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Summary

The First Republic of Czechoslovakia existed from October 1918 to March 1939. Formed from territories previously part of the Austro-Hungarian or Habsburg Empire, the nation of Czechoslovakia was a unique democratic state in a Central European region of less stable entities, establishing a modern and future oriented nation.

This thesis is an examination of the representations of the concept and idea of home across several different spheres of ideation, examining in turn: the space of nation building, nationalism and nationhood, showing the uses of home in the creation of and the running of the state; architectural theorisation and modernist building projects that sought to refashion living styles and housing, and social and socialist planning manifestos are compared to the initial energy and enthusiasm of avant garde explorations of everyday life; the concept of home and home life, coupled with the housewife’s life within them are examined in the stances of the populist periodicals of the era which were directed towards a female audience.

The final section of the thesis examines, in the penultimate chapter, the concept of home by in-depth readings of literature and personal writings, feuilleton, diaries, letters and poetry. The final chapter presents the testimonies of residents of Prague during the interwar, using life histories and questionnaire responses, to present a completed picture of the multi-level meanings of home.
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Introduction

When Tomáš Garrigue Masaryk found out he had been elected President of the newly created state of Czechoslovakia in November 1918, he was away from home in America. In his later conversations after he had left the Presidency in 1935, Masaryk told the writer Karel Capek “I was completely unprepared to become president. Even though I had been recognized as head of our government abroad, even though I was certain we’d emerge from the war a free nation, and I’d return home, I hadn’t had time to ponder what to do with myself.” Masaryk had been working towards the situation and negotiations which resulted in there being a home created for the Czechs and the Slovaks, and was in exile whilst the Habsburg Empire was still in power, but at the time this happened he was away from that newly created home. Masaryk suffered not only a certain disjuncture from his sudden elevation, which he immediately put out of his mind, “Well, that’s settled” he noted, a master of understatement, but also suddenly finding himself so far away “I was at a considerable disadvantage, however, in that I was unfamiliar with what had been going on at home.” a situation which affected his health:
When I first arrived home, I didn’t feel very well; in fact I didn’t think I had long to live. It must have been the meals we took together… [on the ship home].

At the moment of the creation of his new nation, Masaryk was not at home, he had been abroad since 1914, and he was in the state of ignorance as to what was truly going on ‘at home’. He developed a serious case of ‘malaise’ from all of these out of home states.¹

Masaryk’s state as it relates to home exemplified also the meaning and importance of the subject in a number of different senses: that of the national home for Czechoslovakia which he strove for; that of the location and place one needs to return to, where an absence creates a longing and feeling of separation from what it is that ‘goes on’, and finally the amalgamated idea of home which is the unique and personal creation, one which can exist in concert with all of the definitions of home.

This thesis is an examination of the representations of the concept of home in the interwar period of 1918 to 1939 in Czechoslovakia and the city of Prague. The arc of focus runs from the most public area of life to the most private realm of memory. The ideas of home are explored from the arenas of nationhood, nationalism and ethnicity, to the cultural life of the avant garde and the social milieu of the city, reading the impact of modernisms and modernity on the concept through the works of architectural professionals and theorists and their built works and projects. Home is then explored through the popular publications and women’s magazines, the changing position of women in the interwar and advice books and columns on the subject. The final focus in the thesis begins with an in-
depth reading of personal and intimate writings, letters, diaries and poetry as well as published essays and fiction in chapter four. The last chapter focuses on the responses from residents of Prague and Czechoslovakia, through questionnaire answers and life histories, specifically oriented to memories of homes and lives. This study, *At Home in Prague: Representations of Home in the Czechoslovakian Interwar*, will make an original contribution to the areas of Czechoslovakian social and cultural history of the interwar and to the social and cultural studies of concepts and representations of home across an era which is situated within a culture and nation.

In this introduction I discuss some of the existing histories of Czechoslovakia and how this work will add to this area of study, show the antecedents of the modernisms in the area of Central Europe which influenced the future stance of the architectural world of Czechoslovakia and some of the specific theorising of modernism through the seminal work of Adolf Loos. As well, I will discuss how the concept of home has been studied and analysed in social and cultural studies, anthropology, architectural theory and cultural geography. Finally I will set out the subjects in this work and how they are covered in each chapter.

In considering this as a subject for investigation in the Czechoslovakia of the interwar period, 1918-1939, I was conscious that my search would need to be wide-ranging across many of these different aspects of cultural life during that period, from the political and ideological landscape to architecture, to the press, to literature and finally to the personal
memories of those who had lived through the period. Choosing early 20th century Europe, including Czechoslovakia, as a location for a study of representations of a subject, provides a trove of developing nascent forms of reproduction and representation from the spread and reach of printed matter, in particular newspapers and periodicals (magazines, journals). The professionalisation and theorisation within architecture began to be extensively published as well, both as the texts for professionals as well as for public consumption. The era has also provided the beginnings of social research and state accumulation and analysis of data, such as the fuller census of the first years of 1921 and 1930.

**Czechoslovakia in Europe**

The political life of Czechoslovakia, from 1918 until 1992, has attracted a sustained attention from historians, and social and political scientists. The impinging of the forces of larger and more powerful states in Europe and near Europe, and the Czechoslovakian reactions to these, have been instrumental in creating the sorts of situations and crises which become ripe for analysis in the subsequent decades. Czechoslovakia was often seen as one indissoluble part of the whole of territory known as Eastern Europe or Central Europe, particularly with the Cold War restrictions on active research. Because of this, some studies would consider the whole area, with some minor comparisons made between the nations, and with a certain approach of orientalising the peoples.

Earlier studies posit a placement for the Bohemian and Czech lands halfway into a Europe split between progressive civilization and the rest. Oskar Halecki’s 1952 wide-ranging study of the Slav lands, *The Borderlands of Western Civilization*, aimed to document what he
saw as the ‘Terra Incognita’ of western historiography between Germany and Sweden and the Russian Turkish and Italy lands to the south and east. The use of the term ‘borderlands’ by Halecki cannot be wholly consisting of a stylish title, evoking as it does wild liminal areas, but rather one of denying coeval status for those inhabiting the Slav lands with the rest of Western Europe.

Both The Origins of Backwardness in Eastern Europe published in 1992 by Daniel Chirot, and Borderlands of Western Civilization first published in 1952 and reissued in 1980 begin from the premise of the existence of a separated space of ‘eastern’ Europe sitting apart from the western lands, and thus the subjects of a particular form and type of study, despite the fact, usually noted by Czechs themselves, that Prague is further west than Berlin. However, Halecki does acknowledge that these areas of Europe and the Bohemian lands were a part of the civilisation of Europe as a whole. From medieval ages, through Charles IV, the Holy Roman Emperor of the 14th century, the religious influence of Jan Hus with John Wycliffe in England on early Protestantism centuries before Martin Luther, (Hus advocating the use of local language in religious worship) and later on, even the linguistic studies of Roman Jacobson and the Prague School, made the Bohemian lands integral to what is seen as European ‘civilisation’.

Despite this snapshot history it remains difficult still to find the Bohemian and Czech lands integrated into and made a part of the histories of Europe. Larry Wolff in Inventing Eastern Europe: The Map of Civilization on the Mind of the Enlightenment has argued that “Eastern Europe was not at the antipode of civilisation, not down in the depth of
barbarism, but rather on the developmental scale that measured the distance between barbarism and civilisation.” 7 For Wolff the division of Europe:

[…] was the intellectual work of the enlightenment to bring about that modern reorientation of the continent which produced Western and Eastern Europe. […] The Enlightenment had to invent Western Europe and Eastern Europe together, as complementary concepts, defining each other by opposition and adjacency. 8

This reorientation had far and long-reaching implications, both nationally and culturally, and was seen in the impetus for the elites in the new Czechoslovakia three hundred or so years later to reorient their own cultural performance during the First Republic, having left behind Germanic and Austrian influences, towards the type of modernity imagined of Western Europe and America, whilst nevertheless still seeking from Russia the energy of revolutionary political transformations, often with mixed results. 9

Contrary to the assumptions of Chirot and Halecki and the needs for primordial histories, modern Czech historiography, on their own Terra Cognita, had begun in the 19th century. The eminent historian of the period was František Palacký (1798-1876) (viewed as one of the ‘fathers’ of the nation), in concert with the nationalist movements of the second half of the century. Long before Oskar Halecki, Tomáš Garrigue Masaryk, the future president of the First Republic, had examined The Meaning of Czech History (English ed.1974) and other examinations of the position of Czechs in Europe, and the beginnings of historiography: The Czech Question (1895), Our
Present Crisis (1895), Jan Hus (1896), Karel Havlíček (1896), and The Social Question (1898).¹⁰

The discourse of Europe and Europeanness, and the imbrication of this over other reasons for the existence of nation-states such as the newly independent Czechoslovakia, was understood so well by the influencers such as Masaryk and Beneš at the Paris peace talks in 1919, after the end of World War I, that as Andrea Orzoff noted, propaganda machines swiftly came into being:

Each state cited its adherence to European cultural norms as proof of its moral worthiness, and thus its defense by the Great Powers. Of course, each state defined Europeanness differently, according to its unique mix of historical circumstance and preferred practices. The “Czechoslovaks” had succeeded in persuading the American and French leadership, and some British diplomats, of their European qualities—their rationalism, tolerance, efficiency, and adherence to democratic norms—[...].¹¹

The failure of the Austro-Hungarian Empire after World War I thus produced several new nations in Central Europe, few of which were ultimately successful during the interwar period if one is considering overall stability, democracy and cultural development. The exception was Czechoslovakia.

Although it is common to theorize post-revolutionary and post-empire changes in Latin American, Asian, and African nations as post-colonial, it is less common to see these same conditions applied for the nations of Central Europe in the interwar era, in fact even in the post-communist era, this is largely absent. However, the post-Habsburg era
fits the ideas of a transition period arising from being latterly territory of the Empire lands, and from having the usual colonial appropriation of economic production and wealth exported elsewhere, as well as the cultural hegemony that accompanies this state. Transitions provide a unique period of liminality in which there is the adoption of the ideas that the future can begin only by breaking down the structures of the past, and which provides an environment for creative energy, and there is much about the interwar period in Czechoslovakia that fulfills this character of a post-colonial transition.

Czechoslovakia had also benefited economically from the reabsorption of the wealth left behind by the Empire, and as described at more length in chapter one, the redistribution of land held by the Habsburg aristocracy.

More contemporary and recent histories relate in a more sensitive way the placements of Bohemian and the Czech lands and thence Czechoslovakia into modern Europe. Prior to the multiple studies of the Velvet Revolution (1989) and the Prague Spring (1968), the most wide-ranging had been the history by Robert Seton Watson of the Czech and Slovaks published in 1943, giving a detailed picture of the formation of the nation. Seton Watson had been sympathetic to the exigencies of the region and had been a friend of both Masaryk and Beneš. 12

The most recent histories, though still dealing with political and national life, have been Mary Heiman’s *Czechoslovakia: The State That Failed* (2009). 13 This is a reconsideration of the events of the 20th century in Czechoslovakia and their protagonists, which attracted a large degree of protest from the Czechs. 14 As an example perhaps why this is so, in one set of paragraphs Heiman placed the following words in quotations when describing the
situations leading up to independence: nation; struggle; awakening; emancipation; rediscovery of languages; defender; awakeners; protestant; progressive and national. However, overleaf, the regions of Bohemia Moravia and Silesia are unproblematically simply noted as Austrian in a discussion of the reigns of Přemysl's dynasty.15 The Czechs and Slovaks were no more special cases, nor duplicitous, for creating nations than others, and scare quotes, casting doubt on the legitimacy of the emic descriptions and definitions for these elements of this era of Czech history, could show a certain kind of contempt for the people who undertook this. Andrea Orzoff’s recent history is more considered. *Battle for the Castle: The Myth of Czechoslovakia in Europe* (2011) which has examined in more detail the workings behind the Masaryk governance, the Castle group and the presidency shows how the uses of myth and symbolism were crafted and manipulated during the First Republic.

My familiarity with Czechoslovakia and the Czechs came from Ladislav Holy’s *The Little Czech and the Great Czech Nation* whose examination of the Czech character and culture was set amidst the events of the late 20th century, and detailed how this identity had survived through these.16 Holy’s interpretation of the Czech character and nation noted in particular that this was a dominant group in Czechoslovakia, once they became independent, and whose Czech identity did not need to be asserted except in moments of national crisis. This type of effacement has been confirmed by the international leanings of much of the projects and movements I found during the period, and the lack of overt and conscious expressions of Czechness. This also exemplifies the dominant
Czech ideas and myths that the Czech people are endowed with an overwhelmingly modest national character as well.17

Derek Sayer has written the most comprehensive and detailed history of the cultural and modern Bohemian and Czech lands with his *Coasts of Bohemia*.18 The title comes from a quotation from Shakespeare’s *The Winter’s Tale*, but is also based in a brief reality when the 13th century Ottakar II (1233-1278) expanded his kingdom to include land all the way to the Adriatic. Sayer’s meticulous attention to this history provides a key to the whole landscape of the life of the nation, both pre- and post-independence. Sayer focuses on the confluence of the cultural lives of the different eras of the Bohemian and Czech lands and the political effects of the developing status of the nation, and shows the interplay of these two worlds, and the effects of the creation of nation on these.

Fin de siècle literary and cultural life in Prague for the German speaking literary world has been explored in Scott Spector’s *Prague Territories*.19 Spector illuminates the modern positions of the German writers in the city of Prague whose positions were conflicted and unstable in an era of increasing Czechification and Czech nationalism. Spector identifies the genre of a Prague German Literature as distinct from the accepted National German literatures, from an era which created and inflected a unique literary identity.

There is, at present, not as extensive a collection of different histories on the social and cultural life of the Czechoslovakian interwar period, compared to neighbours such as Germany and Austria, though Bohemia occasionally is included in discussions of the Austrian and Hungarian environments (see for instance Schwartz 2010).20 In some
particular areas this is growing, and specific attention is now being paid academically in areas of architecture and the avant garde such as Matthew Witkovsky’s study of the place of the Devětsil group in the interwar period and the pre-war and interwar architectural movements some of which were unique to the Czech lands which have been published and translated by Czech scholars. Works from Vojtech Lahoda, Vladimír Šlapeta and Stefan Templ have presented the new movements that occurred in architecture during the First Republic, such a Czech Cubism and Rondo Cubism, which were to be seen as the ‘National Style’, and the works and projects of the multiple modernisms of the era. Eric Dluhosch and Rostislav Švácha brought the works of theorists such as Karel Teige back into publication as editors, reproducing Modern Architecture in Czechoslovakia and Other Writings in 2000 and The Minimum Dwelling in 2002 and producing a biography Karel Teige: L’Enfant Terrible of the Czech Modernist Avant-Garde in 1999, which works informed much of my initial investigations for the subject of the effects of modernism and modernity in Prague.

**Prague - The modernizing city**

Karel Čapek described the streets in Prague as an extension of the home, in contrast to the shut-door of the English home, which he had experienced on his travels. With the exceptions of Sharon Marcus’ Apartment Stories, studies of the modern city do not often include the homes that the denizens lived in as part of the analysable fabric of the city. Nor do many present day empirical studies dealing with the concept of home make very much of the location, except a brief glance. The location of Prague as a city is an essential
part of this study of home, affecting as it does the meaning of the modernizing of a medieval and renaissance fabric and landscape imbued with tradition, and the movements of the cultural and literary elites. Prague becomes one of the protagonists in Angelo Ripellino’s Magic Prague, but also one of the characters in Peter Demetz’ Prague in Black and Gold, and both of these present a picture of the milieux of cultural life in the city from the 6th century on, but we do not know as much from these of the ways of living in the city, and they suffer from a bit of baroque spookiness. As Ripellino noted “Ladies and gentlemen, this is not a Baedecker”. Ripellino wove together a picture of a Prague which was still living with the ghosts of its past into the present, re-populated with characters from fictional protagonists, the Golem, to the real Emperor Rudolf.

Jane Pavitt has examined both the city of Prague’s architectural fabric through the different historical eras in The Buildings of Europe: Prague and the modernist projects of the First Republic in a chapter ‘From the garden to the factory: urban visions in Czechoslovakia between the wars’ in the edited volume of The City in Central Europe: Culture and Society from 1800 to the Present, providing a detailed history of the inception of the modernist projects, and their leading figures in the First Republic.

During much of the First Republic - 1918-1939 - the population of Prague was around 500,000 and the central areas were, and are still, compact. This compactness meant that there was a wide-ranging circle of intellectuals of various stripes and occupations from journalism, literature, theatre, photography and architecture, who socialized, made associations and worked together in different ways from revolutionary projects, housing estates to magazines. This element of the city of Prague was the type of environment that
allowed much of the experimentation and creativity which flourished in the short period of the interwar. The links between these different groups and people appear quite often: Architecture spoke to poetry and literature through the meetings of Karel Teige and Karel Honzík with Vítězslav Nezval, Jaroslav Seifert and Josef Čapek; Karel Čapek, the brother of Josef, was a confidant of Tomáš Masaryk and one of the most popular and successful writers of the interwar; Milena Jesenská knew and loved Franz Kafka, and was later married to modernist architect and ČSD member Jaromír Krejčar, and Jesenská also edited the magazine Žijeme and was named on the first masthead in 1930.

These are only some of the examples of the sort of fertile land which was the environment of Prague during this period, and which was instrumental in the assumption of the specific Czech-inflected modernity. Many of these cultural elites also came from modest family backgrounds – there may be a fruitful project in examining that so many of them had fathers who were teachers – and their mature success had a lot to do with the newly liberal conditions, both politically and socially, in the lessening of fixed class hierarchies with the removal of the aristocracy.

**What is ‘Home’?**

To write about home is in some ways to attempt to write about everything. It is as a term so metonymic and at the same time so fungible that there is an impression that this is a concept that does not need to be more descriptive than the name. We know, or think we know, of course, what it means. But the meaning of home is a shorthand for such a number of different aspects of social and human organization, from the economic unit of the ‘household’ to the kin relations known as the ‘family’, to the refuge and shelter of a
single individual, the bricks and mortar building space, and the land and territory of a
nation, that it expands beyond easy definition. Peter Somerville described the keywords
of home as hearth, shelter, heart, privacy, roots, and abode. Somerville also added to
these the concept of a paradise, as the ideal home, possibly one of spirituality and bliss.
All of these concepts appear to inhabit different and potentially discrete spheres, with the
link being a cognate understanding of the word.

The Czech language provides several choices from a latinate root (*domus*) for connoting
home: *doma* – home; *dům* – house (used for municipal and public buildings – as in *maison*
house) *domov* – hearth; *domovem* – homey; *vlast* – country, homeland; and *byt* – flat. *Byt* is also
used to connote home in the phrase *naš byt* – our place/home – and is cognate with the
verb to be, and to live – *byt* – and to *bydlit*, to live in, giving *bydlitě*, an abode or residence
and *bydlet* to house. *Byt/ byt* in Czech is interestingly also cognate with the Russian *byt*
meaning: “Everyday life, daily life, quotidian existence, material culture, private life,
domestic life: all of these various shades of meaning are present in the term.” As a
language with declinations it also gives as one version of *doma* as *domu* – which can mean
towards home, and inside home. Czech also gives a difference between living – *žít* – as in
existence, to be living, and the word for residing and living in – *bydlet*, a difference which
became a point of contention after the first edition between the editors of the 1930s
magazine *Žijeme* – We Live, or We are Alive, and architect JE Koula “Isn’t that phrase a
little too self-confident?”

There are several worlds contained in this idea of *Home* that come into play and therefore
several different areas of representations. A concept of ‘Home’ requires definitions in
more than one sphere of ideation. It is a set of necessary persons, locations, routines and
times (temporal locations) that serve to create this idea of home, and a collection of
expectations, it is also a resource. Home also involves areas in social and cultural life that
include architecture, material goods provision, hygiene, economy and wealth, class structure
and ethnicity. It is reflected and represented in literature and art. In the nationalist sense,
and the national anthem sense, ‘Home’ is also larger than the personal and becomes one of
the important element of the symbolic life of the nation.

**The Push of Modernity**

Seeing the home as a place set apart from others is a particular development of
modernity, as Walter Benjamin saw it. Not only the home, but within it the private
and male individual, embedded in a capitalism which demeans and demands service:

> The private individual, who in the office has to deal with reality, needs the
domestic interior to sustain him in his illusions. This necessity is all the
more pressing since he has no intention of allowing his commercial
considerations to impinge on social ones. In the formation of his private
environment both are kept out. From this arise the phantasmagorias of
the interior - which, for the private man, represents the universe. In the
interior he brings together the far away and the long ago. His living room
is a box in the theatre of the world.\(^{32}\)

Benjamin’s description sees the home, its uses and meaning, existing in service only to
the male member of the household, created by his will and through his own social,
emotional and political needs and comforts, including fantasy, such as a king could
command. When Witold Rybczynski wrote his journey through the historical idea of
Home, he was particularly concerned with delineating the growth in ‘comfort’ which is equated in his examination with the concept of ‘home’. Whilst he sees this as an expansion from the aristocratic forms of spatial organization and the implementation of comfort, Rybczynski’s historical survey was confined by the political realities of the Cold War to an examination of western European modes, using France, The Netherlands and England.

Within this Rybczynski attributes, by and large, the ideas that we find, or are supposed to find, comfortable now - those of privacy, space, cushioning and a single family unit - with an overall definition both of ‘comfort’ across history and ‘home’. Partitioning of space, the partitioning of use spaces within the home, which began to occur with modernity, in Rybczynski’s argument, grew from a single space or room, in which everything took place, to specific and dedicated rooms for different activities, thus creating, he argues, the idea of difference and specificity in activities, and embedding within this a modern concept of privacy. As will be seen later on in this discussion, the Kabyle research undertaken by Pierre Bourdieu showed that the differentiation of, in effect, the production of space related, as Lefebvre and Bachelard also noted, to the activities that occur within it and how this serves itself to give the definition of the space.

Rybczynski considers ‘comfort’ to be an idea which only arises in early modernity, almost because it can, and as a response to the increasing commodification of material life which is an adjunct of the growth of capitalism and individuation, but these conjunctures are perhaps too broadly written as the overall explanations. Comfort is hardly new, and there
is indeed an idea of style and fashion which is expressed through different levels of comfort, in which it is not necessary for there to be only an economically and materially based rationale, as a dialectic. It may have more to do with an evolution of those forms of symbolic cultural capital which were described by Bourdieu more particularly in his study *Distinction* that indicate reliably the position in the class hierarchies for the taste levels:

“Objectively and subjectively aesthetic stances adopted in matters like cosmetics, clothes or home decorations are opportunities to experience or assert one’s position in social space, as a rank to be upheld or distance to be kept.”

There is little agency for this positioning in only responding to external economies, and whilst this does not sum up Rybczinski’s main stance, one of the more interesting aspects of home as a space for performativity is the desire inherent in its creation for an eschewing of the outside world for one wholly created, encompassing in addition its own hierarchies, classes and economies. Whilst Rybczynski establishes the space, delineated, protected, partitioned as the modern discrete home, the activities within it are those which also create the idea by which it is recognised by the inhabitants.

**The Survival of a Modern Domesticity**

Christopher Reed argued that a suppression of ‘domesticity’ in art and architecture was part of the movement of Modernism in his introduction to *Not at Home: The Suppression of Domesticity in Modern Art and Architecture*, though the term ‘domestic’ is presented as impermeable in his context. It is equated with decorative elements in some lights, in others the specific overall design and use of space which is recognised as in the home, and in particular perhaps, as the practice which delineated the separation of work from the
home, with the distinction of ‘work’ as being only that which is about outside remuneration. Therefore the home becomes considered as a place dedicated to comfort, to the family and to the feminine.

What is described by Reed is also akin to the suppression of the feminine influence, as so defined, though this is so only if domesticity is only and forever a pure essential of the ‘feminine’ in the household and of nothing else. Ben Highmore points out how Benjamin’s reading of the street exterior as a dwelling place, and ‘at home’ for the flâneur, thus could be seen to domesticate and feminise the street, but the relation between home, domesticity and gender, noted Highmore, is not symmetrical. Neither can street level be seen as only essentially male.37

Removing domesticity then, controlling its presence or refashioning and reconceptualising it, is a control of the domestic which was attempted as an exemplar of the visions of a new way of living for modernity being created by the leaders in the fields of architecture. To shoehorn the industrial views of form and materials into the home is to attempt to erect a barrier of expertise and streamlined function stemming from an area of activity in which the female gender was understood to be either absent or lacked any power to affect and manipulate.

“A house is a machine for living in” was architect and theorist Le Corbusier’s shorthand for his ideas of the functionalist homes (he also wrote that an armchair is a machine for sitting in). To have a house/machine fashioned from factory and mechanically made
materials allows the thinnest and strongest of walls thus allowing sun, air, and light in, a theme and proviso which became a common modern recommendation in interwar Czechoslovakia. Prague in particular, Le Corbusier noted, suffered from ancient regulations fixing the depth of walls on an ascending scale, leading to dark interiors.  

How people lived in buildings became a modern subject not only for architecture, design, style and aesthetics, but also for political and cultural decisions that carried a weight beyond the practical aspects of function. Coupling these with the ideas of necessary social change would intentionally leave some behind in the push towards the modern future.

Architecture and architectural style became one of the modern symbols of nationhood in the new nations of Central Europe. Czechoslovakia had explored the creation of a recognisable ‘national’ style before independence and the onset of the war, (see below for a fuller exposition) which echoed Viennese and Austrian architectural expressions of the Secession movement which aimed to create new art. Czechoslovakia’s ‘national’ style was not a contested set of motifs seen not to represent nationhood per se, as perhaps was seen in Poland following the war, where peasant motifs were to be integrated into modern national style architectural design, but were nevertheless difficult aesthetically. However, as also discussed by Pantelić for Serbia, these new architectural styles, linked to the economy of a national symbolic were seen to be drivers of cultural renewal, whether grounded in a historical peasant foundation, or newly created.
Pavel Janáček (1881-1956) was one of the leading architects in pre- and post-war Prague. Janáček had devoted the earlier years of his career to devising this home grown architectural style that it was hoped would become a ‘National Style’, more popularly known now as Czech Cubism or as later developed a slightly more gentle Rondo Cubism. This was a consciously created and developed (rather than evolutionary) style of architecture which relied on the surface application of cubist like shapes of prisms and triangles and spheres, which eschewed the square and rectangle. Applied as relief surface decoration, this ‘National Style’ was part of the revival of nationhood (described in chapter one) as a movement to form a unique architectural identity. The founders of Czech cubism, Janáček and the architect Josef Gočár (1880-1945), used it as the vernacular for every part of a designed project from the fabric and construction of the building to the furniture, plates, lights, fixtures, wall clocks and coffee cups in the same way that Frank Lloyd Wright, the Arts and Crafts Movement, the California Craftsman movements, and future modernists such as Le Corbusier and Mies Van der Rohe worked for a seamless and total expression of the styles they created. Interrupted by the First World War, at the start of the First Republic, Rondo Cubism, or the National Style was soon abandoned by architectural practitioners in favour of exploring the possibilities of modernisms and the International Style. This move away from the manufactured vernacular of the National Style in Czechoslovakia was an example of the overall lessening of the importance of the usages of the created traditions, and the fixed ideas of what the nation had to become.

If prior to the First World War there was an earlier tradition of Central European engagement with the idea of the salience of modernism and the function of domestic
architecture in society, other than Czech Cubism, this was certainly brought sharply into the new times by Adolf Loos’ (1870-1934) seminal article *Ornament and Crime* originally published in 1908. The ideas which Loos worked with in this essay were reflected in the following decades in the works of the central European architects, Le Corbusier and the Bauhaus, if they were not perhaps as condemnatory of the ‘primitive’ as Loos showed in his essay. But the view of these ‘primitive’ aesthetic forms as ‘other’ gave their re-use (one thinks of Picasso et al. here) a frisson of the exotic.

Written at a time of the flourishing of Art Nouveau and the Vienna Secession style, and in the Czech lands, the era of the National Style - Cubism and Rondo Cubism - as well as elsewhere the beginnings of the return to craft, Loos was contextually iconoclastic. A Viennese practising architect, though originally born in the town then known as Brunn (now Brno) in Moravia, Loos argued for the ‘otherness’ of the use of ornament. He used a peculiar hand sweep of modernity to agglomerate the Papuan tattooed primitive, the Slovak peasant woman, the overly rich clothing and food of previous centuries, and erotic and scatological degeneracy, placing these against the idea of an evolutionary culture with a progressive teleological composition, which he develops into one rationale for one style. Loos likened ornament (and most particularly the desire for ornament) to the waste of skilled labour producing a useless visual image of which people tire easily. Going further than stylistic aesthetics, he likened the use and production of ornament to an induced delay in evolutionary cultural development, a type of regression to the past, as no new ornament could be produced that could be authentic, there being no need for it. Loos in effect sets out his own manifesto for what was to become the International Style, his
vision is of white walls in the city, smooth surfaces, and perhaps one of the more
interesting ideas of Loos’ to deconstruct, of the case of individuals who need the masks of
plain clothes rather than velvet suits to hide themselves in (or behind).

Whilst Loos’ negative notions were nominally about primitivism, the peasant mind and -
despite a manifesto that annoyed Viennese Bourgeois as he noted - bourgeois and racial
sentiments we would find uncomfortable today, it is the strength given to his argument
that is striking. The presentation on the new architecture, of the International style as it
became, is as a moral condition and requirement for modern living. It goes straight
beyond questions of style (though of course is in the end only a question of style)
through to a manifesto for modernity and for its necessity. Loos can relegate the primitive
(so far away in space as well as time) and the Slovak peasant, as there is no need to
include them. In fact his notion of the inability of those who surprisingly do not choose
the sort of modernity that he advocates is that they are sadly incapable, on the one hand,
and on the other have not any ability to externalise their cultural appetites beyond the
home:

I suffer the ornament of the Kafir, that of the Persian, that of the Slovak farmer’s
wife, the ornaments of my cobbler, because they all have no other means of expressing
their full potential. We have our culture, which has taken over from ornament.
After a day’s trouble and pain, we go to hear Beethoven and Wagner. My
cobbler cannot do that. 42

This externalisation professionalises cultural production and crafts into public – read
cosmopolitan - performances and expressions. The site of the home as a place for craft,
art and beauty created by the householder is superseded in terms of expertise and talent by the manufactory of things, which become of value by virtue of the difficulty of acquiring them, as Simmel – (also discussed by Appadurai) – argued:

Objects are not difficult to acquire because they are valuable, but we call those objects valuable that resist our desire to possess them. Since the desire encounters resistance and frustration, the objects gain a significance that would never have been attributed to them by an unchecked will.

What Loos, perhaps inadvertently, sweeps away by theory, is not only the work of craftspeople but also a home-grown economy which has its own system to ascribe value, both economic and aesthetic, which he seeks to replace with a public economy. Loos’ indication of a type of morality attaching to the uses of decorative style and architectural space planning establishes in certain ways, also, the ideals about social organisation, that of economy and culture, which begin to underpin the choices contained within this materialism, enabled by the growing wealth in the later years of the 19th century and first decade or so of the 20th century. These themes, as delineated by Loos, afterwards occur repeatedly in the choices made by the architects of modernism and the International Style, with similar veneers of different types of morality, political and social. Ornament becomes the realm of the peasant cottage only, which becomes, as will be discussed in chapter three, a form of consumption and leisure, and the crafts and skills involved are eventually seen as the evidence of the essential primitive purity of the past.
Beyond Ornament – Defining ‘Home’

Shelley Mallett has taken some researchers of the concepts of home to task as they “uncritically conflate house and home”, particularly in examination of the design, furnishing and spatial organisation of home, but also with family, etc. and how this may inflect the concepts of home as seen in analysis. 45 However, the conflation is also routinely made without angst by those who are inhabiting these houses as homes outside of the areas of academe. This conflation also raises issues for an analysis of how these are and are not conflated in practice, both architecturally and politically for instance. Peter Somerville has noted also that ideas of the real home and the ideal home, normally as a house, are congruent parts of the social construction of the concept of home as well. 46 Home can also be experienced, not in discrete moments with clearly defined boundaries, but also as a synthesis of more than one definition, sometimes of competing concepts, such as the connotation of home as being ‘where you are from’ from nation to birthplace, and ‘where you are’ being an abode, house and home, together with a destination from one to another. This is revealed in moments of transition, of migration and arrival from one to another, but also in recollection and memory. 47

Mary Douglas has defined home, not as a located place, in a building or space, but as a place of movement and flow, of people, activities and temporal continuity with others. 48 Bourdieu’s study of the Kabyle home provides an example of this definition. The one-room Kabyle house was quite specifically and firmly divided into areas of specialised activity, with rather little supporting architecture and structure. Zones existed for
different genders, and different activities and labours, and for different times of the day: women having the space of the house during the day, retreating behind the loom once the men come into eat, and areas in which the operation of hierarchy could be performed in receiving guests. As Bourdieu argued for the Kabyle house (in the absence of written methods for conserving of symbolic records and cultural capital):

…above all the house - is the principal locus for the objectification of the generative schemes; and, through the intermediary of the divisions and hierarchies it sets up between things, persons and practices this tangible classifying system continuously inculcates and reinforces the taxonomic principles underlying all the arbitrary provisions of this culture. ⁴⁹

Space, in order to be constructed as a home, does not need actual material constructed division, to enable a different meaning and function to be ascribed, and to allow different social interactions and relationships to be written on to space.

Douglas added to the idea of home the space and the flow of people, that of cooperation between the inhabitants and of serving the whole. But Douglas also questioned the persistence of the regularity of the home’s processes, as “inexorable and absurd”. ⁵⁰ However, the idea that homes are stable, that all happens the same from day to day, isn’t sustainable. The home is subject to constant change, suffering from economic pressures, births, deaths, moves, and other losses. A home is not stable, it is the idea of home for the residents that is persistent enough to survive.
But boundedness and boundaries are important for the ideas of home for the protagonists in the real world, even if theoretically there are reasons to see these as permeable or conflated. Borders and land areas, for instance, are of vital issue for the construction and idea of the nation, of the _vlast_. In similar fashion the boundaries of the house - even if the ideas of who can inhabit and come and go are flexible, and if public and private areas within it can change - matter in practice to those who call particular buildings home. The academic worry about the conflation of the house and the home perhaps cannot be sustained when the first description from subjects of their home delineates the physical boundaries (private space ended “on the other side of the garden fence” as one respondent wrote to me) the size, where it was, and the quality and layout of the rooms and even the style of the house is part of the description of the home.⁵¹ In practice, the place where the home ends and the house begins is ambiguous and these terms are used interchangeably.⁵² As the Czech word lists above show, the fungibility of the concept of home is one of the essential qualities that allows this to be used in many and varied ways and hence to be applied to different realms of human activity.

**Re-presenting Home**

This work is divided into five chapters, this introduction and a conclusion.

Chapter one is entitled *We Came from Cottages: Nationhood*. In it I detail the lead up to the start of independence of the First Republic, the work of Czechification based on language and history, and the creations of the national symbols of ‘banal’ nationalism.
The new nation also recreated the contested ideas of the peasant and the land as repository of Czech culture, through a reading of the Czech language classic by Božena Němcová *The Grandmother Babiška*, and how home was a salient feature of this movement, and came to be a key symbolic tool for the creation of the independent nation. I also detail how this was perceived by the populations who were not folded into the idea of a Czecho-slovak nation and what sort of political and social reactions this engendered amongst the remaining nobles by detailing the pre-independence home and lives of the Rohan family and Karl Princ Rohan. Finally I detail Tomáš Masaryk’s own new home in the castle, the *hrad*, in Prague, and the work involved in restoring this, which is revealed and understood through contemporary accounts as a nationalist task. By this chapter, I do not intend to re-describe the history of the creation of the nation, but rather to find and relate within these events the subject of home and how this was utilised and reified.

The second and third chapters come under the heading *Prescriptions for Modernity I and II* which examines the work of the, oftentimes, self-proclaimed experts on the subject of housing, houses and home in the field of architecture. Writing in stylistic and avant garde magazines, these experts and those who wrote on household management and about the housewife, used these themes in the popular press and produced advice and help for the general public. *Prescriptions for Modernity I and II* present two sides of the ways in which modernity, and in that, the varieties of Czechoslovak modernisms, were presented as a necessary evolution of the styles and modes of living, and divide along gender lines; the most proscriptive and prescriptive are the male theorists who write
about the putative residents as abstract beings. Women writing advice for other women approach their advisees as colleagues or parts of a community sharing the same conditions, problems and solutions — these attempt to democratise the realms of advice and comfort for the work of the home.

I. Chapter two, subtitled *The Modernists and the Modernisers*, details the effects of the different modernities of democracy, socialism, modernisms and the avant garde on the concepts of home, refashioning and redefining these, through the works of Karel Teige and other architectural theorists, and how these were delivered into real world projects for housing and home or failed in the attempt.

II. Chapter three, subtitled *The Popular Periodicals and the Populist Experts*, explores the ways in which popular and general publications provided advice for housewives, and crafted the idea of an ideal housewife, and linked this advice to the advertising and sale of modern technology and goods for the home. This chapter will show the link with the position of women in Czechoslovakia and how their status was challenged and changed over the two decades of the First Republic. This was reflected in the change of focus of one of the popular periodicals, which used the home to establish a naturalised place and position for women. The creation of new leisure activities that used peasant and country locations is also shown as one of the advice giver’s areas of expertise.

The focus of the final two chapters is the realm of the personal and the intimate areas and of their expressions, as well as those which bring in the voices of the people who
were living in Prague in the era. This set of chapters accomplishes the arc of focus which ends with the most personal areas of representation, having begun from the most public.

Chapter four is titled *Writing Home*, and explores through the works of contemporary writers, poets, and journalists how homes have been thought about and expressed, through diaries, letters, essays, articles and feuilleton, fiction and poetry, and how the surrounding areas of their lives affected this, using the methods of reading in-depth to arrive at a ‘thick’ description of their lives and to develop within this a picture of their ideas of home. Writers included are Jaroslav Seifert, Jiří Wolker, Vítězslav Nezval, Karel Čapek, Franz Kafka, Milena Jesenská, Josef Skvoretský, and Jaroslav Hašek, all of whom, with the exception of Kafka and Skvoretský, were popular or prominent during the interwar period. Though he was a part of the independent Czechoslovakia for six years, my inclusion of Kafka’s earlier writings prior to 1918, shows that they are vital to understanding his later thoughts on home which emerge as his life was coming to an end and he was expressing these in a final letter to Milena Jesenská.

Chapter five is titled *The Location of Memory*. This chapter completes the focus on the personal and intimate detailed in the final two chapters, presenting the memories of home from the respondents to the questionnaires distributed in Prague from 2008 to 2012, as well as from the life histories of residents of Prague which are part of the collection of the *Centropa Organisation* in Vienna. Certain themes are revealed through these two (though many individual) sources, such as the routines and activities that make the family home,
the importance of the physical qualities of the home, and the way that loss is written through the dislocations of home. Livia Rothkirchen has written on the life of the Jewish communities during the interwar, showing there to have been substantial changes in the levels of integration through intermarriage and the effects of the Masaryk government positions on minorities.54 It is important to note here therefore that I am reading the memories from Centropa’s life histories of Jewish residents of Prague with this in mind, as simply part of what and who the city was at that time, and how lives were lived in it.55

Research was conducted through several field trips to Prague, visiting the different housing estates such as Osada Baba, Spořilov, Zábělice and Orechová and doing work in the Czech National Library Narodní knihovna and Uměleckoprůmyslové museum v Praze Museum of Decorative Arts in Prague Library, researching the architectural history, and the popular periodicals and the rare copies of some of the literature. The creation of digital libraries since I began this, has markedly changed the ways in which research on periodicals and other data had to be done, and I have been able to view series of the avant garde magazines Žijeme, Pasmo, ReD and Devětsil at the New York Public Library Digital Archive and at the Czech Language Institute Digital Archive Ústav pro českou literaturu v Digitalizovaný archiv časopisů whose list is extensive. The Architectural digital archive Archiweb.cz a repository of the architectural history of projects from the turn of the century to the present day, including plans, articles and biographies also provided access to more specialised documents.
Questionnaires were distributed in Prague through the Život 90 Foundation, a social service organisation for senior residents of Prague; through The English College in Prague’s pupils, who asked their grandparents; and by asking the members of a senior English language conversation group run by Gina Hearn in Prague.

The work is an in-depth study of the place and time of the interwar era of Czechoslovakia which began in 1918 and ended at 9:15 am on the 15th of March 1939. It is an approach to the subject of home which is defined by the wide and substantial use of sources, using and considering each within and with the analytical tools which derive from their own disciplinary studies. My approach overall has been to consider, interpret and analyse the empirical historical evidence from an anthropological stance which privileges multivocality and interdisciplinary approaches to empirical evidence, and is concerned particularly with a holistic view, not only of subject matters and themes, but locations and times. Such an approach provides a unique synthesis of disciplines and foci. This study is thus an important addition to the social and cultural history of Czechoslovakia during the interwar period, an era which was a uniquely creative and liberal moment, both for the nation and in the area of central Europe, and whose demise in 1939 destroyed the landscape in which these concepts of home could and did flourish. They did not exist again in the same way. By locating it in this way, both for time and for place, this study of the subject of home, a subject which is ubiquitous and universal, shows that it can still be seen as comprising many and particular definitions, which will be demonstrated through the range of focus of this work, from the public arena to the most private.
We came from cottages:

Nationhood

But always and in everything, in scholarship and in politics, my motivating force has been ethical in nature, and ethics I base on feeling, love, sympathy, and humanity. 56
Tomáš Garrigue Masaryk

The legend of Libuše, the wife of Přemysl both founders of the Premyslid dynasty of the Czech Lands, tells that she looked out from her castle on Vyšehrad and prophesied the future of a wonderful city. Libuše told her followers to find the man building the threshold of a house, the práh, and that it was there they should build the city. The city was then called Práha – Prague. 57

Tomáš Garrigue Masaryk and his nation-state

What we tell ourselves about the nations in which we live, most especially as Europeans, depends in part on the correctness (in sentiment) of the nationalistic interpretations of past history as much as on the aptness of the present day reconstructions. What is at second glance extraordinary about Masaryk’s sentiments about his politics (above) in the Czechoslovak nation, are their direct appeal, not to the usual rota of ideologies of strength, conquest and domination, but to those of family and fraternity, even of charity. Masaryk’s sentiment calls back to the idea of the Bohemian lands of Jan Hus, the Protestant reformer of the 15th century, of the ideal of truth both to power and of power, which runs like a seam through the ideology of Czech history. 58
TG Masaryk (1850-1937) was born in Honodin in modest circumstances, began first as the professor and philosopher of history, eventually became the first President of Czechoslovakia, and was seen as the father of the nation. His theory of history and the history of the Czech lands was that progress was as much about the individual actions and decisions of the ordinary citizen as it was about the block forces of economic or conflict based change.59

František Palacký (1798-1876), the first modern Czech historian of the nineteenth century, and viewed also as one of the ‘fathers of the nation’, also fused the modern progressive new Czech people with the religious symbolism first exemplified by Hus and included a natural democracy and egalitarian nature, suppressed by the domination of the Catholic church and the Habsburg rule. Plaschka and Haselsteiner described Palacký’s adoption of his tasks as that of ‘a historian who bears witness for his nation’.60

Palacký wrote in the first Czech history of a certain character and quality:

The characteristic feature of the ancient Slav constitution is that total absence in Bohemia of all political class distinctions complemented by a corresponding absence of all privileges, immunities and exemptions resulting in complete equality before the law and the enjoyment of full political rights by all the people. 61

A description which Masaryk found more optimistic than realistic, and one which he looked to the later historian Havlíček to correct with a more pragmatic and practical description, quoting in his biography of Havlíček:
The inner strength of a nation, however, depends upon how well educated, sound, rational, upstanding, and moral it is, and anyone promoting these qualities in his nation will best serve its future freedom. Let each of us do so in his home, in his immediate surroundings, and no power shall be able to restrain us.62

Palacký, Havlíček, and later on Masaryk, made a democratic spirit and egalitarian character essential as a natural, almost biologically determined part of the people in Bohemia. Palacký, working in Prague, was one of the first historians to investigate the archives and craft a past suitable to create the modern historical consciousness for the Czech peoples that was instrumental in the legitimizing development of the Czech National Revival; culturally, linguistically and politically in the latter half of the nineteenth century. Masaryk, Havlíček and Palacký therefore create a Czech people who fulfilled the meaning of the history appropriate to the nation to come, a people moreover who could, as Karel Kosík later described, be the subject rather than the object of history.63

Masaryk wrote in 1898, on the answer to the Czech question (Česka Otázka):

Not with violence but with love, not with the sword but with the plough, not with blood but with work, not with death but with life - that is the answer of our Czech genius, the meaning of our history and the heritage of our great ancestors.64

Masaryk here establishes a unique Czech inflection to the idea of nation, imbued as it is with a Christian providential symbolism (the meaning of our history) side by side with the everyday of plough work and love.65 Whilst the meaning of the Czech Question was
nominally about the meaning of Czech history, in turn this was a reaction to the situation of the Czech people in the last decades of the 19th century and as such was shorthand for a ‘crisis’, hence Masaryk’s exhortations contra violence. Whilst Masaryk’s quoted pragmatism predated the creation of Czechoslovakia, it is fair to say that he did not deviate during his presidency from the essential idea providing such a meaning, or rationale if you will, for the rightness of the Czechoslovak nation and to make sense of it for its inhabitants, though it was only for the Slav populations that this could be claimed as the proto-national and nationalist antecedents.

The Czecho-slovak ambition for an autonomous nation-state grew on the type of fertile ground of an industrial society that Ernest Gellner described as part of the necessary features for a modern nation: “(an almost) Universal literacy and a high level of numerical, technical and general sophistication [...] among its functional prerequisites” 66. That it was the Empire that prepared the bureaucratic population for the mobility and the fitness for anonymous and fact (rather than context) based communication was lucky, even if not for the old regime.

