T. G. MASARYK AND OUR TIMES

Edited by Vilém Prečan

Published on the occasion
of the international Conference

THOMAS GARRIGUE MASARYK 1850 - 1937

organised by the
School of Slavonic and East European Studies
UNIVERSITY OF LONDON

11th - 16th December 1986

CSDS

T.G.MASARYK AND OUR TIMES

Edited by Vilém Prečan

Published on the occasion of the International Conference
THOMAS GARRIGUE MASARYK 1850-1937
organised by the School of Slavonic and East European Studies
University of London, 11th-16th December 1986

by

Dokumentationszentrum zur Förderung der unabhängigen
tschechoslowakischen Literatur e.V.

HANOVER
1986

ACTA CREATIONIS, No. 2.

Dokumentationszentrum zur Förderung
der unabhängigen tschechoslowakischen Literatur e.V.
(Documentation Centre for the Promotion
of Independent Czechoslovak Literature)
D-3000 Hannover 1, Postfach

Copies may be ordered from:
DOKUMENTATIONSZENTRUM
Schwarzenberg 6
D-8533 Scheinfeld, Federal Republic of Germany

Translated by:
A.G.Brain

Printed in the Federal Republic of Germany

CONTENTS

Editorial note

This booklet is the brainchild of a number of Dutch philosophers and theologians associated with the organisation "Stichting Informatie over Charta '77". Their concern over whether any independent Masaryk scholars from Czechoslovakia would be attending the London Conference on the fiftieth anniversary of T.G.M.'s death led them to approach our documentation centre last May. They requested us to make available to them texts by those Czechoslovak scholars who - outside the academic institutions - have continued to study Masaryk in the difficult conditions of the past sixteen years and keep alive the memory of Masaryk's personality as a thinker and a representative of Czechoslovak statehood. Since none of the scholars in question - apart from one possible exception - were invited to the conference, we decided to issue this limited collection to give some idea of their work.

The reader will be aware of the great efforts made by the state-controlled institutions in present-day Czechoslovakia (no others exist) to erase Masaryk's name from the memories of the Czechs and Slovaks. It never appears in the press even on the occasion of major anniversaries such as his 130th anniversary in 1980 or the 60th anniversary of the Czechoslovak Republic in 1978. In school history text-books T.G.M. is referred to only disparagingly. His name has long since disappeared from schools, streets, stations, bridges, etc., along with statues to him. Since 1972 Masaryk's writings have once more been banned from public libraries. The only spheres in which official reference to Masaryk is still made are those of ideology and politics, or

academic literature dealing with the historical periods in which he was active or with his particular fields of study. Even in these cases, apart from the rare exception, assessments are negative and his spiritual legacy is either played down or distorted in accordance with the theories of the Communist Party's "class" ideology that happen to be currently in force. Masarykian scholarship is absent from universities, as well as from all other academic and educational institutions, and not one study of Masaryk has been published by a Czechoslovak publishing house since 1969.

Our booklet focusses on the two most important productions of independent scholarship in Czechoslovakia: the anthology "T.G.Masaryk and our times" [T. G. Masaryk a naše současnost] and Jaroslav Opat's study "T.G.Masaryk in Bohemia in the eighteen eighties (1882-1893)" [T. G. Masaryk v Čechách v letech osmdesátých /1882-1893/]. These are the only works on T.G.M which have been partially available to the Czechoslovak public in the form of typewritten copies, in the sense that they have circulated since the seventies among a limited readership.

The samizdat anthology "T.G.Masaryk and our times", made up of articles, reminiscences and documents, together with a bibliography of works by and about Masaryk from the period 1935-1978, has already been mentioned in specialised literature, particularly in H.G.Skilling's wide-ranging article "The Rediscovery of Masaryk" (Cross Currents. A Yearbook of Central European Culture, 1983, pp. 87-112). A number of articles from the anthology were were reprinted in their original language in the journal Proměny (published by the Czechoslovak Society of Arts and Sciences, Flushing, New York), or in English translation (again in Cross

Currents, Ann Arbor and the Pittsburgh journal Kosmas).

We have learnt that copies of those translations will be distributed among conference participants, and have borne this fact in mind in preparing the present booklet.

We selected as the basis of our information about the anthology "T.G.Masaryk and our times" a summary of the collection issued by another Czechoslovak samizdat publication entitled Studie československých dějin [Studies of Czechoslovak History], issued in Prague in 1980. That summary, bearing the pseudonym Jaroslav Klatovský, provides an abstract of each of the titles included in the collection, thereby giving a certain idea of their particular line of thinking or relevance, which could be useful to those interested, since most of the texts in question are not readily available in libraries.

Opat's study is dealt with in an article by Czech political scientist and publicist Petr Pithart (b. 1941) who has suffered the usual fate of non-conformist Czechoslovaks. Pithart was co-editor along with Milan Machovec and Josef Dubský of the Masaryk anthology summarised in this booklet. Pithart's article, which we also include, was produced for the purposes of Czechoslovak samizdat.

For the benefit of those participants able to read Czech who and would like to know more about Opat's study, the Documentation Centre has had copies of it made which will be available in the Conference Hall.

Our short collection concludes with an article by Czech philosopher Ladislav Hejdánek written in 1986, also for samizdat purposes.

*

Publication of our booklet "T.G.Masaryk and our times", which takes the title of the home-produced 1980 anthology, has been made possible thanks to the support of the Central and East European Publishing Project in Oxford.

Hanover, November 1986 Vilém Prečan

Documentation Centre for the Promotion of Independent Czechoslovak Literature

T. G. MASARYK A NASE SOUCASNOST. MASARYKUV SBORNIK VII

[T.G.Masaryk and our times. Masaryk anthology VII]
Milan Machovec, Petr Pithart, Josef Dubský, eds.
Prague, 1980. Typescript, 758 pp. A4, frontispiece, 6 photographs

To mark the 130th anniversary of T.G.Masaryk's birth, a typescript anthology of writings by Czechoslovak authors living in the homeland and in exile, dealing with the thought and political achievements of the first President of the Czechoslovak Republic, was published in Prague 1980 as a self-help project by a group of independent Masarykian scholars.

The main section of this rich collection, preceded by reminiscences by Masaryk's grand-daughters Anna and Herberta and a Masaryk family-friend Julie Matoušková, comprises no less than twenty specialised articles, followed by a whole series of documents related to Masaryk's life. The volume concludes with an extensive Masarykian bibliography from the years 1935-1978 (1980).

Alongside articles written specially for the anthology by authors living in Czechoslovakia, the editors included a number of contributions by exile authors, originally intended for a conference of the SVU (the Czechoslovak Society of Arts and Sciences) held in 1980 in Interlaken (Switzerland), and a paper from the legacy of Jan Patočka *.

---

* The editors probably obtained the texts of the articles by exile authors (i.e. Kohák, Hrubý, Lochman, Schwarzenberg and Štefánek) in the language in which they were delivered at the Interlaken conference, whereas they subsequently underwent further editing before their publication in Proměny. The exception is Štefánek's paper which the editors took from a manuscript in German which was published unaltered in 1981 in the journal Bohemia; at Interlaken, Štefánek had delivered it in Slovak. Where applicable, we have appended to Klatovský's summary, bibliographical details of any subsequent printing history. The title of the contributions in their original language is printed in brackets after their English version. For the guidance of the English reader, we also provide an estimate of the original length of each piece. V.P.

The editors - Milan Machovec (b. 1925), a leading authority on Masaryk, and until 1969, Professor at the Philosophical Faculty of Charles University in Prague; Petr Pithart (b. 1941), until 1969 assistant lecturer at the Law Faculty of Charles University; and the pseudonymous Josef Dubský - dedicated the anthology to "The greatest Czech thinker of modern times and champion of the ideal of our national sovereignty, on the 130th anniversary of his birth."

As indicated by the collection's sub-title: "Masaryk anthology VII", the volume is intended as a continuation of the series of inter-war Masaryk anthologies published by V.K.Škrach, President Masaryk's academic secretary. The previous anthologies were printed and published in Prague as follows:

I: 1924-1925. Prague 1925

II: 1926-1927. Prague 1927

III: 1928-1929. Prague 1929

IV: 1930. Prague 1930. (First published in Prague in 1910 under the title "T. G. Masarykovi k šedesátým narozeninám" [60th birthday tribute to T.G.Masaryk], and edited by Edvard Beneš, František Drtina, František Krejčí and Jan Herben.)

V-VI: Vůdce generací [Leader of Generations] I-II. 1931. Prague 1931.

Our intention in the following pages is to provide a brief summary of each individual item in the anthology for the information of those unable to obtain the full text of the original collection due to the limited number of facsimiles published. Each of the titles is followed by a page reference to the original typescript edition.

*

PART I. REMINISCENCES

Anna Masaryková:

Masaryk and the continuity of Prague Castle.

[MASARYK A KONTINUITA PRAŽSKÉHO HRADU]

(pp. 10-17; approx. 2,700 words)

The opening reminiscence, by a daughter of Herbert Masaryk, highlights the President's lively interest in every aspect of post-war life, in this case, new building projects in Prague, from the Liberation Memorial in Žižkov to the construction of the old people's homes in Krč named after him and the interior design of new flats for the city's inhabitants. After recalling various aspects of Masaryk's personality, the author focusses on his love of books and describes the atmosphere of his unique library at the Castle. However, of the many places where Masaryk resided as President, he felt most at home at Lány, where he also kept part of his book collection and was able to work undisturbed.

Masaryk masterminded the gradual refurbishment and reconstruction of Prague Castle and its precincts which had previously been abandoned and neglected. As a direct participant and by profession an art historian, Anna Masaryková is aptly fitted to describe, both objectively and through the eyes of a child, how Prague Castle looked with its gardens, the Deer Leap and the Castle Riding School, the "Paradise" and "Royal" Gardens and the Belvedere. The task of modernising the entire castle complex and creating accomodation was given to the Yugoslav architect Josip Plecník. The author's thoughts on how successfully he accomplished his mission, form the core of her reminiscences. Masaryk and Plecník were of one mind about the role of architecture and on the use of stone as the main building material, and shared the view that the alterations should be "democratic", simple and

harmonious. The author mentions the little-known fact that the monolith in the third courtyard was ordered privately by the President as a memorial to those who fell in the independence struggle "as an expression of deep respect and the hope that they did not fall in vain", as Masaryk himself put it.

*

Herberta Masaryková:

Once upon a time...

[BYLO NEBYLO ...]

(pp.18-24; approx. 2,500 words)

Herbert Masaryk's second daughter opens her reminiscences with a recollection of one of the birthdays of her grandfather - the President - and the visit she made to the Castle, where her favourite room was Masaryk's library. She acquaints the reader with her school years in Prague and what it was like to be the President's grand-daughter, which conferred no advantage or privilege apart from the opportunity to know him spiritually and meet many representatives of European culture. The reminiscences switch from Prague to Lány and the simple and dignified surroundings of the President's mansion which was in no way closed - particularly not to the local children, and she paints a picture of the life of its residents: the President and his daughter Alice, including details of visits, Christmas celebrations, literary and musical evenings, film shows, etc. Finally, the author recalls the sadness of the thirties when Masaryk's life was coming to a close and the threat of German fascism hung over the Republic.

*

Julie Matoušková:

My recollection of T.G.Masaryk

[MOJE VZPOMÍNKA NA T.G.MASARYKA]

(pp. 25-29; approx. 2,500 words)

This short reminiscence of a friend of Olga Masaryk-Revilliod opens with a portrait of Masaryk's almost forgotten younger daughter who spent the exile years with him during the First World War as his faithful colleague. There is a description of Olga's pre-war activity, and her personal life, as well as the life of her family following her marriage to Dr.Revilliod in Geneva. Her Christian convictions and her constant helpfulness towards others are eloquently and succinctly conveyed by the author. The second half of the reminiscence consists of an account of two meetings between Julie Matoušková and President Masaryk - a private audience at the Castle and a visit to Lány in 1937. Their first conversation dealt with religious matters (e.g. the situation of women clergy),including the problem of the historical Jesus, wherein Masaryk set out his belief in God. During the second meeting, just before his death, the President was still interested to know of preparations for the founding of the World Council of Churches (which did not come about until after the War).

*

PART II. ARTICLES

Jiří Hájek:

What T.G.Masaryk means for us today

[ČÍM JE PRO NÁS T.G.MASARYK DNES]

(pp. 31-43; approx. 5,000 words)

The opening article in the specialised section of the anthology seeks to assess Masaryk's position in modern Czech history, in the half century accurately characterised by Zdeněk Nejedlý as the "Masaryk Era". The author gives a picture of Masaryk's activity, showing his influence and importance for Czech society in the last century and detailing his emancipatory endeavours to democratise the Austrian monarchy, and his war-time activity to achieve his goal of Czechoslovak independence. The study then focusses on his standing as President and the fate of his legacy in the course of anti-Nazi resistance and after World War II.

Masaryk's historical dimensions and the essence of his personality are such as to demand a critical approach, and this the author adopts in relation to Masaryk's character and achievements. The article consists of an appraisal of the example provided by Masaryk and the effects of his spiritual legacy in the fifty years since his death. The author, who took an active part in the cultural and political campaigns of the period, recounts how the Masaryk tradition was complemented by the laying of foundations for the renewal of the Republic during and after World War II. In the author's view, the heart of the matter was the Communists' attitude to the Masaryk legacy and their changing attitudes to him: from 1934, through the 1935 Presidential elections, to the wartime period, the 8th CP Congress in 1946, the February 1948 events and the 9th CP Congress in 1949, culminating in the total rejection of Masaryk in the fifties when his books

were removed from libraries, his statues demolished, and his name erased from history books. The sixties marked the rediscovery of Masaryk by a new generation, a process which was brought to an end by August 1968 and followed by today's situation in which, as in the fifties, Masaryk is officially denied a place in our history.

The article concludes with a discussion of the relevance of Masaryk's message for present-day society and a self-critical recollection by the author - a former Czechoslovak Foreign Minister - of his own reactions to and experience of Masaryk and Masarykism.

*

Jaroslav Hora:

T.G.M. - a few episodes from his life

[T. G. M. - NĚKOLIK ČRT Z JEHO ŽIVOTA]

(pp.44-65; approx. 8,500 words)

In the author's view, the key to the mystery of Masaryk's outstanding personality is to be found in his childhood and adolescence and he acquaints the reader with that period of Masaryk's life, so important in terms of experiences and ideas, connected with his family, religion and schooling. Early in his life, Masaryk demonstrated an independence of spirit, parting ways with the Catholic church (though not with Christianity) and becoming progessively confirmed in his Czech consciousness in the course of his secondary school and university years. The next milestones in his life were his marriage to the American Charlotte Garrigue and his subsequent arrival in Prague at the Czech university in 1882. The author describes Masaryk's rich contribution to the Czech academic, cultural and political life of the eighties and nineties, summarising his campaign over the "Manuscripts" and the crystallisation of Masaryk's philosophy of Czech

history, and the struggles which that involved.

After recording how, on the outbreak of World War I, Masaryk had the vigour and courage to to take a stand against the Austrian monarchy, the author traces the entire evolution of Masaryk's relationship with Austria, from being a reformer of the empire to its destroyer, when Austria unleashed its war of aggression and Masaryk lost all hopes of its possible transformation.

The paper goes on to record the last period of Masaryk's life following his return home and assumption of the Presidency, when he was to tackle the problems of the new Republic - including foreign relations, domestic questions, and economic and national issues. The author evokes the atmosphere of the First Republic and illustrates Masaryk's greatness through reference to his tackling of everyday problems and public scandals (e.g. the Šmeral affair and the business of Braf's memoirs, etc.)

The author notes in conclusion how "all decent people" in Czechoslovakia mourned his death and that even the communists upheld his legacy, so that even as late as 1947 Klement Gottwald was to declare Masaryk's legacy an example to be "...an ever bright source of enlightenment and advice," which, in the author's view they remain today, despite all the setbacks which his achievement and memory have suffered.

*

Milan Otáhal:
The significance of the campaign over the "Manuscripts"
[VÝZNAM BOJŮ O RUKOPISY]
(pp. 66-99; approx. 12,000 words)

The author cites a whole series of documentary forgeries in various European countries in the 18th and 19th centuries (Eng-

land, Russia, Bulgaria, Hungary), as a means of demonstrating, by a comparison of motives, that the forgery of purportedly historic Czech manuscripts was nothing out of the ordinary in the European context. However, the campaign to unmask the deception turned out to be a lengthy one because of the outstanding role the forgeries played in Czech society, among other reasons, because of the enormous influence they had on on art, literature and music. The reason they had such a great and lasting effect had much to do with the nature of the Czech national movement in the period of national renewal, which came under the influence of German-style romanticism. Milan Otáhal points to the factors governing the evolution of the Czech national movement (its situation within a multinational monarchy, facing creeping Germanification and the splitting of society into two ethnic groups) and the emergence of Czech nationalism with its own particular traits. He notes the weaknesses of the Czech nation and the qualities of its leading (middle class) representatives and examines the motives for their constant and damaging efforts to assert their separateness from their - in every sense stronger - fellow-citizens, the Germans.

