HOKKAIDO UNIVERSITY

Title	Japan and T. G. Masaryk : Some Commeuts on CHUO NO BUNRETSU TO TOGO : MASARYK TO CZECHOSLOVAKIA KENKOKU [Disintegration and Interation of Central Europe : Masaryk and Making of Czechoslovakia], By Tadayuki Hayashi, Tokyo : Chuokoron Publishing Company, 1991,230pp
Author(s)	Ieda, Yuko
Citation	Acta Slavica Iaponica, 13, 238-251
Issue Date	1995
Doc URL	https://hdl.handle.net/2115/8086
Type	departmental bulletin paper
File Information	KJ00000034051.pdf

Hokkaido University Collection of Scholarly and Academic Papers : HUSCAP

REVIEW ESSAY

Japan and T. G. Masaryk: Some Commeuts on CHÛÔ NO BUNRETSU TO TÔGÔ: MASARYK TO CZECHOSLOVAKIA KENKOKU [Disintegration and Interation of Central Europe: Masaryk and Making of Czechoslovakia]. By Tadayuki Hayashi. Tokyo: Chûôkôron Publishing Company, 1991, 230 pp.

The author Tadayuki Hayashi is a professor of international relations and diplomatic history of Europe. His main theses are concentrated on the Czechoslovak independence movements and on the internal and foreign affairs of the Czechoslovak First Republic. This is his first single-authored book and one of the Chūkōshinsho Series. This series has provided Japanese readers solid information on a range of subjects.

Hayashi studied at Prague University for two years (1978-79) under the Communist regime, and so was not officially allowed to work with materials concerning with T. G. Masaryk in Masaryk's homeland. But this unfavorable situation never prevented the young Japanese researcher from pursueing his subject. Besides the official sources, Hayashi interviewed opposition intellectuals and read underground publications, inquiring not only into the Czechoslovak historical past but trying to analyze current political tendencies as well, directing special attention to T. G. Masaryk and E. Beneš.

Hayashi's latest book is on the Czechoslovak statesman and philosopher Masaryk, following his career from its beginnings in the waning days of the Habsburgs up until the end of his life and examining how his life and work can give us new insight into the current problems faced by the region today.

In general, Japanese specialists of East-Central Europe always meet great difficulties when they write for the Japanese readers because of readers' decisive lack of the fundamental knowledge of their subjects. Such difficulties are not exceptional of the Japanese. Before the First World War, Western authors faced similar challenges. For instance, the Scottish pioneer R. W. Seton-Watson's books on East-Central European nations show how hard it was for him to make educated Western readers and political leaders understand the unknown peoples inside the Habsburg Empire. Seton-Watson was not a mere scholar. His vivid interest in and affection for East-Central European nations soon drove him to practical action. He became a commentator on contemporary political trends of the area and a spokesman for the subjugated nations there, introducing and defending their cultural and social activities. Above all, he was the historian, who established East-Central European studies in the English-speaking world. For their entirety, his works display something of a missionary zeal.

Such is still the case in Japan even today, because this Far-Eastern island country, primarily awkward at understanding heterogeneous situations, has had

neither direct interest in Central European nations, nor any experiences of accepting an influx of immigrants or settlers from there. In addition, the Cold War strictly prevented mutual exchange, and the Iron Curtain shut out a real view of human lives there. Thus, the previously mentioned difficulties and gaps grew even larger in Japan after the Second World War. Hayashi's book is also burdened by the same difficulties, but his careful presentation and reliable orientation offer readers an instructive inquiry into unfamiliar areas.

This paper consists of two parts. First we will take a short survey of how Japan understood Masaryk and Czechoslovakia, and then we shall review Hayashi's book.

* * *

Japanese understanding of the Czech lands and T. G. Masaryk

[I. The Meiji Era 1868-1912]

In the middle of the nineteenth century Japan had to abandon the long isolation of the Tokugawa Shogunate and begin modernization after the West European and American models. Through their efforts to transform Japan into a centralized modern state, the Japanese people of the Meiji Era eagerly wanted to acquire Western knowledge. At the same time, they had a strong will to be recognized as a respectable independent member of the international society, to counter the danger of colonization by the Great Powers.