The Empire and its trappings, even so, had its consolations, however. Vladimír Denkstein (1906-1993), an art historian who wrote on the gothic art of Bohemia, also wrote a short memoir of his childhood in the years leading up to the 1918 independence. Denkstein wrote of the beautiful thing which was the red and blue uniform of a dragoon, with sharp outlines and silver buttons, and of watching them parade by. But he also reported the suppression
of food riots and the spying activities of a Zeppelin over Prague. His greatest excitement though was for the news that the Empire had ‘fallen’:

I heard excited female voices calling from the courtyard. I ran up to the gallery and could hear the stunning news cry going from gallery to gallery. “It’s the end of the war! Austria has fallen apart! We have a republic!” I grabbed my hat and ran out into the streets in a quest for details of this miracle in the history of this subjugated nation.

In the street, Denkstein saw immediately the shattered bits of the Austrian eagle which had been liberated from its perch on a building nearby. Grabbing a souvenir (a wing) he saw crowds and newspaper headlines announcing the news, and cheering people.

Vladimír noted in particular the change at his gymnasium school, the institution of democratic school procedures, the lessening of enforced Catholic religion along with the sudden disappearance of the head suspected of being sympathetic to the Austrians. But in particular he had Czech studies:

At fifteen or sixteen years old, in that critical age, Professor Voborník forever won for his teaching of Czech fiction and for our Czech language. I fell in love with all my soul with the beauty and richness of its shades of meaning, and considered it as the most sensitive tool for expressing ideas.

After his resignation from the Presidency in 1935, Masaryk, in his conversations with the writer Karel Čapěk, was still musing on the development of the ideal nation-state. The old Austrian themed negation, an Empire-bred indifference to the state –“almost anarchical”
– would need to be replaced by an adoption of the rightful importance to the nation of a functioning state. Such a state would allow the establishment of a successful democracy which was to be the fulfilment of God’s plan on earth, and in which, for instance, an uninterrupted period of fifty years of development could take place in a cosmopolitan and cooperative international setting - an idea stemming from Palacký.

As a society, we are without traditions; the folk tradition of the peasantry is breaking up, and we have no other. Almost every one of us has come from cottages and we have not yet had time to get ourselves into [political] shape. Masaryk’s reference to cottages doesn’t appear to be simply about having a peasant past, but also to the idea of the colonised nation under the Austro-Hungarian Empire struggling under a hegemony of language, culture and politics, a lack of sophistication making a people unused to political power and unable to access a definable (and thus modern) identity. An identity able to be expressed as a nation and equipped to govern as a state. But Masaryk’s invoking of a ‘cottage’ past also draws the correct ‘everyone’ in to the authentically required antecedents for the Czechoslovak nation and creates the boundaries of a national character.
The cabinet of the Princess was decorated with green hangings wrought with gold, curtains of the same stuff were at the door and over one window, which was as large as a door. Many pictures of various sizes hung upon the walls, but all were portraits. Opposite the window was the fireplace, made of grey marble variegated with black and green; upon the mantle stood two vases of Japanese porcelain, holding beautiful flowers whose perfume filled the whole cabinet.

The Grandmother (Babička) Božena Němcová 111
First published in Czech in 1855

Figure 1 Castle of the Rohan Family
Minulost – creating the peasant past

Masaryk’s ideas that the peasant traditions were disappearing, thus leaving the Czechoslovak population without a foundation to access, were not new. Božena Němcová’s classic of Czech literature The Grandmother (Babička. Obrazy z venkovského života - pictures of a peasant life) references a particular fictionalised and vanished world: one in which the wisdom of the peasant population was also under threat from the advance of modernity and from a lack of political nous in the midst of the Empire. Němcová’s book was first published in 1855, and came to be seen very soon after as a key text in the Czech National Revival in the second half of the nineteenth century. Like Austen, Němcová, working in Prague, wrote of the generation before hers with a nostalgia that sought to capture again something almost, if not already, lost. The Czech National Revival aimed to renew, linguistically and culturally, an idea of the essential Czech life, one absent from the urban, bureaucratic, industrialised, even cosmopolitan life, in the Habsburg Empire of central Europe. The world that Němcová [re]created was one of the traditional village life, governed by the seasons, by feast days and by the social and family life in a rural peasant community: “from this their conversation [after church] drifted to the crops, the Hood, storms and bail, washing and bleaching linen, how the flax was this year...” Němcová credited her own grandmother for her knowledge feeling:

…only my grandmother, a sincere, old time Czech such as we can still find in Bohemia today, except that no one pays attention to them, admonished me to love our fatherland and told me events from Czech history [...] and always tried to turn me against the German language.
Of the actual peasants and villagers she encountered in her life, in contrast to her hagiographic Babička, Němcová privately expressed a harsher and less romanticised view, even whilst professing affection and joy about them:

...The people [in Domžalice, a town] here are frighteningly backward. They speak Czech because they do not know German, but they know beans about higher education and national feeling. And the country folk! Very few know anything about history, or have ever read a book. [...] The real catastrophe in some of these villages is that damned-to-hell Jesuitism! The Jesuits made fools of these people and impoverished them, so that they walk around like stray sheep...  

Němcová felt it her responsibility to attempt to educate 'country people' and her social circle, at least with Czech books from her publisher, but was also seen by contemporaries as “the gentle [national] awakener ... ‘with her whole soul she agrees with the aims of the nationalists to liberate themselves from the...fetters which have been repressing the life of our nation for ages’.”  

Němcová expresses in her personal correspondence the key points of the ideas of the Czech Revival: the oppression of the Catholic Church, seen as symbolic of the Habsburgs; the lack of a historical consciousness in the people, and the suppression of modern progress. These are more attenuated in Babička, however.

Němcová’s work was ground-breaking in several ways. Its presentation as a novel was innovative and unfamiliar, and her use of a vernacular Czech which picked up and reproduced the spoken rhythms of the language (in contrast to formal written Czech) reinstated something considered to be almost lost to modern speakers.  

Czech, for those in the cities, was the language of peasants and nursemaids, for the most part not literate.
The creation of her protagonist in the form of a wise Czech peasant woman, and her creation of a milieu set firmly in the rural life was as important as the linguistic fidelity to the cultural revival movement. Němcová created the symbolic ideal that becomes in Pierre Nora’s fashioning, a *lieu de mémoire*, the needs for which Nora attributes to the “irrevocable break marked by the disappearance of peasant culture.”, a realm of memory, whether fictional or real, which becomes significant for a community engaged in nation building, in a mythological fashion.76

The world of Babička includes and references the normal societal hierarchies for the time, for attached to, and also naturalised in the village life, is the aristocratic family running a large estate, full of servants and gamekeepers. So important were they in one part of Němcová’s plotline that she has as a protagonist the noble lady of this family, the Princess, who solves an impasse, provides employment to a destitute family, enlightens the villagers and allow true love and family lives to flourish. Němcová also links the grandmother as the heroine of the piece in a relation of unspoken equality with the aristocratic mother. Perhaps the most interesting encounter occurs in chapter 7, when Babička and her grandchildren are invited to share a meal with the Princess at the castle. This occasion enables Němcová to establish the contrast between the traditional life and that of the aristocratic life. Served chocolate and watching the Princess eat oysters in the landlocked country, Babička gives the daily diet of the montane peasant, the sour soup for meals and a slice of bread. It is the aristocratic life that represents a type of unwished for modernity when set against the village ways, rather than an ancient system akin to feudalism, about to be swept away. Němcová thus sets up the same oppositions that were used for the labours
of the national awakening. Němcová’s description of the castle and its accoutrements establishes an aristocratic cosmopolitan relationship with the world that is one of aesthetic remoteness [See Figure 1]. Objects are collected and displayed for beauty or exotic interest, but have no practical use for daily life: “…still, I should not want to live here [...] What should I do here?” Babička surmised “You have no housekeeping” and points to the evidence there of a life of touristic travel experiences that serve markedly to contrast with the only journey made by the grandmother, who, displaced by the Napoleonic wars, followed the Prussian regiment and her husband Jiří. 77 When he died she made her way back on foot to her home and parents. There were no souvenirs. Madlenka’s decision to return is based on this impetus for home and familiarity and for her wish that her children be home to learn the right language: “No, no, who is born of Bohemian blood, let him learn to speak the Bohemian tongue!”78 The grandmother (called Madlenka but for the novel’s purposes only in her youth) has an opportunity to expand her feelings about what is the correct education in life for a Bohemian. It is not sufficient for her children to have had a foreign education and been left for others to raise in a foreign land (which could have occurred when they were stranded in Prussia during the Napoleonic wars), for something essential is lost and a correct life cannot be lived:

Who would have taught them to love their home and their mother tongue? Nobody. They would have learned a strange language, strange customs and finally would have forgotten their own kin. How could I then justify myself before God?79
Whilst the Princess exhibits graciousness and generosity in her encounters with the villagers, the grandmother has wisdom and access to a life full of long held traditions which serve to ameliorate the encroachment of modernity. The displacement caused by the War or economic migration which causes family members to lose contact are not solved by the modern Empire postal services as described by the Princess, but by messages passed from person to person and third party enquiries. This oral tradition is more reliable and trustworthy than any system - it is the clash that Walter Ong described as the ‘technologising of the word’ - the replacement of ancient oral traditions with the written and fixed word.\textsuperscript{80}

Němcová’s embodiment of a golden past in the person of the grandmother and the meeting of this with the modernising world, exemplifies the idea of a falling away of a local and person centred reliance on the trust of familiarity and on the social world encompassed in the village. One cannot trust a message on paper, nor the messenger, who is unknown. Babička’s oral telling of the traditions and skills of the peasantry and of the past are only available to the Princess through tale telling by Madlenka. She is given, not a written historical account of the Franco-Prussian war, but a personal history of the events from the point of view of one of the participants. The Princess, the modern world, is veiled from the one of long and wise tradition and requires instruction, in the use of plant medicines, in the notion of who to trust, and to know the real human costs of war.
Němcová’s description of the meeting of the two parallel worlds of the Habsburg nobles and the rural Czech inhabitants not only reproduces the social and hierarchical structure but speaks more deeply to a cultural difference, from two worlds whose mores are foreign and incomprehensible to each other, such that mutual translation and instruction are required for them to understand each other. Babička also exemplifies the pragmatic and modest idea of the Czech nature, rejecting the luxurious and unnecessary. Babička gives voice to the Czech (sic) nation to be: the only place to be and live is at home, and the only language to speak is the one of your blood. The rest is exotic, and untrustworthy. The Princess, whose life appears so fortunate, in contemplating Babička’s life, says at the last: “Happy woman!”

The Grandmother was so important as a story in the Czech National Revival because it gave form to the idea that the last safe place as a repository for ancient and precious habits and skills was existent in the peasantry and able to be revivified for contemporary contexts. The repository was a cultural resource for those purely Czech ways about to be subsumed under the growing state and bureaucracy of the Austro-Hungarian Empire. The Czech National Revival was a cultural movement to restore an assumed ‘lost’ Czech or Bohemian nation, one whose antecedents were seen as a synthesis of the Bohemian land ruled by St. Vaclav (Wenceslas), the iconoclasm of Jan Hus and the ways of the rural peasantry. Němcová’s text was instrumental in the modern use of a language which came close to dying out, in particular as a literary written language, or at least was in danger of being corrupted by German syntax and inflections in the cities and borrowed modern vocabulary. It was thought only in the peasants in village life that a pure Slav
Czech had remained which could begin to be adapted to the needs of a modern population without foreign influence.

**Kde Domov Můj? - Where is my Home?**

The concept of home, the land, was intimately linked to the national concept of the Czech/Bohemian lands, and the national possession of these. The actual creation of the nation, beginning with the nationalist movements of the late 19th century, did not neglect the symbolic meaningful aspects of the nation from currency to the language of street names, the Czechoslovak Koruna being introduced after independence. Chief among these was the choice of the national anthem in 1918. For the new nation of Czechoslovakia the adoption of the first verse of the song composed by Josef Tyl and František Škroup, originally produced for an operetta, sketches a picture of the nation as a rural, sylvan and bucolic place. The question of ‘where is my home? Kde Domov Můj?’ (or properly where is that home of mine?) is answered not, however, with a location per se, but with a series of qualities for the land and for the Czech people.

```
Where is my home?
Where is my home?
Waters murmur across the meads
Pinewoods rustle 'pon the cliff-rocks,
Bloom of spring shines in the orchard,
    Paradise on Earth to see!
And that is the beautiful land,

The Czech land, my home!
The Czech land, my home!
    Where is my home?
    Where is my home?
If, in the heavenly land, you have met
```
Tender souls in agile frames,
Of clear mind, vigorous and prospering,
And with a strength that frustrates all defiance,
That is the glorious race of Czechs,
Among the Czechs (is) my home!
Among the Czechs, my home.87

The Czech Home therefore is recognisable by the goodness of the land and its people, a connection to God (Paradise, Heaven) and an ability to prevail without getting too rough about it. “Amongst the Czechs, is my home.”

Whilst the link between the texts used for national anthems and the ‘real’ spirit of a people and nations is tenuous at best and cannot be seen as indexical, the Czech anthem at least had the benefit of being a popular song, used more and more in the intervening years prior to its adoption by the independent nation. ‘Where is my Home?’(Kde Domov Muj?) became an increasingly popular ‘national’ song or hymn and the first verse was chosen as a part of the national anthem at the start of the First Republic. 88 The expression of a longing for the ‘home’ described and its identification is something peculiarly and specifically Czech, weighted with ‘history’. Asking ‘where is my home?’ referred not to a lost location, but to the qualities of the relationship between the people and the land which make a ‘home’ for the people who reside on it, who are uniquely attached. This is autochthony. Divorced from the context of the opera tale of the cobbler’s feast, the song as the anthem becomes a continual question, echoing Masaryk, of this relationship to the right home for the Czech People.89
However, the idea of a nationalism uniquely linked to land, to ‘my-home-ing’ was not without contestation even prior to the 1918 independence, with movements to view the possible nation to come placed within, and equipped for, what was perceived to be the modern world, which included ideas of liberal inclusive politics. Symbolically, whilst the land under colonial rule was a diaspora in situ - the Czechoslovak idea of home became more than the idea of the qualities of the nation and was more pragmatic and economic. Land grew to become more than a rural idea on which resided wise peasants and was politicized based on the larger moves occurring in Czechoslovakia around the overall ‘domestication’ of the previously colonised nation.

**The creation of Czechoslovakia – Československá Republika October 28 1918**

That Czechoslovakia came to be was as much a consequence of the chaos of the First World War, and of the revolution in Russia in 1917 as well as most manifestly because of the growing defeat of the Habsburg Empire and Germany. Throughout 1918, the real possibilities internally for the idea of a Czechoslovak nation were put into place through a building process of agreements between Czech and Slovaks in May 1918, as well as the inclusion of the Poles in Silesia and the sub-Carpathian Rusyns (Ruthenians) to make a numerically superior Slav state. Though long the subject of campaigns and fervour, and a lessening of the hold of the Austro-Hungarian Empire towards the end of the 19th Century, the circumstances that enabled this talk to become a nation were more contingent. A campaign for an official Bohemian Kingdom had been running for several decades and this was conceived originally as a restoration of a monarchy with a Slav Romanov king at its head, an idea which was put to the Tsarist regime. Karel Kramář’s (1860-1937) Young
Czech Party in effect wanted to depend on the Russian intervention to achieve independence for the nation. German and Austrian imperial ambitions during the first stages of the War led to any idea of Czech (or even Slovak) nationalism being viewed as treason. Death penalties in absentia were handed down for Czech political figures such as Karel Kramář during the War for their activities on behalf of Czech nationalist ambitions.93

Other nascent political parties working before the War, including Tomáš Masaryk’s Realist Party, were dedicated to a representative democracy, a notion which found more favour with the United States and which attracted their diplomatic and political backing.94 The start of the First World War changed the orientation of this notion of representative democracy from one of accommodation with the Empire to independence, autonomy and self-determination once the War has started. Masaryk’s links to the United States through his marriage and residency there also gave him the entree to this influence.95 It was according to Oskar Halecki at the impetus of the then President Wilson that the ideas of granting independence to the states of Central Europe became not just “rather vaguely in the air” but were given substantial weight. As Halecki noted, empires at the negotiating table conceded the necessity for liberation under the ‘yoke’ of other dominances.96

The creation of the Czechoslovak nation transubstantiated the nationalist ideas operating from the mid-nineteenth century and in particular healed, at least ideologically, the split inherent in the distance between the idea of a citizenship, in this case of the Austro-Hungarian Empire and the modern identity as a Czech man or woman, unable, before 1918 to fit these both together without irresolvable conflict. The Czech and the Slovak
nationalising identities were beginning to recognise the fount of history, in particular a founding myth, culture, a primary language, the memory of oppression by foreign domination, and the commemoration of loss in battle and sacrifice. Conversely, the Austrian citizenship between 1867 and the end of the Empire demanded duties (such as military service), payment of taxes, and provided only a weak enfranchisement for local government and a weakly male one at that, marred by what was seen as the hegemonic demand for the use of the German language, and the vesting of so much of the land in the nobility.97 Democratisation during this period also led to a loss of the privileges of governing and the elite capital influence for the nobility.

Who ‘we’ are – creating a Czechoslovak identity

The preamble to the Czechoslovak constitution which was adopted in 1920, following the independence (declared by the National Committee Act No. 11/1918 Coll. Laws and Regulations of 28 October 1918) read in part:

\[\text{W}e, \text{ the Czechoslovak nation, declare that we will endeavour to carry out this constitution as well as all the laws of our country in the spirit of our history as well as in the spirit of the modern principles embodied in the slogan of self-determination; for we want to take our place in the community of nations as a cultivated, peace-loving, democratic and progressive member. [emphasis added]}\]

What the preamble demonstrates is the adoption of several key points that will serve to become a part of legible identity, with a flavour of both Masaryk and Palacký. A unified Czecho-slovak nation would need to have the uses of history made authentically, and the embrace of modernity and autonomy, which are necessary not only for the health of the nation, but as the entrée into the ‘community’ of nations - a fact not automatically (a least
signalled by the slightly poignant ‘we want to take our place’) guaranteed. The
Czechoslovak constitutional description synthesizes an identity from issues normally of
contestation - this idea of a historical spirit against the modern cultivated progressive
nation.

The first census for Czechoslovakia conducted on the 15th of February 1921, led by the
statistical office set up in 1919, The Státní statistický úřad (and following a preliminary census
of the Slovak population in 1919) reported a nation of just under ten million. Surveyed by
household units, the census changed the previous Austrian assessment of national
affiliation arrived at by questioning major language use (which would have continued to
privilege the German Language), to that of ‘affiliation with a tribe’ with language use in
common communication as a secondary characteristic.99 Already in the Slovak census of
August 1919, the choice of ‘Czechoslovak’ existed for nationality along with confessional
affiliation and the impact of the Great War on the household.100 The census survey in
Slovakia was particularly important whilst the borders were being established between
Hungary and Czechoslovakia at the Paris Peace Conference to determine the ethnicity of
the populations and their proper locales. The interest of the new Soviet state in the
eventual carving up of the post-Empire Europe after 1917, though chaotic and still in
revolution and civil war, presaged in large measure the post -World War II distribution. The
defection of a large number of Czech soldiers by agreement to the Russians, a scheme
endorsed by Masaryk, and used by Masaryk to make his case to the Wilson government
also led to the destabilization of the Empire side of the War.101 Domestically, the
suspension in war time of the few democratic rights accorded to the Czechs and Slovaks
made the impetus for a nation-state of their own more timely and pressing. It is perhaps therefore almost a happy accident, despite a multi-headed sometimes contradictory campaign led by more than one faction, that Czechoslovakia was able to be created as an autonomous democratic nation in October 1918, the only state to be able to do so and to maintain that democracy until the advent of the Nazi invasion in 1938/9.102

**The Ground of the New State**

With the loss and dissolution of the Habsburg monarchy, the noble families in the new Czechoslovakia had lost their legitimating and ennobling roots, and their primary claims to hold on to vast tracks of arable and forest lands, as well as industries, had disappeared. It was expedient for the new state to have the links to an earlier nobility and monarchy, which sent these further back to before the Battle of White Mountain, on which to base the legitimacy of the claim to the lands, rendered into a mythos. Local nobility in Bohemia tussled with Germanic identities and noble family relationships, but for the Czechoslovak state the realities lay more in the amount of land held by the 300 or so families which amounted to one-third of the lands of the new state. Conceptually ‘domestication’ of the land, its rendering from one of diaspora to home for the Czechs and Slovaks, required what the noble houses most feared: appropriation. Compensation was set at property value levels from before World War I and this was viewed as a form of confiscation given the increased value of land after the War. At the time of the 1918 inception of the Republic, the Czech lands in particular were one of the most advanced and industrialized nations in Central Europe, with a small ‘multicultural’ and overall more literate population, a larger portion of whom had settled in the cities than was common
in neighbouring nations. The new Czechoslovakia benefited from the confiscation of many of the Austrian industrial plants, and the redistribution of the land which had been held by the Austrian Empire and the Magyars, the Habsburgs and the local nobilities.  

The domestication of the Czech lands following independence, the Land Reform, as Lucy Textor described it, had “conspicuously and consciously a double purpose. It seeks to better the lot of the people and to right a great historic wrong”.  

The vast territory of existing land ownership prior to independence was retained by a tiny percentage of the population, most notably in the nobility whose large estates did not allow a sufficient number of livings from the remaining land for the peasants in all of the areas, from Silesia to Bohemian lands. As Textor analysed, the economic rationalisation and thus practices of the large estate owners reduced the peasants and the local inhabitants to seasonal or temporary work and led to a population loss, not only from migration to the city and towns, but from the lack of year-round subsistence even for those who remained.  

As soon as the new state came into being, all large estates were ‘frozen’, unable to be alienated in any way, such as sold, mortgaged or divided without the consent of the new Czechoslovak Department of Agriculture. This initial appropriation eventually led to the distribution of ‘confiscated’ land and property by the National Land Office, as well as industry (breweries, logging forests, glass industries etc.) to Czechoslovak citizens. This resulted in some cases in the demise of the industry through a lack of appropriate knowledge, and the division of land into strips which made cultivation difficult. The new
Czechoslovak state legislated that land estates over 250 hectares could be taken, but not necessarily automatically confiscated, for national purposes. The state vested itself with sweeping powers over the management of large estates as a prelude to appropriation, the fear being that neglect or even the stripping of assets would take place in the interim. A list of suitable husbandry practices was established and local supervision took place. In cases of neglect, the state could take over the management and visit and examine every aspect of the running of the estates. Economic considerations were given as the overriding rationale in the language of the legislation, but as Glassheim explains, the social, class and economic structure of the old lands meant that this fell (as was the plan) on the German land owners. The distribution, or domestication, also allowed a social refashioning of the populations into the democratic and middle class denizens appropriate to the new Czechoslovakia.  

One of the rallying cries to the creation of the nation, as reported by Eagle Glassheim in his Noble Nationalists, was the call for a redress for the damage from the cultural domination of the Habsburgs, dating from the Battle of White Mountain in 1620, a battle which began with the defenestration in Prague of Catholic nobles, and which led to a long and presumably dark age of 300 years of Catholic, Jesuit and Habsburg domination and a decline of the Bohemian crown lands. The loss and suppression of Czech or Bohemian culture led to what was seen as the last remaining repository for this cultural, ethnic and linguistic identity, which was imagined to be in the peasantry. Whilst it was Ernest Renan who claimed that the first task in the creation of a nation is to forget: “For, the essential element of a nation is that all its individuals must have many things in common but it must
also have forgotten many things.” the idea of a cultural loss had been potent enough – part of the emotional saliency of the Czech Revival prior to independence in 1918 – to lead to the creation of several of what became the new nation’s artefacts and monuments.108

Whereas the political and influential investments of the nobility were located in the Austrian Empire, the dissolution dictated a refashioning of these into a useful direction of nationalism previously (and rightly) seen as the threat to the survival of the Empire. Glassheim reports on the various attempts to craft a Czech or German nationalism that was pitched towards the persistence of the Empire - though never sufficient to satisfy ardent independence driven nationalists. Accommodation created ‘amphibians’ who nevertheless were able to hold onto economic position and influence. The threat of confiscation attacked real modern and profitable positions that had developed in the first decades of the 20th century.109

The synthesis of art and architecture in the direct service of the nation, as opposed to the nobility, continued the efforts by the Bohemian aristocracy, beginning in the 18th century, of the delivery of art and artefacts to the public. As part of the enlightened and enlightenment civic development in Prague, organisations such as the creation of the Patriotic Friends of the Arts, which took its place with scientific and education institutions of the era, became part of the civic and more cosmopolitan development in Prague in the latter part of that century. As Rita Krueger explains, activities that showed the aristocracy as part of the community, contributing to the cultural life, were made as attempts to redefine the concept of the modern state of nobility: “[…]by the turn of the eighteenth
century, patronage as a function of status had been amended and augmented to include the notion of service to the nation.” 110

Paradoxically also for the new pre- and post-independence nationalist sentiments however, the ‘dark age’ of Habsburg rule led also to the Baroque architectural and cultural flowering of Prague. Many of the buildings and monuments which made the city unique were created during these eras. The Obecni Dum (Municipal House or Presentation House 1913), decorated by Alfonse Mucha with murals depicting the mythical and actual history of the Czech lands, was completed just before the First World War and had been conceived as a cultural centre for Prague citizens. Mucha’s epic murals gave an evocation of a determinate history, one in which there was a prophetic legend and providence for a future glory, depicting the noble sentiments and virtues of the people as embodied by historical and legendary figures such as Comenius and Jan Hus. The nation was already imagined as an entity and a deserving one before there could be any suspicion that world events would turn the correct way.

The Narodni Divadlo (National Theatre) was built from subscription funds (including a contribution from the Emperor) and local building materials and completed in 1881. However it was open just a scant month before a fire destroyed a major part of the building. A second public subscription raised sufficient funds to repair and rebuild in record time such was the importance of the building nationally. The appropriation of the term ‘Narodni’– national – as only applying to those Czech and Slovak monuments, were defining moments for the German populations.
Not at Home

The subtext of the meaning of Masaryk’s Czech history, in concert with the teleology that resulted in the nation, is that it was Czech history which would predominate, rather than the combination of the territories and their polyglot inhabitants. The collected territories and populations did not provide a clean slate from which to build a mono-cultural nation, neither ethnically nor politically. The Rusyns, or Ruthenians for instance, on the eastern border with Ukraine, desired at first a union with Slav Russia, determining that these were their own people. It was only in 1919 that the failure of this venture led to their request to join Czechoslovakia, at first as an autonomous region. The land areas which comprised the new nation were also the home to approximately 3 million German or German speaking inhabitants, and some few thousand Magyars or Hungarians. Both of these groups, economically and socially dominant, were de-facto disenfranchised culturally and politically by the creation of this new nation-state with the Slav and Czech and Slovak predominance. As the reproduction of the postcard [Dat Unrecht am Hultschiner Ländchen] below shows, German populations protested both the appropriation of land and the fears of cultural damage to their earlier ways of life, their language and their children’s education in an area they saw with a majority German population.

The political congruence required for the nation and its territory, as Gellner emphasised, was already problematic. At the beginning of the Czechoslovak nation the Deutsche-Bohem were left in the contested ‘Sudetenland’. This was created as a defensible border in the 1919 Versailles negotiations, but became also an idea to fight for on both sides.
Figure 2 Das Unrecht am Hultschiner Ländchen

(The wronging of the Hultschin Land (people).

“Political propaganda protesting the Czechoslovakian annexation of Hultschin province in 1920, without plebiscite; and protesting the destruction of German culture in that region. “

http://www.ww1-propaganda-cards.com/hultschin.html
Historically more integrated over the centuries in Bohemia than recognised, the creation of Czechoslovakia also led to a German speaking population struggling to reconcile themselves to the new political landscape and the loss of choice in nationality, and their demands for autonomy were resisted by the new state with force. The language border, as Mark Cornwall has examined, was even more acutely felt than the physical land borders. Cornwall calls this part of the Sudetens’ (both Czech and German) “active consciousness” which was enough to cause conflict at the intersections of the two languages. 19th century Czech nationalism activities caused anxieties and the Czech National Revival, culturally and politically (against the Empire’s waning power) created political tensions needing remedies. Czechoslovak ethnographies of the Czech peasants and lidé – people – went as far as comparing the graffiti left behind by Czech and German soldiers, which exemplified the essential differences in the two characters of peoples:

How movingly sentimentally, with a mournful tinge, on the other hand, resonate the sad sighs of our Czech boys and fathers, taking leave with a heavy heart of their children, wife and native village! Not one of the German verses mentions a mother, wife, children or home. At the first sound of the bugle, as if everything noble . . . immediately evaporated from their hearts.

The transition to the dominance of the ideas and ideals of the Czechs also occurred in the confessional divisions in the Czech lands between the Catholics and the Hussite Protestants, as described by Cynthia Paces. The Catholics, followers of the St. Jan Nepomuk symbol of martyrdom, were seen as Habsburg sympathisers and loyalist in the years leading up to WWI, and they assumed a victimised stance following independence, aggrieved by the reliance on Hus as the Czech symbol of defiance, democratic movements
and martyrdom by the Church. The feeling against the Catholics and the Habsburgs was so high that a column to Mary in the Old Town Square (the Marian column) mistakenly assumed to commemorate the defeat of the Czechs at the famous Battle of Bila Hora (White Mountain) in 1620 was destroyed soon after the declaration (in October 1918) on the anniversary of the battle. Protests, in their turn, had attended the installation of the statue and monument to Jan Hus himself in the Old Town Square before WWI, on grounds of an aesthetic mismatch to the old buildings surrounding this monument not least among them. Feelings of aggrievement and accusations of German leanings followed the Catholics and their political movements. Efforts by the new government of President Masaryk to integrate the Catholic People’s Party into the governing ministries led to its integration into the political landscape as one of the legitimate political parties attendant to Czechoslovak politics. Thus a confessional and political movement seen generally in the first few years after the independence as a suspicious element in the Czechoslovak national fabric was consciously domesticated by inclusion and by the allowing of commemorative events.

The impetus to attempt to politically re-integrate the German populations into the new state differed however from the notions of ‘Czechoslovakism’, identified by Elisabeth Bakke, a Czecho-slovak, (though largely Czech driven) project to create a national unity, which was to justify ideologically (after the fact) the creation of the state of Czechoslovakia. It was to do so by attempting to unite cultural markers as fraternally or cognate to each other in areas such as linguistic similarity, shared history and shared
nationalistic projects which were progressively synchronic over time, indicating the natural justice of their fulfilment. The Czech project led, however, to a state of internal exile for the 3 million German speaking inhabitants and the extended nobility whose accommodations to the new state varied according to how much of their previous life was at risk of loss. The strength of Germany on the northern borders in the 1930s led to an abandonment of most attempts at integration.

The last Late Romantics - the real princes

When Claudio Magris, in his sweeping and wonderful history of the Danube, surveyed the lives of the Imperial Family of the Habsburgs, and in particular, the Arch Duke Franz Ferdinand, heir to the imperial throne, he mentioned the sweetness of the family life with the Arch Duke’s created Duchess Sophie, the photographs of the children, the homely and comfortable castle. The dark side to this was the heir’s seemingly unstoppable desire to amass hunting trophies and records of thousands of birds and animals killed in one day: “This sweetness turns to vulgarity in the photographs of sporting scenes, which show the heir to the throne as possessed by a mania to accumulate killings.”

As an example for the Bohemian lands as well, the photographs from the digital archive of the Šechtl and Voseček Museum of the local Rohan family and their castle between 1902 echoed the image painted by Magris of the imperial family, and the depredations of the countryside which also took place near their manor in Choustník. Even the ladies’ drawing room was adorned with the antlers of small deer and stags. Only the more formal reception room, taken over by arts and silks, escaped the parade of animal trophies. What
Magris’ incisive and symbolic shorthand illuminates are the realities of the state of the Czech lands: those of a colony subject to the exploitation and expropriation common across all of the empires. More unrecognised than perhaps those in other areas of the world, the colonial status of the territories held by the Austrian Empire entailed after independence, an adjustment to more than the political landscape and governing which changed the territory anew. This was as much a social and societal transformation as a change of government. The family group pictured, the House of Raoul Rohan, originally dynastically derived from Rohan, Les Ducs de Monbazon in Bouillon in France, having intermarried with the extended Habsburgs, and exemplified what Krueger calls the “fantastically varied” lineage of pan-European alliances and allegiances from the Empire to older royal houses and land-located national identities that characterised the Habsburg aristocracy. Although anachronistic, an apt term would be ‘transnational’ though the contemporary impetus was to seek an identity in internationalism.  

The head of the Rohan family, Karl Princ Rohan (1898-1975), a few years after independence (1930), worked towards a pan-European confederation with a German influence to safeguard the minority rights, as he saw them, in Central Europe and established the text of a ‘treaty’ for the involved states to sign. Rohan’s cosmetic position was that the fragmentation of the empires, from the Austrian to the Russian, left a vulnerable collection of small nation states unable to ‘face’ the larger more powerful USA or USSR.
Figure 3 The Family of Prince Raoul Rohan at Choustnik 1911

Figure 4 Hunting Trophies in the castle at Choustnik 1911
[...] the national right of self-determination is one of the fundamental demands of democracy and of its legal consciousness. In broad regions of Europe, however, for ethnographic and economic reasons, this principle cannot be carried out completely. Even the most ideal form of justice could not, through the drawing of boundaries, completely eliminate the problem of national minorities and their organic integration into states. 124

Rohan’s more particular project was seeking to safeguard what were seen as minority populations, as shown above, however constituted, including by self-declaration (effective on the following January or July 1st), such that they could be seen considered and safeguarded as a public body. In some ways accidentally prescient of what was to come with the German National Socialism, in others unclear of the exact reality of the lost influence of the old Austrian Bohemian aristocracy, Rohan’s European alliances afterward came to nothing, as events overtook any such fledgling European super-states, the danger not arriving from the anticipated and feared directions.

Karl Rohan’s attempt exemplified the uncomfortable adjustments to be made by nobles attached to the Habsburg state, both in terms of losing the ruling power and influence, and of the loss of cultural legitimacy, Babička’s Princess also already carried a tinge of this discomfort. Although the Rohan family did not perhaps lose as much as others, they lost the establishment of themselves as being at home any more. Recent migrants as a house to the Bohemian lands, several of the family migrated across Europe (including to England), and part of the family estate (which included the ancestral castle) was deeded to the Czech Tourist Club (Klub Českých Turistů) and then to the town of Choustník. 125
Tomáš Garrigue Masaryk moves into the castle

“Masaryk family life was beautiful” - Jan Masaryk 1947

Jan Masaryk quoted his father as saying: “it is better to be an honest shoemaker than a dishonest scholar”. Masaryk, son, describes a family life which was rich in feeling and fun, even if not rich in material goods. The life of an exiled scholar, with a family, which Tomáš Masaryk was for much of his life, either in Vienna, America, or England, was not one of easily acquired bourgeois comfort: “we were poor, but if I may say so, we were fed physically and mentally”. By accident, or design, Masaryk exemplified his own natural philosophy (and one echoing in Němcová’s Babička) of a modest existence, concerned with integrity and honesty. Moreover this was the kind of existence he ascribed naturally to the ‘true’ Czech people. The census in 1930 reported that more of the inhabitants lived in villages of 500 persons or fewer than any other type of community. Thus Masaryk’s espousal of his modest and simple life style was, even if a life-long philosophy, also expedient politically.

Masaryk’s presidency, which spanned in large measure the life of the First Republic, probably presented some difficulties with this political stance. The ‘castle’ is more symbolic than the embodiment of the Czechoslovak post-war (first) democracy. This was the term used by Masaryk for his group of political movers (including Karel Čapek and Eduard Beneš) who worked towards the negotiations to the settlement for the independence of Czechoslovakia but remained after independence as an informal political
party. The symbolism of the Castle, the Hrad, was as ambiguous a symbol for Masaryk and for Czech political and democratic life as had occurred often with the motif in Kafka’s literature. As Andrea Orzoff describes:

By 1922, the Castle was one of two extra-constitutional power centers to dominate Czechoslovak political culture until the end of the First Republic; the other was the equally unofficial group of parliamentary bosses, the Pětka (the Five), frequently opposed to the Castle. 128

The castle building and surroundings itself, the Hradčany, was also to be considered as a monument restored democratically to the people, as Masaryk related to Karel Čapek:

Another important aspect of my politics is the refurbishing of the castle, by which I mean turning it into a historical monument, the emblem of our once old now new state, and a symbol of both its past and future. In concreto, I wish to transform the monarchist castle into a democratic castle. 129

At the mid-point of Masaryk’s Czechoslovak Republic, the completion of the refurbishment of the private living quarters in the Hradčany, the Prague castle, was described in the magazine Byt a Umění (Apartment and Art) in their second edition in 1930. 130 The refurbishment was described as a present for the eightieth birthday of the first President of Czechoslovakia. Hradčany is the complex of the Castle, several other palaces (the Belvedere), a series of terraced gardens and the St. Vitus Cathedral. The buildings had suffered from neglect and poor facilities. Prof. Čeněk Chyský, who wrote the article in 1930, expressed surprise that when Masaryk had returned to take up his residency of the Castle as President, he found that his accommodations were not appropriate quarters. It
Figure 5 „Z PŘEDIDENTOVÁ BYTU NA PRAŽSKÉM HRADĚ” At the Presidential Home in the Prague Castle
Illustration in Byt a Umění 1930 no 2
was a castle, which, whilst imposing from the view of the river and the city, lacked heating and plumbing, all of which had to be installed in an unobtrusive way.

The story of the renovation of the Hradčany complex from 1920 to 1930 reveals the growing feeling of nationalism in the new republic. Masaryk had offered the majority of the project to a Slovene Architect, Josef (or Josep/Jože) Plečnik (1872-1957), who had trained under Otto Wagner in Vienna, collaborated with the illustrious Josef Gočár and had been working in Prague for several years. Plečnik was part of the generation of architects who, pre- and post-war, had started to internationalise and modernise the vernacular of the new architecture. Plečnik’s task was not simply to renovate the Hrad and its surroundings but to express in the architecture the aesthetic identity of the new democracy. To do so without losing the palpable historical context of the buildings, and to create a form of democratic space, was not simple. A modest, unassuming castle is not entirely possible. Masaryk’s commission of an ideology as well as a building renovation accorded with what Tamin El Haje described for Plečnik, whose own liberal childhood had accorded with a fellow feeling with both Masaryk and Masaryk’s daughter Alice.  

Byt a Umění, in their article, reported that by the conversion to a domestic, comfortable space, the Hrad had been modernized and been brought decoratively into the twentieth century. The work had also, in some way, become a symbol and an example of the democratisation of the place itself that comprised the nation. Masaryk’s newly created space was made up of comfortable living areas and beautiful colours, with the function of the President’s rooms showing the integration of the existing fabric of the castle into the
newly modernized spaces. A library holding 50,000 volumes and a working study were created for this working President. “His office has a smooth, glossy and brown-coloured floor, [marble?] simple book shelves, two chandeliers, a large desk, on the one hand, and a small round table with an easy chair on the other hand, all perfectly done” Ceremonial halls and galleries were created in the ground floor level of the castle. Chyský stated that: “…but as a work of art it speaks not only for its maker, for its simplicity and space in its entirety, moreover, however it may appear gracious and noble, it is in agreement with the presidential personality”.  

The story of Josef Plečník is less triumphal. The Hradčany project was one which consumed ten years, but towards the end of 1930 the initial internationalism of the government, under whose bloom Masaryk had been able to hire a Slovene for a national project, was no longer present. Although responsible for the majority of the renovation project and for its subsequent appearance, the architect Pavel Janák was brought in to complete the project. It is Janák whose bust adorns the walls of the castle above the terraced gardens.

**The modern complex of nationhood**

It is useful to consider Masaryk as a starting point for the idea of the Czechoslovak nationhood in all of its eventual complexity, rather than as an end definition. Whilst Masaryk was significant for the inception of the nation, in particular the tone, as witnessed by the constitutional language, it would not be sufficient to subsume under a somewhat nineteenth-century sensibility what are the more complex components to the modern
nation-state that was the First Republic. Where the spirit differs more fundamentally from Masaryk’s is that this Czechoslovakian modernity is about turning away from the ideas of the expectations of what providence might allow the nation, into the realm of structure, scientific planning and the conscious betterment of living. The inherent immanent meaning of ‘Czech History’ becomes one which allows and is subject to perfectibility, seeking and crafting a uniquely national solution for the problems of living – and consequently the symbolic destruction of the troublesome and slippery past.
Prescriptions for Modernity I

The Modernists and the Modernisers

*When we move into a new apartment, the first thing we think is to remove the traces of the previous tenant: dust, dirt, holes, even a tasteless feature.*

  Emil Edgar 1920

*A family house means nooks in which one can dream; where one can talk in twos, threes, and fours, where the place around the piano is a nest for dreams of tomorrow.*

*Wherever the decorative urge subsides, wherever construction is permeated with the notion of the functional, we experience maximum modernity.*

  Karel Teige 2000 [1930]

Although when Tómaš Masaryk referred to the familial past of the inhabitants of the new Czechoslovakia as having come from “cottages”, he was using it as a metaphor for a political innocence, the identification of this new Czechoslovakia as having a wholly peasant golden past was more fanciful than actual, at least within the living memory of the time. Czechoslovakia had had an urban and industrialised population earlier than others in the region. But Masaryk’s type of past, an innocent rural technologically ignorant one, as well as one of political naïveté, was also used as the basis for the prescriptions for modernity, and for ‘teaching’ modernity by those who had assumed that they grasped it in its entirety: the expert theorists, architects and professional design consultants. The Czech lands and the successor Czechoslovakia demonstrated in the interwar years, through domestic architecture particularly, desires to find solutions for the integration of modern
living styles and modern life, both functional and aesthetic. Combined with the wish to
express the political and national landscape through the meaning and symbolic capital of
the choices being made, Czechoslovakia’s architectural practitioners wanted to be on the
forefront of new development.

Establishing new structures and modes of living, and of availing and making available
what was seen as the best of modern living, was viewed by educated elites as an essential
task of the work to modernise Czechoslovakia and the cities. It was also a time of
creation and innovation for a culture which, through the aesthetic and cultural elites, was
attempting a synthesis of art, technology, and energy as a new approach to life. There
was however, far less impetus to resolve and revolutionise rural life. This was left as a
project to the state, which from 1919 redistributed confiscated land to the peasants,
returning the pattern of the land to smallholding by 1920.135

Those who imagined themselves at the forefront of these changes can be roughly split
between the Modernists and the Modernisers. I view the Modernists as those whose
approaches were based on having a cleared space physically, politically and socially, on
which to inscribe their plans and fulfil their projects. The Modernisers are those whose
viewpoints encompassed the existing conditions, including traditional social structures,
and sought to ameliorate and update these. Both of these approaches (sometimes
espoused by the same architect) envisaged a crafted controllable future. In this chapter I
will examine the different ways these two types of experts approached the idea of how to
achieve the fulfilment of what modernity could bring to the nation, through their writings and through their works, and how this affected ideas of home and home life in Prague. The salient feature of the projects of both of these sets of experts was the absence of any material input of the actual people to whom they were addressed and who were due to benefit from them, and featured a top-down approach.

‘...today it is normal to be revolutionary’— Devětsil and the avant gardes

In July 1923, one of the members of the avant garde group Devětsil, Karel Honzík (1900-1960), a Czech architecture student who was in the midst of his studies, wrote a letter from Italy to his friend, the architect Jaroslav Fragner. Musing on the meaning of the different architectural styles he was encountering abroad, Honzík was grasping the intersection of, as he saw it, the Empire style and modernity. Whilst admiring the collective simple style of individual houses “from here to the south of Sicily” (he admired in particular their lack of ornament and use of concrete) and how their folk architecture had translated into civic buildings, he was taken also with those long apartment houses, classics of the Prague streets in the Nove Město, the new town, that he also saw and recognised in Italy. He thought these at the time as important to civilisation as the Pantheon, or at least as beautiful:

It belongs to a collective architecture - when you walk through a city do you care about the architects of apartment buildings? [...]And still, [...] such a house is much more important for our civilization than a Gothic cathedral. This type of house is a temple of democracy. [It is] a prophet of the city house.
Honzík’s subtle reference to “a Gothic Cathedral” is to the monumental architectural fabric of Prague, buildings which he no longer saw as the most important in the city; he was looking rather specifically at housing and how the different cultures had expressed this.

What seems to be a simple commentary at the time about the architectural styles he was encountering was in fact prescient. Honzík’s career played out the thoughts expressed so casually whilst on a holiday in the focus he gave to the external context of his culture and society and how this was made manifest in the fundamentals of his designs. His approach extends beyond the ideas of Janák, and others such as Josef Gočar, that the task was one of finding a ‘national style’. His feelings were more fundamentally about the identity of Czechoslovakia being in the substance of the total design and function which thus linked this to a world-wide movement. But Honzík also shows how in architecture there is very often a distance between the concept of a ‘house’ which could be a “temple of democracy” and the concept of a ‘home’. Honzík expressed his view of these buildings in the outward looking, societal context of collectivity and democracy. Placed at the starting point for one of the most exciting eras in Czechoslovakian art design and architecture, Karel Honzík, like his contemporary and colleague, Karel Teige, was born in 1900 and mirrored the age of his nation. Both Honzík and Teige were prolific theorists, Honzík the practising architect, Teige the artist, avant gardeur, and graphic designer, were in large measure also contemporaries of the major European theorists such a Le Corbusier and Ludwig Mies Van Der Rohe and were no inferiors.
In Prague in particular, the realities of housing shortages following the War, the influx of refugees and the breakup of the Empire, made what was a time of crisis also a time of fluid opportunity to refashion and to re-imagine the world. This kind of opportunity enabled the work of Teige, Honzík, the older Pavel Janák and others, both at home and abroad, and provided the space and field to develop new theories of how the needs for a dwelling could be satisfied and how it could or should be used by its inhabitants in their modern world. This also led to projects and developments, including ordinary builders, financiers and developers who put these theories into practice. This was a movement of a certain class of intellectual elites, rather than an overall public adoption or actual demand for the new forms that were being proffered. Occasionally the choices made by the people for whom these schemes were devised, showed at times a reluctance to be lured by the new. Practically, in a city with a building fabric that was ancient and enduring, it was all the more difficult to integrate both physically and as an idea. The lure of new and modern also collided with city memories of the destruction of Josefov (the old Jewish Quarter) and parts of the Malá Strana and Starý Město, the Little Quarter and the Old Town. Tradition as understood through the architectural landscape of the city was not automatically seen as dispensable.

