

The ‘breakthrough generation’ as the bearer of the idea of a European federation

Jan Svoboda¹

Abstract

The term ‘breakthrough generation’ was coined by the German philosopher Hugo Fischer (1897–1975) in 1930, at the very beginning of the Great Depression. This structural notion represents a timeless, emancipation oriented ideal that effectively integrates the relevant positive qualities and abilities of modern and critically thinking man, which he has potentially picked up in the course of his historical development towards a higher humanity as a European and realist, and which he actually possesses as qualities and norms. This complex ethos is intended to form the initial basis on which the modern idea of a European federation is consciously realised. The purpose of this paper is not only to creatively point to these concrete and supporting motivational starting points and qualitative-historical assumptions of the modern European and to place them in a functional framework of intelligibility, but also to recall the important historical-philosophical fact that Fischer’s specifically grasped and developed idea of the formation of post-war Europe is very closely linked to the thinking of T. G. Masaryk, whom Fischer admired and respected as a philosopher and statesman and whose democratizing idea of a ‘new’ Central European space fundamentally inspired him in many ways.

Keywords: ‘breakthrough generation’, Europeanism, realism, federation, religion, ancient democracy, Hugo Fischer, Tomáš G. Masaryk, Karl Marx

Introduction

The aim of this paper is to highlight the historical significance of the term ‘breakthrough generation’, which was programmatically coined and purposefully developed by German philosopher Hugo Fischer (1897–1975) at the beginning of the Great Depression.² At the very outset, I would like to make two brief remarks that will preliminarily help place this specific concept in its proper ideological context in the present text, in a twofold historical-philosophical respect. The first remark concerns a reminder of its relevance and indispensability for modern European thought. The second is related to its often neglected significance for Czech, and hence Czechoslovak, philosophical-political thought within the framework of European development – to the possibility of understanding and conjecturing the historical uniqueness of this type of Central European ethical-humanistic approach to reality and its ‘breakthrough’ socio-political context in the interwar period.

First of all, it should be stressed that the term ‘breakthrough generation’ does not denote a partial and narrowly ideologically defined movement of an artistic and philosophical character, as it might seem at first sight. It is an expression of an independent critical and humanistically oriented stance – a natural need for rationally based intellectual defiance against existing dysfunctional approaches or patterns in modern thought. Its most intrinsic essence is grounded in the authenticity of the existential experience and sense of cultural and historical belonging of a particular creative and committed personality. In his study, Fischer emphatically warns us that this specific notion must be understood *structurally*, i.e. in the necessary and general cultural, social and political context that has characterized and meaningfully shaped this concept historically as a sustainable and resilient functional entity – as a global idea, which, in its sequence of logical developmental, embodies the noblest emancipatory aspirations and desires of our ancestors, and which originally led us – as Europeans – and permanently motivated us to realise a sense of European belonging in the spirit of the best democratising traditions built on the ideals of humanity.

¹ The Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic, Prague (Czech Republic); svobodaj@flu.cas.cz; ORCID: 0000-0002-6672-4832

² This text is based on (Svoboda, 2023c). Cf. also (Christians, 2018; Kinzel, 2019).

Secondly, it should be noted at this point that the possibility of understanding this specific notion in the context of Czech thought is inextricably linked to the very creative motivation with which Hugo Fischer philosophically approached the formulation of this specific notion in his extensive and very concise study. The thematic sequence of his original and framed inspirational reflections was guided by the creatively directed need to philosophically balance and – from the perspective of a progressive and democratically minded European thinker – to ideologically develop the “thought-world and worldview” of philosopher and first Czechoslovak president Tomáš Garrigue Masaryk (1850–1937) in other essential philosophical contexts.³

The ‘breakthrough generation’ in relation to Europeanism and realism

The first prerequisite for understanding the notion of a ‘breakthrough generation’ is that ‘realism’ and a full-fledged consciousness of “being European” form a single “coherent structure and approach” (Fischer, 2019, p. 25). If we conduct a proper structural analysis of this contextual assumption of our starting concept, it is first of all important to realise that the notions of ‘Europe’ and ‘Europeanness’ are complementary concepts. Already Montesquieu understood Europe as *one nation composed of many*, and this consciousness of belonging to a historical whole as the possibility of creating a distinctive culture, with its principles, values and norms – *a general European consciousness* (Ortega y Gasset, 1961). The ideas of Europe and conscious Europeanism are not mere abstracted concepts, divorced from the natural dynamics of events and the developmental specificity of their processes. They always represent something *real*, rationally graspable in concrete existential contexts and socio-political changes, which, moreover, the pre-Socratics had already “instinctively” inscribed in our “relation to God and the world” (Fischer, 2019, p. 7). Europeanism is always an “actual” realism (Fischer, 2019, p. 8) and realism is concrete knowledge as much as a permanent rational challenge of the present.

Fischer thus understands realism as the conscious and responsible attitude of a free man who does not limit his view of reality to a mere anticipation of the phenomenal givens of this world. Although he is intrinsically connected to a particular space – his ‘homeland’ – the realist “does not serve what is powerful because he has power” (Fischer, 2019, p. 10). The realist’s goals are not limited by the ambitions of this or that political party. He is not a party adherent, although he must reckon with this ‘unstable’ force. He does not lean towards chauvinism and moralistic nationalism, nor does he promote class hatred (Fischer, 2019, p. 12). He is not a pan-European (Fischer, 2019, p. 15). Mere subjective self-attribution of a person as a ‘world citizen’ is not sufficient. As a rationally thinking and creative human being, he or she stands at the imaginary ‘centre’ of all that is European, so to speak (Fischer, 2019, p. 16), and is therefore able to credibly assess the priorities that need to be urgently addressed as potential challenges in a given context.

The realist believes in reality, in the fact that reality points positively towards something rational – that it has *meaning* and that this *belief is creative* – seen in the contemporary prism of the situation after the end of the war and the emerging spirit of the ‘world revolution’.⁴ The realist has penetrated the realm of instincts and as a *meaning-seeker* he is always fully ‘present’

³ As the title of Fischer’s German-language study suggests: *Der Realismus und Europäertum (In Beziehung auf die Gedankenwelt und Weltanschauung Masaryks)* [*Realism and Europeanism (In relation to Masaryk’s world of thought and world view)*] (Fischer, 2019, p. 136).

⁴ The book *Světová revoluce. Za války a ve válce 1914–1918* [*The world revolution. During the war and in the war 1914–1918*] Masaryk published the book as a whole in 1925 (Masaryk, 2005, p. 483). It was published in English two years later under the title *The Making of a state. Memories and observations 1914–1918* (Masaryk, 1927).

– permanently consciously ‘participating’ in this unique process. That constant making present of meaning (and value) by which we as individuals orient ourselves is ‘perspectivalism’ (Fischer, 2019, p. 13; Stack, 2005, pp. 60–102). Not relativism. It encompasses the ‘whole’ of reality and this, if we are heading towards a desired goal, by its very defiance determines the path to be followed by the realist.