In 1981 an international symposium on the cultural relations between Japan and East-Central European countries was held in Tokyo. The published papers of the symposium[1] tell us that although the quantity of information about Central Europe was quite limited in Japan during the latter half of the last century, the quality was not negligible. The Japanese government mission of 1871[2] observed that the Habsburg Empire was suffering from effects of its ancient regime, and, in spite of its brilliant façade, the foundation of the Empire seemed rather weak. The mission further reported on social inequality, discordance between classes, serious nationalist struggles, general suppression of freedom and so forth. The mission concluded that the Empire was slow in developing both economically and politically, compared to the stronger West European Nations.

On the other hand, the Viennese Exhibition in 1873 attracted Japanese interest and some trainees were sent to Bohemia, which was at that time the most industrially developed region in the Empire.

The Japanese Imperial family felt friendly ties for the Habsburg Emperor. It welcomed a Japanese woman, Mitsuko Aoyama, marrying a Habsburg diplomat, Count Heinrich Coudenhove-Kalergi. Their second son Richard was born in Tokyo in 1894, and later became a citizen of the newly founded Czechoslovak Republic. Richard considered himself as a disciple of Masaryk, inspired by his ideals of New Europe. He became a founder of the Pan-Europe movement and, as well, something of a precursor of the later European Union.

At the symposium it was also noted that some Japanese writings of the Meiji Era showed a sympathetic understanding of Polish and Hungarian struggles for independence. Most notably, the Japanese novel "Kazin no Kigu" by Sanshi Tokai, which awoke strong sympathy for Kossuth and Koscuszko among the Japanese public became a rare best seller. The Japanese people could fully realize the tragedy of small nations suppressed by big ones. And the patriotism of tragedical heroes straightforwardly affected the traditional Samurai Spirit, or Japanese knighthood. The symposium concluded that these Japanese escaped arrogance or indifference toward small nations that big nations are apt to fall in.

By the end of the last century, T. G. Masaryk was known both in his country and abroad. The 'Hilsner case'; where Masaryk fought against anti-Semitism, the 'Agram Trial', the 'Friedjung case' and 'the indictment of Foreign Minister Count Aehrenthal'; when Masaryk continuously criticized the Austro-Hungarian policy after the annexation of Bosnia-Herzegovina, all served to focus international attention on Masaryk. In addition, as a distinguished active moralist, Masaryk broadly delivered public lectures and was twice invited to America. Through such activities Masaryk won sympathies beyond the border, which resulted in support for him during his wartime exile. But Japan knew nothing of Masaryk, as those activities were utterly unfamiliar there.

[II. During and after the First World War]

Masaryk suddenly came into Japanese sight in April 1918, when he arrived in Tokyo on his way from Russia to America. By then, Western Allied powers had already valued Masaryk's analyses on the ongoing Russian Revolution, momentarily sent from Russia. But the Japanese Government or the Foreign Office did not pay much attention to the aged foreigner. Masaryk's visit to the Foreign Office bore no fruit. Only a few months later, the Japanese Government became aware of the importance for Japan of the Czechoslovak Legions in Siberia, where the Japanese then dispatched troops.

Staying two weeks in Tokyo, Masaryk himself neither showed special interest in Japan. It was an accidental visit for him to stop off in Japan which was located on the line of his ship to America. Some outstanding Western philosophers and thinkers of Masaryk's contemporaries had attained considerable understanding and even penetrating interpretation on Eastern thought and Asian civilization. But Masaryk, a different type of philosopher, often commented negatively on Asia in his writings. It is impossible to overlook Masaryk's coolness against Asia. For instance, in Masaryk's important work "*Russland und Europa*," published in 1913, he recounted the division between European Russia and Asiatic Russia. For Masaryk, Asiatic Russia meant tzarism, blind obedience, irrational mysticism, and the like. "*Russland und Europa*" was based on his earlier lectures delivered in America in 1902, by which time Masaryk had already been convinced and openly predicted that the Asiatic Russian absolutism would fall in the end.

For another instance, during the First World War, when Masaryk reproached the Magyars as suppressors of the Slavs in his article for English weekly "*the New Europe*," he stressed the Magyars were of Asiatic origin.