In his important essay – “The Prism and the Pyramid” (Hranol a Pyramida) – written just before World War I, Architect Pavel Janák establishes a history of styles that he felt inexorably, and as an evolutionary hybrid of the French Gothic and the Greek classic architecture, led to the Czech Cubist or National style of architectural motifs: “The span of, and movements of our domestic architecture were and are defined by the two great families
of European architecture, ancient Southern and Northern Christian.” Conversely Karel Teige in his later examination of architecture in Czechoslovakia does not see, as Janák does, that the existing landscape of Czechoslovakian architecture can be the basis of an evolved style. He vaults over centuries back to the common Greek village style of a simple construction of white boxed spaces, which he thinks will result naturally over the centuries in the new modernist white boxes, eschewing everything in between: “Modern architecture will probably one day adopt the Mediterranean model. This is closely linked in form to the house in antiquity (the Greek peristyle house, turned inward, which embodies an explicit anthropocentrism) […] or to the developed form of the Pompeian house (the plan of which seems so modern to us in its separation of residential and housekeeping quarters.) [emphasis added]”

His evocation of these plans for building as explicitly anthropocentric, which he cites in contrast to fussy feudal solutions, is an indication that his evolving ideas about the lack of social amelioration should be achieved through socially conscious and well thought-out design. But, in contrast to his later work, it is surprising to find that in 1930 he still sees the family house as having advantages over the anonymous monumental multiple occupancy building: “A family house means nooks in which one can dream; where one can talk in twos, threes, and fours, where the place around the piano is a nest for dreams of tomorrow.” Teige writes in his survey of architecture in Czechoslovakia. The strangeness of this little statement tucked away in a large survey of building styles and buildings raises the questions: for whom were his solutions meant, and who was exempted?
In his study of the suppression of the domestic in art and architecture, *Not at Home* (see introduction), Reed noted that the *idea* of the avant garde normally was as a movement in art and culture which “imagined itself away from home, marching towards glory on the battlefield of culture” \(^{142}\). But following the War the avant garde movements in Czechoslovakia had their own particular permutations and refinements that do not sit so squarely within Reed’s interpretation of the discreteness (its separation from the everyday) of other avant garde movements, such as Dada and Surrealism. The foremost examples of this in the Czechoslovakian cultural environment of the interwar was the establishment of the avant garde group *Devětsil* (the name of the Butterburr plant, but also literally – nine forces) formed in 1920 and lasting until 1932, being succeeded by *Leva Fronta* (Left Front) and the *Poetism* movement. Karel Teige was intimately involved with both of these parallel movements. *Devětsil* took inspiration from its European cousins in the Italian Futurists and Dada, but forged a lighter, more energetic and youthful movement.\(^{143}\)

Matthew Witkovsky, in his study of the *Devětsil* group in Czechoslovakia, sees their place in the new nation as the synthesis of modernity, art (avant garde) and nationhood rather than an automatically oppositional movement. The avant garde itself in Czechoslovakia should be seen not as an ‘idea’ and a single one at that that sweeps all aside, but one contextually about a positioning, not *away* from, leaving the rest of society behind, but in *front* of as the name itself implies, leading their society and culture onwards. All members worked professionally, some as architects and as designers, and others looked on as theorists, poets and artists, but all were seeking a novel evolution in life and art. This included the importance of the experience of the objects of the everyday and how art and spirit could
have effects in everyday life. Some of the practicing professionals tried to integrate these areas and their work with those of the future oriented and iconoclastic revolution of thought, such as the projects undertaken by Czechoslovak Werkbund society (Svaz Československeho Díla - SČD).  

Neither Devětsil nor Poetism automatically precluded or excluded the domestic, though it did not articulate it as precisely as for some other less tangible areas of life. The effects of these movements were made to reach all areas of life, including that of ordinary daily life. Members of these groups were as deeply involved in the ideas of the transformational work of the house and the home acting as professionals, as in the works of art, photography, poetry and typography. As an avant garde movement, the Devětsil group wanted to integrate art in the social and cultural changes as a factor of everyday living, both at home and world-over, rather than distance itself as an elitist avant garde.  

Devětsil urged the new artist to take note of: “the table at which we sit, and the lamp that affords us light […] to pay attention to the most ordinary of situations and the simplest of things” Devětsil issued its manifesto in 1922, and claimed in it that the movement was one with a global reach of “cosmopolitan art, to extend a hand across borders and languages”. Devětsil proponents saw artistic work of this type as having the ability to dissolve individualism, and to institute a new order, one of collectivism. This, in the form of the new art, would organise a new spirit and new formulas for living.  

It sought to delve into the life of the everyday and change the perception of the possibilities within this. The direction of Poetism was to be about integrating a viewpoint and interpretation into the material world as well as the ideational land of work and experience rather than
setting up a discrete location for it. Karel Teige’s own Poetist Manifesto, published in 1924 in their own magazine ReD (Revue Devětsil) magazine established the depth to which it was hoped that this avant garde movement would reach into daily life:

Poetism has advanced proposals for a new poetry, which wants to turn the universe into a poem using all the means made available to it by modern science and industry, a new poetry to capture the entire universe of the human spirit by stirring all the human senses. The holy and healthy thirst of our modern senses and nerves, the hunger of our personae, the lust of our bodies and minds, life’s fire burning within us — élan vital, libido, or tropisme vital — cannot be sated with what was offered by the former art. 147

Teige like Honzík turns away from the cultural meaning and importance ascribed to the cathedrals and galleries, for that taking place in the work of daily life.148 Teige’s gaze onto the beauty of the everyday was very much influenced by the work of Josef Čapek, the brother of Karel, in the collection of essays in Nejskromnější umění ‘The Humblest art’, who, as Peter Zusi noted, moved away from the supposed importance of conventional arts to that of the beauty and being of everyday objects and the effects on daily life of living and using them.149

Teige and the poet Jaroslav Seifert, one of the founders of Devětsil, used their magazine ReD (Revue Devětsil 1927-1931) to present a maturing and global viewpoint that allowed an “international and synthetic creation” of new and modern life with a new form.150 New ideas, whether able to be realised or not, were to be presented in the magazine, one that saw itself as the presentation of the work that Devětsil were hoping to accomplish.151
Almost every area of life, under the headings of Constructivism and Poetism, was seen to be available for re-imagination, refashioning and reportage. In its brief publishing career, ReD delved into poetry, short stories, reporting art developments from Paris, some architectural news of modernist developments, in Europe and the USSR, as well as the latest films. Whilst its ambition was all encompassing, the realities of publication for a small and discrete audience meant that the output was modest. Teige, Honzík, Jaromír Krejčar and others went on to further projects that in some senses diluted the acute and essential spirit which was evident in these declarations and manifestos. Political and economic realities in Europe also curtailed the taste for an overwhelming revolution of life in this fashion, it was already occurring in other less happy ways. These early and youthful unions demonstrated the effects that the establishment of nationhood had had on the 1900 generation, strongly flavoured by the Russian revolutions and the start of what they believed to be a socialist future.

Following the War, the political landscape in Europe was one of disjuncture and rebuilding, of the cessation of old alliances and new social and ideological paths. Socialism was a potent lure for those who were seizing the opportunity for change as a new order for social organisation that promised new ways of living and they saw, in the ancient tradition of communal property, the seeds of a radical future, based on a historical project that would see an end to prior injustice and charged a new class of the proletariat with the task of the future, building towards communism. The theorists and practitioners who took on the work of engaging with these ideologies demonstrate a type of enthralment with the solutions which appeared to be offered, by weaving in the ideas of the necessity of the
socialist teleology, solving thus the material needs of a deprived class. But even for the most die-hard ideologues, the application of these ideas was not total, nor even adopted personally, or as their only professional projects.

Those who took on these projects as ideas of housing builds found that, as with viewing most things through a particular optic, certain things can be bent out of view. So it is with the minimum dwelling solutions to human daily living, which could not always see the whole. Architects such as Karel Honzík, Jiří Kroha, Jaromír Krejčar and Jan Gillar took on the task of considering solutions for worker or proletariat housing, but many of these found housing solutions could be successful only by being full of compromises for the inhabitant. These architects also continued to design and build villas for the middle class or the industrial rich, and for themselves. This indicates not so much a lack of sincerity about their beliefs, which were minutely and meticulously elaborated at times, it rather shows the environment in Czechoslovakia of relatively liberal politics that allowed picking and choosing.¹⁵⁵

The Modernists
The Modernist experts differed from Masaryk in that the ideas of the future which they wished to create for Czechoslovakia contested the image of the nation as the enhanced strengthened version of the good and excellent qualities already found there before independence: the peasant egalitarian finding fulfilment in the nation. Rather,
as Gupta and Ferguson have argued, the modernist theorists (and their analysers) wish to “see space itself becomes a kind of neutral grid.”

The contestation of the identity of Czechoslovakia was between the ideas that the essential character was awaiting liberation from the colonisation of the Empire, and that freedom meant also the freedom to create a new future oriented and modern Czechoslovakia, bound to no-one’s familially linked past. The diversity and sophistication of the responses also belie the assumption of political naïveté on the part of a population who had previously negotiated lives under the complexity of colonial powers.

Architecture in Czechoslovakia was a developing domestic profession. It had seen a growth from the turn of the century onwards, and the Viennese influence was waning. Through the success of the careers of practitioners just before the War such as Joseph Gočar (1880-1945), Jan Kotěra (1871-1923) and Pavel Janák (1881-1956) along with the wealth of the new industrialists who were taking over from the fated aristocracy, the professions developed, both as practice and theory. These architects were innovatory in establishing a Czech vernacular found in Czech Cubism, and trained and taught the new generation, even if they were to be later rejected. In the post-war years, the profession took a newer and modern-leaning stance on aesthetics and design and this was becoming politically charged in more complex ways. This development of a newly theorising professionalism and the desire for international recognition became in the architectural world in Czechoslovakia evidence of a major transition that arrived with
the advent of nationhood but which eschewed the idea of a strict historical continuity. It consciously moved away from the old Empire and the stylising of monumental palace-like buildings. Czechoslovakia’s subaltern peasant position within it could be erased through the adoption of modernist aesthetics. As Stephan Temple noted “Architecture is the political medium and vehicle of the young state.”

Modern Czechoslovakian developments in design and housing give more of a mixed picture over the course of the First Republic. The adoption of modernistic functionalism – funkčionalismu – came to be applied in differing ways, some for far more commercial and fashionable reasons which were more remote from an ideology based on socialism and the transformation of social existence, even if still in thrall to modernism’s own hegemony. It also became seen as a responsibility for the products of architectural practice to carry meaning and purpose beyond their simple usage, and these should be from the architect’s own ideals and political loyalties. This had also to originate in good architectural practice and should be seen as the result of this. “[N]o architectural, scientific, or technical problem can be separated from political and economic questions.” noted Teige. Not taking these political rationales into account in the overall architectural work would denote “a weak spirit and mediocre talent.” This development in the consciousness of the practice of architecture began from the assumption that architectural styles would be able to be the symbol of a nation, such as the Czech Cubism championed by Pavel Janák, and led to the new sensitivities of aesthetic modernisms. The attempted solutions for the inequalities of material, economic and political life in modernity were seen to be, at least publicly, the main rationales for the adoption of modernist design. The solutions to the problems of living,
particularly those in urban areas, also were seen to be achieved by the wholesale application of ‘science’ and the science of social realities, to the problems and conditions which attended ordinary living. Rural and peasant ways of living, so important in the lead-in to nationhood, were either ignored or used in specific other ways. Biological needs for space, health and hygiene were calculable. ‘Function’ became modern.

Many of the designers and theorists of influence in Czechoslovakia also adopted purely Marxist ideas of ‘bourgeois’ in their definitions, despite perhaps many of their clients, and they themselves, being exactly so. What had been historically the simple definition of a town dweller, a bourg-eois, *of the town* (and a Frankish Germanic one at that), and therefore engaged in trade rather than the land and farming (but also not aristocracy), took on a refinement of meaning to encompass a type of class behaviour and political culpability. ‘Bourgeois’, though also redolent of a concept of the comforts of domesticity and home, was not acceptable at either end of the scale - in either minimum housing or high level modernist designs - as a recognisable identification, designers designed against this. Whether in the high aestheticism of Loos, Krejčar and their cohort, or in ideological positions for worker housing that comes from Teige, Zák and Honzík, ‘bourgeois’ became a shorthand not only for the wall of Empire tradition to break through, and the realities of modern late capitalism, but also could be seen simply as a settled unfashionableness becoming a shorthand for criticism of poor design that failed in its political and aesthetic tasks.
Despite this public image of bourgeois, architects and designers also more quietly took up some of the advances of bourgeois comfort to incorporate into their new design ideas and solutions. They also depended on the wealthy town dweller, the middle class owners, whose innovations, willingness to turn away from tradition and access to capital became instrumental in enabling the paths through to the iconoclasm of modernism in domestic architecture. The industrialists in Czechoslovakia such as Müller (Adolf Loos) and Tugendhad (Mies van der Rohe in Brno) were able to commission high modernist villas that remain icons of the style, and had the access to capital that enabled the commissions of sometimes difficult builds - Müller is placed onto a steep bank - to be completed. The Müller Villa, seen as Loos’ masterpiece built at the end of his life and career, is an example of the dichotomy of the application of a notion of modernist styles – stripped, pure, and using clearly industrial materials coupled with a desire for the performance of capital through the achievements of building a type of bourgeois palace. The exterior of the villa fulfils the modernist strictures of smooth undecorated planes and square surface, but the interior design by Loos recalls that sumptuousness of the most aristocratic of dwellings. Whilst Loos did not deviate from his early rules of avoiding decoration in raised profile (ornament) on the surfaces of this house, he used rare woods, such a burled wood panels, and porphyry marble to clad the walls in the living room, all with strong jewel-like colours even extending to radiator colours. Beatriz Colomina astutely points out the turning away from the outside view that is a characteristic of the house, shielding the windows and placing built-in furniture so as to block directly standing in front of these to gaze outwards:
This ambiguity between inside and outside is intensified by the separation of sight from the other senses. Physical and visual connections between the spaces in Loos’ houses are often separated.161

A further interpretation of this is that the shields prevent the inside being viewed by outsiders. These interior furnishings link the richness of the František Müller house, Müller being the second generation owner of a building firm, to no less than the sumptuousness and theatricality of royal palaces. Whilst Loos was never a champion of the working classes - he skirted close to seeing anyone below a certain class as automatically criminal and primitive (though allowed it in peasant folk-art applications) - he kept to his vision of purity, at least on the exterior of his houses. The decorative richness of interiors belie his claims to this modernist purity.162

The theoretical work in the interwar period of the architectural professionals about housing and dwellings seems remote at times from a familiar or well-worn concept of home. The ways in which these were integrated (or not) in the real-world housing that was eventually built are as much a part of the fashion for Modernism, as of the take-up of a modernity that allowed the sweeping away of previous forms of organisation of the house and home. From floor plans which dictated a different flow, to eschewing decorations, all that was previous to this was assumed in some theoretical stances to be able to ‘melt into air’. Prior ways of living were also viewed as harmful or linking to a past world, before the War, invoking the conditions of Empire and thus a lack of autonomy.

Periodical publications (magazines) such as Stavba (Building), Umělecký Měsíčník (Art
Monthly) and Styl (Style) and ReD, as well as the published writings of the theorists such as in Nejmensí Byt (Karel Teige) and the essays of Karel Honzík and Adolf Loos, present the sometimes contested and contingent ideas with which they worked. Entrées into the high style ideas for more general consumption were provided by the magazine Byt A Umění which presented a digested view of the current trends, and re-edited publications such as Emil Edgar’s Moderni Byt (Modern Home/Flat) which gave a more simplified and collected view of the most up-to-date developments in architecture and decoration. 163

Nejmenši Byt ‘Maximum Liveability’ and The Minimum Dwelling

In 1929 Swiss architect Le Corbusier, reported to the 2nd CIAM congress on the state of housing – Analysis of the Fundamental Elements of the Problem of “the minimum house” –. Along with Pierre Jeanneret, he declared that “The dwelling place is a distinctly biological phenomenon.” The world housing crisis was created by the static systems of buildings which confine the biological ‘event’ of living within them. The solution proposed would be to have highly flexible buildings. Essentially the problem of housing for those unhoused was to be solvable by an architectural design – that of the curtain-walled, columned construction with changeable open spaces – this would allow build-outs not reliant on exterior walls, nor confined by them. The International Congress of Modern Architecture had, reported Karel Teige, despite there being no Czechoslovak representation, placed the problem of housing and the minimum dwelling on its agenda for the architectural avant garde to undertake this as an urgent task. 164 Karel Teige was asked to review the state of new housing built in Europe, the USSR and the US following the CIAM meeting. 165
Teige’s transition to a strict socialist thinker was thus allowed an opportunity to be aired. He was seeking a singular modernist answer to the urban problems of worker housing, but this went against his apparent early interests, flourishing in the liberation of the early years of the post-war, of a humanist Poetism and desire for beauty in daily home life. This dichotomy is noted by Ladislav Cabada in his study of the left in Czechoslovakia’s First Republic: “Teige’s shifting positions demonstrate his constant adjustment to the newest, fashionable trend, whether it be in the area of art or politics.” 166 Teige was to be particularly disappointed by the trajectory of Socialism and its brutal effects on his life. 167

Following the end of the First World War and the growth in population in the first Republic and in the capital, the issue of sufficient housing became both a state and social question. The extant problem was housing for the poor and for workers, but the approaches touched on several political and social questions and the answers and solutions proposed were used to further certain political and ideological stances. The Czechoslovak census for 1930 recorded about 10 thousand persons without any home, but also almost 250 thousand persons who were lodgers, or overnight lodgers, as well as guest in homes. In the small population of ten million, this was a large transient and unhoused population, even twelve years after the start of the republic. 168

Overall the problem of housing following the War was not solved in total with any of the solutions. Housing for returning veterans for instance was proposed by the creation of two neighbourhoods in Prague 4, financed by savings banks and offered for
mortgages with those banks. Others addressed the question in very large and broad-ranging ideological ways, but which built few dwelling spaces as a result. Karel Teige, Karel Honzík and other architects tackled the problems of space planning and design via different lenses, but with surprisingly similar results in terms of the actual space which was proposed to be allocated, which remained around 30 to 40 square metres. The projects which attended to the *Nejmensí Byt* (The Minimum Dwelling) idea manipulated the concept of ‘home’ and what it could consist of for the inhabitants. Achieving a complete dwelling in one room, excepting the bathroom, was a contest of functionalist design. What could be pared away, in the areas of activities, relationships, or even who consisted of the household, was pared away. ‘Housing’, rather than a home, was only a need (rather than a desire) of the proletariat as Teige surmised:

> A rational solution to the problems of housing means the following: (1) to understand the living needs and lifestyle of the proletariat, which have nothing in common with the lifestyle and *home life* of the bourgeoisie, (2) to eliminate all housekeeping functions and centralise them, because the proletarian woman who earns her living cannot, simultaneously, keep house. (emphasis added).\(^{169}\)

The proletariat, here are a fictional population, equipped with a carefully crafted set of positions and stances which serve as counterpoints to an imagined set and inflexible home life enjoyed by the bourgeoisie.

Teige wrote that the only way one could consider any question of architecture in the modern world is to view its social and economic context as integral and essential, and the only theory worth deploying would be Marxism.\(^ {170}\) Equating the bourgeois with the
concept of ‘home’ and ‘homeyness’ went further “Furniture […] was burdened with […] petit-bourgeois opinions about “cosy living” and “the sweet comfort of the family hearth”. Taking a Marxist/socialist position, Teige however argued for the natural development of modern functionalism and of the decisions to turn away from notions such that “sentimentality has disappeared from our attitude to the dwelling, and we have forsaken slogans such as “my house, my castle” or “home, sweet home”. The idea of the family was a relic, somehow, the functions (those of bodily care of children, laundry, cooking) could be taken care of in a centralised fashion.

Teige uses the term ‘home’ as a metonym for the past. One was born at home, lived at home, worked at home and was nursed and died at home. Modernity gave these new workers, a “dwelling place”. Otherwise, families were to be dispensed with as old patriarchal vestigial institutions from a capitalism which was on its way out. Teige disagreed with the approaches from the German Bauhaus (though he admired the aesthetic solutions of the major architects and designers such as Gropius and Mies Van Der Rohe) of designing in such a way as to provide workers with a small cottage and garden. Such an error would reinforce the idea of private property which “silly thought” posed a threat to the worker’s movement. Housing a worker was done within a single solitary cell for one adult. The cell minimum dwelling “does away with the permanent cohabitation of two persons in a single dwelling”. One can enjoy private intellectual and emotional life. Company can be found in the clubs. Teige’s description of these places as cells, which afford a private intellectual life, echoes the
monastic life of contemplation and prayer in a simple space but with the biological needs to maintain life provided for.

What is also absent in these configurations is the idea of the home as a place in which work is needed. Beyond viewing it as a locus for a profession or a mix of work and living space, such as a farm or workshop, homes - to be such - require work to create and maintain. The monastic single space leaves no room for this, no kitchen, scullery, laundry or garden is allowed - these activities all take place centrally and more importantly, communally. This removes the ability of the inhabitants to have a sense of ownership, an important result from transferring to communal arrangements. There are also no spaces given over to children, or emotional life or companionship. These are also cared for communally. Company is provided in the worker’s club, downstairs. Teige’s rationale is that these un-domestic arrangements allow the proletarian woman to be thus freed from having two kinds of work. Technology, social and communal arrangements and the progress in architecture has managed to replace the need for space. Teige goes so far as to term the cell “a place for enjoying private intellectual and emotional life”.\textsuperscript{176} whereas a traditional apartment, sometimes crowded, could not provide \textit{cultural needs}, or even a means of satisfying them.\textsuperscript{177}

What Teige in effect seeks through this to change is the context, concept and environment of how everyday life is lived, with the imposition of an authoritarian and politically salient milieu. Decisions on whom to live with, or to socialise with, are externalised and made public. The progression of life is also flattened out: where
residence would be changed with life transitions, such as coupling, marriage or children, these become tidied or whisked away. If one were to view the home and house as a metaphor for the existence, or manifestation of the human body, with its protected entrances, need for maintenance and repair and holder of secrets and the life of the intimate, then these are not able to exist in the publicly managed, cell-like environments that Teige had proposed, one is left only with a labouring body.

Where Teige fails perhaps, although he had created a lengthy thesis on the political rationale for his housing ideas, was that he did not manage what Jane Jacobs has called a ‘platonic dialogue’: to consider contextually in dialogue the aspects of living, and in particular to have such a dialogue with those who might live in these cells, which would make the whole. That some arrangements may work for some areas, but which transplanted to others become a poison to living.178 Both James Scott and Michel de Certeau have mentioned the concept of métis – the intelligence embedded in local and daily practice. Scott in particular sees métis as the opposition to the hierarchical schematic of modernist social planning, which fails to take into account, in this case, how people have come to live.179 So that extreme functionalism, for instance, increased the efficiency of economy and factory, or even the office, but deadened the life of the house. In the future minimum dwelling, where an idea, such as the family, or a marriage, or even ‘cottage ideology’ would contradict or make his solution unworkable or even manifestly undesirable, Teige dispenses with it. Teige’s consciousness of the ‘spirit’, so palpable in his Poetist Manifesto, had fled by the time he was considering and trying to integrate his political beliefs. It took the failure of constructivism in the Soviet
Union to affect this, as Rotislav Švacha noted in his biography “[he considered that] the constructivist project had erred on the side of overemphasizing its role in satisfying man’s material needs, whilst paying no attention to his aesthetic and spiritual needs.”

Five years after an entry into the competition of the ‘cheap’ flat in 1927, in which he achieved second place, Karel Honzik also felt the need to step back from the purist political ideal of functionalism: “Modern architecture, in spite of all its effort to be hygienic and free of ornaments, has no hope to live. [...] It represents complete negation of the concept of living.” The needs for comfort had been turned away and “has given birth to the tendency for self-punishment” perhaps because of guilt about capitalism. Honzík avers that architecture cannot return to previous world views, but “I want the house to attract, to look habitable, even seductive, to excite desire” he quotes “to be and live within, to walk through its spaces and touch the surfaces and shapes within”. Honzík’s is such a direct appeal to sensuality, to the life of feeling and sensation and that is outside of the scientism that was thought to solve the puzzles of life. “something which could not be measured...”

Jan Gillar, another of the cohort of functionalist architects who were wanting to adopt the most scientific solutions to ways of living, was in fact commissioned to design and build housing in the area of Prague known as Vinohrady. Gillar created a series of five buildings linked with various levels of accommodation. These were developed and were providing up to three bedrooms to house families, a solution which led Teige to see this as a ‘bourgeois’ character in Gillar’s work. Gillar’s work on his real life commissions demonstrated in particular the lack of appetite by those developing and providing housing,
for eliminating through space planning the normal associations and social organizations in the society and culture of the time, but also a lack of the same appetite for this by the VCELA (Bee) Communist Cooperative Central Worker’s Consumer Association in Prague, who established the competition for the project which was known as the *Kolektivní dům družstva Včela* – the cooperative collective bee house. Gillar illustrated his entry with representative photographs, children taking communal showers and being taught. He also included one dilapidated peasant interior of a crumbling fireplace, and a peasant family. We know nothing about the circumstances of the family, but there is a shorthand language that Gillar is using in his paperwork and plans of showing deprivation in one image. These are unusually included on the side of the architectural plans. The family are grouped together. They lean against one another comfortably and look towards the camera. They touch. This is contrasted on the other side of the plan with an example of a minimum dwelling bedroom. The bedroom is clean, modern and tidy. There is, however, no-one in it. Certainly the peasant family are not newly housed there as they would have had to have become members of the working proletariat in order to inhabit the bee’s cell.

Teige commented on another of Gillar’s projects, which also had a feature in *DP* magazine, in his Minimum Dwelling book, but with a certain amount of reservation:

As far as projects of housing with small apartments are concerned, the conceptual project of Jan Gillar for the Ruzyň district in Prague also deserves mention: it consists of single rows of houses, and includes central kitchens, dining halls, clubs, children’s day care centers, and schools; the dwelling units are not conceived as a traditional household type but consist of two-room units (for married couples) with a hall and a toilet. Here, the architect reduced the kitchens
to a single piece of furniture (closets, shelf, hot plate, and sink), or included them as part of a single bachelor’s room. Gillar’s solution must be considered the most advanced and most progressive design in its cultural implications, even though it does not yet implement full collectivization—that is, the principle of a dwelling without a kitchen, so that each adult is allocated his or her independent dwelling space only.187

In my introduction, I have argued that the concept of home is ultimately fungible, as well as metonymic. Within these contexts of the application of modernity and its permutations, home as one of the products (or by-products even) of architectural design, also becomes a vehicle for newly emerging political and societal ideals. The seeming loss within this, however, was that home, homgrown, homely and all of the ideas they contain, as well as who it was that held the repository of this knowledge, appeared at times to be wholly under attack. Not only were changes to be made to stylistic modes, but the practice of living was to be transformed through the expert applications of new knowledge and through this the human being was also to be transformed. This required the wholesale abandonment of old traditional ways of living and doing things. It also evolved into the banner waving politics sewn into the ideas about the dwelling spaces which were to be accorded to the elected proletariat - housed but required to dispense with inconveniences such as families, that delay the political path into the future.

Architects put forward ideas for proletarian housing as projects, but worried also over the issues of beauty and design. The design theories such as those espoused by Karel Teige and his cohort were to be placed squarely interpolating and transforming the conception of ownership as one could expect within socialist ideology. In non-socialist systems, real
property, house, flat, land, is owned and alienable to others for value, Teige argued that the current projects could only attempt to resolve “evils and greed of usury” but would need a revolution of the entire economic and social system to succeed overall. Removing the ownership of property as ‘private’ would allow the ownership of all property as communal.188

Teige was also arguing against the proletarian dweller creating the old bourgeois comforts. He argued against these as the symbols of the wages of the ownership by the bourgeoisie. A home cannot be alienated in the same way as the land and buildings of ‘property’, but becomes the prima uncommodifiable valuable from which other things flow – in specific, a form of cultural and social capital. The sense of ownership of ‘home’ for those housed in the minimum dwelling houses would have fled, but there was intentionally no room for this. The idea of ‘home’ as an essential element in a dwelling (that this is after all ultimately what is being created), is almost silent, or even denied as a vital component of the impetus to house the worker. Teige argued against bourgeois comforts, into which he folded the idea of ‘home’ as it had been understood, and thus was able to argue for the removal of not only the capital recognised as commodifiable, the land and buildings, the ownership of a flat, but the more intangible one of the social capital afforded by having a home. Teige obviously predates Bourdieu’s extensive analysis and discussion of the forms of capital, though I believe he understood this quite clearly.
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Following a successful exhibition at Stuttgart of the Deutsche Werkbund which inspired European architects, the first project for the *Svaz Českého Díla (SCD)* - The Czech Work Guild, or Werkbund - of the ‘New House’ (Novy Dum) in Brno, over the summer and autumn of 1928, attracted over thirty thousand people to the different expositions of 16 model single-family houses and technical innovations. These had been designed and created, as well as built, by some of the foremost and established local architects of Brno, and the newer post-war generation of architects. Despite this eminent provenance, at the close in October of that year, not one house had been sold.\(^{189}\) The designs and house plans of Novy Dum attracted criticism from Oldřich Starý (1884-1971) an architect and university professor, in the periodical *Starba* (Building). Starý had been conversely extremely impressed with the Deutsche Werkbund and the architectural innovations developed for that show and the ideas that this led to a pan-European movement of modern solutions to the questions of living. He took many of the architects to task for their work on the houses of Novy Dum for failing simple common sense arrangements, privileging modernist design. Starý noted that few of the bedrooms had direct access to the bathroom, some settled on two bedrooms only, which Starý saw as a major problem for families with children of more than one sex, “the idea is that the father will sleep with the sons and the daughters with the mother” which recalled feudalism, a common motif for criticism. The kitchen, no longer being managed by a maid or housekeeper, in many cases was not close enough to the living areas. Architects will need to work harder on the actual construction details of the houses, Starý concludes, rather than be carried away by the romantic idea of a social mission which remains unrealised.\(^{190}\)
Nevertheless, the SČD embarked on the creation of the kolonie, the estate at Osada Baba. Land had been set aside by the City of Prague in various stages, including the Letna plain, near the banks of the Vltava River for government buildings. Part of the Greater Prague (Velka Praha) initiative for comprehensive city planning engaged with as soon as 1918 after independence. The land above the castle in Dejvice was given over to the SČD Guild organisation, the Svaz Českého Díla which was formed in 1920. Pavel Janák, so influential in so much of the world of architecture in Czechoslovakia, and one of the restorers of the Prague Praský Hrad (Castle), and Josef Gočár headed the guild along with other architects and industry and design professionals. Pavel Janák took over the organisation of the Osada Baba project from the original design. Where the designs for the minimum dwelling pitched towards fulfilling the socialist project, Baba could only be said to be reliably bourgeois whilst still seeking to transcend this in some way via the purity of functionalism and the white walls of what later became known as the International Style.

The topology of the site was a viewpoint towards the castle complex and in the layout of plots each house was to be given the view. More so than the health giving properties of having adequate light in a home, the residents were imagined to also need the nourishment of an aesthetic delight and a beautiful view. A quick pencil sketch, one of the original plans, developed the lines of sight for the views of the castle and for Prague itself. These sight-lines were worked out for all of the proposed houses in the colony, not even trees were to interfere with these.
The designers of the Osada Baba (Baba Colony), that is those of the overall site and the design motifs, reintroduced the concept of the luxury of good taste into the adoption of the functionalist style, beyond its programmatic. Luxury also came from the realms of allowing individual aesthetic judgements, for houses designed specifically for each client by hired architects. Each was to adhere to certain motifs of the planned kolonie: the porthole window in the front door; the design of the railings around any roof or garden terrace of tubular shape; the ratio of wall to window; the use of series ranks of windows etc. The repetition of motifs unifies the settlement into one whole neighbourhood even now. The overall volume and shape of the houses were allowed to differ, the use of whilst remaining in the same family. The whiteness of the stucco render itself, which contrasted so strongly with the majority of the facades of Prague buildings, even those recently built and constructed with brick and stone, made the colony stand out on the hill. These houses were reminiscent of Adolph Loos’ (1870-1933) desire and command for the future of cities in Ornament and Crime in which he waxes both lyrical and brutal, evoking a promised land:

We have outgrown ornament; we have fought our way through to freedom from ornament. See, the time is nigh, fulfilment awaits us. Soon the streets of the city will glisten like white walls, Like Zion, the holy city, the capital of heaven. The fulfilment will be come.192

The plans for the individual houses records the beginning of the social changes in the composition of a household as well. Starý had noted the lack of maid’s rooms already at Novy Dum in Brno. In the years leading up the First World War, the majority of family homes that were designed for individual professional (or bourgeois) families allowed rooms and space for nursemaids and maids. No villa was complete without these. The
very small spaces allotted to the služka or dívka, the maid, were usually next to the kitchen, or adjoining a child’s room, and were almost always present in Villa plans, but also not unknown in Prague apartments.

The kolonie at Osada Baba fulfilled several of the aims of the SČD, in contrast to Novy Dum. Rather than speculative, and this having proven more risky economically as had been the case at Novy Dum, the plans for the kolonie were put in place and agreed as a plan with the city by 1930, but each house was only built according to a commission and by a single architect. The expression of modernism which resulted in these houses was a surprising declaration of the importance of the middle class in the city, the housing of the single family and the need to be responsive to a customer with money, in an essential contrast to the earlier socialist leanings of some of those who worked on the project.

The Modernisers

Whilst the Modernists, their ideas and their projects needed some sort of cleared ground, whether actual parcels of land, or brand new social organisation, those I will call the Modernisers here can be viewed as seeing the current conditions as the environment with which they were required to work, which they would try to modify and improve. Houses were planned, for instance, without seeking to entirely eliminate not only the family, but any sort of companionship, and without farming out the work of living. The Modernisers also took clear-eyed views of the ways in which people actually were living and how, if the cases were those of poverty and what they would have perceived as a lack of knowledge for instance, these could be changed through various programmes.
One of the investigations informed by these new approaches to modernising living was done by Jiří Kroha (1893-1974), a polymath architect (he was also a set designer, artist and amateur theatre player) who examined the cases and causes of lives which were without work, food and a place to live and how these could be improved. In addition to his work architecturally, he developed a growing sociological focus on the particulars of living and its arrangements in the house. His artistic avant garde visual style is probably unique in a sociological enquiry document, and resembles the collages that were produced by the Devětsil group. Kroha’s *Sociologické Fragmenty Bydlení* (sociological slices of living or life) published in 1933, stated that the solution to the problems of the poor could be found through the rational application of science and technology, and that this application could take into account the biological necessities, and thus cause a design for a suitable and efficient space. Kroha maintained, as did Karel Teige, that there were fundamental and essential differences in the life ‘styles’ of the different classes, rather than positions on an economic continuum. That economic deprivations were the direct cause of different ‘styles’ was of secondary importance, and these were classes whose expectations would thence differ (and be differently satisfied).

Kroha’s use of illustrations and collages to demonstrate his theories and ideas, also document his times and his investigations in an artistic fashion. His repetition of the shapes of plumbing ware, with an evolutionary direction similar to the ‘ape to human’ journey, is more telling and full of impact. His photographs of people show joy, worry, consternation and despair, as well as nudity and sexuality, which resembles also the
collages and super-impositions contained in the Edition 69 (1931) collection of text and illustrations from Vítězslav Nezval (1900-1958) and Jindřich Štyrský (1899-1942).  

Kroha’s representation of život – life – reintegrates the actuality of people and the human bodily existence into the consideration of those that ‘live’ in the homes.

Considering the influence of Kroha on the examination of social living, Barbora Krejčová had noted that “The inconsistent figure of Jiří Kroha […] is often related to the leftist oriented wing of the Czech avant-guard (sic) movement. Despite his extreme views on politics, Kroha’s analysis of interwar housing challenges remains a unique example of a scientific approach to the matter. His dynamic, expressive nature guides him along a path full of experiments, innovative ideas and mistakes.”

Kroha, as with other architects such as Krejčar and Gillar, and despite his focus on the potential for ‘proletariat’ housing and in particular how far it could be pared to the collective, took several commissions for villas, commercial premises and medical buildings, doing so during the same period.

**Full Ownership of the Family Hearth**

Housing solutions in Czechoslovakia, and in Prague, were not limited to the ideas of the minimum dwelling lived in collectively which was set aside for workers or the proletariat, so-called, the efficiency flats, nor to estates of high modernist villas, specifically commissioned and developed by those who found more sympathy with the idea of a family home and the single fully equipped house with a garden. In fact those
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who did so in two different estates in the Prague 4 area felt that these were minimum essentials of anything that was offered. The cottage idea of the Bauhaus, what Teige termed ‘cottage ideology’- the idea of an owned parcel and building - was not an anti-modern anathema to all, but was the guiding principle of several projects in the interwar years. Building projects for homes and neighbourhoods included the development of an artists’ ‘colony’ in Ořechovka in Prague 6, an area which was created in the image of the winding streets of an English town, with half-timbered gabled houses and larger studio buildings. These were not dedicated in a specific way to solving housing problems for poor workers as such, but this was one of the first planned and designed Prague estates after the date of independence, and is the location of Adolf Loos’ Müller Villa.

The most significant housing solutions, though the ones which are more often ignored in discussions of the significant projects during the interwar, were created by the city estates of Spořilov and Záběhlice in Prague 4, funded by mortgage bankers and dedicated to returning veterans. In contrast to the spareness of the minimum dwelling and its ideological weight, these two new neighbourhoods in Prague 4 were actually planned and built to solve the pressing housing needs of the returning veterans and workers. Working with the City of Prague, the developers of Spořilov and Dr. Karel Polívka, an architect and opera and set designer, thought the concept of private property so important in fact that they made sure that the land on which the houses were built was not long-leased from the city but was held freely. Dr Polívka described the smoke, dust and soot and overcrowding of the city as
Figure 8 Sales flyer for Villa Type C in Spořilov - Prostor
injurious to the health of the multi-generational family and his solution was the expansion into a garden designed suburb, a type of ‘little cottage’.  

Polivka championed the multi-generation family, and the solution was not přelidňování - uncontrolled flats, new and already overcrowded. He wanted to “meet the basic feature of human nature, the human ideal ie: achieving full ownership of the family hearth and to own the roof over your head”. Writing in 1928, at the same time as the Osada Baba development was also being considered, Dr Polivka noted the inspiration given from Dr Ebenezer Howard’s English Garden Cities which integrated hardscaping and buildings but with a life giving element - sufficient green spaces within and surrounding the laid out streets. Spořilov approximately followed the circle radiating model of Howard’s Garden City in one sector with a central square in which was placed the Church of St. Agnes, itself a high modernist structure. Seen from the air the site is laid out as a cross with the church at its centre and more modest houses. In these forms of space planning and design, the traditional segregation of space is resolved into open rooms which have an idea of a flow of circulation without the use of corridors as transition, or too many interior walls and doors. What has become so familiar in our time, was innovative and new.

Spořilov and its sister development Záběhlice presented a complete package of location, ownership, build and financing that was a new type of modern solution to the city’s problem of providing housing. Coupling the finance of the development and building and allowing these to be chosen by the properly credentialed buyers. It was understood that
these were people who were not cash rich – in this case veterans from the War – and the identification of this part of the city population created as much of a new deserving class, though with differently manufactured solutions, to the ‘proletariat’. The Czechoslovak Koruna was trading at around 1500 Kc to the pound in 1928, so a modest villa or terraced house priced at 137,000 koruna was more achievable; sales sheets calculated mortgage and monthly payments for the buyers. The idea of an individual home with a garden was seen more democratically, rather than either the Empire style of multi-occupancy living or the minimum dwelling. This also continued the more modern choices for individual villas, those which had flowered at the turn of the century with the growth in architect designed villas for the elite and the rich becoming possible for the urban middle and working classes after independence.

Individual and one-family houses reflected the demographic changes both in family makeup and economic terms as well, though this was also something which others, the room occupiers, the lodgers and the transient or homeless who were measured in the census, could only observe. The developments at Spořilov and Zahbělice, which ranged from the two bedroom model as seen below [Figure 9] to a five bedroom villa, demonstrated the transitions in living space and activities, but also a changing more open relationship to the exterior and proximity to the street, and the removal from plan of a space for household help to live in, or even extended family. This is individual and privately owned housing, but modest in design, providing about 100 sq.m. (about 1100 square feet) for the model A. Its individuality, spatially, is opening a type of private life to a new economic class in the city, the working classes, who could afford one of the
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mortgages offered by the bank in Vinohradi, moving away from the crowded multi-occupancy residence in the centre city. The development was also making a mixed, and thus economically mixed, neighbourhood of small terraced houses and larger set aside villas. This contrasted both with the neighbouring Barrandov development, which included a lido, the famous film studio - Barrandov Studios - and quite a few sumptuous villas. As with the Osada Baba development, those developments in Barrandov were areas set aside for a single economic and social class, the entertainment wealthy and the upper middle classes. There was no provision in Baba for housing for lower income clients.

Spořilov advertised the home in newspaper advertisements: “Levné Byty Cheap homes: immediately realise the purchase of a family home”. These houses were recommended as close to the transport of electric trams 3 and 19, and buses. Two, three, four and five bedroom houses from Kč 121k to Kč 377k were listed “with rich accessories” verandas, cellars, gardens and a growing list of different rooms, and durable materials – enamel, bronze – rich fittings bohatá výprava, and electric installations, as the prices increased. The sales pitch included the cost of the financing, ranging from Kč 750 to Kč 1951 per year, and promised no transfer charges. Záhřelice and its neighbour city of Spořilov, was promoted in a 1938 film from Jan Svoboda called “How to Grow Prague - The Garden City of Záhřelice” which documented the opening ceremony and the visitors who came to view the new homes. Panning over the main square, the streets of houses, and views of the tram links which were already (and are still) available for residents and showing the leisure activities which were possible already in the growing community, a fictional Prague
couple discuss the location, close to Prague, for family homes: A garden city is ‘Velký Pěkné’. Very nice (pretty).\textsuperscript{202}

One of the first settlers of Spořilov, Verka Drozdová, as one of the first residents of the town, described in a walking tour its self-sufficient design, remembering all of the different shops, purveyors and tradesmen as well as professionals and services that existed on each street for the 7000 inhabitants, and the names of their owners. Mrs Drozdová, whose grandparents had first lived in Spořilov in 1933, was extraordinary in remembering also the names of each writer, composer, orchestra conductor and photographer in the new town and their address and who their neighbours were. Each shop, service or trade was described “Mr Panocha in no. 602 – all the usual drugstore and perfumery goods, but you also could buy a 5kg bag of cement”. The longest description was reserved for the bank, the Sporitel’ňa (the Spořilov 1\textsuperscript{st} Republic Savings Bank), which had been the financing for the town and mortgagee for the purchases of the houses, and its continuing place in the community, providing credit for her grandfather, and insurance for the residents.\textsuperscript{203}
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Žijeme za 10,000 Kč měsíčně (t.j. za 100,000 dluhů) (Living on 10,000 Kč a month and 100,000 in debt);
Žijeme za 2,500 Kč měsíčne. (Living on 7500 Kč a month) (A. Hoffmeister)
Žijeme za 750 Kč měsíčne (Living on 750 Kč a month);
Žijeme (Living?)

Žijeme : orgán Svazu českoslavenského díla. / Žijeme, 1932, no. 1, 16-17
In a 1932 edition of Žijeme, Adolf Hoffmeister (1902-1973), contributed four cartoons about the different possibilities of living standards according to monthly income.

Hoffmeister, one of the founders of Devětsil, who was the type of polymath that Prague of the era was so good at producing (such as Teige, Kroha, Honzík), produced with the same energy as his contemporaries, art, typography, editorial work, essays, book covers, cartoons and stage sets. Like his Devětsil comrades, Hoffmeister had found salience in the leftist politics of the day, his depictions are ironic, but also reflected the concerns expressed by his cohorts in Devětsil and the focus of the ČSD, whose publication it was. Hoffmeister manages to express several comments on the social and culture world of Prague and Czechoslovakia echoed by those concerned with the housing question, such as Teige and Kroha and even Engels: the problems of low income affecting health, the difficulties of over-crowding with multiple generations in one home, making work or study at home impossible (750 Kc), at least for the male, the amount of work done by women to maintain the system of bourgeois patriarchy (2500 Kc), but finally also the elegant loneliness of the functionalist home and couple (10,000 Kc) investing not in children, but in art, and who are in fact 100,000 Kc in debt. Finally, he depicts the misery of no income, harassed by the state in the form of the policeman.