The Manuscripts were intended to bolster up all aspects of Czech nationalism and prove the Czech's superiority over the Germans, thereby promoting anti-Germanism and playing on Slav sentiments. They gradually turned into a cult and were regarded universally as an inviolable asset of Czech culture. All the leading figures of the national renewal enthusiastically hailed their "discovery", including Jungmann, Palacký and Šafařík. Only Dobrovský, who was fundamentally an enlightenment figure, proved that the "Zelená hora manuscript" was a fake. In doing so he

called down on himself a campaign of personal vilification. Palacky overcame his initial scepticism and immediately after the "discoveries" in 1834, became a champion of the authenticity of the "Zelena hora manuscript", to be joined in 1840 by Šafařík who also recanted his initial doubts. Thus the authority of the Manuscripts was enhanced and Czech nationalism greatly strengthened.

The article scans the subsequent stages of the campaign to prove the fraudulent character of the Manuscripts which finally achieved its goal in the second half of the nineteenth century as a result chiefly of the efforts of the German scholars Haupt, Fejfalík and Budinger who undermined the theories of their authenticity. However the fact that they were all of German nationality only served to bolster Czech nationalism still further.

In the 1870s, two Moravians came out against the manuscripts' authenticity: A.V.Šembera who disproved the authenticity of the "Zelená hora manuscript" and Vladimír Vašek, who also challenged the authenticity of the "discovery" at Dvůr Králové. A hate campaign was whipped up against them both which eventually hounded them to their deaths.

By means of a detailed analysis of the final stage of the controversy over the Manuscripts' authenticity, Milan Otáhal is able to indicate the changing situation in the Czech lands, where the existence of the Czech nation was established and Czech scholarship had evolved to the point where in 1882 the university was divided into Czech and German sections. In 1883, the academic journal "The Athenaeum" was founded with T.G.Masaryk as editor. Together with the historian Jaroslav Goll and the philologist Jan Gebauer, Masaryk was to play a decisive role in the final phase of the controversy. The chief aim of their efforts

was to free Czech life, politics and culture from the clutches of nationalistic interests and values. It was therefore not solely a controversy between two different attitudes, but an attempt to assert the moral aspects of the Czech intelligentsia and culture and an attack on empty nationalism.

The article recapitulates the course of the dispute: the publishing of Gebauer's article in "The Athenaeum", Masaryk's article, the sharp reaction from the nationalist camp, vilification in the press, Vlček's counterblast, and the articles in "Národní listy" (Grégr) as well as in other newspapers and magazines, whose authors went on to include Neruda, Krásnohorská, and Heyduk. Masaryk was ostracised from the nation ("The devil take you, base traitor!"). In 1886, "Hlas národa" even organised a ballot about the Manuscripts' authenticity (!) asking among others, Rieger, Tomek, Hattala, Kalousek and Emler. But even that did not help. The arguments against their authenticity were so convincing and they had gained so much support that they could no longer be silenced. Victory came in the period 1886-87. Echoes of the controversy could still be heard in the First Republic when right-wing Czech politicians re-asserted the Manuscripts' authenticity. The most recent research into the Manuscripts in 1967-68, used chemical analysis to provide final proof that they were indeed forgeries.

The author's article not only contributes to study of the controversy over the Manuscripts, but above all, it provides a perceptively critical view of Czech nationalism and its concomitant traits in the last century and shows the state of Czech society, including its leading elements in a less than attractive light.

[Printed under the title "The Manuscript Controversy in the Czech National Revival" in Cross Currents 5, 1986 (Michigan Slavic Material No.26), pp.247-277]

*

Josef Mrakavský:

Masaryk and Literature

[MASARYK A LITERATURA]

(pp.100-146; approx. 15,000 words)

This paper traces T.G.Masaryk's activity as a literary critic from its very beginnings. It notes Masaryk's enjoyment of reading which developed into a systematic study of Czech and world literature, from which a particular critical stance finally emerged. After an examination of his earliest articles, there follows an assessment of his critical activity in "The Athenaeum" and his concept of aesthetics as expressed particularly in his lecture: "On studying poetical works" [O studii děl básnických]. The author considers Masaryk's greatest achievement in literary criticism to have been his personal contribution to the controversy over the Manuscripts, which he believes to have been a moral act and part of the struggle to purge the nation's past and combat the narrow-minded provincialism of Czech national life. The author regards Masaryk's forerunner in the literary field to have been Karel Havlíček about whose literary works Masaryk wrote critical studies. Mrakavský goes on to indicate the principles of Masaryk's realism, as he applied them to literary criticism, before dealing with Masaryk's studies of eclecticism and dilettantism. He discusses Masaryk's attitude to the leading exponents of Czech literature of the late nineteenth century, particularly Jaroslav Vrchlický, and points to the parallels between Masaryk's view of literature and his attitude to life and religion and those of several other world thinkers including Groce and Santayana. He notes above all Masaryk's relation to Goethe

and the latter's ethical concept of literature, particularly in connection with feminism. The author devotes a separate chapter to Masaryk's criticism of literary "titanism". He also turns his attention to Masaryk's attitude to children's literature and translations and their importance for the national culture. The author assesses the literary merit of critical chapters in his main works, particularly Masaryk's article on Russian literature in his "Russia and Europe" [Rusko a Evropa] - including the 3rd section which is yet to appear in Czech. He deals with Masaryk's relation to F.X.Šalda in his criticism: "Of puppets and God's labourers" [Loutek a dělníků božích], as well as in his talks on literature during his period as President. Mrakavský's motivation throughout the piece is to reveal to today's generation certain - still little known - reasons for Masaryk's importance for Czech literary criticism and history.

*

František Kautman:
T.G.Masaryk and the problem of national identity. Theses

[T.G.MASARYK A PROBLÉM NÁRODNÍ IDENTITY. TEZE]

(pp.147-157; approx. 3,700 words)

The article consists of seven theses which seek to present a model of Masaryk's concept of national identity. - I. Nationality was not a once-and-for-all phenomenon for Masaryk - he came from a mixed Moravian Slovak/German family - Czech was not his mother tongue - his schooling was in German. He acquired his knowledge of Czech gradually, chiefly through his own efforts. He first wrote in German and was unfamiliar with matters Czech, not acquainting himself with Czech society, culture and history until he moved to Prague. - II. The mythico-biological concept of nationality inspired by German romanticism was alien to Masaryk

(but Masaryk was to admit his debt to it in later life - though the concept underwent a fundamental transformation in his hands). This came out clearly in the controversy over the Manuscripts in the 1880s, when Masaryk did not believe that it would be a national tragedy were the "discoveries" proved to be forgeries: the Czech nation having other, genuine and viable, traditions. - III. Masaryk sought to shape modern Czech nationality, i.e. to transport it from "the stage of ethnographic existence to being a cultural entity of European or global standards." Nationality was relevant solely as a creator of cultural values; efforts to protect a nationality made sense only in so far as the nation created cultural values to enrich the whole of humanity. This aim motivated the whole of Masaryk's efforts with respect to Czech cultural life. - IV. As a member of the Vienna parliament, Masaryk pursued not a Czech policy, but a European one (e.g. the "Hilsner Case", his defence of the Croatians, his exposing of imperial intrigues against Serbia, the "Wahrmund Affair", his support for the Slav student movement, his co-operation with the Czech Social-Democratic Party, etc.). A nation's capacity to foster its culture depended on its not being indifferent to issues of concern to Europe and humanity as a whole. - V. There is a sense in which Masaryk conceived the Czech question in religious terms. He sought to bond the achievements of the National Revival to reformation ideals, while ignoring the catholic component - Bolzano's enlightened catholicism - and Jungmann's liberal nationalism. He thus achieved an amalgam of Reformation ideals with ideas of national revival, which, after he had worked it into a viable political program, served to unite the nation at the moment an independent national state was estab-

lished in 1918. - VI. Masaryk defined nationality in positive terms, in the tradition of Hus, Comenius, Kollár, Palacký, A.Smetana and Havlíček. Anti-German nationalism and chauvinism were alien to his thinking. Having grown up in a German-speaking environment, he went on to absorb Western and Russian culture and guided Czech culture in that direction. In his relations with Russian culture, he sought to temper uncritical Slavophile and Russophile approaches. From national history he absracted an all-embracing human principle which consisted of respect for the human individual and hence for all other nations. - VII. Masaryk's concept of national identity was an ideal that has never been attained in Czech modern history, if one looks at the attempts to achieve it in the period 1918-38, which nonetheless gave rise to outstanding cultural achievements in all fields. Since that time there has been the systematic dismantling of Masaryk's national programme which has only served to weaken the Czech national character and national consciousness.

[Printed in Czech in Proměny 19/3, July 1982, pp. 3-10; in English, under the title "T.G.Masaryk and the Problems of National Identity" in Kosmas, Vol.4, No.2, Winter 1985, pp.71-81]

*

Rudolf Jasen:
The dual function of Masaryk's striving for social renewal

[DVOJÍ FUNKCE MASARYKOVA ÚSILÍ OBRODNÉHO]

(pp.158-171; 5,000 words)

This article seeks to present an overview of Masaryk's efforts to achieve a renewal of society, both in global and national terms. The author classes Masaryk among such thinkers as Plato, Hus, Comenius, Pascal, Locke, Herder, etc., who devoted their mental and practical efforts to the goal of social renewal. He briefly traces Masaryk's links with Kant, Comte, Spencer,

Michelet and Renouvier and moves on to Masaryk's contemporaries: James, Royce, Wildelband, Cohen, Eucken and Paulsen, to show how close they were to his thinking.

Masaryk's striving after social renewal served also to acquaint him with Tolstoy, Dostoyevský and Gorky, and among the younger generation - Albert Schweitzer. Masaryk's proclaimed intention of "disconcerting people" summed up for him only the first part of his chosen task. The subsequent diagnostic efforts were exerted in the fields of philosophical anthropology, sociology, pedagogy, ethics, literary criticism, the philosophy of history and culture, political science, university teaching and educative journalism, in all of which his ideal was a vigorous, healthy, balanced and creative life. Nejedlý's view of Masaryk as a philosopher of crisis is an incomplete assessment in Jasen's view, in the sense that his concern was always and above all to solve and overcome crises. Masaryk investigated the present at every level, in his search for the causes of "the century's malaise". For instance, he carried out an all-round analysis of suicide and its causes. A whole series of contemporary trends and developments Masaryk concluded to be degenerate and destructive in the light of the evidence and they came in for his criticism. These included decadence, nihilism, Zola's naturalism, illusionism, mediaevalism, aesthetism, formalism and extremisms of every variety. However, he was never a proponent of opportunist centrism, but stood head and shoulders above his contemporaries in his radical approach to evaluating problems.

The second section of the paper investigates Masaryk's renewal efforts in relation to the national issues in which he became involved after his arrival in Prague at the Czech university, continuing the tradition of the finest representatives of

the national revival. On the one hand Masaryk quickly found himself at home in the Czech milieu, while on the other "he found himself in the Czech cultural world at the turn of the century more isolated than in the wider European context". The Czech milieu - in the sense of the official world of the bourgeoisie, the university and the press - was unacceptable to Masaryk for several reasons and the author describes Masaryk's various endeavours within it, which earned him its hostility. In the author's view, the theme of Masaryk as an expert on the Czech character would provide matter for several studies, which could take as an illustration a list of "all the abuse and slander, together with the various public and secret plots that were hatched against him from the moment he arrived in Prague, and continued throughout the years of his presidency, and did not even end with his death, of course - not to mention the present day campaigns against him."

While noting that Masaryk attracted whole generations of followers, the author lists a large number of those who later parted company with him, such as Machar, Šalda, Nejedlý, Chalupný, Albert Pražák and Milena Nováková among others, before concluding this section of the paper with a descriptive account of those who were close to him in all spheres of cultural life.

Masaryk's work in favour of the nation's revival also had other dimensions. These included his search for the living legacy of Czech history, which led him to conclude that the Czech question was a religious - though also social - one, and that the meaning of Czech history was a concept of humanity. Masaryk's philosophy of history which played a foremost role in his efforts in favour of national renewal became the subject of one lively

debate after another and many objections were voiced against them (Pekař). Jasen is of the view that Masaryk's philosophy of history has two separate aspects, on the one hand historical, and on the other, ideological (philosophical), and this is a factor which Pekař and other historians failed to perceive. The author maintains that those who denied the continuity of Czech history "underestimated the legacy of reformation values within the re-catholicised section of the nation", overlooked the importance of self-taught scholars, failed to take into account the activity of exile literature and ignored the significance of the reformed regions of Slovakia in the 17th and 18th centuries, from whence the preserved ideas of reformation returned to Bohemia and Moravia at the time of the national revival, without all of which it is hard to explain the line of continuity that led to Kollár, Šafařík and Palacký.

Jasen's article concludes with several interesting comments on Masaryk's political activity and the importance of Masaryk's legacy for the Czech and Slovak nations and an assertion of the importance of his "second coming".

*

Jan Mlynařík:
Milan Rastislav Štefánik in Masaryk's correspondence

[MILAN RASTISLAV ŠTEFÁNIK V MASARYKOVEJ KORESPONDENCII]
(pp. 172-204; approx. 8,500 words)

This article centres on those parts of Masaryk's correspondence with Edvard Beneš, Karel Kramář and Vavro Šrobár from the collection left by Prof.Jirásek, and now housed in the archives of the "National Literary Memorial", which throw light on the personality of M.R.Štefánik, one of the leading figures of the first resistance movement.

The introduction consists of a general analysis of Masaryk's

relations with the Slovaks and his influence on Slovak political life and concludes with an explanation of the increasingly closer ties between Masaryk and Štefánik. In 1900, Štefánik transferred from the Prague technical college to the philosophical faculty where he attended Masaryk's practical philosophy lectures and soon was visiting Masaryk at home so that he began to accept him as a father figure. Subsequently, Štefánik was to become the Slovák editorialist of Herben's "Cas" and develop into an important political figure and protagonist of Czecho-Slovak unity and cooperation. In the period 1904-14 he became a naturalised French citizen at a time when he was working for French astronomy. When war broke out he began, as a soldier and French army officer, to put his weight behind the idea of the independence of the Czechs and Slovaks and wage effective propaganda in French political, diplomatic and military circles. In this way he prepared the ground for Masaryk and Beneš. As soon as resistance started to be organised in exile, it was expected that Štefánik would assume a role in the forefront as a representative of the Slovaks.

At the end of 1915, Štefánik met Beneš and they became associates. It was Štefánik who paved the way for Masaryk to be received by Briand in February 1916, which was only one of many occasions when Stefanik was able to make use of his contacts and acquaintanceships in the upper echelons of French society. Štefánik also played an important role in having Durich excluded from the exile resistance in France (after which Durich left for Russia where he created further problems). In 1916, Štefánik prepared the ground in Rome for Masaryk's proposed visit to Italy, which in the end did not take place, so that he was

obliged to assume the lion's share of resistance activity in that country. Meanwhile a certain degree of rivalry developed between Benes and Stefanik, so that Benes did not include Stefanik in the preparatory presidium of the resistance committee.

From Italy, Štefánik was sent to Russia where he sought to counteract Durich's divisive activities. His efforts in Russia were sucessful; he had a free hand wherever he went and was able to take decisions on his own initiative. All his efforts eventually led to the expulsion of Durich from the national council at the beginning of 1917.

The previously mentioned correspondence also throws light on the evolution of the "Slovak question" within the resistance in exile and clarifies the position taken by the Slovaks in Russia and America, as well as Štefánik's reservations about the description "tchecoslovaque" (preferring the adjective "tcheque" for tactical reasons), and the history of difficulties with Osuský, etc.

Once Masaryk was in Russia, Štefánik returned to Paris where he helped create favourable conditions for talks in Italy, and in the summer and autumn of 1917 he organised the recruitment in the USA of Czech and Slovak volunteers for service on the battlefields in France. By the beginning of 1918, he was already in Italy where he pressed for Czech and Slovak prisoners to be allowed to form an independent military force. In these efforts also he was successful.

During the second half of 1918, tension between Štefánik and Dr.Beneš again started to mount, and each of them complained about the other in their letters to Masaryk. Beneš accused Štefánik of being unstable, hypersensitive and touchy and underlined their philosophical differences and their contrasting atti-

tudes to life. For his part, Štefánik complained about Beneš' dictatorial manner. The author concludes that they were probably both right.

One of the most difficult tasks with which Štefánik was entrusted, and one which Mlynárik believes Beneš refused, was to arrange for the transfer of the Czechoslovak legions from Russia to France after Brest-Litovsk. Meanwhile, the National Council had been transformed into a government recognised by the Western powers. On 10th October, Beneš sent Masaryk a proposal for the distribution of government portfolios, whereby Štefánik would be minister charge d'affaires. Masaryk amended the proposal and made Štefánik Minister of War. While Štefánik was still in Siberia the independent Czechoslovak state was proclaimed with Kramář as Prime Minister of a government including Klofáč as Minister of National Defence and Štefánik, though still abroad, as Minister of War. These far from normal circumstances gave rise to an exchange of letters between Masaryk and Kramář who did not want Štefánik in his government at all. In the end, Masaryk wrote to Kramář in April 1919 that Štefánik would relinquish the portfolio, though he could not say what position would be offered Štefánik, whether in Slovakia, or possibly as an ambassador to Paris or Rome. In Mlynárik's view Masaryk's estimate, which was the most likely outcome, showed that he was yielding to anti-Štefánik and essentially anti-Slovak tendencies in Czech society.

Štefánik died tragically on 4th May 1919 and it is difficult to predict how he would have fitted in and what role he would have played in the new Republic, though it is likely that he would have found himself on the right wing of politics. Nonetheless, his demise meant the loss of a personage the like of which,

after Rašín's murder and Švehla's untimely death, was rare, and was to be sorely lacking in the crisis year of 1938...

