The Carl Beck Papers
in Russian and East European Studies

No. 708

Masaryk's Understanding of Democracy Before 1914

Marie Neudorfl

University of Pittsburgh Center for
Russian and East European Studies

MARIE NEUDORFL received her Ph.D. from the University of Alberta (Edmonton) in 1981. The focus of her thesis was T. G. Masaryk. Dr. Neudorfl has worked for the Canadian National Archives, conducted research at Carlton University and taught history at Ottowa University. She has published articles in *East Central Europe.* Dr. Neudorfl is presently completing research on the role of women in Czech society before 1914 and has several forthcoming publications on this subject.

August 1989

ISSN 0889275X

The Carl Beck Papers:
Editors: William Chase, Bob Donnorummo, Ronald H. Linden
Assistant Editor: Rosemary Anderson
Design and Layout: Robert Supansic

Submissions to *The Carl Beck Papers* are welcome. Manuscripts must be in English, double-spaced throughout, and less than 100 pages in length. Acceptance is based on anonymous review. Mail submissions to : Editor, *The Carl Beck Papers*, Center for Russian and East European Studies, 4G21 Forbes Quadrangle, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA 15260.

Masaryk's Understanding of Democracy Before 1914

Background

Tomáš Garrigue Masaryk's theories on democracy evolved primarily from an intimate knowledge of the social and political realities of his time, combined with relevant knowledge of the past both of Czech as well as other European nations. They reflected Masaryk's conviction that the ideal of modern democracy was most desirable for a majority of people, as well as his belief that since the French Revolution, the gradual realization of this ideal became possible in many European countries. At the same time, he was aware that the ideal of democracy was especially attractive to underprivileged entities, be they individuals or nations, and that the dominant forces in Central Europe had little sympathy for this ideal. While he did not discount German and Russian expansionist potentials and tendencies as negligible and insignificant for Central Europe, in the context of the Austro-Hungarian Empire his major concern was with the inequitable possibilities for the development of non-ruling nations as compared with those of the Austrian Germans and Magyars who constituted, in their respective domains, less than half of the population.[1]

Masaryk accepted the theory of the first significant modern Czech politician, František Palacky,[2] that even small nations in the Austro-Hungarian Empire had a strong cultural and historical identity, and that forced Germanization or Magyarization would have destructive consequences. He also agreed with Palacky that respect for deeply rooted significant entities and equal opportunities for their development were the best options to assure the empire's stability and prosperity. He shared with Palacky and Karel Havlícek[3] the conviction that broad cultural work and education aimed at the elevation of individuals, as well as the nation as a whole, were the most solid foundation for overall progress, and the most secure way to prepare people for democratic political participation.

Democratic ideals were probably cherished more after 1848 among the Czechs than among any other of the Empire's groups, because they saw it as the only way to improve their position in the Empire. They had no

kinsmen outside the Empire with whom they could dream about unification, and they had no nationally oriented nobility as did the Germans, Magyars, and Poles. The Bohemian Catholic nobility, gathered from all over Catholic Europe to replace the Protestant domestic nobility after the loss at the Battle of White Mountain in 1620, never earned, as a group, deep affection among the Czechs, though some of its individual members developed great sympathy with Czech cultural and national aspirations.[4] Palacky was in the forefront of those who, in 1848, called for the abolition of aristocratic privileges, and for the establishment of a federal and more democratic system in the Empire.[5]

The defeat of the Austrian revolution strengthened the forces traditionally resistant to substantial political change, and only Austrian military disasters hastened the Empire's relaxation of absolutism and the renewal of constitutionalism in the 1860s. Since 1867 the rule of the Austro-Hungarian Empire had been divided between the Austrian Germans and the Magyars, and neither was seriously interested in expanding political and national rights to other national groups. This became the cornerstone of Austrian national problems in the long run, since centralized rule increasingly became an obstacle for initiatives to make improvements in a number of important areas of modern life.

Given their historical experiences, level of advancement, and political ambitions, the Czechs were more forthcoming than other groups in the struggle for federalization and more equal status with the German minority in the Bohemian Kingdom (almost six million Czechs and almost three million Germans).[6]

While the struggle of Czechs for political and linguistic equality with the Germans in the Bohemian Kingdom remained central to Czech politics, German pressures went in the opposite direction - to preserve centralization, to establish German as the official language in the Western part of the Empire, and to divide the Bohemian Kingdom on national lines.[7] Policies of the Viennese government toward these vital issues were a mixture of ambiguities, inconsistencies, and broken promises to Czechs.

The Czechs, unlike the Germans, Magyars, and Poles, were without substantial independent financial resources,[8] and without a nobility who would stand firmly behind Czech cultural, economic, and political interests. Consequently, they were in an exceptionally bad position to promote their goals by force. Development on the road to increasing democracy was their greatest hope. The Czech political leaders believed that the Empire would not be able to escape modern political reforms. In times of Czech despair, the usual argument was that if reforms were continuously resisted by policy makers, the Empire would not survive a major international political crisis.

After 1848, Czech politicians believed that it was important to preserve the Empire, but on progressive federal principles. Regardless of whether or not it would be preserved, they assumed that both alternatives required individuals and nations to expand general knowledge, professional skills, and the ability to communicate efficiently with others in order to respond to the needs of modern society. All these issues were already included in the 1848 Czech political program formulated by Palacky, Havlícek, and others. This political and cultural program remained basically valid until 1918.[9] Masaryk valued it highly, especially for its complex content which dealt with the position of the Czech nation in the framework of the Hapsburg monarchy as well as its concern with the cultural, intellectual, political, and economic growth of individuals and nations. He especially appreciated its emphasis on democratic values, national tolerance, and 'cultural democratization', i.e., the concern of those more privileged with the cultural elevation of those in less privileged positions in order to advance their abilities for greater individual initiative and efficient work. All these ideas were a part of their broader faith based on Christian principles; not only was it possible, but it was the duty of people to work for an increasingly humanistic society.

Masaryk greatly admired the work of Czech intellectuals, particularly writers, in this process. Since the 1870s, they had reflected on the realities of Czech life, thus expanding the knowledge of Czechs about themselves.

Their criticism of 'empty patriotism' and of other dubious, nonconstructive values, were at the root of a new, more 'modern', outlook on life. The call of a Czech poet, Jan Neruda, "The glory of the fathers is a beautiful gem for their sons, but those who desire glory must achieve it for themselves", became an important aspect of the cultural atmosphere of the nation, which, in many respects, lagged behind the Germans and other European nations.[10]

Public collections and donations were traditionally the most popular sources for cultural and educational undertakings. The most important examples of this national struggle for overall elevation were the National Theatre in Prague (opened in 1883 and again, some months later, after a disastrous fire), an increasing number of public libraries and schools, local theatres, and gymnasiums for gymnastic societies. More than one third of the Czech secondary schools were built and maintained with the help of contributions from the Czech public. When it was proved difficult to get permission from the Viennese government to establish a needed education or cultural institution, despite available money, emotions of the Czech nation ran high.[11] Education was, for the Czechs, the main avenue for social advancement since they had no upper class and the middle class had only started to develop in the last quarter of the nineteenth century.[12]

Masaryk maintained that Czech politicians, deeply involved since 1878 in parliamentary struggles for political concessions for the Czech nation (of which the establishment of a Czech University in Prague in 1882 and changes in electoral law were the most significant achievements)[13], had neglected many important aspects of the 1848 program. He felt that the political progress being made by the Czechs, as well as the Austrians, was unnecessarily losing momentum. His parliamentary work, similar to other Czech deputies,[14] focused on analyses of what they viewed as hindrances to progress in important areas such as the quality and accessibility of education, legal issues, national problems, social and women's questions, etc. In 1893, when Masaryk lost his belief that the Viennese Parliament would be used rationally for badly needed improvements, and when he

realized that the government's official policies were becoming a major source of public demoralization, he turned away from politics. His fears that parliamentary work was increasingly less important for the policy and decision-making process in Austria proved to be correct, especially after the abolition of Badeni's language decrees in 1897, which made the Czech language almost equal to German for administrative matters in the Bohemian Kingdom. This view was again underscored after 1907, when imperial decrees became the prevailing means of governance, and when it became clear that the introduction of universal suffrage had little impact on the policy-making process. Masaryk became a deputy in 1907, it was mainly to expose the government's misconduct and injustices. He believed much less intensely that relevant information and thorough analysis of problems would influence the concepts and beliefs of the ruling echelons.[15]

From the early 1890s, Masaryk felt that, under existing political and social conditions, it was better for the Czechs not to expect any substantial political concessions in order to avoid bitter disappointments and humiliation. After 1893 he turned to non-political areas, seeking means to enhance knowledge and attitudes essential for the advancement of democracy. Education, especially at the university level, remained at the centre of his attention. In his view, ignorance was an obstacle to improvements in all areas. He encouraged the formation of various interest groups, especially voluntary and professional organizations, to increase effective communication of relevant knowledge about particular needs and problems. These groups would also enhance fruitful cooperation and positive competition at the individual and group levels. He saw the greater concentration on all aspects of national life as a necessary condition for more rapid modernization, as well as establishing and maintaining democracy. He believed that the future participation of the broad public in the political process was unavoidable. Similarly, like Havlícek and Palacky, he wanted public involvement to be responsible, to avoid extremes, and to be capable of democratic conduct.

Masaryk considered Havlícek and Palacky's views as still relevant and better suited to Czech needs than prevailing contemporary ideologies, such as extreme economic liberalism, Marxism, anti-semitism, Catholic conservatism, and nationalism - all of which were relatively strong among Austrian Germans. He had a great admiration for both Havlícek and Palacky and absorbed most of their major political views as a part of his own philosophical and political outlook on human life, society and progress. He did not view as healthy the prevailing thinking among Czech intellectuals, which was heavily influenced by German philosophy, history, and literature.

From the 1880s, he tried - at least for Czech students and intellectuals - to balance this German influence by presenting translations of major Anglo-Saxon, French, Russian, and other European thinkers in his numerous articles in *Atheneum, Cas, and Naše doba.*[16] At the same time, he was also involved in the popularization of various scientific findings, since he viewed the sciences as the major source of modern, practical, and useful knowledge, and necessary for rational thinking and general progress.

Masaryk appreciated the fact that Czechs were open to the idea of progress and improvement, including areas which were not traditionally subject to public discussion. These topics included family relations, human relations, including those of the sexes, prostitution and its consequences for health, women's education and voting rights, raising children, social issues, etc. The Czechs relatively strong concern with social problems and their overall economic, moral and intellectual level made them unique in the Habsburg monarchy. Masaryk found these traditions more attractive than the traditions of the Austrian Germans, with their conservatism, extremism, and much sharper social divisions.

In this respect, there was great similarity between Germans in Austria and those in Germany. Imperial Germany had been an important source for intellectual and political ideas in Austria proper. This influence was probably most instrumental in the widespread disinterest of Austrian Ger-

mans, politicians, and intellectuals in the lives and needs of non-German groups and to their contributions to the achievements of the Empire. Bismarckian Germany was conservative at its roots, and remained so after Bismarck.[17] Germany's ambition to be a great power left very little space in the domestic sphere for introducing many important aspects of democracy , despite the presence of voting rights for workers. Consequently, the gap between the German Austrians and other nationalities in the Empire, especially Czechs, grew rapidly, not only in the sphere of politics, its perception and aims, but also in many other respects.

Theory of Democracy

Masaryk devoted a substantial part of his productive life before 1914 to his efforts to expand the knowledge and skills which he considered necessary for the social and political democratization of society. For a number of specific reasons which will be discussed in this paper, his main concern, at a practical level, was with the Czech nation. For various reasons, his work related to the struggle for the advancement of democracy has often been misunderstood by Western, as well as by Czech and Slovak, historians.[18] This paper will present the Masaryk's ideas on democracy, their assumptions, and the main areas of his endeavors.