It is not, therefore, a notion of a particular goal that is statically fixed. This idea is consolidated, so to speak, before our eyes and takes on an increasingly concrete form. By the permanent discrepancy between the ideality of the goal and what was possible to do in a given situation, the realist also makes *himself* present – which is his ‘real’ value attitude. In the words of Fischer: “He does not keep his goal in front of him, he is at the same time carried away by events, he *lives* in the goal, he has confidence in himself and does not need to prove this confidence to himself. Spiritual vitality and calm certainty are united; foreign points of view are understood as halting places (*Haltepunkte*) of possible perspective” (Fischer, 2019, p. 14).⁵

Masaryk’s realism and the ‘breakthrough generation’

Fischer’s specifically ideological and thematically-philosophically hierarchical series of four typical Europeans – St. Augustine (354–430) – Karl Marx (1818–1883) – and Otto von Bismarck (1815–1798) – is significantly concluded by T. G. Masaryk (Fischer, 2019, pp. 19–20). Fischer praises Masaryk for his ‘revolutionary’ *internal and external politics during the war*. Masaryk sees the war as a revolutionary European movement into which all the world’s continents will be drawn. According to Fischer, he wants to “carry out the emancipatory movement of the French Revolutionary period on Slavic territory” (Fischer, 2019, pp. 19–20). Ideologically firmly anchored in his homeland, he fulfils this specifically European developmental-historical tendency in the spirit of Johann Gottfried Herder (1744–1803), whereby this ‘naturalisation’ (*Einbürgerung*) of the individual Slavic nations in the old Germanic-Roman family of nations is a symptom of the “inner revolution of the European cosmos” (Fischer, 2019, p. 20) – a social development that made the leading 19th-century Russian giants see themselves as European revolutionaries.⁶

Masaryk is a realist because the shape of his goals and actions is determined by the background of real events. The driving force is an intimate love for the country, not a fleeting flare of the mind. Even before the birth of his own state, he worked to draft a constitution that would place this nascent state formation in the ‘homogeneous’ system of Central European states so that it could sustain itself as a democratic state. Masaryk recognized the essence of nationalism and its chauvinistic tendencies even before the war. At a time of growing fascism and communism, when the *legibus solutus* occurs, it is necessary to have a constitution for a system of states that is not provisional. Fischer calls for a “maximum of what is desirable” (as

⁵ In German original: “Er hält sich das Ziel nicht dauernd vor, sondern die Ereignisse tragen ihm zugleich mit, er *lebt* im Ziel, hat das Vertrauen zu sich und braucht sich dieses Vertrauen nicht zu beweisen. Geistige Lebendigkeit und ruhige Sicherheit sind vereint; fremde Standpunkte werden verstanden als Haltepunkte einer möglichen Perspektive”.

⁶ “For since the days of Peter, Russia has been in a chronic condition of revolution, and the problem of the revolution is one of the leading interests of all philosophers of history and statesmen in Russia. We may indeed say that the problem of revolution is preeminently the problem of Russia” (Masaryk, 1968, p. 528), because, on the other hand “Russia has preserved the childhood of Europe” (Masaryk, 1961, p. 5). It was reflection upon Dostoyevsky that prompted Masaryk to portray “the nature of the Russian revolution, and of discussing the Russian problem as a whole” (Masaryk, 1961, p. vii). According to Masaryk, “A philosophic interest in Russia and Russian development is however displayed in the extensive European literature concerning Russia. This interest has become so marked that it is now possible to speak of the Russification of Europe as well as of the Europeanisation of Russia” (Masaryk, 1968, p. 564).

opposed to a “maximum of what is achieved”) and refers to ‘leader democracy’, which he understands as “democracy based on differentiated equality” (Fischer, 2019, p. 21).⁷

Generally speaking: the essence of the European-realist is that he must opt for something ‘certain’ in the world. He is at the same time prefigured by similarities, different directions and contradictions, without subjugating this ‘other certain’. The prominent qualities of a European are methodical, exact and reliable. On the other hand, as a thinker he must be able to calculate coolly and as an organizer he must have the ability to unify everything – he stretches his imagination to achieve the ‘impossible’. The European is a ‘unity of opposites’ and in this unity lies his true strength (Fischer, 2019, p. 22). He acquired it by absorbing the thought-world of Hellenic world of thought, the legacy of the Roman Empire, as well as the influence of Christianity, later capitalism, nationalism and the ideas of socialism. The European is a polytheist, a Christian monotheist, he is a citizen, a proletarian and an aristocrat, he is a man of the country and the city, he is a man of the European ‘South’, ‘North’, ‘East’, ‘West’ and ‘Centre’. His cultural and other influences range from North Africa to the Horn of Africa (Svoboda, 2022a, pp. 115–117; Gluchman, 2023a, pp. 232–234), Asia Minor and the Caucasus. The European must be able to reconcile these dynamics and their tensions effectively – transforming himself into a ‘world citizen’. Moreover, by being built ‘perspektival’, Europe is, according to Fischer, equipped for revolutionary changes in history. It possesses “a general force that spreads through all parts of Europe” (Fischer, 2019, p. 24).

Awareness of this ‘real’ potential of Europe then determines the actual task of the ‘breakthrough generation’. As Fyodor Mikhailovich Dostoyevsky (1821–1881), the supreme representative of Russian realism, aptly put it: it seeks *the rebirth of life* (Fischer, 2019, p. 25). Fischer wants to point out that exceptional personalities who reacted critically to the generally bleak situation of the 19th century world were profiled in different decades. The hallmark of these personalities is that they consciously distance themselves from any given order of things because they are fundamentally dissatisfied with the state of the present – with its ‘mediocrity’ and ‘powerlessness’. The target of their sharp and scathing critique is that modern approach to reality which is based on the mere givens of the objective world and which is typical of positivism and capitalism: this approach lacks ‘metaphysical faith’ and there is ‘nothing sacred’ about it (Fischer, 2019, p. 26). This one-sided and narrowing approach to reality ‘hardens’ human hearts because it holds only to raw or ‘brute facts’ (Masaryk, 2012, pp. 225, 329, 348). It ceases to appreciate that integral heritage of the past and ascribe to it the necessary contemporary significance. The actual task of the ‘breakthrough generation’ is to rediscover the lost ‘nobility’ in the genesis of development (Fischer, 2019, p. 27).

The ‘breakthrough generation’ and the idea of federation

The main content of the life of the ‘breakthrough generation’ is the idea of a European ‘federation’ (*Bund*).⁸ However, it is an unmistakable fact that the original roots of the idea of a European federation are religious (in the sense of *relegere* or *religare*). By its very nature, this idea reveals how the innermost human motivations, embodied in religious motivations, have been effectively and with the necessary sense of reality integrated into the desires and needs of practical life.

The religious character of the idea of federation can be traced in all cultural periods, whether in the time of Panhellenic cult festivals, the Pantheon during the Roman Empire, or embodied in the medieval-Christian idea of the peace of God (*pax dei*). Later, the universalism of the

⁷ Cf. chap. Max Weber – Der Geist des Kapitalismus und die Führerdemokratie [Max Weber – The spirit of capitalism and leader democracy] (Röhrich, 2013, pp. 99–118).