Žijeme? asks Hoffmeister. Do we live?
Prescriptions for Modernity II

The Popular Periodicals and the Populist Experts

Believe me, that was a happy age, before the days of architects, before the days of builders. ~ Seneca

It is interesting to note that people need the most varied forms of advice to live by and that the majority of humans don’t think for themselves, but rather expect someone else to give them worthwhile hints. ~ Jaroslav Hášek

The growing interest in the subject of housing, dwellings and ‘living styles’ in popular discourse and as a subject for marketing ideas, goods and publications in Czechoslovakia during the interwar years, demonstrated a synthesis of theory, practice and practicality in domestic and interior design. The quality of housing which this provided was also closely linked to an idea of national esteem and civilisation “What is a nation if it is not how we live?” asked Byt a Umění (B&A) Apartment and Art, in their inaugural edition. “Living well means a good life, and one becomes a better person.”

In this chapter I will be looking at the ways in which the periodicals and popular books dealt with the subject of the design and management of home life and country leisure, how these magazines and other publications, and their commercial arms in some cases, positioned
themselves as advice givers, and how the focus of these changed over the course of the two decades of the Republic and lost some of their initial energy and liberality due to the economic and political strictures that engulfed Europe. For this I was able to examine the women’s magazine *Lada*, the design and art magazines *Byt a Umění*, and the *Družstevní práce* publication *Panorama*, and articles from the newspaper *Tribuna*, as well as the approach of *Družstevní práce* to the commercial and market possibilities through their *Krásná jízba* (beautiful room) shops.208

The years following the War in Czechoslovakia started a growth in publishing of specialising magazines and publications, aimed at demographically identifiable audiences. Periodicals and magazines in the decades prior to 1900 in the Czech lands were general family entertainment, or political (especially socialist) and nationalist publications.209 The end of the War relaxed the strictures on the use of raw materials, including paper. The national and political environment had allowed the explosion of different cultural and social movements, such as the avant garde, Poetism, and modernism movements, who all sought to publish their own magazines, - titles were *ReD*, *Bytova Kultura*, *Byt a Umění*, *Naš Byt*, *DP* (*Družstevní práce* magazine), *Žijeme* and *Panorama* to name but a few. Most, however, were under capitalised and failed to attract sufficient readers or advertisers to exist without subsidy, and they survived for only a few years. Only *Panorama* was still being run after the middle of the 1930s having ceased to exist for a few years at the end of the 1920s then being reworked and revived.210

By contrast to these short-lived attempts, by the middle of the 1920s the ladies magazine *Lada*, which had been in existence since the middle of the 19th century, had grown from the
rather economical publication it presented in 1920 which had few illustrations, either for stories or advertising, to a much richer and more lively and successful publication. A growing focus on domesticity and the explosion of different elements attached to domestic life, as in the growth in technological and machine solutions to household tasks, allowed a finer and more specialised publication to cater to defined audiences.

The advice givers and columnists of the popular periodicals and books here considered the problems of living within these spaces only as homes and sought ways to determine what could be accomplished and bettered within them. Health and well-being were often the focus and guarantee of these changes, and there was an implicit assumption that circumstances were fixed and options could be limited. Whilst the professional experts offered up modernity as achievable by a transition to new political structures or by purchasing their services, or both, those I term the populist experts approached the same problems of living by adopting a type of partnership with their readers, and thus seek to represent themselves as also sharing the same conditions, in a similar style to populist politicians.

The impetus for transformation of these areas, and in part, their democratisation, their opening to the attention of an interested public in the 1920s, also reflected the trajectories of life and careers of their proponents, as well as the evolution of the life of the societies such as the SCSD and Devětsil whose members would partake in the popular ways of reaching and converting the public through ReD, Žijeme and Byt a Umění, each approaching the subject matter of home and architecture within these in differently modulated ways. The approach of
the architectural theorists in the more rarefied atmosphere of only their peers, as described in
the previous chapter, had been to consider such things as spatial relationships, volume, flow
and materials in novel ways, and to find rules, both political and architectural, for these to be
automatically adopted. But several of the members such as František Hála, another member
of Devětsil who edited and wrote for Byt a Umění, were looking for more direct and achievable
results for the general public. The specialised art and avant garde magazines that had
publicised the new and exciting in architecture, such as ReD – Revue Devětsil and Žijeme
performed more as showcases, celebration or presented theoretical approaches which were
given to exhorting utopian change, as Hála noted.211

The usages of periodicals, magazines, newsletters and newspaper columns were a conscious
move to popularise the modernist theoretics that were informing the more purist stances in
the high-end projects. These moved beyond the stringency of the Marxist or socialist
model of living, found in the elite discourses, and were more attenuated, sometimes by the
need to be more comprehensible, and often by the desire to translate architectural
aesthetics which were distant and abstract into solutions which were attainable by all.
There was also a desire to create a commercial world which attended to the modernist ethos
through the production, whether industrial or craft, of household goods such as those
found in the Artěl home accessories manufactory and the Krásná jízba household goods
stores, run by the Družstevní práce publishers. The whole of the life of the home was a
commodifiable quantity, from the material needs of the household, the facets of the builds,
the furnishings, to the anxieties of the housewife. There was always a way to find something
marketable in home life and to link the advice to specific purchases and manufacturers.
The titles given to many of these new enterprises, from publishing and retail to manufacturing, play with various cognate version of the idea of the cooperative – *Artěl* is a play on the word for cooperative/team in Russian, *družstevní práce* is cooperative work, the *SCD* was a Werkbund, which was another form of cooperative guild – reveal the planners’ need to view their activities as oriented towards disseminating their views and knowledge to the masses, to the general public, the stated aim in many of their initial statements and editorials.

As advice givers, when magazines, such as *Lada*, discussed aspects of the domestic environment, say about new furniture, new cooking possibilities, or the problems of domestic work, the direction is to address the audience singly, directly to the putative reader as an individual house-holder or house-wife. 212 The attitudes and aspects, the tone of the writing, is presented and crafted to appear to be about a shared experience, and the authors adopt a conversational and intimate tone which creates an idea of community. 213 *Byt a Umění*, *DP* and *Panorama* aimed to educate and facilitate the best of modernism and modernity for the general public.

The audiences and readers that the populist experts were hoping to reach were the result of major demographic changes. Following the end of WWI, the number of marriages in Czechoslovakia increased, and the size of households decreased slightly, whilst increasing in number, indicating that more couples were setting up individual homes rather than staying in
one or other family home.\textsuperscript{214} The city of Prague was also becoming suburbanised, with family populations solving overcrowding not necessarily through new architecture or social revolution, but through small migrations to other new neighbourhoods. Julie Moscheles noted the number of children just normally present on the street (not as a consequence of poverty) increasing markedly the further one walked from the centre by the 1930s. The outer neighbourhoods showed increased percentages of children, and a decrease in domestic servants as residents which indicated the fundamental social changes had taken place following the War.\textsuperscript{215} Suburbanisation of the city also reflected not only the needs for more space to live in, but also a different relationship with the city space, and the modern assumption by planners, city government and house purchasers that overtaking space and land was possible. Prague had incorporated and sought to develop outer lying areas as early in the life of the Republic as 1920 when the Greater Prague Act was originated, at a time when the transition government was still unsettled.\textsuperscript{216}

New developments, from the Osada Baba to the Spořilov housing colonies were able to use up land which had previously been separate villages. This suburban choice of housing for new families had other more symbolic rewards for those in the new Republic. Choosing a single-family home rejected the common Empire style of living in grand, urban and cosmopolitan flats or apartments which echoed palaces which was the natural domain of a Habsburg functionary who was assumed to wish to emulate aristocracy and aristocratic style, but whose facades were only just that.\textsuperscript{217} The crumbling state of the city centre and the housing available to the former small bureaucrats was a common and familiar condition. In a serialised story called \textit{Fraternity of Small Comfort}, published in 1919, D. Salaba described the realities of living in
the centre city in crowded, but not necessarily slum-like conditions. For the people living there, the buildings show a magnificent facade but inside, beyond the grand staircases, were rooms like holes, dark kitchens, small and with “false” cheap beautifying, of painted “marble” which is flaking and fading Art Nouveau decorations, inherited by the successive tenants. Behind the facades live the functionaries, also the Jews (used as shorthand in this case for urbanity) who liked the grand image of the buildings, and the large apartments but which were unfortunately without modern conveniences. The assumption of the style effects of aristocracy, but not the built solidity or the income, are shallow, false and non-durable. The old houses in the centre city had also become covered by advertising and hoardings: those houses which had been “inhabited with old settled tradesmen, artisans and merchants”.

Further out in the neighbourhood of Žizkov (adjacent to Josefov), Salaba wrote, were the small bourgeois houses, unremarkable and blank and the “eternal row of walls, walls, walls, walls” of the tenements. Overall, there is a “peculiar wretchedness and lack of life”. One of the things Salaba also describes is that lack of containment or privacy and the freedom from experiencing, unbidden, others’ lives, the noise and familiarity of the engineer coming home and shouting at the children, and the troubles, or even the cooings, from upstairs. The Prague of 1919 that Salaba depicted is living on the vestiges of a decayed and lost past that cannot be revived, a picture of a defunct Empire style of living which had been deemed sufficient for the subjects under that Empire, but which cannot serve a new independent population.

**Sentimentality and a perfect rest for the soul.**

It was not only the city building conditions which were in need of renewal, but the attitude and approach of the Czechoslovak housewife needed to be examined for their distance
from the needs of the modern nation. In 1920, the Czech housewife, as described by Milena Jesenská to the readers of Tribuna, was a woman who felt that

[the] household is a kind of mission in life; every plate and every dinner is something deadly important. In Czechoslovakia, an entire day of religious reflection is devoted to domestic chores, and usually the housewife tyrannises those around her with her precision, her scrupulousness and self-importance. [...] A sentimental importance is attached to every jar of preserves and every parquet floor, and a person might suppose that the purpose of life was to clean, do dishes and do the washing and then repeat it over again, continuously until death.

The Czech housewife (Jesenská wrote this instead of ‘Czechoslovak’), even if beginning to see and have available the same machines to help with household tasks, would be unable to enjoy them, nor to use them as an American woman would, who is free, Jesenská thinks, of any sort of cloying sense of sentimentality that would hamper her. So bound is the Czech woman to this and the time that it takes, that other pursuits are unavailable to her.

Jesenská here take the Czech housewife as an embodiment of what she sees as the flaws of the nation itself. The sentimentality, the focus on small local and domestic dramas and the reliance on religion, and possibly a misplaced sense of worth, describes also the defects of the perceived Czechoslovakian approach to the world:

The Czech housewife is like a peasant from Mokrá ves: ploughing with a plough, reaping with a scythe, sticking money into a sock in case lightning should strike, by the will of God.
One perhaps could wonder what any peasant from Mokra, let alone any housewife, could have thought on reading this in a national newspaper. Jesenská embodies in the problematic Czech housewife several of the themes that the professionals also thought afflicted the nation, the idea that the persistence of the peasant way of doing things, the cottage way, could harm the future of the population in the modern world, and that there was a resistance and even an inability to adopting the best that modernity had to offer.

Jesenská’s attitude toward the poor benighted Czech housewife has that touch of the expert’s inside knowledge about modernity. It is not enough to have the technical advances and the machines, as well as the ideas imported from America, if the housewife cannot divest herself of the feeling and sentimentality attached to her household chores. Jesenská is demanding that Czech women, and if possible the whole of the Czech(oslovak) nation, throw off the vestiges of their peasant habits, superstitious, god-fearing and thrifty, for the life of available leisure, plenty and modern efficiency. The irony of her stance at this time was her location in post-war Vienna, living the conditions of a growing impoverishment with a straying husband, whilst estranged from her well-to-do father. Jesenská sets herself apart from these housewives, whom she does not address personally, but rather describes and views them as creatures set forever in a different realm from the type of modern consciousness she possesses. Exiled from the nation and perhaps from some condition of ideal housewifery that she recommended for others (it is unlikely she wished for this), Jesenská’s depiction is also a call to assume ownership of a type of better future, one already possible elsewhere in America for instance, rather than a passive acceptance of what arrives.
“Fifty percent of Czech women become homely, worn-out servants of the household, who have, of course, one satisfaction all their lives, the stove gleams like a mirror.” The Czech housewife as servant to the house was symbolic of the subaltern past, which needed to disappear.222

The position for the Czech housewife however was not only a part of accepted custom that was a question of will, attitude and decisions for the women in the home, but was, as Melissa Feinberg has explored, a legal requirement based on the persistence of the marriage law from 1811, modified by 1919:

…three years of work had done little to change the old code. The subcommission’s draft continued to label the husband the legal “head of household” and empowered him to direct his home as he saw fit. The husband remained the family’s sole legal representative, with full power over the property and persons of his wife and children. He alone had the right, for example, to determine the family’s place of residence and set its standard of living. […] Wives were legally obligated to obey their husband’s wishes in domestic matters. They also had a legal obligation to see to household chores and even to assist in their husbands’ professional activities […] it made it hard for them to be economically self-sufficient if their husbands did not want them to be.

The restrictions of the law made economic independence subject to the will of her husband, and could lead to divorce if disobeyed. Married women’s citizenship rights were also linked indissolubly with their husband’s, changing automatically if he chose to naturalise elsewhere, or if a woman chose to marry a foreigner.223
As Feinberg noted, and as confirmed by the professions listed for women by the respondents to my questionnaire, the subject of whether or not women did and could work was obviated by the economic situations throughout the decades of the late twenties and thirties, which necessitated that they do so, and these jobs were not only for pin money but as professions: teachers, managers, and shop keepers.

“The Painful Question of Servants” 224

The position of women as workers, who were also responsible for the work of the house, created what was called later during the communist era the ‘double burden’. Rather than the housewife disappearing into a nonchalant American, the loss of available servants and cooks in the post-war era also created new, somewhat involuntary housewives. As Melissa Feinberg points out, full time doyennes who had earlier relied on servants had rarely been trained for any other work, either in the house or as a professional.225 This formation of a new specific and particular identity seen to be belonging to a hearth and a home was the focus of attention of the middle class housewife and householder in a new and for them, unexpected ways. Both the economic strictures after the War and social changes had completely changed the expectations and assumptions of married women. Both Hermine Hanel and Ruth Klinger, in memoirs of their lives in Prague, noted that they had not, because of their class position, been instructed in household management or cooking in any way.226 These had been jobs left to the domestic servants, normally Czech peasant girls. “My housewifely skills were meagre” wrote Hanel of her first household just before the War “but
the efficient Czech cook and a smart chambermaid took care of everything so well that I
could entertain guests”. 227

It was not only class but nationality that also indicated whether household tasks and cooking
were learnt.

As the art of cooking is considered particularly important in Bohemia, [...] I was also
supposed to be introduced to it. Our servants, Mariánka, Katinka, Aninka, Božena
etc. were good, hard-working, modest Bohemian girls, devoted to their masters,
polite, indeed humble and satisfied with their lot. They were treated well, had plenty
to eat, did their duty and with natural tact respected the differences in social
status.... 228

Hanel expresses in a clever but telling shorthand this exact class and hierarchical structure, a
recitation of a series of Czech female names gives an inkling that these were not long lived
situations. Their lack of importance in terms of their identities succinctly put into an ‘etc.’.
Hanel, without explicitly doing so, puts forward all of the reasons why learning to cook, the
skill and activity of these girls ‘etc’ (however old), would have been beneath a German
speaking or bourgeois girl, daughter and granddaughter of factory owning industrialists, who
would not be satisfied with any ‘lot’. The loss of these housewifely helpers, (it was not only
more economical to work in a factory or shop, but households could no longer afford them)
meant that after the War women recently married had to find a way to learn cooking and
household management themselves and become a hospodyně or domácí pani house
woman/lady with a different relationship than that of a doyenne to the house and home.
Recovering from the War: the importance of the home.

Those who wished to learn some household management and domestic skills, as well as decorating tips, could increasingly throughout the two decades of Czechoslovakia find dedicated and specific publications to help address these. Professionals, architects and designers, and retailers who dealt in household furnishings, wrote advice columns in women’s magazines and books, taking over the sort of knowledge that would have been transmitted in the past more locally from relatives, the reader’s mothers or grandmothers.

Emil Edgar, a pseudonym of architect Emil Kratochvíl (1884–1963), who has earlier written on churches and architecture, wrote also a decoration and life style handbook, ‘Moderní Byt. Výklady, Rady a pokyny k jebo Zarižení a Úpravě (Modern Home, Interpretations, Advice and guidance to its Facilities and Furnishings),’ a book of household knowledge and expert tips for more established housewives. Edgar was innovative in writing a compendium before WWI of household decoration which was addressed to the householder or housewife, rather than tradespeople, and which assumed that the decisions of these would be made in the absence of more expert outside influence. He therefore wanted to provide advice that would be able to be consulted from the first decisions which would need to be made, such a choosing the best sort of environment in which to live. This became, in his view, more important in the recovery after the War. In the early years of the new Czechoslovakia in 1920, he wrote in his introduction: “Since the first edition of this book (1913), we’ve had the war” by way of explanation for the some of the issues which he was to discuss. Edgar referred to the era before the War almost as a place and time of
innocence, “the young once breathed joy and had their follies and dreams fulfilled”. A time in which decoration and luxury were available to be used, not only materially, but also morally. These decisions were about whether to buy this - or that, to be guided correctly in deciding questions of ‘style’, and to choose decorative items, wallpaper, paint colours, furniture. But in Edgar’s 1920 re-edition of his style and household decoration manual, which previously had invoked beauty, decoration, even luxury and the fineness of choices’ the best, newest, most modern as the starting premises necessary for decorative success, it now had to take into account such things as suffering, turmoil, shortages, chaos and disruption.

According to Edgar, the householder after the War had many new things to deal with in creating a house and a home, unforeseen before the War - the lack of housing, problems obtaining food, the inflation of the prices of goods, and overall, a condition of disjuncture - survival was paramount. The effort of survival also increased the need for leisure and rest for the housewife, which it was important to provide through the properly managed and organised home. Edgar echoes in his introduction the importance of the effects of the environment on health. A subject which was also a renewed Czechoslovak state focus in the area of public health and the attempted nationalisation of health services. In the few years following the War, to begin again, Edgar recommended simplicity, cleanliness, health - no more “forced and artificial decorations”. This is not only about the form and detail of decorative effects any more, but about the health effects he saw of open and airy spaces. The more rooms there were for the household, the fewer there were deaths. The past he surmised, was a time of unhealthful living “dark and overcrowded”, which filled hospitals
and increased mortality rates. The conditions and responsibilities of the housewife were particularly difficult now, Edgar noted. “Life was disrupted, changed, more women were shackled to the household, finding (seeking) food, mending clothes for the family” there was “restless anxiety and no end to unrest”. Edgar links the poor conditions of the problems for households (and the women in those households) immediately to a national question, one of esteem, of civilisation: “Had the *culture* of our nation been measured by our housing conditions, we must appreciate that we have fallen far”. The War had changed perspectives of the meaning of the house and the home in fundamental ways. Edgar’s initial new recommendations achieve all of the watchwords of the modern arrangements for living (those which he himself dates from the 1890s) and the concerns of post-war modernity with health and its prophylaxis or cures - to seek and arrange for purity, air, light and sun - which apparently kills germs such as tuberculosis (where the sun does not attend, the doctor does attend - *Kam nechodí slunce, tam chodí lékař*).  

The notion of design purity is not only based aesthetically, in cleanliness of line necessarily, but is rather more abstractly linked to the motivations for these choices, those of health, safety and well-being. Thus Edgar picks up one particular focus of the post-war approach to modernity, with its intention to establish recovery and health, which he inscribes as a task to be accomplished on to the house and the housewife. Emil Edgar’s integration of the more difficult recent past into his recommendations, which contrasted with the atemporal nature of the earlier household advice, was a signal that there was a consciousness of a caesura, a past and a new future that he could not ignore. But what Edgar shows in his re-edited introduction is that the repositioning of the home as the source for assuring survival is
paramount before its use as an image maker of status and style. He accomplishes a fundamental purifying stance, and though this is short-lived, his new descriptions are still sitting at odds with the old emphases on decoration incorporated from the earlier 1913 edition. In 1920 the conditions in Prague were still quite difficult, and they had even worsened since the end of the War. This was so even though the nation was in a far better economic and material position than its cousin city, Vienna, which had lost its bread basket and its industrial base as a source of wealth and food.

Edgar’s work for *Moderní Byt* had earlier been a digest of the best work from architects, such as Otakar Novotny (1880-1959) a studio apprentice of Kotěra’s and a villa designer, amongst others. Their solutions for the domestic interior are explained for the lay homemaker. Edgar also uses commentary on foreign household arrangements, such as the usage of rooms in English labour houses (which he overestimates), with their already discrete use of space according to function and family identity, for parents and children.

The past for Edgar was twenty years before. He advocated the change of decoration to modern furniture and décor, which was plain and light, because of its mistaken reliance on the historic and inherited hand-me-down styles of furniture, heavy, dark and over embellished, with furrows and spaces which collected dust. Edgar also recommended that people no longer use any sort of folk and peasant decoration, or collect objects that were in this style, as it was incorrect to have a living space in a city which was ‘ethnographic’. These
sorts of designs were to be only useful and appropriate for rural environments, a stance which is repeatedly put forward by some of other the advice givers as well.

An organisation of function between public and private and the times of the day according to use was also important. “Try to find” he writes, “an apartment facing both south and north to arrange rooms appropriately, a spacious kitchen, the family will sit there in the winter, larger flats can have a maid’s room near the kitchen.”240 Dedicating discrete space for discrete functions was a way to avoid contamination from other areas of the house where the more basic activities could take place, preserving physical health and modesty. There is, in modern life, as Mary Douglas noted, “more self consciousness about the processes of communal life”. At the same time that modern life creates more examinations of social and communal behaviour, the more frequently there needs to be a way to veil these as well. “Modern means differentiated” and discrete and separate places serve also to indicate symbols of modern affluence and urban civilisation.241

These more modern arrangements of space were beginning to eliminate set-aside room for domestic servants to live in, but Edgar’s focus still is, in particular, on a well-to-do middle class audience, those who he believes can still think of accommodating a maid in a three or four room apartment. As modern households and housewives he also believed them to be in a position to think of redecorating their homes, of thinking independently, of buying new furniture, and of considering the meaning and aesthetics of where pictures should hang, where furniture can sit and how rooms can be disposed of. These are concerns of the classes of householders who had the leisure and money to do so. Whilst Edgar would not
share the existence and life of his readership, he nonetheless adopts a personal and direct tone in his advice to them, as if both could share in the resulting effects.

The changes in the demographic and social make up of Praha and the growth in suburban families, the focus on the responsibility for the work of the household became vested in a single housewife. This becomes evident in the evolution in focus in a magazine which presented itself during the two decades of the First Republic as one for modern women, the magazine *Lada* (*Lady*). *Lada* was a magazine which described itself, not for its content, but directed itself for its putative reader providing household tips, cooking, fashions and sewing, literature and poetry, news from the realms of architecture and new furniture designs, housing developments and advice for domestic economies and new technologies.

*Lada* went through marked changes in the editorial content through those two decades. In the first editions just after the War in 1920, *Lada*’s approach to entertaining the modern woman was very much based in literature, reviews of theatre and discussions of politics. *Lada* had initially followed in the model of popular publications such as *Zlata Praha* (*Golden Prague*) publishing articles, stories, poems and reviews of poetry, theatrical and musical performances and had discussion features, it was described as a belletrist and fashion magazine from its earliest publication in the mid-19th century. A few cooking or domestic subjects were included, but these were presented briefly and as a collection of related items in one column. Serial novellas and features, poetry and reviews took far more space than any focus on the work of the home, such as one called The English King *Anglicky Kral*, and a serialised feature biography of the most famous Czech language novelist Božena Němcová.
A feature called *From Home and Abroad* (Z Vlastí a Cizíny) - home in this title is rendered by the use of the word *Vlast*, homeland or native land - listed the professional accomplishments of women in academic spheres, professorships, memberships of the Academie of Arts in Berlin, or of the installation as a jurist. Women in the new Czechoslovakia were to be shown as normally present in these spheres, rather than rarely included. The focus of the magazine in the earliest years of the new Republic, in which domestic subjects were of more minor focus, and the potential public life of women in the new nation was made more prominent, reflected the ideas of political and social equality which had been newly instituted in Masaryk’s Czechoslovakia which accorded women the vote in 1918.

Leisure in the *Lada* of 1920 (which included *Modni Svet* - Fashion World) was illustrated by the intellectual pursuits of literature, poetry and fiction. Articles about crafts were in these years theoretical and historical, such as a history of embroidery, which continued for several issues. Scrapbook of an old Housekeeper (Ze zápisníku staré hospodyně) briefly told the new housewife how to judge an egg’s freshness, or the consequences of roasting coffee (a loss of net weight), which had more to do with the economy of the home than cooking arts. These were quick little snapshots of household management rather than work, which shared space on the page with poetry, personal advertisements and items on oil paintings.

By 1923 the content of the semi-monthly issues of *Lada* had begun to focus far more on the work in house, household management and the housewife within it. The addition of photographs and custom illustrations for many different aspects of the articles, indicated not only the lessening of the strictures of war time but also that the magazine itself was
becoming successful and could spend money on its production values. The amount of advertising was also greater and showcased the growing numbers of goods and technical innovations which were to be brought to the attention of the reader. Goods, imported or local, new convenience foodstuffs (Dr Oetker for instance) and household services from decorators to engineers for heating systems now filled the pages. As a more populist periodical, it used the devices of modernity and its prescriptions to address issues of family health, the assumed naturalised solo work of women in the home, and the desires for beauty and elegance, as much in fashion as in decor. Whereas we saw the disappearance of the home dwellers, the householder, certainly the women of the household, in the theoretical stances of the expert theorists and architects of the projects meant to be the housing future, popular and populist periodicals as *Lada* was, were aimed specifically at solidifying and acknowledging the positions of those ‘at home’.

Modernity and modernisms were also used as themes, both aesthetically and technically, to create descriptions of the desired living styles, as well as the concern with time in the household, the saving and productive use of it, and the necessity to have the chance to do things at speed. The temporal awareness with being ‘in modernity’ and becoming or being ‘modern’ was often expressed, and the faults and habits of the past used as a time placement. There is no lack of nostalgia though, in an article ostensibly about the magic of an electric cooker able to heat things at the touch of button, it still described the good old days of the past, when tea was brewed on a “large kitchen stove, shining morning and evening as a beacon in the coastal fog”. 245
Features were included on the modern design of houses and furniture, illustrated by black and white photographs, abandoning for the most part the larger amounts of page space on cultural and political articles which had been the attention in the beginning years of the Republic. Regular column were now titled, Bytova Kultura Housing Standard, Hospodarstvi Household Economy, Moderni Domancost Modern Household an ‘advertorial’, Kuchyne Kitchen, and Moderni Manzelstvi, Modern Marriage. Advertising for items to use in the house also increased, and reflected the overall growth in pictorial advertising, indicating healthy circulation. The modern home, and therefore the modern housewife, is concerned with health, convenience and economy, but also with modern style, which can be achieved by not only new methods and by new tools and devices, but also by new attitudes. Modernity was a shared experience that was full of possibilities, and which could attend to almost any area of the housewife’s activities and her body.

The work in the house is important; the maintenance of health and family life can be also made easier via the application of various techniques of and the adoption or purchase of new appliances. Not only the health of the family but the ability for renewal of the housewife were vital, with the advice that a rest at the appropriate time was essential. The importance of the continuity of this work was compared in 1930 to the skills of Napoleon, who was found sleeping usually five minutes before a battle so as to be able to renew his energy.246 The comparison of import and position of a battle commander and a housewife’s work and position are oddly juxtaposed and flattering, making the work of the house perhaps as important as the conquest of Russia, though with a better result.
Hospodářství (Household - a regular column without an author listed) in 1927 discussed the problems of the damage to ‘our hands’ in Ochrana rukou při domácí práci - Protecting hands during housework:

If we work in homes, sometimes even with the greatest care we can not avoid the fact that our hands are suffering. Many housewives will proudly neglect hand care as otherwise it can be a sign of vanity and flirtation. This view is absolutely mistaken. We need to distinguish reasonable care of the hands from manicured hands. Our purpose is not to recommend this, or perhaps to achieve the softness of hands that do no work. […] But many who must work would not suffer so much if they had more efficient equipment.

Hospodářství here wishes for the same transformation in the housewife, as Jesenská was asking for, typifies her in similar but more sympathetic way but also valorises what Jesenská disdains. It is not their, but ‘our hands’ that suffer, and the answer is for those who work, because to do no work is clearly something to be condemned. Those women will have manicured hands, a visible sign of not working in the home. The reconceptualisation of how to be the proper type of woman in the home, with her well-maintained but unmanicured hands, is a shared task between the magazine and the readers. The importance for the woman in the home not to appear vain or frivolous or to appear to lack a certain modesty, contrasts with the Neff and Electrolux vision of an attractive woman who not only takes pleasure in doing the housework, but is able to do so very efficiently, leaving time for fun. The sorts of ideal housewives depicted in the editorial content, modest, hard-working, without vanity and who consider the work involved of the house as a mission, echo those that Jesenská would have wanted to see disappear in favour of a more dispassionate tenant.
Lada also presented the myriad of solutions and new devices, whether appliances or decorative items, as a plethora of choice, which contrasted markedly with the notion of a purist application of modernist and simplified style. These choices were in contrast to the conspicuous, almost compulsory element of the recommendations which were put forward by the noted theorists. The apprehension of modernity by those to whom these popular recommendation were made, and its ability to be ‘consumed’ rather than taught to, or prescribed, which is represented via the popular magazines, present a multi-faceted modernity, which introduces the rich market of goods, whether ideas or items, which were becoming available to the modern city dweller in Czechoslovakia during the interwar era. ‘Of all of the virtues of housekeeping, no art grows as does the art of shopping’ it reminded its readers in 1923.248

The regular Moderní Domácnost column allied the provisions of the ‘modern’ home, in which they problematized aspects of domestic life, subtly with good manufactured by Neff. The confluence of advice, consumption and the influence of a brand was married to small household chores and simple problems.

Today’s picture brings us two practical tools that should not be missing in any household. Both mean a great saving of time, effort and money, which is the motto of every modern housewife.249

The motto of every modern housewife is satisfied by the use of the correct brand of household goods, and the accompanying advertisement next to the Moderní Domácnost article
“Polly, what is all this delay in the kitchen?”

“Since I got new pots and pans from Neff, I cannot get enough of cooking!”
is an additional reminder of which one to buy. The article also ends with a pointer to visit the retailer and manufacturer J.Neff, in Prague. The Neff showroom was available, no purchase required, for each lady to see the range of household practical and technical help, at Příkopy 24. 250 There is no indication otherwise in the layout or the typeface used, which matches that of the rest of the magazine’s text, that this is an advertisement of the same kind as the pictorial panels from other brands and not simply an editorial production. A twin column also called Moderní Domácnost also ran in the Být A Umění magazine, which recommended and extolled the Electro-Star vacuum cleaners. 251

‘Today, no woman wants to be a slave to cleaning’. 252

Practical, technical, and economical were the watchwords for the housewife to think about, and what was practical and efficient could result in being a modern housewife. The J. Neff advertisement also illustrates the benefits that can arrive from using the newest kitchen and household equipment, that of pleasure. Lada and other magazines undertook to give advice and recommendations about the new machines and devices which were now becoming available, and which also reflected the transitions from regular domestic help in the pre-war years which only the smallest household did without. ‘Today, no woman wants to be a slave to cleaning’ averred the furniture shop UP Zavody in advertisements for smooth surfaced modern furniture in Lada. In several editions of Žijeme of 1932, the same furniture company UP Zavody describes in detail the manufacturing materials of tubular steel, leather and other durable substances of the furnishings and furniture available.
Words such a rationalisation, organization, freedom, solution, and calculation described the advantages of conducting the home as a modern sort of engine. Even in straightened economic times in Europe in the mid-1930s (a time when Czechoslovakia was still doing better than its neighbours) the purchase of new and modern appliances which promised to reduce the work of the keeper of the house was growing. Ota Pavel (1930-1973 né Otto Popper), described his father Leo Popper’s success as an Elektro-lux salesman for refrigerators and vacuum cleaners at an almost miraculous average of three cleaners a day. A success which meant that “Mama was immensely satisfied that we were doing so well. Our apartment was furnished, we were able to dress up, we had a full pantry and could afford to buy at Lippert’s delicatessen.”

Elektro-lux advertised itself also as the guarantor of family health, collecting up “the biggest enemy of our health - the dust” but also “with the replaceable filter cartridge it cleans air in which there are a large number of bacteria”.

All of the unseens and threats were able to be removed by a machine which recognised the precious health of families, Stráže zdraví me dráhe rodiny. But subtly it seems to offer more than a balm and cure for family health. Leo Popper was helped in his sales by the promise of more than a clean home. The clever pretty housewife shown in the illustration, cradling the Elektro-lux XI machine in an ambiguous way, but demonstrating its lightness, is dressed up with a peplum party dress and Marcellled hair. Her counterpart, just visible across what presumably be a courtyard, still deals with the dust in the inefficient old way, which spreads it into the air with a broom and dustpan and requires a costume of dowdy kerchiefs and aprons. This housewife with the dustpan must do this in view of the neighbours who are in close proximity in the classic configuration of apartments in Prague which open internally into a courtyard. What is on offer, other than the efficient and
Figure 12 Elek-tron-Lux advertisement “Guardian of our family’s precious health”
modern cleaning here, and the safeguarding of the family, is time for glamour and freedom for the household and wife who chooses these products, as well as a similar pleasure as for those who can have Neff saucepans, and to consider these tools and implements with affection.

**Práce Doma** Housework - Relieving the Labour in the House

The home was seen to be the site of many technologies, whether newly conceived or traditional, and equally as many skills. The approach of the magazine and the copy space devoted to it recognises the complexity and the variety of these skills and the world in which these existed which naturalised this world for the woman of the house. From cooking and dress making to correct child rearing, household decoration and cleaning, the home was seen to encompass an engine that cycled according to the seasons, the numbers and ages in the home and its own economy, and there is one centre of the home, the hospodyně. *Lada* valorised not only these activities of the house and their hospodyně but encouraged also the practice of crafts, in lace and dressmaking. Often issues had large fold-out tissue patterns for their readers to use to make dresses and other garments, or instructions on how to create lacy table coverings, doilies and decorations and babies’ bonnets and caps, under the features of *Ruční Praše* meaning ‘Handmade’ which was a pull-out for advertising patterns which were available to buy from the shops. The first of these inserts being included in 1923. These types of craft were not in the same vein as more personal art work, such as pottery or painting, or even writing, whose rewards would singularly be for the woman engaging with them. These crafts had a household purpose, above all to clothe the house or the family.
Lada did not ignore the new architectural work and designs of the modernists, but analysed this in the context of the women and families who would be using the spaces and the new furnishings. Regular features known as Bytova Kultura (Housing Standard) explored what they considered the best and most up-to-date of new designs in housing. The object of this was not just to be congratulatory to the designer or architect, as was perhaps some of the impetus in the more specialised magazines such as Žijeme, but to relate these to the household work for women and how successful this could be. An article entitled ‘The password is rationalisation’ (or the motto is rationalisation), Za heslem racionalisace, reviewed a kitchen designed by Walter Gropius which had a ‘beautiful simplicity’.

This kitchen, which enhanced ventilation through a large window, something which was lacking in old apartment interiors, also created an orderly system for the work. A pass through to the dining room was seen as innovative, and took in stride the absence of servants. These modern designs were seen to be essential to the new life, and solved so many problems of the ‘liberated’ housewife, such that a sadness was expressed by the author Oldřiška Zemanová for the women around the world who were not able to have this new system in their home: “Once every kitchen of the future is a similar, then we can talk about [this as] a boon to the rationalization of domestic labour. Many still do not have the opportunity to appreciate this.”

Gropius, in explaining the meaning of rationalisation, later described it as the ‘purifying agency’ of modernism - that which produced the form and the function from the raw materials both actual and intellectual. Labour saving is therefore seen by the designer as epiphenomenal for the woman in the ‘new kitchen’. It is not in fact the goal of the urge to
Figure 13 Walter Gropius German Kitchen illustration in Lada 1930
rationalise. The loss of carved ornament and its replacement by smooth planed surfaces cuts down on the work of dusting and cleaning, but is actually about spatial and visual lightness and economy from the architectural and construction point of view.

Ideas to rationalise and ‘Taylorise’ labour for the housewife in the home were related directly to the new industrial methods for streamlining production, and the fashion for Americanism, and thus to increase the economic return. Whilst Gropius’ kitchen was presented in Lada as preventing fatigue for the cook (who was most likely viewed as the mother or wife of the household), and as ensuring the health of the family with proper ventilation, the energy of the woman and her labour was also seen in the same terms of production as a resource. The home was an economy in the same terms as the factory, or the industrial bakery. Rationalising work and actions was assumed to work in both locations. Oldřiška Zemanová wrote in Housing Standard Bytova Kultura:

> Our homes and the improvement in housing in recent years are truly remarkable! Architectural design takes into account in many apartments the already considerable demands on hygiene, convenience and labour saving, as well as numerous technical facilities which make it more pleasant and easier to do housework, our household [goods] industry produces ever new and practical help.

Rationalising introduced new concepts into the space design and management of kitchens such as flow and circulation, which took care of the random placement of furnishings in a traditional kitchen. Existing houses and space could be reorganised, Taylorised, with functions moved or streamlined. The introduction of machines and technologies eliminated the need for a set-aside domestic space in favour new ones such as a working study for the
housewife a *Pracovna Panina* and could provide more functional relationships between rooms such as the kitchen and dining room, which could have in earlier times been quite separate. Despite the prescriptions for the rationalising of work in the home through design, and the transformation of the house into a factory of results and resources, the homes in *Lada* are still revealed through these ideas of modernity as places for women of performativity, of decisions, agency and acts that create the place itself understood as home, through organisation, maintenance, housework, cleaning and commensality, as well as being a place to learn and enhance skills. The home is a place that must be created from the raw substance of bricks and mortar. It is fundamentally, as Phillip Aries reminds, the place for a private life, whether lived as a family group or singly, and in this private life there can be many worlds.259

The variety of activities taking place in the home and the importance of this as the locations for these activities is in a strong contrast to the reduced ideas of the common activities of the ‘home’ barely allowed to be in the minimum dwelling. That conception left sleeping, rest and study as the only recognised activities. Performativity and I use this in the sense of almost ‘doing things without words’ or even, in effect, ‘saying things without words’, which are the acts that *make* the home. The actor, the mother, the housewife or domestic servant, or the father and mother who in the context of other family members provides economic support, create the differences between these actions and the same or similar ones done in a restaurant, laundry, or dressmaker’s studio.

**We therefore recommend - Doporučujeme**

For those engaged in the work of the home and seeking advice there were more than purely domestic and maintenance subjects available. This advice ranged across a cultural pastiche
of the arts and decorative elements as well. Information was included on the understanding
of colour, the pleasures of surfaces, the appropriate textures to use and arrangements of
space. A consideration of the decorative and architectural arts at home was also linked in to
the cultural life of the city and productions of poetry, crafts, novellas and films. For the
magazine *Být a Umění*, (The title is essentially *apartment* and *art*) these two areas of cultural
life were imagined as integrated and the home is presented as the desired location for this
integration.

*Být a Umění*, published from 1930, described itself as a monthly revue for the current housing
standards. It looked for the most part to the architectural professionals to interpret, discuss
and present to the public lay reader the top-flight opinions on this integration into the
environments of people’s home. The magazine set out this aim in the first editorial of their
first edition:

Almost everyone who is arranging their apartment […] wants to be informed in
advance about all that is new in this rapidly developing field. Magazines dedicated to
architecture are normally exclusively for the experts.

Magazines which, noted the editor František Sala, who was earlier involved with the avant
garde revue *Pasmo* along with Teige and Jiří Wolker amongst others, are filled with “ideological
contests, projects, public buildings and the regulation of urban and technical details.”

Using some of the same devices of a personal engagement with the themes, but not the same
tone as *Lada*, *Být a Umění*’s editorial style reveals the assumption that their reader shares the
levels of taste and style that are the subjects of the articles, and the same backgrounds,
historical and cultural knowledge, and capital. Its aims were to serve as the salon for the readers to meet the artists and artisans, “craftsmen, tradesmen, merchants and industrialists, etc. all actors who in one way or another contribute to the creation of a flat.” Byt a Umění made a promise to its readers that it would keep up to date with “exhibitions, markets and auctions, where subjects are dedicated to home furnishings, changes in housing and building codes, new inventions to simplify the management of household machines, devices, etc.”

The magazine had a mixture of showcases for the work of high-end modernism and some of the practical domestic problems of living, and also paid attention to the more modest types of homes.261

In the fifth edition of Byt a Umění, Prof. Dr Alfred Almon (a university professor) in his article Art and the National Household (Umění a Národní Hospodářství) saw the integration of the best of industrial arts into the home as a type of democratisation of art, or even a sort of aesthetic noblesse oblige: “to promote conscious efforts within business to make art accessible to simple citizens and workers.”. “It is through the excellence of the new industrial manufacturing of goods, and their affordability for the home” he wrote “that art [as in the art and aesthetic quality of industry and design] can be enjoyed and as such be evidence of the higher level of civilisation of the nation.” Almon is giving a new meaning to craft and design of household items as arts, which normally are not accorded the respect given to pictorial representational art and the decorative arts such as those which Loos had argued against.262
This level of civilisation inscribed on the ordinary home and homeowner changes the usual historical focus of the meaning of the nation and it reliance on public buildings to provide evidence of its riches, both culturally and economically, to a more democratised idea of where these might be. The entry of the best of art into the home (though a particular and specific idea of art) is a way to give the ideal of a participation to each citizen. Though of course, to do so as prescribed. This art is therefore not one practised within the home as a craft, but is purchased, manufactured and comes in from outside, removing the hand of the householder in traditional fashioning of objects for the home.

This is the problem: the problem of art, beauty, comfort and the economics of the housewife. [Whether you live in] a house big or small, a modest or a luxury apartment, it is the environment in which we spend most of our lives. And nothing is more natural than to try to make sure this environment is as pleasant as possible.

Wrote Ludmila Stránská who was the owner of a soft goods retailer in Prague. Rather than a purely aesthetic consideration this notion was a prelude to a recommendation for refurbishment of the textiles in the home. Art has become integral to the work of industry in home furnishings, allied with modern architecture. She noted that it is “a new concept of modern decorative art, which after a long search finally has found its expressive possibilities.” Therefore, the householder should replace curtains and other items to achieve these. Stránská’s editorial column is placed next to her own panel advertisement for her shop. Whilst she undoubtedly had expertise to impart, this expert advice is allied to the sale of goods, without, however, making this explicit. As was seen before for Moderní Domácnost.
columns, neither the layout nor typeface indicate the fact that the advice is not entirely neutral, and more pecuniary than not.

*Byt a Umění* was a publication which was as concerned with its own aesthetic quality as well as with representing the best, most modern and technically advanced elements to make the modern home. The magazine was published on heavy coated paper and illustrated fully with photographs of the houses and art it was showcasing, including colour reproductions protected by tissue interleaves. It was, unfortunately, a short-lived experiment, being only published for three years. Priced at 18 KČz (Czechoslovak Koruna), its goal to bring the masses into the fold of experiencing the possibilities of modern life and living was not able to survive for long, but its aim to allow the message to go beyond the rich and middle class to let everyone have “their own smallest sweet home, which is the beginning of the happiness of the family, the state, and the nation” had a definite sense of honourableness, even if it had overtones of a marketing and trade exercise.  

### One bedroom, three persons, two thousand books, not a lot of light

The publisher *Družstevní práce* (Cooperative work), founded in 1922 by many of the same avant garde figures who were involved in the multitude of expressions of the modernist movement, believed that there should be an integration in daily life of art and aesthetic and ethical criteria and that this should be made available to the general public. A project formed by artists such as Toyen (Marie Čermínová 1902-1980), photographer Josef Sudek (1896-1976), designer Ladislav Sutnar (1897-1976), writer Vadislav Vančura (1891-1942), poet Jaroslav Seifert (1901-1986), artist Adolf Hoffmeister (1902-1973) with other graphic
and literary artists, *Družstevní práce* was a cooperative guild which published magazines and sold well-designed household goods through their *Krásná Jizba* shops in addition to publishing books. This was a membership organisation which grew from a few hundred members in 1922 to eleven thousand in three years and eventually reached twenty thousand. The UPM in Prague, the museum of decorative arts, regarded *Družstevní práce (DP)* and its retail arm *Krásná Jizba* as the most prominent cultural institution of the interwar.265

DP publications included the magazine called *Družstevní práce* and *Panorama* a supplement to their publishing bulletin for several years, which was then published alone.266 In addition to their work in design and in household goods, *DP* also offered advice in *Panorama* to the general reader for decoration and space planning problems by a column written by architect JE Koula. *Bytova Poradna* (Housing Advice) was a write-in help column in *Panorama*, which illustrated some of the answers with space and furniture plans to back up the written answers. Representing real world buildings in this way showed that there was a transition to a method of communicative abstraction for explaining the arrangements of homes. This indicates that the columnists had confidence in the sophistication of their readers, and in one case a reader sent a plan of her home to explain her question. Plans used as illustrations for the advice being offered showed a two dimensional and much simplified representation of living space, in most cases without dimensioning, and also used symbolic shapes for household items. These were used quite simply without any further explanation of the architectural vernacular as there were normally no legends or keys to explain the symbols, nor to the meaning of the lines drawn, what thickness of line meant, whether a wall or a threshold, or whether breaks in a line meant a doorway or window.267
Figure 14 Solution plan of Bytova Poradna.