Mlynárik's article helps in a very original way to explain the role of the neglected - though probably for that reason, idealised - personality of M.R.Štefánik.

*

Josef Dubský:

Masaryk and the Germans

(Masaryk's concept of German nationalism in his campaign for an independent state, and his attitude to the Germans after 1918)

[MASARYK A NĚMCI]

(pp.205-231; approx. 9,200 words)

Masaryk's attitude to the Germans and Germany is undoubtedly a key issue in studying his achievement. The author notes Masaryk's attitude towards the Germans before World War I and during the First Republic, both in terms of Germany and the German minority, and also his relationship to German culture.

Masaryk sought in German literature, philosophy and culture a key to understanding Germany. In his research during the eighteen nineties he studied the influence of German philosophy on the moulding of national consciousness both in Germany and Bohemia. For Masaryk, the programme of German nationalism was not to be found solely in German philosophy, but also in literature and culture in general. Masaryk, himself the product of German schools and with his countless experiences from political campaigns in the imperial parliament in Vienna faced the World War without illusions. He was in Germany when it broke out.

The first section of Dubský's paper is made up of an analysis of the memoranda which Masaryk wrote in the course of the World War and sent to the allied governments. They were all intended as publicity to influence the great power governments at

war with Germany. 1. a memorandum from 1914 (conveyed by Seton-Watson) that included, among others, a character-study of the Czech nation and an assertion of the demand for Czech independence which could only come about if Germany were defeated. 2. a memorandum sent in 1915 to the Russian government; 3. a memorandum from 1915 entitled "independent Bohemia" and intended for the British government, containing a character-study of Germany, a summary of its military aims, an analysis of pan-Germanism, etc. 4. a memorandum from November 1915, sharply critical of pan-Germanism and its leaders. 5. a memorandum entitled "The Eleventh Hour" drafted in 1915, in which Masaryk warned against underestimating Germany and countered the German concept of "Mitteleuropa" with a programme for an independent central Europe made up of an independent Bohemia, Poland and Serbia. 6. a memorandum entitled: "A Pan-German `Central Europe' or Czech independence?" which was addressed to the French government and reiterated the main ideas of memorandum No.3: including that of an independent Bohemia, Poland and Serbia as a bulwark against Prussia.

The author pays particular attention to the paper "The New Europe" [Nová Evropa] written by Masaryk during his stay in Russia (May 1917 - April 1918), in which he once more analyses the essence of Pan-Germanism, the character of the Prussian state, the chief features of German culture and the status of the German minority in Bohemia, and asserts German and Austrian responsibility for the war.

After an appraisal of the last three memoranda from the end of the war, the author goes on to deal with Masaryk's contribution to the formulation of the now independent Czechoslovakia's

foreign policy towards Germany. As a realistic statesman, Masaryk did not preclude post-war cooperation with the Weimar Republic but merely demanded that the new regime should give up the earlier aggressive policies towards the East.

The second part of the article traces Masaryk's relationship with the German minority in the Czech lands, from the theoretical approach in "The Czech Question" [Česká otázka] to his practical proposals for the two nations' coexistence. Masaryk's chief endeavour was to retain the German minority in the Czech lands on the basis of voluntary loyalty and also to prevent a secession of their territories.

The third section deals with Masaryk's contacts with representatives of German culture: Kraus, Kautský, Wassermann, Schweitzer, Ludwig, Brod and the brothers Mann.

In the final section the author endeavours to sum up Masaryk's attitude to German nationalism. While acknowledging Masaryk's efforts in favour of Czech-German harmony, he nonetheless raises the issue of how much this aim was neglected by the Czech side. In this respect, Masaryk's concept of the nation, like the national policy of the First Republic and the role that Czech nationalism played within it, call out for further study.

[Printed in Promeny 19/3, July 1982, pp. 16-35]

*

Josef Nedoma:

T.G.M. as President of the Czechoslovak State

[T. G. M. JAKO PREZIDENT ČESKOSLOVENSKÉHO STÁTU]

(pp.232-254; approx. 6,700 words)

By way of introduction, the author cites several works of independent Masaryk scholarship (Machovec, Patočka and Černý) which take a critical stance to Masaryk's presidency, regarding

his post-war activity as something distinct from his achievements prior to the founding of the Republic. Nedoma disagrees with this assessment and in his study analyses Masaryk's work as President, basing himself on the first President's ideas on the independent Czechoslovak state as revealed in "World Revolution" [Světová revoluce], which also set out Masaryk's views on historical evolution and the First World War. That interpretation was attacked soon after the book's publication (in 1925), by, among others, Ferdinand Peroutka, and subsequent developments indeed proved Masaryk wrong.

The central plank of Masaryk's concept of foreign policy was reliance on France, and then the creation of viable states in central and south eastern Europe (though admittedly he had inadequate understanding of the problems of Austria and Hungary, for which Masaryk has often been criticised by authors abroad). The crux of his domestic policy was his demand for "de-Austrification". Otherwise, he avoided questions of the structure of society: he restricted himself to the demand that the state and politics should have a "moral basis". His economic and social program was a moderate one, initially favouring the socialisation of key sections of the national economy, supporting social legislation, agrarian reform, the creation of a developed health service and school system, etc. It was always his desire to solve social ills by means of reforms rather than radical methods.

The author goes on in the next section to examine the way Masaryk went about implementing his program. His accession to supreme office was above all a reflection of his supreme role in the foreign resistance rather than any indication of broad support within the national political scene. Masaryk wasted little

time in asserting his opinions and conceptions and gradually intervened in policies about relations with Russia (leading to the conflict with Kramář), and with the Germans in the Republic (causing a conflict with the Czech nationalists), as well as engaging in the controversy over the President's powers and over his succession, etc. In the early twenties, the Masarykian political coterie - "the Castle" as it was called - entrenched itself in the political mechanisms of the First Republic, playing a decisive role within it throughout its lifetime.

Nedoma's article continues with an account of the most important political battles fought out in the First Republic: Kramář's conflict with Beneš, Masaryk's attempts to get Germans into the government, the controversy over the character of "28th October", the National Democratic Party's campaign against Masaryk's new term as President, the NDP's defeat in 1925 and its subsequent attempts to join up with the fascists, followed by its fresh onslaught on Beneš in 1926, subsequent conflicts between Beneš and the agrarian party, and finally Masaryk's fourth presidential election in 1934, his abdication in 1935 and the presidential elections of the same year.

The author concludes by highlighting Masaryk's chief political achievement - the construction of a democratic Czechoslovak state and a partial solution to the problem of coexistence between Czechs and Germans within the republic. However the social problem was inadequately solved, and likewise the question of civic education. In terms of foreign policy, Masaryk underestimated the consequences of the disintegration of the Austro-Hungarian empire and rejected the formation of a Danube federation. He failed to realise that the great powers represented a

far greater threat to central Europe than did Vienna or Budapest. All in all, Masaryk left behind an achievement which bore the imprint of his personality and which remains a living chapter in our history.

*

Petr Pithart:
Recognition of a prophet in Bohemia: T.G.M. and our society

[UZNANÍ PROROKA V ČECHÁCH: T. G. M. A NAŠE SPOLEČNOST]

(pp.255-278; approx. 9,200 words)

Central to this study is a search for an answer to the question whether the Czech nation really understood Masaryk's legacy, or rather what it was capable of understanding in view of the particular circumstances of Masaryk's life and work and above all, the particular circumstances of the Czech nation's historical experience.

Masaryk, whose personality and outlook led him to seek "invisible moral victories", by chance achieved a victory in the world of power - the unique moment in world history when a philosopher founded a state. The simple and widely accepted explanation of this phenomenon was that the ideas that Masaryk adopted from the world at large proved effective and they were then entrusted with the care of the state. Such an approach to Masaryk's vital role in the creation of the state served to alienate Masaryk for the Czechs as a source of moral inspiration.

In all the campaigns waged by Masaryk, the author's argument runs, his concern was always for the truth and never for the advantages or positions that he might achieve thereby. Moreover, it was not a question of his having a monopoly of the truth, but of the "truthfulness" of those who sought the truth from his or opposite standpoints. In the words of Erazim Kohák, his concern

was not for the truth "about something" but "of something". Thus for Masaryk what counted most was that people should be true to themselves and live a life "sub speciae aeternitatis". What sort of success did Masaryk enjoy with such requirements in Czech society?

Naturally, such postulates as Masaryk's are not conducive to victory. All one can do with them is to persevere untiringly and cleave to them even despite oneself, Petr Pithart replies. Masaryk's voice sounded at that time in Czech society rather as Socrates' daimonion, i.e. the voice of one's conscience warning against wrong - in the sense of dishonest, superficial, indifferent, etc. - behaviour and thinking, and the louder and more insistent it is, the more alive it is. Looked at in this way, there was no chance of Masaryk's achieving total success or final victory. All the more "precarious" therefore was his triumph - or alternatively, its inevitable reverse side: the illusion that "truth prevails", possibly "of its own accord", even. In the nation's eyes, by and large, his superficial triumph obliterated everything that had gone before. It was as if Masaryk's previous activity had been no more than a logical preparation for the final victorious act - the independent state, and as if that were somehow the culmination of Czech history.

After comparing the careers of Masaryk and Kramář, the author sums up his thesis: that people's lack of understanding of Masaryk prior to his "success" and the honour and admiration accorded him after it, served to obscure the meaning of Masaryk's overall and long term influence on Czechoslovak society during the First Republic. The external success proved an obstacle to an understanding of the true meaning of his lifelong endeavours, in the sense of ideas and of practical activity. Whereas previously

he had irritated and provoked others and aroused disapproval, now he had become a visible incarnation of the idea that "truth prevails", and proof that all you need is to have right on your side. But truth, says Pithart, only prevails when it is championed in favourable circumstances by people of Masaryk's calibre.

But it was Masaryk's very ideas, which were furthermore often taken at face value and not understood even by his supporters, let alone his critics and opponents (who as a result, were not equal partners) that gave rise to misunderstandings.

Petr Pithart then goes on to cite several of the basic questions dealt with by Masaryk and illustrate how difficult it was at the time for people to grasp the actual meaning of Masaryk's ideas, whether about religion or the meaning of Czech history. And it was particularly difficult in the Czech lands.

The author sums up his thesis with a study of the tension between Masaryk and the Czech milieu, and in its context, the question of democracy and its preconditions. He also describes some characteristics of 19th and 20th century Czech society, because the very way in which Masaryk was misunderstood reveals many important aspects of it.

In conclusion, Pithart returns to the quotation heading his article and maintains that Masaryk was not recognised as a prophet when he arrived but when he was victorious, which is not the same thing at all. He then became a personification of authority and a legendary figure, at which point his provocativeness was no longer perceived. The state he founded survived him by only a year, when it failed to cleave to the ideals on which it was founded - which were "the ideals of a fighter".

In what is in many ways a provocative article, Pithart seeks to throw light on Masaryk and Masaryk's concern for the inner values of human authenticity which often cannot be conveyed in words.

[Due to appear in Czech in Kosmas (Winter 1986)]

*

Josef Zveřina:
A catholic theologian's brief conversation with T.G.M.

[MALÝ HOVOR KATOLICKÉHO TEOLOGA S T. G. M.]

(pp.279-286; approx. 2,800 words)

In this study, the author sets out to engage in a "brief conversation" with one of the historical "greats": professor, polemicist, campaigner, politician malgre lui, sociologist and philosopher. The unifying element in this complex, heterogenuous - though unified - monolith of a personality is, in Father Zveřina's view, religion.

The author considers that Masaryk's approach to religion may be looked at in two ways: historically and practically. Historically speaking, Masaryk's opinions evolved from those of his essay on suicide, through his "Struggle for religion" [V boji o náboženství], "Russia and Europe" [Rusko a Evropa] and "World Revolution" [Světová revoluce], to the serenity of his conversations with Čapek. As for Masaryk's practical approach, the author detects three areas, firstly, his historical experience of religion, his philosophical justification of religion and lastly, his personal religious life. He deals with the latter first of all.

The core of Masaryk's being was his innermost spiritual life. In order to understand this, it is necessary to realise that Masaryk's piety was extrovert and active. This was the

basis for his religion, which represented for him an attitude to life, not a doctrinal system. However, not only does Masaryk's religion not constitute a unified whole, but neither does it exert a unifying force.

Father Zveřina goes on to tackle the question of Masaryk's approach to catholicism which the author does not believe to have been a categorical rejection. On the contrary, Masaryk found positive attributes in terms of past and present, while being sharply critical of the church's "irreligiousness", its anti-scientific attitudes, contradictory morality and political activity. As for the church, it found nothing good to say about Masaryk and fought him tooth and nail. The author expresses regret that the Catholic Church proved incapable of accepting Masaryk's criticisms and treating them with understanding.

History has not borne out Masaryk's scepticism about the future of the christian churches, although in the author's view, he would undoubtedly have welcomed the present renewal movement, for, in many respects, this movement comes close to Masaryk's own views on religion. Masaryk nowadays would find himself confronted by pre-Vatican Council theology of terrestrial reality or even the more recent "political theology", which might do much to improve his attitude to theology as such.

The third area mentioned, i.e. that of Masaryk's philosophical justification of religion, is particularly complex. The author examines various different statements on religion and admits that they have not been examined systematically from a catholic standpoint. Equally complex was Masaryk's concept of God - he was a traditional theist in terms of his concept of a personal God, but the precedence he gave to eternal life over belief in God, made him more of a deist. Masaryk's Jesus was a

preacher of humanitarian ideals and he rejected the concepts of the Son of God and the Saviour as myths, along with that of revelation. As for the church, Masaryk regarded it as a sociological and political organisation to be discarded. In the author's view, the image of the church has changed since Masaryk's time and he hopes it will continue to do so. Thus he thinks it will gradually be possible to find within the area of Masaryk's deepest concerns a "communis consensus" from a catholic standpoint. Meanwhile, Masaryk's work remains a binding challenge to Christians.

Father Zveřina's study is a substantial contribution to discussion of Masaryk and catholicism, a theme which still awaits a broader assessment, one covering its cultural and political aspects and its significance for Czech society. It was precisely the catholics who failed to integrate Masaryk into the new state, with all the repercussions which that entailed.

[Printed in Czech in Proměny 19/3, July 1982, pp. 11-15]

*

Jan Šimsa:

Hromádka's critique of Masaryk

[HROMÁDKOVA KRITIKA MASARYKA]

(pp. 287-313; approx. 9,200 words)

The author regards his article (initially written in 1968 for publication in "Plamen", and reworked for the anthology) as an instalment towards repaying a double debt - to J.L.Hromádka and to T.G.Masaryk alike. It is well-arranged in twenty-five separate sections.

1."A double duty" - Introduction. 2."The nineteenth century scholar who gave up religion" - describing the situation of religion and the church in Europe at the end of the 19th century.

3. "Masaryk as a child of the 19th century" - describing the climate in which Masaryk grew up as a child, and noting the influence of Kant and protestant theology on him, as well as the role of religion in Masaryk's life. 4. "A critical though warm relationship with religion" - Masaryk's theme of suicide. 5. "Masaryk appeals for a new living faith" - his search for a new religion; his assertion of the contradiction between orthodox teachings and the contemporary face of the world. 6. "The Czech Question is a religious one" - on Masaryk's becoming a protestant; his study of Palacký and Havlíček; formulation of the Czech national programme; his writings of the 1890s; his rejection of "indifference-ism" and his critique of liberalism. 7. "Masaryk's faith is decisive for his development" - further influences on Masaryk, and the character of his Christianity. 8. "Hromádka criticises Masaryk as a religious thinker" - acceptance of Masaryk's concept of faith by Czech and Slovak evangelical Christians before 1918.; Hromadka's critique of Masaryk in 1922 and his attack on "soft Masarykites"; the prevailing positive assessment of Masayk. 9. "Does Masaryk overcome his positivism?" - the essence of Masaryk's ideal of humanity. 10. "Does Masaryk care about God's mercy?" - Hromádka's assessment that one of Masaryk's failings was his neglect of the question of God's mercy, that he regarded God - in the light of his synergism - as a democratic colleague; the difference between Masaryk and German liberal theology; Masaryk's influence on Hromádka's perception of the limitations of liberalism. 11. "Who is the better Christian: Masaryk or Dostoyevsky?" - Hromadka's attempt at a deeper understanding of Masaryk in his 1924 study of Masaryk and Dostoyevsky; Hromádka's positive assessment of Masaryk's analysis of suicide

in modern society and the crisis of modern man; a comparison of Masaryk and Dostoyevsky, and of western and orthodox christianity. 12. "Is providence a Christian concept?" - Hromádka's 1924 lecture on Masaryk's concept of Christian faith; for Hromádka, Masaryk's piety was "philosophy with a religious tinge"; what the concept of providence meant for Masaryk. 13. "Are ethics a religious weakness?" - Masaryk's liking for Hume; Hromádka's later assessments of Masaryk's ethics. 14. "What does Masaryk know about sin?" - the limitations of Masaryk's understanding of the Christian doctrine of God and Christ, and - in Hromádka's view - the consequent inadequacy of his understanding of sin and mercy in protestant terms. 15. "Salda's view of Christianity and democracy" - Hromádka's critique. 16. "The strength and depth of Masaryk's faith is to be found in his philosophy" - Hromádka's study "Masaryk" of 1930 and its analysis. 17. "Masaryk's noetic approach" - Hume, Brentano, and the link between them: Husserl. 18. "Masaryk's critique of Kant" - the essential points. 19. "Is Masaryk a Kantian?" - Kant's influence on Masaryk; the essence of his philosophy. 20. "The heart of the matter" - Hromádka's stress on Masaryk's corrections to Kant, and his view that Masaryk provided a good example. 21. "Hromádka grows out of Masaryk" - Masaryk's influence on Hromádka, particularly in the latter's critique of Kant and Kantians. 22. "Masaryk and Rádl": Radl's critique of Masaryk. 23. "The usefulness of Hromádka's endeavours" - Hromádka's sojourn in the USA; his positive assessment of Masaryk taken further. 24. "The limits of Hromádka's critique" - Hromádka's criticism was limited to Masaryk's subjectivism and individualism; Simsa's critique of both Hromádka's and Masaryk's concept of man and society. 25. "Masaryk's heirs Radl and Hromádka" - the need to approach them critically.