⁸ In addition to the ‘first’ representative of the ‘breakthrough generation’ Dostoyevsky, Fischer considers Friedrich Nietzsche (1844–1900), Arthur Rimbaud (1854–1891) and August Strindberg (1849–1912) as pioneers of the idea of European federation (Fischer, 2019, p. 28).

medieval political form of feudal monarchy evolved into its modern form with its emphasis on the aspect of social contract, choice, corporate self-governance and mutual cohesion between the various participants – a sense of collegiality. In the 16th century, the ‘law of nations’ (*ius gentium*) began to be understood in a binding connection to a certain natural-law community of nations (*societas gentium*), and the idea of federalism was legally consolidated (Gierke, 1880, pp. 226–263). The Baroque period brought the hard-won need for a balance and harmony of power (William of Orange created it practically, G. W. Leibniz historically/metaphysically). Although this effort definitively faded with the rise of “positivist nationalism and planetary imperialism” in the 19th century, a “remnant” of the Christian idea of federation nevertheless survived (Fischer, 2019, pp. 29–30).⁹ Fischer considers Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel (1770–1831), Friedrich Hölderlin (1770–1843), later Dostoyevsky, and Masaryk, who declared: “It is our task to make realities of the religion and the ethics of Jesus”, to be the most important carriers of this Christian idea (Masaryk, 1927, p. 452; Masaryk, 2005, p. 383; Fischer, 2019, p. 31).¹⁰

From the position of the Christian faith, a specific task is carried out through the idea of a European federation – a certain *mission* in the earthly planetary sphere. This mission connects Europeans across centuries and denominations, whether Protestant or Catholic. “We are called to shape the earth”, says Friedrich Schleiermacher (1768–1834) – the Christian God himself is dependent on our purifying participation (Fischer, 2019, p. 31). So are Catholics. They speak of the ‘transubstantiation’ of the material into the spiritual, of transforming or cultivating the wild rawness of nature into a ‘garden of the children of God’. And the achievement of this ‘Kingdom of God on earth’ in Christian coordinates is only possible through practical action – through hard – “unostentatious” or “small” – *work* (Masaryk, 1927, p. 466; Svoboda, 2023a, p. 74). The Christian God is a God of ‘work’, just as he is a God of the ‘growing masses’ (“Be fruitful, and multiply ...” Gen 1:28). The original belief in the transubstantiation of everything earthly and material later becomes the original driver of technology, industry, science, and social and political life (just as the sexual act of love finds its justification as a technical means of procreation – whoever serves it is ‘equal’) (Fischer, 2019, pp. 32–33). However, it should not be forgotten that at the very beginning of European metaphysics, Greek or ancient-polytheistic metaphysics stood as a part of it. With its sense of reality and activism, it succeeded in global politics and enabled Europe to civilize itself – to “shape” it “at least in one sphere”: *in its attachment to the Earth*. The idea of ‘mission’ therefore precedes in practice any theoretically established federal constitution (Fischer, 2019, p. 34).¹¹

According to Fischer, the post-war efforts and thinking in foreign policy regarding the idea of a European federation are set in the spirit of the idea of *merging smaller states into complexes of larger states* with a supranational character. We note the efforts to create a *Central European federation*, as advocated by Edvard Beneš (1884–1948) in the spirit of Masaryk (Masaryk, 1972), but also tendencies towards a Balkan, Islamic, Pan-Scandinavian, Latin American or Pan-American federation. In place of the (nationalist-particularist) *atomizing* idea of the right to self-determination comes the ‘new’ idea of *federalist-universalist* law, the law of the corporation instead of individualist (super)government. It is at the same time a principled return

⁹ To what extent this idea is theoretically still actually Christian, and whether a person in the present transformed pace and style of life can still call himself a Christian at all, based on the cult of Holy Communion and the Word as heard and read, is a complex question in itself (Fischer, 2019, p. 30).

¹⁰ In 1929, the German Catholic theologian Franz Keller expressed himself in a similar vein: “Es ist Platz für alle Richtungen auf das eine große politische Nahziel hin, die Volkseele zu gewinnen für die Vereinigten Staaten von Europa. Wer hieran mitarbeitet, arbeitet nicht gegen, sondern für Christus und sein Reich [All trends have room to win the heart of the nation for that great political goal close at hand, the United States of Europe. Whoever cooperates here works not against but for Christ and his kingdom]” (Keller, 1929; Fischer, 2019, p. 31).

¹¹ Concerning the position of the Christian churches and their justification of the First World War (Rázus, 1915, pp. 274–284; Gluchman & Gluchmanová, 2024).

to the original legal idea, based on the law of groups, or the coherence of the community, from which only later derives the law of the individual (Fischer, 2019, p. 37).

Militarism and ‘the fourth estate’ law

Fischer does not forget to point out that power belongs to the law (just as the body belongs to the spirit). A crisis situation arises when the right to togetherness begins to be permeated by the desire for power. In the Baroque period, this was the so-called ‘pious purpose’ (*pia causa*); in the 19th century it became unbridled *militarism*, where law and power are completely opposed to each other. But medieval caesaropapism has been irretrievably overcome. In the post-war constellation, a new idea of the right to universality is born – a new *ethos* is born. This ethos, however, is not exclusively a matter of morality. Law, like morality, has its source in certain motives in life, which are embodied in various ideological attitudes and conceptions. The idea of federation therefore arises at present from different sources, i.e. in direct connection with various religious, democratic, but also communist or fascist movements.¹² Turning to fascism, Fischer emphatically notes that it is a direct continuation of the “militaristic tradition of those old bourgeois upper classes” (Fischer, 2019, p. 41).

So the idea of federation cannot just be invented (fabricated). It is a real idea when it is based on real “motives, goals, destinies, cultural heritages (and those of different spheres)” (Fischer, 2019, p. 42). This real potential, which emerges from the life of this or that group or community itself, creates ‘the common’ that holds a particular grouping together. It is therefore necessary to examine what kind of ‘substantive’ commonalities (these ‘homogeneities’) that could form the desired federation of states today, and whether these are even fit to claim corporate law (Fischer, 2019, p. 42).

Starting from the then thorny problem of the so-called fourth estate, Fischer argues that it becomes obvious that the legal claim of the lower working class must be based on contemporary legal perception and thinking. Then even the natural-law norm that is supposed to emerge as the guiding ideological figure from this problem is not a norm in the sense of the rationalism we know from Rousseau to Fichte, i.e. it is not with Maximilien Robespierre (1758–1794): general reason in its ‘highest essence’ (Furet, 1996). The norm, according to Fischer, is indeed ‘superhistorical’, but nevertheless inclined to reality and therefore ‘*not without history*’. The workers’ legal claim must therefore be situated within the complex of contemporary European-universal natural claims – “it is as little and as much ‘Marxist’ as the legal claim of the new third estate was once Rousseauian” (Fischer, 2019, p. 43).¹³

What, then, is the natural leading real figure or norm that the lowest working class promotes? Referring to Karl Marx, Fischer points out that it is the inalienable right to *solidarity* that will gradually permeate the socio-political structure of the whole of Europe.¹⁴ Marx extracted this natural right from the concept of a ‘naturally growing’ community together with a ‘naturally growing’ system of social division of labour. Moreover, the immediate solidarity of workers only becomes meaningful through and on the grounds of technology (*Technik*). This also has its (traditional) implications for the definition of the concept of *work*: it is a continuous joint performance – it is the source of the continuous realisation of a common goal. Through this planned co-operation with other individuals, the worker frees himself from individual limitations and develops class consciousness. In the spirit of such a revolutionary

¹² In relation to the universalist aspirations of Italian fascism, which “transcend national borders”, Fischer refers to Giuseppe Bottai (1895–1959) and notes that he sees the origins of Bottai’s views in Russian Slavophiles (Fischer, 2019, p. 41).