Rooms: kuchyně = Kitchen; ložnice = Bedroom; obývací pokoj = living room; spiž = bathroom
The plan above is in answer to a question for a flat which needed to accommodate three persons, 2000 books and a space for a sewing machine, leaving also room for a guest. “We have a flat which is small and crowded”. JE Koula’s advice is to rearrange the furniture to make the most of the floor space. Koula discusses at length the different options for this rearrangement, but also as an addendum, explains that no flat is so hopeless that it cannot be solved by the re-arrangement of furniture, even in a space that did not look very promising, “as our plans have shown”. The plan is provided as a guide, but also it gives a type of imprimatur of a guarantee that these solutions are actually workable for the flat owner, and as a shorthand way of communicating some complex instructions on whether two beds are to be used as ‘marriage’ beds or not. It was up to the householders to not only implement but to understand the plans as a relationship to the three dimensional space.

DP undertook to not only provide advice on modern living but to provide the tools for doing so through the shops in Prague named Krásná jízba Beautiful Chamber/Parlour. That they should have had such a romantic name for the establishment of the purveying of functional and modern styled household goods demonstrated the impetus behind the movement, or possibly reflected the involvement of poets as well as designers and photographers. Krásná jízba echoed a part of the model of the Edwardian English designer William Morris, whose Craftsman movement attempted the same integration with theory, ethos, feeling and the production of goods specifically following this and for this to be available to all. As an idea, the impetus behind the shops of Krásná jízba tried to integrate the best of arts, whether industrial or in terms of crafts (such as art glass), into the home and to eliminate the
boundaries of elitism for well made goods. The *Družstevní práce* publications house, whose concerns were both literary and aesthetic, through their magazines and shops took some of the original members of *Devětsil* beyond the realm of the *Poetism* theories or the strictures of the socialist ideology imbued into the *Nejmensí Byt*, the minimum dwelling, and provided more realistic and material answers. JE Koula’s advice, as above, was practicable, pragmatic and reasonable and delivered a comfort to those whose circumstances, such as “three persons and two thousands books in a two room flat” could not be easily otherwise remedied.

One of the keys to the success of the *Krásná jízba* shops was the artistic direction provided by the photographer Josef Sudek, who also photographed the new published books for *DP*. Sudek had begun collaboration with *Družstevní práce* in 1928 and was the producer of the advertising booklets and catalogues, both photography and layout, and the printing production of *Panorama* along with typographer and artist Ladislav Sutnar who became officially the art editor and art director for *Krásná jízba*. Both created a unique image for the shops that combined the purity of line that was modernism with the practicality of domestic wares. Sudek’s initial photographic interests had been with surrealism with the impressions from edges or vertigo from the looming angle of monumental objects or of the putative viewer. Sudek’s later photographs for *Krásná jízba* were also concerned with pose, dramatic lighting and the beauty of objects. Sudek had photographed juxtaposed glasses, surfaces, cups and light for the simple beauty of these before he began his work for *Krásná jízba*. His work as a photographer for goods to sell were styled and arranged by Ladislav Sutnar and this was used to represent the products in the most modern fashion.
Sudek achieved the quality of the uncanniness of ordinary things that Lahoda had identified for his art photography. Sutnar’s arrangements of dinner ware, cups, saucers, plates and bowls of Sutnar design appeared to float across an unblemished field. The repetition was cleverly done through using the forms of the designs themselves, expressed in the different objects of a tea or coffee set, instead of identical objects so that there grew a familial recognition. Plates and saucers were collected in their different sizes and ranged diagonally across the frame, or stacked and arranged with an almost comic haphazardness, but in all these the light gave the surfaces flawless gleams.\(^{273}\) It is the lack of any flaws in their surfaces that attest to, not only the quality of the designs, but particularly to the strength of the industrial manufacturing process, and this perfection in execution was made available to the normal, even quite modest household, thus fulfilling the aim of the entry and integration of the best of the technological and industrial arts into the home.

Ladislav Sutnar’s cover design for the o bydleni issue of Žijeme (the title is ‘about living’) also shows their innovations in creating images of living spaces, mixing cut outs, blocks of colour and graphic line-drawn elements in place of the walls for instance, with a posed model and inserted shadows along with the quality and device of vertigo as Sudek had previously used in his art photography. The space which is showcased on this cover for Žijeme is composed of few of the elements of the room, one angle line, the suggestion of a mirror – with no reflection – and the only realistic items, the sofa and the woman reclining on it.
Sutnar and architect Jaromír Krejčar, the husband of Milena Jesenská, came in for some ribbing from their own in Žijeme magazine, in a two-panel cartoon by Antonín Pelc in 1932. Sutnar is seen recoiling after being accosted by a rather buxom mother who says: “Professor Sir, I’m in love with the shapes of your glass and porcelain. See how beautiful they are decorated with coloured oil paints” as she proffers a redecorated sugar bowl towards him. In the other panel, Krejčar is depicted with Milena and their daughter Honza in a minimalist room with one chair and a rug on the floor, packing suitcases. Honza is weeping and tugging at his coat whilst Milena sits a bit dejectedly on the radiator. “The modern architect moves from another modern flat: “Don’t cry Honza, winter in the hotel will be fine, when spring arrives it will be nice again”.

The level of humour allowed in the house magazine Žijeme, did not obscure the fact that Sutnar and Sudek’s shepherding of Krásná jizba was one of the most successful syntheses of the high modernist designs and their crafting of an appeal to the ordinary householder through the objects of the everyday, though this settled eventually, as UPM noted, on “the educated and culturally progressive middle-classes – civil servants, some entrepreneurs and tradesmen, professionals and intellectuals”; the Krásná jizba shops were open to the general public. The membership numbers of 20 thousand were substantial enough to indicate a sufficient mass appeal, but the weight of these numbers led to a loss of the quality they had wanted to maintain. Nevertheless, their publications and designs “had a great influence on forming the lifestyle of the public” in the decade of their existence. Whilst their style was dissimilar to that of Lada, they also presented a modernity of choice rather than the imposition of ideological rules to be followed, appealing to their customers and readers by the promise of
living a better, more aesthetically pleasing life that fulfilled their ethos of the opening of the industrial arts to the ordinary household.276

A Return to the Cottages

Milena Jesenská’s earlier evocation of the peasant from Mokra vez, whose habits were cumbersome and superstitious, illustrated the form of tension that the meaning of the peasant world had for the modernising Czechoslovakia. Masaryk’s and Teige’s use of the ‘cottage’ life as the main inheritance for the cultural life of the nation were in diametrical contrast: Masaryk’s use of this was at least affectionate, whereas Teige wished to completely distance the modern nation from this – notwithstanding his admiration for the Greek peasant houses – as too sentimental and unsuited to the socialist future.

In the first pages of Vadislav Vančura’s Rozmarné léto Summer of Caprice, first published in 1926, his description of the summer countryside for the city dweller was comforting thus: “In the midst of fertile fields there are plenty of white farmsteads as imagined by our national poets.”277 What Vančura perfectly encapsulated in what seems to be a quick humorous description was what he would have believed was the common reader’s understanding of the countryside, viewed from afar as a whole, fertile, inhabited, perduring, and existing as an integral part of the national heritage. That approach echoes some of the attitudes that found expression in the start of various new movements that created discrete areas of life out of those which had been a normal part of Bohemian and Czech land life, such as peasant and montane ways of life, or at least the ideas of what these had been. This change in the integration, rather than denial, of country peasant life into the life of the Czech lands was
accomplished by them being reincorporated in consumable ways: the weekend trips out to the
countryside and the beginning of the chata (huts) and chalupa (cottage) as a leisure homes for
city dwellers.  

The Chata Movement and Czechoslovak Tourism

Karl Rohan’s donation (see chapter one) of the ruins and estate of a castle to the
Czechoslovak Tourist Club illustrates the importance of the change of the countryside in the
decades following independence from it being the breadbasket and symbolic repository only,
to becoming a space for recreation. The liberation of so much of the land to general
ownership also allowed it to be parcelled up for small holdings and absentee ownership as
well. The land became ‘elsewhere’ an ‘outside ‘for those living in the cities. One of the
activities that had grown up in the first years was the ‘tramping’ movement, or a type of
Cowboy and Western flavoured hiking. In particular for those who were sufficiently
energetic and whose working week was in the factories, the tramping movement allowed
them to escape the cities and walk off into the countryside.

Throughout the 1920s, activities in Prague such as tramping was the leisure activity of living
rough in the ‘wilderness’ surrounding Prague and play-acting a type of communal and
egalitarian life style formed the countryside into a discrete area with an overlay of American
‘cowboy’ ethos that took this out of the realm of simply enjoying the land, into a type of
packaged experience with specific rules for engagement. The chata and chalupa lifestyle also
was the base for the city dweller to live in for leisure. Most of the inhabitants of the country
lived on farms, in villages or on land estates and living in nature was not a romantic pastime which could be left behind during the week, but was about work, subsistence and survival.

The conversion of peasant based ways of living, so valorised in Němcová’s *The Grandmother*, and as the basis for the ideas of the authentic nation, was presented in the first decades of the Republic, as things apart with a need for the city dwellers to be introduced to them anew. The peasant life ways, the design and arrangements of the country cottage *chalupa* and the aesthetic appreciation of properly placed folkloric decoration became the past which was desired and made available for the flat and city house dweller. Making pejorative reference to a peasant village as emblematic of a type of backwardness, whether for Jesenská about the right mind for achieving modernity, or for Masaryk’s political innocence, became within ten years the symbol of a type of pure and simple living with the addition of aesthetic pleasure, for leisure purposes. This type of leisure pursuit also had to have to input of advice givers to create the correct way of utilising and living the cottage way.

*Byt a Umění* (Art and Home) presented and explained the ‘weekend’ possibility in the countryside, whether the joys of outdoor camping or the complete home contained in the *chalupa*. By 1930 examples of these were to be found in the Tatras Mountains in a village called *Vážec*, in an area of Slovakia. In contrast to the stories about modern furniture and architecture which are realistically depicted by photographs that document their appearance, the *chalupa* in Vážec is only depicted in line drawings that sketch an impression of a sweet and sentimental view of an interior space. Presenting the cottage in a line drawing is an
anachronism in a publication which also showed modern interiors richly illustrated with many photographs.

The Važec chalupa is shown as a one room wooden structure, but in this all of life can be conducted. Each corner has a specific function, sleeping, eating, heat from the tiled stove, seating. “The first impression is one of colour” and this not only on the walls and furniture and plates, but on the people themselves: “Everything has a distinct and rich colourfulness”, but there is not much in the room. On the bed in the corner a man goes through his whole life, birth, marriage and death, and in the other corners he can live the transitions of his life as well. This how the author Jan Halá presents for the reader a peasant life. This life is assumed to be governed by simple solutions: money is traditionally kept in the table drawer and is thus referred to metonymically as such “from the ‘table drawer’” to afford to buy or pay for things. The Bible and religious books are the only books on the shelf and a remedy for ailments, a “physic oil” and brandy sit on another “simple” shelf.

Everything that is owned in the peasant life is displayed, like the wealth worn on the body. The chalupa is shown as representative of all cottages in Važec, which are arranged in this traditional way. Hála quotes the inscription above the door: “With the help of God, this house was built by Pawel Lučanskj in the year 1816, the day of the 8th of July”\(^28\) The date is far enough in the past to give a sense of the exoticism and strangeness of past ways of living for those in 1930, and the location is far enough away from Prague in the Tatras of Slovakia to achieve a similar effect. The past has not gone though, but is just a small distance away from everyday life, able to be reached to enter into a pure and simple life.
Figure 15 Illustration for Važec Traditional Chalupa Byt a Umění

Važecská Izba (Važec Room) by Jan Hála, Byt a Umění Ročník I, Praha 1930, Číslo (number)2 pp27-30
Next to the article on the *chalupa* of Važec, a companion article by architect Karel Kuthan recommended that the city dweller should build a country home according to this blueprint for living.\textsuperscript{283} The joys of sleeping under the stars and taking a small pack along with simple provisions, tramping and spending the “weekend evening” around the campfire, such as in tramping, allowed one not to worry about the usual things, which create wrinkles and heart problems. You can “sing merrily until the flames die down” and “fall asleep in the flickering star light”, Kuthan recommends. But the real rest for the soul is found in the cottage, dry, comfortable, and simple. It is best to ask a skilled carpenter to help build this house, Kuthan does recommend, but eventually the plans will come true. A “home and castle” for a healthy stay in the woods is the result, close by for excursions into the woods and with the happiness of the simple physical labour which is the result of maintaining the home. This gives a “simple joy, simple life, fun, fulfilling the desires of one’s own home.” The owner of the *chata* in this way can live an upright life, without the burden of unnecessary luxury.

Kuthan does not present the peasant cottage and lifestyle as an alternative to the urban life for his readers in *Byť a Umění* to take up permanently, but as a remedy. The supposed simplicity of the peasant in the mountains is not to be adopted full time, nor are the weekenders to integrate into the life of the village, or to know them, but rather to emulate, for a brief period, the qualities of life that the peasant is able to achieve by the traditional
“simple” and “ancient” ways of living. What is achieved is a link back to the “self”, a “perfect rest for the soul”.

In the same way that tramping emulated the outdoors life of the American cowboy, but without the full rigours of moving cattle on the trail, the weekender in the chalupa was able to edit out the hardships or the tenuousness of survival of the peasant in the land. Lucy Textor had pointed out that the land had been emptied somewhat by the inability of the peasants to survive at a time when monoculture agriculture was beginning to be implemented by the large estates. This popular impression of the land of the past ignored the reality of the vast tracts which were owned by Habsburg Empire estates and which were unavailable for so many of the prior inhabitants either for subsistence or leisure. The countryside was shown in a tourist film for national domestic consumption made in 1927 and leisure as a paradise. Going back to the land, whether to camping, tramping or weekending, recreated a fantastic past, applying a balm also to a historical loss, but also made comment on the present status of home lands which were now accessible to all.

Folkloric crafts and life gave the city dwellers access to aesthetic and symbolic qualities that would have made Adolph Loos shudder. Mixed and bright colours, every useable object decorated, as Pec's cartoon of Sutnar showed, and the idea of the presence of God, was naturally included in the home. Pleasure is achieved, not in the assurance of a level of “civilization” but in the creation of craft by the householders for use by the families or the community.
Folkloric crafts were also valorised on a national level as emblematic of the best in decorative arts. Examples were sent to the exhibit in Paris in 1925 as part of the pavilion for “Modern Decorative and Industrial Arts”. Czechoslovakia sent lace and embroidery: “Czechoslovakian and Greek pavilions contained a great deal of peasant embroideries”. But these were unfortunately greeted as if there was neither skill, nor thought in their making. The report from the British Delegation to the Department of Overseas Trade wrote rather pejoratively:

> Traditional folk art, thought yielding invaluable material to the archaeologist and ethnologist, no more lends itself to critical analysis than the colours and forms of nature. In relation to modern civilised man, the spontaneous products of folk art were really more akin to natural phenomena than to the results of his own conscious artistic efforts.

The inclusion of these natural arts against the consciousness of modern art and innovation could only be incongruous, to be admired, and only so. It was seen as a symptom by the British commentator of the “fierce and transitory ebullition” of patriotism and nationalism (previously furtive) that followed the carving up and reorganisation of Central Europe following the War. It was not only the folk art that suffered from the derogation of primitivism, but possibly the entire region. The development of a discrete area for leisure fit in with the creation of different areas of life that allowed also a subject for the modern perfectibility of all aspects of life by a devoted attention to their elements and the creation of the best representations of them.

Reconfiguring the past through the activities of ‘tramping’ and the uses of *Chaty* and *Chalupy*, huts and cottages, as authentic experiences of the peasant way of life are essential elements for
a cosmopolitan and modern population. The report from the British Department of Trade of the value and remoteness from modernity of the folkloric crafts, echo the prescriptions and proscriptions for their use by Emil Edgar, who condemns their appearance in a city home and the horror caricatured for Sutnar. With the compartmentalising of peasant colours into the Važecká izba, the Važec room, by Jan Hálás and the expert instructions for the uses of these, convert these peasant ways of life into another externalized decorative thing and a consumable experience of leisure. These are in effect vital and emblematic elements of the distance that was required for these to be used as reliable oppositional counterparts, which also serve to create the modern existence of Prague and Czechoslovakia.
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Writing Home

‘Well, the main thing is you’re home again - thank God.’ She said.

The Cowards. Josef Škvorecký

Tá naše světíčka
bezka je, malíčká.
jsme v ní:
Já, tatíček, mamička, sestřička.

This is our little world
Pretty she is, and small
inside her, we
papa, mama, sister and me

Doma Home~ Emanuel Lešehrad

But as it is the apartment belongs to my happiness

Franz Kafka 1922

In the introduction to Writing Culture, James Clifford put forward the notion of the literary qualities of the representations in ethnographic works, and how this not only shaped but influenced those representations: “Literary processes – metaphor, figuration, narrative, affect the ways cultural phenomena are registered”. Clifford questioned the validity of the representations that came about through writing and its devices and their relation to the phenomena they sought to re-create. The question he posed arises in a form of reversal then for the reading of literary works, in all their permutations, found using all of the compositional tools Clifford listed, for their own representations and registrations of
These texts are in effect ‘writing culture’ before any analyst might come upon them to write this again, to subject them to what Michel de Certeau described as “the technical and conceptual apparatus of enquiry and interpretation” which makes the “clean break” with the past, but whilst all of the texts were intended to bridge it. Certainly poetry, letters, essays and diaries involve a speaking to the future.

Rather than killing the texts by dissection, one way in which this problem can be approached with these pieces of written culture, is to consider (as does Geertz) that texts, including fiction, are “things in the world” and are in and of themselves already ‘descriptions’ of culture. Thus to be more of a literary critic, and to read them as Ben Highmore has suggested in the introduction to his *Cityscapes: cultural readings in the material and symbolic city*, that of performing the close reading of literature which can result in what Clifford Geertz termed “thick Description”, and reveal what can be seen from looking back. Geertz’ instruction with “thick description” was to make sure to see the multi levels of meaning that should be part of the interpretation of the complexity of cultural artefacts that a native would be able to do.

Derek Sayer noted that it would be hard to overestimate the importance of writers to the public life of the Czechoslovakian nation during the period: “Modern Czech writers have had a different relationship to their people […] Czech novelists, poets, and playwrights enjoy great public esteem, even veneration.” They are charged with great responsibility and “expected to write for the newspapers (and) to assume moral leadership.” In 1939 (written in 1938 – the date must have been between Sept and Dec 1938) René Wellek (1903-1995) published a survey of the developments in Czech literature, in large measure
because of the signing of the Munich agreement in September 1938, the upheaval of which he felt would change literature profoundly. During the twenty years of the First Republic:

Czech literature expanded considerably [...] the reading public increased by leaps and bounds, not only because Czech had again become a language read in Slovakia and by the reclaimed Czech minorities, [...] education spread a hunger for literature… .

Literature had also been democratised by the entry of so many new writers, the abandonment of the formal style of written Czech and the possibilities of writers making enough money to live. The new work in the interwar left behind the themes of the coming resurrection of the nation, one needed prior to independence, as Wellek noted, and became lighter, celebrating the beauty in the simplest and the nearest things. As in the art and avant garde world, as well as architecture, the professionals looked outwards to the rest of Europe particularly France and the Anglophone literatures of England and America, thus changing the home tradition of literature irrevocably.

Czechoslovakian writers, journalists, poets and novelists were a part of the displaced or transient populations of post-World War I Prague, displaced even by virtue of the sudden transition in nationality. Many were coming of age just after the War, and were of the age set that was forming households and finding what it was they wanted to do. They expressed their reactions to this status through their diaries, poetry, essay, newspaper articles and feuilleton, their letters home as well as through their creative fiction or
fictionalised works. They wrote in many varied ways about their own personal experiences and consideration of the subject of home, both the physical and psychic aspects of this, but also their apprehension of the disjuncture, as well as opportunities, contained in a their new and modernising society. They also managed to evoke and describe some of the more usually ineffable feelings of what can be considered a requisite of a home.

What their works demonstrate also, is that the state, condition and position of people in life deeply affects their ability to derive a sense of comfort, of being comfortable somewhere. Displacement, migration, and the strange as well as the new, create feelings of discomfort, unease and loss, and indeed a need to cure this. Škvorecký’s hero Danny in The Cowards, who recurs in his other novels, is an example, albeit fictional, of the importance of the still small centre of home in the face of chaos and turmoil. Škvorecký’s depiction of home is echoed, sometimes in its counterpoint, in the personal writings of Franz Kafka, and Milena Jesenská, as well as more fully in Karel Čapek, and in the search for this by the young poets, Jiří Wolker, Vítězslav Nezval and Jaroslav Seifert.

A change in the definitions of where ‘home’ is, for most, is a time in which there is a certain amount of thinking about home, about its makeup and about which of the material as well as emotional conditions will be able to create this thing anew. If perhaps things are not right, a draft here, noises above them, an uncongenial
housemate, there is often complaint to the intimates they left behind or who are absent.

“The power comfort has over me, my powerlessness without it. [...] the maid who
forgets to bring me my warm water in the morning overturns my world” wrote Kafka in
his diary in February 1922 tellingly.297

Whether it is the first foray into home creation at the beginning of adult life, or that
which is needed for a social change such as marriage, engagement or newly acquired
wealth, the state of mind is one of exploration and enquiry as to what is desired and what
is needed to be able to know comfort, and to have the feeling of being ‘at home’.
Essentially, those in search of a home begin to more consciously theorise what it is that
makes a location into a home where perhaps before it was an unquestioned state of
affairs. Whether it is in a city, a building, or a house, imagined spaces and arrangements
are often conjured up. Who will inhabit the home and how, also becomes part of the
conditions for ascribing the moniker ‘home’ to a new place. More than one home exists
in these forms of narrative, the past longed for lost home, “The house has been torn
down long ago, but my longing rebuilds it” wrote Hermine Hanel of her grandmother’s
home, or the one more recently left, a ghost temporally held as well as the future new
home, for those able to do so, which is to be wished for, sought and made in imagination
before bricks.298

The ways in which the subject of home arrives subtly as a motif in these texts is often
tangentially around a rendering of something else in the description, a time of transition,
travel and arrival or of some change sometimes unbidden by the narrator. Sometimes the
discussion of home expressed misgivings about another subject, doubts about an
engagement as in Kafka, or anxiety about leaving the childhood village or town. The left-
behind home, or the as yet unrealised home, then becomes more than a location and
becomes a symbol within which the relationships of life are mediated, by its settled and
‘located’ attachments. Thus the writers refer to home as the place where family or loved
ones reside, or will reside, even whilst inhabiting, habitually, another place entirely. It is in
returning to the place considered home after an absence, that its contingent nature is
revealed, as Wolker the poet’s return shows. The contingent element is the presence of
the subject themselves, a return with a changed character, new achievements, explorations
and experiences changes the place called home into a thing always from the past and
unable to be recaptured in its entirety.

The idea and possession of a home crystallises also on the concept of a type of social
capital, as a location for the kinds of cooperation and links which occur amongst the
intimates in a home, the family, spouses and in some cases, such as Čapek and Teige,
intimate friends or partners, and thus the locus of the beginnings of the larger community
in modernity. Bourdieu considered social capital as the durable networks and links in social
life in which one could expect some preference to had, and thus those without this are at a
disadvantage. Moments of change – marriage, new members, deaths, as Bourdieu noted,
reconfigure the boundaries of what it is that is depended upon, whether a group or a
family. And although he allows that the family could continue to influence the boundaries
of the group by “producing occasions, (rallies, cruises, hunts parties, receptions, etc.) […]
places (smart neighbourhoods, select schools, clubs etc.)” nevertheless, although he cites
the family as a network maker, he does not see these as ever located in or because of the home. To be without a home, temporarily or permanently, means existing outside of the foundations of civil society, as well as the ordinariness of social and physical comfort. It also puts the displaced in a different moral universe, where things are differently done.

Perhaps it is the case that there is a mysticism about the feeling for home which cannot be shoe horned into the locations for social capital; it is expressed by Karel Čapek in June 1924, writing from London to his erstwhile partner Olga Scheinflugová. He writes of meeting Shaw and Wells and seeing: “posh English households” but this does not quench something: “…I feel somehow sad. I don’t know, last year in Italy I was much happier. And at home – I’d love to be at home. I often close my eyes and imagine that, say, tomorrow I’ll be going home. Instead, maybe on Friday or Saturday, I shall travel further into England.” Čapek’s moment of longing is strongly expressed and common to all who find themselves away from home. What is it about home that can outshine even having lunch with George Bernard Shaw and visiting H.G. Wells? Čapek mentions not one single element of what it is he longs for, whether a house, his city, or his nation, or even the person of Olga, but simply the whole of it.

The personalised nature of home will differ for different individuals, it is in some senses a particular and specific love affair, but for all of the following writers it becomes an important subject matter. Jiří Wolker, and Vítězslav Nezval, both poets-to-be born in
1900, arrived soon after the end of the War. A longing for home is evident in some of their first works which are built around the themes of their strange arrival in Prague from the provinces and of its eventual familiarisation for them. Writer Jaroslav Hašek, the author of *The Good Soldier Švejk*, *Oudy dobřeho vojáka Švejka*, returned from internment and a time of Russian exile along with other Czech legionnaires, and wrote his Švejk almost as a coda to the sensibilities that had to exist throughout the relationships of Czechs/Bohemians to the bureaucratic empire. Hašek’s characters, whose peripatetic bohemianism inhabiting Prague in the collection of short stories, *The Tourist Guide*, reflect his own transient grasp of a settled life, but show how to succeed somehow, nevertheless. ³⁰¹

Karel Čapek became a published author of the play *R.U.R* (Rossum’s Universal Robots) in 1920, and perhaps more importantly published his first translations of French and Continental poetry such as those of Guillaume Apollinaire, which marked and opened the literary world in Czechoslovakia to outside influence beyond Austria and Germany. ³⁰² Čapek tackles the subject of home in many ways, building one himself, musing on the curious elements of doing so, and writing about this in his personal works, as well as for publications as essays.

Franz Kafka also emerges surprisingly as a home maker, or at least as someone who is contemplating and organising the details of a home, and who has a firm idea of what one should be, something not usually evident in the other analyses over the years of his diary entries and letters which focus more on his literature, writing and neuroses. Jaroslav Seifert, another of this generation of the new Czechoslovakian poets, who survived long
after his contemporaries, uses home as a motif in his poetry from a position of a mutual understanding (between the voice of the poem and those to whom they are addressed) of its meaning and definition. For Seifert, home is often a plot point, a counterpoint to the place or situation of the speaker. Conversely journalist Milena Jesenská writes more poignantly from a type of exile in Vienna exploring the meanings of home and Czechness for readers of the Tribuna newspaper. In novels such as popular writer Marie Pujmanová’s People at the Crossroads (Lidé na křížovatce 1937) the status of being strangers and newly arrived are familiar themes as well.

Jaroslav Hašek (1883-1923), at the time along with Čapek one of the most famous of the contemporary writers, stands in a type of oblique and puckish position to the conservative and settled position of Čapek, the self-imposed transience of Kafka and the helplessness of the characters who might find themselves in a similar circumstance. Hašek, via his hero Švejk and the cast of characters in his short stories, as well as through the simple troubles that his own approach to settledness in life created for him, illustrates a type of feckless or charmingly careless opinion about the mores of bourgeois, establishment or even institutional life. Hašek has Švejk undermine the normalised understanding of standards used as a model for living, by interpreting orders with a literalness which allows the fulfilment of that order to drop into the absurd. Hašek, in his own life exemplified the opposite of settleness: anti-bourgeois but not in the socialist sense, anarchical but not in any organised way, Hašek spent early years ‘tramping’ in the true sense of this in the country-side. Time in Prague was spent as a young man, taking
up residence in several bars around the old town, usually by spending the night or asleep. Payment was made possible occasionally with stories.

Hašek’s heroes or protagonists had transient existences that experienced enforced absences through accidental arrest – (whether guilty of the crime of not, the arrests were accidental) – or in the case of Švejk, leaving through his army duties. Hašek’s experiences are writ through to his characters and the absurdist logic went with this. After his marriage, hard won, to Jarmila Mayerova, Hašek strained against the ligatures of settled bourgeois life coupled with a position as a journalist. He opted for a fake suicide from the Charles Bridge. This allowed him a well-earned rest in the asylum for a few weeks, which allowed him to do some writing.  

Hašek described usually a character who had an unusual ability to be comfortable in most of the bad luck or accidental situations they had put themselves into, from finding someone else in their beds after an absence in jail, the comforts of jail itself, or to the opportunities afforded by a voting drive set up to encourage people to vote more often (in a single election) by providing disguises, which yielded a new overcoat. Hašek’s characters like Mr Cetlička are not especially settled in any way, though land somehow on their feet, even if temporarily. Hašek’s own experiences became material for Švejk, who also spent sunny days in the asylum and who was able to call a prison cell ‘home’ and remark on the smoothed planks on the bunk beds as a good thing, with an obvious comparison to a familiarity with poorer types of accommodations. Hašek’s characters are never entirely homeless, though he was himself for a time after his first marriage separation. Hašek
managed mostly to stay with his illustrator Josef Lada, and made himself welcome by cooking rather well whilst he was there.

The success of the peripatetic Švejk for Jaroslav Hašek enabled him to settle down in some fashion. Hašek had extended his unsettled youth longer than most, but Švejk enabled him to buy a cottage in order to write the remaining volumes of the adventures of his soldier. However, this was not in Prague but in Lipnice Na Sazavou, a village about 115 kilometres south east of the city, thus removing him from his most troublesome milieu. But he continued certainly in choosing a house a short stroll to the local inn. His was a small house perfectly domestic in contrast, in which he lived the last few years of his life, completing his Švejk before his health failed and he died in 1923.

You wish for a kitchen, tiny, quite small

Along with Jaroslav Seifert, the Nobel Prize winning poet, one of the poets most associated with Prague of the interwar period and with the avant garde and modernist movements within it, was Vítězslav Nezval. One of the 1900 generation (1900-1958) with Jiří Wolker, Seifert, and Karel Teige, Nezval came to Prague to study, but became part instead of the new literary and avant garde of the city – founding with Teige the group Devětsil. One of his first collections of poems was initially about inhabiting Prague as a walker, as a flâneur, and as a newly arrived but homesick resident – Prague with Fingers of Rain. The poems cycle from a lonely and homeless physical and psychic state, the classic lost feeling from leaving home for the first time, to the beacon of finding a room, a balcony, a friend and the building of a new familiarity with his new city.
One day in April 1920 I arrived in Prague for the first time
At the station as sad as ashes huddled a dejected crowd
They were emigrants

Nezval in *Walker in Prague* had, as a poetic self, arrived at a moment when Prague was receiving refugees from the Russian revolution, and at a moment when Czechoslovakia, as a nation and home, was new but suffering from the effects of the War and the economic strictures that arose from the reorientation of the previous colonial position, placed within the larger economy and the Empire. Nezval’s first experience of Prague is not the mythic future shiny modernist and developed city, but one of poor buildings and of a multitude of human spice – the smell of my suitcase is making me cry he wrote in *Walker*. Nezval’s feelings of displacement create odd imagined fears about his new environment – “The yard hangs like an evil cloud outside the window from which I never lean” - and his newly arrived presence in Prague means “everywhere I feel a stranger” - accommodated only in a poor lodging, he writes “I try in vain to sleep in the room where a man once shot himself”. He tries to avoid falling for Prague as if it is a dangerous woman, a perhaps slightly timeworn poetic device, used as a way to address the cycle of desire: “a none too original simple substitution, comes alive in newly invented metaphors, which dominate the lover’s discourse throughout the cycle.” as Banerjee argues. Prague is, however at first, an entirely non-demanding lover, one to be only observed, gazed at, offering at first only scenes and sensory experiences rather than the relationship with the challenging built environment which is a condition of city living. Alfred Thomas argues also that Nezval
treats Prague in this poem as “a dream landscape rather than a real city in which
unconscious sexual drives assumed their own peculiar logic.” The commodification in
and of the city projects the same uncomfortable perception of women available in this
way in the city, which is shocking and serves to disenchant Nezval and to remove at the
first his innocence. 312

It is in the gradual familiarisation that Prague turns from an exotic woman, one who has a
multitude of threatening definitions, to reimagined spaces that are seen as ones of comfort
and leisure. His Prague, the longer he is there, transforms itself under his eyes; an
embankment becomes a terrace with lanterns. One startlingly sensual experience of seeing
an umbrella unfurl is looked forward to as a routine of future pleasure “Leaning over the
Bridge of Legions (Most Legi) I shall watch this fiesta of parasols [the lanterns] every day”.
The familiarity which grew with Prague, “Thus I learned to love Prague” ceased the
peripatetic searching for new lodging. Nezval wrote later in his autobiography about this
transformation:

During the time when Prague was depressing to me, when I was so homesick [for
Moravia] that I could not uncover its beauties, at that time, it was the lights of the
bridges of Prague reflected in the water [that] were the first signal for me of the
magic of that city. 313

Michel de Certeau would have rendered this transformation for Nezval as that of
finding his style, his way of living through repeated daily practices, and walking through
the city as Nezval does, is a form of discourse, of finding sentences, rhetorics and expressions (paths) that allow forward travel. “Style, and use” de Certeau argues “both have to do with a way of operating.”

Nezval establishes his own practice of his everyday through the softening edges of a city becoming not a destination but his home town.

*Host do Domu – Guest in the House*

Jiří Wolker, also newly arrived at that time, in one of his first volumes of poetry - *Guest in the House* - *Host do Domu* - also gives us a series of vignettes of his initial feelings and experiences. Though there is much less of a sense of a definite date (though his letters provide this) – he seems to gradually arrive as one would into adulthood. The world described in these poems is dreamlike on occasion, or inhabited by hallucinatory beings or images. Rather than the transition of strange spaces to familiarity that Nezval gave us, even in his surreality, Wolker writes more tellingly of smaller conditions of comfort and moments of readjustment to his new home in his poetry. This new world is not unfriendly, but rather than wait for its transformation through time and familiarity, as does Nezval, Wolker finds the small familiar in the larger strange environments: “All the boys went home, but I stayed in a strange city”. Lyrical and open, Wolker is a boy in the strange city, “In the night, as a window to the world opens” but hopes to find a place in the new city.
Wolker uses Christian and Marian iconography, he meets a ‘saviour’ “The Lord God” on the road, also a traveller, with a leather bag and a smile, who becomes a guest in the houses, or he writes of the ordinary kitchen which could become every day “silently” at noon, he thinks, a flower field, with food offerings which are blessed. A hearkening back to the rural childhood so recently left, Wolker rusticates his new urban environment in his poetry. But his struggles as a nineteen year old into a Prague which was not only urban in comparison to his rural childhood, but suffering under the immediate post-war conditions, is most revealed in his letters home.

After leaving home, the letters from Prague that he wrote to his family in the short time he had as an adult begin as soon as he gets there. Within a few days of arriving to study at the University (Charles University), Wolker wrote to his mother on the 9th of October 1919, he had made it! Very soon however, other more practical concerns arise quickly.

Maminka (Mummy), please send me the following things: Sokol pants, shirt, the low heel shoes, send them to me too. It will be good to have gym shoes. I bought gloves. Also please send that hard (probably rugged or durable ed.) hat. Everything is amazingly expensive. (so far) I registered four classes instead of two, I have taken philosophies: Czech literature, literary criticism, English literature, seminars and English. I got out of the mandatory 21 hours well. It is enough - right? I still remember you [I think of you] and thank you. Greetings to my father and Charles.

With love from Jiří.
Within the first few weeks, Jiří chooses to visit the popular icons of nationhood, the *Obecni Dum* (the Municipal House), and the *Narodni Divadlo* (National Theatre) to see *Pygmalion*, and has plans to attend a cabaret, all of which could only have been exciting to a nineteen year on his own for the first time. His new life in Prague had its strictures in contrast to his home village; Jiří had to get his ration cards for meat, sugar, fat and bread. Prague was under the limits of food rationing.

“Soon I’ll have a lot of work. I will learn English at university, French starting at home with the help of Miss Blueberry, (sl. [slechna - miss] Borůvkove) promised in exchange for teaching English.” Jiří reports already by the 19th of October that he is suffering from a respiratory ailment: “Our room is quite cold and faces north”. He suffers as he can only work at night, the ‘holy’ night he calls it. Jiří reports as a child almost everything that he experiences, and complains of almost every pain and occurrence; he walks everywhere, he dislikes his new third roommate, and notes the things he has to buy and the quality of the bread against their own home made. Jiří asks immediately for a new overcoat, hat, boots; the sleeves are short on the coat and the wind blows into them. He writes almost every five days to his mother or his father, he reports almost all of what happens to him in a way which seems to be staving off becoming a stranger to those he loves at home. Wolker makes Prague home not by the transmutation of places into familiarity as Nezval, but as with almost all emigrants, by importing home such as he can to his new location, asking for familiar objects and comforts to be sent to him. Jiří also behaves in reporting the details of his life in a way that emulates him just walking through the door of his family home.
Wolker’s career and life was short, he became ill soon after his first poetic publications with tuberculosis, and died in 1924, and suffered or enjoyed a posthumous career of being criticised and then valorised as the original poet of the proletariat and a pioneer of socialist realism, which served the later Socialist Czechoslovakian literary world. This short trajectory took *Host Do Domu* from the strange arrival in Prague, the boy, to a suffering man aware of the nearness of death through his own impending end, and that of his close family. In one of his longest poems, he returns to his childhood holiday village and home Prostějov, a place for pilgrims and holidays, to his grandparents’ house. He finds again “the bell on an iron wire at the end of the corridor”, “the hallway, smelling the same each year”. His childhood home where his grandmother gave him oranges when he was ill was now sad, with an ailing grandmother. Whilst he recognises qualities and the smallest of places, he find them changed as well, such as his childhood friend changed and grown, the hands of his grandfather grey and blue. His whole life rises before his eyes “as a flower” and he completes a circle. But the home he described again, visited under the sadder circumstances, is as much one of the rewriting of memory as of the familiarity found once more. Woven in among imminent death, change and loss, is the future of the young looking to the East and taking up the socialist and proletariat political ethos, demonstrating by his description of the “brave and great; Lenin and Russia” as the best direction and examples. “[O]ur thoughts are green and tall like the trees in the woods today” he writes, the new socialist politics seen as leading to national renewal.

Wolker’s goodbye is to his former home as well as to the former world of the provincial style political life.
Solitude in the world

Whilst Jiří Wolker creates the world of the young man, the scholar and talented poet, and every freedom that that implies, the case for a young and also talented woman creates a more human scaled world. As a young woman, still recently but not newly married, Milena Jesenská, wrote about home as a metonymic location for the creation of a successful, more modern marriage. Not, she stressed the marriage of novels, of desires for romance and some notion of creating happiness, but the place where there could exist a place to be oneself, against the ingrained solitude of the human person in the world. “Every natural woman in her prime longs for love, a home and a child.” Home is the place where one (a woman) waits for the husband to come to in the evening, and the success of the marriage is measured by whether, waiting at home, one is happy to see him home. Home is defined by Jesenská is the place to be able to be oneself, and therefore the test of marriage, is its ability to withstand the relaxation into oneself, in which the street standards of appearance, hygiene, and politeness are absent: It is, she writes, “fantastically difficult to get to know another person” in the way of how they actually are at home, sleepy eyed, or their ways of gargling or brushing teeth, ears that stick out and cravats tied crookedly. Knowing one another’s deeds and ideas before marriage, is not knowing (in a wonderful phrase) “one another’s stockings”. But the metonymy of home is more than the place to be oneself in friendship and acceptance which should precede all unions, and which she categorises as more important than romantic love. It is the place in which, and from which a man or a woman, to each other or to a child, can promise to protect the essential self: “I won’t let them get you”.


Comfort in the marriage is the same as comfort in the home, an ability to be oneself, a feeling of welcome and of having a bulwark giving safety against the rest of the world. Not letting 'them' get you encompasses everything: one’s consideration for the other; one’s truthfulness to the other; to home; fidelity; allegiance; commitment; friendship.\footnote{322}

Milena wrote this, and published it in January 1923 in *Narodní Listy*. Her relationship with Franz Kafka could not continue, he was unable to see their relationship as having any future “No Milena, the possibility of a shared life which we thought we had in Vienna did not exist […] I looked ‘over my fence’ and then fell back with lacerated hands”, he wrote to her on reading a copy of the article, and her own marriage was also not able to survive. There is a poignancy to these recommendations for marriage, and therefore for what a home should have had the potential to be. They are desires rather than experience. By 1925 Milena had left Vienna and her husband Ernst Pollack and returned to Prague.\footnote{323}

**Noise in the afternoon**

Prague resident Franz (or František) Kafka himself, the friend and erstwhile lover of Milena Jesenská from 1920 to 1923, lived a condition of transience, insecurity and a continuing search for his own definition of comfort and wish to settle in a home. In 1922 he wrote to Milena about his new apartment, and particularly what he felt he was able to close the door on:
But as it is the apartment belongs to my happiness, everything quiet, the bathroom, the kitchen, the hall, the three further rooms, not as in those communal apartments, the noise, the lechery, the incest of the dissolute, uncontrolled bodies, thoughts and desires where in every corner, between all the furniture, illicit affairs, improper accidental things occur, illegitimate children are begotten, and where all the time life proceeds not as in your quiet empty suburbs on Sunday, but as in the wild, overcrowded, suffocating suburbs during an uninterrupted Saturday night.324

Kafka gives an example perhaps, of the anti-home, the home which no-one would or could wish for and this occurs both in his personal writings and his fiction. The description above is an extraordinary depiction of his fears of living with others and what they might get up to. For Kafka, an ideal would be to be alone by choice, though with either a maid or a female relative, quietly creeping in, taking care of his material needs.

One of the more general myths about Kafka is that he never managed to leave his parent’s house (and that he was impoverished). In his life, although Kafka had the ability to continually attempt to cure the deficiencies of his accommodation - he had a salary and, in illness, a subsequent pension, and several places to go when things went awry, as they did often - he was however, unable to permanently resolve his housing troubles until the last year of his life. In fact from the time of his first engagement to Felice Bauer in 1914, Kafka conceived and made plans and arrangements, took leases, and moved to find another home other than his father’s house. Themes which arose, tangentially in his
letters and diaries, about choosing a home reflected in such measure that he was, at one time, a young man with hopes, though ambivalent most of the time, for creating a family home, but who also at times craved only the solitude and eternal quiet of a well provisioned dungeon in which he could write.

In November 1911, prior to his attempts to find another home, when he still did not imagine this, he wrote in his diary:

I want to write, with a constant trembling on my forehead. I sit in my room in the very headquarters of the uproar of the entire house. I hear all the doors close, because of their noise only the footsteps of those running between them are spared me, I hear even the slamming of the oven door in the kitchen. [...] it comes back to me again that I might open the door a narrow crack, crawl into the next room like a snake and in that way, on the floor, beg my sisters and their governess for quiet.325

By 1914, in fragments of stories in his diary for that year he set small scenes in houses with strange landladies, or neighbours in the next room who insist on coming to wrestle every evening. Narrators return of evenings, to homes, or rooms, or seek them.326

Other than occasional trips for holidays and stays in sanatoria for health reasons, Franz first moved away from his parent’s home during the War, exchanging accommodation with his sister Valli to a house in Bilekgasse, (now Bílková) due to the War and her husband’s absence327. He was 32. This did not last more than a month, but he was then
inspired to find a location to write: “Finally took a room. In the same house on Bilekgasse”. Soon though his need for quiet is interrupted by his landlady and neighbours talking “Absolute despair. Is it like this in every house?” Finally after a month, he gave notice, gently attributing the lack of quiet to an internal state that he could not overcome. Moving soon after to Dlouha, Franz is pleased by the room’s friendliness and beauty and a view from the window along the street to the Tin church, something which he came to value more and more.328

Very soon he experiences all of the ambient and attendant noises common to being in a central busy part of the city, from the carriages going by and then “the noise in the afternoon. From time to time a crash in the kitchen or the corridor. Yesterday in the attic above, perpetual rolling of a ball, as if someone for some incomprehensible reason were bowling.” This was the lift in the building. Franz veers from a sudden type of contentment with his room, an ease, inside after a walk in Chotek Park, then torments. “Today, kept from sleep, from work, from everything by the noise”329

This reflects early on, his ambivalence about domestic life and the seemingly normal life of the home in the house, a lifelong theme in some ways of his struggles to find a perfect situation. He believes himself to be unwelcome in a house nominally belonging to someone else, like the protagonists in The Judgment and The Metamorphosis, he is not comfortable at home either physically or psychically, in effect not ever at home. Kafka reproduced the peculiar arrangement of a room made out of a pass-through space to his parents’ bedroom in The Metamorphosis. Gregor Samsa’s is also not really a room but part of a closed off passage.
In the midst of his epistolary relationship with Milena Jesenská in January of 1922, and after the official ending of his triple engagements, Kafka wrote to Milena in 1922:

– to be alone in a room is perhaps the condition for living, to be alone in an apartment – to be exact: temporarily – a condition for happiness (one condition because what good would the apartment be to me if I weren’t alive, if I didn’t have a home in which I could rest for instance…).\(^{330}\)

Kafka had perhaps more false starts at marriage and homes than could be imagined, and in the same way as he had prior to his relationship with Milena, he found that making a home was what it was that was impossible. He wrote to Milena a short time (or as they are not dated, a few letters before) before he finally broke the bond between them:

Few things are certain, but this is one of them. We shall never live together in the same apartment, body to body, at the same table, never, not even in the same town.\(^{331}\)

It was only after Kafka found this at the very end of his life when he moved with Dora Dymant to Berlin that his misgivings about living, in myriad ways, had settled. He described it in his penultimate letter to Milena:
I live almost in the country, in a small villa and garden, it seems to me I’ve never yet had such a beautiful apartment, I’m also sure I will soon lose it – it’s too beautiful for me:332

: The Smell of Home

The existence of comfort, of at-homeness, were literary motifs in the works of Franz Kafka and Karel Čapek, but in vastly divergent ways. Čapek in most of his stories establishes home as the safe haven from the activities in the rest of the world. Čapek writes also directly about home and its meanings for him in his essays. In the collections Tales from Two Pockets characters look and muse on the action, or recall the strange occurrences or crimes to be described, one has the feeling almost all seated comfortably. Čapek’s characters are often recalling incidents, with a friend or spouse, or the clerk or court sergeant, at leisure. It is of course, in the basement of the home, where God is absolutely captured in a boiler, emanating inescapable ecstasy to all.333

Conversely for Kafka, it is quite often inside the home that the uncanny, the unhappy and the disturbing occur. It is in the home that Josef K is arrested, that Gregor Samsa becomes an insect and that Blumfeld is invaded by a clever set of bouncing balls, and it is on the stairs of the family home that Odradek settles.334 Both Čapek and Kafka create worlds of magical realism, before this became a genre, but whereas Čapek’s characters encounter mysteries or human criminal foibles and have a sidekick to muse over these later on, to compare notes, to wonder at the otherworldly occurrences, Kafka’s protagonists are trapped within the nightmare with a type of urgency to the narration. It would be easy to
interpret the differences in the nature of each author’s characters to their own ‘kinship’ with them, as Ivan Klíma termed it, inadvertently expressing some part of their own nature, but this avoids taking account of the creative nature of the writing and the labour of this.335 Both authors in fact had similar adult lives in which the normal trajectories are not realised, and in which they depended on siblings and family as to the matter of home-making. And both only achieved a partnership at the last end of their lives, Čapek marrying Olga Scheinpflugová, and Kafka spending his last year with Dora Dymant in Berlin. The differences in how they both dealt with these similar elements of their lives are described and expressed in their work.