It may be worth quoting here what Masaryk told Karel Čapek:

> I am consciously European in my culture — by that I mean that European and American culture (America is ethnically and culturally a fragment of Europe, transported — though not completely — to America) satisfies me spiritually. Eastern philosophy and literature I know very slightly and only at second hand, because I do not know the Oriental languages. The culture of India, China, and Japan is inaccessible to me. I am very sceptical of those opinions which exalt them above European culture — And as a European, I am a Westerner... I say this for the benefit of those Slavophiles who see in Russia and Slavdom something super-European. The best Russians were Westerners too![3]

The 'Westerner' means an antithesis of the 'Slavophile' in a narrower sense, but it seems 'to be a Westerner' was an aim and a goal of his life for Masaryk. Actually Masaryk saw the schisms not only in Russia, but also between the Western democracy and the Habsburg absolutism, as well as between the spirit of modern European criticism and the blind nationalism prevailing in his own nation. Having been born on the rim of European culture and having learned many languages for the comparative study of European national thoughts, Masaryk intentionally chose and absorbed Western ideals, and wished to lead both himself and his nation to Western forward. Paradoxical as it may sound, however indifferent was Masaryk to modern Japan, his conscious self-identification is full of interest and inherently comprehensible for Japanese intellectuals whether negatively or positively. Probably Masaryk was not aware of the fact that Japan had also been divided into Asiatic Japan and Westernized Japan. His ignorance was caused not by mere lack of knowledge of Oriental languages, but primarily by the fact that his touch-stone was Christianity. The dualism between Asiatic tradition and Western influences continues to cause questions as how to find harmony between them here in Japan as well as in Russia.

At least one Japanese came to admire Masaryk during his stay in Tokyo. It was Yasutaro Takeyama, an officer of the Japanese Police Agency, who managed to arrange Masaryk's visit to the Japanese Foreign Office. Escorting Masaryk for a few days, Takeyama was deeply attracted by his personality.

In 1930, Takeyama was invited to the Czechoslovak legation in Tokyo on the celebration of Masaryk's 80th birthday, and later received an English version of "*Světová* Revoluce (*The Making of A State*)" by President Masaryk with his compliments. It is quite amazing that Takeyama, one retired Japanese officer, translated the Masaryk's voluminous book, covering a world-wide record of the First World War, containing intermittent philosophical fragments of Western thought, full of unknown names of foreign places persons, and written in the following style:

> — In form, and lack of form, it is a compilation of notes and reminiscences, reflections and observations, put together... If he (Masaryk) has unwittingly raised his own monument he has not built it as a trained architect with a nice sense of proportion and embellishment, but rather as a hewer of

> stone in a quarry, winning block after block from its reluctant flanks and scarcely pausing to think how best they might be arranged in organic symmetry.— (by H. W. Steed's foreword),[4]

within the space of only one year.

Takeyama's translation was published in 1931, and in his Japanese preface, he reveals himself to be a typical Japanese of the Meiji Era, who adored the Japanese emperor as a holy supreme being and was such a loyal subject that he shed tears when he heard the news that the last Habsburg Emperor visited President Masaryk at his former Imperial Palace in Prague.[5] The Japanese people of Meiji Era had experienced the civil war and the upset of social orders. And the Meiji government tried to deny ideals and social values of the former Tokugawa period in such a conventional way as to replace common loyalty to the feudal lords with a loyalty for the emperor. So we see strongly feudalistic remains in the hurried modernization of the Meiji Era. Takeyama, though essentially feudalistic in his character, was saved from serious mistranslations of 'the memoirs of making a republic' by his sincere craftsmanship for translation and by his admiration for Masaryk, although plenty of minor errors and inaccuracies are inevitably seen in his work. Furthermore, Takeyama did not seem to have been vexed by differences between Eastern and Western civilizations, and simply wished that his translation would advance Japanese understanding of foreign affairs. He also dreamt that his translation would encourage his compatriots to contribute to world peace hand in hand with the Czechoslovaks through a harmonious combination of Masaryk's teachings and the Imperial Message of the Mikado.

Besides the Takeyama's translation, one book was written on Masaryk's life by Tadakazu Okada, published in 1930. It was a small sketch rather than a neat biography, aiming to inspire readers by a success story of a great man of humble origin. This certifies that Masaryk was regarded as one of the greatest heroes of the First World War also in Japan. Adding to these two books, more influential were the many articles on Masaryk appeared in Japanese journalism. They won him a personal reputation. Moreover, almost everyday the Japanese people read about 'the Czech Legion' on the newspapers. Wounded Czech soldiers were sent to Japanese hospitals, and some of them held concerts for friendship. These episodes of Japanese-Czech relations had been forgotten.