When Masaryk came to Prague in 1882, the major assumptions of his political philosophy had already been formed.[19] He believed in the obtainability of the tools for more rapid progress; progress in the sense of making individuals as well as society less 'sick' and more human, moral, rational and efficient. He saw a great need for a more balanced development of individuals and societies, preventing as much as possible the waste of human resources, be it physical, moral or intellectual. The combination of moral principles (based mainly on Christian teachings, especially the concept of love and immortality of human soul), the continuous search for knowledge, the use of this knowledge for the benefit of all, and hard efficient work combined with competition and cooperation were at the root

of his understanding of progress. Incorporation of positive attitudes toward the development of individuals, singly and as components of the 'whole' (family, community, nation, civilization) into a personal philosophy and actions on one hand, and the incorporation of principles assisting the advancement of progress on various levels into the political process and interest groups on the other hand, was a part of his scheme. Masaryk assigned great importance to moral incentives, particularly to avoid the abuse of those in an economically, intellectually or physically less privileged position.

He saw a great need for philosophy to assist this process under the prevailing influence of positivism and the ideology of economic liberalism and Marxism, which in his view oversimplified the complexity of human existence to the detriment of concern with the true welfare of human beings. While he accepted some Western philosophers' notions of progress (particularly Comte, J.S. Smith and Kant), Masaryk insisted that their practical applications must be seen in the context of the cultural, social, economic and moral realities of each entity, paying attention to the positive potentials of these entities. He was also critical of the generally accepted concept of progress, which was more concerned with economic expansion, growth and politics than with cultural, intellectual, moral and social achievement.

The process of complex democratization of society formed an integral part of his broad understanding of progress, since Masaryk believed that democracy was both an efficient means for greater progress and a safeguard for its continuity. He never considered progress to be irreversible and to evolve automatically, as he is sometimes accused. On the contrary, he believed that the combination of theory, knowledge, specific values, rationality, morality and efficient work were necessary conditions for the advancement and durability of progress. He believed that Western countries were already deeply involved in this process, though not all to the same degree, and that it was in their interest to support the advancement of democracy in other countries. Although he considered that mul-

tinational entities would have greater difficulty in instituting democracy, he believed such development was possible.[20]

Thus, while Masaryk viewed democracy as superior to authoritarian systems because it was more concerned with personal freedoms, human and political rights, and allowed for the positive advancement of the individual and the community, he did not consider it completely natural for individuals and society. If democracy was to be effective and lasting, certain conditions, relating first to the level of cultural, political and economic development at the individual and national level, and secondly to the continuous cultivation of democratic values, attitudes and ethical principles, had to be met.

Since the overall level of the development of nations varied, and since different problems resulted from divergent traditions, values, historical experience, geographical conditions and language, Masaryk increasingly doubted the possibility of speaking meaningfully in general terms about democracy. He claimed that one could at best speak only about the democracy of a particular country. But considering the application of democratic principles, equal attention should be paid to all significant institutions (political parties, family, schools, etc.). This limitation would allow the specific conditions in each particular instance to come into clearer focus and result in a better understanding of the positive aspects and problems of each particular country or case.

Masaryk did not believe every society was ready for the introduction of unqualified democracy. Although he favored the extension of voting rights to as broad a segment of the population as was feasible in the Habsburg monarchy, he did not consider the Empire's nations mature and educated enough to successfully maintain democracy and benefit equally from its existence. However, he found the Empire sufficiently developed to involve people on much larger scale in the process of democratization on the cultural and political level, especially through education.[21] He also wanted the government, politicians and the public to pay greater attention

to those problems which posed obstacles to a more rapid advancement of democracy.

He saw 'democracy' as a world-outlook and life style, in public as well as private life,[22] combining respect for the positive potentials of the individual with concern for the good of others. No significant group ought to be excluded from the process of democratization once it has begun. The interplay between the theoretical ideas of democracy and specific individual, social, cultural, economic, political and others conditions of each particular society constitutes an area of Masaryk's work that has, despite its importance, been overlooked until now by historians. It deserves scrupulous attention.[23]

Masaryk's perception of the human person is characterized by a strong vision of its complex reality, a reality in which its multiple - moral, cultural, economic, political, and religious -dimensions are of equal significance and value for its individual and community life, and thus for true progress. In his view, only democracy can provide the optimal conditions for the advancement of increasing numbers of people to reach their full potential in all their many dimensions assuming, of course, that they share the desire for democracy and the concerns and obligations that this implies. Greater individual initiative, the freedom to communicate openly and efficiently about problems and interests, and skills to make the compromises, also implied an easy access to knowledge.[24]

For many years, before he intensified his attention on the theoretical concepts of political democracy, Masaryk was primarily concerned with issues which were at the root of what could be called the social, moral, religious and cultural democratization of a society which had just begun to free itself from a hierarchical social structure and non-democratic mode of thinking. In other words, Masaryk occupied himself primarily with issues which he saw as serious obstacles to the advancement of democracy, such as the quality and character of education, traditional social and political values, lack of individual, group and government initiative, conservatism

in the Catholic Church and upper classes, the 'social question', 'women's question', 'Czech question', etc..

Democracy and Nationalism

Masaryk's major pre-1914 works were written against a background of the realities of his day, often referring to specific conditions and problems of the Empire. The centre of his attention was understandably the Czech nation, with its internal problems and those arising from its inclusion in the Habsburg Empire. All of his works reflected a belief in the need to respect the separate identities of the individual nations that made up the Austro-Hungarian Empire, and as an understanding of their skepticism and disappointments about the failures to achieve some very necessary and long overdue political reforms through political initiative. As the main preoccupation of the ruling segments of society, as well as the ruling nationalities, increasingly focused on the preservation of the *status quo*, the mood of the dominated national groups swung between renewed hope for change and discouragement resulting from Vienna's unfulfilled promises and avoidance of debates on Empire's problems. This was especially the view of the Czechs.[25]

The issues raised by the existence of small European nations lie at the core of most of Masaryk's pre-1914 work. Masaryk appreciated some of the advantages created by large national entities, and acknowledged that an ideal situation would be represented by a universal order since it would limit the range of problems and conflicts related to the coexistence of different nations. But he strongly believed that such a development would have to be backed by the general acceptance of a united 'world outlook' on the part of humanity. While he considered that the ambitions and activities of the Christian Church through the centuries had had the chance to fulfill this task, he argued that "history has shown that the aim is impossible to achieve".[26] Masaryk felt that multinational entities could be useful if their existence was based on progressive aims. Security was such a

progressive aim, but he did not consider their existence secure if they were principally the instrument of one group's dominance over another.

In the case of Habsburg Empire, Masaryk saw the concentration of the Empire on progress, democratization, and the advancement of justice as contributing to its inner strength, stability and durability, especially in the light of its multinational character and limited possibilities for external expansion.[27] He entered the Viennese Parliament at the beginning of 1891[28] with a conviction that knowledge and sound arguments based on sufficient empirical evidence and comparisons with developments in other Western countries would soon persuade the majority of the parliamentary representatives of the necessity of democratic reforms.[29]

The main thrust of Masaryk's parliamentary speeches between 1891 and 1893 was his conviction that the Empire's primary concern should be preserving its inner strength through the implementation of reforms. His speeches analyzed issues which, in his view, were the key to the modernization and democratization. The most important of these being national equality and open communication about common problems, universal suffrage, foreign policy, education, and social questions. In his second term, starting in 1907, he focused on the criticism of government policies which he viewed as incompatible with decency, justice and progress.

Masaryk based his complex arguments in favor of greater national equality in the Empire on the assumption that, given the existing level of advancement of Western civilization, national entity is the most suitable form of community for overall progress. Its members shared a common language, territory, and social, cultural, political and historical experience, as well as many specific common interests which underscored their concern for public matters.[30] Since the identity of the Empire's nationalities had advanced through long and very painful historical developments, it was, in Masaryk's view, in the Empire's own self-interest to fully incorporate this fact into its political system and philosophical outlook, replacing defensive and even destructive policies with more positive approaches.[31]

Masaryk saw federalism as more compatible with modern society because of its greater potential for implementing democratic principles, financing cultural, educational and social needs, and enhancing opportunities for the activities of special interest groups.[32] He considered the work of interest groups and associations a necessary part of the democratizing process at the lower levels of the social scale. They provided opportunities for public discussions of specific issues and contributed to the formation of an informed public opinion. At the same time, the existence of various interest groups had the potential to ease the impact of the centralistic system, and to influence it by creating pressures for change. His parliamentary speeches dealing with policies toward non-ruling nationalities thoroughly analyzed all the factors that contributed to the overall stagnation and growing tensions between the non-ruling nationalities and the government, and pointed to the defensive attitude of the central government on imminent issues as the major source of the problem. The growing tendency to avoid discussions of serious problems and to seek solutions favorable to the ruling nations, was a cause of increasing public indifference toward the Empire's future.[33]

Masaryk was also involved in the parliamentary struggle for universal suffrage.[34] He was naturally in favor of workers' and women's voting rights, but he did not believe that the right to vote would significantly change the situation of either gender without simultaneous changes in the contemporary attitudes toward their role in society. He viewed the representation of interest groups as important as universal suffrage since without it the majority voice could easily suppress the minority. He was specifically concerned with national representation in the Viennese Parliament. His concern proved to be justified when universal suffrage was introduced in 1907 in Austria, and yet, the Germans preserved the majority in the Reichsrat.[35]

In the context of parliamentary rules, Masaryk found some of the restrictions on freedom of discussion imposed by the government intolerable. He especially objected to strong governmental pressures to ban

discussions of the Empire's national problems in the Reichsrat.[36] Believing that the free discussion of problems was a healthy start, not only toward political democratization but also toward their eventual resolution, Masaryk was apprehensive about the impact of this ban.

On several occasions he argued that the alliance of Austro-Hungary with Germany increasingly amplified the ignorance of Austrian decision-makers regarding the Empire's grave problems and complex realities (the most important being its multinational character). He believed that in the long term this escapism would threaten the future of the Empire. In several speeches concerned with so called 'Czech question', he tried to prove that, despite denials by the government and the majority of German deputies, such a problem existed. In fact, it had been the most important issue confronting the Reichsrat for many years.[37] Masaryk also tried to show that the undemocratic attitude of Germans toward the Czechs was based on false assumptions and insufficient evidence. The widespread belief of German politicians that the higher level of German culture was sufficient justification for German political and national dominance was clearly incompatible with modern and progressive political concepts, but, more importantly, given the high degree of development achieved by the Czechs, the German perception of superiority was distorted. He was alarmed by the political philosophy of the German Liberal leader, Ernst von Plener, who maintained that the freedom of individuals, and the autonomy and equality of national groups, had to be sacrificed in favor of the modern centralized state, and safeguarded by those in already privileged positions, namely Austrian Germans.[38]

Education

Since Masaryk considered education - its character, level, and accessibility - as a necessity for modernization and maintenance of democracy, he devoted a considerable part of his work to analyzing conditions in schools and formulating his ideas on the goals and character of education

in modern society.[39] He saw education, progress and democracy as synergistically elated. He firmly believed that under all circumstances a more informed public resulted in having their political representatives enact more responsible policies. Expanded and improved access for all the people to general and basic information, as well as other more specialized types of knowledge, were necessary for professional advancement in an industrialized society, to assure initiative on the individual level and to provide opportunities to use that knowledge for the benefit of as many people as possible. His criticism of the Austrian school system centered on its curriculum, which did not provide enough possibilities to gain a sufficient and comparative knowledge (which would reasonably reflect the available important and relevant knowledge of the time). He also felt its methods of teaching, which was overly dependent on rote learning, suppressed the potential for independent thinking and initiative. He opposed the efforts of the Catholic Church to gain more control over elementary schools because it had very little sympathy for liberalism and relied too heavily on dogma and authoritarian values. He argued that the Church had ample opportunity to exert an influence on children through the regular religious lessons in schools and during church services.

