head of the Brearley School, a private school for girls in New York City, a position in which she remained for 17 years and during which she raised five children. In November 1946 she was named as Barnard’s fourth president, taking office in July 1947. Serving as president until 1962, McIntosh oversaw a period of substantial growth in endowment and facilities, including the building of Lehman Library in 1959 and Reid Hall in 1961. She also broadened access to the college, paying special attention to the children of World War II refugees; she enhanced faculty salaries and increased the exchange of courses and teachers between Barnard and Columbia. In 1969, the college’s new student center was named in her honor.

Frances Ruml Jordan (1899-1980), b. Cedar Rapids, Iowa, of Czech ancestry, was a daughter of the famed educator and business executive Beardsley Ruml. She became dean of Radcliffe College, holding the position of dean for academic
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affairs of Radcliffe from 1936-40. Graduated from Vassar College in 1921, Jordan received her master’s degree in economics from Radcliffe in 1928 and was appointed tutorial secretary for Radcliffe later that year. Jordan continued to work for Radcliffe, as assistant dean, acting dean and then as dean for academic affairs. According to her contemporaries, she was an extraordinary woman, very strong and with a brilliant mind. She was the wife of Dr. Wilbur Kitchener Jordan. Frances Jordan ended her work at Radcliffe when her husband was appointed president of Radcliffe in 1943, because “she felt she couldn’t keep on when Mr. Jordan was made president.” Although she ended her work at Radcliffe, Jordan remained active in the Boston community during the years of her husband’s presidency, from 1943-60. She held the position of executive secretary to the Commission on Plasma Fractionation and Related Processes at the Medical School, was a member of the executive committee and of the board of trustees of Wheaton College, Abbot Academy, and the School of Nursing of the Massachusetts General Hospital.54

Among the contemporaries, Eva Dubská Kushner (1929-), mentioned earlier, has the distinction of becoming the first woman of Czech extraction who attained a high administrative university position in Canada. She became President of Victoria University in 1987, serving two terms there until 1994.

The last person to be included here is Doris Leonora Eder (1936- ), a native of Teplice, Czechoslovakia, who received training as a literary scholar at Hunter College. She first taught English at Ohio State University (1966-70) and then she moved to University of Rochester (1970-77), where she attained the position of associate professor of English. Subsequently she was named dean of faculty at Schenectady County Community College (1977-78), dean at Keene State College (1978-82) and eventually dean of School of Arts and Sciences at University of New Mexico, where she has served since 1982.

III. Entrepreneurship

Although American women, including those of Czech extraction, owned businesses in nineteenth century, such as taverns, general stores, millinery shops, schools, farms, etc., entrepreneurship, until recently, has been a male-dominated pursuit. This has, of course, changed in the twentieth century.

There must have been several successful Czech-American women who would fit in this category; however, none of them would come even close in stature, accomplishment and shrewdness to Estée Lauder, nee Mentzer (ca. 1910-2004). This generalization would probably apply to other American business women as well.

Born in Corona, NY, of Czech father and a Hungarian mother, she was the American founder of the Estée Lauder Companies, a pioneering cosmetics company. She was the only woman on Time magazine’s 1998 list of the 20 most
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54 “Former Radcliffe College Dean Frances R. Jordan Dies at 81, The Harvard Crimson, Friday, August 15, 1980.”
influential business geniuses of the 20th century. She was the recipient of the Presidential Medal of Freedom and was inducted into the Junior Achievement U.S. Business Hall of Fame in 1988.

The Estee Lauder Companies began in 1946 when she and her husband Joseph Lauder began producing cosmetics in New York City. At first, they only had four products: Super-Rich All Purpose Creme, Creme Pack, Cleansing Oil and Skin Lotion. Two years later they established their first department store account with Saks Fifth Avenue in New York. Over the next fifteen years they expanded the range and continued to sell their products in the United States. In 1960 the company started its first international account in the London department store Harrods. The following year it opened an office in Hong Kong. In 1964 they started Aramis Inc., which produced fragrances and grooming products for men. In 1967 Estée Lauder herself was named one of ten Outstanding Women in Business in the United States by business and financial editors. This was followed by a Spirit of Achievement Award from Albert Einstein College of Medicine at Yeshiva University in 1968. In that year the company expanded again, opening Clinique Laboratories, Inc. Clinique was the first dermatologist guided (Dr. Norman Orentreich), allergy tested, fragrance free cosmetic brand created by Estée Lauder.