Though Takeyama was rooted deeply in the Meiji Era, new tendencies appeared in Japan under the new Era of Taisho. This short era (1912-1925) was marked by growing democracy and liberalism, legislation for the introduction of universal suffrage, and the organization of Japan Socialist Party, Communist Party, Agrarian cooperations, and rising movements for women's rights. Once the patriotic heroism of Kossuth and Koscuszko touched the Japanese traditional heart of chivalry, 'the Taisho Democracy' now enabled Japanese people to comprehend Masaryk's democratic ideals. However, those liberal tendencies were soon suppressed by the emerging militarism and fascism of the following Showa Era, beginning in 1925. Takeyama's translation was published in the very year when Japan began its violent expansion into Manchuria. The newly rising Japanese Empire betrayed Takeyama's dreams, and more and more strengthened its self-confidence as a great power, which

inevitably blocked or distorted Japanese understanding of East-Central European nations.

Between the Great Wars, foundations for the study of Poland and of Hungary were laid in Japan, or at least the pioneers had started their notable works. Strangely, the study of Czechoslovakia was not advanced, even though the Czechoslovak First Republic was the most developed and prominent creation among the 'successor states' of the Habsburg Empire, and though relations at a governmental level kept on good terms for a considerable time. The reason is not yet fully explained by any Japanese historians.

[After the Second World War]

The Second World War brought communist rule to the East-Central European countries. Mutual communications at a governmental level became poor. This general indifference was broken when the Prague spring and its tragic end was broadcasted live, arousing the Japanese people's sympathy and much discussion. But ideological comments predominated over scholarly criticism. On the other hand, though there were no proper institutions, faculties or chairs for the study of Central Europe in Japanese universities for a long time, scholarly investigations proceeded, supported by the individual efforts of researchers.

Kei Kurisu, who began his career as an Esperantist, has translated many important Czech literary works, including those of B. Němcová, J. Fučík, K. Čapek, A. Bednár, L. Mňačko. Particularly, he has translated complete versions of J. Hašek's Švejk Stories with the full collection of original illustrations by J. Lada. They are of the highest level among the translations of Hašek all over the world, and needless to say, far better works than contemporary Czech versions which struck off many important sentences from the original under the socialist censorship. At first, the antiwar philosophy and the truth of Czech literature as an universal literature captured Kurisu's attentions. Later Kurisu became more and more devoted to his special studies of the Czech and Slovak nations. Each of his works has an excellent commentary supplement for a better understanding of Czechoslovak affairs.

Younger researchers began to study abroad in the 1960's. A linguist, Eiichi Chino, explored his method of the Czech language education for the Japanese by his textbooks and class-teachings. Many of his students have themselves gone on to specialize in Czechoslovak studies.

While progress in linguistics and literature was remarkable, there was and still is no proper textbook on Czechoslovak history written in Japanese, outside some concise translations from foreign languages. This creates many difficulties not only for common readers but for specialists as well. Masaryk's "*Russland und Europa*" was translated by Japanese specialists in German history and published in two volumes in 1956 and in 1962. Modern Japanese literature was strongly influenced by Russian literature, so this translation was widely read. But many mistranslations and errors on the Slavonic affairs were contained in these two volumes.

1960's and 70's witnessed further development of the Japanese study of Czechoslovakia. The Japanese Association for East European Studies was founded in 1978. Today we have many specialists, and younger researchers have increased remarkably

both in number and in the range of their interests. Besides the scholarly investigations, cultural interchange has been continued and expanded through non-governmental efforts. The Czech and Slovak music, movies, puppet theaters, juvenile literature and Bohemian crystal have been highly accepted in Japan. Komensky has been an outstanding figure in Japanese pedagogic field. The recent political transformations should accelerate the further opening of cultural exchange.

The division of Czechoslovakia into two states indicates the need for proper study of Slovakia, which is as yet supported by Susumu Nagayo alone. At once, the exchange of views with researchers in Austria, Germany and Russia, as well as of Eastern European nations are indispensable.

After an interval of about twenty years Masaryk again occupies a prominent position in Japanese scholarly field. In the past ten years, in addition to Hayashi's works, essays on Masaryk's ideas by Tatsuo Ishikawa have been published, besides my papers on Masaryk in exile. Just recently Ishikawa translated K. Čapek's important work, "*Hovory s T. G. Masarykem* (*President Masaryk Tells His Story*)," which was published in 1991. And "*The Lectures of T. G. Masaryk at the University of Chicago in 1902*" in my translation in 1994. Those achievements prove Masaryk has been studied continuously during the Cold War in Japan. And it may be no exaggeration to expect the coming of a flowering time and a fruitful season in Japanese field of study of the Czechs and the Slovaks.