Masaryk demanded that education be made more relevant to the social, cultural, economic, historical and political realities. He considered it important especially at the higher level in humanities, law and social sciences because these were the major avenues for employment in the government administration. Furthermore, he strongly objected to the German bias in the educational system which disregarded the identities and needs of the non-German nationalities. The fact that eight million Germans had eight universities and six million Czechs had only one, overcrowded at that, was untenable. The Viennese government had for years ignored the Czech's call for a second university. In Masaryk's view this was self-evident proof of Vienna's dubious sense of justice, as well as a serious hindrance to the advancement of democracy on individual and communal level.[40] He believed that education had to be both a means of

cultivating the skills necessary to make a decent living and a means of building a good foundation for life-long personal, moral and cultural growth. Although he saw both aspects as equally important, he recognized the crippling impact of economic hardship on those who had barely enough skills for survival. For Masaryk, economic well being was never an end in itself, but always a means to be used for the advancement in other, more spiritual spheres. The democratization of the access to knowledge was not to be limited to young people, but was to encompass other groups, such as adults, workers and women. Masaryk also urged intellectuals to get involved in the popularization of scientific findings and knowledge. After he realized that, given the German deputies' obsession with preserving the political *status quo*, parliament was not a platform for free discussion and rational deliberations, he resigned his seat, although he remained involved in all major struggles through his writing and lecturing.[41]

Masaryk's attention turned to areas less dependent on political institutions and decisions, and more on issues which he considered as barriers to democratization in various non-political areas. He focused on work which would encourage greater initiative among groups with the power to influence others, such as young intellectuals, teachers and women. He also tried to illustrate that the relatively liberal conditions of the Austrian political system provided many unused opportunities for individual and group initiative, especially in the area of values, learning and volunteer organizations.

To achieve maximum general and specialized knowledge, and thus the ability to compete with the most advanced sectors of society, Masaryk emphasized the importance of the learning process as a lifelong concern which brings psychological satisfaction, self-esteem and, at the same time, the flexibility to adjust and make the best out of changing opportunities. He also considered concentration on personal growth and open communication with others about information, interests and needs as preconditions for satisfying human relations, including marriage. While Masaryk was well aware that perfection was an unreachable goal in any human ac-

tivity, he viewed the struggle for improvement in all important areas of human existence, including human emotions, morality, character and relations, as a necessary component of a fulfilling and meaningful life experience. A part of this scheme was the ability to think, to form an informed opinion, and to get involved in work for improvement of others. He saw destructive phenomena even on individual level (be it ignorance, alcoholism, immorality) not only as a private affair, but also as the concern of others. This was an alternative outlook on life, different from a current liberalistic view which overemphasized individualism, took exploitation for granted, and stressed competition to the detriment of cooperation and positive human relations.

At the centre of Masaryk's concerns was the quality and meaning of life, which he perceived as a complex phenomenon, embracing all areas of human existence, However, the areas in which injustice and suffering were the most apparent needed particular attention, at the individual, institutional and legal levels. While it is not clear to what extent Masaryk believed that the improvement of moral, educational, and economic conditions for groups and individuals can influence an unresponsive political system, he did link this to the nation's ability to gain independence when the opportunity presented itself, and then to maintain its independence and democracy.[42]

National Identity

After 1893 Masaryk's writings and public lectures focused on such problems as national identity, status of women, prostitution, alcoholism, and the lack of a useful education. He viewed all these issues as relevant to greater spiritual, cultural and moral advancement of individuals and democratization.

Since European nations had maintained separate identities for more than a millennium, he believed that self-knowledge was very important for the self-esteem and orientation of individuals and nations. He urged

Czechs to become thoroughly acquainted with their past, its achievements, struggles and failures to better understand themselves and realistic opportunities for overall development. Although he accepted Palacky's and Havlícek's concepts of culture, he rejected their principal assumption that the dominating feature of Czech history was the struggle of Czechs for survival against German expansionism. Masaryk believed that positive achievements in non-political spheres were equally worthwhile.[43] With regard to the Habsburg monarchy, he felt that historical research was too narrowly oriented, ignoring sociology, anthropology, philosophy, and psychology as important axillary tools of historical investigation. He thought it was undemocratic to view only politics, economy, wars and geography as the objectives of historical research. Also, he objected to the fact that the history of non-ruling nations in the Empire was not included in school textbooks and that official historiography stressed interpretations favorable to the ruling nationalities and ignored the history and achievements of non-ruling nationalities. In addition to his basic belief that it was impossible to understand fully the present without a considerable knowledge of the past, Masaryk was convinced that it was possible to learn from history and to avoid at least some tragedies and mistakes of the past.

He found many rich and long-forgotten sources from which individuals and the Czech nation could draw upon for inspiration. While he perceived Jan Hus and the Czech reformation of the fifteenth and the sixteenth centuries to be at the roots of modern Czech thinking and of Czech 'humanistic ideals', he equally appreciated the philosophical assumptions and intellectual endeavors of the Czech enlighteners of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, especially political concepts formulated by František Palacky and Karel Havlícek. Because of their attention to cultural work, in the sense of spiritual elevation of common people, Masaryk fostered their concepts as better suited to the complex needs of modern Czech society than the relatively narrow orientation of Czech political parties of his day. He called this philosophy of a broad outlook on positive human

potentials in relation to the idea of progress, 'humanistic ideals'.[44] Masaryk sagaciously placed his deliberations in a broader European context, pointing to similarities, and especially differences, reflecting upon the variety of conditions in which specific patterns emerged.[45]

Masaryk was less critical of manipulative and often ignorant German interpretations of Czech history, than of the reluctance of Czech historians to utilize several decades of relative freedom in the Empire to produce any substantial works on Czech history.[46] One of Masaryk's major objectives (which reflected the stand of 'Realist' historians) was to obtain the inclusion of Czech history and its major figures (such as Jan Hus, J.A. Komensky, Karel Havlícek Borovsky, František Palacky) in school textbooks.[47] He considered it highly undemocratic that non-German nationalities had to learn a great deal about German history, yet Austrian Germans lacked even basic knowledge of other nationalities in the Empire. Even more importantly, these nationalities were unable to freely learn about themselves in their schools.

In *Ceská otáazka,* Masaryk urged young Czech intellectuals to study their historical and cultural heritage, to accept it as a part of their identity, and to work for the advancement of its positive aspects while not ignoring its negative sides. This implied that making a conscious effort to relate personal growth and advancement to that of the nation would in many ways be beneficial for both the individual and the nation. His efforts reflected his persuasion that the past had a much greater impact on human psychology and values than was generally acknowledged, and that this knowledge could provide for constructive views and attitudes. In this respect he rejected the excessive individualism of liberalism because, in his views (based on his own sociological observations), it underestimated the psychological and practical benefits of the feeling of belonging to a larger community, of which a nation had the greatest potential to provide optimal conditions from the overall development of the individual and his involvement in the advancement of society. He believed that the right of

nations to their identity and dignified existence had roots in the humanistic concepts of Western European thought in the seventeenth century.[48]

The reason why Masaryk got involved in these issues, which seem to be of only secondary importance for modernization and democratization, was that the young Czech intellectuals and students lived with a 'crises of identity' and general disorientation as to the purpose of their work.[49] Too often they looked to foreign countries, especially France and Russia, for inspiration. This increased the tendency to embrace radical ideas, but they lacked the knowledge of the realities from which these various radical ideas had developed, as well as of their own environment and roots. He considered a thorough knowledge of one's own environment and an awareness of its potential and problems to be necessary preconditions for genuine work designed to improve and democratize society. The most apparent and immediate consequence of Masaryk's writings was a substantial rise in interest among Czech intellectuals in the history of their own nation and its destiny. The combination of 'humanistic ideals'[50], the conscious identification with the Czech nation, and the emphasis on positive personal growth and the growth of others, became known as the 'Czech philosophy'.[51] Its practical side, the search for numerous non-political ways to help individuals as well as groups, was possibly one of the most instrumental components of Czech development before 1914, and contributed to the relative success of Czechoslovak democracy between the world wars.

Women's Rights

Women, as the largest group so far excluded from the process of democratization, became an object of Masaryk's continued attention. He viewed the impact of their role as mothers and wives as critical to the goals of democratization. He investigated their situation and the obstacles preventing them from obtaining a more equitable position in education, the family and society as a whole. He perceived women as equal to men,

with some differences due to their biological role, and he insisted that the differences were of a complementary nature and not a sign of female inferiority. Masaryk considered the equal opportunities for women as an extremely relevant issue. He wanted men and society at large to recognize that motherhood was, socially and economically, as important as paid work and that the child-bearing role of women should not be a reason for their discrimination.

In relation to the democratic values, he considered 'enlightened' motherhood quite pertinent. His major assumption was that basic social attitudes, values and feelings of trust are formed early in life, and that children probably learn these more through experience and the examples of others than through instruction. He was aware that most women were not in a situation where they could give the necessary basic care to their children, much less cultivate socially desireable feelings, attitudes and skills. Obedience, fear, and physical punishment were the major tools of child rearing, an unsuitable heritage from the undemocratic social and political order of the past. Most women, in Masaryk's view, were in great need of emancipation through education, political involvement and the ability to support themselves economically when needed. Changes in the attitude of the men and husbands toward women were inseparable elements of this scheme; on the part of men, he called for a better understanding of women's intellectual and emotional needs.[52]

Masaryk favored equal educational opportunities for women, and argued, notably in the Reichsrat, that not only families but the whole of society would benefit since more women would be responsive mothers and happier human beings.[53] Expanded educational opportunities would also enhance the abilities of women to positively contribute to the economy. Most women had to earn money at some point in their lives, but were poorly prepared for such a task. Moreover, the income of most families, especially in cities, was far from sufficient to secure a decent living. Thus, most women were severely overworked as a result of their efforts to supplement the family income since, in addition to a paid job,

they had to handle all work at home as well. In his public lectures, Masaryk discussed other important aspects of women's unequal lot, the most important being too great a number of unwanted pregnancies which resulted either in too many (often unwanted or illegitimate) children or disastrous abortions, all due to the excessive sexual demands of men, cultivated by fashionable medical theories about the harmful effects of sexual abstinence on mental health. All these aspects had a serious negative impact on women's health, contributed to their subordination, and were the major factors in preventing women from greater involvement in public matters and the advancement of their intellectual potential. Masaryk especially condemned the widespread absence of husbands from the home and child-rearing responsibilities because of their supposed 'right' to rest and to spend a considerable amount of time and money in pubs after work.[54]

Masaryk clearly believed that a woman's potential was equal to that of a man. He suggested that more attention should be given to the cultivation of greater understanding and cooperation between men and women, instead of retaining the traditional master-slave relation based upon the physical and economic advantages of men. Such equality would also provide a solid foundations for the democratic process. In his studies on women's emancipation, he tried to trace the traditional as well as modern roots of women's subordination, most important being the physical superiority of men, the role of men as warriors and bread winners, disadvantageous religious beliefs and erroneous medical theories. He showed the incompatibility of these theories with the possibilities and needs of a modern society, whose major goal was justice and prosperity. But he warned that providing equal opportunities for women, in order to give them chances to choose and develop their potential, should in no case mean imitating men (especially their bad habits such as smoking, drinking, avoiding family responsibilities, etc.). This could open the possibility for an even worse exploitation of women.[55]

As with other underprivileged groups, improved educational opportunities were a means for an increase of female pride and self-respect, as well as respect from others. Masaryk wanted women to be more involved in voluntary organizations, interest groups, political parties and public life in general. He urged women to use existing opportunities, including those provided by activities of their husbands,[56] and to work for generating as many new openings as possible. Public debate and communication of existing problems was again seen as a necessary condition for improvement.