When the Čapek brothers, Karel the novelist and playwright, and Josef, the artist and illustrator, built the house that they eventually shared, Karel Čapek’s descriptions in his essays in the volume Intimate Things, presented his own personal experience.336 The Čapek brothers lived in a status and social position, famous and successful as well as affectionately viewed, which could also ignore conspicuously proving this.337 Karel was unconcerned, in his essays, with all of the political and modern social meanings which should have attended the building of a house and home. Instead, we are made aware of evanescent and shifting experiences, the odour of the carpentry being worked on downstairs, the differences in light, the changing of the seasons. Čapek used his new home as a motif for several of the letters and essays that he published in the mid-twenties.
“Today I wanted to be idle;” he writes in *In Praise of Idleness* “perhaps because it is so exceptionally lovely, or because the carpenter is working in the yard down below”. How important it is that ‘the’ carpenter is down below, because we know where Karel Čapek is, and it could only be at home, where idleness is available and where someone who is temporarily unique is working there as well.338 Building a home, for Čapek, is a lengthy process. It is not sufficient to finish the structure, for it takes *The Smell of Home* to complete this.

I live in a young suburb which is growing to the ringing of hammers” he writes “and if you blindfold me and led me through the town I should be able to tell by the scent: this is an old street; these are new houses, some of them still untenanted [...]. Until a house smells of man it gives off the smell of the material from which it originates. [...] And a new house does not lose this scent of its own all at once. [...] It is a long time before the people living in it smell the smell of home.339

Houses smell of building materials, even the earth on which they sit. Homes smell of home.

It only becomes really and completely a home when it ceases to be a new house [...] no longer the handiwork of the builder but of the people living in it.340

Newly erected buildings have a ‘strange hollowness’. Home smells “a little like a mill, of flour, mellowness, and a peculiar dryness which recalls the scent of straw and decaying wood”.341
Čapek sees his observations of the slow building of his house as a part of his personal history. “The building of the house unfolded itself as a two-year social struggle. [...] I went regularly to watch how my house was coming to light”. The labour of the masons, the joiners, their chats and tea breaks, the serious and jocular men, he calls them, are built into the house, but more so than this. He regards a loyalty to the house as related or similar to a link to a home country. “All of this got cemented into the bricks and joists of my house. You must see that after so many drawbacks I cling to it with a certain fierce patriotism” in contrast to the fast efficiency he attributes to American building techniques.” and that I wouldn’t change it for anything.”

We have entered a different realm entirely from that of functional rationality into one in which familiarity and comfort are desired, and idiosyncratic decisions can be made. Whilst Čapek was fortunate to be affluent enough to build his own house, and to able to wait for the ‘smell of home’ to grow, others were more caught by circumstances from tenancy to transient homelessness. Čapek’s description of what makes a home from the material of a newly built house, eventually, is charged with his own needs, memories and expectations of long residence in one particular place.

Čapek’s feeling of settledness is so palpable. Whilst he touches on the work, it also gives him the seat from which to begin to muse on life. His place at this house becomes the inspiration for the year-long cycle of The Gardener’s Year, a sort of fugue meditation on
becoming a new gardener, the sorrows and triumphs, but also the wonder of the volition of the garden itself. Čapek and his neighbours, as fellow gardeners, are a new breed reproducing decorative nature in a controlled suburban way, but in a haplessly small way. Growing everything a gardener would want to try would take eleven hundred years “to try, work through and in a practical way evaluate everything which appertains to him.” Working a garden creates different beings throughout the year:

In summer one may be a pantheist, one may think of oneself as a part of nature; but in autumn a person can think of himself only as a person. Even if we do not mark our foreheads with the sign of the cross, we all slowly return to the birth of man. Every home fire burns in honour of the household gods. Love of home is the same ritual as worship of a celestial deity.

Čapek’s chapter in In Praise of Autumn ends there with almost a non-sequitur. Who are the household gods when he also invokes a celestial deity? Čapek was fortunate that his literary success allowed him to build a fraternal house in Vinohrady, with his brother Josef, which was alternated with a country house in Stare Hut, where he spent more and more time before his death in 1939. His comfortable existence was evident in the certainty given by the presence of the large house itself, newly built in an emerging and more affluent suburb.

If My Own Home Could not be Found

A born resident of the area of Prague Praha known as Žižkov, Jaroslav Seifert had a natural claim to the city as his home, and this transforms his use of this in his poems. He
was a close friend of Karel Teige, was one of the founders of *Devětsil* and Poetism and a contributor to several leftist publications, until his real life as a poet took over from his political inclinations.\textsuperscript{345} It is in the works of Seifert that Prague is presented as the settled place of home in contrast to the location of an arrival or an attempt to create one. He writes in the *Wreath of Sonnets* in 1956 – *Věneč sonetů* – of its meaning as the place, the city, in which he lives, but more tellingly as the location of his lifelong loyalty, where his heart is found. Prague is a ‘sip of wine’, personified as feminine, “I’ve always loved her like a woman, and in her gowns I’ve wished to hide” whose destruction is something to be feared but which also galvanises a defence: “I won’t be one of those who’re leaving”.

\begin{quote}
I’d man my post, steadfast, believing,
though I’d be starved and barely living,
if my own home could not be found.\textsuperscript{346}
\end{quote}

The idea of home, not only a home city, but the many different definitions of it, is much more in evidence in his early poetry, more so than his contemporaries at the time. In the sense that he was much more of a dedicated poetist revolutionary than either Nezval or Wolker, Seifert give his characters a place to yearn for and to compare with their current place – it locates the possibilities of beauty, as Poetism recommended, in the daily experiences of life. The exotic, and spicy, the places of cultural interest are only so in contrast to what is home. The dream of home arises for the victor and vanquished waging war:

\begin{quote}
home they go
How far how far is home
\end{quote}
for the returned traveller who remembers the sights and smells of warmer lands “home he returned all this to remember”. For the child waiting for father. It is a constantly occurring motif, whether it is the house, or the nation – home is a doorstep, a lock and key, a window to own, a square in the city to play again the spectacle of exotic lands, a harbour, or a lover. In his poems Seifert does not have to create home, to muse about its composition or how it becomes such. Home always already exists in the imaginary for Seifert and for his protagonists.347

**That same old familiar**

In the five days that it took for the invading army to get into their vehicles and move out, rain dripping on their helmets, and for the liberating ones to arrive, Josef Škvorecký’s narrator in *The Cowards*, Danny Smificky, spends the days negotiating the shiftingly established powers, some with guns and tanks, others with moral imperatives, playing jazz in the cafe, and yearning after Irina. Almost each night, however, he goes home and steps into a centre of calm where the routines of home still prevail. Danny always finds his mother at home, and usually, despite the hour, she is awake and waiting, offering tea:

> I was alone in my room with the tea. I drank it and then crawled down under the eiderdown quilt and curled up. That same old familiar, eternally recurring and always wonderful feeling swept over me. I closed my eyes and started saying my prayers. Dear Lord, help me to win Irina.348
Danny’s mother represents a still calm centre for the home, quietly provisioning, fretting or worrying, but only able to guess at what is happening from the noises that she can hear in the streets. “What was all that shooting then?” Only Danny would be able to supply the answer from his forays into the outside world.

Danny gets up in the morning and butters several rolls to take with him, a family meal consists of beef stew, and there is always tea. This is a form of war time paradise, but also a type of home paradise as well and ideal for an adolescent male with a war going on outside in the streets, Danny can creep up the stairs in the dark late at night. An eternally recurring wonderfulness that comes from mother and tea and eiderdowns, as well as one’s own room and the presence of a God who can be petitioned with varying levels of detailed prayers and supplications, leavened by asking for some protections for those whose lives, in Prague, were not so easeful in war: “and so I went on and hardly knew anymore quite what it was I was thinking about and what was real and what wasn’t until I fell asleep with all these pleasant thoughts, without even knowing how.”

Škvorecký writes a perfect evocation of the comforts of home: a combination of ease, emotion and familiarity that allows the security that washes over Danny despite the chaos which is occurring outside. There is a timeless even anachronistic quality to what is available in the interior of this home. Whilst outside it is still the Protectorate of Bohemia, inside the house it is still Czechoslovakia of another time.
The Location of Memory

The past is reminiscent of a ruined castle, seen from a speeding train, writes Peter Fritzsche, sometimes near, sometimes far, nevertheless always somehow in view whilst going to other places. Created as the motif in a story Fritzsche cites by Eichendorff, this castle is filled with fanciful and romantic arrangements, unable to be sustained in the modern eras of timetables and trains and passengers. A castle inhabited by an old man and by children, and thus, the ruin becomes the symbol of the lived life at the end, and is also the emblem of the lost childhood, ruined by time and war and history. “Whether we are talking about the lost causes that ruined the castle or the childhood pleasures that come up in our memories, the past is disconnected from the present [but] is also something that can be recovered in imaginative recollections […] in voyages to the ruins.”

For the ancient Greeks and Romans, Maurice Halbwachs reminds us, the family was rooted in a location, and the memory, the social identity of any family, was “fused with house and land”. The hearth, he quotes De Coulanges as writing, was always behind a boundary of some sort, a wall, a hedge, earth and this set it out and differentiated it against other families. As the location of the family physically, as common to those times, and as the location of
the economy of the family, the contemplation of this place could lead individual members to be able to access in memory the activities that went on there, as well as link again to the kinship ties. Those activities that were part of the economy of the family, tending the land, for instance, even if identical to the rest of the community, and even if these were done as part of a community effort, made on the land the memories of the family inscribed on the land – a seasonal palimpsest. The home thus becomes a locus for retrieving the memory of not only the family home but also the personal childhood memories, and thus a resource of identity as well. Halbwachs situated the ancient house and land for the family firmly within the idea of a community, as a working element whose activities are not only important in sustaining an individual family group but which also form the community itself, and whose meaning as a family are set against the context of the community. Modernity has changed the influence of the idea of a community in situating the history and memory of a family and a family home, condensing this to the private and individual unit. Halbwachs sees, for more modern times, the construction of a family memory not from the repeated workings on the land but rather from the repetition of activities in the daily life of the family which are later seen as ritual: the way evenings were spent; the habitual dress of father; the nightly walk. “The scene as it is represented nevertheless gives, in a gripping abbreviation, the idea of a family. Even though it is a summary of collective reflections and feelings.”

Where does the location of all of these repeated acts sit in the idea of a familial memory? The palimpsest of the ancient land is not sustainable for most of a mobile and modern population, neither can the economy of the family as a single goal sustain itself against the fragmentation which arrives from more neolocated nuclear family groups. Halbwachs’ collective reflections
and feelings of the abbreviation (collective as of the family as a unit) are set upon an undescribed and unrecognised stage of a mnemonics of feelings, but that stage is, of course, the home whether this is an estate or an apartment of three rooms. Frances Yates noted that the first step for an art of memory, and for mnemonics, is to “imprint on the memory a series of loci or places. The commonest, though not the only, type of mnemonic used was the architectural type”. For memories of the family, an artificial mnemonic does not need to be constructed in advance in the same way, it is always already there. Memory itself is the process of reconstruction and recreation and at times, confabulation. It is in this way that the home for the family exists briefly anew on recollection, and as Yates noted, the same locus can be used again and again for remembering different material. Gaston Bachelard saw the resource for the work of recollection in the house and home (these he uses interchangeably): “The house, like fire and water, will permit me later in this work, to recall flashes of daydreams that illuminate the synthesis of immemorial and recollected” […] “[T]he various dwelling places in our lives co-penetrate and retain the treasures of former days”. The first universe is the home, as Bachelard noted, and he argued that the home inscribes itself on any other inhabited space ever afterward. It is not only in and due to modernity that the home becomes more abstracted, but also in the course of lifetimes, that home commonly becomes progressively more of a meaningful idea situated as a memory and less of one single set location. The daily habits and the people who did them together create what is viewed and recognised later as home. It is through the shared memory of these that the identity and authenticity of the family is recognised. The
pain of absence from home, whether it is Čapek’s temporary journeys, or the more permanent departures, such as relayed by the poets Wolker and Nezval, is most keenly felt in the loss of the contextual elements of the dailyness of the home, to become either a guest or a visitor, though always welcomed back. In these memories, home is both the building, the house, and the way life as it was lived within it and the family who were there. The boundaries of this accord with Bachelard’s use, as freely interchangeable from one to another.

In this chapter I present the memories of home from residents of Prague and the near surroundings which were gathered through the life history research carried out by the Centropa Organisation and through the questionnaires which were distributed in Prague from 2008 through to 2012. The Centropa interviews were taken by the organisation with a view to recording the life of the Jewish residents of several countries in Central Europe using a standard methodology, with provision for flexibility according to the conduct and progress of the interview and the life histories of the respondents. The complete methodology document used as a guide for these interviews is attached as Appendix IV and references to the subject name and Centropa refers to work undertaken under this methodology. The complete interviews are available on the web site listed in the Bibliography and referenced in the introduction to this work. The questionnaires which were distributed in Prague from 2008 to 2012 were specifically designed to address questions and ideas of home during the interwar period. Respondents were asked about their families, their parent’s profession and the type of home they lived in. They were then asked to describe private and public space in the home
and to contribute a description of a routine. Finally a blank page was included for any other information that respondents wished to include which provided some of the most interesting material. Respondents were given the choice to be anonymous. A facsimile of the questionnaire and a translation of the questions is included as Appendix V of this work and all references to ‘Questionnaire [name][date]’ refer to these. The data and responses gathered are archived and are available to view with prior notice to the author.

A number of my respondents had spent their lives up to the present in the same family house, in many cases first bought or built by their grandparents. The continuity of these homes through time, with three or four generations ‘owning’ the home via living in it, present a different set of circumstances that arise here about the capacity to inherit a ‘home’ (rather than just property) which does not ‘die’ as Finch and Hayes had queried.358 In these houses and homes, the work of creating a home is an ongoing and flexible process across time and generations, not the work of one individual who would be able to pass it on complete at death, and ownership of the home has been traduced in its simple definitions which normally accompany the concept, becoming a far richer idea. However, as Finch and Hayes had found, homes in the singular sense of the work of one person, or normatively, a couple, are not normally seen as able to be inherited, and revert to only property as an inheritable asset.

Anna Brůhová, who was born in 1923, has written a picture of her home and her life which accords with Karel Čapek’s notion that Czech homes included the street outside and the
activity that went on, and has given one of the most complete and holistic descriptions of a home. This home is a location of continuity for Anna and for her family, dating from the ownership by her grandparents, her life as a child with her own parents and three other siblings, and her adult family life with her own children, and becomes a ‘house’ in the sense of the place for a multi-generational family group. All of the different but related elements that she has described and given here, also becomes the way in which Anna has made sense of it in the writing of it.

The house had only 3 rooms hall, kitchen, and room. On a small backyard was a privy (without water) and a stable for horses. Furniture in the house, was a stove, desk, chair, beds, wardrobes. Wooden flooring.

Her mother was a shopkeeper at a loggers’ forest: “She worked in the forest”, (Grocer and shopkeeping - obchodovala s potravinami) and her father worked as a mason and worked with the horses at the food market. Anna lived in the centre of town in a 300 year old house in a historic part of the town, on a small square, which has been in the family for 100 years, “People came to the water pump in the middle of the square”.

The daily routine for Anna Brůhová was about the work in the house and for the family. But routine also was part of living in the neighbourhood:

After I came from school mother cooked lunch and gave it to me. I had to feed the horses, the goose, and dog. I took lunch to father at work – getting on for 4 km away.
We had an evening meal of bread and white coffee before I went home. With the neighbours we often sat and sang. Their children didn’t sing, they played football in the square in front.

Anna’s home included the square, and the back garden and could even be seen to include her remembered daily journey of 4km to meet her father at his work and staying to have a small meal with him. At the end of her answer, Anna’s childhood memory is compared to things today: “It was a small town, but today people don’t care about neighbours, and children cannot play because it is for parking cars.”

Asking respondents to remember and describe a routine in the family home, particularly one which they could consider to be something which made the home ‘homely’ means that De Coulanges’ interpretation of the familial snapshot is perfectly on point. It is these types of recollections that emerge freely, an activity described as a single activity repeated daily, or sufficiently enough to be not only remembered, but to be seen as representative of what home used to be, and with a sometime economy of description just short of the ineffable, that allows a glimpse into the meaning of the home to these lives.

Journeys to and from home surround it as orbits, the daily exits and entrances of the father and the children going to school, mother going shopping, or leaving it for longer period to visit relatives in other towns, grandparents and distant relatives on the other side of the city, or to take holidays to the mountains. The home is what is performed within it, but not every respondent followed the same elements to describe their home, choosing instead the
shape of the family over time to delineate the home. The recitations of memories of the home are wound round by the daily activities, and the work that was done by the family members, and (often for the period) by the maid, the služka.

For Jiří Rybička, the routines of the day were structured around his father’s, who was a postmaster:

Father went at 7 o’clock to the post office. He came back at 12 and he left the house at half past one pm, and returned at 6 o’clock. At 7 we had dinner.

Jiří’s mentioned only that his mother was a teacher, but nothing more about any other life of the house, a villa which he lived in until he was thirty.360

To recapture memories of the family, remembering the activities of the individual family members and what life was like in the family, the physical form of the home is oftentimes the initial description: a three-room apartment say, or four rooms and a kitchen, or a new house, or a villa. The amenities of the home are also described some times as an assurance that the family home was an up to date and civilised one for the era: Ljuba Liškov had a memory particularly of a specific household furnishing:

In the living room was the large boiler ‘Americké’, which swallowed coke all winter long and heated two other rooms. It was a very cozy apartment and I am very glad (na to velmi ráda vzpomínám) to remember this.361
‘Americke’ founded in 1892 made highly ornate and beautiful coke stoves to sit inside the room, as well as functional furniture such as pantry dressers and sideboards.

When remembering family life, and describing this, the home becomes the important and essential setting against which other stories are told about the family. In recollection, the household and the home are the setting off point for the life of the family itself. In the telling the home becomes the shorthand descriptor for the condition of the family, economically and socially. Describing the family home allows the rest of the life of the family to blossom outwards from the memory. Michal Maud Beer relates a very detailed tour around her family home, in effect her grandparents’ home, with many tales emerging from the rooms and the objects she sees. These exist then, and now in an amalgam of the existence of the places in her past and observed in the present:

This is the building where in the spring of 1929 - the coldest spring in memory - I was born. Downstairs there was the shop, warehouse space and a cellar, and on the first floor lived Grandpa Max with Grandma Stefanie [Steffi] neé Steiner from Ivanice, along with their only daughter Katharina [Käthe], my mother. A hallway led from the shop into the residential part of the building, but I remember the main entrance from the street better. The door, almost a gate, made of heavy wood, a huge key and already we’re in the passageway; a narrow little passageway to the courtyard and a broad wooden staircase to Grandma and Grandpas apartment on the first floor.
We used to enter the apartment through the kitchen. Grandma’s kitchen! Bright, clean-smelling. In the center of the kitchen ceiling was a hook, where once a gas lamp hung. Grandma was an excellent housewife, and her meals and baking were perfect. A doorway led off the kitchen into the bedroom; doors so wide that in the corner formed by one of them, Grandma used to force-feed a goose. A large window looking out from the bedroom onto the town hall.

The living room, in it Grandpa’s piano, a shelf with a flute and sheet music. A clock that was wound once a year; Grandpa showed me: he pulled one weight down, that pulled the other one up - and that was it! A sideboard with better dishes, tablecloths and napkins. In a pot a plant almost to the ceiling. Grandpa’s library, books, atlases, a lexicon that Gusta and I liked looking through; a vessel made of olive wood, from Palestine - from the Holy Land, and on it something written with Hebrew letters. That vessel was later at my relatives’ in Prague. My relative Nada, née Steinerova, who lives in Prague, gave it to me during our visit to Prague in 2006. I have it here in my apartment in Tel Aviv.

In the living room, various pictures hung on the walls, and also a photo of Grandpa’s beautiful sister Gisela, who died at the age of 21 during childbirth. Then there was a narrow small room where my mother had grown up, and another room where Pepka, Grandma’s household helper, lived. On Saturday afternoon, Father, Mother, my sister Karmi [Karmela] and I used to come to Grandpa and Grandma’s place for coffee and Grandma’s good cakes.
Michal Maud Beer inhabits both the present building and the past home in the same narration. Time cycles back and forth, “there used to be”, and “there was” then give way to “a huge key and already we’re in the passageway”. The memory tour of the home allows her listener as well as her own self to return to the past and walk through the house, to see the goose, and the gas lamp in the kitchen, and grandmother and grandfather.

**Chava Pressburger**

The apartment which we grew up in was relatively modest, nevertheless furnished with all the necessities. We had two rooms and a kitchen with conveniences. When we were small, we slept with our parents in the bedroom, later in the living room. The apartment was furnished mainly with antique furniture that our father had inherited from his father.

Our household was always a hive of activity and fun, and we always had visitors over, and also our Ginz relatives, grandma and my father's brothers and sisters. My father's four siblings and mother lived in Prague and we would visit them regularly every week.  

How the family existed together in the home becomes also an encapsulation of how they existed in the world, and also how the world impinged on them.

**Jan Fischer**

Jan Fischer explained how his family expressed their position in Czechoslovakia as a Jewish family:
Our family was assimilated, so we had no direct connection with Jewish traditions. We weren't observant, didn't eat kosher food, and didn't go to the synagogue. As a family we were traditionally aware of our Jewishness, so it was respected but not celebrated. I knew I was a Jew, except in those days knowing you were a Jew meant something completely different from what people think today. It wasn't anything particularly special, for we were surrounded by people like us. It wasn't anything out of the ordinary; it was just like you were a member of Sokol or something. You were a Jew, so you were a Jew. We weren't practicing Jews. We kept company with Jews who were assimilated like us.

We lived at 19 Týnská Street near Tyn Church [in Old Town Prague]. If you go down that narrow lane between the church and the House of the Stone Bell, you'll come across two passages. The one on the left leads to an ancient house where there used to be a notorious dive.

At night there was always the sound of an accordion playing, and there were always very suspicious characters that would be staggering around. Naturally, I was really scared of this dark spot, so I would run quickly down the left passage that led to our street. We lived in a turn-of-the-century house, with the windows overlooking the yard. In our street was Mrs. Eisner’s grocery store, where we did our shopping. […] Opposite our house was the Tabarin Bar, a place of ill-repute, simply a brothel. It wasn’t talked about in our house.
In the case of one respondent, Dagmar Straková-Elsmicová, the home and the house, the dům, are the description of what it was that made her home, homely, but in addition the continuity of her family’s generations in the same place. Dagmar’s home is in a 1929 functionalism apartment building designed by Pavel Janák in the Bubeneč neighbourhood of Prague, an area very close to the Osada Baba estates. Dagmar attached a photograph of this building to her answers.\textsuperscript{367}

Listing the residents of her five bedroom home, which she still inhabits, Dagmar, who was a chemist and now describes herself as a pensioner, begins with her grandparents, from 1929 to 1932. Then she lists her parents: her father who was an official for the Prague town council, and her mother a housewife; and siblings, from 1932 to 1953, her marriage in 1957. Then she notes the expansion of her family home for extended family life, to include her husband (“+ manžel”) and children in 1957: father, mother, husband, son Petr and daughter Lucie. Petr and Lucie, she wrote, left home and the family, and later died. At the end, she notes her husband’s death in 2008. She writes at the end “I am alone”, but notes she will hand over the apartment to her daughter Lucie’s daughter Kamila.\textsuperscript{368}

Dagmar’s representation of her home is built from a synthesis of the physical structure of the building, whose provenance is part of its identity and importance, and therefore the fact that her family has owned and lived there for eighty years, as well as from the continuous residency that she describes for her whole family, and thus also describes the family.\textsuperscript{369} Within this the time span is punctuated by the times of important family transitions, which she gives as the meaning of the home. Just under the beginning of the
description of a routine “evenings we ate at 19 hours exactly” this breaks off, and does not complete; Dagmar begins to list her granddaughters Kamila and Žusana, and their children Laura and Erik, and Malouš, the recollection of this, in the midst of a memory of the evening meal, brings this from the 1930s to the present day.

Questioning the conflation of the idea of the house and the reality of the home, or even vice versa, is illuminated by the ways in which respondents used the house, the building, as an essential element of what they wished to relay about the subject of home. In Marie Jiřičková’s telling below, the house’s creation, and how and why this came about before her birth is an indelible part of her experience of home, giving a the idea of the roots and the antecedents into which she arrived, and in which she has lived for her life.

I was born in 1943 and since then I have lived in this house. My grandfather built the house with my grandmother in 1922. These houses were built for government employees – he was a transit driver - for the train drivers or policeman, etc. - My grandfather was a tram driver, grandmother was a housewife. My mother (1913-2010) lived with her parents on the ground floor, where there were two rooms, a kitchen, shower, the toilet was on the mezzanine. Students lived in two studio rooms. The house is a two and a half of a basement building; when my mother married (1936) the parents moved upstairs and she and her husband, when they still had no children, lived in the basement. My grandparents and my mother were able to create a beautiful home for us children.
In the same way that Dagmar has spent her life in the one home created by her grandparents, Marie presents the same conditions, with multiple generations successively and together inhabiting the same home. This home changes identity with the life transitions that the inhabitants undergo, or choose to change, such as marriage, children, who then become the elder members, move around and reconceptualised the spaces according to the current needs of all the family, and which changes once on the death of the elder members. In Dagmar’s case, her children had both left the family home, and also sadly died subsequently. The family home was to be returned to the continuity of the family by being passed over to the second generation by its gift to Kamila. Rather than changing locations and finding new homes, it is the home here that becomes a flexible space, which is held onto through economic and inheritance needs perhaps, or for reasons of family tradition, and which adapts to the new family residents.

The houses and the homes which Dagmar and Marie describe exist as modern buildings, but the ways in which they are used conform to the traditional conception of a family home which persists as such through years of both family and political changes. In these two cases the persistent of the places in the ownership of the same family are successes of a different sort than simply husbandry and maintenance of the material form, surviving as their homes through the socialist years as well. For both Maria and Dagmar, these separate histories of their homes, and they are one part of them, were the most important part of their descriptions of these homes, being given more attention than other elements. However, they also both have a contrary experience to those whose homes are lost through time, the effects of occupation, war and transport and change. Dagmar’s small sentence, “I am alone”, which she
uses twice in her listing of the family’s residence in her home, is a small glimpse of the ways in which the reality of her home has also been lost in time through the departure of her husband and children in death. The home is not necessarily an invariant place of refuge from the dangers of the world, but also one that itself can be the location for suffering and loss. The different effects of loss, both of the home and of loved ones, on the concept of home will be also be explored later in this chapter through further life histories.

The memories of family homes are, of necessity, framed within the historical and political situations in which the family lived, but the reach and meanings of the external situations are replayed inside the home in fashions which are open to the householders to enact in their own chosen ways. Poverty, widowhood or divorce and separation are encapsulated by the changing home, as is success, wealth and class, or the chaos and tragedies that arrive from war. For Harry Fink, his home was a happy result of the demise of the Empire and the loss of control of the numerous Old Town palaces:

We lived in Prague, on Jindřišská street. Our apartment was in a former palace. It was a huge apartment building with three stairwells and dozens and dozens of rooms. The smallest room was the bedroom, which measured about 68 square meters.

Originally we lived in the third wing. We had four large rooms, a toilet, pantry and kitchen. The apartment was very nicely appointed, the furniture was from the Exner company.
For the Jewish residents, whose childhoods were lived during the First Republic, and whose Centropa memories I have read, the memories of the home are recoloured in particular by the later historical tragedy of the occupation, the loss of the home, and in tragic numbers, the loss of their family members. But often the meaning of this home, as they remembered it and as it is related, is situated strongly in the nationhood of the new republic. This identification with the quality of life under nationhood is brought out through questions of language and importantly, of levels of culture and education. These were the elements of culture which had been identified also by Masaryk as important for national life and which transcended the occupation of the parents and therefore more fixed ideas of ascribed status. Andrew Lass has pointed out the claim to nationality in the interwar period in Czechoslovakia, as elsewhere, was in asserting a certain and individual way of doing things that signal belonging to a nation. What the elements of nation in these recollections also show is that belonging to a nation is proven by saying ‘this is who we are because we have these qualities’, in particular those of education and cultural knowledge of literature and language.

If there was a library at home, this was noted; also important was that these books were of Czech literature. Whether the family spoke Czech at home was also important in the First Republic and even in recollection, confirming the quality and fluency of the Czech language in the home was pointed out:

My mother was named Olga Brodová […] her mother tongue was also German I think, but she spoke Czech perfectly, her handwriting was also clear. When she
spoke, the same as when she wrote letters, she crossed over fluently from one language to the other. Both languages were completely normal back then. 374

For Jewish residents of Czechoslovakia, giving evidence of Czechness via language fluency was more important in an era of burgeoning Czechoslovak nationalism, rejection of the previous German cultural hegemony and growing tensions with Germany itself. In a multilingual nation immediately after the War, there was still an emphasis on the importance of speaking Czech:

There were no Czechs in Mikulov before World War. I and both my parents went to a Jewish School, which had German as the main teaching language. They couldn’t speak Czech well. […] We were raised bilingually, but our mother tongue is German. We spoke German with our parents at home, but I spoke Czech with my sister. 375

For Anna Hyndrakova speaking Czech (or not) at home and her family fluency levels (especially written) at that time was something that required some explanation:

[father] came from a Czech family, so we spoke Czech at home. My dad and mum spoke German together only when they didn’t want me to know what they were saying. […] Mum went to a German language school, but not out of conviction, it’s just there weren’t Czech schools everywhere. She spoke Czech with my grandmother, but wasn’t too confident about her written Czech 376
Anna stressed as well their choice of Czechness as a nationality: “My parents were traditional Czech Jews who liked it over here. In 1930 they registered as Czechs, not Jews”.

Chava Pressburger, who grew up in Prague, links her family’s cultural levels and education as deriving from her antecedents, her father’s family or at least her paternal grandfather. Chava begins her family’s narrative with this grandfather, and the fact that he Czechified his name even before the turn of the century from Günz to Ginz:

According to various letters, notes, pictures and what I had heard from my father, my grandfather was a very educated person, though I don’t know where he came by his education; most likely he was self-taught. Grandpa also knew many languages and was very intelligent and had a talent for art. I have several pictures that he himself painted and that look like they were done by a professional artist. He also wrote poetry, and I have part of his business correspondence written in verse in German and also in Czech.

This was a level of attainment fused with a strong business sense that benefited the central Prague communities of Nove Město (the New Town) and was, it seems, celebrated:

My grandfather’s store on Jungmannovo Naměsti was in those days a well-known place in Prague where Czech and German artists and poets would meet. They would mainly pick through rare books that my grandfather was an expert in. A large part of his antique collection was made up of rare old books. While he was still alive, my
grandfather was a big proponent of Czech culture and associated with the Czech intellectual elite.377

For Harry Fink, the emphasis was on the range of the books available in his home:

We had a lot of books at home, but only general ones, not on a Jewish theme. The only thing that I’ve got left after my mother are her four books from Machar. Evidently he was her favorite author. She always signed her books. Otherwise we had a lot of books at home. As a child I very much liked to read. I very much liked the book Kaja Marik [by Wagnerova-Cerna]378.

The childhood remembrances of Kurt Kotouc use the house or apartment in which the family lived as the mnemonic for the life of the family, remembering the condition, and the social status and appearance of the home and how it was lived in and used.

I think we lived in relative poverty. We lived in an old rental unit in a two-bedroom apartment with a kitchen, a hall and without a bathroom. There was a little garden and gazebo that we also rented. In the apartment, everything was very basic, primitive almost. I remember as a small child my mother bathed me in the kitchen in a basin. My brother and I shared one small room: we each had our own bed and my father’s typewriter and desk was also in our room. My mother and father were next-door in the other small room. They had a bed, a night table, an old dresser and mom’s vanity table. When we had guests, we received them in the kitchen. In the kitchen we cooked on a
stove; we heated the apartment with coal or wood that we would bring up from the basement. We had cold running water and electricity. In the room we had wooden floors and in the kitchen there were wooden boards on the floor. The walls were also painted crudely. My parents were both from the countryside, they were new to the city and so they were adjusting to city life. It can’t be said that we had a painting of value or any kind of art in the apartment.379

Although the parents were renting the home, as described above, Kurt Kotouc makes allowances after noting the crudeness of the painted walls by noting that his parents were both from the country and unused to city life. Kotouc’s memory of the painted walls linked to question of whether any of their possessions could have been valuable, even that there was nothing that could be described as art.

Jaroslava Liba’nská’s home, a new functionalism house in Běchovice (“today part of Prague”) is captured simply by what she did each day:

I went to and from school, a kilometre away. After school I ate lunch at home, and played with the other kids in the neighbouring houses, the dog in the courtyard and the rabbit.

but then within this small list of her childhood day, she includes the memory of seeing daily the paraffin oil lamp shining in the window, which meant there was someone waiting for her to arrive home on a winter afternoon from school.380
For Karel Barták, his memories of his family home, a villa built in 1928, were told as a journey through his year, focusing greatly on what happened in the kitchen: putting up the summer vegetables that his mother grew in the garden, and making *kompot* from the summer fruits, helping his father make wood chips for the stove, which made the kitchen hell in the heat and full of ashes. The Barták family produced eggs preserved in lime, cucumbers and cabbages from their garden, as Karel remembers. But winter and Christmas in the same kitchen brought sugary things (*cukroví*) and Christmas cakes (*vanočky*). Pan Barták’s memory of the cycle of the year is brought through by the idea that the family, father working nearby and mother in the home, was one of self-sufficiency located in the place of the home itself. His routines were those of the provision of food from their land, like Halbwachs’ ancients, across the seasons and the ending with the Christmas celebration, and it is these remembered routines and the work and products that were remembered seventy five years later as what made his home homely. Karel’s most succinct and short answer to the question of what was considered private space in the home was that “The house was ours – *Dum byla naš*”. Having household help was common, a more modest family would have had one maid, usually a Czech speaking young woman from the country, oftentimes living in small rooms directly adjacent to the kitchen. Many of the plans of the richer villas build during this time, show a small room, specifically dedicated as the maid’s accommodation specially created for the maid to live in, and upstairs a similar room near the children’s bedrooms for a nursemaid.
We had a cook, a servant and a Fraulein [governess]. Her name was Ada. They lived in our house, which was usual in those times. The servant and the cook weren’t Jewish, but the Fraulein was. The cook did the bigger part of the shopping, but my mother also did some. We never had a kosher kitchen.\footnote{383}

The people whose memories and recollections that I include here, those who have been through not only the second World War but also the forty years of communist social and economic control, are happily illustrative of an argument which I have made earlier. In my discussion of the gulf in the prescriptions of Karel Teige and the architectural theorists of the era for what is appropriate and adequate housing, I noted that Teige et al. erased or denied the wishes of those they had ambitions to house in favour of the ideology of the worker in a socialist state, whose need for a family life and home was viewed as sentimental. What these survivors remember best about their home does not lie in the areas of economic and spacial efficiency, nor in the ability to conduct an intellectual life freed from the distractions of children taken care of by someone else, but in the warmth and comfort of their home, in the presence of their family members – parents, grandparents and siblings – and in the work and actions they did to keep and create their homes. It is these memories that belie Teige’s socialist-influenced denial of the family nuclear group as an ideal to be worked towards and to be planned for. The respondents here do not view their homes as a node of an economic activity, but as a centre of family activity, more holistically as being about the work of the house that maintains the life of the family in the house and outside it, and acknowledging the external paid work that supports it.
Recalling and expressing the memories of the family through the mnemonic of the family home also proved contingent on the larger historical and political pressures which could and often did lead to its destruction, and most importantly here, oftentimes described and illustrated by the changes to the home forced on the family through the exigencies of war and occupation as well as exile and transportation. The ending of the life of these homes is even more unnatural than through the normal transition of maturing and leaving home. The lives of extended family members, uncles, cousins, even close family, are recalled and ended in one breath in the telling because of the Holocaust. Others, Czech Hussite or Catholics were also affected by the War though not in the same devastating fashion.

The loss of the home through war is made more acute, by knowing of those who moved in after the family is forced to leave, as Liselotte Teltscherova related. Not only the German Gestapo, but the secret police, the STB, took over after the War. The house and home, in all its beauty, is lost twice, by the confiscation, and by the destruction of the beauty of the house itself, and the garden.

We were raised in an old patrician house, which was very beautiful and overgrown with Virginia creeper. There were two floors. We had a cellar on the ground floor and there was also an apartment there, where one of my father’s employees lived. Then there were six rooms on the first floor, a big hall, a terrace and a beautiful garden. There was an old sycamore and gingko and then two Mediterranean trees with lovely blue blossoms in the garden. I really loved the house. The Gestapo established their headquarters there after we left during World War II. And they
left the garden as it was. But then the STB [Státní tajna bezpečnost] came and they destroyed the garden as well as the Virginia creeper. They cut down the trees and painted the house in an ugly yellow color. They only left the sycamore, and that’s why the street is called Pod Platanem [Under the Sycamore].

Memories of the three years of the last family home and his life as a child are reinforced for Asaf Aurbach, as the next move was not only extreme but involved separation from his parents: “The last time I saw my parents was in the summer of 1939, when my brother and I, as ‘Winton’s children,’ immigrated to England.” I was eleven”. Asaf’s recollections of all of his activities and the environment of not only his neighbourhood, but the physical reality of his house are powerful:

When at the end of the summer holidays in 1936 we came back from pioneer camp our parents were waiting for us at the train station, but instead of Podbaba we drove to Vršovice. To our third, and last apartment. They didn’t tell us about the move ahead of time, it was a surprise. It was a new building, the apartment was more spacious, there was a large living room, which was the children’s room and dining room, our parents had a room that was a little smaller, and along the entire width of both rooms there was a balcony. It was about the same size as the one I have now. The kitchen had only indirect light, between our room and the kitchen there was a wall with glass bricks from a meter above the floor to the ceiling. It was already a modern apartment, with central heating, hot water, an elevator in the building, in the basement there was a laundry room with a washing machine and a heated drying room.
Asaf’s connection to his neighbourhood, how he played and lived in it, becomes part of the wide orbit of his idea of his childhood home, a structure which becomes important:

My memories of childhood are basically tied only to Vršovice. Back then it was still full of empty lots, a little ways away from us were the barracks of the 28th Infantry Regiment and its military training grounds, we children were also allowed on them, a few hundred meters further Eden, with merry-go-rounds and a summer athletic grounds, which in the winter changed into a skating rink. We had everything.

Back then I read a lot, that was my favourite pastime, to lie on my stomach and read. At home we didn’t have a lot of books, I remember only Švejk, which I faithfully read in its entirety, from children’s books I remember Čapeks fairy-tales and Dášeňka [Karel Čapek Dášeňka čili život štětěte Dášeňka or the life of a puppy] and also the book ‘Bambi’ by some Northern author, it was about the life of a fawn. I liked that one a lot. It was bound with green cloth, with gold lettering. Probably someone gave it to me for my birthday. I took it with me to England, where it probably remained. I used to go to the children’s library regularly, it was on Korunní Třída [Avenue] in the Vinohrady quarter, beside the water tower, on foot it wasn’t even a half hour. That children’s library is still there.387

The home in Vršovice becomes the emblem of the last years of a childhood of family life, as opposed to exile, and the place for nostalgia and remembrance:
There I finished attending what was back then called elementary or grade school, it was Grade 1 to 5. At the end of the school year in 1939 I applied for council school, but I didn’t actually go there. At the end of July my brother and I left for England.

Not only the home experienced during his last years of childhood in Czechoslovakia, but the home that still exists in the present, is able to be revisited. Asaf not only gives us his recalled memories of his home as it was in 1939, but also in a rare example, the method he uses for recapturing his memories in his present day existence. When he goes to the vet, who was specifically chosen for his location in Vršovice, he tells us meditatively:

[---] if I’m not in a hurry we take the streetcar to Orionka [tram stop], where in those long-ago days it smelled beautifully [a large candy factory used to be located there], I take the steps down to Ruská [Street] then to Bulharská [Street], we lived on that one, we stop for a while and I look at our balcony, reminisce and in my mind’s eye I see my mother there. I then take Bulharská to Kodaňská [Street], along my usual route to school, there I also stop for a while, in front of it we non-Catholics used to play ‘Odd Man Out’ during religion class, and then it’s only a bit further to Dr. Bondy’s. 388

Remembering and seeking out his earlier home, and his earlier routes to school, has become a routine of memory for the present day. Being able to visit allows Asaf to recapture his earlier life, and those he lost to it. Home for Asaf is also a place of “no return”, but becomes complicated by the ability of having again some of the lived experience of locality. 389 Retracing steps, taking the usual route, and gazing at his old home is a ritual that
can be repeated without the procedures becoming tiresome. Asaf takes these if he has time, on the way to another task. Asaf gives a rendering of two homes: the publicly described, meticulously remembered home, heavy with detail, and the ghostly building, sketched in with just a balcony on a certain street, re-visited on occasion. This second home, and the ritual of travelling to see it, is the one which allows him to remember his mother, whom he last saw in 1939.

As a location of memory, of the family and of their childhoods and lives, the homes people described here have fulfilled my notion of their fungibility, both freely interchangeable as buildings, sanctuaries, ideas and memories. Home has been demonstrated to be the location of the rituals and routines that make up everyday life, and the repository of personal achievements. Homes are claimed as a creation and as a possession. Home is not a place apart, temporarily inhabited just in a form of respite from the real noise of life, work, city streets or political exigencies. Instead it forms an integral part of all of these, as an element of these landscapes. As seen with Dagmar and Marie, Liselotte and Asaf, the material actuality of the home is a substantial element of its reality in the world which can be shown, and which mediates daily life and memories —‘naš byt’ our place - at the same time as the psychic and emotional substance of it.
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Conclusion

As a historical entity, the First Republic of Czechoslovakia existed very briefly, just over twenty years from October 1918 to March 1939, and could in some senses for the region and the events on either side of this era, be considered simply a liminal state and therefore relatively neglected in Western historiography. In that time, the nation itself developed from one that was a post-colonial agglomeration of territories from Germany, Austria and Hungary, to a liberal generally cohesive state with two mutually understood common languages.

During the twenty years of the interwar period, Czechoslovakia developed an automobile industry that invented the rear air cooled engine (later appropriated by Hitler for the Volkswagen), built up a respected film industry and studio system at Barrandov in the area of Prague 4, experimented with avant garde in art, typography, photography, illustration and periodicals, with ideas of socialism and with modernism in architecture, literature, poetry and film. Whilst looking to the east for political ideas of socialism, avant garde artists, poets and writers looked also to the west, to Paris for recognition and to Berlin for acceptance, and England for living styles. Whilst not immune to the political realities
outside of the borders and the dangers that this posed to it, Czechoslovakia believed that links and relationships with the western European powers would be able to protect it, and in a characteristic response, believe that proper diplomacy and negotiation would bring protections. At the same time that the elite in Czechoslovakian and Prague society were grasping a future that seemed possible, the best of the past and founding myths of the location of Prague, the founding family of the Přemyslid dynasty had become official past history as opposed to counter-history. This is particularly significant in terms of the ‘rightness’ of the nation in Europe and it resonance as a ‘home’. As in all founding golden age myths, these events lead inexorably to the moment of the nation, however delayed.

The aim of this thesis has been to add to the knowledge of this era and to make an original contribution to the history of the social and cultural life of the Czechoslovakian First Republic, doing so through a multi-level examination of the concept of home. This has been a reading that has brought the focus in from the breadth of the construction of a nation state to the experiences of one of the most intimate aspects of people’s lives, their memories of home, from the public arena of ideas to the private worlds of family and personal lives.