From a company employing 5 persons and grossing $850,000 in sales in 1958 the company, known as Estee Lauder Inc., grew to employ 1,000 people and earn $100 million in sales by 1973. The products are sold in more than 70 countries. Today, Estee Lauder is a recognized brand name in over 118 countries with $3.6 billion in annual sales and her family’s shares are worth $6 billion.\[55\]

The second most accomplished woman in this area is probably Ivana Trump, nee Zelníčková (1949-), a native of Zlín, Czechoslovakia. Former Olympic athlete, socialite, and fashion model, she is noted for her marriage to real estate mogul Donald Trump. She worked her way into his male-dominated empire, eventually becoming executive vice president of Trump organization. She played a key role in the 39-story Trump Plaza Casino Hotel in Atlantic City and became chief executive officer of Trump Castle Hotel and Casino and later vice chairman of Trump Hotels; in 1988 she was named president of the $390 million Plaza Hotel in NY. Soon after her divorce from Donald Trump, Ivana signed on with the William Morris Agency and developed lines of clothing, fashion jewelry and beauty products that have been successfully sold through television shopping channels. She has also written several bestselling books including the novels For Love Alone and Free to Love and the self-help book The Best is Yet to Come: Coping with Divorce and Enjoying Life Again. In 2001, Trump penned an advice column for Divorce Magazine. She played a cameo role in the Hollywood film

---

‘The First Wives Club’ with the memorable line: ‘Remember girls: don’t get mad, get everything.’ Today, she has established two companies: Ivana, Inc. that manages her appearances and Ivana Haute Couture, which markets Ivana products with sales of Ivana’s line of cosmetics, accessories and fragrances sold over the Internet, Ivana’s company has matured into a multi-million-dollar business. To expose her products, Ivana appears in other countries such as the Canadian Shopping Channel.56

Interestingly, her daughter, Ivanka Maria Trump (1981-), a native of New York City, would have to come next. She attended The Chapin School in New York City, and graduated from Choate Rosemary Hall in Wallingford, Connecticut. She spent two years at Georgetown University, then transferred to the Wharton School of Business at the University of Pennsylvania, graduating *summa cum laude* in 2004 with a B.S. in Economics. Ivanka was encouraged to earn her own money while growing up. She started modeling at just 16 years of age and has appeared in numerous popular magazines, including the cover of *Seventeen* magazine in 1997. Ivanka Trump also hosted the Miss Teen USA Pageant in that same year.

Currently, she is Executive Vice President of Development and Acquisitions at The Trump Organization. Before joining the family business, she worked for Forest City Enterprises, and joined forces with Dynamic Diamond Corp., a diamond trading company sight holder, to design and introduce a line of jewelry at the brand’s first flagship retail store called ‘Ivanka Trump’ on Madison Avenue. In Spring 2011, Ivanka came out with her own line of shoes and handbags.57

**Epilogue**

Once the colleges and universities opened their doors to women, it did not take long for women to start filling professions that had not been accessible to them before, such as medicine and law. Simultaneously, they began entering practically every field of higher learning—humanities, social sciences, and biological and physical sciences, as well as entrepreneurship. This was applicable to American women generally, including those of Czech ancestry.

With respect to the latter, this study demonstrates that many of them became prominent in their fields, some clearly achieving distinction and attaining success above their fellow men. This is truly remarkable, considering that this happened within one generation.


Evelyn Funda’s memoir explores the three-generations-long farming experience of her Czech immigrant family cultivating their infertile land. She was born in the 1960s into a family that settled in Emmett, a small Idaho town, beyond the edge of the fertile American Plains. *Weeds: A Farm Daughter's Lament* is a biographical work, but also a contribution to cultural history, Funda’s academic specialty.