Workers' Rights

In the context of democracy, Masaryk's analyses of what he called the 'social question' are highly relevant.[57] While he believed that a satisfactory solution to the plight of the working class was not possible without workers' participation in the political process, he thought that some improvements might be possible through greater understanding and initiative on the part of parliamentary representatives.[58] He viewed repressive policies of the state against workers as counterproductive and contributing to social tensions rather than to social stability. As was the case with the 'women's question', Masaryk perceived the 'social question' as primarily a moral issue, since most workers lived in conditions which could hardly be considered humane. The official working day in Austria was eleven hours, but employees, especially in small businesses, worked much longer. Masaryk suggested such social security measures as pensions for retirees and disability payments as not only justified and affordable but, in the long run, advantageous for society and employers. He argued that an eight-hour working day would make employees more efficient and responsible. It would also give workers more opportunities to be constructively involved in family life, self-education, and to maintain better health. Although Masaryk concurred with many of the complaints and demands made by the workers, he profoundly disagreed with the radical and revolu-

tionary theories of the workers' parties, particularly those of which posited Marxism as a realistic program for solving social problems.[59]

Masaryk tried to explain in the Reichsrat as well as in his writings why modern social problems could not be resolved by charity alone, and why the Christian concept of love, so valuable an aspect of Western civilization, was insufficient in this respect. In his view, to achieve greater harmony of political practices with modern political concepts and ideals, and to prevent undesirable radical developments, the concept of social justice had to be incorporated into the political philosophy of the Empire. Greater government initiative was indispensable for substantial improvements in the conditions of the lower classes. He also noted the need for more initiative from the workers themselves, particularly through voluntary interest organizations and self-help associations. As in the case of the general population, Masaryk saw education as the most important instrument for the spiritual, moral and economic well being of the working classes.[60] His enthusiasm for special schools for workers was reflected in the fact that in the 1890s he was the first Czech university professor to give lectures in workers' associations and in the Workers' Academy, of which he was a founding member. It was not a coincidence that his lectures in the Academy focused on modern ethical trends.[61]

While Masaryk was primarily concerned with the 'humanization' of conditions for the workers, he had equal concern for the alienation of all 'dependent classes' from the mainstream of society. He considered their social, political and economic integration important for social and political stability and for the quality of the whole society. Unlike many of his contemporaries, he viewed workers and the lower classes as a part of the nation, and insisted that their integration was not only of interest to the more privileged classes, but that it was the obligation of the elites to assist in this process. From this perspective, Masaryk was critical of the ideology of economic liberalism and of Marxism because they were socially divisive, splitting society into uncooperative and even hostile factions. Although Masaryk underestimated Marxism as a future political force, he

analyzed Marxism thoroughly, criticizing mainly its inconsistencies, radicalism, narrow orientation, the lack of constructive concepts. He was, however, also critical of contemporary economic liberalism because it failed to pay adequate attention to social and moral evils. Liberalism seemed to lack a concern for the cultural and historical dimensions of the life and weakened the religious and moral foundations of society, thus contributed indirectly to the growth of radical movements.

Role of Religion

Religion played an important role in Masaryk's reflections on democracy. He saw the advancement of democracy interlocked with the advancement of individual moral and ethical values. He criticized churches and the insufficient incentives they provided for believers to cultivate an enlightened and knowledgeable world view. But, at the same time, he saw religion as the most important source of human ties to other people and to the universe, one which provided the perspective needed to form a consistent philosophy of life, without which no true morality was possible.

Masaryk's concept of democracy was inseparably bound to morality as well as to a balanced concern for physical and spiritual needs of human beings, both as individuals and members of a community.[62] He believed that general principles of morality were dependent on an 'objective perception of the world', which was difficult to obtain without some ultimate authority - God.[63] In the historical context of individual and social human existence he viewed the continuous search for meaning in life as real and in need of fulfillment and explanation. Consequently, he rejected the theory of the 'struggle for survival' as insufficient since it ignored some important aspects of human nature and existence. In his view, only religion possessed a key to this mystery, though he was not sure to what extent, nor even what kind of religion, i.e., within the framework of Christianity which he felt was inseparably bound to Western civilization. While unsure of several things, he did not doubt that the modern struggle for

democracy had its roots in Christian ethics, especially its concept of love toward one's fellow man. He was critical of positivism as a method of scholarly investigation because it ignored values as irrelevant. He viewed positivism's central thesis, that facts speak for themselves, as ethically deficiency.

Masaryk was frequently criticized by Czechs because of his insistence that Protestantism, with its practice of Bible interpretation by the laity, fostered freer and more critical thinking than Catholicism. But he reproached both churches for their preoccupation with increasing their temporal powers.[64] The cultivation of morality did not seem to be at the forefront of their interests, though many social problems were a direct result of the increasing moral uncertainties of the time.[65] He believed that science, philosophy, agnosticism (often really indifferentism), liberalism (especially American liberalism with its tolerance of any view) and law could not replace the role of religion in the moral sphere, particularly where attitudes to other people and the responsibility for their overall positive developments were concerned. Masaryk also pointed out that the inter-relationship among politics, morality, and religion was an urgent issue requiring scrupulous investigation.[66]

While Masaryk was in favor of scientific explanations of the world, human experience and truth, he saw no contradiction between science and religion. He believed that the complete truth about the universe was most probably out of reach of human beings, and that their energies, in the search for knowledge and its responsible uses for the benefit of people and civilization, were limited. Since he valued democracy because it provided the best possibilities for the human development, religion as an instrument of morality on several levels had, in his view, the power to encourage the harmonious development of human beings in all important areas; be it moral, intellectual, cultural, political or economic.[67] Under existing conditions, the involvement of churches in cultivating morality, assisting in removing traditional class and gender privileges, and advancing

the idea of social justice seemed to be their most important, and to date, neglected task.

Religion and the churches could not escape the process of incorporating the expanding knowledge about the world and human experience into their teachings. It was increasingly difficult for people to accept religion and God only as a result of 'revelation'.[68] He was particularly concerned about the Catholic Church's lack of concern with positive moral and intellectual human potentials. This lack of concern was, he felt, turning young people away from the Church, and spreading materialism despite the general recognition of the need for a greater emphasis on the spiritual aspects of life.[69] Although Masaryk did not underestimate the importance of economic well-being, particularly for the underprivileged, he believed that a much broader effort was needed to elevate the lower classes to a level in which they could become an integral part of society in a cultural, moral and political sense, and in which they could responsibly and effectively participate in the democratic process.[70]

Advancing Political Democracy

Indicating the realistic possibilities for improvement, and attempting to increase conscious efforts on the part of institutions, groups and individuals to get involved in working for improvement, are salient features of Masaryk's writing on democracy. Its substance rests equally on an individualistic drive to improve one's own qualities and abilities, and on incorporating the concerns with the needs and problems of others. This approach was important primarily from psychological point of view, moderating the liberal idea of excessive individualism which took the privileges of some and the exploitation of others for granted.

Discussions of various topics related to democracy are present in most of Masaryk's writings, but he produced several short studies devoted completely to problems of advancing political democracy.[71] On the whole, while he appreciated the common historical roots of the Western struggle

for political and social democratization, he also considered as important the differences that developed in each individual country which were conditioned by a unique historical experience, character and level of development. Masaryk believed that this struggle could be successful only if the particular conditions of each entity are taken into serious consideration, and emphasis of efforts to improve is placed within the specific context of each entity.

With regard to the important realities of the Habsburg Empire, Masaryk especially noted the issue of equitable representation of all national groups in government, and the 'social question'. In relation to the situation of the Czech nation, he viewed its concentration on advancing democracy in non-political areas through various individual and group initiatives as highly relevant. Generally, Masaryk presented self-knowledge, knowledge of one's environment, and rationality combined with morality as key instruments to resolve problems, to make compromises and to advance justice. He considered it important that the public have open and easily available access to up-to-date information, and that it obtain a good and relevant education, including politics. In this respect Masaryk worried that the press, as a main source of information and political education, had a dubious impact on the public. At the same time, he saw the need for a far greater public control of the political process, particularly in light of the fact that parliamentary representatives lacked professional expertise in various fields, and that the parliamentary process was becoming more inefficient.

Masaryk was increasingly interested in analyzing why democracy and democratic values had made, after 1900, such little advancement in the Empire.[72] He found representation of various interest groups to be the most crucial to this problem, primarily because of the serious shortcomings in the Austrian electoral system. He accepted from Mirabeau that representative bodies should proportionally reflect organized political parties and trends, and cautioned that universal suffrage by itself does not guarantee that this important demand would be met.[73] This situation be-

came even clearer after 1907, when universal suffrage was introduced in Austria, but the significance of representative bodies decreased. The advancement of democracy was threatened in the whole of Europe by birth of extreme political attitudes, which occurred even within parties with democratic ideologies.[74]

Masaryk believed that the root of this development was complex; among the most significant factors were the insistence on maintaining the *status quo* by most influential political leaders in Austria, and the unwillingness of traditional liberal institutions to respond properly to important and relevant social, economic and national realities. The lack of concern for existing social problems and for the advancement of democracy in social, cultural and intellectual contexts, he found especially frightful. In the general atmosphere of an impending disaster, he probably hoped that his studies would generate greater interest on the part of intellectuals, politicians, and elites in these issues which had been ignored to an alarming degree for decades.

He felt that concentration on the advancement of democracy was the only realistic option to decreasing existing social and national tensions and to invigorating the Empire. But he did not perceive democracy as something 'natural' for the society. In his view, it was a result of the conscious effort and work of the institutions and individuals (especially the educated) who shared the faith in the overall benefits of democracy, and in determination to advance and maintain it.[75] As such, democracy had to encompass all important areas of public, private, and professional life. He felt, however, that most people were still more concerned with gaining privileges for themselves rather than struggling for democracy. In fact, he considered the struggle for individual gain to be closer to human nature than the emphasis on the advancement of democracy. He viewed contemporary society as in transition from undemocratic traditions and political system to democracy.[76] Masaryk argued that the revolution was a legitimate means to establish democracy,[77] but only if it was the last remaining alternative. But he also maintained that it had no chance for

lasting success if it was not firmly backed by generally accepted democratic values, attitudes, and if all the necessary virtues and skills for democratic conduct on the part of a substantial segment of the population were not present.

He also recognized democracy as synonymous with efficient and honest work by individuals,[78] groups, and institutions bound together with a shared concern for the individual, community and the common good. He had, however, no illusions as to the difficulty of influencing deeply-rooted attitudes, perceptions, interests, and natural inclinations. Thus, he considered schools and the family as the most important instruments in rearing future generations who would be prepared for the complex tasks of democracy.[79] He also did not underestimate the significance of the press and other means of communication as tools for the advancement of democracy.

Conclusion

For more than three decades, Masaryk wrote on and discussed the topic of democracy theoretically and with a view to the specificity of Austrian and Czech realities. Besides relevant political institutions, and freedom for as much individual initiative as possible, the most crucial aspect in advancing democracy was, in his view, education in the broadest sense of the term. The search for knowledge and its rational and moral application for the benefit of as many as possible, combined with the continuous cultivation of democratic and moral values and skills, was essential for democratic conduct. Democracy was the best available means, as well as guarantee, for the advancement of people as multidimensional beings. Their cultural, intellectual, moral, emotional, economical and political dimensions were equally important in the stage of development which Western civilization had achieved by that time. It still remains to be seen how much influence Masaryk had on the Czech public generally, but there is significant evidence that his ideas had a considerable impact

on certain groups, such as students, women and teachers. This was probably more noticeable after 1918, when the democratic system in Czechoslovakia proved to be more stable and durable than in other Central European countries.

Notes

1. Basic statistical data on the population of the Austro-Hungarian Empire and its organization can be found in a number of books. A good review in English, for example, is in Bruce M. Garver, *The Young Czech Party 1874-1901 and the Emergence of a Multi-Party System*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1978, 29-60.

2. František Palacky (1798-1876) is best known for his two statements proclaimed in 1848: "If Austria did not exist, we would have to create it". After the creation of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, he lost faith in its ability to survive a major European military crisis and proclaimed: "We existed before Austria was created, and we will exist after it breaks up." Palacky was an official Czech historian, who wrote four volumes of *Ceské dejiny národu ceského*. The first volume was written in German, the other three, after the defeat of the revolution in 1848, in Czech. He greatly contributed to the self-knowledge of the Czech nation, and had a much greater understanding for the positive aspects of the Czech Hussite movement than did the Austrian historians. He ended his *Ceské dejiny* with the year 1526 (the enthronement of the Habsburgs in the Bohemian Kingdom), because the Viennese censorship would not permit a critical approach to the rule of the Habsburgs in the lands of the Czech Crown. The major theme of Palacky's historical work was the Czech struggle for survival against the Germans. Masaryk opposed this interpretation of Czech history, trying to prove that Czech history had many positive achievements and ideas worthy of further cultivation. Palacky was a Czech political leader until his death, capable of preserving relative unity of Czech political struggles.