In conclusion, the author maintains that Christianity is again becoming a source of inspiration for all, thanks among others, to Masaryk and his critically-minded heirs.

[Printed in Czech in Proměny 20/2, May 1983, pp.19-37]

*

Jan Milič Lochman:

Masaryk's heir Emanuel Radl

[MASARYKŮV POKRAČOVATEL EMANUEL RÁDL]

(pp.314-327; approx. 4,600 words)

Lochman shares the view of Hromádka, Patočka and Černý that Emanuel Rádl was the most important of Masaryk's students and heirs. Within Rádl's writings the author observes three main themes: nature, the nation and God.

Rádl came to philosophy through the natural sciences, and the author detects three phases in the evolution of Rádl's natural philosophy: a) "face to face with nature" (the period of Rádl's concentration on questions of natural history; b)"turning his back on nature", when Rádl took up a post as professor of philosophy at the natural science faculty of Charles University, apparently turning away from the natural sciences and starting to take part in public life as a political and cultural commentator; this period was marked by an aversion to naturalism and positivism and a critical stance towards German idealism and an appeal against the enslavement of nature by modern technology. Rádl's humanist programme culminated in the third phase: c) "the defence of nature". In that period he wrote "The consolation of philosophy" [Útěcha z filozofie], in which he imagines a dialogue between Aristotle and Galileo. Rádl's ideas of that period are particularly topical nowadays in view of the destruction of the environment and ecological catastrophes: no Czech thinker had

ever advanced such an eloquent defence of humanity and nature as Emanuel Rádl.

During the First Republic, Rádl became involved in many campaigns of the moment, principally, those that concerned the concept of the nation, democracy and the state. He took a determined stand against the romantic, nationalist idea of the nation, "the war between Czechs and Germans". He campaigned for a philosophy and policy of peace between Czechs and Germans, criticising the Czech standpoints and analysing, in this connection, Herder's concept of the nation and warning against its possible narrowing down and misuse. Rádl sought an alternative concept of the nation in a "transnational European civilisation", a "contractual democracy" both in theory and practice. He regarded it to be a clear future task to transcend tribal feelings precisely through the notion of a political nation. From this standpoint he criticised the constitutional practice of the First Republic whereby the "Czechoslovak nation" was regarded as the natural basis of the state and other nations within it were condemned to second-class status.

In this connection, Rádl criticised T.G.Masaryk and his humanistic concept of the nation, which also derived from Herder, and pointed to its ambiguity. Lochman rightly points out that the evolution that "solved" the problem of Czech-German relations in no way proved Rádl's ideas wrong - on the contrary. In fact the recent debate on the theme of the nation - pursued both in Czechoslovakia and in the exile community - only go to show how alive his ideas still are.

Rádl's ideas about natural history and the nation were to culminate - in accordance with Masaryk's legacy - in God. Rádl sought to define the role and nature of theology, to reconcile

himself with positivism, to explain the role and status of philosophy and define their mutual relationship. In the "Consolation of philosophy" he discussed how God's rule on earth was to be achieved - "...God behaves in the same way as Christ..." in a world in which "truth prevails" in the end and which gives rise to the "power of the powerless".

[Printed in Czech in Proměny 17/4, October 1980, pp.87-95]

*

Václav Lesák:

The philosophical significance of Masaryk's concept of religion and of his interpretation of Czechoslovak history

[FILOZOFICKÝ VÝZNAM MASARYKOVA POJETI NÁBOŽENSTVÍ A JEHO VÝKLADU SMYSLU ČESKOSLOVENSKÝCH DĚJIN]

(pp.328-345; approx. 6,200 words)

Masaryk's philosophy of religion is once more at the centre of discussion following the publication of studies by Jan Patočka and Václav Černý which criticise Masaryk's concept of religion from the standpoint of the phenomenologist and the literary critic, based on his alleged failure to appreciate the depth of Dostoyevsky's thinking.

The author of the article first cites Černý's interpretation of Dostoyevsky's religious views which were allegedly based on mysticism and recalls Masaryk's rejection of the latter. The author also mentions Masaryk's attitude to Dostoyevsky as revealed in his conversations with Emil Ludwig and also the views he expressed about Russia as early as in "Suicide" [Sebevražda]. To Masaryk, Dostoyevsky's mystic stance was no more than subjectivism and he posited in contrast, his concept of religious democracy based on an interpretation of Jesus. Democratic religion is the counterpart to critical reasoning - mediation through philosophy and religion. In Masaryk's eyes, our epoch is one of

temporary crisis marked by a loss of moral authority on the part of Christianity in its existing forms. This interpretation of Masaryk's and Dostoyevsky's views concludes with an examination of the relationship of religion to philosophy.

Another interpretation of Dostoyevsky is contained in Patočka's second study of Masaryk "Around Masaryk's philosophy of religion" [Kolem Masarykovy filozofie náboženství]. Patočka maintains that Dostoyevsky's concept of religion was an expression of the "phenomenon of openness towards being", in terms of Heidegger's philosophical analysis. Patočka bases his argument on Dostoyevsky's story "The Dream of a Ludicrous Man" and interprets it in a Heideggeran manner and expresses agreement with Heidegger. Nevertheless he makes a distinction between Dostoyevsky's doctrine of love and Heidegger's concept of being. Lesák goes on to explain this distinction in the following passages.

The author then returns to Masaryk's concept of democracy as an alternative to contemporary spiritual semi-literacy and half-heartedness, and analyses its main characteristics. He also mentions Masaryk's attitude to previous philosophical traditions and the meaning of philosophy ("the reason for philosophy is to emphasise the religious basis of people's search for a way out of the present crisis of the European spirit".)

Masaryk's concept of religion provides the basis for his philosophy of Czechoslovak history of which the article's author provides a resume. He agrees with Masaryk in regarding the Czechoslovak spiritual revival as a continuation of the reformation, in terms of the history of philosophy. He goes on to express the view that Masaryk was an heir to the Hussite spiritual striving and that Masaryk's endeavours ran in the same

spiritual direction as those of Husserl, Heidegger, Fink and Patočka.

Jan Patočka failed to appreciate the significance of Masaryk's efforts. In his essay "An experiment in Czech national philosophy and its failure" [Pokus o českou národní filozofii a jeho nezdar], he criticises Masaryk for not being a philosopher.

In concluding his article, Lesák stresses the importance of Masaryk's concept of religion and of the meaning of Czech history, which, together with the philosophy of Heidegger and Fink and Patočka's interpretation of a responsible philosophical standpoint runs counter to latter day totalitarianism.

*

Karel Hrubý:
The philosophical roots of Masaryk's political concepts
[FILOZOFICKÉ KOŘENY MASARYKOVY POLITICKÉ KONCEPCE]
(pp. 346-376; approx. 11,500 words)

In his introduction, the author reflects on the character of Masaryk's philosophy and asserts that for Masaryk, philosophy was simply the preparation for effective and consistent public activity, and the same was true of sociology. His activity culminated logically in that of a professional politician. Masaryk's interest in politics can be detected as early as his first activities in Prague, and Karel Hrubý briefly sums up and presents Masaryk's main themes, starting with his philosophical and sociological study of broad human issues, and touching on his treatment of national issues, before returning once again to the universal questions, when Masaryk finally formulated a new political programme, e.g. "The New Europe" [Nová Evropa] or "World Revolution" [Světová revoluce], in which he summed up his life's endeavours.

After explaining what Masaryk understood by political acti-

vity, the author suggests that Masaryk's political concepts covered three main areas: the national culture, state policy, and the philosophy of civilisation. Masaryk formulated his Czech national programme in the nineties of the last century - his main concerns being to achieve for the nation a higher standard of education and morality, as well as a better economic performance and cultural development. The programme sought the complete cultural, economic and administrative autonomy of the Czech nation within the Austro-Hungarian state.

The second element - the state programme - dominated later versions of the programme, reflecting the new reality of the First World War and leading to the formulation of a new goal: the achievement of an independent state.

These first two elements were reflected in the third area mentioned: that of civilisation in general, which provided the justification for the practical programmes and hence all of Masaryk's political campaigns.

Masaryk built his political concepts around a number of metaphysical, historical, ethical and social premisses expressed in philosophical terms. In his article, the author comments on the problems of freedom (freedom in Masaryk's sense as a moral category; determinism; Masaryk and Schopenhauer; Masaryk's areas of agreement with Marx; the concept of causality; world organisation; the "Providence" plan), the meaning of history (historical development and responsibility for it; the continuity of values; Masaryk and historicism; humanity as a category and an ideal; the concept of progress; rejection of fatalism; democracy versus theocracy; the significance and meaning of the world war), humanity (various forms of the ideal of humanity; Masaryk's

ambiguous concept of humanity; the basic planks of Masaryk's political programme; confusing aspects of Masaryk's concept of humanity; the concept of the nation; the morality of the nation and mankind), and democracy (as an outcome of historical evolution and a political expression of the ideal of humanity; the individual as a subject of politics; liberalism and its achievements; American democracy).

The article goes on to survey the criticisms of Masaryk's political concepts. It avoids both left-wing and right-wing critics and such expert opponents as Pekař, in order to focus on criticism from among Masaryk's own associates and supporters. He presents in turn the critical comments of Kaizl, Werstadt, Modráček, Šalda, Arne Novák, Jaroslav Stránský, Peroutka, and Nehněvajsa before noting the most recent ones from within Czechoslovakia: those of Vaclav Černý and Jan Patočka.

In conclusion, the author seeks to explain Masaryk's errors as being a result of the latter's acceptance, albeit critical, of Comte's philosophy. Similarly, Masaryk's failure categorically to deduce freedom and humanity (from natural and methaphysical sources) gave rise to the confusion of terms, ambiguousness and frequent contradictions in Masaryk's statements. By the same token, Hrubý points to three major snags in Masaryk's concepts: 1. the fact that he based his concept of democracy on the assumed effectiveness of a humanist morality sanctioned by belief in God; his belief in good as the basis of human nature; his consequent overestimation of the Czech nation's piety. 2. his conclusion that protestant individualism was the main vehicle for democratic ideas; 3. his concept of progress as the inevitable and constant improvement of society, as the continuous advance of good over evil.

Despite the contradictions in his concepts mentioned, Masaryk remains, even in today's conditions "the Czechoslovak statesman whose concepts have yet to be superseded by anyone".

[Printed in Czech in Proměny 17/4, October 1980, pp. 4-14]

*

Zdeněk Pinc:

A thinker for bad times

[MYSLITEL PERIODICKÝ]

(pp.377-400; approx. 9,000 words)

The author's intention is to demonstrate just how patchily today's thirty- and thirty-five-year-olds first encountered Masaryk, and pose the question as to the relevance of his legacy nowadays. He conjures up the period of his secondary school years which provided him with no opportunity to encounter Masaryk. When finally he did get to read "The Path of Democracy" and "Suicide", they failed to arouse his enthusiasm. Not even his time at university in the sixties when many external restrictions had been lifted, made Masaryk any more attractive for him. Among other explanations for this he cites the fact that for him Masaryk was always an "ill-weather thinker", capable of inspiring people at a time of social decline and hopelessness. When things are on the up and up, as they undoubtedly were in sixties Czechoslovakia, such thinkers tend to be misunderstood. In that sense, in the author's opinion, Masaryk had little to say to young people, either in terms of criticism of Marxism (his criticism being essentially directed against dialectical materialism which was already dead by then), his interest in "marginal European philosophy" (and Pinc cites Patočka in his support) or the manner he presented his philosophy (which failed to excite Patočka's students). Even the Czech Question was of marginal interest for

young people in the early sixties, and those that showed any interest in it preferred the views of Pekař.

The author then turns to Masaryk's concepts of humanism and humanity, maintaining them to have been a substitute for religion, and asserting (in agreement with E.Denis and J.L.Fischer) that Masaryk's views were as metaphysically and mythically based as traditional theology, which Pinc considers to be further evidence of an erroneous approach to the essence of religion. Masaryk was to introduce such concepts into the political arena and promote them there, thereby mixing religious and political thinking, practice which tends to have tragic consequences.

In the subsequent section, Pinc goes on to question Masaryk's merits as a statesman. At the moment of his triumph - the founding of the First Republic - Masaryk ceases being a champion of the truth and becomes its embodiment instead, a cult figure who lost contact with mere mortals.

The author then turns his attention to the question of titanism and Masaryk's concept of religion. Rejecting Masaryk's solution he declares it to be evidence of his collapse as a thinker. He asserts, nonetheless that Masaryk's philosophy and the manner he sought to solve problems in terms of it are not the most important elements of Masaryk's legacy. Apart from the significance of Masaryk's life and times, the key to Masaryk's influence, in the author's view, is in the present moment, which brings him back to his main thesis that Masaryk is a "thinker for a particular moment", in whom the Czech nation seeks refuge when times are bad. For this reason it is not surprising to find which authors have turned again to Masaryk in recent years, including Kohák, Machovec, Patočka, Belohradský, Pithart and

Cerny.

Pinc's critical and provocative paper is a remarkable testimony about one generation of "Masaryk's nation" - if we regard it as typical, that is. It can help us to assess to what extent that generation was artificially alienated from Masaryk, but also how much it was already alienated from him and is now coming closer to Masaryk once more.

*

Vladimír Kadlec:

T.G.M. and economics

[T. G. M. A EKONOMIE]

(pp.401-431; approx. 11,000 words)

The author's contribution is most likely the first ever attempt to tackle this theme. It is based on a critical assessment of Masaryk's views on economics selected by the author.

In the first section, the author recalls how Masaryk rejected "the methods and philosophy of Marx and Engels" as a whole as early as his "Social Question" [Otázka sociální] of 1898. There were some opinions of Marx that he did share, however, and valued even (Marxism's importance for the scientific interpretation of history and the evaluation of labour; its rejection of subjectivist scepticism; its belief in progress, etc.). Furthermore, Masaryk was a sharp critic of capitalism, though he differed from Marx over explanations for its crisis. This gave rise to differences in their respective views of what was wrong with capitalism and hence to the solutions they proposed to its ills (Masaryk preferring reforms - and not only in the economic sphere; whereas Marx was a proponent of revolutionary social change). In addition, Masaryk criticised the one-sidedness of Marx's historical materialism. Masaryk's views on economics are ethically based, which was why he criticised the amorality of the Marxian

critique as well as its one-sided concept of class struggle, etc. From the ethical point of view, Masaryk positively assessed Marx's critique of exploitation in "Das Kapital", and he also called for an ethical judgement of revolution. He welcomed Engels' opinions as a turning-point "in the direction of non-violent and non-revolutionary tactics". He likewise rejected Marxian laws of economic development because of their rigid determinism.

The author goes on to analyse Masaryk's economic views one by one, concentrating on the few comments on the economic problems of socialism to be found in "The Social Question". Here also Masaryk stressed that necessary reforms could not be carried out solely through economic measures - "morality and attitudes also require reform".

The following section of the article traces the development of Masaryk's views on the question of socialisation. The author notes the great variety of terms he employed in this connection: "social revolution", "economic revolution", "socialism" and "socialisation", "revolutionary reforms", etc. which often make it difficult to grasp Masaryk's argument as a whole. Masaryk distinguished between "political" and "social" revolution, citing Marx and Engels in support (specifically, their opinions of the 1870s), while advocating a moderate economic revolution carried by parliamentary means. Masaryk sharply differed from Marx among other things in his belief that economic revolution may be pursued only in agreement with the bourgeoisie. He warned against the use of violence, and the overthrow of the bourgeoisie, while at the same time being aware of the dangers of gradual socialisation allowing the capitalists to salt away their capital abroad.

Masaryk was aware of the obstacles to the socialisation of Czechoslovakia - the danger of a possible boycott by foreign capitalists, the need for a high standard of education in order to run the economy expertly, and the specific features of our development. The author illustrates all these aspects with quotations from Masaryk, which he subjects to analysis.

Masaryk also tackled the question of democratic economic self-management, which he considered could be achieved only within the framework of political democracy, and in this connection called for the implementation of a series of healthy and well-tested principles for limiting centralisation and promoting autonomy and personal responsibility in the economic sphere. He therefore rejected state socialism and warned against bureaucracy.

Vladimír Kadlec concludes his study with a summary of the basic areas of agreement and disagreement between Masaryk and Marx, before finally confronting hypothetically Masaryk's views with three major events in Czechoslovak society since the second World War: nationalisation in 1945, the attempt at "socialism with a human face" in 1968 - including its economic aspects, and the years of "normalisation" from 1969-80. The first of these failed to satisfy Masaryk's ethical criteria, in the second case, many of the economic endeavours of the time were in line with Masaryk's views, and the period of normalisation illustrates that many of the economic faults and weaknesses which Masaryk pointed to in his writings and speeches, continue as before. Kadlec's topical and stimulating study opens up a new, and so far untried, area of debate.