* * *

Review on Hayashi's book

It is quite impressive that professor Hayashi greatly laboured in preparing a structural invention for readers' benefit to understand very rich contents within a limited volume of the book. He distributes abundant topics into a compact style composed of; a prologue, four chapters and an epilogue. For common readers he had to give fundamental previous knowledge before every particular discussions. The skill of his presentation itself is worth taking up in detail, but for the benefit of non-Japanese readers of this article, I point out some characteristic features of his book and limit my discussion only to Hayashi's main interpretations.

Hayashi has already introduced some of the recent academic achievements on Masaryk with a short biographical sketch for the 50th anniversary of Masaryk's death, in an article for "*The Japanese Journal of East-European Studies*" in 1987.[6] This article assures that Hayashi's biographical knowledge is substantiated by vast and intensive reading of Masaryk's life and of those established works by K. Čapek, J. Herben, Z. Nejědly and others. But in this book, Hayashi's aim is not to write a Japanese version of Masaryk's biography. Instead he adopts an another method to pile up historical evidences which would focus on the man himself, and Hayashi rather uses Masaryk as a lens to examine the historical record of Czechoslovakia.

The prologue "Prague (1990)-Tokyo (1918)" begins with the division of Czechoslovakia into the Czech and Slovak Republics in 1993. This short but stimulating

prologue consists of two main topics. First, Hayashi talks about his personal memory of his visit in Prague and Bratislava in 1990. After the political transformation, there was growing enthusiasm for revaluation on Masaryk in Prague. Political changes were felt everywhere and in visible ways. People restored statues of Masaryk to the original locations, one of which is the entrance hall of a faculty of Prague University where Hayashi saw a statue of Lenin thirteen years before. Contrary to Prague Hayashi heard the Slovak nationalists' appeals of "No more Prague, No more Masaryk!" echoed in Bratislava. Hayashi witnessed first-hand the sharply different atmosphere in the two capitals which led the historical division of the state. Here Hayashi puts the question of whether this division may ultimately be rooted in the figure of Masaryk himself, the founder of Czechoslovakia, who defined that the Czechs and the Slovaks were one and the same 'Czechoslovak' nation.

Hayashi then goes back to April 1918, Masaryk's visit to Japan. This part is based on his paper for the previously mentioned symposium in 1981. The paper brought to light some materials, ranging from articles in a Japanese newspaper that reported on an aged member of the Reichsrat and his views of the War, or of some memoirs of famous Japanese diplomats referring to Masaryk. Through Takeyama's encounter with Masaryk, Hayashi engagingly explains the Japanese situation surrounding Masaryk's visit. It is only to be regretted that Hayashi did not refer to the many articles in Japanese newspapers and periodicals which appeared at the end and after the First World War. Through them Japanese citizens came to know who Masaryk was and what he achieved, with the exciting reports on 'the Czech Legion' and Japanese troops in Siberia. The juvenile memories of the famous episode of 'W. Wilson and Masaryk' or the moving stories of 'a Philosopher King' are still alive in a considerable number of older Japanese intellectuals.

At the end of the prologue, Hayashi indicates that Masaryk was 'a traveler' all through his long life. Then Hayashi asks readers to meditate on the goal of Masaryk's travelings, and what he gained and what he lost.

*

The first chapter "Masaryk's childhood and days of self-improvement-Hodonín, Brno and Vienna" deals with the young Masaryk from his birth in Moravia to his days as privatdocent in Vienna. To begin with Hayashi spares a long paragraph to present a brief historical outline of the Czech land from the seventh century up to the nineteenth. Such outlines often begin articles on Czechoslovakia by other authors as well. This is partly due to the general lack of knowledge about Czechoslovakia, but primarily because of the inherent reasons of East-Central Europe, where the historical past inevitably affects present situations and 'Historical Rights' has been considered the most important factor in political decisions as late as in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, or even today.