Using a concept of ‘Home’ for these many different arenas presents difficulties of definition. Home could be seen as an example of modern heterotopia, as defined by Foucault, of a mirror to reality, which encompasses different places meant to be one.
Thus home in its different definitions mirrors them. As Foucault illustrated for a simple reflection:

"I am over there, there where I am not, a sort of shadow that gives my own visibility to myself, that enables me to see myself there where I am absent: such is the utopia of the mirror. But it is also a heterotopia in so far as the mirror does exist in reality, where it exerts a sort of counteraction on the position that I occupy."^{390}

Home in its different guises could be seen simply as one of scale, from the enormity of the state and nation reducible to the house, juxtaposed in a single (sur)real place, a sort of Platonic ‘home’, but this would fail to take into account the differences, the uses, the elisions and the divergences of home found as a symbol and as a place. This work therefore has sought to illustrate these confluences, mirrors, elision and gaps in the understanding, symbolisms and devices of the subject of home, though in no case could it result in more than what Geertz – writing on the subject of cultural representation – termed a ‘partial truth’. Full of “foreign, faded, […]ellipses, incoherencies, suspicious emendations”.^{391} Thus the subject of ‘home’ in this work is linked in the many various and divergent areas because there is an implicit understanding that this is the correct terminology for what is described, even if, under a more stringent analysis, Geertz’ incoherencies and ellipses are revealed. The link, overall, between the different expressions of home in these areas, is the use of it as mediation for the human relationships involved, whether politics, status, or family, and, not coincidentally, as the medium here for a fuller telling of the social and cultural history of the Czechoslovakia.
The themes which have emerged from the public arenas, those of the nation, and those of design and journalism, of the understanding of home could be understood as coming under three different cottages: The cottage that Masaryk saw as the antecedent of the Czecho-slovak populations, politically and culturally; The cottage way of Karel Teige, which he hoped to expunge from the life of the nation and the coming modernity of a socialist future for Czechoslovakia; and the Chata rural cottage, the reimagined form of peasant and rural living that became a symbol of the natural opposite of the modern lives in the city and the consumption of leisure. These themes, explored in the first three chapters of this study, illustrate the details of the multilayered discourses of a particular expression of modernity in Central Europe and Czechoslovakia in the interwar era and expand on the notions of modernity itself more generally, integrating this with Czechoslovakian history. I also explored in a more detailed way how the ideas and symbolisms of home are used at these levels of public discourse both at the national and state level and the level of the expert theories of a professionalized architectural world.

As an aspect of people’s lives the concept of home sits at the crucial interface between these levels and the more intimate and personal levels which have been demonstrated in chapters four and five. Home becomes a vital nodal point in all of the discourses of Czechoslovak nationhood, public life and levels of ‘civilisation’ as a modern nation, carrying with it both the hopes and dreams of nationhood and those of comfort belonging and security.
My reading here of this subject and its location in the era of the interwar in Czechoslovakia has illustrated the complexity and multiple components of ‘home’ in the context of its specific inflections in this area of Central Europe. The several worlds that this concept contains opens up the lifeways of the nation of this period in definition and in, as noted before, more than one sphere of ideation at the intersection of a complex, multivocal and multilayered set of discourses, integrating the wide range and variety of analytical sources: the historical, literary, and archival texts, and the astonishing and touching richness of the direct testimony, memories and writings of the people who have lived through this era which I was able to use for this work.

In summary, my aim has been throughout to write a fuller history of the First Republic of Czechoslovakia. In chapter one, *We came from cottages: Nationhood*, the subject of home has been used to expand on the subjects of nation and nationhood, which goes beyond notions of the work of nationalism in the creation of Czechoslovakia, to the more difficult and unresolved aspects of nation building. In chapter two, *Prescriptions for Modernity I the Modernists and the Modernisers*, home has been essential in illuminating, beyond the aesthetic, how the function of architecture have been overwritten by the theorists in assuming the rights to have fundamental effects on people’s lives, and how these stated aims sometimes fail in the attempt. In chapter three, *Prescriptions of Modernity II, The Popular Periodicals and the Populist Experts*, ideas of home show the imbrication of a complex set of discourses which illustrate the position and status of women in the era
and how these are reflected in the content of popular publications directed towards a female audience. In chapters four *Writing Home* and five *The Location of Memory*, the meaning of home is particularly shown to exist beyond the public areas of discourse, and truly beyond a hegemony of meaning from political and social forces, within a separate realm, thus consisting of the essential combinations of family situations and family history that remain as indelible traces in personal literature and in personal testimonies and memories.

These several areas of discussion and evidence are integrated into a social and cultural history of Czechoslovakia, and through this illustrate a commonly and almost universally shared aspect of human lives – home.
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Addendum to Chapter Five

Respondents and Interviewees

This addendum provides information on the data gathered by the Centropa Organisation and the respondents to the questionnaire distributed in Prague in 2009, 2010, 2011, and 2012 by the author of this work.

Centropa Organisation (CO)
Pfeilgasse 8/15 1080 Vienna, Austria
Tel: +43 1 4090 971
Fax: +43 1 4090 971 4
office@centropa.org
[Subjects are listed in the order they appear in the chapter]

1. **Jan Fischer [1921- ] – Centropa Interviewee**

CO INTERVIEWER:
Silvia Singerova
November 2003

2. **Anna Brůhová [1923 - ] – Questionnaire Respondent Život 90**
Received 2010

3. **Jiří Rybička [nbd] - Questionnaire Respondent Život 90**
Received 2010

Received 2010

5. **Michal Maud Beer [1929- ] – Centropa Interviewee**

No interviewer listed
No date of interview
Interviewed in Tel Aviv, Israel.

6. **Chava Pressburger [1930 - ]– Centropa Interviewee**

CO interviewer
Martin Korcok
May 2005


Received 2012


Received 2012

No interviewer listed
No date of interview

10. Lenka Koprivová – Centropa Interviewee

(Record no longer available)
Date of interview 2005

11. Anna Hyndraková [1928 - ] – Centropa Interviewee

Interviewer
Pavlà Neuner
Date of Interview


Interviewer
Pavlà Neuner
Date of Interview
October 2004

13. Jaroslava Liba’nská [nbd]– Questionnaire Respondent – Senior English Conversation Group
Received 2012

Received 2010

15. Liselotte Teltscherová [1921 - ]– Centropa Interviewee
Interviewer
Eva Pressburgerová
Date of interview
June 2003
16. Asaf Auerbach [1928 - ]– Centropa Interviewee
Interviewer
Lenka Koprivova
Date of Interview
November 2005
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This was a nineteenth century urban solution, as was also noted by Sharon Marcus for the Paris of the Empire years, and whose street patterns and buildings styles were reflected in the 19th century planning for Prague. During the redevelopment of Josefov, the Jewish neighbourhood, one of the boulevards was created in this image and named Pařížská. Sharon Marcus Apartment Stories City and Home in Nineteenth Century Paris and London 1999 UCLA Press Berkeley CA

Tribuna was a new newspaper, the first Czech Jewish daily, which was published following WWI by F. Peroutka a confidant of Masaryk’s and member of the ‘Castle’. Jesenská wrote for Tribuna and edited the Modni Revue (Fashion Review) supplement and Přítomnost (the Present) another of Peroutka’s publications which was funded by a donation from Masaryk. Tribuna ran into financial difficulties and ceased publication in 1928.

221 Milena Jesenská 'The Household and the Overalls 24th October 1920 Tribuna' in The journalism of Milena Jesenská: a critical voice in interwar Central Europe. 74: Several villages in Moravia and Slovakia are named Mokra

222 Milena Jesenská 'The Household and the Overalls 24th October 1920 Tribuna' in The journalism of Milena Jesenská: a critical voice in interwar Central Europe. 74


224 [No Author] ‘Modení Domacnost’ in Lada (year) 1930, Čislo (number) 10, 195

225 Melissa Feinberg Elusive Equality: Gender, Citizenship, and the Limits of Democracy in Czechoslovakia 1918-1950. 58, 75


227 Wilma Abeles Iggers ‘Hermine Hanel’ in Women of Prague: Ethnic diversity and social change from the eighteenth century to the present. 187

228 Wilma Abeles Iggers ‘Hermine Hanel’ in Women of Prague: Ethnic diversity and social change from the eighteenth century to the present. 179

229 Emil Edgar Moderní Byt. Výklady, Rady a pokyny k jeho Zařízení a Úpravĕ Druhé. Rozmnožené Vydání s 219 Vyobrazeními v Tekstu a na 26 Listových Přilohách. Modern Home/Apartment Interpretations, advice and guidance to its facilities and furnishings. Published with 219 Images in the text and 26 leaf annexes -1920. Šolca Šimáček, Nakladatelska Spol. (Publishing House) SRO v Praze (Prague): Být as a term refers to home but also more often apartment or flat or dwellings in multi-occupancy buildings. Compare to dum. house

230 Emil Edgar Moderní Byt 3

231 Emil Edgar Moderní Byt 4

232 Emil Edgar Moderní Byt 1

233 Hana Mašová/Social Hygiene and Social Medicine in Interwar Czechoslovakia with the 13th District of Prague as its Laboratory.’2004 Sociologický ústav (Social Science) Akademie věd české republiky (Academy of Sciences Czech Republic)

234 Emil Edgar Moderní Byt 4

235 Emil Edgar Moderní Byt 4

236 Emil Edgar Moderní Byt 11

237 Emil Edgar Moderní Byt 11 “Život proměnil se v hudiařinu; ještě více připoutal ženy k domácnostem, nutil šlahení stravu, zašívatí prádlo pro rodinu.”

Milena Jesenská, who was living in Vienna with her first husband Ernst Pollack in somewhat impoverishment following the war, wrote articles for the Tribuna (27 January 1920) about the lack of food for everyone but the very rich or very foreign. The journalism of Milena Jesenská: a critical voice in interwar Central Europe Milena Jesenská, Kathleen Hayes. Berghahn Books, 2003

Emil Edgar Moderní Byt 11


Lada - časopis LADA redaktorka Věnceslava Lužická Nakl. Karla Vačeny Mladá Boleslav, ročník 1919 a 1920

Edith Heyermann-Springerova


Moderní Domácnost Modern Household (n.a.) Lada, Ročník 7. Číslo (number) 3 1927. 55

Moderní Domácnost Modern Household “O Napoleonovi na př. bylo známo, že třeba 5 minut před zahájením rozhodné bitvy klidně usnul, aby načerpal nových sil” (About Napoleon, for instance, he was been known to be still asleep five minutes before the start of the decisive battles which gave him new strength.) Lada Rok 1930 číslo 23 strana 456

Julie Vlasakova Nakupováni Zena v domácnosti Shopping by the Housewife in Lada Rocnik 1923 Číslo (number) 22. 423

Lada Rocnick 1930 Čislo 3 page 55


Elék-trolux was founded in 1910 in Sweden by Axel Wenner-Gren (of the later foundation). By 1928 turnover was 70 m Swedish Kroner worldwide. Source Electrolux History: http://group.electrolux.com/en/category/about-electrolux/history/ . Otta Pavel delightfully parodies Wenner Gren’s name as “President Vennegreen”.

Oldřiška Zemanová ‘Bytova Kultura Za heslem racionalisace’ Lada, Rok (Year) 1930. Číslo (number) 12. 240

Walter Gropius The New Architecture, Walter Gropius 1965 MIT Press, Massachusetts. 23


Oldřiška Zemanová ‘Bytova Kultura Za heslem racionalisace’ Lada, Rok (Year) 1930. Číslo (number) 12. 240

František Hála ‘Nas Program’ in Byt a Umění 1-2

František Hála ‘Nas Program’ in Byt a Umění. 2

Prof.Dr. Alfred Almon’Umění a Narodní Hospodářství’(Art and the National Economy) Byt a Umění Revue pro současnou bytovou kultuра 1930 Rocník 3-4. 2

Ludmila Stránská’ JSTE SKUTEČNĚ DOMA?’(Are you really at home?) Byt a Umění Revue pro současnou bytovou kultuра Rocník I 1930. 13

František Hála ‘Nas Program’ Byt a Umění 2


A further interesting discussion on the uses of architectural drawings can be found in Sharon Marcus’ Apartment Stories (1999) illustration note p115. I am disinclined however, to go as far in ascribing such overall cultural meaning as does Marcus to the solutions employed by draughtsmen to complete drawings from flat elevations to ‘cut’ walls, either as a reflection or as a driver because their reach into cultural life is still tiny. Many of these are a function of the necessity to fit whole buildings on limited paper space, there are limits to the sizes of velum paper and the blueline/blueprint paper for printing them, and in particular the meaning of flat elevations are to save space whilst still allowing all the elements to be included making them technically useful. Isometric or axonometric drawings can both hide elements and consume more drawing space than is useful for the depictions of elements in a space.

The usual measurements which would be essential to consider the space actually as a basis for any additional work for builders or designers and therefore for the plans to be actually architectural or technically useful.

JE Koula was one of the editors and the layout artist of Nová ceská architektura a její vyvoj ve XX.století. (New Czech Architecture and Its Evolution in the 20th century) published in 1940, a sort of coda to the explosion of the new architecture and modernism by the 1900 generation of architects, a lot of whom did not survive the war. Koula also here advertises weekly appearances for late afternoons to answer questions.

Shops called Krásná jizba were also run throughout Czechoslovakia during the Socialist era, but sold folk themed craft objects and became part of the ULUV government sanctioned cooperative for the production and preservation of the folk art crafts after 1948. These ceased after 1989 and privatisation entirely.

Morris’ insistence that everything revert to being made in a craftsman-like manner by hand, doomed his productions to being purchased more often by those who were wealthier, the products proved simply too expensive because of the labour costs.

Vojtech Lahoda’Chaos, Mess and Uncertainty: Josef Sudek and Surrealism.’(2005) Papers of Surrealism, 3 Spring 2005

Josef Sudek’s photographs can be viewed on the http://www.sudek-atelier.cz/en/the-atelier.html the photographs: Obrázek 48 z 226; Obrázek 12 z 226; Obrázek 22 z 226; Obrázek 43 z 226; Obrázek 58 z 226; Obrázek 63 z 226; Obrázek 69 z 226; Obrázek 83 z 226; Obrázek 85 z 226; and particularly Obrázek 97 z 226; Obrázek 98 z 226; and Obrázek 108 z 226.
Chata is a smaller, usually a one room hut, the chalupa is a cottage which can be quite large, sometimes a former peasant home.

The Tramping movement has been examined in *Socialist Spaces* and more local examination and history is published in *What is Czech Tramping?* P. Hubka http://domov-trampu.home.comcast.net/~domov-trampu/Tramping.htm


Lucy E Textor *Land Reform in Czechoslovakia*, 1923 – London, George Allen and Unwin


Geertz’ use of the term, as he noted, was originally from Gilbert Ryle: *The Interpretation of Cultures* Clifford Geertz 1973 Fontana Press, New York Pp5-6, 10.

Cityscapes: cultural readings in the material and symbolic city, Ben Highmore 2005 Palgrave Macmillan, Basingstoke and
New York

294 Derek Sayer *The Coasts of Bohemia* Derek Sayer 1998. 24


296 René Wellek ‘Twenty years of Czech Literature (1918-1938), 330


300 Karel Capek ‘Letters to Olga 9 June 1924’ in *Believe in People: The Essential Karel Čapek.* 2010 Transl, Šárka Tobraňanová-Kühnová Faber and Faber Chatham. 24-25

301 Jaroslav Hašek *The Tourist Guide* 1961 Tr. IT Havlí Prague. 192


303 Marie Pujmanová (1893-1958) was a popular writer in the interwar and managed to survive as one into the early communist years in Czechoslovakia, writing poetry and novels. Derek Sayer noted that she was one of ten elected female writers in the Czech Academy which included not only writers, but artists, scientists and composers. Note 125 pp 343. *The Coasts of Bohemia: a Czech History* Derek Sayer 2000 Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey.


307 Marie Pujmanová (1893-1958) was a popular writer in the interwar and managed to survive as one into the early communist years in Czechoslovakia, writing poetry and novels. Derek Sayer noted that she was one of ten elected female writers in the Czech Academy which included not only writers, but artists, scientists and composers. Note 125 pp 343. *The Coasts of Bohemia: a Czech History* Derek Sayer 2000 Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey.

308 Marie Pujmanová (1893-1958) was a popular writer in the interwar and managed to survive as one into the early communist years in Czechoslovakia, writing poetry and novels. Derek Sayer noted that she was one of ten elected female writers in the Czech Academy which included not only writers, but artists, scientists and composers. Note 125 pp 343. *The Coasts of Bohemia: a Czech History* Derek Sayer 2000 Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey.


318 These are the same rations that Derek Sayer has described were used in the over 2000 soup kitchens in Czechoslovakia, so soon after the war. Derek Sayer, The Coasts of Bohemia: A Czech History. 2000. 165

319 Wolker’s landlady was named in his letters as Pani Boruvkova, Mrs. Blueberry, her daughter would be Miss Blueberry. Jiří Wolker Korespondence s rodiči. (Jiří Wolker Letters to Family) 37

320 Jiří Wolker Svatý Kopeček (Holy Hill) Host do domu 2002 Praha (Prague): Primus. 57


324 Franz Kafka Letters to Milena Willi Haas Ed. Secker and Warburg 1953 London. 89


328 Dlouha means long in Czech. The street is short.

329 Franz Kafka Diary Vol II 1914-1923. 119

Their architect was Ladislav Machon, a pupil of Josef Gočar’s and a member of the CSD. Machon was part of the development of Vinohrady where the Čapek house was located. He later on was responsible for the design of a house in the Osada Baba development in Prague 6. The Capek house was built in the mid 1924-25.

Karel Čapek ‘In Praise of Idleness’ in Intimate Things O Nejbližším Večech (1925) 1935 Unwin Brothers Ltd. Woking, 80

Karel Čapek ‘The Smell of Home’in Intimate Things O Nejbližším Večech (1925) 74-76

Karel Čapek ‘The Smell of Home’in Intimate Things 76


Karel Čapek The Gardener’s Year 141


Jaroslav Seifert Venice Sonetu – Prague a Wreath of Poems 1956 Stanza II

Jaroslav Seifert The Early Poetry of Jaroslav Seifert. Fiery Fruit 98; Lullaby 64; Bread and Roses 179


Josef Skvorecky ‘Sunday May 6 1945’ in The Cowards.

The Cowards, written in 1948-9 was not published until 1958 in Czechoslovakia and immediately criticised and suppressed. Škvorecký’s preface written during the socialist years explains the limitations as he sees it, of the bourgeois understanding that the heroes of the novel could only possibly have, even as they worked hard to overthrow these same bourgeois mores, they dealt in a limited vocabulary.


355 Frances Yates *The Art of Memory* 23


357 Centropa Organization’Jewish Witness to a European Century’  http://www.centropa.org/?nID=1 All of the life histories are available through the data base, by choosing the family name. There are not stable URLs to quote

358 Janet Finch and Lynn Hayes “Inheritance, Death and the Concept of the Home’ *Sociology* 1994 28:417

359 Questionnaires Anna Brůhova

360 Questionnaires Jiří Rybička

361 Questionnaires Ljuba Liškov

362 Maud Michael Beer Centropa 2007

363 Centropa Chava Pressburger 2005


365 Centropa Jan Fischer 2003

366 Centropa Jan Fischer 2003

367 Questionnaire Dagmar Straková-Elsmicová

368 Shelley Mallet ‘Understanding Home : a critical review of the literature’. 65

369 I have not been able to identify this with one of Pavel Janák’s named projects, but he was a prolific architect, and I have no reason to not accept this as one as well.

370 Questionnaires Marie Jiří Čková

Centropa Harry Fink 2005


Centropa Lenka Koprivova 2005

Centropa Jiří Franek 2005

Centropa Anna Hyndraková

Centropa Chava Pressburger 2005

Centropa Harry Fink 2005: Machar, Josef Svatopluk (1864-1942) Czech poet, writer, journalist and publicist (Centropa note)

Centropa Kurt Kotouc

Jaroslava Liba'nska Questionnaires
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Centropa Liselotte Telscherová 2003

Centropa Liselotte Telscherová 2003

Winton's Children was a rescue organisation during WWII for children in Czechoslovakia arranged by Nicholas Winton (1909-
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Appendix I

Source: Historical Lexicon of Municipalities in the Czech Republic 1869–2005, recounted to territorial structure as at 1 January 2005.


Population by nationality

By clicking on ‘other’ in a specific year, a graph will be shown demonstrating the structure of other nationalities than Czech in that year.

Structure of other nationalities

Source: Czech Demographic Handbook 2007
Tab. 7  Přítomné obyvatelstvo podle poměru k přednostovi domácnosti a podle druhu domácnosti k 1. 12. 1930

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Druh domácnosti</th>
<th>Přítomné obyvatelstvo</th>
<th>Z přítomných obyvatelů v soukromých příbytcích</th>
<th>Čechy</th>
<th>Morava a Slezsko</th>
<th>Celkem</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>v soukromých příbytcích</td>
<td>v ústavech</td>
<td>přednost</td>
<td>domácnosti</td>
<td>přednost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>manželek</td>
<td>družek</td>
<td>dětí</td>
<td>ostatní</td>
<td>zaměstnanců</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hlavní domácnosti</td>
<td>6777485</td>
<td>181730</td>
<td>132244</td>
<td>170921</td>
<td>1383974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vedl. dom. příbuzných</td>
<td>105060</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>35493</td>
<td>31855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vedl. dom. v podnájmu</td>
<td>37475</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13151</td>
<td>9745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bez bytu</td>
<td>7626</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1141</td>
<td>1357</td>
<td>856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celkem</td>
<td>6927646</td>
<td>181730</td>
<td>133385</td>
<td>175921</td>
<td>1426430</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

APPENDIX II
### Tab. 3 Národnost československých státních příslušníků podle žup a zemí k 15.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Národnost československých státních přís</th>
<th>župa, země</th>
<th>ruská</th>
<th>(velkoruská,</th>
<th>německá</th>
<th>maďarská</th>
<th>židovská</th>
<th>polská</th>
<th>jiná</th>
<th>úhrnem</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Národnost československých státních přís</td>
<td>česko-slovenská</td>
<td>karpatoruská</td>
<td>slovenská</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>a) Župy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hlavní město Praha</td>
<td>624744</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>30429</td>
<td>953</td>
<td>5959</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>663295</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Župa I. Praha</td>
<td>1045772</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>11128</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>1058404</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Župa II. Pardubice</td>
<td>415645</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>58393</td>
<td>602</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>475119</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Župa III. Hradec Králové</td>
<td>360024</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>141805</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>502823</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Župa IV. Mladá Boleslav</td>
<td>500746</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>224715</td>
<td>538</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>726784</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Župa V. Česká Lípa</td>
<td>59524</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>489129</td>
<td>567</td>
<td>606</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>550217</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Župa VI. Louny</td>
<td>463152</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>308401</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>1208</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>773564</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Župa VII. Karlovy Vary</td>
<td>15500</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>505701</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>521992</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Župa VIII. Plzeň</td>
<td>499088</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>249365</td>
<td>716</td>
<td>1160</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>750631</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Župa IX. České Budějovice</td>
<td>398593</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>154173</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>553996</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Župa X. Jihlava</td>
<td>294459</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>126792</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>1083</td>
<td>424526</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Župa XI. Brno</td>
<td>604574</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>135900</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>4329</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>745687</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Župa XII. Olomouc</td>
<td>495471</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>295403</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>2465</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>794101</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Župa XIII. Uherské Hradiště</td>
<td>367343</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>4608</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3313</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>375534</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Župa XIV. Moravská Ostrava</td>
<td>405147</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>214261</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>4208</td>
<td>2189</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>626354</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Župa XXI. Těšín</td>
<td>177626</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>23005</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2715</td>
<td>69360</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>272972</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>b) Země</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Čechy</td>
<td>4382788</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>2173239</td>
<td>5476</td>
<td>11251</td>
<td>973</td>
<td>1091</td>
<td>657625</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morava</td>
<td>2048426</td>
<td>976</td>
<td>547604</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>15335</td>
<td>2080</td>
<td>1481</td>
<td>2616436</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slezsko</td>
<td>296194</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>252365</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>3681</td>
<td>69967</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>622738</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Úhrnem</strong></td>
<td><strong>6727408</strong></td>
<td><strong>3 321</strong></td>
<td><strong>2 973 208</strong></td>
<td><strong>6 104</strong></td>
<td><strong>30 267</strong></td>
<td><strong>73 020</strong></td>
<td><strong>2 671</strong></td>
<td><strong>9815999</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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AN OVERVIEW

This book is divided into several parts, and each one will walk you through that part of the interview process.

introduction
--What Centropa is all about
--How to use this book; how not to use this book

part 1
the interview (biographical data)
--Before the interview: we show you how to prepare
--Explaining the contract
--Getting a great story from the 15 life stages and suggested questions

part 2
the interview (photographs)
--Going over the documents and pictures with your interviewee
--Filling out the template by hand

part 3
after the interview
--Sending the tapes out for transcription
--Filling in the Family Tree
--Forming a good biography out of the transcription
--Translation
--Scanning the photos: we give you the parameters

part 4
entering data
--Filling in the template
--How to make the Photo Descriptions better
part 5
completing your project
--How to organize your material
--What to send to Vienna office and when
--Payment and expenses

INTRODUCTION

The Central Europe Center for Research and Documentation is a US federally tax-exempt, non-profit organization specializing in documenting Jewish life in Central and Eastern Europe. We are also established as a foundation in Hungary and a Verein in Austria. You can find the results of our research on our website, www.centropa.org.

The goal of our signature project, Witness to a Jewish Century, is to create the world's first online searchable library of Jewish family memories and the images that go with them. The concept is to make this ever-growing archive available from every computer in the world with internet access. This is not so much a project about how Jews were murdered in the Holocaust. This is about how they lived — both before and afterwards. Naturally, we understand that the Shoah is the black hole into which every life was pulled, and we will discuss as much, or as little, about this horrid chapter of their lives as possible. But we want to use family photographs and oral history techniques to get these elderly Jews to share with us the history of the entire 20th century — as they lived it, suffered through it, and survived it.

We need your help in carrying out the project in your country. We would like you to conduct an in-depth life history interview with each interviewee, gather as many of their family photographs as possible, and have the photographs professionally scanned. Then, using our Witness template, you will enter the biographical information into the database.

Because we want this archive to be as complete a record as possible, you will be creating a biography of each family. Or think in these terms: that you are a 'ghost writer,' helping someone create a readable and accurate autobiography. Whether they have five photographs or one hundred, it doesn't matter: we're interested in all of them. We are especially interested in photographs that have something in them that looks specifically Jewish, but this is not of critical importance. We will ask you to exercise some editorial discretion. If, for example, someone presents you with twelve baby pictures of the same person, try to choose two or three at most. We are also interested in documents that pertain to their lives, especially if they have some Jewish connection.

Please use this workbook wherever you go, and feel free to show it to your interviewees. When you have questions, don't hesitate to contact us by email, telephone or fax.

Thank you for joining us on this exciting project!

edward serotta
nicole javor

eszter andor
dora sardi
HOW TO USE THIS BOOK

Our goal is to help standardize over 1,700 interviews so that the same basic life-stages will be covered, no matter where you happen to live.

We know that someone who lived in a small Ukrainian town had radically different life experiences from someone who lived in Budapest. And you will tailor your questions to fit the life experiences of your interviewees.

HOW NOT TO USE THIS BOOK

We do not expect you to ask every single question in each of the categories. In fact, each interviewee will set the tone of how they wish to be interviewed, what subjects they wish to cover, which ones they will not touch. Keep in mind that this book is there to remind you of the many, many questions you could ask — not copy Stalinist interrogation methods!

There are some sensitive questions in this book: What was your political affiliation (section 12)? Did you teach your children about Judaism (section 13)? What did your parents teach you about Judaism (section 8)? And some will feel that all questions that have to do with religion are too intrusive.

We leave the diplomacy, the sensitivity, and the respect in your hands. Remember, this book is like a toolbox with a thousand small tools in it. Use the ones you feel you need — and contact us any time you have a question.
PART ONE

THE INTERVIEW
(BIOGRAPHICAL DATA)

--Before the interview:
    we show you how to prepare

--Explaining the contract

--Getting a great story from the 15
    life stages and suggested
    questions

BEFORE THE INTERVIEW

BUDGETING YOUR TIME

--Keep in mind that older people are usually at their best in the mornings. When you
    make your appointment, please be sure not to intrude on their daily routine.
--Most of us find that we need two visits with each person. We don't insist you do this,
    but we do insist on a completed interview. Here's how — in most cases — our time
    breaks down:
--The first thing is to fill out the Family Tree together with your interviewee. This can
    take between 20 — 40 minutes.
--Then you'll get their life story. This can take between 1 and 3 hours.
--Going over their family photos and calmly working with them to get as much
    information about each photo in the template as you can. This can take anywhere from 20
    minutes to 1.5 hours, depending on how many pictures they have and how detailed you
    can get them to be.

CHOOSING YOUR INTERVIEWEE

Age of the interviewees — Please try to choose elderly interviewees, because they will die
    soonest. Of course, if you come across someone who is relatively young but has an
    interesting story and many memories of his/her ancestors, you can interview them but on
    principle, try for older people (born before 1930).

INTERVIEWING "NON-JEWS" (FOR COUNTRIES OUTSIDE THE FSU)

If the potential interviewee was married BEFORE the Holocaust, it is better that they
    married a Jew. In every case where they married out -- and Serbia is the most telling
    example -- the Jewish content of their lives drives right off the road. We want you to ask
    older people if BOTH parents were Jewish. We very much prefer this.
AFTER the Holocaust, however, we know it’s a different story. So, it is not a problem to interview people who married out after the war.

In the FSU, of course, things were different and we cannot apply this rule. However, if someone had a non-Jewish father or mother, we simply do not need too many photos or family descriptions from them about their Christian side of the family.

SETTING UP THE INTERVIEW

When arranging the visit by telephone, here is a suggested summary of our project. Of course you can use your own words, but if you wish, describe Centropa in this way:

“Centropa is a historical project run by a team of Jewish historians who aim to create an oral history project on pre-Holocaust Jewish life in Central and Eastern Europe. This is not a Holocaust video project. Our goal is to show how this world lived before the Holocaust. We are using tens of thousands of old family photographs to tell this story. Nothing like this has ever been done before. We are working in 15 countries, and when we are finished in eight or nine years, our archive will be used in important Jewish museums and universities in Israel, Europe and America. I would like to come and visit you, talk with you about your family’s history, and look through your own family pictures. With your permission, I would then like to borrow them for 24 hours and make copies of them. The point I wish to make is that Centropa is a very important historical project, and we would like you and your family to be a part of it.”

Be prepared to hear them say “I don’t have very many pictures,” or “I have only one or two,” or “I have nothing interesting to tell.” That’s okay. Go anyway. They will dig around and find photographs once you start talking with them. Also, please keep in mind we’re looking for great stories, not only pictures.

PREPARING FOR THE INTERVIEW

Before going to the interview you have to look over the Interviewer’s CD that you will need in order to produce an interview, and the Interviewer’s Kit, that you will take with you to the interview.

INTERVIEWER’S CD

On the CD you will find 6 different folders.

1. Contracts: In this folder you will find two different contracts, one for the interviewer and one for the interviewee. The interviewer’s contract must be signed by every person that is to work on the Witness project and has to be sent to our office in Vienna. The interviewee’s contract has to be signed by every person you are making interview with and sent together with the completed interview to our office in Vienna. More about Interviewee’s contract can be found on page 22
2. FileMaker: Installing FileMaker is as simple as installing any other computer software. Without FileMaker you will not be able to complete the interview. Program FileMaker is located under the folder named FileMaker. When you open the folder, first write down the serial number that you will find in a text document in the FileMaker folder. Then open the folder FileMaker 4.1 and start the installation by double clicking the icon named SETUP (the icon looks like a small computer). Follow the installation steps.

3. For you to work with: In this folder you will find all the documents you need to conduct the interview.
   - Family Tree: This is a MS Word document that you will need to fill out during the interview. More about Family Tree and how to use it can be found on page 23 and 69.
   - Interviewees: This is an MS Excel document that will provide us with contact details about the interviewee. You must fill this document out and send it to our office in Vienna.
   - Postwar professions and Prewar professions: Here you will find a list of all the professions you can enter in our Witness Template. For more details please see page 96.
   - Question Checklist: This is an MS Word document and contains a short list of the questions you will find in this chapter.
   - What to take: This is a check list of the things you should take with you to the interview.
   - Witness Template: This is a FileMaker template in which you will import photos from the interview and write down detailed explanations about each photograph. This template, and how to fill it in, is explained in detail in the following chapters.

4. Interviewer's Workbook: In this folder you will find a PDF file of this Workbook. You can use it with the program Adobe Acrobat Reader, which you can download for free from the internet at the following address http://www.adobe.com/products/acrobat/readstep2.html

5. Money Matters: In this folder you will find all the necessary documents regarding financial matters. More information about it on page 116

6. Samples: In this folder you will find examples of a well conducted interview.

The Interviewer’s Kit is a printout of the documents you can find on the interviewer’s CD. You should take the Interviewer's Kit with you to every interview in order to have all the necessary documents with you. In this kit you will also find Certificates to give to each of your interviewees.

WHAT TO BRING

- A tape recorder, with enough blank tapes and extra batteries for 2-3 hours.
- A small gift, such as flowers or chocolates (flowers work better as many elderly people have diabetes). If you prefer, bring the gift on your second visit.
- Empty copies of your FileMaker template — as many as you think you might need (one for each photo). Reason: you can write everything directly on the template, you can also make notes for the photo description but please record everything the interviewee says about the photos on tape as well.
- An empty copy of the Family Tree.
- Small yellow sticky post-it-notes, which you should use to stick on the back of the photos and write the number of the photo on it.
- Interviewer's Kit
- Interviewer's Workbook
- Interviewee's contract
- Certificate for the interviewee (don't forget to write their name on it)

Be sure to test the tape recorder to make sure you're recording the interviewee clearly because some of the recordings will be placed on our website!

AT THE INTERVIEW

EXPLAINING THE CONTRACT

Centropa requires a signed contract from the interviewee so that museums, libraries and Jewish institutions around the world can legally use the photographs you are about to scan. Begin by explaining why Centropa is important (this is also in the contract itself). Please read through the contract with them (you will coordinate with us on obtaining a translation into your own language).

The contract may seem complicated to an elderly person, but this is the legal way to carry out such a project. It protects the lender as well as the book and/or internet publisher who may wish to use these pictures. If they are unsure about a particular clause, you can have them strike it out for the time being, and we will try to re-institute it, with their permission, later.

Others have told us that they will sign the contract, but do not want the results published for five or ten years. The reasons for this are obvious, and we always agree. Please record these conditions on contract in English in red ink and also make a note about it on the CD to call Vienna office's attention to the special close on the contract.

YOUR GUIDE FOR GETTING THE MOST COMPLETE STORIES

THE FAMILY TREE

As we have suggested above, you should start the interview by filling in the family tree with the interviewee. Although you will write down the data needed for the tree, turn the tape recorder on, as your interviewee will start telling you stories even at this stage. It is helpful to write down the names of people, place names, etc. that your interviewee mentions during the interview because the transcribers of the interviews may not understand the names clearly.

THE BIOGRAPHY

Begin by going through the family and life history of the interviewee. Do not forget that the project concentrates on the entire life of the interviewee (that means pre-war period,
wartime, as well as their life after the war), with a special emphasis on topics related to Judaism. Ask if they were involved with the Jewish community after the war, and if not, why. Ask the same about their politics — if you feel it won’t bother them.

If your interviewee wishes to speak about a certain subject, like the family store, a favorite neighbor, a terrible experience, let them. A good interviewer will always say: “Tell me more about that.” And most people will. Or, after they have said a few words about someone, you can respond by saying, “She sounds like she must have been a very interesting person.” And chances are, your interviewee will add another anecdote.

Forgive us for stating the obvious: discussing the Holocaust is often disturbing for those who survived and we do not want to pry too deeply or cause undue stress. If it becomes clear that the subject is difficult for them, please react sensitively and move on.

Everyone loves a story. We like to hear them and we like to tell them (even though not everyone is a good storyteller). In order to encourage the interviewee to share stories, ask them open-ended questions like “tell me about your mother” as opposed to “was your mother strict?”

You may find that working with your interviewee on their life story has drained them emotionally. We often return for a second visit to work with them on their photographs, documents and our templates.

SUGGESTED INTERVIEWER’S QUESTIONS

keep this book open during your interview or use a printout of the question check list included on the cd

1. THE ORIGINS OF YOUR FAMILY
Ask the interviewee about what they know about their ancestors, where they came from, who they were, and ask the interviewee to recount any family legends that they might remember.
--Where did your great-grandparents or great-great grandparents come from?
--Do you know what they did for a living? Do you know how they lived, what their material circumstances were, how religious they were?
--Please tell me any stories you have heard.

2. YOUR GRANDPARENTS
We want to learn about the world the interviewee’s grandparents came from. Begin by asking what sort of people their grandparents were. What sort of personalities they had — solemn and quiet? Lively and talkative? Was their grandfather humorous and liked to tell jokes, or was he serious and rarely smiled. How did he dress? What was his daily routine? In other words, have the interviewee paint a picture of their grandparents’ personalities.
--Where are they from, approximately when were they born? Tell me about any previous family names and why they changed their names.
--What did they do for a living?
--What languages did they speak, and what did they speak with each other?
--Tell me about their clothing and outward appearance. For instance: “Did your grandfather have a beard, payot, kipa or hat, did he wear a kaftan or a suit or something else?”
--Did your grandmother wear a sheyl (the wig Orthodox women use)? Did she wear it inside the house as well, or did she wear a kerchief; how did she dress?
--What did their house/apartment look like? Describe it for me — the number of rooms, the furniture, if they had running water and electricity and how they heated their home.
--Did they have a garden, did they grow anything, did they have animals?
--Did they have any domestic help: servant, cook, washer woman, nanny or Fräulein? If so, tell me about them.
--How religious were they? What did they observe of the Jewish tradition; were they kosher, did they keep Sabbath, did they go to synagoge every day or every Friday or only on the high holidays? Did they keep Jewish holidays at home?
--What were your grandfather’s political views? Was he a member of any party or political organization? Was he a member of any social or cultural organization?
--Tell me about their relationship with neighbors. Were their neighbors Jewish or Gentile?
--Tell me about their friends.
--Describe their holidays. Where did they go and how often? Did they go alone or take their children with them?
--Do you know anything of your grandparents’ siblings? (their names, birth and death dates, education, professions, children, etc.)
--Tell me any stories your grandparents told you about their own childhoods.
--Tell me the stories your mother and father told you about their parents.
--Tell me any stories you remember about your grandfather’s military experience.

3. YOUR TOWN/VILLAGE AS IT WAS WHEN YOU WERE A CHILD
We want the interviewee to paint a picture of their town and Jewish community. Ask them to think back and describe the place — full of horses and carts? Muddy, unpaved roads? Or big boulevards with lots of fancy cars? Ask the interviewee to describe the town they grew up in.
--About how many people lived in your town, and how many Jews lived in it?
--How would you describe the Jewish community?
--How many synagogues and prayer houses were there?
--Was there a rabbi, a shochet, chazan, or other functionaries there? If so, do you know how many?
--Tell me about things like mikves, Jewish schools, cheders, Talmud Torahs, yeshivas or pre-yeshivas there.
--Was there a separate Jewish neighborhood (or ghetto) or did Jews live scattered around the town?
--What were typical Jewish occupations there?
--Was there already electricity and running water everywhere?
--What do you remember of the political climate as a child? Did you feel any anti-Semitism?
Do you remember military parades, special army days or patriotic days? Tell me about the patriotic songs you learned as a child. Can you sing them for me?

Describe market day in your town. Who went to the market in your family? Did your family have favorite merchants or traders they liked to work with?

What big political events do you remember (assassination of a political leader, Hitler coming to power, the Munich accords of 1938, the invasion of Poland) and how did you feel about them — or what do you remember your parents saying?

4. YOUR PARENTS

We'd like to learn about the interviewee's parents, and get to know them through his/her stories about them. You should begin by asking for a general description of their father. Have them tell you about what sort of person he was. For instance, was he witty and highly conversational? Or was he serious and not very talkative? Was he a stern father or was he flexible? Then have the interviewee tell the same about their mother.

Where were they born and where?

What education did they have?

What was their mother tongue and what other languages did they speak?

What did they do for a living?

How did they meet? Was it an arranged marriage or not?

When and where did they get married? Did they get married in a synagogue or was it a civil marriage?

Describe the way they dressed: traditional or modern?

How would you describe your family's financial situation?

Describe your house for me: how many rooms did they have and what other spaces (kitchen, larder, bathroom, etc.) did they have in it? What kind of furniture did they have? Did they have running water in the house? What did they heat with?

Did they have a garden, did they grow anything? Did they have animals?

Did they have any domestic help: servant, cook, washer woman, nanny or Fräulein?

Were there books at home? What kind: religious or secular or both? Did your parents read? What and when? Did they tell or advise you what to read? Did they read newspapers regularly? Did you or your parents go to a library regularly?

How religious were they, what Jewish traditions did they observe (were they kosher, did they keep Sabbath, did they go to synagogue every day or every Friday or only on the high holidays? Did they keep holidays at home? Were they members of the Jewish community? Did they have any function in the community?

What were your parents' political views? Were they members of any party or political organization? Were they members of any social or cultural organization?

Tell me about your father's military service.

What was their relationship with neighbors? Were their neighbors Jewish or Gentile?

Who did they make friends with? Jews or non-Jews? Relatives or neighbors or colleagues or people from the community?

Did they go on holiday? If yes, where did they go and how often? Did they go alone or take their children with them?

What do you know of your parents' siblings? (their names, birth and death dates, city where they lived, education, professions, children, etc.)

Which relatives did your parents keep in regular touch with? How often, where and on what occasions did they meet these relatives?

5. YOUR EARLY YEARS AND SCHOOLING
Now we want the interviewee to describe their own childhood. How they fitted into their family, who looked after them, their school and classmates and teachers, their Jewish community.

--When and where were you born?
--Did you go to kindergarten, or did your mother look after you, or did you have a nanny or Fräulein (or did your older siblings look after you)?
--If you were at home, what did you do during the day with your mother or the person that looked after you?
--Where did you go to school? Was it a Jewish school, a state school or a Christian denominational school?
--What were your favorite classes?
--Do you remember any teacher you liked or hated very much? Who and why?
--Did you experience any anti-Semitism from teachers or classmates?
--Did you have any private lessons outside school, such as languages or music?)

6. YOUR FRIENDS, FREE TIME AND HOLIDAYS
Get a description of and stories about the interviewee’s friends as a child.
--Who were your friends in school? Were they Jewish or not?
--Who were your friends outside school?
--What did you do with your friends?
--What did you do in your spare time? What were your hobbies?
--Did you pursue any political, sports or cultural activities? Were you a member of any such club or association?
--How did you spend the Saturdays and holidays? With your parents or not? Did you go somewhere?
--What kind of activities did your do with your parents on holidays?
--Did you go on vacation with your parents and/or did you go to any youth camp? Did you go on holiday with friends?
Tell me if you remember:
--The first time you rode in a car?
--The first time you rode on a train?
--What was your favorite vacation place and why?
--Did you eat out in restaurants with your family? If so, tell me about that.

7. YOUR SIBLINGS
We want to learn about the interviewee’s brothers and sisters. What was their childhood like with them, where they went to school, what became of them later, etc.

8. JUDAISM AND TRADITION IN YOUR CHILDHOOD
Some of us had religious upbringings. Some of us lived in completely secular homes. Ask the interviewee about their experiences.
--Which Jewish traditions were observed in your home when you were a child?
--When and how often did you go to synagogue? Did you often accompany your father when he went?
--Did you study Hebrew or religion in the school, or outside the school?
--Did you go to cheder or yeshiva?
--What did your parents teach you?
--Did you study with your father on Sabbat?
--For boys: did you have bar mitzvah?
--What was your favorite holiday and why?

9. YOUR ADULT LIFE BEFORE THE HOLOCAUST
If your interviewee was more than 18 years old, or was married, or had a job before the occupation and/or deportation, ask these questions now. If not, we will ask about their adult life after war's end in Section 11.
--What did you do for a living and where did you work?
--Did you have any conflicts at work because you were Jewish?
--Where and with whom did you make friends? Was being Jewish important in choosing your friends, partners and spouse?
--If you were married before the war, how did you meet your spouse? Where did you get married?
--Tell me about your spouse; what is their name, where were they born, what is their mother tongue and educational level, what is their profession? Do you know anything about their parents?
--If you had any children before the war, tell me about them. Did you raise them Jewish?
--Which Jewish holidays did you keep in your own family before the war? Did you keep Christmas and Easter? If so, why?

10. HOLOCAUST AND EVENTS THAT LED TO IT
Our project is not specifically a Holocaust interview project. However, that does not mean we are not interested in the Holocaust. We'd like to learn as much as possible about this period of the interviewee's life, but only as much as they feel comfortable telling us about. If speaking about this period is upsetting to your respondent, then, of course, do not pursue the matter. But do make every attempt to fill in this period of their lives in as much detail as possible. You'll want to borrow any documents they have for scanning.
--When did you first come across serious anti-Semitism and what incidents did you experience?
--How did the anti-Jewish laws affect you and your family? (Did it affect your schooling, your job, or your parents' own business, etc.?)
--Where were you during the Holocaust and what happened to you?
--If you were taken away, did you have any news from your family or could you send them news of yourself?
--How long were you away, and when, where and how were you liberated? Do you remember that day, can you describe it to me? How did you learn that the war had ended for you?
--What happened to your family during the Holocaust?
--How many family members survived?

11. RETURNING HOME
We would like the interviewee to tell us about the period right after the war. Many Jews did not go home from the camps and many of those who did go home, left soon after for Israel or the West. We are interested in learning of the interviewee's own experiences and why he/she made the decision to remain.
--How did you come home from the war? What did you find on arrival? Describe your home, your town, your community? When and how did you learn what happened to your family?
--How did your non-Jewish neighbors react when you returned?  
--What happened to your family's property and home?  
--Where and how did you restart your life? (home, work, family)?  
--Why did you decide to stay and not emigrate?  
--What were your political beliefs then?  
--Did you have friends who left for Israel or the West? How did that make you feel?  