¹³ In German original: “... er [der Rechtsanspruch der Arbeitenden] ist so wenig und so sehr ‘marxistisch’, wie einst der Rechtsanspruch der neuen dritten Standes rousseauistisch war”.

¹⁴ Regarding the notion of the ethics of social consequences as one of the versions of nonutilitarian consequentialism in the thought of early Marx (Gluchman, 2023b).

transformation, a new *conscious* existence is born in the world. Because it is, in socio-political terms, an existence that is wholly creative and by its very being precedes every effort at formulation, as well as the need for legal-political confirmation, the worker as an active individual demands his own rights. “In the midst of decay, exhaustion, and mendacity, modern Europeans, as cooperative workers, have discovered within themselves an omnipresent primordial force – ‘living labour’” (Fischer, 2019, p. 48).¹⁵

Fischer does not believe that the new federal law – which, after all, has to take into account national conditions, just like the order of the European state system – develops only in the economic sphere. Nevertheless, he is convinced that a new European legal consciousness will first develop out of a new federalist social law appropriate to the European industrial nations (Fischer, 2019, p. 50). It will therefore be necessary to develop an entirely new *social policy* whose binding determinations will derive from supranational rights. However, this will not be possible in practice without the application of a certain *regressive* method (Fischer, 2019, p. 51). It is this regressive path that is the way out of the ‘impasse’ for the current ‘small’ European policy. Its consistent pursuit will, according to Fischer, lead to a significant “rejuvenation of the life of nations from European soil” (Fischer, 2019, p. 52).

The ‘demonic power’ of colonialism and the rediscovery of religiosity

The whole problem is complicated by the action of modern, economically oriented life with all the social-collectivist contradictions in the interests of those involved and the socio-legal tensions that have ceased to be confined to the borders of Europe. Indeed, in a situation in which “*European imperialist powers are spreading out across the globe*” and colonizing it relentlessly and without scruples, “Europe is only seemingly still a centre in a passive sense: it is a battleground for intercontinental power groups” (Fischer, 2019, pp. 52–53). Another question, however, is whether in this new space of imperialist politics these *external imperial powers will increasingly have a decisive say*. Indeed, various statistics confirm that the national power of indigenous populations is gradually increasing, precisely in direct relation to the development of nationalism and capitalism. On the other hand, it is important to recognise the growing predominance of America – it is the ‘rentier of Europe’, with the ‘over-saturated’ Americans profiting at the expense of the Europeans. The need for a European ‘continental workspace’ (breaking down tariff barriers, European traffic rules, international cartels, collective trade agreements, organisation of state banks) is echoing ever more strongly in current party politics. “The minimalist policy of mere self-restraint against the financial controller of Europe speaks in favour of a European supranational economic organisation and corresponding institutions” (Fischer, 2019, p. 54).¹⁶

If we take into account the *geopolitical dynamics* of materialist interests and the might of imperialist power, we must conclude that the world political situation since the Great War can no longer be seen as *Eurocentric*. “The demonic power of the European”, Fischer states, “for whom the deepest historical and metaphysical presupposition is and remains the Christian faith in a working creator God..., is spreading over the planet. This force spews everywhere political, economic, social, cultural, religious problems that can only be consistently resolved on the European soil on which they originally arose” (Fischer, 2019, p. 55).¹⁷ And the Slavic (Eastern European) nations will meaningfully participate in this process of shaping the future European

¹⁵ In German original: “Als kooperativ Arbeitende haben die modernen Europäer inmitten des Verfalls, der Erschöpfung und Verlogenheit in sich selbst eine allgegenwärtige Urkraft entdeckt, die ‘lebendige Arbeit’”.

¹⁶ In German original: “Die minimalistische Politik bloßer Selbsterhaltung gegen den Finanzkontrolleur Europas spricht für eine europäisch-übernationale Wirtschaftsorganisation und eine entsprechende Institution”.

¹⁷ In German original: “Eine dämonische Kraft des Europäers, deren tiefste geschichtliche und metaphysische Voraussetzung der christliche Glaube an den arbeitenden Schöpfergott ... ist und bleibt, breitet sich über den Planeten aus. Diese Kraft wirft überall politische, ökonomische, soziale, kulturelle, religiöse Probleme auf, die nur vom europäischen Boden aus, auf dem sie ursprünglich entstanden, gründlich gelöst werden können“.

union. They are the potential bearers of the original Christian religiosity, and this newfound pure religiosity will complement that old Germanic-Romanic family of nations, socially uniting and enriching it with fresh strength, not fragmenting it. In this new and highly dynamic rhythm of life, it is therefore the primary task of Europe to discover and ‘ideational’ (*ideell*) define the role and place of religion in society, as well as, in connection with its original social function, the intrinsic value of natural law and, consequently, of politically positive law. The techno-economic and collectivist existence of modern Europeans means much more than a *civilization capable of exercising* itself. The new dynamics of the times require a *new art* of living together. Intensity must precede the extensiveness of contemporary imperialist world politics. The right to quantitative “expansion” is only available to Europeans if they make every effort to direct their economic power and its development into an appropriate legal and political form. Things are fixed in their expansiveness, they are just missing: the “order of things” (Fischer, 2019, p. 56).

Federation and democracy

The existing socio-political conditions for the effective organisation of Europe therefore need to be structurally reorganised so that the original residues that are typical of the monarchist system are consciously eliminated to the extent possible. Fischer first criticizes the then form of the ‘Geneva League of Nations’ (*Société des Nations*) and asks whether this community is not merely “a variously clumsy and ugly embryo of a European federation of states” (Fischer, 2019, pp. 56–57).¹⁸

In addition to overcoming various ‘contradictions’ (such as the differences in the North American federation between the democratic states of the North and the agrarian-aristocratic states of the South, etc.), Europe has to fulfil the condition of *homogeneity* – it gives the necessary form to the federal arrangement (Schmitt, 1929, p. 127). On the other hand, the federation must possess the appropriate *physical power* to enable intervention in order to make that required homogeneity sustainable. Fischer is of this opinion that the condition of homogenous developmental direction has already been met by the present states with their common development ‘rhythm’ (inflations, deflations, unemployment, financial crises).

According to Fischer, it is necessary to realise that the current power represented by this ‘rhythmic consensus’ (by this ‘identical’) no longer consists in forcibly maintaining a continuous balance in the spirit of monarchist-liberal constitutionalism. Power is now in the hands of cartels and trade unions, of parties with their immense apparatus, of intercontinental powers and modern state corporations, of dictatorships and mass movements of the proletariat and nationalists in the streets, of continental European and financial imperialist power aspirations, all taking place at different political levels and without the presumption of balancing themselves in a particular system of equilibrium. A future European federation is only possible if “what belongs together is arranged together, layer by layer, according to the degree of gradation” (Fischer, 2019, p. 60).¹⁹ Fischer considers a form of *democracy* as the European political form of the future that has the desired potential to encompass and effectively channel this multi-layered dynamic reality.