The author is the last descendant of an extended and disunited family. Although a girl, not a boy, she is the one who is expected to continue the farming tradition. She sells the last remaining lot of exhausted land, and this sale is a metaphor for the end of the family’s Promised Land narrative. *Weeds, A Farm Daughter’s Lament* offers detailed descriptions of the difficulties farmers encountered and did not overcome. They simply ran out of steam—cultural, ethnic, and generational.

The reminiscences in this book are not the usual stories of Czechs who settled on the Great Plains at the end of the nineteenth century such as are found in Czech-language publications. In the *Kalendář Amerikán*, the immigrants’ stories tell of simple survival in America, followed by self-sufficiency and some modicum of material success. If there were financial successes or other achievements, they were due to the immigrants’ hard work and smarts. People who were not successful did not publish accounts of their failures.

The myth of emigration to the Promised Land and the narrative of life of the glorious, hardworking and therefore successful pioneers have no place in *Weeds*. It describes rather oppressive provincialism interpreted as the maintenance of cherished traditions and reinforced by geographic isolation.

Evelyn Funda, a professor of English and American Literatures at Utah State University, writes engagingly and elegantly; moreover, her book is easy to read. The characterization of the people is realistic and congruent with their natural surroundings. The author lovingly depicts the beauty of the countryside along the Snake River, the seasons and the running of the farm. She details the overcoming of the difficulties and the catastrophes that come back again and again. Funda deconstructs the myths of the family’s glorious past. That story was not a real part of Grandfather Frank’s life; yet as it is a part of the family narrative it does not matter whether it is, or is not, true.

In the opinion of this reviewer, as well as the committee which awarded it the Evans Handcart Prize for Biography Set in the Intermountain Region, *Weeds, A Farm Daughter’s Lament* is a very good book. Nothing more should be said in order not to spoil the reader’s pleasure.

*Mila Šašková-Pierce, Lincoln, Nebraska*

Emil Zátopek was one of the greatest long-distance runners of all time. He earned his first gold Olympic medal in London during 1948 in the 10,000-meter event. That was only the beginning. At the 1952 Helsinki Summer Olympics, he captured first place in the 5,000-meter race, the 10,000-meter competition and the marathon. Not only did he win these events, but he also broke their world records.

In *The Rise and Fall of Emil Zátopek Olympic Legend: Today We Die A Little*, author Richard Askwith admits that, as a passionate runner himself, he admires Zátopek. However, the writer does not only show Zátopek as a national hero. He also describes Zátopek after he was punished for speaking out against the Russian tanks crushing the Prague Spring, when the sports star became a broken man and heavy drinker.

The biographer’s descriptions of the Olympic races in which Emil ran are so brilliant that they would keep even people with absolutely no interest in running on the edge of their seats. Readers are not just imaging competitors do laps around a track. Thanks to Askwith, they feel as if they are witnessing these historic events. Take, for example, the writer’s description of the 5,000-meter race at the 1952 Helsinki Summer Olympics.

Four men…each at his physical peak, each focused with every fibre of mind and body on the same prize, each giving the last possible drop of effort he can summon … and yet still it isn’t over. Still there is another notch to be turned up. This is where words fail and all that remains is to imagine the boiling intensity of their struggle, in which the roar of the crowd and the roar of the bloodstream cease to be distinguishable. This is the lost zone, a place on the edge of death, in which only a handful of champions have ever set foot, and from which none has yet brought back a coherent account (175).

Readers can hear the shouting crowd and feel the intensity of the moment because the writing is so vibrant. Through Askwith’s words, readers not only get a mental picture of the race; they also feel as if they are present, experiencing every step toward victory and defeat.

Askwith focuses not only on Zátopek’s victories but also on his behavior toward his competitors. Zátopek saw people as individuals, regardless of their political beliefs. He did not let the Cold War or Iron Curtain stop him from forging close friendships with athletes from the West. He even memorized dictionaries in order to be able to communicate with his opponents off the track. In addition, he openly explained his unique interval training program to his rivals. One of Zátopek’s many generous gestures involved giving a gold medal from the 1952 Olympics to a former opponent and long-time friend, Australian Ron Clarke, who was a victim of bad luck and never won gold.