Masaryk authored several studies on Palacky because he felt that younger generations knew nothing about him, despite the continuing relevance of his works. His most significant study is "Palackého idea národa ceského." *Naše doba*, 5 (1897-98): 769-95. 2nd ed., Praha: Grosman a Svoboda, 1912.

Masaryk also wrote about Palacky in other works such as *Ceská otázka, Karel Havlícek* and in "*Casové smery a tuzby,*" *Naše doba* I (1894), no. 2, 3, 4.

3. Karel Havlícek (1821-1856) was a brilliant Czech journalist. He was a political writer, journalist, author, and poet. He published several Czech newspapers, was a deputy in the Kremsier Parliament, and actively resisted Austrian conservatism, clericalism, and neo-absolutism. His major concern was with the political education of Czechs in a democratic spirit. The Viennese government exiled him to Brixen because, with his balanced liberal views, he had a very broad influence among Czechs. He was called the 'darling of the Czechs', *(Milácek Cechu)*. He contracted tuberculosis in Brixen and died

in 1856, soon after his release. Masaryk discussed Havlícek's ideas in a number of his works, and wrote one full volume on Havlícek, analyzing his views on a number of modern political ideas and concepts: *Karel Havlícek: Snahy a tuzby politického probuzení.* Praha: Jan Laichter, 1896.

4. The most detailed work on the national role of the Bohemian nobility before 1918, is Josef Holecek, *Ceská Slechta*, Praha: Ceskoslovenské podniky tiskarské, 1918.

5. The activities of Palacky and Havlícek during the 1848 revolution are explored by Stanley Pech, *The Czech Revolution of 1848.* Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1969.

6. These figures on the number of Czechs and Germans in the Bohemian Kingdom are generally accepted by historians. They are based on the government's official data published on a regular basis before 1914.

7. German demands for the division of the Bohemian Kingdom were first formulated in 1880, probably as a result of the German failure to prevent the introduction of the Stremeyer linguistic decrees in 1880 which had increased the status of the Czech language in Bohemia and Moravia, and the failure to establish German as the official language in Austria. These were proposed in the Viennese Parliament (Reichsrat) by Herbst and Wurmbrand in May 1880. These motions are discussed in detail, by William A. Jenks, *Austria Under the Iron Ring*, 1879-1893. Charlottesville: The University Press of Virginia, 1965, 90. It is sometimes claimed even by serious historians that the German demand for the division of the Bohemian Kingdom was made in response to the Czech demand for the establishment of Czech as "the only official language throughout Bohemia and Moravia," (but not Silesia, which was the third Crown land of the Bohemian Kingdom). This is unlikely, because the Czechs never made such a demand. (For example, such a claim is made by Robert Kann, *History of the Habsburg Empire 1526-1918.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1974, 440).

8. Czech deputies in the Viennese Parliament often presented as "the most ruthless exploitation" the fact that only 40 percent of direct taxes collected in the Bohemian Kingdom went back to it for all its needs; the rest was kept by the Viennese government for its particular purposes (over 17 percent of it went to the military). For example, "Rec Dr. Eduarda Grégra na ríšské rade." *Národní listy,* 17 December 1891. The Czech demand for the federalization of the Empire was based partly on the argument that more money would be available for economic purposes, especially agriculture, education, and culture if the Land Diets had more money at their disposal.

9. A detailed description of this program can be found in Stanley Z. Pech, *The Czech Revolution of 1848*, 47-48.

10. Jan Neruda (1834-1891), together with Vítezslav Hálek (1835-1874), Karolína Svetlá (1830-1899) and Eliska Krásnohorská (1847-1926), are the most significant representatives of the generation of writers and poets who, since the 1850s, revolted against romanticism and moral codes based on authoritarian values. Their works combined a sensitivity toward the often unpleasant realities of Czech life with ambitions for artistic expression and modernity. Neruda, with his most realistic approach to life and admiration for knowledge, including scientific knowledge, came to be more appreciated after his death than others. A good description of literary works in Czech lands in this period is in Arne Novak, *Czech Literature*, translated from Czech by Peter Kussi, edited with a supplement by William E. Harkins. Ann Arbor: Michigan Slavic Publications 1976, 161-198.

11. The best work in English on Czech cultural advancement in the nineteenth century is Peter Brock and H. Gordon Skilling, *The Czech Renascence of the Nineteenth Century*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1970.

12. Differences in the social mobility of Czechs and Germans (especially in Prague) are discussed by Gary B. Cohen, *The Politics of Ethnic Survival: Germans in Prague, 1861-1914*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1981, 72-75.

13. In 1891, approximately 10 percent of the male adult population had the right to vote (the majority in rural areas, only indirectly). In 1895 due to Badeni's electoral reforem the fourth curiae was created and the number of voters was approximately tripled. The absurdities of the electoral laws in Austria were analyzed on several occasions by Czech deputies in the 1890s who mostly favored universal suffrage.

14. The National Liberal Party *(Národní strana svobodomylslná),* usually called "The Young Czech Party" *(Mladoceska strana),* separated formally as a more liberal wing from the only Czech party, the National Party *(Národní Strana)* in the 1870s. It was steadily gaining support among voters and in the elections for the Viennese Parliament in March 1891 resoundly defeated the National Party. Its official policy toward the government until 1896 was oppositional, allowing its deputies complete freedom to expose the Empire problems in public. Never before had the Reichsrat and the delegations (the only common government institution of Austria and Hungary dealing with foreign policy) heard such detailed, factual, and suggestive speeches. The most detailed work in English on the Young Czech Party is Bruce M. Garver, *The Young Czech Party 1874-1901 and the Emergence of a Multi-Party System*. The period of 1891-97 in relation to Young Czech deputies'

parliamentary work is dealt with in detail in Marie L. Neudorfl, the *Czech Liberal Party and its Political Activity, 1891-1897* unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Edmonton: University of Alberta, 1981.

15. Little could be done before 1914 in the Austrian policy-making process without the consent of Austria's German nobility, which was firmly tied to tradition and conservatism. This is explored by, for example, William M. Johnston, *The Austrian Mind - An Intellectual and Social History, 1848-1938*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1972, 30-75. He also elaborates on prevailing intellectual and ideological orientation among Austrian Germans.

16. While the number of Czech periodicals by the 1890s reached over one hundred, it was not easy for lower classes to have regular access to them because of their prohibitive cost. Most of these newspapers, magazine, and journals were, in the 1890s, in opposition to the Viennese government, maintaining great sympathy for the aims and concepts of the Young Czech Party. The most comprehensive work on Czech periodicals in this period is Frantisek Roubík, *Bibliographie ceského casopisectva z let 1863-1895,* Praha: Ceská akademie ved, 1936. He claims that the quality of Czech newspapers did not lag behind - and probably surpassed - the quality of German newspapers in Bohemia. *Ibid.,* xiii. In 1891, thirty-two Czech deputies (out of forty-two) were regularly contributing to Czech newspapers. Josef Penízek, *Ceská aktivita v Cechách v letech 1878-1918,* 2 vols, Praha: Cesky ctenár 1930-31, 1:11.

17. Many of these aspects of pre-1914 Germany are explored in English, for example by Gordon A. Craig, *The Germans*. New York: New American Library, 1983.

18. While Masaryk enjoys the reputation of being a great democrat, the historical literature which investigates his work from this point of view is scarce. Older Czech studies still provide the best references, either in the form of extensive quoting from Masaryk's works, or summarizing his major ideas. The principal works are: Frantisek Fajfr, "Masarykova filisofie demokracie", *Masarykuv Sbornik* I, Praha: 1924, 24, 1-16, 106-118, 207-225; E. Beneš, ed., *Sbornik T. G. Masarykovi k 60 narozeninám.* Praha: Grosman a Svoboda, 1910; Zdenek Franta, ed., *Masaryk, Mravní názory.* Praha: Státní nakladatelství, 1923; J. B. Kozák and others, eds., *Masarykova prace: Sbornik ze spisu, reci a projevy prvniho presidenta Ceskoslovenské republiky k osmdesátym jeho narozeninám,* Praha: Státní nakladatelství, 1930; Jan Herben, *Masaryk Politik.* Praha: Svaz národního osvobozeni, 1925; Josef Král, *Masaryk filosof humanity a demokracie.* Praha: Orbis, 1947; very useful is also Karel Capek, *Hovory s T.G.M.* Praha: Ceskoslovensky spisovatel, 1969 (first ed. issued between 1928 and 1935).

In English, a review of Masaryk's major ideas was made by Otakar Odlozilík, ed., *T. G. Masaryk: His Life and Thought.* New York City: Masaryk Institute, 1960. In Czechoslovakia after 1948, it was impossible to print objective works on Masaryk. The exception was 1968. However when Milan Machovec published his biography of Masaryk in 1968, he was more concerned with Masaryk's critique of Marxism than his views on democracy. Although eighty pages of Masaryk's works were included in the book, little referred to the question of democracy. (Soon after August 1968, Machovec's book was, of course, removed from libraries and put on index of prohibited books.) In Western countries it is only in recent years that the interest in Masaryk has been noticeable, though not always in the areas important for Masaryk's principal activities and thoughts. The subject of Masaryk's concept of democracy has received relatively little attention. There might be two reasons for this. First, Masaryk's understanding of democracy was unusually broad, interlocked with all major areas of human activity, making it difficult to study without considerable knowledge of conditions in specific areas of his contemporary environment. (An attempt to explain Masaryk's concept of democracy was made by R. Szporluk, "Masaryk's Idea of Democracy", *Slavonic and East European Review*, XLI, no. 96, December 1962, 31-49. Here, however, the author oversimplified Masaryk's assumptions with respect to his approaches to reality, and made sweeping generalizations and speculations.) Secondly, there is a recent tendency to approach Masaryk 'critically' (maybe a response to his presumed 'glorification" before 1938, maybe other more obscure reasons are involved), and a number of works, which can hardly be considered objective, were published in the 1980s.

René Wellek has called attention to the fact that "Masaryk has often been grievously misunderstood" in Tomášs G. Masaryk, *The Meaning of the Czech History,* edited and with an introduction by René Wellek, translated by Peter Kussi, Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1974, xvii. In general terms Wellek probably grasps the complex meaning of Masaryk's understanding of democracy better than any other historian; "Democracy meant to him the belief that every man should be able to strive for perfection, that no outward constraint, no social barrier, no economic or national oppression should bar his way to the realization of his humanity." He also tries to explain, especially for an American reader, differences between Masaryk's humanism and seemingly similar concept known in North America.

In relation to the second reason for neglecting Masaryk's concepts on democracy in most of the recently published works, Roman Szporluk's *The Political Thought of Tomas G. Masaryk*, Boulder, CO: East European Monographs, 1981, deals with Masaryk's ideas principally from philosophical - speculative approach. The reader is left puzzled why Masaryk occupied himself with a number of issues, including the concept of democracy. At the end of the chapter on 'Leadership: Democracy versus Theocracy', Szporluk says "No wonder that many of his contemporaries regarded him simply as a romanticist or

political mystic" before 1914 (79). Many of his exaggerated statements do not make references to their sources and, on the whole, do not link Masaryk's theoretical considerations with the existing social, economic and national problems in Austria. Eva Schmidt-Hartmann in her evaluative work, *Thomas G. Masaryk's Realism. Origins of a Czech Political Concept*, Munchen: R. Oldenbourgh Verlag, 1984, often discourses on details of terminology and phenomena of a secondary importance, and thus fails to grasp the essence of Masaryk's and the 'Realists' activity before 1914. For example, when describing Masaryk's work in the Reichsrat in 1891-93, she highlights his inexperience in parliamentary work and a lack of clear realistic objectives, ignoring the fact that Masaryk (as well as other Young Czechs of that period) provided the parliament with urgently needed and highly informative speeches, supported by detailed statistics on many long neglected educational, economic and political problems. Methodologically the least acceptable work is that of Josef Kalvoda, *The Genesis of Czechoslovakia*, Boulder, CO: East European Monographs, 1986. Kalvoda makes no attempt to distinguish between significant and insignificant facts, often making detailed speculations for which sources are dubious or unspecified. He shares with Schmidt-Hartmann a view that Masaryk's "mode of thought resembles modern totalitarian ideologies or a totalitarian kind of democracy" (Kalvoda, 20, Schmidt-Hartmann, 130).