In contrast to monarchy, whose polythetic form is not perspectivalist but Christian-absolutist (it focuses on *one* exceptional essence and *one* law, directed towards monotheism and idealism),

¹⁸ In German original: “Ob der gegenwärtige ‘Genfer Bund’ als ein vielleicht ungeschickter und hässlicher Embryo eines europäischen Staatenbundes angesehen werden soll”.

¹⁹ In German original: “Ein künftiger Bund ist nur möglich, indem sich Schicht für Schicht das Zusammengehörige nach Maßgabe der Staffelung aller Schichten zusammenordnet”.

democracy corresponds to *ancient polytheism* and *realism*.²⁰ It does not draw on absolutist power. Democracy derives its strength from the *reality* of diverse human impulses and movements and, as “polytheistically unleashed” according to Fischer, opens up space for a “polymorphous multiplicity of rights” (Fischer, 2019, p. 62). Compared to Christian metaphysics (anchored in a transcendent absolute idea and desecrating everything earthly – it lacks ‘measure and purpose’ in dealing with this idea), polytheistic metaphysics is ‘intimately’ connected to earthly existence. It takes full note of the life of even the poorest craftsmen, whereby technology and the economy are invested with a last but not final *value*.

But we must avoid reducing democracy to a mere ‘technique’ of governance. Only the actual process of voting – the practice – will show whether the majority really decides when it comes to voting, and whether its forms (rights, laws, hence fundamental rights and institutions) are not given, so to speak, *before* the actual political life of the nation. The fact that the nation is a living creative base implies something multiple – that ‘unity of will’ does not precede the multiplicity and contradiction of perspectives of different interests. Unity of will must come from the nation, and only in this pluralistic sense is it part of the *perspectivalist* essence of democracy.

Every decision must therefore be seen as differentiated in itself (it is not absolute). Unity must therefore be achieved within the ‘perspective’ of the interests of the individual members, just as the conflicting interests of the individual members will be reconciled through the laws of federation, i.e. such laws as allow adversaries to be ‘in solidarity’ with each other. In terms of the need for general reconciliation, then, political party ceases to play a determining role in a federation of nations. In Fischer’s view, actual free decision-making is based on the direction of one’s interests and is justified in the sense of a certain legal norm that is binding on that *particular* person and not on another. Even in a (pluralist) democracy, this norm has a supra-personal validity, but it is never *disembodied*. “Federation and democracy are structurally the same” (Fischer, 2019, p. 65).

Fischer characterises democracy in general as a “differentiated unity” (Fischer, 2019, p. 70) and only as a *unity in multiplicity* – possessing the necessary looseness (not ambivalence), dynamism and fresh energy (Fischer, 2019, p. 72) – can it become a constitutional form of federation, especially a ‘universal’ federation of European states. The natural contradictions of social and national nature will thus be ‘politically’ provided with a unifying framework, and the strength and energy of the federation will lie in its internal ‘resilience’. And Fischer concludes: “In its differentiation, the political formation as a whole has its relief and physiognomy” – its typical face and expression. “The dynamism and layeredness and homogeneity of the individual state corresponds to the dynamism and layeredness and homogeneity in the life of the whole federation” (Fischer, 2019, p. 77).²¹

Fischer summarizes the contradiction between democracy, or federation, and monarchy, or imperialism, as follows: Monarchy corresponds to monotheistic metaphysics – the metaphysical egoism of the sovereign ruler; it tolerates no other gods beside itself, and for its political egoism and conquering imperialism it tolerates no other monarch beside itself; the spirit of monarchy is *exclusives*, monarchy is *anti-federal*. Democracy corresponds to a polytheistic metaphysics; its spirit is *inclusive*; it requires equal forces within and without its borders and can only stand if it has many other democracies beside it – just as a polytheistic god needs other gods beside him; democracy is *federal*, it is not metaphysical-egoistic in nature;

²⁰ According to Fischer, Niccolò Machiavelli (1469–1527) and Charles Louis Montesquieu (1689–1755) in particular, as “the most sophisticated and insightful political thinkers,” draw on an ancient European perspective in their timeless reflections on democracy (Fischer, 2019, pp. 66–77).

²¹ In German original: “In seiner Differenziertheit hat das ganze politische Gebilde sein Relief und seine Physiognomie. Der Dynamik und Schichtung und der Homogenität des Einzelstaates entspricht die Dynamik und Schichtung und Homogenität im Leben des ganzen Bundes”.

it is a “society of societies” (Montesquieu, 1989), as is ‘the god of gods’; the political renewal of democracy means the political renewal of the metaphysics of antiquity (Fischer, 2019, p. 78).

‘Europäistik’ as a structural science

The practical approach to reality nowadays in all European countries is in the spirit of *realism*. And, as Edmund Husserl (1858–1938) pointed out in his *Philosophie als strenge Wissenschaft*,²² “the most powerful reality is science”, and what “our time needs most of all” is precisely *philosophical science* (Husserl, 1965). Realism is *formative* because it is linked to *philosophical* and *scientific* inquiry. Science in its generality is then understood by Fischer as “realism in pure culture” (Fischer, 2019, p. 79).

However, the purpose of general or philosophical science must be distinguished from the purpose of the individual scientific disciplines (*Fachwissenschaften*). A specialist science proceeds from its subject matter without taking into account world view, structural and spiritual-historical assumptions. Its conclusiveness is determined by its performance and effectiveness. It is characterised by its flexible response to the latest trends in society – it is in a constant process of *self-actualisation*. In spite of this functional distinction, Fischer argues that, in principle, it must always be remembered that “between promise or continuity with higher laws and performance lies an indomitable unity” (Fischer, 2019, p. 79).²³

Realism, then, is now necessarily based on the fundamental assumptions of modern science, and in the crucial sphere of modern life and its performance, this realistic approach can therefore be regarded as an *existential truth*. It is precisely in this most general sense of existential-functional continuity with ‘higher laws’ that Fischer speaks of ‘Europäistik’ as an ‘overarching’ science in the *narrower* sense and refers to it as “the science of science”. He adds: “‘Europäistik’ in the narrower sense is ‘Europäistik’ as a structural science” (Fischer, 2019, p. 80; Svoboda, 2023a, pp. 68–69).²⁴

In a *broad*er sense, ‘Europäistik’ focuses on the *specific* content it is supposed to instil in the individual subject-oriented sciences, and consequently on how (European) significant these contents are in terms of their qualitative gradation (hierarchy), but also in terms of their intrinsic necessity. ‘Europäistik’ in a *broad*er sense can also aim to investigate those positive connections that the various sciences do not or have not taken into account. Individual disciplines such as Slavonic, Germanic or Romance studies are indispensable to ‘Europäistik’ as a general source of knowledge, revealing both the significance of these particular ideological contents for individual cultural areas and the essential correlations concerning the history of the development of European character. Thus, it can be summarized in general terms: in a broad sense, ‘Europäistik’ *observes and collects*; in a narrower sense, it goes back to *knowledge and structural-theoretical assumptions and systematizes* (Fischer, 2019, p. 81).²⁵

Science is inherently systematic. The very factual content that this or that science aims at puts it at a certain proximity or distance from the goal of systematics. It is through ‘Europäistik’ that it becomes clear that each individual science (whatever degree of generality it may possess) has its necessary relation to the typically European one. In this systematic approach to reality – essentially bound to reality in all concrete, rationally graspable particulars – ‘Europäistik’, at various levels of scientific perspective, will represent, in its substantive contribution and in its

²² The text *Philosophie als strenge Wissenschaft* [*Philosophy as a rigorous science*] was first published in *Logos* 1910/1911. This was Husserl’s first publication in ten years since the publication of *Logische Untersuchungen* [*Logical Investigations*] in 1900/1901.