Zátopek’s performance in Finland during 1952 made him one of the most well-known athletes in the world. He was inundated with public appearances. He
gave speeches at factories. His autograph was always in demand. Poems were written about him. The Communists used his feats as political propaganda. However, the writer also describes Zátopek’s life when things were not so rosy. Askwith also explains to readers why Emil was a Communist, putting it into context for readers who are not familiar with the history of Central Europe. “Emil had been brought up as a Communist, had been bombarded with Communist ideology since joining the army in 1945, and had experienced both the evils of fascism and the poverty of the ‘have-nots’ under capitalism” (199).

Most of all, readers see Zátopek as a human being, a gentle and generous man whom the Communists used as propaganda to promote their regime. However, Askwith is not afraid of asking the hard questions: Did Zátopek write a letter for the *Rudé Právo* daily in which he denounced Milada Horáková, the champion of human rights who was executed by the Communists in a show trial during 1950? Did Zátopek collaborate with the StB, the Czechoslovak Secret Police? Was he a spy?

A key feature of this book involves Askwith’s descriptions of the political context in which events play out. Askwith publishes the letter that Zátopek allegedly wrote for *Rudé Právo*, one that condemns Milada Horáková, who promoted the democratic principles of the First Republic and was very active in political life as a supporter of democratic ideals. In a show trial in June of 1950, she sentenced to death and later executed.

The author is not afraid of sharing his own reaction to seeing Zátopek’s byline under the letter from June 10, 1950. “When I first encountered it, I refused to believe it. I cannot imagine anything more out of tune with what I believe to have been his generous, gentle character. Yet it appeared,” Askwith writes openly (117). Once again, his expression of emotion gives the book a sense of intimacy. Zátopek’s wife, Dana, claimed that Emil did not even know about the letter and that they both had no idea the charges were false.

Askwith puts the situation in clear political context. “But I think it is also true that, then as now, many people will have known as much or as little as they chose to know… The less we know, the less we have to worry about, the less reason to disturb our otherwise comfortable lives” (117-118). The author stresses that people who did not experience the Stalinist era first-hand are not able to judge it; they only can speculate. And Askwith provides us with the information to do just that, to try to discover for ourselves the truth we can never truly know.

Another case in point is the author’s take on whether Emil was a spy for the StB while competing in the West. Although even after the 1989 Velvet Revolution, Emil asserted that he was a Communist, there is no evidence that he was a secret police informant, the biographer concludes:

...certain conclusions leap out at me. Emil is in these files as a ‘person of interest,’ not an agent. He does seem to have reported back from some foreign trips, at least early in his career, but the reports have not been preserved—although at least one such report seems to have been considered unacceptably thin. And I can find no reference anywhere to Emil’s having been an agent
Askwith goes on to argue in great detail that the facts do not illustrate that Zátopek was working with the StB. He does admit, though, that many files were destroyed—most from the 1950s and the first half of the 1960s. The author relays the opinions of other people who said that most likely the Communists took advantage of Emil because he was so trusting. He was easily manipulated, according to these sources. Many of the events described in the book support this argument.

Askwith also poignantly describes Zátopek’s transformation into a broken man after he openly criticized the Soviet invasion on August 21, 1968. Indeed, Zátopek paid a high price for voicing his opinion. Dismissed from the army, Zátopek was also expelled from the Communist Party and found himself without work. He wound up taking menial jobs, such as laboring in a uranium mine. Later, Zátopek tried to redeem himself with the Communist regime by taking back his remarks about the Soviet Union’s 1968 intervention and by condemning Charter 77, a document by dissidents calling for human rights. While he did get a better job, it was too little, too late. Emil Zátopek had fallen from grace.

This book is no dry or merely factual account. Askwith describes his own emotions about events. By sharing his point of view, he creates a sort of intimacy between author and readers. Also, he refers to Zátopek as Emil throughout the book, which allows readers to feel as if they are getting to know the legendary athlete. Yet, Askwith does not let his own feelings blind him from presenting both sides of controversies.