Though only partly relevant, discussion on Masaryk and the Czechoslovak Republic 1918-1938 by F. Gregory Campbell, "Empty Pedestals?", Comments by Gale Stokes and Roman Szporluk, *Slavic Review*, Spring 1985, 1-29, should also be mentioned. Campbell's position is that Czechoslovakia as a nation-state collapsed because it was based on Masaryk's nationalism which was incompatible, in the long run, with democracy. While Stokes succeeds in pointing out the weaknesses of Campbell's major arguments and approaches, it is symptomatic of this discussion (similarly of those mentioned above), that specific grave problems in Austria are treated as irrelevant. If these problems were taken into account, the questionability of Campbell's belief that Austria might had developed in a more democratic direction after 1918 would, perhaps, have been clearer.

Other critical essays on Masaryk are in Milíc Capek and Karel Hruby, ed., *T. G. Masaryk in Perspective: Comments and Criticism*, SVU Press, 1981. Jan Patocka in "An Attempt at a Czech National Philosophy and its Failure" tries to show that from a philosophical point of view, Masaryk was unsuccessful. However, he ignores the fact that Masaryk viewed himself more as a sociologist, and with this perspective he approached realities, including historical developments. Vaclav Cerny's "The Essence of Masaryk's Personality" notes that Masaryk failed in all his undertakings, except in his admirable ability to consistantly exhibit moral strength. Cerny's considerations are very abstract, and the essential Masaryk's is overlooked. Karel Hruby in "Masaryk's Political Outlook" elaborates only briefly on Masaryk's understanding of democracy (129-30). He presents a short review of Czech scholars who recently expressed criticism toward Masaryk and his

political concepts, 130-34. A samizdat publication, *Masaryk a soucasnost*, a 600-page collection of studies on Masaryk by dissident historians, was edited by Milan Machovec, Petr Pithart, and Josef Dubsky, and is available in a few Western libraries. The publication was thoroughly reviewed by H. Gordon Skilling, "The Rediscovery of Masaryk," *Cross Currents: A Yearbook of Central European Culture*. Ann Arbor, 1983, 87-112.

The most recent relevant work on Masaryk published in the West (but in Czech) is that of Jaroslav Opat, *Filosof a politik, Tomáš Garrigue Masaryk 1882-1893*, Köln: Index, 1987. This book is an excellent review of Masaryk's various activities before 1893, as well as his views and those of many of his opponents. However some important issues of Masaryk's concern were not explored, including democracy. A book by Roland Hoffmann, *T. G. Masaryk und tschechische Frage,* Müchen: 1988, has also been recently published. This work is primarily concerned with Masaryk's views on position of the Czech nation in the framework of the Habsburg monarchy.

19. Around 1875 Masaryk published nine articles in *Moravská orlice* about political theory and practice. Jan Herben, *Masaryk politik*. Praha: Svaz národního osvobození, 1925. As more detailed explanation of his assumptions is in *Základové konkrétní logiky*, Praha: Bursík & Kohout, 1885, 108, 150-187, and in *Modern Man and Religion*. Translated by Ann Bibra and Dr. Václav Beneš (from *Moderní clovek a nábozenství), London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd., 1938, 37-61, 161-212.* Also published by Westport: Greenwood Press, 1970.

20. Around 1907 Masaryk began to consider revolution as the last recourse for achieving legitimate aims, if all other means failed. He added this option in later editions of *Ceská otázka*. For example, *Ceská otázka. Naše nynejší krise*. Praha: Cin, 1936, 287. Masaryk seems to mention revolution as an alternative for attaining political and social changes in Austria for the first time in 1894. "O pomerném zastoupení." *Naše doba* I. no. 1, 20 December 1894, 17-21. Masaryk also viewed Jesus as a kind of a revolutionary. T. G. Masaryk, *Klerikalismus a socialismus*. (Public lecture, 30 March 1907 in *Valasské Meziricí). Valasske Mezirici, Politicky pokrokovy spolek*, 1907, 2nd ed.

21. Masaryk always understood education in a broad sense, which included efforts for a better grasp of social, cultural, economic and political realities. He believed that such a comprehensive understanding contributed to a more responsive and constructive approach to life; not only to one's own but also to that of others, and the nation's. Although this thesis occurs in the majority of his work, it is developed most extensively in *Ceská otázka*, Praha: Cas, 1895.

22. *Základovékonkrétní logiky*, 224. Generally, these ideas can be found in most of Masaryk's relevant works; they are best summarized in T. G. Masaryk, *Demokratism v politice*. (Originally a lecture at the Czech Technical School on 19 May 1912); and in *Nesnáze demokracie*. Praha: Pokrok, 1913. Other more specific works will be mentioned below.

23. The most important of Masaryk's works discussing various problems related to the democratization of non-political areas are *Ceská otázka. Nase nynejsi krise a desorganizace mladoceske strany*. Praha: Cas, 1895; *Karel Havlícek: Snahy a tuzby politického probuzeni*. Praha: Jan Laichter, 1896. (It is important to be aware that the English translation of *Ceská otázka* is not verbatim. It includes parts of other studies by Masaryk, and references to contemporary conditions were often omitted from the translation. *The Meaning of Czech History*, edited and with an Introduction by Rene Wellek, translated by Peter Kussi, Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1974.) In other studies, Masaryk relates the issue of democratization with national identity more explicitly: *Jan Hus*. Praha: Cas, 1896; *Hus ceskemu studenstvu*. Praha: Spolek evangelickych akademiku Jeronym, 1900 (2nd ed.); "O národnosti, mezinárodnosti a humanite." *Cas* XI. no.5, 30 January 1897, 72-76. A series of articles in *Naše doba* (1894-96) on Dobrovsky, Kollár, Safarík and Palacky is also relevant in this context. *Právo historické a prirozené*. Praha: Cas, 1900. Most of Masaryk's important articles and speeches on 'women question', which he regarded as exceptionally relevant to democratization, are compiled in *Masaryk a zeny. Sborník*. Praha: Zenska narodni rada, 1930.

24. It would seem that this approach has important implications even in our times. In spite of their struggle for democracy, some countries repeatedly failed to achieve it mainly because they focused exclusively on the political aspects of democracy and did not pay enough attention to other relevant factors.

25. The best review of the negotiations between Czech politicians and the Viennese government about political, national and cultural concessions to Czechs between 1848 and 1914 is still to be found in Zdenek V. Tobolka, *Politické dejiny ceskoslovenského národa od roku 1848 az do dnešní doby*. 4 vols. in 5. Praha: Ceskoslovensky Kompas, 1932-36. In English, reviews can be found in Bruce M. Garver, *The Young Czech Party 1874-1901 and the Emergence of a Multi-Party System*, 29-59, 121-153, 217-278. Masaryk's *Ceská otázka* was to great extent a response to the political demoralization among Czechs after exceptional measures were declared for Prague and surroundings in September 1893 which were designed to block the increasing political activity of the Czech public. Masaryk argued on several occasions that closer relations with Germany fostered an unwillingness on the part of the Viennese government and Austrian politicians to make genuine attempts to solve

the major political and national problems in the Empire. Like the other Czech deputies, he especially opposed the rule in delegations not to make connections between foreign and domestic policies and the principle of 'non-political policy.' (This principle was accepted by the majority of the Reichsrat at the suggestion of the Crown Speech of April 11, 1891. It basically meant an exclusion of all discussions about national constitutional and denominational matters. The rule was in force for several years, and was especially aimed at critics of increasingly closer relations between the Empire and Germany. "Otázka ceská v nové rade ríšké." *Národni listy*, 29 March 1891.) For Masaryk's speech in the Reichsrat on foreign policy, 14 June 1893, see *Narodi listy*, 15 June 1893.

26. *Základové konkrétní logiky*, 224.

27. Masaryk's parliamentary speeches on foreign policy, especially those delivered between 1891 and 1893, reflect these views clearly. Most of them, slightly abridged, are in Jirí Kovtun, *Slovo má poslanec Masaryk*. München: Edice Arkyr, 1985.

28. Masaryk summarized his views on major political problems in the program of the 'Realists,' of whom he was one of the most prominent member. "Návrh programu lidového." *Cas* IV. no. 44, 1 November 1890. Analysis of this program is in "Glosy ku programu lidovému." *Cas* IV, no. 45, 8 November, no. 46, 15 November, and no. 47, 22 November 1890. Universal suffrage and equal educational opportunities at the secondary and university levels for women were a part of this program. The 'Realists' joined the Czech National Liberal Party (the Young Czechs) before the elections for the Viennese Parliament in March 1891, and they were very influential (especially Masaryk) in formulating the party's political program: "Celostátní prohlášení mladoceské strany k ceskému lidu." *Národní listy*, 22 February 1891 (and in several other following issues).

29. Masaryk's conviction that the support of Austrian Germans was needed for political reforms was expressed most strongly in his speech to the voters of Strakonice on 22 September 1891. "Poslanec prof. T. G. Masaryk pred volici." *Národní listy,* 24 September 1891. Because of the speech, this edition of *Narodni listy* was confiscated by the police, but *Plzenské listy* reported the content of the speech in detail on 24 September 1891.

30. Besides monographs and studies mentioned in note 23, the following works are most relevant: *Ideály humanitní*. Praha: Cas, 1901; English translation, *Humanistic Ideals*. translation and Preface by W. Preston Waren with a Foreword by Hubert Humphrey. Lewisburg: Bucknell University Press, 1971; "Humanita a narodnost." *Naše doba* IV, no. 3, 20 December 1896, 193-205; "O národnosti, mezinárodnosti a humanite." *Cas* XI, no 5, 30 January 1897, 72-76; *Právo historické a prirozené*. Praha: Cas, 1900.

31. Masaryk valued the existence of the Habsburg Empire from the national point of view (mainly as security for participating nations) as well as from international point of view (economic advantages, etc.). He firmly believed that it was possible to persuade the Austrian Germans and their representatives through detailed information and sound arguments that it was in the interest of all to work for the genuine solution of existing problems. However, by 1893 he became bitterly disappointed and on several occasions noted that the stubborn insistence of the German representatives in the Reichsrat on centralism and the *status quo* generally, would eventually work against the stability of the Empire and towards its destruction. While he favored federal reorganization of the Empire, he focused on arguments justifying the demand of a greater autonomy of the Bohemian Kingdom (concentrating particularly on issues such as taxes, educational system, and economic policies). When Masaryk realized that the parliamentary majority (mostly Austrian Germans) was not responsive to the evidence presented and that parliament had increasingly less influence on policy and decision-making, he resigned his parliamentary seat in September 1893. It is noteworthy that in 1891 Masaryk had openly written that it was necessary to be prepared for a collapse of the Austro-Hungarian empire. This statement was made in the context of addressing the question of how to make the Czech nation more mature in all spheres, particularly in the political domain. T. G. Masaryk, "Nekolik uvah o slovanské otázce." *Cas* V, no. 4, 17 December 1891, 660-71.

32. For example, in 1890s Bohemia annually contributed about 120 million gulden to the state treasury, but Bohemia received back from the Viennese government only 40 million for all its needs. "Schuze Snemu ceského království." *Národní listy*, 1 January 1891. More detailed statistics are in *Oesterreichisches Statistisches Handbuch. K. K. Oesterreichische Statistische Zentralkomission.* Wien: A. Hoelder, 1891-1900.