Then Hayashi gives a picture of the young Masaryk against the complicated background of Central Europe in the Habsburg regime. Showing that Masaryk's early circumstances arose from the different language groups and various feudal classes, Hayashi notes Masaryk had to choose his national-identification by himself at

the very moment when the old empire was in a transition to modernization, and that Masaryk had to publicly state his identification again and again. Then Hayashi comments that however complicated Masaryk's early circumstances were, we cannot consider them very exceptional in the region and in the age which Masaryk belonged to. Hayashi asserts that according to the living circumstance, people in the Habsburg monarchy changed their consciousness of self-identifications and speaking languages, and that it happened commonly. As such complexity was a commonplace in the Moravian surroundings in those days, Hayashi continues, the self-identification did not matter for Masaryk as long as he remained in his heterogeneous native land, but mattered only when he left from it to set for the outer world.

As we well know, for the study of national problems in the Habsburg monarchy, it is quite necessary to pay careful attention on real aspects of the researched region and period. In some regions various nations lived quite intermingled, and you can suppose mixed marrige might have been a commonplace. But in other regions various nations lived alongside but quite separately, and mixed marriage is supposed to have scarcely taken place there. Or no matter how some region had a mixed appearance, its inside was tidily partitioned by an invisible hierarchal order, and the order strictly limited mutual intercourses of different groups. In other cases chaotic appearances could be false in reality because differently looking groups had inherent common bonds of the religion, social position, intellectual standard and otherwise. Every region in the Empire had its own remarkable features of the inhabitants.

I can understand Hayashi's intention to present a Moravian habitual sight without exaggerations, or the conscious restraint in his description of small matters of private interest, for many biographers have either overestimated Masaryk's legendary humble origins to highlight his later greatness, or have used his origins to minimize him for political reasons. But I cannot agree with Hayashi that Masaryk's circumstances were rather habitual ones, because not only the social classes and cultural levels of his parents, but even their speaking languages had nothing in common. Or when Hayashi considers Masaryk's linguistic mastery of as many as ten languages to be common among European intellectuals, I cannot help but be reminded of the fact that Masaryk was not born in an intellectual household, and that Masaryk began his linguistic practice in his boyhood by lively interest in different nations, leading him to inquire into their national thoughts. It was not the usual image for a son of an illiterate serf. My own experience in the Moravian town Hustopeče, the birthplace of Masaryk's mother and Masaryk himself went to the Real School there, made a great impact on my reconsideration for Masaryk's spiritual growth. An inhabitant of the town guided me to the former German girls' school where Masaryk's mother went to, and he stated that Hustopeče and its surrounding were 'Sudetenland'. How can we grasp the real image of a cook woman who could study at the girls' school in the early nineteenth century? Or how can we correctly understand Masaryk's political decision to keep German regions within the new Slavonic state? Here I only wish to suggest that many questions still remain unexplained in Masaryk's spiritual growth. And I think Masaryk began by trial and error in his self-identification very early in the native land, producing very important effects for the formation of his world view.

Another notable remark in this chapter is a commentary on the political

situations in the 1860's and early 70's, when many countries, including Italy, Russia (emancipation of serfs), America (the Civil War), Japan and Germany, were in the process of becoming "Nation States," running after France and the Great Britain. Only those countries which succeeded in becoming Nation States could participate in the upcoming Age of Imperialism as the Great Powers. Here Japanese readers, who often consider the Japanese historical experience as a particularly isolated one, are given food for thought. When Hayashi comments how slow and awkward the Habsburg Empire was in this process, you are perhaps reminded of the reports of the Japanese mission of 1871.

At the end of this chapter Hayashi claims that 'the young Masaryk had chosen to be a Czech, but it was not enough for the perfection of his self-identification since it also needed the acceptance by the Czech society in return.' Readers may want to know why Masaryk chose to 'be a Czech'. And what did it really mean for him to 'be a Czech'? In addition, an intellectual of a small nation usually needs to master some international language besides his mother tongue. Masaryk did not choose to be a German, but contrary to Hayashi's view, Masaryk never quitted the German language for the Czech.

*

The second chapter "Between scholarship and statesmanship — in Prague." finds Masaryk as one of the Czech social leaders, and Hayashi describes him mainly in social and political phases of the Czechs, which are Hayashi's specialties. Every sentence is displayed by careful presentation and we can understand the Czech society at the end of the last century very clearly. Furthermore, readers who possess good insight would notice the social similarities between the Czechs and the Japanese by such topics, of young Professor Masaryk's critical challenges to the scholastic authoritarianism or his isolated battles for the truth against forged national prestige. Hayashi expresses these topics not as foreign matters, but as comprehensible matters that commonly happen in all of us.