²³ In German original: “Zwischen Versprechen oder Gebundenheit an höhere Gesetze und Leistung besteht eine ungebrochene Einheit”.

²⁴ In German original: “Die Europäistik im engeren Sinne ist Europäistik als Strukturlehre”.

²⁵ In German original: “Die Europäistik im weiteren Sinne beobachtet und sammelt; die Europäistik im engeren Sinne geht auf die erkenntnis- und strukturtheoretischen Voraussetzungen zurück und systematisiert”.

possible degree of realization, the desired “provisionarium on the path of scientific-systematic generalization” (Fischer, 2019, p. 81). According to Fischer, the *assumption of all assumptions* is thus given, namely that individuals or a set of individuals (institutions) are the bearers of the European, and hence European-colonial tradition.

Thus, ‘Europäistik’, as a presupposition of *all* presuppositions, has its “universalist and typological character” (Fischer, 2019, p. 84). For Fischer, the crucial importance of this assumption of *all* assumptions today lies not only in the reference to the European origin of science as such, but also in the fact that the “contemporary *rebirth* of science” can explain various tensions in *European* life, precisely in the period of the current *global crisis* (Fischer, 2019, p. 83). If ‘Europäistik’ – its approach to life – is grounded in science, it has the potential to stimulate a new scientific spirit that will purify science from the negative admixtures of class and chauvinist prejudices and all the nagging, as well as from the one-sided influence of positivist ‘pseudo-metaphysics’ and servility to technology (to which it has ‘positivistically’ and ‘pragmatically’ committed itself). It does not care whether its yields are convenient for this or that church, regime or mentality, whether it disturbs the peaceful life of secure citizens or whether it does not want to see or conceal the pitfalls of modern nihilism. Nor does science live any longer at the mercy of the individual state, and is no longer sustained by it as a mere ‘ornament to its rawness’. It is not morally beholden to the state in any way, nor does it glorify it (either historically or systematically), nor does it lend it a helping hand in weeding out or selecting soldiers and civil servants and deem itself harmless in doing so. Science has an *ethos* in itself. While it is highly desirable that it should speak to Europe as a whole with this ethos, its most intrinsic commitment to Europe lies in the intensity of the performance itself. Let Fischer speak: “The realist ethos is the ethos of the actively engaged; the mindset emerges only with performance” (Fischer, 2019, p. 84).²⁶

Since ‘Europäistik’ is a science that is currently supposed to uncover a completely new layer of subject matter in the European field, it is necessary that all scientific fields gradually crystallize their working approach adequately. However, the condition is that the sciences take a structural-analytical approach to this new layer of givenness, which is generally valid. Fischer refers to this new (holistic) working approach of the sciences as a *reductive method* and points to modern scientific disciplines in which this holistic approach to reality is already reflexively manifested (Fischer, 2019, pp. 85–86; Bäumer, 1928; Hehn, 1911; Simmel, 1908; Tillich, 1933; Troeltsch, 1922; Tönnies, Wiese & Hartmann, 1969; Weitzsäcker, 1940).

According to Fischer, even the effort to find truths that transcend us cannot lead us off this course of the all-round formation of a new consciousness of Europeanism. The philosopher himself knows best how the European understands these transcendent truths in order to be able to reason freely as a rational being. This ‘European’ is precisely a kind of concrete ‘a priori’. It is for the knower a kind of “last resting place” (“eine letzte Ruhestation”) – a territory that is no longer a national territory, but developmentally-historically, sociologically, politically and metaphysically – in its tensions, pressures and challenges – a *universal* territory. This imaginary territory creates a ‘closed universe’. And on such a specifically ‘circumscribed’ universal ground, we can then use practice and science to discern what “effective reserves and spiritual foundations” we should reach for and how to appropriately come out with “our own material and our own ideas” when we create something – that *microcosm of the continent* (Fischer 2019, p. 87).

Conclusion

Against the backdrop of the turbulent development of the Weimar Republic, Fischer’s universalist reflections on realism and Europeanism offer a specific philosophical and socio-

²⁶ In German original: “Das realistische Ethos ist das Ethos des lebendig Tätigen; die Gesinnung entsteht und wächst erst mit der Leistung”.

political probe, which can be considered an appropriate ('Reich-German' or 'Lesser German') supplement to illustrate the state of Central European thought in the interwar period, especially at the beginning of the Great Depression. This specific point of view, however, cannot do without taking an appropriate socio-ethical stance towards life and the world around us – without the *ethos* that underlies the intensity of the emerging continental mission (Bednář, 2022; Hroch, 2022).

Independent and critically aware European thinkers are the bearers of this ethos, which stems from a fundamental conviction of the cultural and historical belonging of Europe. These authentic and socially indispensable original individuals, whom Fischer summarises as the 'breakthrough generation', have, at various times in modern historical development, striven for a 'rebirth of life' and its meaning, and thus for the effective establishment of traditional and often forgotten European values – for the rediscovery of the 'nobility' of Europe as a homogeneous continental whole. With their personal courage, combined with their indiscriminate critique of established patterns of thought and action, these visionary and inspiring creative figures pointed the way towards a 'new' and more hopeful Europe – laying the foundations for the realisation of the idea of a modern European *federation*.

Hugo Fischer believed that the qualitatively new and comprehensive ethical attitude of the individual in this revolutionary interwar period was structurally rooted in the free and responsible exercising of democracy of the ancient type – in its conscious *activist realism*. And 'Europäistik' as a philosophical science that leads us back to a systematic recognition of the 'structural-theoretical presuppositions' of reality – to the discovery of meaning and value as its most intrinsic realities – is to fulfil that overarching 'meta-theoretical' role: to become a 'science of science'. Referring to T. G. Masaryk and his democratizing efforts (Svoboda, 2022c), whose initial epistemological presupposition was the integrally directed participation of positive sciences and rigorous scientism, Fischer thus foreshadowed the possible eventuality of a federative development of a 'new' Europe towards a higher and 'fresher' humanity. With direct references to his earlier and more recent European predecessors, he also pointed to the necessity of rediscovering social cohesion – to the indispensability of natural interpersonal *solidarity* across a democratic plurality of partial views (Svoboda, 2023b).