33. This was especially relevant concerning the abolition of Badeni's decrees in 1897. They were aimed at the near parity of Czechs and Germans in government administration in Bohemia and Moravia. The violent reactions of Austrian Germans had a demoralizing effect on Czechs. Josef Penízek, a Czech journalist residing in Vienna in this period, claimed in 1906 that the failure of Viennese government to implement these decrees caused, among Czechs, a complete collapse of trust in the monarchy. Josef Penízek, *Aus bewegten Zeiten 1895 - 1905.* Wien: Karl Konegen, 1906. He also described the German victory as permanently weakening parliamentarism and constitutionalism in Austria. Penízek, *Ceská aktivita v Cechách v letech 1878-1918.* 2 vols. Praha: Cesky ctenár, 1930-31, 2: 386.

Masaryk's arguments in favor of greater political democratization for the Czech nation took into the consideration that the Czechs comprised two thirds of the population in the Bohemian Kingdom. Thus, their unequal position *vis-a-vis* the German minority was

absurd in the light of modern progressive political concepts. He also claimed that German justification for their dominant position by their economic, cultural and historical superiority did not truly reflect realities of the 1890s. For example, W. A. Jenks, in *Austria Under the Iron Ring, 1879-1893,* 274, states that Czech cultural development was by the 1880s very close to that of the Germans. A comparison of economic development among the Bohemian Czech and the Germans is found in Jan Havránek,, "The Development of Czech Nationalism," *Austrian History Yearbook*, 3, pt.2 (1967), 223-60. Havranek states that "during the second half of the nineteenth century the Germans were actually surpassed in wealth by the Czechs in Bohemia." Ibid., 245.

34. "Poslanecká snemovna." *Národní listy*, 20 March 1893. Masaryk remained in favor of universal suffrage, even when the Young Czech Party temporarily removed the demand for it from its program in 1896. When Masaryk established a new People's Party at the beginning of the 1900s, this demand was a part of its program.

35. A review of attitudes on universal suffrage is found in Jan Havránek, *Boj za všeobecné, prímé a rovné hlasovací právo roku 1893.* Praha: Ceskoslovenská akademie ved, 1964. Penízek mentions that the arguments used in the Reichsrat in favor of direct elections in rural areas were based on the fact that there had been eight years of compulsory education in Austria since 1867. Penízek, *Ceskí aktivita*, 2: 121. Masaryk's view on proportional representation is summarized in "O pomerném zastoupení" *Naše doba* I, no. 1, 1894. The Austrian electoral reform of 1907 is analyzed in William A. Jenks, *The Austrian Electoral Reform of 1907.* New York: Columbia University Press, 1950. The electoral reform of 1882 made about 10% adult male population eligible for voting. By 1896 this percentage was approximately tripled, and in 1907 a universal suffrage was introduced; indirect for males older than 24 years, and direct for males older than 30 years.

36. See note number 25.

Masaryk and other Czech deputies pointed out that it was, basically, a lack of knowledge of Slavs on the part of Austrian Germans and their political leaders in particular, which generated their prejudices toward Slavic groups in the Empire. This lack of knowledge contributed to the German desire for greater centralism and Germanization. In November 1892, Masaryk delivered a speech in the Reichsrat where he analyzed, in very specific and bitter terms, German ignorance of important realities of the empire related to its multinational character and historical context. "Rec poslance prof. dr. T. G. Masaryka pri rozpoctové debaté ra ríšské rade dne 18 listopadu." *Národní listy,* 23 November 1892. The speech caused a great commotion in the Reichsrat, and since Masaryk made references to the Bohemian *Staatsrecht,* German deputy Max Menger declared him a traitor.

Despite the loud support of German representatives, Menger was rebuked by majority of the house. The detailed description of this incident is in Josef Penízek, *Ceská aktivita*, 2: 161-62.

37. "Rec poslance prof. dr. T. G. Masaryka pri rozpoctové debaté na ríšské rade dne 18. listopadu."

38. Ibid. In this speech, Masaryk also refers to several German authors writing in favor of Germanization of Slavs, including the Czechs. During his second term, Masaryk devoted two speeches to the defense of the federal reform (20 July 1907 and 7 November 1911), in which he tried to demonstrate the impracticality and injustice of centralism. In this respect, Masaryk's speech in the Bohemian Diet in April 1892 is also relevant. The last Masaryk's speech on this topic was delivered on 7 November 1911. Kovtun, 191-95.

39. Most of Masaryk's parliamentary speeches related to education are in Kovtun, *Slovo má poslanec Masaryk*. However, several important speeches are not included: "O ukolech ceské politiky školské." *Národní listy*, 21 July 1891. This speech focused on the methods of learning and teaching, and contains valuable statistical data; "*Ríšská rada.*" 25 January 1892, *Narodni listy*, 26 January 1892. The speech is concerned with the reorganization of the university level schools and what direction it should follow; "*Ríšská rada,*" 29 January 1892, *Národní listy*, 30 January 1892. A speech dealing with the insufficient relations between legal studies and social and political realities of the Empire.

Verbatim translations of parliamentary speeches of Czech deputies were usually published in *Národní listy* until 1893. However, beginning in September 1893, the editor yielded to official pressures not to publish complete speeches anymore.

The struggle of the Catholic Church for more influence in schools of all levels was criticized by Masaryk in several speeches, the most important being: "Rec posl. dr. T. G. Masaryka o konfesioná í škole pri rozpoctu ministra vyucování na ríšké rade [30 January 1893]", *Národní listy*, 7 February 1893; *Za svobodu svedomí* (speeches in the Reichsrat 3 and 4 December 1907), Praha: Pokrok, 1908. The essence of Masaryk's arguments was that the Catholic Church's conservatism and its inability to incorporate scientific knowledge into its teaching were increasingly alienating believers, especially the younger generations. The efforts of the Church to impose its conservative, hierarchical, and dogmatic outlook on students was considered by Masaryk not to be beneficial to the majority of people. Masaryk also criticized the Church for not using its influence and power to struggle against the existing social and moral wrongdoings.

40. From the end of 1880s, Czech politicians struggled for the establishment of a second Czech University in Moravia. Despite a great demand for university education in Moravia,

the opportunities for higher learning were very limited for Czechs as compared to Germans. Czechs, therefore, considered their proposal for the second Czech university more than justified. Finally in 1896, the Reichsrat approved the establishment of a second Czech university, but the decision was never implemented because, due to a special character of the electoral law, Germans were able to preserve the majority in the Moravian Diet and successfully blocked the implementation. In English, the most detailed comparison of Czech and German schools in the Bohemian Kingdom is Marie L. Neudorfl, "The Young Czech Party and Modernization of Czech Schools in the 1890s." *East Central Europe*, 13, no. 1 (1986), 1-27.

41. Soon after his arrival in Prague, Masaryk began to publish a monthly scientific and literary journal, *Atheneum: Listy pro literaturu a kritiku vedeckou*, to increase general awareness of the scholarly and literary advancements in the Empire, as well as other Western countries. Then, in the 1880s, when the intellectual group 'Realists' was established, a larger journal, *Cas*, was founded in which views on various contemporary problems could be communicated. Masaryk was its most energetic contributor. Within a few months after resigning his parliamentary seat, he began to publish his own journal, *Naše doba*, devoted to all important problems of the time. Until 1914, most of this monthly periodical was usually written by Masaryk himself. He also got involved in lecturing to specific groups such as intellectuals, students, women, workers, etc.. His lectures were often published. A number of them will be mentioned below.

42. Masaryk believed that some historical periods were more conducive than others to the advancement of the positive potentiality of people as individuals or as communities. A great deal depended on the attitudes and policies of those with political and economic power. In the Czech case, for example, he believed that the cruel imposition of serfdom on the majority of rural population in the Bohemian Kingdom in 1487 undermined the nation's vitality and the will to defend itself, and contributed considerably to the Czech disastrous defeat on the White Mountain in 1620. *Ceska otazka*, 226-28.

43. Ibid., 173.

44. · Masaryk's concept of 'humanistic ideals' was immediately attacked from two sides. Liberals disliked Masaryk's criticism of their narrow economic and political orientation, and his insistence that non-political means for the advancement of the Czech nation were, under the existing conditions, more important than political ones. Summary of liberal views is in Josef Kaizl, *Ceské myšlénky*. Praha: E. Beaufort, 1895. Czech historians have primarily attacked Masaryk's belief in the continuation of ideas from the Czech Reformation to the Czech national revival in the nineteenth century. The latter dispute produced

dozens of works in which, however, Masaryk's beliefs (based more on logic than evidence) became increasingly more valid. For example, see Wellek's Introduction to *The Meaning of Czech History*, xxii.

45. From the point of view of the advancement of humanism, Masaryk especially appreciated the European humanism of the eighteenth century. He believed its impact had been diminished by the increasing influence of the ideology of excessive economic liberalism of the nineteenth century. Masaryk in *Ceska otazka* as well as in other works (the largest and most relevant being "Slovanske studie," *Naše doba* 1, no.7 (1895): 481-500; no.8 (1895): 588-98; no.9 (1895): 655-71; no.10 (1895): 721-59; no.11 (1895): 822-43; no.12 (1895): 891-920., tried to show the roots and the nature of humanistic philosophy of numerous Czech and Slovak awakeners (Kollar, Havlicek, Palacky, and others). He considered it to be important that there were substantial differences in their perceptions on how to advance humanity as well as their views of other Slavic thinkers concerned with similar issues, especially Poles (their messianism) and Russians (their idea of universal orthodoxy).

46. This aspect is critically discussed in Jaroslav Papoušek, "T. G. Masaryk a ceskoslovenské dejepisectví." *Cesky casopis historicky* XLIV, no.1, 1938, 1-29. Papoušek also elaborates on views of Masaryk's principal opponent, Josef Pekar, showing that their differences gradually decreased.

47. Jan Herben, *Deset let proti proudu 1886 - 1896.* Praha: Jan Herben, 1898, 167-69.

48. *Ideály humanitni. Demokratism v politice*, 103-109. Relevant ideas are also in "Humanita a narodnost". *Naše doba*, IV, No.3, 20 December 1896, 193-205.

49. For example, students at the Czech University complained that they had no outlet for their patriotic feeling, that they were forbidden political participation, and that the way they were thaught discouraged them from forming their own views. They also complained about most of their professors, who were unconcerned with serious shortcomings at the university and unwilling to oppose the government. All these were feelings expressed at a meeting of almost 600 students at the end of July 1892. *Národní listy*, 28 July 1892. Masaryk, unlike the other professors, maintained regular personal contacts with students, and talked with them about topics which were considered tabu (such as social problems, religion, and intimate and sexual relations).

He wrote regularly about students and their activities in *Cas* and *Naše doba*. The most important articles were published as a part of *Naše nynejší krise*. Essays for students, published later, are *Jak pracovat*, Praha: Cin, 1946 (7th ed., originally published in 1898-

1900 in periodicals), and *Student a politika*. Praha: Cas, 1909. In this study (originally a lecture for students) Masaryk elaborates on what democracy should mean for students. Jan Herben was probably the first to notice the beneficial impact of Masaryk's friendly and informal attitude toward his students in an environment where open and informal relations between students and professors were not customary. Masaryk's home was always 'full of students'. His wife Charlotte often participated in discussions as well. Jan Herben, *Deset let proti proudu*, (1886-1896). Praha: Cas, 1898, 24-40.

50. It is not easy to define the meaning of Masaryk's concept of "humanistic ideals". For example, Wellek interprets it as follows: "Democracy is another name for this idea.... Democracy meant to him the belief that every man should be able to strive for perfection, that no outward constraint, no social barrier, no economic or national oppression should bar his way to the realization of his humanity. When Masaryk stresses the natural right of every man, he does it out of reverence for the immortal soul of every single man." *The Meaning of Czech History*. Introduction, p. xvii.

The most valuable aspects of Masaryk's efforts to clarify and advance 'humanistic ideals' were his tireless references to the areas in the greatest need of attention, be it on the personal or institutional level, or in the sphere of relations among individuals or between individuals and institutions. Wellek also clarified the meaning of Masaryk's 'humanity' for a North American reader: "...humanity is an ambiguous term and Masaryk has often been grievously misunderstood. Humanism never meant to him sentimental humanitarianism, nor is a secular humanism ever set in opposition to a belief in God, as the term is frequently used in the United States. Nor does Masaryk share the view of the Neo-humanism of Irving Babbit and Paul Elmer More, which emphasizes man's opposition to nature, his duality. Rather, humanism is for Masaryk the perfection of man conceived as a religious, moral and responsible being." Ibid., xvii.