A slight dissatisfaction with this chapter lays in its lack of explanation as to why Masaryk had come to the decision on his Czechoslovakism, which was to bring the controversial combination of the Czechs and Slovaks together as one people. Hayashi explains it mainly as the result of Masaryk's in-born sympathy for the Slovaks or by his irresistible need for self-identification here, and following chapters will not offer clearer reasons any more. Though other specialists have not yet succeeded in answering this question convincingly, Hayashi's comments still seem insufficient because Masaryk's decision on Slovakia concerns the main theme of his book. We need political and diplomatic analyses from Hayashi's specialized point of view.

Another noteworthy comment is Hayashi's explanation on Masaryk's 'non-political politics'. Hayashi claims that 'through the critical and scientific thought movements, Masaryk tried to produce practical effects on actual politics, and it did not necessarily mean actual grip on power'. Hayashi concludes that this has become a national tradition of Czechoslovakia, with quoting the "Charter '77" as an example of oppositionist movements done in a traditional way of the non-political politics.

Masaryk's main achievement in this period was his philosophical interpretations of meaning of the Czech history, in which he campaigned publicly for enlightenment. But Hayashi, according to his scholarly conscience, refrains from plunging into the ideological arguments, and devoted himself to write concrete evidences. His sincerity is notable, though it causes considerable inconveniences in the next two chapters where Masaryk's political decisions arise from his philosophical perspectives.

Hayashi closes the second chapter with the observation that through his travel in middle age Masaryk found his place in the Czech society. Then Hayashi announces that in the next chapter old Masaryk starts traveling all over the world to find the place for the Czechs and Slovaks.

*

The Third Chapter is "Break up of the First World War and the independence movements — the way to London." Here Hayashi spends a great deal of time on minute descriptions of the war-aspects in Europe, then explains the Czech inner political trends and the exile movements led by Masaryk's group. Instead of strengthening the accomplished greatness of Masaryk's foresight, he rather points out various other political possibilities assumed by Masaryk's group, which have been little noticed or rather overlooked by historians. And Hayashi recounts many contradictions or ambiguities in Masaryk's appeals for the Allies.

As a whole this chapter seems to not be clear in showing Masaryk's motivation or purpose for independence, which may be better explained by Masaryk's philosophy of history or by his world view. Here I meet a politician who struggles for his political goal of achieving independence, and his cleverness made him turn to the Western Great Powers following the theory of balance of power. But I believe that the achievement of political independence was not Masaryk's goal, but a step toward the fulfillment of his true aim of autonomous national development for the Czechs and Slovaks. The Czechs who, Masaryk considered, had once been the forerunners of modern Western ideals, were now suppressed in their natural development under the yoke of absolutism. With his love for Western culture, Masaryk could not favor absolutism of the Habsburgs or of Czarist Russia. Ideological arguments may not always be necessary for practical analyses of political situations. If this is so, descriptions might better be focused on Czech affairs, especially Czech views on Russia, on Germany and on the Habsburg rule. Above all some explanation of the Slovak situation under the Hungarian rule is needed. This chapter might have benefited from somewhat less detail and more analysis of the implications and evaluations of the significance of the events and processes presented. Sometimes provocative comments or questions are left hanging, or points of the discussions are difficult to grasp because of the author's rhetorical expressions. We would wish Hayashi to deepen his suggestive comments on Masaryk's federation theory or Masaryk's anticipation of future international relations within Europe.

*

The Fourth Chapter "the Incidents of the Czechoslovak Legion and Independence of Czechoslovakia — from Russia to America" gives us the story of the Czechoslovak Legion in Russia, against the background of Allied Powers' constantly shifting policies or against the background of the ongoing Russian Revolution. Intricate historical tendencies are presented comprehensively, since Hayashi clearly focuses on the necessary threads of the story of Czechoslovak independence. As a specialist, Hayashi tries to present the actual facts without conjectures or assumptions. He explains how historical process and a mass of unexpected incidents brought Masaryk's scheme to a realization. Thus this chapter helps to give a true understanding for the story of the foundation of the Czechoslovak state, which happened to deny much of Masaryk's established reputation as a prophet who possessed incomparable foresight. Hayashi admits that to realize independence, Masaryk's organization of Czech and Slovak prisoners of war on the Russian front into the legion was a decisive and sole political asset, nevertheless the actual achievements of the Legion were beyond Masaryk's control. If it was Hayashi's purpose to present real history without Masaryk's Myths, he is successful. His views, concisely summarized in the following chapter, are as follows:

> Czechoslovakia achieved its independence; through the unexpected international situations resulting in the defeat of Germany and Austro-Hungary, as well as the isolation of Russia because of its revolution and civil-war; through a political vacuum appeared in the Eastern Europe; through a series of unexpected incidents in Siberia beyond Masaryk's control — all those tendencies favoured Masaryk's exile group, which was in the end supported by a Czech land political power.