The author made sure his readers knew that Zátopek was embroiled in complex situations; nothing was black-and-white under totalitarianism. The stellar athlete was rehabilitated soon after the 1989 Velvet Revolution that toppled the Communist regime. Askwith puts the events in perspective, describing Zátopek as a man with flaws who was a genuinely good person. Zátopek broke down barriers between the East and the West, viewing people from all over the world with compassion, showing deep respect for both rivals and admirers alike. Perhaps, during the Cold War, these qualities were even more significant accomplishments than winning gold medals.

Tracy A. Burns, Prague, Czech Republic


After the fall of Communism, scholars have begun to address those little studied and often ignored aspects of European history, such as agrarianism, the topic of Agrarismus ve střední a východní Evropě: 19. a 20. století. Although the
book focuses on the agrarian movement and party in Czech Lands and Slovakia, its perspective is broader. It also explores the origin, existence and persistence of agrarian political parties in other European countries.

The book consists of twenty-two papers presented at an international conference held in 2013 to commemorate the 140th anniversary of Antonín Švehla’s birth and the 60th anniversary of his death. The contributions are written in Czech, Slovak and English.

The first three articles provide a scholarly and historical framework for the book. Josef Harma evaluates the historiography of Czech and Slovak agrarianism, noting its strengths and lacunae. It falls to Ladislav Mrklas to provide a theoretical framework in his discussion of “the family” of European agrarian parties past and present. Jan Rychlík provides a factual dimension in his essay on the agrarian parties and movement in Central and Eastern Europe during the inter-war and immediate post-World War II era.

Twelve articles in *Agrarismus ve střední a východní Evropě* deal with the Czech Lands and Slovakia. Several essays are devoted to outstanding personalities. Eva Broklova evaluates the role of Antonín Švehla in creating the Czechoslovak state and maintaining its democratic character. Two additional contributions have to do with this statesman: Antonie Doležalová critically looks at the Nadace Antonína Švehly as a clientilist structure, while Marek Šmíd discusses how the Holy See viewed Švehla during the first Republic. The economist Cyril Horáček, senior, and Karel Viškovský, the President of the Land Reform Office and cabinet minister, are the subjects of Ilona Bažantová’s and Lukáš Kopecký's articles, respectively. Ľubica Kážmerová writes about the activities of the important Slovak Agrarian, Anton Štefánek during the years 1918 to 1925. Jaroslav Rokoský answers the question whether the agrarians who were jailed after World War II were traitors or cowards.

Several articles deal with the Agrarian Party's political activities. František Čapka describes the efforts of the Party to influence sugar beet growers before World War I. Miroslav Septak’s essay details Czech and Slovak Agrarians, attempts, especially Milan Hodža’s, to formulate and influence the prevalent Masaryk-Beneš foreign policy. The Union of Slav Agrarian Youth (*Zväz slovanskej agrárnej mládeže*), which was founded in 1924 as a complement to the International Peasant Bureau and functioned until 1938, is the subject of Roman Holec’s contribution. The remaining two essays deal with agrarianism in Slovakia. In his discussion of the 1933 Zvolen congress of the younger Slovak Agrarian generation, Róbert Arpáš points to the attendees’ discontent with the position of Slovakia in the country and their party’s inability or unwillingness to redress the situation. Matej Hanula assesses the substantial contributions of the Agrarian Party organizations and their affiliated groups to the educational, cultural and scientific progress of Slovakia.

The next four essays present other countries’ agrarian parties and their activities. Miroslav Novák addresses himself to the paradoxical position of the Swiss Agrarian Party which receives the largest popular support yet has the smallest representation in the government. According to Miloš Brunclík and
Vlastimil Havlík, the Scandinavian agrarian political parties stand as prime examples of successful adaptation to the contemporary milieu. Éva Cseszka details the theoretical and political struggles between the agrarian experts and the Communist party in Hungary from 1945 to 1948. Suzana Leček details the alternative political strategies “to made use of all opportunities” that the Croatian Peasant Party employed from 1918 to 1941.