*

Milan Machovec:

Masaryk and Marxism

[MASARYK A MARXISMUS]

(pp.432-465; approx. 13,000 words, including an introductory note and an afterword)

The article is prefaced by a personal note by the author about his book "Tomas G. Masaryk" which was published in two editions in 1968, explaining how it was that it contained no chapter on Masaryk's relationship to Marxism.

The question of Masaryk's attitude to Marx (and Marxism) had always been a matter of crucial interest to the author. He admits that in the apparently "more favourable" conditions of today when it is not possible to write a book on this topic which would stand a hope of being published, it has proved much more complicated a task to draw comparisons between Masaryk and Marx than might at first sight appear. The author goes on to approach the question of comparison in the conviction that the two figures and their works are not mutually exclusive, but in fact, in terms of their goals (in Marx's case the elimination of the principle of class struggle and class contradictions, and with Masaryk the struggle for authentic human existence) are complementary.

The author bases his study neither on the writings of Marxists, who "uncompromisingly" attack Masaryk from the point of view of class theories, nor on those of Masaryk's apologists. Nor, in his view, is an understanding of the links between the two thinkers particularly assisted by a study of Masaryk's "Social Question" [Otázka sociální], i.e. his polemic with Marxism, since the essence of a personality cannot be reduced to a polemic with another personality, particularly not in the case of Masaryk who throughout his life took issue with practically everything he encountered, above all when he felt that it addressed or chal-

lenged him in some way. It is to Masaryk's credit that he was probably the first to make a serious and systematic study of Marxism, recognising in it a complete theoretical system, and that he foresightedly assumed that it would successfully challenge the bourgeois ideologies.

A further difficulty the author found was that in "The Social Question", Masaryk dealt with individual Marxian theses and in criticising them moderated their meaning in various ways - which is what official Marxism does nowadays. Furthermore, he interpreted Marxism mostly on the basis of Engels' writings - yet another far-sighted "guess" as to how Marxism would develop in the next hundred years, during which "Engelsism" has come to prevail in the socialist movement. Summing up the first section of his article, Machovec asserts that in his arguments with Marxism, Masaryk asserted democratic values and sought some metaphysical grounding for them. However he overestimated the strength of democracy in the 20th century, while on the other hand, underestimating the movement that Marx gave rise to. At the same time he suspected that Marxism could one day emerge victorious, and his fears were related precisely to the form it might assume in victory: a degeneration into "centralism, monolithism, totalitarianism and self-deification", as Machovec lists them.

The author devotes the second part of his study to a more detailed categorisation of Marx and Masaryk. To understand the former, he declares, it is important to realise his oft repeated love for the myths of antiquity, and particularly that of Prometheus. Like Prometheus, Marx also sought a "new fire", and wanted to "steal heaven's fire and bring it back to earth".

Machovec asserts a likeness between "Prometheanism" and "prophecy" and sees in Marx a latter-day prophet, rabble-rouser and inciter, sharply attacking his opponents. In the nineteenth century such a prophet had to be an empirical scientist, which is what Marx became, before founding a movement whose ideal was the creation of a radically different future. What made Marx great for the mass of his followers, was not, in the author's view, his scientific theory, but the fact that he revived in our civilisation an age-old eschatological archetype that satisfied the need for a robust vision of a future of commitment.

Masaryk's case was different and he finally developed a different style of thinking, stressing something quite other than Marx. Nonetheless, he grew from similar roots, traditions and experiences.

Machovec lists the points they had in common, including: the need to protest, a critical attitude to mainstream philosophical ideas, an aversion for provincialism and nationalism, an ability to consider the human personality in all its aspects, etc. These factors - roughly speaking - led Masaryk not to adopt a hostile stance to the ideal aims of Marxism, though he entertained great fears about its eventual deformation and deprivation. This was appreciated in Czechoslovakia by those who knew Masaryk's life achievement as a whole: Šmeral, Nejedlý and the communist artists. The author then comes to the crux of his thesis and categorises Masaryk as the other basic human type: the "Epimethean", which is not a negation of the Promethean but complementary to it. As such, in Machovec's view he belongs to the same intellectual line as Socrates, Pascal and Kierkegaard, i.e. critical,sober-minded thinkers, always asking disquieting questions, "keeping an eye on" their Promethean brothers.

The actual form that "Epimetheanism" assumed in Masaryk's case, how he himself subjected it to his own unyielding critical gaze and derived from it lessons for his many-sided political activity - all this is what makes the Masaryk phenomenon so fascinating and what gave rise to the greatest political act of Czech modern history: the creation of a modern democratic state.

The examination of the Marx-Masaryk relationship and the author's categorisation and classification of the two figures, does not complete the article, however. He goes on to subject both types to close analysis and traces what the confrontation between Masaryk the "Epimethean" and the Marx the "Promethean" gave rise to. Masaryk put his finger on what was dangerous in Marxism, those elements that derived precisely from its Promethean-prophetic characteristics, all the more heightened in Marx's case in that he was a German philosopher with a messianic self-awareness, a fascination with himself (with the consequences which that entailed for the third and fourth generations), all of which fostered in his followers and heirs a pride in their own power and successes, an imperviousness to criticism, etc. From here it is but a short step to titanism which the author comments on with compact brevity.

The article concludes with the author's comments on the state of contemporary Marxism in Czechoslovakia and elsewhere, and his views on the fate of Marx's achievement in our country. He voices the conviction that if Marxism is to avoid further tragedies it must have an open mind to "Epimethean" criticism a la Masaryk. In this sense, thinks the author, it is possible to accept Marx and Masaryk's criticism of him.

Machovec's major article, which elucidates the roots of the

two personalities in an original fashion, illustrating both what they had in common and their differences, will undoubtedly be welcomed not only by creative Marxists around the world, but by those who find inspiration in Masaryk and his legacy.

*

Erazim Kohák:

Towards living in the truth

[O ŽIVOT V PRAVDĚ]

(pp. 466-491; approx. 10,500 words)

(A reflection on the moral significance of Masaryk's humanism)

In this article, the author reflects on Masaryk's humanism in an untraditional fashion, as he declares in the introductory section entitled "The Moral Accent of Humanism: Humanism and the Science of Man". The author's aim is not a historical analyis of humanism but intead a philosophical interpretation of it as something that has eternal and lasting existence. Masaryk's humanism is not a temporal phenomenon; it is a quintessence of European humanity. To reject Masaryk's moral humanism is to reject the specific importance of European learning.

The author seeks first of all to define the term humanism which has acquired over the past half century the superficial meaning of "an indefinite concensus of kindness and undemanding indulgence towards human weakness and wickedness". Such a concept has been criticised by Heidegger and by our own writer Durych, and at the present time Solzhenitsyn is its main critic. In fact the entire first section of the paper is made up essentially of an analysis of Masaryk's concept of humanism.

In the second part of his text, entitled "Truth about... and truth of...", Kohak distinguishes between "truth with the ablative" - truth about something, where truth is when the intellec-

tual reflection coincides with reality, and "truth with the genitive", i.e the truth of something, when truth is the very meaning of being. It is the latter which was Masaryk's concept of truth: the inner authenticity and purity of human action, reality itself, which reveals itself and is there waiting to be found. In this light, Masaryk's search for truth becomes the most fundamental means of human fulfilment, and the meaning of humanism is the search for the truth of life in knowledge and action.

The third section is entitled: "The search for truth". The dual meaning of enlightenment is explained by Masaryk's choice of "practice" as meaning an "immediate consciousness of the sense of our daily actions". The author sets out what constituted for Masaryk an authentic life, noting that his emphasis on "small-scale endeavours" has a parallel in Husserl's direct perception of the sense of human action. The author considers both figures to be direct heirs of enlightenment rationalism and he concludes this section of his paper with an interpretation of the Enlightenment and its significance in European history.

The fourth section, entitled "Naivety and initiation" is an interpretation of "initiation" and its pretentions to explaining life's events and processes by revealing "real" causes which are hidden to the eye, whereas in fact it merely constructs theories and loses sight of living reality. Today's world is intoxicated with "initiation" of this kind and courage is needed to have the naivety essential to the search for truth.

The fifth chapter: "The metaphor of the fall and the sense of alienation" explains yet another category: alienation, the mediaeval "esse est bonum", the doctrine of a fallen world alienated from the truth of its own being. It also replies to the

question how one is to perceive the truth of being in a world alienated from the truth. It ends by expressing agreement with Patocka's critique of Masaryk's underestimation of "the fall" and how this concept is reflected in Plato, Aristotle and Marx.

The sixth chapter: "The theory and experience of alienation. Mediation". According to Heidegger, the truth of being is concealed by the banality of everyday life. Kohák expresses disagreement with this concept, because life is banal in all places and at all times, whereas the truth of being is not concealed in all places and at all times to the same degree, and the author cites examples from various periods of history. Nor is Kohák satisfied by the theological answer that people fail to see the moral significance of life because they do not want to, because it fails to explain the great fluctuations in humanity's moral sense at different times in history. Equally the Marxist theory of alienation is inadequate. In the author's view, the main reason that life appears alien and meaningless is because it is mediated and artificial; it lies in the assumption that the world is a human creation. This world of manufactures lacks its own code and intrinsic truth. In such a world moral sense is concealed. It is a world deprived of the awareness of "work as a deed of love and love as the meaning of work". The author returns to the term "alienation" which is not a mere result of capitalism but is also present in socialism, and he gives the following definition of it: "Alienation results when the fundamental relationships which create life's structure are rendered indirect: when they are mediated by technological or social intermediaries which make an operation easier while at the same time obscuring its meaning".

The seventh section: "Technology and Consumer Man. Nihilism

and Romanticism", seeks to demonstrate the way Europe reacted to its encounter with technology, among others in the form of nihilism and romanticism, and also comments in general on the phenomenon of technology and its consequences (consumerism etc.), and how they result in the dehumanisation of people and the world.

The eighth section: "The humanist alternative. Disengagement and humanisation", seeks to demonstrate that the way out of the conflict between the reality of human existence and the world of artificiality is the moral humanism of Masaryk and Rádl, which first and foremost is a challenge to the increasing self-determination of the artificial world and a strategy for its humanisation.

Kohák's concluding "Notes on philosophy" sum up the points made throughout the article, whose originality and clarity make it one of the most valuable contributions to the anthology.
[Printed in Czech in Proměny 17/4 October 1980, pp. 73-86]

*

Jan Patočka:

Czech thought in the inter-war years

[ČESKÉ MYŠLENÍ V MEZIVÁLEČNÉM OBDOBÍ]

(pp.492-503; approx. 4,200 words)

This article is taken from the collection:"Jan Patočka: Masaryk" (Prague 1979) and is a transcript of Patočka's lecture "Czech philosophy in the inter-war period" given in 1974. In it, Patočka analyses the main line of Czech thought between the two world wars. He highlights the unique situation in our country after the First World War, when a philosopher founded the state and set society as a whole a universal task. The creation of an independent state of the Czech nation required a reformulation of the Czech Question in global terms. Since Masaryk the founder of

the state is inseparable from Masaryk the thinker, Patočka is led to raise the question of the character of Masaryk's thought which at that time culminated in his "World Revolution". Masaryk saw the world as a world in crisis - an idea he took from Comte, to whose thinking Masaryk was introduced by his Viennese teacher Brentano. Comte represented both a teacher and an opponent for Masaryk. Having examined the Masaryk-Comte link, the author goes on to draw comparisons between Masaryk and Nietzsche, both of whose thinking stresses the importance of deeds, but whereas Masaryk actually performed them, Nietzsche remained at the level of criticism and theoretical projects. (And here Patočka is influenced by Rádl).

The author then goes on to analyse Masaryk's action of founding the Czechoslovak state as an "act of responsibility and courage", which constituted a challenge to everyone else "to assume personal responsibility" in that he presented his achievement in terms of an action creating "scope for the Czech and Slovak people to engage in political life". At last the Czechs had the opportunity they had long demanded to prove that they were capable of free political activity. Through this action, Masaryk was renewing the ideal of a political life, a life of free and responsible behaviour, quite distinct from other areas of life. Thus Masaryk's action was a challenge to the Czech people to live freely, i.e. to behave "sub specie aeterni". It cannot be viewed except in the light of specific Czech history, but its greatness "determined the main tasks and character of recent Czech history".

Czech society never attained Masaryk's level of maturity, (and in asserting this, Patočka comes to the main point of his

lecture) and this is reflected in the fact he was either criticised from entrenched political positions - conservative, left-wing socialist and communist, was uncritically acclaimed or interpreted eclectically by academics, or was isolated in the narrow circle of those who really understood him. Patočka goes on to develop this idea with several all-too-brief character studies of individual representatives of philosophical thinking and proponents of various philosophical schools, which bring to an end this short but masterly piece by Patočka.

*

PART III. DOCUMENTS

T.G.M.'s letters to Zdenka Šemberová

[DOPISY T. G. M. ZDENCE ŠEMBEROVÉ]

(pp. 505-530; approx. 8.000 words)

The documentary section of the anthology opens with a transcript of twenty letters or postcards from T.G.Masaryk to Zdenka Šemberová from 1875. The originals are housed in the A.V.Šembera Museum in Vysoké Mýto. They provide a glimpse of the still unformed character of the twenty-five-year-old Masaryk who apparently found insufficient spiritual resonance in Zdenka Šemberová. Several years his senior, she seems to have regarded Masaryk rather more as a potential marriage partner. Their friendship was not without tension and came to a relatively early end. Some of the letters were cited in Nejedlý's monograph on Masaryk.

The letters testify, among other things, to the young Masaryk's already considerable self-confidence, his outstanding position among his contemporaries, and his loneliness. They also betray the great efforts that Masaryk would still have to make in order to master Czech.

*

Masaryk's letters from the period of the "Hilsner Case"

[MASARYKOVY DOPISY Z DOBY "HILSNERIÁDY"]

(pp.531-540; approx. 2,500 words)

This is a set of twelve apparently still unpublished letters of T.G.Masaryk from 1900, probably addressed to Dr.Auředníček, counsel for Leopold Hilsner in the Polne trial. The letters refer to the appeal proceedings and testify to the fact that Masaryk was au fait with the intimate details of the case, and that his concern was not solely to counteract anti-semitic super-

stition but also to assist in ascertaining the truth of the case in practical "criminological" terms.

*

A letter written by Masaryk on 8.2.1907

[MASARYKŮV DOPIS Z 8. 2. 1907]

(p.541; approx. 400 words)

A letter from the election campaign of 1907 in which Masaryk expresses regret at having been put up against a working-class candidate.

*

T.G.Masaryk: Good Manners in Bohemia

[T.G.Masaryk: O SLUŠNOSTI V ČECHÁCH]

(pp. 542-566; 8,500 words plus introduction)

This unpublished article, written by Masaryk in a gently humorous vein, most likely dates from late August/early September 1925 and is probably based on his personal experience as President. (Apparently, the author himself subsequently decided not to publish the article).

The piece is divided into an Introduction and 32 chapters: 1. the behaviour of various social strata; the nature of good manners and democracy; 2. where good manners may be learnt; 3. overcoming bashfulness in company; 4. poseurs; 5. the importance of knowing oneself; 6. how first appearances can be deceptive; 7. conversation; knowing how to listen; gestures; 8. the "salon"; 9. going visiting country style; 10. greeting; 11. the use of titles; 12. letter writing; 13. public house "manners"; 14. eating and drinking; 15. attire; 16. use of perfume; 17. self-adornment; 18. decor; 19. the home; 20. mistress-servant relations; 21. children in company; 22. personal hygiene;

23. comfort is not a luxury; 24. hospitality; 25. travel; 26. family life; 27. public ceremonies; 28. official ceremonials; 29. on human relations in general; 30. lying; 31. discretion; 32. superficiality in society.

Apart from some matters of external social etiquette which seem rather quaint nowadays, these chapters contain a whole series of shrewd moral comments and critical observations, including several typical "Masarykian" pearls. This above all was why the editors decided to publish the article in toto, as they explain in a short preface.

*

Masaryk's last speech on literature

[POSLEDNÍ MASARYKŮV PROJEV O LITERATUŘE]

(p.567; approx. 400 words)

The document contains Masaryk's last statement concerning literature. It was printed on the first and second pages of "Kolo" [Circle], the newsletter of the Moravian Writers' Circle, No. 7, 1936, and is virtually unknown. In a short speech, Masaryk declares that, as a politician, he has learnt much from writers, admits to being a Moravian regionalist and thanks the writers for accepting him as one.

*

Josef Kyncl:

Masaryk and the revolutionary army

[MASARYK A REVOLUČNÍ ARMÁDA]

(pp. 568-82; approx. 5,000 words)

This document contains a speech made by Col.Josef Kyncl (1893-1979), Legionary and participant in both wars of resistance, which he delivered at Lany on the occasion of a Legiona-

ries' rally on 7th March 1970.

In his introduction, Kyncl recalls Masaryk's decision to take a stand against Austria and stresses the two essential aims of the resistance: the political effort to gain allies and the establishment of the largest possible national army in battle-readiness.

Kyncl devoted much of his speech to the military element in the anti-Austrian resistance, from its beginnings in Italy and Russia, also recounting Masaryk's Russian sojourn when he engaged in political and military organisational activity. Kyncl chiefly highlighted the mutual relations that grew up between Masaryk and our troops and Legionaries. He also stressed Masaryk's efforts to achieve the neutrality of Czech units in the Russian revolution and the events that followed it; Masaryk sought to treat the Bolsheviks loyally and honourably.