According to Fischer, this fundamental social bond, without which every conceivable social unit lacks its essential existence, has a completely 'real' basis and is therefore something real in its natural spontaneity. It springs immediately from the intrinsic motives and existential desires of the individuals who ideologically share a particular social unit. Its dynamic essence lies in its functional interconnectedness and cooperation through an increasingly developed social division of labour. Through the appropriate and effective transformation of one's innermost experiences and the corresponding positively directed motivations into the sphere of social life, these individual motives and desires are fundamentally transformed into completely new and defining qualities of universal life and lend it the desired homogeneity as a unique social whole.²⁷

This has real consequences and concrete effects on our perception of the world around us – the world in which we live and share our values. Man as a *zoon politikon* develops a sense of collective consciousness and, in the consciously selective spirit of his best cultural traditions and with the judicious use of the scientific and technological conveniences of contemporary civilizational trends, qualitatively transforms himself against the background of the natural hierarchical ordering of a plurality of social functions into a new type of European, while in his

²⁷ Let us remember that in his ethics John Stuart Mill (following from those who preceded him) embraced the doctrine of the 'transformation of emotions'. He believed that it is against a backdrop of intensive social activity that the composition of these emotional transformations can be so internal and perfect and like emotional unity can acquire a purely subjective (experienced) nature, as with this unity emerges 'the idea of moral obligation', on which this experienced total unity is essentially founded (Höfding & Král, 1946, pp. 237–238).

highest spiritual achievements this fundamental qualitative transformation can also take religious forms (Svoboda, 2022b). And the Slavic nations have an important social role to play in this process of meaningfully shaping the new collective consciousness of the future European federation. A few years later, that potentially new moral-political humanizing activism of the Central European space was violently interrupted by the rise of German nationalism and the new world conflagration. Nevertheless, Fischer's optimistic idea of the continuity of a strong functioning European federation, based on convincing traditional spiritual principles, equality in collective decision-making and substantive open (non-discriminatory) critical debate, has remained an enduring inspirational challenge even today.

In the context of the history of Czech thought, which has traditionally placed a special emphasis on the axiological moment in philosophical reflection, i.e., it favoured a sense of responsibility for the fate of the world and efforts to change it for the better – that engagement in the rectification of human affairs (Jan Hus, Petr Chelčický, Jan Amos Komenský, later Augustin Smetana and Tomáš Garrigue Masaryk), we can essentially speak of a traditional challenge. In the history of Czech thought it is even a “dominant” tradition and the thought experiments connected with this tradition “have produced the most remarkable results” (Zumr, 1991, pp. 62–63). Masaryk's humanist-democratic legacy, which can only be realised against the background of a modern federation of European states operating on democratic principles, is inherently linked to the thought of Emanuel Rádl, Josef Tvrđý and Josef Ludvík Fischer, but also to those Czech philosophers who were not direct followers of Masaryk's views, whether subscribing to phenomenology like Jan Patočka,²⁸ to existentialism like Jiří Němec, to the philosophy of Protestantism like Ladislav Hejđánek, to analytical philosophy like Ladislav Tondl, or to non-dogmatic Marxism like Robert Kalivoda or Karel Kosík. In the recent past, most of them actively or passively opposed the totalitarian dictatorship and, in accordance with their conscience, paid a heavy toll for it by losing their jobs and other security and means of existence (Zumr, 1991, p. 66).

Acknowledgement

This article was written as part of the research activities of the Department for the Study of Modern Czech Philosophy of the Institute of Philosophy of the Czech Academy of Sciences in Prague.

References

- BÄUMER, G. (1928): *Deutsche Schulpolitik* [German school policy]. Karlsruhe: G. Braun.
- BEDNÁŘ, M. (2022): Philosophical and geopolitical resources for ethical justification of the national and state revival of the suppressed nations in Central Europe. In: *Ethics & Bioethics (in Central Europe)*, 12(3–4), pp. 166–172.
- CHRISTIANS, H. (2018): Der Verschüttete [The buried man]. In: *Die Welt*, January 16. [online]. [Retrieved January 16, 2018]. Available at: <https://www.welt.de/print/die%20welt/kultur/article172515876/Das-Verschuettede.html>
- FISCHER, H. (2019): *Der Realismus und das Europäertum* [Realism and Europeanism]. Hrsg. und kommentiert von S. Dietzsch und M. Havelka, 1. Aufl. Berlin: Matthes & Seitz.

²⁸ A specific view of Jan Patočka's philosophy and his conception of the meaning of national identity is offered by Erazim Kohák (1933–2020), a Czech philosopher who was significantly influenced by Masaryk's and Husserl's thought (Kohák, 1989; Kohák, 2008). From 1948 to 1990 he lived in exile in the USA, became a full professor of philosophy at Boston University and in 1991 also at the Faculty of Philosophy of Charles University. In 1995 he returned to the Czech Republic permanently and continued teaching philosophy at the Faculty of Philosophy of Charles University. In 2006 also began working at the Centre of Global Studies in the Institute of Philosophy of the Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic.

- FURET, F. (1996): *The French Revolution: 1770–1814*, trans. A. Neville. Malden, MA & Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
- GIERKE, O. (1880): *Johannes Althusius und die Entwicklung der naturrechtlichen Staatstheorie* [*Johannes Althusius and the development of the natural law theory of the state*]. Breslau: Verl. von Wilhelm Koebner.
- GLUCHMAN, V. (2023a): Review: J. Svoboda, M. Hrubec & A. Kasanda: *Africká filosofie společnosti. Vývojová perspektiva* [*African philosophy of society. A development perspective*]. Prague: Filosofia. In: *Filozofia*, 78(3), pp. 232–235.
- GLUCHMAN, V. (2023b): The idea of the common good in the young Marx and nonutilitarian consequentialism. In: *History of European Ideas*, 49(8), pp. 1347–1360.
- GLUCHMAN, V. & GLUCHMANOVÁ, M. (2024): The Slovak ethos of plebeian resistance and the First World War. In: *Studies in East European Thought*. Published: 26 September 2024. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11212-024-09670-1>
- HEHN, V. (1911): *Kulturpflanzen und Haustiere in ihren Übergang aus Asien, nach Griechenland und Italien sowie in das übrige Europa; historisch-linguistische Skizzen* [*Cultivated plants and domestic animals in their transition from Asia, to Greece and Italy and to the rest of Europe; historical-linguistic sketches.*]. Achte Auflage. Neu herausgeg. von Otto Schrader. Mit botanischen Beiträgen von Adolf Engler und Ferdinand Pax. Berlin: Verlag von Gebrüder Borntraeger.
- HÖFFDING, H. & KRÁL, J. (1946): *Přehledné dějiny filosofie* [*A brief history of philosophy*]. Prague: Česká grafická unie.
- HROCH, M. (2022): Morality and the nation: Was the birth of the European nation an immoral deviation? In: *Ethics & Bioethics (in Central Europe)*, 12(3–4), pp. 111–127.
- HUSSERL, E. (1965): Philosophy as rigorous science. In: Q. Lauer (ed.): *Phenomenology and the Crisis of Philosophy*. New York: Harper, pp. 71–148.
- KELLER, F. (1929): *Kriegsächtung und Friedensrüstung* [*War defence and peace armament*]. Freiburg/Brsgr.: Akademischer Werkverl.
- KINZEL, T. (2019): IFB-Rezension: Der Realismus und das Europäertum [IFB Review: Realism and Europeanism] / Hugo Fischer. Hrsg. und kommentiert von Steffen Dietzsch und Miloš Havelka., 1. Aufl. Berlin : Matthes & Seitz, 2019. Informationsmittel (IFB) : digitales Rezensionsorgan für Bibliothek und Wissenschaft. [online] [Retrieved January 1, 2022]. Available at: https://www.academia.edu/39346559/IFB_Rezension_Der_Realismus_und_das_Europäertum_Hugo_Fischer_Hrsg_und_kommentiert_von_Steffen_Dietzsch_und_Miloš_Havelka_1_Aufl_Berlin_Matthes_and_Seitz_2019?email_work_card=view-paper
- KOHÁK, E. (1989): *Jan Patočka: His thought and writings*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- KOHÁK, E. (2008): *Hearth and horizon: Culture identity and global humanity in Czech philosophy*. Prague: Filosofia.
- LITT, T. (1918): *Geschichte und Leben. Von den Bildungsaufgaben geschichtlichen und sprachlichen Unterrichts* [*History and life. On the educational tasks of history and language teaching*]. Leipzig/Berlin: Teubner.
- MASARYK, T. G. (1927): *The making of a state. Memories and observations 1914–1918*, trans. H. W. Steed. London: Allen & Unwin.
- MASARYK, T. G. (1961): *The spirit of Russia. Studies in history, literature and philosophy*, vol. I, trans. E. & C. Paul. London: George Allen & Unwin.
- MASARYK, T. G. (1968): *The spirit of Russia. Studies in history, literature and philosophy*, vol. II, trans. E. & C. Paul. London: George Allen & Unwin.
- MASARYK, T. G. (1972): *The New Europe (The Slaw standpoint)*, eds. W. P. Warren & W. B. Weist. Lewisburg: Bucknell University Press.