The last three chapters deal with developments during the Cold War era. Two essays address themselves to the International Peasant Union (IPU). Piotr Swacha examines the organization’s position on regional and pan-European integration. The IPU’s attitudes on Communism from 1947 to 1989 are the subject of Stanislaw Stępka’s study. The last contribution in this section is Tomasz Skrzynski’s study of the Polish Peasant Party on the political stage after its leader, the former prime minister Stanislaw Mikołajczyk, left for exile.

Readers will find useful material at the end of the book. An excellent and coherent survey of the East European agrarian parties opens this section. It concludes with the realistic assessment that the time of these parties is now gone as none has managed to emerge as a relevant political force after 1989. The non-Czech speaking scholarly audience will appreciate this article’s English translation. Incongruously, the Czech version is simply called “Zavěr” (conclusion), but the English one is entitled “Agrarianism in Central and Eastern Europe” and is followed by the word “summary” in the next line. The inclusion of a bibliography, a name index and a list of the political parties mentioned in the book should also prove very helpful to anyone wishing to study further the politics of this region.

The book does not entirely escape the intrinsic weaknesses of publications that originate as conference presentations. The quality of the contributions is not uniform. The chapters written in English present a special problem: some of the writers’ and/or the translators’ command of that language is so poor that the essays are nearly unintelligible. Although the editors do specify that the responsibility for the translations is solely the authors’, the badly translated articles do detract from the book as a whole. Moreover, the work has a hit-or-miss quality because the editors did not or could not compel the contributors to write on all the germane and important facets of the topic.

Agrarianism and its political expressions were ubiquitous in eastern and central Europe during interwar-period. Agrarian political parties were present in Bulgaria, Croatia, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Lithuania, Latvia, Hungary, Poland, Romania, Slovenia, and Serbia; however, dictatorships of the left and right eventually suppressed them all. Some of these parties had played a crucially significant role in their country’s politics, especially Czechoslovakia’s Republican Party of Smallholders and Peasants (Republikánska strana zemědělského a malorolnického lidu), Bulgaria’s Agrarian National Union (Bulgarski zemedelski naroden sújuz) and Romania’s National Peasant Party (Partidul Național Țăranesc). The first was, after 1922, the single largest party in Czechoslovakia and the linchpin of all its political government coalitions. Until after World War
II, the other two parties mentioned above were major forces in their respective countries.

Agrarian political parties, the book notes, also did exist in other parts of Europe. They were or are present in Sweden, Finland, the Netherlands, Norway, Switzerland, Greece and Denmark: however, unlike their eastern and central European counterparts, these parties emerged and survived only under certain circumstances. While their existence validates agrarianism as an appropriate subject for the inquiries not only of East European specialists but also the wider community of historians and political scientists, their exceptionalism supports the contention that agrarianism intrinsically belongs to a specific time and place. The book under review provides ample factual and analytical evidence for the conclusion that agrarianism and the political parties espousing it were the salient distinguishing characteristic of the politics of Central and Eastern Europe in the inter-war period.

_Agrarismus ve střední a východní Evropě: 19. a 20. století_ concerns itself with political groups, events and people that in the words of one of the contributors (Jaroslav Rokoský) were to be “once and for all rejected and forgotten” (146) in Communist-controlled Central and Eastern Europe; however, ideological desiderata do not history make. _Agrarismus ve střední a východní Evropě: 19. a 20. Století_ laudably aims to make up for the past neglect. It is a genuine contribution to our understanding of Central and East European history and politics in the nineteenth and twentieth century, in general, and agrarianism, in particular.