Kyncl went on to recall the Siberian anabasis, the Brest-Litovsk Peace and its outcome for the Legions; the subsequent fate of the Legions in Russia, which were in direct contact with Masaryk; Masaryk's influence on the Legions in France and Italy; the visit by Masaryk, now President, to the Czechoslovak units in France. He concluded his speech with an overall assessment of Masaryk's services to the Czechoslovak Army.

*

František Schwarzenberg:
Masaryk and our statehood
[MASARYK A NAŠE STÁTNOST]

(pp. 583-610; approx. 9,500 words plus editorial afterword)

This paper was delivered at the Masaryk Conference in Interlaken (Switzerland) and is an interesting testimony of the attitude towards Masaryk held by one of the last leading figures of

the Czech aristocracy. The author seeks to elucidate the question of the legal and political continuity of the Czech state and substantiate the thesis of the legitimacy of the creation of the Czechoslovak Republic. In order to do so, the author considered it necessary to explain at length the concepts of state, statehood, revolution and coup d'Etat, and demonstrate their applicability to our history while ascertaining what meaning Masaryk assigned to them, particularly in "World Revolution" [Světová revoluce] and "Conversations with T.G.Masaryk" [Hovory s T.G.Masarykem].

The author considers that the thesis of the legitimacy of the Republic's creation is justified above all by the Austro-Hungarian government's acceptance of the American position as expressed in Wilson's new conditions that the fate of the Czechs and Slovaks would be decided on by those nations themselves. As the author states, "in so doing, the Emperor Karl released the Czechs and Slovaks from the ties of the monarchy and recognised their right to decide their own destiny". Thereby, the sovereignty of the last King of Bohemia legally passed to the sovereign people.

The contribution concludes with an editorial note on the role of the aristocracy in our history and the need to review the one-sided and wholesale rejection of that entire social stratum.

[Printed in Czech in Proměny 17/4, October 1980, pp.36-45. The editorial note by the Prague editors was printed in Proměny 19/3 July 1982, pp.36-39]

*

J.L.Hromádka:
Draft of a lecture about T.G.M. to be delivered on 7.3.1948

[OSNOVA PŘEDNÁŠKY O T. G. M. K 7.III.1948]

(pp.611-616; approx. 2,000 words)

This document consists of the text or draft of a lecture by J.L.Hromádka, which was never delivered in the end. The lecture is in four parts: 1. "T.G.M. - teacher at difficult moments". 2. T.G.M. and national unity based on truth". 3. T.G.M. and the meaning of democracy". 4. "T.G.M. and living in purity".

In the first part, the author asserts Masaryk's continuing relevance to everyday life, and commends him as a source of advice at times of difficulty in our lives. Hromádka stresses the importance of reading Masaryk's books and speeches in search of answers to the problems facing us. Not being a mere school philosopher, Masaryk understood life in the fullest sense. He himself was a student of Havlíček, Palacký, Kant and Plato and a regular reader of the Prophets, Psalms and Gospels.

What is especially helpful about Masaryk's writings, J.L.Hromádka maintains in the second part, is their moral earnestness and spiritual truthfulness, together with their concentration on the practical need for individual political parties and schools of thought in the nation to find a morally based concensus of ideas.

The third part is a statement of the concept of democracy as Masaryk understood it. Finally, the closing part is a sort of warning for the times (1948) in the form of an appeal for purity in relations between people and nations, in the spirit of Masaryk's legacy.

Hromádka returned to the theme of Masaryk many times in the course of his life, always adopting a "positive" and "critical"

approach to him. This document is a mere drop in the ocean of Hromadka's thinking about Masaryk. But it was obviously included in the anthology, not only because it was so far unpublished, but also because the period it was written lends it tragic significance.

*

Ivan Dérer:
Against the falsification of T.G.Masaryk's historical role

[PROTI FALŠOVANIU HISTORICKEJ ÚLOHY T. G. MASARYKA]

(pp.617-641; approx. 9,000 words plus preface)

This document is made up of excerpts from the still unpublished book by Ivan Dérer "Anti-Fierlinger" written in the period 1952-1961. It is prefaced by a brief biographical note about the author.

Dérer's study was a direct polemic with Fierlinger's book "The treason of the Czechoslovak bourgeoisie and its allies" [Zrada československé buržoazie a jejích spojenců] of 1951. The author points out that that book had been the source of all the anti-Masaryk and anti-Beneš propaganda of the fifties which is why he felt duty bound to answer what he describes as Fierlinger's "pamphlet".

Fierlinger, a member of the Social Democratic Party, had worked in the diplomatic service during the First Republic and had had no influence on his party's domestic policies. At that period he was regarded as a supporter of Masaryk's and Beneš' philosophy and policies, and still declared as much in 1947 in his book: "In the service of the Czechoslovak Republic" [Ve službách ČSR]. After liberation, he led the Social Democratic Party - as its leader - into a "political and moral slough" of corruption, including shady dealings in property confiscated from

the Germans, etc. The Social Democrats jettisoned Masaryk's moral principles and Derer considers that the main representative of the "new morality" in the party was Fierlinger himself.

In one passage after another, Dérer rebuffs Fierlinger's allegations about "the liberation legend", the imperialist character of World War I, the Russian Revolution of 1917, Masaryk's bias towards western democracy, etc.

The excerpts chosen by Dérer serve not only to illustrate the sort of documents published in the fifties and the typical language they employed. Their primitive onesidedness makes them sound almost up-to-date thirty years later, now that criticism of the "liberation legend" has been revived and Masaryk's crucial historical role in the founding of an independent Czechoslovakia is once more denied, 28th October is no longer a national holiday...

*

Branislav Štefánek:

The Humanitarian Ideal as Ideology

[HUMANITÄTSIDEAL ALS IDEOLOGIE]

(pp.642-679; approx. 12,000 words)

The author traces the long-running controversy about the ideological content of Masaryk's ideas. He seeks to explain why Masaryk's opinions encountered agreement among broad sections of Czech and Slovak society after the World War. Masaryk was known as a moralist who had the courage to voice unpopular public criticism before the war and wage solitary political campaigns, who after the war became the charismatic leader of the broad mass of the people, even though his writing was addressed at only a narrow section of the intelligentsia.

The main thrust of the article is an elucidation of the content of Masaryk's philosophy of history and society, and of

his national, social and political programme. The author concentrates on explaining the concept of humanity, and of humanity as an ideal. The article also gives a picture of Masaryk's thought, philosophy, sociology and psychology, in which the author stresses Masaryk's critique of subjectivism, his attitude to positivism and Marxism (points of agreement and disagreement), and Masaryk's synergism. He treats Masaryk's piety to a lengthy analysis, dealing also with his attitude to religion and faith. The author also takes issue with Machovec's interpretation of Masaryk as a pre-existentialist thinker.

B.Štefánek also points to those features of Masaryk's ideology which most often inspired others in the past. At the same time the author seeks to determine when and why Masaryk acted from non-ideological or even anti-ideological positions.

This article is the text of a lecture delivered at the Masaryk Conference in the Swiss town of Interlaken in the spring of 1980.

[Printed in German in Bohemia 22, 1981, pp.79-104]

*

Jiří Němec:

2 x 2 studies about Masaryk

[2 x 2 STUDIE O MASARYKOVI]

(pp. 680-685; approx. 2,000 words)

This is a brief review of the two most recent works on Masaryk: Jan Patočka's Dvě studie o Masarykovi ["Two studies on Masaryk: An experiment in Czech national philosophy and its failure; Thoughts about Masaryk's philosophy of religion"], Petlice Editions, Prague 1977, and Václav Černý's Dvě studie masarykovske ["Two Masarykian studies: The essence of Masaryk's personality and what T.G.M. still means for us; some notes on the

modernity of Masaryk's religious feeling"; plus an afterword: "On the anniversary of Masaryk's death"], Expedice Editions, Prague 1977. Němec's review is taken from an occasional collection, sometimes entitled "Spektrum".

The author recalls Patočka's efforts as early as the thirties to find an answer to the question as to the basis of Masaryk's views. Patočka's final work is precisely the answer. Němec stresses that Patočka regarded Masaryk as a pre-critical thinker, who still lacked the ability to frame "Kantian" questions. He also noted Masaryk's relation to Dostoyevsky and Nietzsche.

Černy likewise - in Němec's view - stands by his earlier opinions and in his book he defends romantic titanism against Masaryk. But whenever he criticises Masaryk, he also agrees with him. He declares for him even when putting forward his own view of God and theology.

The reviewer underlines several matters which both authors only touched on, above all Masaryk's failure to confront the problem of mastering technology and the question of the totalitarian state. This failure derived from Masaryk's concept of science and his objectivism. Němec makes a valuable point, which Patočka had missed, to the effect that Masaryk's ignoring of both problems was related to his narrow concept of religious activism.

In conclusion, Jiří Němec joins with Černý in rejecting Machovec's categorisation of Masaryk as a pre-existentialist thinker and like him, argues against that view.

*

The fate of the T.G.Masaryk Institute

[OSUDY ÚSTAVU T. G. MASARYKA]

(pp.686-695; approx. 3,500 words)

This document is a brief account of the history of the Institute which was founded in 1932. The introduction quotes from the charter of foundation setting out the Institute's tasks in five points and recording its material basis (libraries, the archive, the museum collections, other movable and immovable property).

By the time of the German occupation, only a small proportion of the planned publication of Masaryk's works - one of the Institute's main tasks - had been achieved. During the occupation, its activity was banned, but the collection of books was saved from being destroyed or broken up.

The document goes on to trace the activity of the renewed Institute after the war until it was banned in 1954. - In 1968, the curatorship of the Institute, headed by Professor Jan Patočka tried to renew its activity. The document includes the text of Patocka's proposals for re-opening the Institute, which set out the planned scope of its research. That text was also an original attempt at an assessment of T.G.Masaryk's personality and achievement.

The proposal received the support of the Central Committee of the Communist Party, and in a letter to the Speaker of the National Assembly, the Ideological Department of the Central Committee expressed is support for the principle of re-opening the T.G.Masaryk Institute. The document cites the statement of the Ideological Department on the role of T.G.Masaryk at the moment when it came out in favour of his rehabilitation in terms both of his person and his achievement.

However, final approval for the re-opening of the T.G.Masaryk Institute as a section of the Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences, planned for 25th June 1969, was never given.

*

PART IV. BIBLIOGRAPHY

A Masarykian Bibliography

[MASARYKOVSKÁ BIBLIOGRAPHIE]

The bibliography concludes the anthology. It is prefaced by several pages of text explaining the fairly complex task of creating a bibliography of work of and about Masaryk. It indicates existing pre-war bibliographies, or refers to works where they may be found. It is essentially a continuation of the bibliography prepared by František Pokorný and Boris Jakovenko and covers the years 1935-1980, with the caveat that it is incomplete. It is divided into 6 sections.

I. Masaryk's writings published in Czechoslovakia after 1935.

II. Masaryk's writings published abroad after 1938.

III. Literature about T.G.M. in Czechoslovakia (comprising publication in book form in the period 1935-80, magazine articles 1945-78 and newspaper articles 1967-78).

IV. Literature about T.G.M. published by Czech and Slovak authors abroad in the period 1948-78.

V. Literature by Czech and Slovak authors containing references to T.G.M., from the period 1945-79.

VI. Foreign authors writings about T.G.M. and the First Republic, published in the period 1935-1975.

The bibliography includes 1045 titles from book, magazine and newspaper publications.

*

The anthology concludes with an editorial note.

(Jaroslav Klatovský)

Petr Pithart:

T.G.Masaryk's first years in Prague

(news of a book by J. Opat - and some questions it inspired)

[PRVNÍ LÉTA T. G. MASARYKA V PRAZE]

Normally speaking, once an author has delivered a manuscript for printing so that it may become generally accessible, his or her work is fair game for the critics as soon as the first printed copies have been sent off.

However, in the circumstances in which various authors in Czechoslovakia publish their texts (i.e. circulated among friends and colleagues in eight to ten copies), we are duty bound, in my view, to react to them in a manner which is not altogether normal.

In these conditions, I believe the first thing to be done is to provide factual reports about new works, in order to stimulate wider interest. It is the latter which may provide the impetus for a "re-publication", i.e. a further (second, third or fifth) set of ten typewritten copies, or (as is more likely abroad) some more photocopies. In the absence of such a minimum distribution of the work - something that, in general, the author is in no position to influence - it can happen that a critical appraisal (in the form of a review several pages long) is soon available to hundreds of readers (e.g. as part of irregularly appearing collections of critical articles) who have no access to the work itself (which could be hundreds of pages long). I believe this only serves to render an already abnormal situation still more abnormal, and at the very least it is unfair to authors and their books alike.

*

So much, then, by way of introduction to news of a work by Jaroslav Opat: "T.G.Masaryk in Bohemia in the eighteen eighties (1882-1893). Contribution to a biography." [T. G. Masaryk v Čechách v létech osmdesátých /1882 - 1893/. Příspěvek k životopisu.] (424pp. A4 typescript). The author "delivered" his work (in other words - in our circumstances - "published" it) in 1985. What I have said in my opening paragraphs in no way implies that in normal circumstances I might be in some sort of hurry to launch an attack on Opat's latest work. However, I intend to leave any individual critical comments and objections I might have until a later occasion.

Opat's work is a painstaking account of Masaryk's first nine years' activity in Prague, i.e. up to the period when he became active in politics as a member of parliament, and, whatever else, it is a valuable contribution to our knowledge. It is only a "contribution" to a biography - as the author modestly describes it - in the sense that it does not cover a longer period of Masaryk's life. The fact is, that it displays an attention to detail that would be hard to match.

I ought to clarify this last remark, though, by pointing out that while extremely thorough, the author does not dwell on those details of his subject's personal life normally relished by readers. By and large, he refers to them only insofar as they throw light on Masaryk's public activity or to assist our understanding of him. Opat focusses attention on Masaryk's involvement in public affairs, recording his actions and words and covering his various fields of activity as an academic and publicist-cum-journalist.

As regards Masaryk's words, in particular, the author considers it necessary to devote scores of pages (possibly over a

quarter of the book) to a recapitulation of what he actually wrote or publicly declared. He uses a combination of paraphrase and direct quotation wherever he feels these express the essence of Masaryk's thinking. He does so conscientiously and objectively, however, neither jumping to conclusions nor formulating premature judgements or interpretations. Nor does he skimp when it comes to conveying the entire context of a particular idea. This means that readers are left to gain their own impressions and form their own opinions. There are points in the book where such recapitulations strike one as being over-detailed (e.g. where he refers to "The Fundamentals of Concrete Logic" [Základové konkrétní logiky] - a book whose importance I feel he slightly overestimates - but all in all, the author's approach is admirable. The point is that were the author to refer to works which, in today's Czechoslovakia, are often well nigh inaccessible (more precisely, Masaryk's works are officially accessible - i.e. in libraries - only to researchers with state permission) it would be tantamount to forcing his own opinions on readers, without their having any chance to crosscheck (unless they happen to own whole collections of Cas, Athenaeum or Zeit). Such a degree of respect for the independently-minded reader should not be taken for granted and is something for which we should be particularly grateful.

In reading this book, it is surprising to note yet again just how little has been published of Masaryk's work (I mean in entirety, not selectively). Frequently, we are not even aware of what it all comprises. There are, for instance, a whole series of articles and reviews signed with an initial or a pseudonym which Masaryk might well have written.

Opat makes the point that this abnormal sitution is due not only to the unfavourable conditions of the last few decades (or the "over-favourable" conditions of the First Republic) but also to Masaryk himself - or more precisely it is the result of Masaryk's own attitude to what he once wrote or said. By all accounts, this could be extremely critical. For instance, when President, Masaryk seems to have been none too keen to have his collected articles published in the definitive editions of his works. (On the other hand, I am aware of the converse case where Karel Čapek managed to dissuade Masaryk from publishing his articles of literary criticism). And apparently it was not solely out of modesty or from a reluctance as Head of State to abuse his standing. In fact, it seems he had a low opinion of many of his own texts. Opat provides documentary evidence to show that Masaryk indeed formulated his opinions hurriedly, sketchily, and, on occasions, superficially even. It was not unknown for him to criticise something with which he was not totally au fait. As an author he did not always display sufficient patience, and in no way could he be described as the model of a true scholar, weighing each word with care. - Even so, it is surprising that full bibliographical data of Masaryk's articles are still not available, and I refer to all of them, not just those he wrote in Czech.

For this reason, Opat is obliged, in more than one instance, to deduce Masaryk's authorship indirectly - from the style, from factual or chronological indicators, or from references in correspondence. However he neither pretends to the assurance of someone preparing a definitive edition nor makes any claims to exhaustive knowledge about Masaryk as an author. - It is therefore a reminder of the debt we owe our own history.

In these circumstances, what would otherwise be unusually extensive paraphrasing or citing of Masaryk's texts is fully justified - all the more so, in that Opat also acquaints the reader with all the most important reactions to Masaryk's public utterances, and does so with the same thoroughness he displays when treating Masaryk's texts. I regard this to be his most valuable contribution.

In several places, he cites the appraisals of other authors even decades after the first appearance of a Masaryk text (e.g. Nejedlý, Vorovka, Fajfr, Černý, Patočka and many others). On those occasions where Opat manages to situate Masaryk's ideas within a particular historical or extra-historical framework, he provides the reader with a rare opportunity to appreciate - in close up and with detachment - the significance and purpose of Masaryk's work in Bohemia.