51. The Young Czech literary critic F. X. Salda was the first to use this term when reviewing *Ceská otázka*. "Tezká kniha," Rozhledy IV (1895): 641-48, and 711-21. He especially appreciated the inspirational aspect of the book, providing an ethos to "resist a passive materialistic and unconcerned deterministic life style". In relation to young intellectuals, he welcomed Masaryk's encouragement to take themselves and others seriously in all important areas of life.

Most professional historians rejected Masaryk's 'Czech philosophy' on grounds of insufficient evidence, and partly also for political reasons. Papoušek, "T. G. Masaryk a ceskoslovenské dejepisectví" shows that many historians gradually moderated their views. But Masaryk definitely had increasing influence, especially among students and women. The students' periodical *Neodvislost* maintained that 'Realists' (of whom Masaryk was

most active member) had the greatest influence on students and intelligentsia. "Radicalism and realism." *Cas* VII, no.1, 7 January 1893.

Similar views were expressed by newspaper *Plzenské listy*. no.53, 2 May 1895: "Z Prahy. Realisté a naše literatura." A review on Masaryk's influence in Moravia before 1910 was written by Zdenka Wiedermannová -Motyckova: "T. G. Masarykovi k 60. narozeninám." in *Masaryk a zeny. Sbornik.* Praha: Zenska národní rada, 1930, 126-28. (The essay was originally published in 1910.) The radical periodical *Neodvislost* already in 1893 accused the 'Realists' of stifling radicalism among students and intellectuals, where their influence was greatest. "Radicalism and realism." *Cas* VII, no.1, January 1893, 3.

52. Discussion of male attitudes towards women are to be found particularly in the following works (some of which are printed public lectures): "První literární orgán pokrokoveéo hnutí," *Cas* VII, no.15, 15 April 1893. (Also published as a part of *Naše nynejší krise);* "Otázka zenská: Volná láska," in *Otázka sociální,* Praha: Cin, 1898, 83-97; *Mnohozenstvi a jednozenství,* Praha: Vlastním nákladem, 1899; "Zena u Jezíše a Pavla," (a lecture to the Czech Women's club in December 1910). *O zene*, 2nd ed., Praha: Cin, 1929, 25-41.

53. Masaryk argued in the Reichsrat on several occasions in favor of equal opportunities for women. For example, *"O ukolech ceské politiky školské,"* and "Říšská Rada," *Národní listy*, 31 October 1891. He was also in favor of women's voting rights, though he did not believe that this by itself would provide an adequate and fast solution of the 'women's question'.

54. T. G. Masaryk, *O alkoholismu*. Praha: Pokrok, 1908, 2nd ed.; *O ethice a alkoholismu*. Praha: Klicnik, 1912. Masaryk was among the founding members of the temperance movement in Moravia in the early 1900s and, by 1910, the movement had achieved some remarkable results.

55. Ethical and decadent aspects of the male - female relations are explored mainly in Thomas G. Masaryk, *Suicide and the Meaning of Civilization*, translated by William B. Weist and Robert G. Batson with an introduction by Anthony Giddens, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970, 27-34, 81-84, 106. (First published in German, *Der Selbstmord als sociale Messenerheinung der Modernen Civilization,*. Wien: C. Konegen, 1881.) Masaryk presented his views in greater detail in his lectures on practical philosophy, *"Prednášky o praktické filosofii."* They remained unpublished, but became available in 1884 in litho-printed form. Parts of them, as well as parts of other Masaryk's relevant essays are in Zdenek Franta, ed., *T. G. Masaryk, Mravní názory*, 2nd ed., Praha: Statni nakladatelstvi, 1925, 136-44.

Other relevant works are "Hlavní zásady ethiky humanitní", in *Ideály humanitní*, Praha: Melantrich, 1968, 55-61, (first published in 1901); *"Boj proti prostituci,"* (a lecture at the meeting of Czech Progressive Party club in 1906), Cas XI, no.330 and 332, 1906.

Masaryk's views on the realistic possibilities for women and the general directions for their struggle is summarized in *"Modemí nazor na zenu,"* (a lecture for students in the Girls Academy in Brno in 1904), and in *"Postavení zeny v rodine a ve verejném zivoté,"* (a lecture for the Association of Czech Women in Chicago in 1907), in *Americké prednášky*, Chicago: Vykonny vybor Svazu svobodomyslnych v Chicagu, 1907, 57-61. Masaryk also wrote a number of articles related to women's issues in *Naše doba* in 1896, 1898 and 1910.

56. *Mnohozenstvi a jednozenství*, Praha: B. Kocí, 1925 (2nd ed. unchanged from 1899). Masaryk also contributed to three respected women's periodicals *(Zenské listy, Zenská revue and Zensky obzor)*, and partly because of his influence, the journals had an increasingly educational character.

57. The largest work on the 'social question' is *Otázka sociální. Základy marxismu sociologické a filosofické.* Praha: Jan Laichter, 1898. It is available in English in *Masaryk on Marx. An Abridged Edition of the Social Question: Philosophical and Sociological Foundations of Marxism.* Edited and translated by Erazim Kohák. Lewisburg, PA: Bucknell University Press, 1972.

58. Masaryk touched on the 'social question' in the Reichsrat on many occasions, and several of his speeches are devoted exclusively to this issue, the most important being that on 26 June 1891. In this speech he bitterly criticized government policies and its basic hostile attitude toward workers, and insufficient educational opportunities for workers. "Říšská rada," *Národni listy*, 27 June 1891, and "O sociální otázce," *Národní listy*, 10 July 1891. (His speech is supported by detailed statistics, comparisons with the situation in Germany, analyses of relevant laws, etc.). He urged the Viennese government to issue, as the Bohemian Diet had already done, provisions for certain basic measures of social security such as pensions, and the support for the case of disability.

59. T. G. Masaryk. *Osm hodin prace.* Praha: Cas, 1904. (Two public lectures delivered in 1901.) "Verejná schuze delnicka v Praze." *Národní listy*, 19 April 1892. The shortcomings of Marxism were analyzed in detail in *Otázka socialni.*

60. While Masaryk objected to the liberal view that the 'social question' is entirely an economic question, he did not underestimate the importance of economic difficulties for lower classes. Nonetheless, he strongly believed that it was possible to provide workers with such conditions that would enable them to buy newspapers regularly, and to have

enough money and spare time to become involved in self-education and self-help organizations. In his view this was also the only realistic way to obtain a balanced political education leading to responsible political participation, as opposed to involvement in radical movements. He not only encouraged the formation of interest organizations, but actively participated in founding several of them, such as *Akademicky spolek*, to the foundation of which he contributed 1,000 gulden (his annual salary was around 2,000 gulden). Opat, *Filosof a politik*, 141. His wife Charlotte regularly donated generously to the Social Democratic women's association, of which she was a member for years.

61. Since the 1890s Masaryk was involved with workers in a variety of ways. Especially important were his lectures on ethics, alcoholism, and the political situation. Prednášky pro delníky." *Cas* VII, no.50, 16 December 1893, 790-91; "Delnicka akademie" *Naše doba* IV, no.2, 20 December 1896, 137-46; T. G. Masaryk, *O klerikalismu a socialismu*. 2nd ed., Valašské Mezirící: Politicky pokrokovy spolek, 1907. (A lecture for workers on 30 March 1907 in Valasske Mezirici.) At this time Masaryk also frequently spoke various workers' meetings, which were attended usually by several hundred and, occasionally, by over a thousand people.

62. Masaryk's sociological observations indicated that excessive concentration on physical needs and overindulgence often resulted in serious mental tensions, illnesses, and even suicide. *Modern Man and Religion*. 45-49, 296. Since students trusted Masaryk, he learned a lot about their private lives, and it was a matter of great concern to him that some students were contracting syphilis, usually after visiting a brothel. (Syphilis was an incurable disease at that time).

63. Masaryk analyzed the issue of the contradiction between spiritual and physical needs in the works of various philosophers and great writers. None escaped his criticism. He especially criticized Comte's positivism and the belief that society can be saved by political changes alone. *Ibid.*, 102-31. His major criticism of Goethe and other great writers was that they saw women mainly as objects of men's desire and ignored women as intellectually and spiritually equal to men. *Ibid.*, 295-6. In the case of German philosophers, he indicated that many of them tried to escape civilization to some mysterious German world. *Ibid.*, 343. He also objected to the theory of evolution as reflected in the concept of human and social development based exclusively on materialism. *Ibid.*, 137-59. His objections to positivism are put forth, for example, in *Naše nynejší krise*, Praha: Cas 1895, 39.

64. T. G. Masaryk, *Americké prednášky*, 50-53, 68.

65. *Ibid.*, 55.

66. T. G. Masaryk, *Ideály humanitní:* "Problem maleho národa, Demokratism v politice", Praha: Melantrich, 1968, 103-108. The attitude of Churches towards this issue is pointed out in "Svobodomyslnost a socialism." *Americké prednášky*, 24-36.

67. *Americké prednášky*, 70-71.

68. *Ibid.*, 65-66.

69. T. G. Masaryk, *Za svobodu myšlení.*

70. Masaryk's most bitter accusations concerning Czech liberalism's insufficient concentration on the cultivation of the values and skills needed for democratic conduct and for fostering abilities needed for greater individual initiative in all spheres can be found in "Aforismy o politickych stranách." *Cas* III, no.9, 23 February 1889, 133-135; no.10, 2 March 156-59; no.14, 30 March, 228-31; "Naše strany a realismus." *Cas* III, no.9. 2 March 1889, 165-67; no.11, 16 March, 195-97; *Politická situace. Poznámky ku poznámkám*. Praha: Beaufort, 1906; "Casové smery a tuzby." *Naše doba* II, no.3, 20 December 1894, 193-98. More detailed analyses of the contradictions between Czech liberalism and the struggle for democratization are in *Naše nynější krise a desorganizace mladoceské strany;* "Ku práci vnitrní." *Cas* XI, no.13, 276 March 1897, 194-96.

Although the roots of Masaryk's concepts came partly from studying American and English authors writing about their experiences, he became critical of some aspect of American democracy. He argued that the increasing concentration of financial monopolies tends to block the advancement of democracy, especially its non-political aspects. Furthermore, he seemed to view the "chiefly economic purpose and ideal" of American democracy as unique, different from that of Europe, because the USA did not have the European kind of political and racial problems and still possessed great opportunities for internal expansion. Odlozilik, *T. G. Masaryk*, 15; Masaryk, *Student a politika*, 13.

71. T. G. Masaryk, "O pomerném zastoupení." *Naše doba* I. no.1, 20 October 1894, 17-29. *Demokratism v politice*. Praha: Studentska Revue, 1912. (Originally a lecture in the Czech Technical School on 19 May 1912.) *Nesnáze demokracie. Syndikalism a demokracie*, 40.

72. Masaryk, *Nesnáze democracie. Syndikalism a demokracie,* 40.

73. Masaryk, "O pomerném zastoupení."

74. From 1893, Masaryk was especially critical of the Young Czech Party because of its formalism, lack of inspiration for young people, and purely political orientation. For example, see *Naše nynejší krise a desorganizace mladoceské strany*. He points to interest organizations involved in an open exchange of ideas and good political literature as the most realistic way to an improved political education for the Czech population. Masaryk was writing quite regularly on the need and the way to increase the political knowledge and awareness of the Czechs. For example, "Politické vzdelání daleko pod urovni našeho nadání a vedení." *Naše doba* IV, no.11,, 20 August 1897, 1020-25.

75. *Ideály humanitní, 103.*

76. *Ibid.*

77. *Ibid.*, 109.

78. In 1898, in his lecture *Jak pracovat* (How to Work), Masaryk distinguished between several kinds and methods of work, physical and spiritual, trying to show how to achieve efficiency, growth and an overall positive attitude to work, understood in a very broad sense, including the spiritual and moral dimensions.

79. Masaryk, *Nesnáze demokracie*, 14-15.