- MASARYK, T. G. (2005): Světová revoluce. Za války a ve válce 1914–1918 [World Revolution. During the war and in the war 1914–1918]. In: J. Srovnal (ed.): *Spisy T. G. Masaryka* [Collected works of T. G. Masaryk], vol. XV. Prague: Masarykův ústav AV ČR – T. G. Masaryka, o. p. s., pp. 9–639.
- MASARYK, T. G. (2012): Univerzitní přednášky I. Praktická filozofie [University lectures I. Practical philosophy]. In: J. Gabriel et al. (eds.): *Spisy T. G. Masaryka* [Collected works of T. G. Masaryk], vol. IV. Prague: Ústav T. G. Masaryka, o. p. s. – Masarykův ústav, pp. 11–471.
- MONTESQUIEU, Ch. L. (1989): *The Spirit of the Laws*, eds. M. Cohler, S. C. Miller & H. S. Stone. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- ORTEGA Y GASSET, J. (1961): Unity and Diversity of Europe. In: J. W. Miller (ed.): *History as a system, and other essays toward a philosophy of history*, trans. H. Weil. New York: Norton, pp. 43–86.
- RÁZUS, M. (1915): Vojna a náboženstvo [War and religion]. In: *Cirkevné listy*, 29(11–12), pp. 274–284.
- RÖHRICH, W. (2013): *Politische Theorien zur bürgerlichen Gesellschaft. Von Hobbes bis Horheimer* [Political theories on bourgeois society. From Hobbes to Horheimer]. Wiesbaden: Springer VS.
- SCHMITT, C. (1929): *Die Kernfrage des Völkerbundes* [The core issue of the League of Nations]. Berlin: F. Dümmler.
- SIMMEL, G. (1908): *Soziologie: Untersuchungen über die Formen der Vergesellschaftung* [Sociology: Investigations into the forms of socialization]. Leipzig: Ducker & Humblot.
- STACK, G. J. (2005): *Nietzsche's anthropic circle: Man, science, and myth*. Rochester, NY: University of Rochester Press.
- SVOBODA, J. (2022a): Racionalita v etiopské filosofii: překonání iluze o 'předkoloniální' filosofii [Rationality in Ethiopian philosophy: Overcoming the illusion of 'pre-colonial' philosophy]. In: J. Svoboda, M. Hrubec & A. Kasanda: *Africká filosofie společnosti. Vývojová perspektiva* [African philosophy of society. A development perspective]. Prague: Filosofia, pp. 51–117.
- SVOBODA, J. (2022b): Ethics in Masaryk's classification of the sciences. In: *Human Affairs*, 32(3), pp. 348–357.
- SVOBODA, J. (2022c): The crisis of modern man in the light of Masaryk's national philosophy. In: *Ethics & Bioethics (in Central Europe)*, 12(3–4), pp. 173–182.
- SVOBODA, J. (2023a): Modernism and transcendence from the perspective of Masaryk's Realism. In: J. Svoboda & A. Prázný (eds.): *Recalling Masaryk's The Czech question. Humanity and politics on the threshold of the twenty-first century*. Leiden: Brill, pp. 57–81.
- SVOBODA, J. (2023b): The relevance of humanities in Masaryk's system of sciences. In: M. Hrubec & E. Višňovský (eds.): *Towards a new research era: A global comparison of research distortions*. Leiden: Brill, pp. 156–170.
- SVOBODA, J. (2023c): Hugo Fischer: Realismus, evropanství a hodnota demokracie [Hugo Fischer: Realism, Europeanism and the value of democracy]. In: V. Gluchman & J. Kalajtšidis (eds.): *25th International Conference on "Ethical Thinking – Past & Present" (ETPP 2023/25)*. Prešov: FF PU, pp. 10–42.
- TILLICH, P. (1933): *Die sozialistische Entscheidung* [The socialist decision]. Postdam: A. Protte.
- TÖNNIES, F., WIESE, L. & HARTMANN, L. M. (1969): *Verhandlungen des 3. Deutschen Soziologentages am 24. und 25. September 1922 in Jena* [Proceedings of the 3rd German Sociological Conference on 24 and 25 September 1922 in Jena]. Reden und Vorträge von Ferdinand Tönnies, Leopold von Wiese, Ludo Moritz Hartmann und Debatten über das Wesen der Revolution. (Tagung: 3. Deutscher Soziologentag "Das Wesen der Revolution"). Frankfurt am Main: Verlag Sauer & Auvermann KG.

- TROELTSCH, E. (1922): *Psychologie und Erkenntnistheorie in der Religionswissenschaft: eine Untersuchung über die Bedeutung der Kantischen Religionslehre für die heutige Religionswissenschaft* [Psychology and epistemology in the study of religion: An investigation into the significance of Kant's theory of religion for today's religious studies]. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (P. Siebeck).
- WEITZSÄKR, V. (1940): *Der Gestaltkreis* [The design circle]. Stuttgart: Georg Thieme Verlag.
- ZUMR, J. (1991): Odpovědnost v tradici českého myšlení [Responsibility in the tradition of Czech thought]. In: *Filosofický časopis*, 39(1), pp. 62–66.