The author also makes use of comments on Masaryk's articles contained in already widely quoted (though still far from exhausted!) correspondence by a whole number of people, whether close to Masaryk or not. They are uniquely authentic testimonies of contemporaries, of particular interest being the comments of those who observed Masaryk from afar - from abroad. Opat similarly draws on diary accounts (such as those of Marie Červinková-Riegrova). It is clear from this that Opat's detailed account of Masaryk's involvement in public affairs, and of reactions to it, is no sterile description by any means. On the contrary, the picture he gives us is multifaceted, lively and argumentative.

Nonetheless, it is to be expected that the author will be criticised for being "over-defensive" in his attitude towards T.G.M. This is indeed a factor to be noted, but it would be

unjust to criticise him for it. In my opinion, this by no means devalues his work, though I can well imagine that there are those whom it might annoy. The point is though, that Opat not only acquaints his readers with the actions and opinions of his hero, but also with the opinions of many of Masaryk's critics, and allows one to draw one's own conclusions. In this way he does not make things difficult for his readers - even those most critical of Masaryk - but, on the contrary, provides them with source material of unprecedented breadth.

Until recently, I had the feeling that all we were doing was interpreting interpretations - "cooking" with "stock" ingredients, so to speak. Opat's work - together with the equally worthy books by Kovtun and Pecháček - are the first in a long while to bring us a creditable sum of unknown, little known or forgotten facts.

*

In the book's introduction, the author tackles, in his customarily thorough way, the problems involved with Masarykian bibliography and with all the biographies of T.G.M. so far published (apart from those of an overtly propagandist character). He reserves his sharpest criticism for the fragmentary biography by Zdeněk Nejedlý, and supplies a number of cogent reasons for his criticism.

In the first chapter (I. In place of an introduction: 1. In Southern Moravia; 2. To Prague), the author describes the basic influences on Masaryk's childhood and adolescence in Moravia and Vienna, his years of study, and his work as a university teacher; he also notes the significance of Masaryk's travel abroad. In the second chapter (II. The first years: 1. Philosopher of concrete logic; 2. Reviews and criticism; 3. Practical philosophy;

4. Science in the service of life; 5.Pedagogue), he provides the reader with a detailed account of Masaryk's entire output in the field of ideas at that time, including shorter reviews and university lectures (from hectographed copies), particularly in connection with the founding of the Athenaeum magazine. Especially revelatory are the assessments of the author's performance as a university lecturer (a job in which Masaryk did not always feel entirely at home!). Chapter three acquaints us with the final phase of the controversy over the "Manuscripts". I think that even readers with a fair knowledge of the subject will discover many elements of which they were unaware: (III. The controversy over the "Manuscripts": What the "Czech forgery" entailed; 2. Prologue; 3. Estrangement and reconciliation with Professor Kvíčala; 4. Schauer's "Our two issues"; 5. Controversy with J.Gregr; 6. Reactions to the Manuscripts controversy, its outcome and significance). In the following chapter, the author focusses attention on Masaryk's unusually (for us) extensive but not superficial interest in the Slav world, expressed in his frequent trips: (IV. Voyages of discovery: 1. To Russia; 2. To Slovakia). In the fifth chapter (V. Into politics: 1. Brains trust; 2. His first political endeavours and their influence; 3. Kvíčala, Cas and the University again; 4. With Cas between the "Young Czechs" and "Old Czechs"; 5. The horizons of the "Czech Question"; 6. The question of labour [most revelatory!]; 7. Fresh talks with the "Old Czechs"; 8. Talks on Czech-German peace and their breakdown; 9. In with the "Young Czechs"; 10. Into the Imperial Council and the Czech Diet), the author deals in specific terms with an episode in Masaryk's search for the right political method and means, including also his uncertain quest for a political platform (an episode about which very little was

known before).

In the final chapter, which is actually an after-thought (Reflections), Opat sets out his conclusions and overall assessment. I would say that towards the end of the theses, his "defensiveness" takes a back seat and the author subjects Masaryk's political quest (which was sometimes uncertain as has been observed) to quite sober scrutiny. The gaze he turns on the Realists also betrays no illusions either. Even earlier in the book, he quotes several of Masaryk's critics who drew attention to a fairly prevalent undemocratic archetype of the Czech Realist, for whom criticism (or hypercriticism) was an end in itself and whose smug condescension alone sufficed to put off masses of people.

In this connection, Opat makes the point that Masaryk's chief fault was to entertain illusions about the likelihood of achieving radical reforms both of the party set-up and of the social system under the monarchy. He also underestimated just how long it would take Czech academic, cultural and political life to catch up with the standards of Europe's most mature nations - even with the decisive assistance of the Realists! He speaks of Masaryk's occasional tendency towards misplaced political ambition, exaggerated self-importance, political impetuosity and a lack of clarity about his goals. He also points out that in his quest for a suitable political platform, the reasons why Masaryk finally opted for the Young Czechs were not principled (being based, in Opat's view on momentary calculations).

Thus the author's enthusiasm for his hero does not prevent him from perceiving Masaryk's individual faults, inadequacies and blunders. What chiefly impresses him is Masaryk's character, his genuineness, fearlessness and remarkable human energy - and those

are qualities which even Masaryk's detractors do not deny.

Opat cites Fajfr's particularly apt assessment of Masaryk's philosophy: "Masaryk's philosophy is not so much a doctrine as a historical event. They are undeniably ideas, but they develop dramatically, and find their expression in action aimed at influencing the social environment of the time..." And Opat's work above all documents and illustrates precisely this aspect - this "concept" - of Masaryk. For this reason, it will also serve as a useful source of inspiration to those who are not themselves Masarykian scholars or expert on the realities of the eighteen eighties.

Oppressed by the deathly inertia which pervades Czechoslovakia, people here can better appreciate that the world is not changed by "words" i.e. ideas, concepts, programmes, etc. - nor yet by more truthful information, for that matter. One can have all these in abundance and things can still remain fixed and unchanging. Conceivably, the only time the world changes, either slowly or more rapidly, is when people let themselves be inspired - to act, even - by the example of people who p r e s e n t "words", and live up to them themselves. This implies people who assume full public responsibility for their actions.

Such cases require all the trappings of drama, however, with an exposition (including some element of surprise) conflict, risk, sacrifice (or at least a reliably demonstrated readiness for it), probably one or more setbacks, and - naturally - a catharsis. This is inconceivable, though, without an audience, without a public forum: it is no drama if it remains a private matter - one confined to a microcosm of like-minded initiates. It must have a public dimension. Surprisingly enough, the one thing that such a story can easily lack is a victory. Victory is

not the most important thing. It can even be misleading, in fact, on those occasions when "victory" consists in getting one's message across to the public and arousing them. And all that is required for the satisfaction that has a carthartic effect even on mere onlookers is a serene loyalty: loyalty to oneself, to decent practices and to decent people. Goals and ideals are seldom in short supply...

I apologise for going off at a tangent like that, but I wanted to stress the point that, in the manner that Opat describes it, Masaryk's story once more comes across as challenging and topical. And I would add also that Masaryk's bold "dramatic development" of ideas "expressed in action" is seemingly also the secret of his charisma - in other words, there is no other secret involved.

A final comment related directly to Opat's book concerns Masaryk's inner resources which fuelled his dramatic life-story. By all the evidence, Opat is well aware that Masaryk's religion was a sine qua non. However he is neither the first nor the last to treat this characteristic - which is so obvious in Masaryk's case and yet so difficult to pin down - with descriptive respect. In other words, he evades it, to all intents and purposes. He does, of course, present all the well-known facts and Masaryk's statement's on the question, but the problem is that they were often unclear and confusing. In fact, this is an honest procedure on the author's part: in doing so he acknowledges that it is a topic he feels unqualified to deal with. And who is, anyway?

But unless we take Masaryk for the uniquely religious person he was (who, though he sought it, failed to find a place in any of the churches, and believed "rationally"), his story - in its

fundamental aspects - will still fail to make much sense to us. And I have in mind not just Masaryk's exceptional strength of personality but also his mistakes and wavering. And our own mistakes and wavering too, for that matter.

*

At this point, I would like to frame a few questions for which Jaroslav Opat bears no responsibility. However, they either struck me for the first time or were brought vividly back to mind, in the course of reading his book. And I would like to stress at the outset that they are in no way rhetorical questions i.e. feigned questions to which I actually know the answers.

It is clear that Masaryk was not first and foremost a thinker. In fact he was no philosopher in the commonly accepted academic or professorial sense: in the same way that he was no sociologist, theologist or historian, either. But was he a thinker at all? In other words: can his ideas be "taken at their word"? Was he sufficiently consistent, precise or unambiguous for this to be possible? Maybe his personal "yea" could be taken at face value, but did the same apply to his writings or public utterances?

He was clearly more of a critic, inspirer or "mentor". (Maybe he was more of a mentor for the nation than for his students, in fact.) Possibly he had something of the "preacher" or reformer. He was certainly a "disquieter"... At decisive moments, he could be a forceful and effective statesman. But throughout his life he was drawn most of all to newspaper and magazine journalism - far more than is generally supposed. And his most energetic efforts he devoted to combatting Czech "journalism" and its propensity for cliche-mongering, demagogy, rabble-rousing, sloganeering, simplification, academic radicalism

and reckless romanticism.

What was the truth about his writing, then? Was his output as a publicist and journalist really quite so ephemeral as one might think from his frequent unwillingness to return to it, and in view of the fact he did not think particularly highly of many of his own texts - or even regretted having written them the way he did? Moreover, there are, in fact, very few here who have taken any interest in these particular writings, otherwise they would have to have been published in some way or at least classified bibliographically. After all, how many times has every word of Havlicek - another journalist - been published here?! So was Masaryk's journalism of transitory importance - or did it have some timeless significance?

*

In reading Opat's book, it once more crossed my mind whether Masaryk was in fact such a "seeker" as he is generally made out to be. At the period we encounter them in Opat's book, Masaryk's main themes - his basic "questions" - were already fully formed, and he was to return to them throughout the rest of his life. Each of them is connected above all with his endeavours to define and overcome the crisis of "modernism" which was overwhelming human consciousness and social relations as a whole - particularly as demonstrated by decadent liberalism.

But didn't Masaryk already by then have an answer to what he later called the "Czech Question"? - in other words, before he even started searching for it? When, in 1893, he was retiring from active political life (as a member of parliament) in order, in his own words, to devote himself to more thorough study of the "Czech Question" in preparation for subsequent, more responsible political activity ("I wanted to do it properly"), was he someone

really setting out to look for something? He declared at the time that he wanted to engage in a new kind of politics - of a revivalist variety, that his wish was to influence the Czech people's way of thinking. But was his quest truly free from preconceptions? Was he really taking the risk that he might have to re-evaluate his previous opinions? Or was he setting out to verify what he had already discovered, to seek fresh arguments to use in his quarrel with the Czech milieu.

It is my view that the reply to the "Czech Question" that Masaryk hinted at not long after he arrived in Prague, was one that he did not subsequently revise, i.e. not even after all those years of concentrated work which culminated in the publication of "The Czech Question", "Our present crisis" and his books on Havlíček. Of course he framed it better and possibly more precisely, and developed his arguments more thoroughly. But it looks as if he arrived in Prague as someone with his concepts and attitudes already formed. I would suggest that to the end of his days his quest was above all for "how" ("at that time I was still politically immature and totally inexperienced") and that he already knew "what". By and large, his quests concerned "the manner" rather than "the content". All the evidence suggests that his view of Hus and the Hussites and his attitude to our national revival were already formed even before 1893 when he started to engage in more thorough research of Czech history. His mind was similarly made up about the baroque period ("the counter-reformation") in which he took next to no interest.

There is no doubt that he went on developing as a human being, maturing into a person of wisdom and discretion. However, he evolved as a "man of action" : a politician, reformer and

mentor. Did he also develop as a thinker, though, one who sought the truth of how things really had been in the past and how they might turn out in the future? Is it not a fact that he always knew in advance how things ought to be, above all? - I would recall here how much Pekař - his intellectual rival - altered, in comparison with him. It is astonishing just how much that genuine professor, with his own university chair, revised his opinions in the light of new information - and I refer by no means to his youthful ideas!

*

There is another question which one may say emerges fairly explicitly from Opat's book, relating to the nature of "Realism" or the "Realist Movement". I would even venture to suggest that the way he presents it even invites one to voice fundamental doubts about whether Realism was anything more than just a persuasive atmosphere or mood that surrounded first Masaryk and later a few of his friends and fellow-campaigners too. It was an unusually compelling and invigorating atmosphere, but no more than an atmosphere for all that. That did not stop certain influential people talking with very straight faces about "Realism" and of its "method", above all! It was an atmosphere of justified dissatisfaction and determination to do something. However it tended to be rather vague because it was always more evident what needed to be got rid of, than what should be put in its place, and - more importantly - how. And this is not to deny the genuine will that existed to formulate realistic goals in a positive fashion. But can one, in fairness, describe it as a particular set of ideas, or as a political movement, or a specific political programme?

As I have already noted, Opat highlights several fairly widespread deviations of Realism: certain sterile and unpleasant off-shoots. He does not hesitate to voice his own doubts about just how consistently the Realists opposed their proclaimed anti-thesis: romanticism. In fact, says Opat, the Realist camp itself succumbed to romantic notions about all the things the Realists were going to do in the Czech lands ("realistic divination").

And then again, if "Realism" really existed, it would have had to give rise to some Realists, and they would have had to remain together as a group for some period of time at least. Can one really prove the existence of Realism by pointing to two of Masaryk's temporary fellow-travellers (Kramář and Kaizl) and a handful of basically immature admirers whose desire was, as Herben put it frankly, "carping about everything all the time"? And were there really so many serious-minded apostates (e.g. Goll and Pekar from the historians alone)? So was Realism a genuine movement at all, or just one more element in the Masarykian legend?

*

Masaryk's search for a political platform (whether with the Old Czechs or the Young Czechs) is described and documented by Opat in a factual manner and not only without any adornment but actually with the inclusion of certain less impressive details. It is a sober look "behind the scenes". Masaryk's systematic disparagement of politics, particularly the "high-powered" variety, involving political parties, states, political systems, or even, for that matter, such goals as national sovereignty, have been often stressed - particularly nowadays, perhaps. For my part, I am rather dubious. In all events, it is certainly not the entire truth. (But this will mean sacrificing the impressive

paradox, which is a particularly consoling thought nowadays - and which I have been known to employ myself - that it was his systematic disparagement of politics that made Masaryk, in the end, the only one who was capable of engaging in high-powered state politics when the time came.)

Opat provides detailed evidence to prove that Masaryk was far from being the naive political abstinent or even a mere idealist improvising his political conduct in the off-handed manner of the deliberately impractical intellectual. It is true that Masaryk was not always quite clear in his mind how to achieve his aims, but even in those days, he did not underestimate "low-power" politics (specific coalitions, alliances, personal constellations and connections) and devoted much of his energy to it. (More than persuasive testimony of the fact that this did not solely involve "low-power" politics is also provided by Pecháček's recently published document "Masaryk, Beneš and the Castle. Masaryk's letters to Beneš".) Although his friends nicknamed him "the prophet" or "the shepherd", and although he was often impulsive and impatient, he was also a man of circumspect and (often ineffectively) calculating political action, frequently prepared in a laborious fashion behind the scenes. I am not at all of the opinion that this reduces his stature in any way: the pedestal reaching to high heaven was erected by his uncritical admirers. On the contrary, I believe that it allows us to appreciate better why and how it was he was able to undertake the statesman's role. The fact is that he was always involved in politics, even small-scale, personal politics - the sort that is generally most disdained. But it is also true that he never allowed himself to be entirely absorbed by it, and maybe that is how he differed from the regular run-of-the-mill politi-

cian.

But there can be no doubt that, at the beginning of the war, his practical political experience helped him much more than the fact that our own history happened to find itself in a happy conjunction with global historical trends - even though it was a theory he vehemently asserted. Unhappily, he wrongly identified these trends with the victorious advance of democracy, for which the First World War was to be the final triumph - the last "World Revolution". His experience helped him more, for that matter, than the fact we were "the nation of Comenius" (as he declared in the "Independent Bohemia" memorandum of 1915) or of Hus, or that "Providence" - in Masaryk's unique sense - worked in our favour. I'm afraid that it was not just a question of error, bad guesswork or over-enthusiastic rhetoric. There seems to have been a need (though was there really?) to sanctify in some way or other the outcome of the war which had been unusually favourable in our case, though largely fortuitous in terms of our own endeavours: i.e. to dress up an accident of history as something pre-ordained, merited and obligating (though it proved impossible to convince all citizens of the new state about the last of these). Thus, among other things, it gave birth to the myth of "Masaryk the Liberator", who stood somehow "above politics" and never dirtied his hands with such matters. (And that wasn't the worst by any means!) It also gave birth to the official optimism of the First Republic and the idea that we would actually have those apocryphal "50 years" we apparently needed to put everything to rights.

*

Reading Opat's book, one is struck yet again by the broad range of Masaryk's activity, and just how many areas of society's life he influenced either directly or indirectly. Maybe other readers will share my impression that the explanation for this is that in fact Masaryk wasn't a real Czech at all; after all he came to Prague as a "foreigner". He was not the product of Prague society; he had grown up in the wide world (which was not particularly accessible to Czechs of those times) and he even married - just think! - an American. And the impression one gains from the book is that he quite likely remained a "foreigner" to the end of his days.