While naturally, we want to learn why they chose to stay and how they felt about the political situation, we want to break this postwar period into two major parts—the life you made for yourself after the war (and by this we mean we want stories of their spouses, their children, their jobs) followed by a chapter on the life they made for themselves after their children left home and they retired from their jobs.

12. FAMILY (MARRIAGE AND CHILDREN) DAILY LIFE, RELIGIOUS OBSERVANCE  
In this part we want to explore the issues of marriage and children, and also what the interviewee observed of Jewish traditions and religion. We ask our interviewees to remember not to embarrass them if they have absolutely no contact with Judaism, as they might feel embarrassed.

MARRIAGE (If he/she has married more than once, please collect relevant information of all the marriages.)  
--How many times were you married in your life?  
--How did you meet your spouse(s)? When and where did you get married? Is your spouse Jewish? If so, was it an important criterium in getting married to someone? If he/she is not Jewish, why was it not so important? If not Jewish, how did your parents and relatives accept this fact? Tell me about the wedding.  
--Tell me about your spouse: what is their name, when and where were they born, what is their mother tongue and education level, what is their profession? Do you know anything about their parents, their relatives, and their life before the marriage?  
--If they got married before the war! What Jewish traditions did you observe with your spouse before the war: clothing, kashrut, observing Sabbath, going to the synagogue, keeping Jewish holidays at home and/or at the synagogue etc. Did you keep Christmas and Easter at home? Tell me about it.

YOUR SPOUSE'S JOB  
--Tell me about your spouse's job. What sort of work did he or she do (or still does)? If he owned (or still owns) a business, tell us about how it grew (or didn’t grow) over the years? Did he start it himself or inherit it from his father (or your father)?  
--Did you ever help out in the business? Were their brothers and sisters involved in the business?  
--How about your children? Are they involved in the business today?  
--If your spouse did not own a business, tell me about what sort of job it was.  
--Did your spouse ever have to take a loyalty oath at work or join a political party?  
--How many years did your spouse work there and in what position did he/she finish?

NOW LET'S TALK ABOUT YOUR OWN JOB.
--What did you do for a living and where did you work? (Please ask the interviewee more about their career, if they changed jobs, why did they do so, etc., rather than just giving a mere list of jobs in the biography).
--Tell me about your work colleagues, the atmosphere, how your work colleagues perceived you.
--Did you ever have problems because you were Jewish?
--Did you have to sign any loyalty oaths? Were any of them those kinds of proclamations for world peace, the condemnation of Israel, against the United States? Do you remember any of them specifically?
--And did you have a song everyone had to sing at work? If so, can you sing it for us?
--In communist countries especially, people learned how to creatively not work so hard. Do you have any stories along those lines you can share with us?
--Tell us about your retirement. Were you glad to retire? Did you want to stay on? (we will talk about your daily activities today later)

CHILDREN AND HOME LIFE
Very important! Please ask your interviewee if their children agree to publish information on themselves, their family and if so, what information. We will not publish names or photos of children or grandchildren unless we are given permission! If they don’t want to use their full names, just use initials such a A, N, J, etc.
--How many children do you have? Where and when were they born? Did they go to kindergarten? Where did you school your children, what was important in their education?
--Who did they make friends with?
--How did you raise your children in terms of the Jewish tradition? Did you tell them they were Jewish or not?
--Tell me about the time you told your children about what happened to you during the war.
--Can you tell me some stories about your children’s early years? Did they ever have trouble with being Jewish at school?
--Did you ever take your children to the synagogue? If so, how often?
--In which language did you speak to your children and did you speak with your spouse in a different language in front of the children?

DAILY LIFE
--In what conditions did your family live: house, apartment, shared apartment or sublet, etc.?
--Did your parents live with you?
--What books, newspapers did you read? Tell me about what you did culturally.
--What did you do in your spare time? Where did you go on holiday? Did you have a weekend house? Did you go to company or trade union holidays?
--Have you been abroad? Did you go to socialist or western countries? Did you go there to work or on holiday? Did you go only with your spouse or did you take your children too?
--If you became independent from your parents only after the war: which relatives did you keep in touch with? What did you do together with them, how often, and on what occasions did you meet them?
--Who did you and your spouse make friends with?
--What percentage of your close personal friends, would you estimate, are Jewish?
--What was your social life like, where did you get together? Judaism or Jewishness (or Israel) ever came up as a topic of conversation with your friends? Did you have friends that you could talk/wanted to talk with about it, and friends that you couldn't? Why?

RELIGIOUS OBSERVANCE, JEWISH ACTIVITIES
--Did you keep any Jewish holidays in your family? Can you tell us what family dinners were like—if you had them—for Rosh Hashanah or Pesach?
--Did you keep Christmas and/or Easter at home? Tell me about it.
--Did you keep any culinary traditions (even without explaining to your children or knowing yourself, such as making matzah ball soup, having a separate pot for boiling milk, etc.)?
--Are you (or your spouse) as traditional a cook as your mother? What are your favorite Jewish traditional foods?
--What sort of Jewish activities did your children do when they were growing up, if any—such as youth groups, summer camps, etc.
--Did you raise your children so they would know Jewish traditions, or did you feel it better to leave them out?
--Tell me about their bar and bat mitzvahs if they had them. Where was it done and by whom? Try and give us a description of these events.
--While your children were growing up, was there any conflict with your parents or your spouse’s parents about religious observance? (Did they feel you were too religious or not religious enough?).
--Did you allow the grandparents to do the rituals (such as lighting Sabbath-candles, Hanukkah-candles) in front of the children? Did you try to hide it from the children? If so, why?
--Where are your parents and/or your spouse buried: in a Jewish cemetery or a general cemetery or in the Jewish section of a cemetery? Was there a rabbi or cantor at the funeral? Was there a religious ceremony conducted? Did you or any family member say a kaddish for the dead? Did you pay anybody else to say a kaddish? Do you observe the Jahrzeit (the memorial day of their death)?

LOSE YOUR CHILDREN TO THEIR OWN LIVES
--Tell us about your children as they grew older. Were you sad to see them leave home? Do you remember the day, for instance, you took your child to university (or the army) or the train station to go off to college? Did you cry? Tell us about that.
--Tell us about the young man or young woman your child brought home, and told you he/she was getting married. Is the spouse Jewish? (We will ask about your grandchildren below).
--Where do your children live today? If abroad: when did they leave? Why?
--What do your children do? Do they have their own family? Do they observe Judaism in any way?

13. LIFE UNDER SOCIALISM/COMMUNISM
We know that some elderly people are embarrassed, or simply do not wish to speak about their “red” past. A very few of them will feel you are accusing them of something. Therefore, do try and ask your questions about postwar life in a sympathetic way, without sounding judgmental.
Were you a member of the party? Did you need it for your career, was it because of your family, or was it because of your political convictions? Did you enter it because of your war experiences?

What memories do you have from the first part of the 1950s? Were you afraid that they might take you or imprison you for some reason? Did it happen to anyone in your family or in your immediate environment?

Did you participate in any socialist holiday celebration in school or working place (such as marching on 1st of May, 4th of April, 7th of November, etc.)? Was it mandatory to participate in them?

Did you ever have any trouble because you were Jewish?

Did you ever think of making aliya to Israel? If so, how long did you stay and when did you return?

If any of your children wanted to emigrate, did you try and talk them out of it, or did you encourage it? If your children decided to emigrate, I would like you to tell me how you felt. Tell us how it felt to see your child (and grandchildren?) leave the country. And tell us about their visits home. Are they very nationalistic, are they sorry they moved?

Do you/did you have family or friends in Israel? Could you keep in touch with them during the socialist regime?

Did you ever go to Israel before 1989? Tell me about it.

14. YOUR LIFE AFTER THE FALL OF COMMUNISM
We also would like to know whether their attitude towards Jewish life and religion has changed since the fall of communism.

How did 1989, the democratization in your country and the opening up of the Eastern block affect you, what were your feelings?

Did your life change in terms of your Jewish identity? Tell me about it.

If you would like to tell us about your political views, please do so.

15. YOUR LIFE TODAY (AFTER YOUR CHILDREN HAVE LEFT HOME)

How active are you in your Jewish community today?

Did you receive any Holocaust compensation? Who from: the Hungarians, the Swiss, the Germans, the Austrians or the Claims Conference?

At the last census, did you fill in the fields about religion?

How often do you see your grandchildren and tell me about your involvement with them. How often do you speak with them by phone?

Do you use email to stay in touch with your family and do you use the internet? If so, tell us about how you use the computer in your daily life.

Are there any frictions (that you’d like to tell us about) between you and your children regarding your grandchildren and their relationship with Judaism? For instance, do you wish they were more religious or less religious?

Do you (or your spouse) still cook for family gatherings or do your children now do that?

Do your grandchildren attend the Jewish school and what sort of Jewish community activities do they do?

Tell me about your friends. How often do you meet and what do you do together?

Tell me about your vacations today.

Do you still work, and if you have a business, are your children working with you?
PART TWO

THE INTERVIEW
(PHOTOGRAPHS)

--Going over the documents and
cictures with your interviewee

--Filling out the template by hand

TEMPLATES, PHOTOS AND DOCUMENTS
Be sure to leave the tape recorder running for this!

SELECTING THE PICTURES
You'll begin by asking your interviewee to take out all their old pictures and bring them
to the table. They may have five or six. They may have hundreds. When choosing which
photos to use, remember:
--Take all those that represent persons, places or events that are important to the
interviewee. Ask them directly "Please tell me which photographs are important to you."
--Take those that are interesting or unusual.
--Don't forget to look around on the walls and ask to use those photographs, too.
--Don't take too many photos of the same person in the same walk of life and in the same
setting. For example a little girl aged 2, the same little girl aged 3 or 4. One of these is
enough.
--Don't worry if the picture is faded, stained or torn. We want it.

When in doubt, take more, rather than fewer pictures! Remember to take post-war photos
as well, photos that have a story, that best represent the interviewee, their family or the
age, or are related to Jewish activities.

Be sure to ask for a recent photograph of your interviewee. We want to see how the
interviewee looks today. If your interviewee does not wish to give you their most recent
photos, don't push them too hard, get one that they are willing to give, where they like
the way they look.

GATHERING DOCUMENTS
--Ask if they have any personal documents from the pre-war period, such as
birth/marriage/death certificates, ID cards, passports, passes, school reports,
certificates or documents related to employment
--Ask if they have Holocaust-related documents, Red Cross postcards, letters, etc. We
wish to scan any documents they have pertaining to this time. This includes passes, false
papers, even ghetto money.

We do not need many of the same type of document, just one or two. Try to choose the
ones that are interesting or typical, or which have a story to go with them. When you
have a document of several pages, you should not scan each page but only the first and/or any page that is of particular interest for some reason.

If you have not done so, now is the time to ask if you can borrow these photographs for a very short time in order to copy them. Assure your interviewee that you will return them as soon as possible, and undamaged. Be sure to leave your own telephone number with them.

Possible problem. Some interviewees will be reluctant to give you certain information (or ask you not to disclose it), such as their own name, the names of their parents, etc. Try to explain to them that this project is for educational purposes and documentation and that it is important for the future to preserve as much as possible. If they are still reluctant, tell them that Centropa has run into other such interviewees and what you offered them — and they accepted this — was that the information will be kept on file and not put on the internet for 10 years, but after 10 years Centropa will complete such biographies, templates and family trees with the missing information. Ask if that is acceptable. If your interviewee accepts this condition, please record it on the contract and also make a note for Vienna in English about this (on the contract) so that we all know these conditions.

ORGANIZING THE PICTURES
--Begin by asking the interviewee to sort the photos in chronological order (or as close to that as possible).
--Use the yellow post-it notes to write a number for each photograph.
--Now take out your templates, and write a number on each of your empty templates in the 'About the photo' box.

THE PHOTO DESCRIPTION
Don't bother writing in the Photo description now because that will be too detailed. Use the tape you are recording to write it later. It is important that you speak into the microphone for each picture — “here is photo number 1.”

In some ways, the photo description is the most important part of the interview, and we really do believe that “every picture tells a story”. This is where we depend on you to ask the questions that will bring this story to life:

--What time of year was this?
--Where exactly was this taken?
--Do you remember who took the picture?
--Who are those other people?
--What can you tell me about them?
--Was this a special occasion? If so, tell me about it.

FILLING THE TEMPLATE

Please see the example of our templates. If you can’t get the information from your
interviewee, leave the field blank. Do not put "no info", "unknown", "?", or any other text in it. For more information see pages 88-108.

Do not add the keywords with your interviewee. Do this at home or in your office.

CERTIFICATE

This is the time to give them the Centropa Certificate (see page 19).

PART THREE

AFTER THE INTERVIEW

--Sending the tapes out for transcription
--Filling in the Family Tree
--Forming a good biography out of the transcription
--Translation
--Scanning the photos: we give you the parameters

AFTER THE INTERVIEW

This section of your workbook will help you draw the best possible story out of the material you have worked so hard to gather until now.

TRANSCRIBING THE INTERVIEW

Once you have the interview on tape, send the tapes to be transcribed in MS Word on diskette. Or, you can have the interview sent to you by email, as well as on paper (in your language). When writing the biography, you will use the transcribed version of the interview.

Transcribing the interview is not your responsibility! Centropa is ready to pay a qualified typist. Please coordinate with us on the price per page.

The transcriber should use all normal diacritical marks in your language, such as accents, umlauts and special characters. After all, this will be read by people in your country.

FAMILY TREE

Your interviewee does not know the answers to all the questions in the family tree, no matter: any information helps. If you don’t have an answer to a question in the family tree, write "No information," and do not leave it blank.
When writing people’s names, observe the English name order: first name and then family name (e.g. Benjamin Schwartz); make sure you write the date in the American fashion: month, day, year (e.g. April 2, 2000). If you don’t know the day and month of someone’s birth or death, write in the year (or the decade if the interviewee only remembers that).

Please write a longer description about occupations of all the people in the family, because in the template you will only have broad occupational categories. If you want to indicate work places, please write only the important ones, where the person spent a relatively long time, or if it meant some change in their professional career.

THE BIOGRAPHY

The top of the biography should contain five things
--The name of the interviewee that MUST BE SPELLED EXACTLY THE SAME ON THE BIOGRAPHY AND IN THE TEMPLATE WHERE IT SAYS ‘INFORMATION ABOUT INTERVIEWEE’.
--The town where the interview was made
--The country where the interview was made
--The name of the interviewer
--The date of the interview

So that would be:
Chaim Federovsky
Kiev
Ukraine
Interviewer: Ella Levy
Date of interview: May 2002

For the people who will be reading these interviews in the years and decades to come, we want you to add a bit of your own creativity to the very beginning of each interview by writing a descriptive paragraph about your interviewee: what they looked like, what sort of home they had, and what they were like in general — at the time you met them. This description does not need to be long, a quarter of page, or half a page is enough.

For instance: Mr. Schwarz is a short, slightly overweight 78 year-old man. He has been suffering from diabetes for several years and now rarely leaves his flat and lives alone. He receives food from the Jewish community, and has a helper come in and straighten his apartment. He says that his children visit him often. In spite of his illness, he is a lively and engaged conversationalist. He lives in a small apartment in the center of town, in a turn-of-the-century building. The apartment is immaculate, and there are plaques of various awards he has won on his walls, as well as pictures of his grandparents. When he speaks, he often sits on the edge of his chair and moves his arms a great deal. During the interview, he sometimes gets rather upset. When I then ask him whether he wants to continue, he insists on telling me everything.

We want you to produce a 8-20 page biography, single-spaced and in 12 point characters. As in all oral history projects, we want you to stay as close to the interviewee’s voice as
possible. We ask you to cite the interviewee word for word—filling in information in your own words only when necessary. That means you shouldn’t summarize what the interviewee said in your own words.

To maintain the ‘flavor’ of your respondent’s speech, if the interviewee uses foreign words (Yiddish, Hebrew, Turkish, Ladino etc.), please leave them in the text and give a translation in [ ] parentheses.

Since a person telling a story will often jump from topic to topic and year to year, you will find your transcription will probably need to be rearranged in chronological order to get the biography right. Be sure to rearrange the story where necessary so that it is chronological and logical and has a good flow.

TOWNS AND VILLAGES

Please write in [ ] parentheses how far the town the interviewee mentions is from your city and in which province/republic it is. For example Kalishnikovgrad (2,000 kilometers east of Kiev in northwestern Chechnya). This is especially important for settlements in the FSU because 99% of all people in the world do not know the names of towns and villages in Siberia, Kazakhstan, and Uzbekistan and, more importantly, where they are.

The coordinators have lists of towns in your country which have had different names in the course of their history, because of a socialist name change or because of shifting borders, etc. (for example St Petersburg — Leningrad, Subotica — Szabadka, Nove Zamky — Ersekujvar, Oradea — Nagyvarad). These lists will be put on the Internet. When you come across a town in your biography or template that had several names, please consult the town list for your country and check if the town appears there. If so, you have nothing to do with it — please do not write in the different names of the town in the bio or the template. If the town is not on the list, please send a note to your coordinator who will then add the town and its different names to the list. The coordinator should also send the town and its names to the chief editor who will also put it on her list that goes on the Internet.

PERSONAL NAMES

When the interviewee first mentions someone in the biography without saying their name, please put in the name as well. We would not like to have “my brother”, “his father”, etc. without knowing who they are because if the name does not appear at least once in the biography, the reader would have to consult the family tree every time.

SPELLING AND PUNCTUATION

We are asking all translators and interviewers who write in English to make sure that they use American spelling and punctuation, not British.

Because of technical reasons connected to the web, we cannot use footnotes. When you have important information that is specific to that biography and is unlikely to appear in many other biographies, put it in an editor's note (see page 78). When you come across something that recurred in the biographies of your country, please use the glossary.

GLOSSARY LIST

As we are working in several countries and our readers come from all over the world, we need to make sure that they will understand the biographies, even if they do not know so much about the history of a given country, region or town. This is why we are putting together Glossary Lists for each country we work in. This is how it works:

1. Each coordinator has a list of historic names, events, dates, etc. which have already appeared in biographies and for which we have already created explanations.
2. When you come across anything in the biography that you think needs an explanation and that is likely to appear in several other interviews from your country, please insert an endnote number manually, then go down to the end of the document and put manually the same number there. Let us give you some examples of what needs a glossary entry and what does not:
   a. You don't need a glossary in the case of Lenin or Stalin, or perestroika for example.
   b. On the other hand, you do need a glossary for Doctors' Plot, Great Patriotic War, Babi Yar, Iron Guard, Dimitar Peshev, Jasenovac camp or Ustashe.
3. Then please consult the Glossary List and check if the term, name already appears there with an explanation. If it is on the list, then do not write in the definition/explanation after the footnote number at the end of the document. It is the final editor's task to include all these explanations in the biography.
4. If your term, name, etc is not there, then please write a good historic definition or explanation and put it into the endnote of your biography. Please do not hesitate to consult your local administrator or historian if you need to write a definition/explanation, or use a lexicon or the internet.
5. When you create a new glossary note for a biography that you are working on, please send the new note to your coordinator, who will send it on to the editors for linguistic corrections. When the note comes back corrected, the coordinator will put it on the Glossary List and send a regular update to the interviewers.

EDITOR'S NOTE

As mentioned above, we use Editor's Note for information that is specific to a biography and is not likely to appear in many other biographies. Thus, you should put an Editor's Note for the following types of things:
- distance of a town from your city (in FSU)
- the translation of foreign (Yiddish, Hebrew, Ladino, Russian, etc.) words left in the text for 'flavor'
- the explanation of abbreviations used in the text. Example: MAV [Hungarian State Railway]
- explanation of names of certain famous people that do not necessarily appear in other biographies, for example an actor or a less important writer. Example: Katalin Karady [Hungarian actress and singer popular in the 1940s]
- clarifications that help the readers to orient themselves. One such area is newspapers, where you describe in short in the Editor’s Note what type of paper it was (political, cultural, literary, etc.), how often it appeared, and if it is relevant, if was left or right wing. Example: New York Times [a left of center daily newspaper]. Another area is the description of streets or districts, if you do not think that they need a glossary note. For example for Nevsky Prospekt, you would put in brackets [the main avenue of St Petersburg]
- short explanation of food or dishes specific to a biography

In the case of such clarifications and explanations, you do not put the words „Editor’s Note”, but simply put the explanation in [ ] brackets after the sentence where the term you explain appears. If necessary for clarity’s sake, please insert the term explained in the Editor’s Note.

Certain oral history projects have had a lot of criticism from historians for allowing material into their interviews that was historically inaccurate. When you are correcting the interviewee’s mistake in an Editor’s Note, please use the following format: [Editor’s Note: ..........]. Only in such cases you should put in the words „Editor’s Note”. We have two areas we need you to concentrate on.

**Historical Accuracy**

When your interviewee says something that you know cannot be correct, you can leave the comment in the biography but please put an Editor’s note in which you correct the mistake. For example many interviewees say that they knew about the Nazi concentration camps already in 1938-1939. This is highly unlikely so you need to state in the Editor’s note that although today, knowing the story of the Holocaust, they think they were aware of the camps already at that time but we know from historical research that news about the camps came out later and even then it was the Jewish leadership, rather than ordinary Jews, who had some knowledge of their existence. Others things we have seen are like “There were gas chambers in Terezin.” You need to add [Editor’s note: there were no gas chambers in Terezin].

**Jewish Issues**

It is quite okay if someone doesn’t know much about Jewish traditions. But if they say something in the story that you know is wrong, fix it with an editor’s note. For example, one of our interviewees said, “My parents put on their best clothes on Yom Kippur and went gambling in the synagogue.” Please add [Editor’s note: Extremely unlikely].

**TRANSLATION INTO ENGLISH**

Please coordinate the translation process with us. We have different arrangements in every city, and we are willing to pay the going rate for high quality translations. We will perhaps test more than one translator per city, looking for the best work as well as a reasonable price.
As you know, English does not have diacritical marks. Since our primary search engine will be in English, your translator must refer to the rules for your language. This will explain how to transliterate characters from your language to English, as well as Hebrew, Yiddish or Ladino words.

Please allow our native English-speaking colleagues to judge which is the best translation. What may seem perfectly acceptable to you might not meet our standards.

SCANNING

You will have to find a professional scanning company in your city. Refer to the scanning instructions on the next page, and please feel free to discuss the scanning with Dejan Petrovic (depetro@centropa.org).

Because the scans are critically important, we have to ensure a high level of scanning quality. Therefore, we want you to take a half dozen of your own family pictures (make it a mixture of old and new pictures, please) and take them to the scanner who you think will do the best job. Of course we will pay for this. Have your pictures scanned exactly to the specifications on the following page in both resolutions and burned on two CDs. One is for you to keep. Send the other one to Dejan by post for evaluation. He will contact you right away and tell you if this scanner is good enough.

WHAT TO TELL THE SCANNER

---Be sure the scanner saves the photos for you by the exact parameters you give to him. The Photo ID on the CD and Photo ID on the template MUST BE IDENTICAL AND UNIQUE (this means that you cannot just write in: 001, 002, 003 since these are clearly not unique). The Photo ID can not be longer than 8 characters.

Photos MUST be named in the following way: First two letters are country codes (Example: For Latvia LV). Third letter is the first letter of the interviewee's First Name (Example: Elina E). Letters 4 and 5 are the first 2 letters of the interviewee's Last name (Example: Falkenstein FA). Final three characters will be numbers (Example: 001). At the end, just add the file extension (.psd,.tiff or .jpg). This file extension is in addition to previous 8 characters.

So at the end the photo ID should read LVEFA001.jpg. Or to give an ID to Sarah Koppels first photo in Ukraine it will read UKSKO001.jpg. YOU MUST USE THIS ID CODE EVERY TIME YOU USE THIS PHOTO — IN THE TEMPLATE AND ON THE CD, SO BE SURE THE PERSON DOING THE SCANNING DOES THIS CONSISTENTLY.

---The scanning firm will scan the photographs in color, at 10x15 cm, 600 dpi. (each photo should be around 25Mb in size). The photos should be saved in Photoshop (PSD), .PICT or .TIFF format. This is the master file from which we will print books, magazines and other reproductions that require high resolution scans.
--The scanner should retouch, sharpen and make all necessary adjustments. He should not, however, clean any old stains or tears in the picture. We want the scans to look like the originals. For your work with the photos and templates together, you will not need such high quality scans (they eat up a lot of space and take a long time to download). Ask the scanning firm to make another folder with the photographs saved in color, 10x15 cm, 72 dpi, and saved in a JPEG, medium compressed format. With scans this size, you will navigate through FileMaker quickly and easily.

PART FOUR

ENTERING DATA

--Filling in the template

--How to make the Photo Descriptions better

FILLING OUT THE TEMPLATE

GENERAL REMARKS

We are providing you with the FileMaker software program as well as the Witness Template, into which you will enter the appropriate information. How to install FileMaker program is explained on page 17. To start using the Witness Template just drag and drop the icon from your CD into your Hard Disc.

If you still have problems with working in FileMaker templates (and you are using PC), the problem may be that it is a read-only document. To change that close the document you were working on, find the icon of that document on your Hard Disc and right click on it with your mouse. Then select properties at the bottom of the menu. A new window will open where there is a box READ-ONLY. Please deselect that box. This should solve your problems.

On this CD, you will find a folder called Samples. Open it to see a completely filled out template — sample for you to refer to. You’ll also find a completed biography as well as a completed Family Tree. Print these for reference, and use them as your models.

No need to Save with FileMaker; this program saves automatically each time you change anything.

PHOTO INFORMATION PART I

Photo information (the boxes above the photo)
All the data here concern the time the photo was taken — not data pertinent at the time of the interview.

---Family name at the time of the photo: If you have a photo of your interviewee when she was 5 years old, the family name in this field will be her original name (that is, her maiden name), not the married name she goes by today, or any other name she might have had. On the next page, you’ll enter their various name changes.

---Photo title: If there are 1-3 persons on the photo, please put in everybody’s full name in the title and their relationship to the interviewee (mention his/her full name as well). If there are more people on the photo, then write in only their relationship to the interviewee.

Example 1: for a photo of the parents of interviewee Alexander Schwarz — the photo title should be: Alexander Schwarz’s parents Shlomo and Rebeka Schwarz

Example 2: photo of the siblings and parents of interviewee Alexander Schwarz — the photo title should be: Alexander Schwarz’s relatives

---When the photo shows a girl or an unmarried woman, please use their married surname in the photo title. (Of course, you have to write their actual surname into the box “Family name at the time of the photo”)

---Photo taken in city: Please write in that name of the city as it was called at the time of the photo. So, for example, if you have a photo from present St Petersburg and the date is 1950. Please write Leningrad.

---Year or decade when photo was taken: Fill out the year the photo was taken, OR, if you do not know the exact year, fill out the decade. Do not fill out both fields!!!

---Photo ID: Photos MUST be named in the following way: First two letters are country codes (Example: For Latvia LV). Third letter is the first letter of the interviewee’s First Name (Example: Elina E). Letters 4 and 5 are the first 2 letters of the interviewee’s Last name (Example: Falkenstein FA). Final three characters will be numbers (Example: 001). At the end, just add the file extension (.jpg). This file extension is in addition to previous 8 characters. So at the end the photo ID in the Template should read LVEFA001.jpg. Please make sure you use the same number in the photo ID as the number of the file into which the photo was saved by your scanner.

---Location of primary person in photo: Fill in the location of the key person of the photo. If your interviewee is in the picture, s/he will be the key person. If s/he is not in the photo, then the person you feel is the closest to him/her. If it’s a group portrait, don’t just write “Second from left.” Write: “First row from bottom, second from left.”

---Country name today: The name of the country should be entered like it is used today, in English.

---Country name at time of the photo: When filling out this field, please pay attention to those ever-shifting borders of your own country.

---Name of the photographer/studio: Please pay attention if there is a name (or stamp) of the photographer, or photo studio, mentioned either on the front or back of the photo.

Please follow these rules concerning ‘Country name today’ in the Witness Template, Biography and Family Tree:

1. Yugoslavia between 1918-1991 was Yugoslavia. No other names please.
3. Use USSR and not Soviet Union.
ABOUT THE PHOTO

Here we would like to hear about the photo and the people on it. All photo descriptions should start with the following:
- who is on the photo
- when and where the photo was taken
- on what occasion was the photo taken (this is especially important when the photo is not a studio portrait)

Then you should ask the interviewee to describe the photo and the people on it at the time of the photo. We don’t really need to know every single aspect of their lives. If we are looking at a young woman walking down the street with her friends, our interviewers should ask:
--You were in a youth group? Then tell me about it?
--How old were you when this picture was taken? Did you have a boyfriend or girlfriend then?
--What part of town was this taken in, and what was the occasion?
--Who are those other people, and what can you tell me about them?

Of course, you can use some texts from the biography, but please always try to include at least one paragraph that really talks about the photo and the people in the photo at the time it was taken. However, please do not use too much canned information from the biography. And if you DO take text from the biography, then be sure not to put in things that are not important or relevant to this particular picture. Since the box is scrollable, you can put in as much information as you feel necessary, but please do not write more than 1.5-2 pages in an MS Word document.

Keep in mind that once we are on the web (as well as when our files are moved to archives around the world) some researchers will not read the family biographies, but look only at the pictures and read the photo descriptions. That’s why every photo description has to be as complete as possible. Since you may be taking sentences from different parts of the interview, just like in the biography, you will be doing a bit of editing. Try and keep the story flowing as you do this.

PHOTO INFORMATION PART 2

The second page of the template is divided into two halves. On the left side you are entering biographical information of the key person in the photo. On the right side of the template you should write information about the other person.

--If you have several people in the photo, the key person will either be your interviewee or the person you judge to be the closest to them;
--If you have two people in the photo, all biographical information for the second person should go in the right section of the template;
--If you have more than two people, choose the second most important person.
-- Our goal is to have personal data about the most people possible in the photos in the database. So, for example, if you have two photos with the same people on it, please vary the person whose personal data you enter on the right side of biographical information.

-- Family name: In this field you will enter the last name of the person. It is the name the person has today, or at the time of the person's death.
-- Previous family names: As you know, people change their names during their lives, most often because they get married, and sometimes for various other reasons (for example to have a more 'national' sounding and less Jewish name). Please enter all names, the reason for the change (marriage, assimilation, adoption, etc.), and the date or decade when this was done.
-- Occupation: For this field we have made a pull down menu with the list of occupations that you must use. There are two different lists, one for 'occupation before WWII' and one for 'occupation after WWII'. In these two fields you must choose one of the offered choices, you cannot edit this menu and add any new categories. Starting from page 100 you will find a prewar and postwar occupation list in which you can find various jobs under the broad categories that appear in the template. When you are not sure how to categorize a particular job, please consult this list. If the occupation you need to categorize is not on the list, please contact Eszter and Dora.

HOLOCAUST RELATED:
-- Be sure to fill out the field 'died before', if the key person in the photo was already dead.
-- The field 'During Holocaust in' is a pop-up menu. You have two fields here—one lists the type of place they were in (ghetto, concentration camp, death march, etc) and the field next to it asks for the specific place (Auschwitz, etc.). We prefer you to write the name of the settlement in or near which the person was, but if you do not know it, or the person was constantly on the move (on a death march, traveling to a place of evacuation in the USSR), then please try to indicate at least the country. Please list each important stage of the person's Holocaust experience in separate lines, this is why we have 5 lines here.
-- In the field 'Died where' try to be as specific as possible, and fill it out only if the person died during the Holocaust. If you don't know the exact place of the person's death, try to at least indicate the country if possible.
-- For 'Liberated from', note that we ask for the description of the place as well as the name (concentration camp/Auschwitz, ghetto/Terezin, death march/Volary). If you don't know the exact place where a person was liberated, try to at least indicate the country if possible.

INFORMATION ABOUT INTERVIEWEES:
-- The name of the person you interview is entered in the fields 'Last name', 'First name' and must be written in the same way as at the top of the biography.
-- The person you are interviewing must sign the contract explained on page 22. Please check the necessary field for it.

INFORMATION ABOUT SIMILAR PROJECTS:
Please fill out the information if the person you are interviewing was interviewed before.
LIST OF OCCUPATIONS BEFORE WWII

Accountant/Bookkeeper

Actor

Artist
  - sculptor
  - painter
  - theatrical producer

Businessman, Retail merchant
  - shopkeeper/shop owner (all kinds of shops)
  - merchant/trader in all kinds of merchandise (food, wine, textile, coal, wood, commodities, etc.)
  - retailer
  - tavern owner
  - innkeeper
  - businessman
  - business agent

Cantor
  - hazzan/cantor

Civil servant
  - higher clerical positions in state-owned institutions (firms, factories, the railway, the post, public transportation, etc.)

Dental technician
  - dental technician
  - dental assistant

Dentist

Doctor
  - doctor
  - physician
  - neuropathologist
  - therapist

Employed by craftsman
  - employees of any kind of workshop
  - assistants and apprentices of any kind of self-employed craftsmen
  - car mechanic
  - cook
Empty space for profession if the person is
  - baby
  - child
  - schoolboy/schoolgirl
  - pupil

Factory owner
  - owner of larger factory, mills, land

Farmer
  - peasant
  - day-man
  - navvy
  - collective farm worker
  - peasant holder

Housewife

Jewish community employee
  - shammash (shames)
  - donation collector
  - employee of the community
  - prayer leader
  - community secretary

Journalist/editor
  - journalist
  - journal/newspaper editor
  - literary editor
  - broadcaster
  - editor
  - reporter
  - photographer for newspapers, journals, news agencies

Landowner

Lawyer

Lower-level public employee
  - lower clerical positions
  - ticket controller in public transportation, bus, train, etc.
  - postman
  - postal attendant
  - manual workers (street cleaners, train cleaners, stoker, luggage porter, carrier, railroad workers, etc.)

Manager (in banks, all kinds of companies and firms, offices, warehouses, etc.)
  - executive
  - chief
- manager
- director

**Manual laborer**
- all kinds of personal services (nanny, housemaid, butler, porter, person who opens gates on railway station or at hotel, etc.)
- Industrial worker
- workers, factory workers, laborers, foremen in all types of factories

**Military**
- soldier
- officer
- navy officer
- professional soldier
- sailor

**Musician**
- musician
- opera singer
- violinist
- folk musician

**Office clerk**
- articled clerk
- bank clerk
- cashier
- telegraphist
- secretary
- typist

**Pharmacist**

**Professional**
- architect
- biologist
- economist

**Rabbi**

**Religious teacher**
- religion teacher
- melamed

**Retail clerk**
- shop assistant in all kinds of shops and trading firms
- salesman/saleswoman, seller
- commercial traveler/agent
- real estate broker
- company agent
Self-employed craftsman in elite crafts
- goldsmith
- silversmith
- jeweler
- watchmaker
- printer/print shop owner
- carter, lithographer
- photographer
- owner/co-owner of car repair shop
- beautician
- building contractor
- funerary entrepreneur

Self-employed craftsman in non-elite crafts
- craftsmen in food manufacturing (wine grower, butcher, confectioner, baker, etc.)
- craftsmen in clothes manufacturing (tailor, dressmaker, seamstress, needlewoman, shoemaker, cobbler, furrier, etc.)
- craftsmen in manufacturing everyday accessories (bag, suitcase, gloves, umbrella, etc. makers)
- craftsmen in building and construction (e.g. carpenter, tinsmith, locksmith, mason, bricklayer, house painter, upholsterer, glazier, etc.)
- joiner, cabinet-maker
- coachman
- blacksmith
- cleaner, window cleaner
- gardener
- barber
- electrician
- weaver

Shoeshet

Teacher
- all kinds of teachers (except religious teacher, melamed) in all kinds of schools
- all kinds of private teachers
- directors of educational institutions (school principal, university rector, dean, etc.)

Technician/engineer
- engineers of all kinds
- zoo technicinn

Translator

University student

Veterinarian

Writer
- writer/author
- playwright

LIST OF OCCUPATIONS AFTER WWII

Accountant/Bookkeeper

Artist
- sculptor
- painter

Assistant in health care
- dental technician
- dental assistant
- hospital nurse
- physical therapist

Businessman, Retail merchant
- shopkeeper/shop owner (all kinds of shops)
- merchant/trader in all kinds of merchandise (food, wine, textile, coal, wood, commodities, etc.)
- retailer
- tavern owner
- innkeeper
- businessman
- business agent
- entrepreneur

Cantor
- hazzan/cantor

Civil servant
- higher clerical positions in state-owned institutions (firms, factories, the railway, the post, public transportation, etc.)

Departmental head/manager in socialist firms
- higher clerical positions in socialist institutions (firms, factories, the railway, the post, public transportation, etc.)

Doctor
- doctor
- physician
- neuropathologist
- therapist
- anaesthesiologist
- dentist
- obstetrician
ophthalmologist
veterinarian

Empty space for profession if the person is
- baby
- child
- schoolboy/schoolgirl
- pupil

Factory owner
- owner of larger factory, mills, land

Farmer
- peasant
- collective farm worker (kolhoz)

Housewife

Jewish community employee
- shammash (shames)
- donation collector
- community employee
- prayer leader
- community secretary

Journalist/editor
- journalist
- journal/newspaper editor
- literary editor
- broadcaster
- editor
- reporter
- photographer for newspapers, journals, news agencies

Landowner

Lawyer

Lower-level public employee
- lower clerical positions
- ticket controller in public transportation, bus, train, etc.
- postman
- postal attendant
- manual workers (street cleaners, train cleaners, stoker, luggage porter, carrier, railroad workers, etc.)

Manager (in banks, all kinds of companies and firms, offices, warehouses, etc.)
- executive
- chief
- manager
- director

**Manual laborer**
- all kinds of personal services (nanny, housemaid, butler, porter, person who opens gates on railway station or at hotel, etc.)
- Industrial worker
- workers, factory workers, laborers, foremen in all types of factories

**Military**
- soldier
- officer
- navy officer
- professional soldier
- sailor

**Musician**
- musician
- opera singer
- violinist
- folk musician
- music score copier

**Office clerk**
- articled clerk
- bank clerk
- cashier
- telegraphist
- secretary
- typist

**Party official**

**Professional sportsman**
- chess player/champion
- trainer

**Rabbi**

**Religious teacher**
- religion teacher
- melanized

**Retail clerk**
- shop assistant in all kinds of shops and trading firms
- salesman/saleswoman
- commercial agent/agent
- real estate broker
- company agent
Shochet

Skilled self-employed
- all those people who knew some craft and who did not work in a socialist factory or
firm but either on their own or in small co-ops.

Teacher/Professor
- all kinds of teachers (except religious teacher, melamed) in all kinds of schools
- all kinds of private teachers
- directors of educational institutions (school principal, university rector, dean, etc.)

University/postgraduate student

Worked in Theater
- theatrical producer
- theatre director
- actor
- dramatist

Working in natural and technical sciences
- architect
- biologist
- economist
- mathematician
- physicist
- engineers of all types
- technicians of all types
- agronomist
- agricultural technician
- pharmacist
- programmer
- scientist

Working in the humanities
- museologist
- librarian
- archivist
- social scientist
- researcher in social sciences and humanities
- sociologist
- psychologist
- translator

Writer
- writer/author
- playwright
DOCUMENTS
--If you have a document and not a photo, the person who appears in the
document will be your key person. Fill in all information accordingly.
--In the ‘About the photo’ field, describe what the document is about when it was used,
etc., but do not translate the document word for word. Of course, do not
forget to use your interviewee’s words. You can give clarifications and
explanations to the document, just make sure to use [ ] parenthesis for your own
explanations.

KEYWORDS
--Future researchers, and the search engine on our website, depend on what you enter for
keywords. So, the more keywords you can find that fit the photo or document, the better.
Please take your time to think about all categories in the keywords that fit the given
photo/document.
--In each big subject box you can tick several small boxes. For example in
portraits of a people and under religious figures, you should mark someone as a rabbi,
and also mark him as people dressed in Orthodox fashion under ‘special categories’;
--Be careful to use the appropriate keywords, as there is one set for photos and one for
documents.

There are two pages for keywords so please pay attention to that and look at both part one
and part two.

Remember: if you have any suggestions for improving the template, please contact us.

Add interviewee to your list

Please use the excel sheet that is included on the CD to make a list of your interviewees
listing their name, address, etc. See page 18 for more information.

PART FIVE
COMPLETING YOUR PROJECT
--How to organize your material
--What to send to Vienna office and when
--Payment and expenses

SENDING YOUR MATERIAL
You will email the Biography and the Family Tree to Eszter and Dora and their team (budapest@centropa.org). Send them in MS Word as attachments. They will review them both, and if they have questions, they will make their comments in red, and email them back to you. Please review their comments, make the adjustments and return the material to them. If necessary, they will repeat the process.

After Eszter and Dora and their team have accepted your Biography and Family Tree you can send them your filled out template. Please do not complete the templates (especially the 'About the photo' field before the revised biography was accepted, otherwise the canned texts from the Biography will not be correct) and do not send them to Budapest before the final version of the Biography and the Tree has been accepted by Eszter and Dora and their team.

Sending complete templates by email is not easy, since they take up quite a bit of space. Also, receiving them can sometimes be a problem because their own mailbox is limited in size. Please divide them up into files about one megabyte (1Mb) in size (this is usually 4-6 pictures & templates) and send them to Eszter and Dora and their team one by one.

If you can’t figure out how to do this, just email Eszter or Dora and their team and they will walk you through it. If it still doesn’t work, no problem — just send it to them on a CD-ROM by registered post!

WHAT YOU’LL SEND TO OUR VIENNA OFFICE

For each interviewee, you will send by registered post the following to Centropa headquarters:
--The signed contract between the interviewee and Centropa (see page 22)
--The tapes with the interview on them
--The excel sheet (you can find it on your CD under interviewees, see page 18)
--The expense reports together with all receipts/invoices for your expense (see page 116)
--One CD containing the following material:
  --Folder with Family Biography
  --Folder with Family Tree
  --Folder with Templates
  --Folder with Transcribed interview
  --Folder with the photos — this folder needs to have two subfolders with the photos saved in two different resolutions
    --Photos saved in the resolution of 72 dpi, in RGB format
    (this is the one you enter in your templates)
    --Photos saved in the resolution of 600 dpi in RGB format

Please look at the example of the folder structure on next page. Each CD MUST have the same structure.

VERY IMPORTANT: Since we are using Apple Macintosh computers in our Vienna office it is very important that you burn your CDs in the right way. You MUST burn them in ISO 9660/Joliet format.
MONEY MATTERS

Centropa will reimburse you for expenses related to the interviews and agreed upon with the Budapest office. These include the cost of transportation to another city if your interviewee lives there and the cost of tapes, batteries, postage, the small present to interviewee, photocopying. Please contact Eszter or Dora before you undertake a journey that will last more than two days and present a budget to us for transportation, hotels, meals.

Be sure to save every receipt and that means you must ASK for every invoice.

On the interviewer's CD in the folder ‘Money matters’ you will find two documents: ‘Summary’ and ‘Fees and services’. The summary statement is exactly what it sounds like — a summary of ALL the expenses you are submitting. It includes all your office supply bills, your taxis, transcribers, etc etc. In other words, it is a list that we can look over and get the full picture. Always fill it in and be sure there is a total at the bottom.

Behind this summary statement you must have all the original receipts, or ‘Fees and services’ forms that you filled out for translators, transcribers, interviewers, etc.

On the summary statement, you will find a column where we have written ‘receipt number.’ Please mark in this column 1, 2, 3, 4, etc. And then we want you to mark those same numbers, 1, 2, 3, 4, etc on all the original invoices AND the ‘Fees and Services’ forms that you are sending in— so we can match them up together.

Finally, on every invoice please be sure that you mark — IN RED IF POSSIBLE— the total amount and the date.

Remember that Centropa operates on public funding from Austria, and we have to account for every penny spent through official receipts. If you buy a tape recorder and do not provide an official receipt, we cannot reimburse you.

Centropa’s policy is to pay once per month, after we receive your completed monthly expense reports. You will decide with our bookkeeping department how to obtain cash to cover your fees and expenses: with a Centropa bank card, a direct bank transfer, or through one of our local partners.

ALL PHOTOGRAPHS FROM CENTROPA ARCHIVES.
TEXT FOR ‘INTERVIEWER’S WORKBOOK’ BY
ESZTER ANDOR, DORA SARDI, NICOLE JÁVOR AND EDWARD SEROTTA.
DESIGNED BY DEJAN PETROVIC.
Translation of the questionnaire distributed to residents of Prague.

[Introduction on the front of the questionnaire]
My name is Michèle Harrison and I am a doctoral student at the University of Sussex in Brighton, England. I am doing research on the Czechoslovak First Republic. I focus on feelings and ideas associated with the concept of "home" during this period from 1918 to 1939. I would be grateful if you would answer the questions on the form, and sent this to me in the enclosed envelope to the address at my university. The published (final) version of my work will not include personal information and my university undertakes and requires that we carry out ethical research that offers anonymity to people who provide information if they wish.

Questions

a) basic biographical information (your name or the name that you want to use) (current age) (gender) (Occupation)

i) the occupation of both parents
ii) the number of family members
iii) where did the family live?
iv) in what type of housing (villa, apartment, etc.) + size and age of housing
v) a description of your neighbourhood
vi) a description of the style of the house / apartment (decoration, furniture, etc., external appearance)
vi) how long did you / your family live in this house / apartment
viii) Your ages at the time

b) what made your home "homely"?

i) Please describe an everyday routine (to come home, dinner or anything else)
ii) Please note what was considered the private space
iii) Please note what was considered the public space
iv) What did you do in preparation for welcoming guests and family
v) Please tell me about your feelings associated with home
vi) What circumstances required you to move to another house / apartment?
vii) Have you ever moved?
(Dalsi/extra page – [open for any other information])
At Home in Prague: 
Representations of Home 
in the Czechoslovakian Interwar
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