Hayashi offers many suggestive interpretations for researchers who consider Masaryk's historical perspectives and ideals as his foremost strength. But when Hayashi argues that Masaryk wished to avoid interfering in the internal affairs of Russia, which embarrassed Allied leaders or even his co-workers including Beneš, his reasoning is not very clear. Masaryk considered the Bolshevism as a transitional stage to a democratic Russia. Masaryk's essay on the Russian February Revolution shows how enthusiastically he praised it for its bloodless achievements, expressing his admiration for the birth of a new democratic Russia, which Masaryk had predicted and waited for a long time. Throughout the Bolshevik Revolution, Masaryk was still convinced that it was only a transitional phase. And so he appealed to other countries not to interrupt the reconstruction efforts of the Russians. He also expressed his wish for the rising Japanese Empire not to attack Revolutionary Russia.

*

The Epilogue, "New departure," is a concise story of 'Masaryk's Republic', and a quick summary of historical trends up to the present. Here Masaryk is mentioned

as a symbol of the new republic, and an arbitrator of different political stand-points. This idealistic position enabled him to serve as president for so long. Avoiding further comments, Hayashi enumerates the various problems, mainly national ones, that existed in the republic, leading to the dissolution of the republic in 1938-39, and again in 1993. Readers are required to carefully follow Hayashi's intentions. Hayashi evaluates Masaryk's foresight which indicated the future European federation based on independent free nations. Probably the most important suggestion in this elaborate epilogue is:

> Masaryk's appeal to the relativity of sovereignties and need for co-operation, which inevitably requires self-control among different national groups. The division in 1993 was accomplished by non-violent measures but by legal act with reason, which was a spiritural inheritance of Masaryk's teaching." "Masaryk had put his criticism not to the outside world but to inner world of his own nation. Such an attitude has universal value.

To discuss that Hayashi refrains from further details may not be fair. But our recent experiences of revolutionary transformations in East Central European countries, once and again convince us of that to overturn the structure of the state is one thing and to create and maintain new state is quite another. We would like more explanations or interpretations from Hayashi on how Masaryk succeeded in running a new state for 17 years. 17 years is not a short time, so there must be some concrete reasons for the stabilization of Masaryk's Republic. And on minority problems that existed in Masaryk's Republic, Hayashi considers that Masaryk might not have grasped or been ready to solve them fully. But while we know that the Czechoslovak First Republic is said to have solved minority problems to some extent at the time, or at least to far better extent than any other neighbouring countries. We wish a clearer contradiction.

Hayashi, like every researcher of Czechoslovak modern history, has eagerly wished to investigate historical materials of the Czechoslovak First Republic, which had been suspended and suppressed during the Second World War broke up soon after Masaryk's death and the following communist age. Now a new epoch has come, which offers new possibilities for the study of 'Masaryk's Republic.' And here, with hope, I cite Hayashi's Japanese fare-well 'promise to show you again further achievement in my next work.'

Yuko Ieda

Notes

1 "*Basic Studies on the Cultural Relations between Japan and East-Central European Countries — A Report of the International Symposium held in Sept. 1981 in Tokyo.*"

2 It is called 'Iwakura Mission'. 41 envoys with 60 students and trainess, led by the ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary Lord Iwakura, went to USA, Europe and Asia. Their inspection of 21 months was reported in 5 volumes.

3 K. Čapek, *President Masaryk Tells His Story* (1934, London), p. 103.
4 Introduction by H. W. Steed, T. G. Masaryk, *The Making of a State* (1928, London), p. 15.
5 Takeyama wrote about this 'news' in his preface for his translation of *The Making of a State* (*Czechoslovakia-koku Kenkoku to Riso*, Tokyo, 1931, pp. 17-18).
6 T. Hayashi, "In Commemoration of the 50th Anniversary of Masaryk's Death," *The Journal of East European Studies*, vol. 10 (Tokyo, 1987).