Mary Hrabík Šámal, Troy, Michigan


Those hungry for fresh insights into the history of “ordinary people” during Czechoslovakia’s Communist era and the years following the Velvet Revolution will find plenty to satiate themselves within this new oral history of Czech society. *Velvet Revolutions* is predominantly a generational narrative of politically inactive Czechs, born between 1930 and 1960, whose values, experiences, and perceptions of their own lives take center stage. A core concern of the authors is to question why a substantial number of ordinary Czechs who witnessed the events of 1968 and 1989 still look back on the Communist period with nostalgia. They argue that such positive reflections cannot be explained by ideological or political leanings nor persisting loyalties to the old order. Rather, Vaněk and Mücke contend that this phenomenon pertains to those factors which contribute to a happy or contented life and have been challenged by the transformation into a capitalist system. Although the authors present this conclusion tentatively, the emphasis placed on the memories and opinions of ordinary people provides a refreshing
model for how the history of everyday life under Communism and feelings of nostalgia can be explored.

The content of *Velvet Revolutions* is built upon public opinion surveys covering the pre-revolutionary period up to the present day and supplemented with excerpts from around 300 interviews with individuals from a broad spectrum of Czech society. The authors have curated their findings into seven chapters covering topics such as the quotidian meaning of freedom; family life, education and employment; perspectives on foreigners; and the value of free time. These chapters offer valuable insights into the development of values within Czech society, juxtaposing reflections on the past with positive and negative reflections upon the present. In their most rewarding chapter, titled “Us and Them,” Vaněk and Mücke examine the many divisions with Czech society. Building upon perspectives emphasized in earlier chapters regarding nepotism and clientelism, they demonstrate how the divisions Czechs continue to perceive in society—which are now predominantly along economic lines—reflect those present in the pre-revolutionary period.

Interestingly, Vaněk and Mücke note that interviewees consistently apologized when their memories fell out of step with the popular memory of life before 1989 as oppressive and lifeless, a point that the authors consider evidence of ordinary people assimilating the “new establishment's message” on how the past should be remembered. That a post-1989 “monopoly on memory” continues to reiterate a singular narrative of an oppressive regime and an oppressed society and potentially has replaced one of the most insidious elements of Czechoslovakia's Communist period—the regime's “monopoly on truth”—demonstrates the dire need for studies like *Velvet Revolutions*. They are needed to elucidate the multifaceted memories of the people who lived through such times.

Despite the variety of individual testimonies, reflections and responses presented, the authors focus on the general trends that can be discerned from their sources. This approach will satisfy strictly empirically-minded historians, making *Velvet Revolutions* oral history for the oral-history skeptic. However, the image of multiple “Revolutions” conjured by the book's title does not match its focus on general, rather than particular, observations. The tendency to provide limited analysis to individual accounts is a missed opportunity in which interview excerpts are commonly deployed as punchlines to broader statements. Moreover, for a book focused on Czech society, the use of the plural of the word “revolution” in the title is questionable considering that the memories of Slovaks or of the Slovak society are not a component of the authors’ project. Furthermore, while the title is presumably referring to the variety of “revolutions” which took place within Czech society across economic, political, and interpersonal lines, this connection is never clearly drawn.

The methodology driving this project is also not always clear, as we are rarely told the questions to which interviewees are responding. Similarly, while the authors acknowledge that the pre-1989 public opinion surveys must be treated with caution given that the agency which conducted them—the Institute for Public Opinion Research—was subject to the direct control of Central Committee of the
Communist Party, this issue receives little attention. Although Vaněk and Mücke’s interest in these surveys lies in their broad trends and tendencies rather than the specific data that they produced, the authors provide limited analysis of the Institute for Public Opinion Research itself. This oversight regarding such politically charged material is troubling for a book interested in examining the relationship between the regime and society, and it leaves the reader with a set of pressing questions regarding this intriguing and important component of the authors’ source base.

Despite these shortcomings, *Velvet Revolutions* makes a valuable contribution to its field. It is a book that demands to be read alongside other social and cultural histories of Czechoslovakia’s Communist period, as well as similar works on other countries within the former Soviet bloc. Its greatest strength is the spirit of its approach, which highlights the discoveries about everyday life under Communism that oral history can provide and the importance of placing memory and opinion under detailed investigation. That it raises more questions than it answers will hardly be a problem for inquisitive readers.

*David Aitken, Montréal, Canada*
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