Otherwise, would he really have been capable of perceiving the wretchedness of our nation's situation in the eighteen eighties for what it was - without the rose-tinted spectacles that everyone else seems to have been wearing? (Schauer was also just such a "foreigner", though he, unlike Masaryk, never truly became a Czech nationalist, or, more precisely, he changed his mind after a time... But what a commotion he caused here, nonetheless!) The fact that Masaryk opted for Czech nationalism was certainly not a conversion in the true sense, but it was certainly no foregone conclusion either That was why there was something unnatural (or possibly non-natural) about it: will-power and rational considerations must have played a significant part in his decision. But thank goodness he took it! How long otherwise would it have been before our complex-ridden (though superficially self-confident) and petty-minded nation finally snapped out of its Old Czech and Young Czech illusions?!

In fact, Opat's book is the story of Masaryk's unremitting conflict with Prague's academic, cultural and political establishment. At first, even today's reader can find its unadorned

pathos moving, but after a while it all becomes rather monotonous. What gives me that impression?

In the course of his various conflicts, Masaryk occasionally had some short-term allies and a whole series of more or less Platonic admirers (particularly among immature youngsters). He also had some quite diligent hangers-on. He never acknowledged the latter because they got on his nerves, and in the end he even developed a loathing for the zealous and worthy Herben. But he never had an real partner worthy of the name, either as ally or opponent. That was Masaryk's big problem. It also represents a major problem for Masarykian scholars. But above all, it presented Czech society in general with an enormous problem: one which was to come to a head in such a dramatic and ill-starred way over the choice of Masaryk's successor.

Masaryk ended up having neither proteges nor heirs of his calibre. Those who considered themselves as such - and in more than one case were so regarded by public opinion - seemed to have escaped his notice, despite the fact that some of them undoubtedly had much to offer (e.g. Emanuel Rádl). For our part, we are finding more and more reasons to call into doubt the qualities of the person he did eventually choose as his successor.

Masaryk's isolation - even though he was constantly surrounded by people and lived in the midst of social affairs - seems to have been something he could never overcome - neither in those early days nor later. Still less possible was it when he became Head of State: his country's revered leader and symbol.

Was it because he really was a "foreigner" here? (After all, one might equally maintain that he saw things more clearly than anyone else precisely because he was more at home here...

But did he actually see things more clearly or wasn't it rather the case that he saw things differently?) Did he really outgrow us? Or was it rather that he passed over?. Maybe it was just a case of his being a man of conflict, or conflict-prone (as, incidentally, he described himself). That was certainly true to a certain extent. Was it a case of his not wanting or being able to seek out or create partners of his own stature? Or was there just nobody here to fit the bill?

All these still unanswered questions force us in turn to ask ourselves who we are, where we have come from and where we are going.

* * *

Ladislav Hejdánek:

Masaryk as a philosopher for today

[MASARYK - FILOSOF A DNEŠEK]

I

Years ago now, at the time when our hopes briefly flowered, I wrote a paper in which I discussed the extent to which Masaryk could guide and assist us at that time of social crisis. I concluded with a warning against superficial optimism, on the grounds that sinfulness always leads to judgement.[1.] What I understood by "sinfulness" in that context was the weakening of the nation's moral fibre in the previous years, a phenomenon most marked among the educated. Of course, my vision of the "judgement" to come in no way resembled, however, what we have now, i.e. the cultural and spiritual disaster which was shortly to overtake us and in which we live now, despite the unexpectedly powerful wave of political and moral indignation with which the nation (alas so briefly) greeted the - in many respects absurd - military intervention. This put paid once more to any opportunity there might have been of drawing on Masaryk's legacy to help us tackle society's ills. It became out of the question even to update Masaryk's remarkable concept of the important role that science could play in renewing society and keeping it healthy.[2.] To start with, all the necessary measures were once again taken to expel and erase Masaryk from most people's memories and from

---

1. L.Hejdánek: Masaryk a nase dnešní krize [Masaryk and the present crisis]. Tvar 3/1968, No.1 pp. 7-11 of the initial version (due to be published in early September).
2. L.Hejdánek: Misto vědy v obrodě společnosti u T. G. Masaryka [T.G.Masaryk on the role of scholarship in social renewal]. Sesity 3/1968 No.1 pp.7-10 (first written for Tvar 2/1965, but was not passed by the censor; Tvar was discontinued)

their awareness, even. And young people were the operation's prime target. Moreover, no one (and least of all the new state leadership) voiced concern any more about (genuine) efforts to remedy society's ills. In official circles the so-called "renewal movement" was spoken of in terms of a mortal peril which we had escaped in the nick of time thanks to the selfless assistance of the country's true friends. The main effort was to restore pre-January conditions, while expelling the progressive forces and preserving the status quo indefinitely. To this end, neither science nor scholarship were to be included among society's priorities - quite the opposite, in fact. Thousands of outstanding scholars and renowned scientists not only lost their former positions, but also any real and worthwhile possibility to work in their own particular fields.

In the circumstances, the question may fairly be asked whether there can be any sense nowadays in concerning ourselves with what was undoubtedly a remarkable phenomenon of late nineteenth century/early twentieth century Czech and Czechoslovak cultural history other than in terms of a past that is gone for ever and no longer (to our regret, perhaps) has any topical significance for our times. Moreover, the way things are, there is no hope even of someone publicly attempting to recall Masaryk's personality, activities and words. This cannot but cast doubt on the chances of reviving interest in Masaryk as a philosopher, particularly in view of the fact that ever since the First Republic, philosophers of the younger generation have either ignored his work, treated it with scepticism or even rejected it outright, calling his ideas old-fashioned, unoriginal or incoherent. And even as recently as the nineteen seventies, the most distinguished Czech post-war philosopher regarded

Masaryk's greatest achievement to have been the founding of the Czechoslovak state - describing it as a unique event in the history of the social influence of philosophers down the ages. And he maintained this regardless of the fact that Masaryk's only genuine pupil and heir criticised his teacher quite severely for the inadequacy of his humanitarian programme and the inconsistency of his concept of democracy. Moreover, even during the eighteen nineties, Masaryk enjoyed very little support amongst his contemporaries (and pupils) and found almost no one who can be said to have really understood him. The situation changed little in the immediate pre-war period and after the establishment of the new republic, the effect of the many and varied popular (and even kitsch) interpretations of Masaryk being to submerge what was essential in his thinking and block all real scope for research. Not only did Masaryk's thinking fail to catch the public's imagination, it even eluded the serious attention of the philosophical community, even though some of them were little more than parasites on his authority, to which they paid lip service only. (This was a charge that Krejčí made against the founders of the Kresťanská revue, but in fact it applied equally to others as well). The conclusion one may draw is that we still await a comprehensive and thorough study of Masaryk's thinking, despite the efforts of certain Marxists in the sixties.

Admittedly, it took a long time for both Kierkegaard and Nietzsche, for example, to be acknowledged as thinkers of prime philosophical relevance - and it was as thinkers that they were "discovered" many years later and interpreted in a new light. However, in the mean time both of them had survived as literary

figures as least. Masaryk lacked that advantage. By and large, his texts do not make for easy reading, on account of the austerity of his style, his unliterary sketchiness, and his seemingly unmethodical approach, but especially because they most of all resemble marginal commentaries scattered variously along the route taken by Masaryk's thinking.

Half a century after his death, we must realistically admit that - at least in certain respects - the interplay of various factors has served so to minimise Masaryk's influence on our society as to render it virtually negligeable, and since one cannot turn the clock back, it looks as if this situation cannot be remedied in the case of two generations at least. The living Masaryk is separated from the present not only by the natural bounds of time, but also by an artificial gulf that can no longer be filled, and to bridge it calls for a certain degree of courage and even tortuous exertion. Thus, in the same way that Masaryk himself sought in his works to bridge the centuries and draw inspiration from events of the distant past, so we too will be obliged to probe what superficially may appear to be only shallow layers of history, but have actually been compressed just as drastically as any of those long lost ones that he investigated. At the present time, it would serve little useful purpose to investigate what scope there might be for extending the social impact of Masaryk's philosophy and his ideas in general. However, what we can and must do - initially in a more limited way and then more comprehensively - is to try and achieve a new and methodical approach to and deeper understanding of this great figure, the like of which there have been few in our history, and also to draw philosophical inspiration from him. And there is - in my view, at least - another reason for doing so,

namely, that genuine attempts to draw inspiration from Masaryk are part and parcel of efforts to reconstitute and preserve our national identity. This is why it is also the task of those Czech philosophers who still preserve - in Hus' phrase - their "conscience and reason", to assist this effort to the best of their ability and within their own sphere of learning. It is a task that will inevitably make demands on their talent and critical faculties, and also on their "sympathy" as a noetic principle.

It is no easy problem, of course, to decide which route to take and which methods to adopt. I believe that the most productive approach - and the most legitimate one in that Masaryk himself commended it - might well be to select certain of today's most burning issues and then try and see how Masaryk himself anticipated, conceived and formulated them, as well as how, and by what paths, he sought to solve them. I would like to demonstrate, with one specific example, how I would conceive such an approach.

II

One of the major problems to be tackled by modern philosophy is the question of "the subject" (in the sense that the term has assumed since as recently as the last century when it first took on a more permanent meaning, though it has still to be precisely defined, and in fact appears to have suffered some severe shocks over these past years). The problem's importance derives not solely from theoretical considerations, in other words, it does not reside merely in the difficulty of grasping the concept or idea of "the subject", "the person", the "ego", etc., (even though these very difficulties are of wide-ranging significance),

but rather in the constant growth of self-feeling and self-awareness within modern and post-modern humanity (which includes the ordinary people of the present day). The roots of this situation need to be sought above all in the age-old historical impact of certain elements of Christian and even ancient Israelite tradition. In view of this, the efforts of certain leading philosophical currents and schools to question the concept of "the subject" and move the debate elsewhere (as can be seen, for example, in the case of analytical philosophy or structuralism), might easily appear anachronistic and unrelated to the needs and "spirit" of the times, as if they derived mostly from the internal intellectual difficulties and technical inadequacies of the conceptual apparatus which, moreover, these particular currents and schools share with the rest of modern thought. It is therefore far from being merely an "internal matter" of philosophy but rather a problem being thrust on philosophy "from outside" as it were, and which confronts it regardless or not of whether it has any urge or desire to tackle it.

Another equally serious problem which philosophy has been confronted with "from outside" is the question of historical evolution (whether history is regarded in the broadest sense, in which case it can imply the evolution of living organisms, etc., or in the narrower sense, in which case we reserve it solely for human society capable of thinking historically). As far as this second problem is concerned, the situation is rather different. By now, almost no one rejects or denies the concept of evolution; philosophical discussions about it are much more restrained and almost extinct (though not always to the same degree). However,

as a philosophical problem it has been merely shifted sideways and narrowed down, but not by any means solved (leastways not satisfactorily so).

I am convinced that it will help us gain a deeper insight into Masaryk's philosophical method and his intellectual strategy if we trace step by step the way in which he not only sought a mutually linked solution to these two problems but also opened a window in them as it were and indicated the way forward to future philosophical research. And although he himself did not undertake it, he nonetheless entertained no doubts about its importance and even its immediate strategic necessity.

The work in which Masaryk especially stressed the importance of the idea of evolution was "The Social Question" [Otázka sociálni] in which he attempted to come to terms, critically speaking, with the Marxism of his day. In it, he pointed out that the issue concerned not solely - or even primarily - the fact of global and social evolution, but chiefly the manner and form of that evolution (in which connection he employed the objectifying term "evolutionary motive forces", while asserting that Marx and Engels were not justified in claiming inspiration from Darwin since their concept of "evolutionary forces" differed strongly from Darwin's). The dialectical solution whereby evolution derives from the tension and conflict of internal contradictions was rejected by Masaryk, on the grounds that he could not accept "objective dialectics" (in which connection he sarcastically suggested a fur-coat tattoo for keeping out the cold). However it would wrong to interpret his statement that "there are no dialectical contradictions within things themselves" as no more than a return to seeking "evolutionary motive forces" solely "on one side of the contradiction" so to speak, or as one set of

"objective" forces alongside others, or possibly against them. This will become clear as we go along.

Masaryk maintained that the fundamental question for Marx's philosophy of history concerned the very source of progress: how were these "motive forces" of progress to be imagined? In Darwin's writings themselves, it was evident that they were forces not just of "impulsion" but also of "perfection". On this point, Masaryk advanced a decisive argument, to the effect that there was not just one force but many. Masaryk recognised determinism, and causal relationships, but did not understand causality in the old sense of "causa aequat effectum". Put another way, this means that no cause contains the entire effect, and equally, of course, that no effect is the expression of just one cause. This raised the question as to what was it that combined the action of many causes into a single effect (and equally, the question of how one specific cause could have a whole series of effects, which quantitatively greatly exceeded the "possibilities" of that particular cause i.e. the problem of the "amplification effect"). Without determinism, no rational human activity would be possible; but nor would it be possible if every action were categorically determined by what preceded it. "Causality in general" explained nothing and in many ways had become a recent superstition. Generalities in this connection were insufficient. What was required was "not to accept the causal relationship too readily and light-heartedly", but rather "truly to interpret life's fullness and social evolution" in terms of certain causes. In other words, it is necessary to define the precise limits of those causal relationships we know properly, as well as their nature, and how they are concentrated and integrated in the

resultant whole, or "totality".

In this respect, Masaryk was not arguing solely against Marxism but above all against positivism which, he said, "remains a half-truth". Masaryk regarded the problem of evolution and progress in society and history as a combination of two factors: sociological and metaphysical (by which he understood academic and philosophical). In his view, an academic approach and exposition had necessarily to be combined with philosophy or it would be inadequate. This was because, in the final analysis, the question was to clarify and explain "the meaning of history and evolution". Both theory and practice demanded "philosophical guidance in the direction of historical evolution". "The question of the meaning of history and social life inevitably raises that of the meaning of the world and life in general". Unlike science, philosophy neither could nor should ever neglect the totality, or lose sight of it even.

Thus Masaryk saw the question of social and historical evolution in the following way: evolution (let alone progress) cannot be explained solely in terms of a single (or even one main) motive social force, or one single principle. "Each single motive force - vis motrix - must be qualified concretely and separately: each single motive force turns out to be a complex of forces". This begged the question how it was that the action of such a complex of forces could be integrated in the form of specific effects. Masaryk's explanation was that this function was performed by the human individual as a conscious subject (and he referred at that point to Engels' "odd" statement that everything that motivated human action had to pass through the brain). Again, it would be wrong to see this as a concession to subjectivism (on the contrary, Masaryk's intellectual strategies can

provide the basis for a far more radical step, i.e. the cosmologisation of his concept of the subject, much along the lines of the experiments of Max Scheler or Pierre Teilhard de Chardin after the First World War). Masaryk simply pointed out that, in society and history, it was human beings who - both with the help of their consciousness and through its intermediary - integrated not just "subjectively" (in the sense of "apparently") but also "really" in the world-transforming practice of "motive forces", "causes" and "laws" of every possible kind, and thus either enabled the emergence of one meaning or another in history, or not, or could even prevent it. However, Masaryk observed that at this point yet another problem was revealed, or rather the existing problem was clarified in a decisive manner, namely, where was one to seek the basis or guarantee of the subject's capacity to integrate "objectively" in terms of consciousness and practice alike, not to mention the basis of the integrity of each and every human being as the subject - the only real subject of history, not only as a physical individual, but particularly as a moral and spiritual personality ?

Masaryk took us along that path no further than this clear formulation of the basic question. But it has long been evident that the most important philosophical act is precisely to present a question afresh and more clearly. Actual answers to a question, or attempts at them, are important in so far as they lead us to further, still more important questions. So where does Masaryk's strategy lead us then ? This was the thinker who asked: "What is it that truly motivates people, whether we study them as individuals or as members of a social and historical entity ? ... In the final analysis, wherein lies human spiritual

activity (...) and even more than activity : spontaneity ? What is the extent of that spontaneity, in other words, to what degree are people motivated by their surroundings, destiny or Providence? To what extent are we in charge of our own individual lives and our historical lives ? To what extent are we - in a word - free ?"

Here again we could misunderstand or mistake his meaning were we to try and interpret the question thus framed as a spring-board to metaphysical speculation. However, such an error could only be made by someone ignorant of Masaryk's thinking. Part and parcel of the great man's philosophical legacy is a call for philosophical work (and scholarship in general) to be rooted in practice, and for it to have a practical application. It is when they are confronted with concrete human situations, where it is a matter of "hic Rhodus, hic salta" that scholarship becomes truly scholarly, and philosophy most truly philosophical. Just a matter of days before police interrogations brought his life to an early end, Jan Patočka invited the rest of us to join him in consideration and discussion of ways to provide a new and better philosophical grounding for the idea of the inalienability of human rights. We must see this nervus rerum of the present-day political, cultural and - above all - moral situation (and not just in our country) as a call to us to assume not only our personal and civic responsibility, but our philosophical responsibility too. And it is my conviction that it is precisely in this great contest of our times that we may rely on Masaryk as a great philosophical strategist, even though it will mean our formulating that strategy in terms of our new conditions - and hence differently. The question of the political subject is part and parcel of the question of the integrity of the moral persona-

lity in the midst of historical evolution. However, true personal integrity in our present day situation will be unattainable unless we draw inspiration from our distinguished forebears, of whom one of the most important for Czech philosophers was Tomas Garrigue Masaryk.

* * *

CONTENTS

Druck: Copy Center 2000 Obere Karlstraße 30 8520 Erlangen