

BETWEEN BEING “INDISPUTABLY WESTERNERS” AND THE MENACING “TRANSATLANTIC VENOM”

THE NOTION OF THE “WEST” IN DISCUSSIONS OF CONCEPTS OF EUROPE AND THE FIRST REPUBLIC

FLORIAN RUTTNER

“Laszlo: Play the Marseillaise! Play it!”⁶¹

I. With these words, the Czechoslovak resistance fighter Victor Laszlo urges in a pivotal scene of Michael Curtiz’s famous antifascist movie “*Casablanca*” (1942) the music band in Rick’s Café to strike up the “*Marseillaise*”, in order to drown out a group of German soldiers who are singing the German nationalist song “*Die Wacht am Rhein*”. As the fiery tunes of the French anthem succeed in inspiring the patron’s enthusiasm and the bar chimes in, the German soldiers have to abandon their singing. The aroused masses end their song with cheers to the French republic and to democracy, which let the Germans resort to more repressive means of quelling the menacing uprising by closing the café. In the movie, the rivalry of the two songs symbolizes of course the struggle of two conceptions of state and society: On the one hand, the Western democratic idea, on the other hand a German *völkisch* tradition of nationalism, which was not only always characterized by a rejection of the former, but also prepared the grounds for German national socialism.

Presumably unbeknownst to *Casablanca*’s screenwriters, a similar rivalry of the two songs took place in the pubs, theaters, and ballrooms of Prague, during the Franco-Prussian War of 1870. These events were interpreted in a similar way as in the movie. About 70 years after they occurred, and a year after the movie’s release, German propaganda remembered them and used them for its purposes. In his

1 Epstein, Julius J. – Epstein, Philipp G. – Koch, Howard: *Casablanca*. <https://thescriptlab.com/wp-content/uploads/scripts/Casablanca.pdf>, 7. 8. 2023, p. 113.

concoction “*Der große Irrweg der Tschechen*” (The Czech’s Great Aberration), to the German writer Oskar Ullrich, this musical rivalry gives evidence of his thesis that, as early as the late 19th century, the Czech idea of the state had been oriented westwards, towards the classic Western models of the French and the American Revolution, and thus against the German nation. Based on articles in the newspaper “*Národní listy*”, Ullrich recreates the events and the mood of the time: During the war of 1870/1871, German national enthusiasm found expression in song and created “a people’s anthem ‘*Die Wacht am Rhein*’”, which was sung “everywhere in the range between North Sea and the Alps”.² But, of course, there were spoilsports: “Only in innermost Bohemia and Moravia unexpectedly another tune emerged: the ‘*Marseillaise*!’”, which soon was to be converted into a “Czech battle-hymn against the Germans”.³ Thus, heated arguments and brawls between German speaking and Czech speaking patrons over which song should be played and sung ensued in Prague. While the Prussian and its satellite’s armies were victorious on the battlefields against the French Empire and later the French Republic, in Prague, according to the articles Ullrich is quoting, the supporters of the *Marseillaise* prevailed. On the 25th of January 1871, the newspaper reported: “The day before yesterday, in the same pub [the beer parlor *Loetsch am Graben*] a brisk quarrel ensued again between some ‘Greater Germans’ from Prague on the one, and friends of the of the French Republic on the other side. The musicians had already received money in order to play the ‘*Wacht am Rhein*’ – but against this such bitter opposition erupted, that the musicians had to return the money and the ‘*Wacht am Rhein*’ could not be played”.⁴ Ullrich resumes: “The Czechs saw it as an indispensable avowal of their Czech-national views to play the ‘*Marseillaise*’ at public events, while the ‘*Wacht am Rhein*’ as an avowal of Germandom was decried, its performance in Bohemia and Moravia being framed by the Czechs as a crime unheard of, which was even stigmatized in the press”.⁵

For Ullrich, this proves once and for all that the Czech(oslovak) national project from its outset was a Western oriented one, and that “the whole of the Czech nation had already embarked in 1870/71, zealous and fully aware, on the great historical aberration, which led her, according to Palacký and based on this Czech historian’s myth, to an always sharper opposition and finally to open hostility towards the German nation”.⁶

2 Ullrich, Oskar: *Der große Irrweg der Tschechen*. Prag 1943, p. 327. All translations are by the author.

3 Tamtéž.

4 Idem, p. 329. *Národní listy*, No 24, 25. 1. 1871, p. 2.

5 Ullrich, O.: *Irrweg der Tschechen*, p. 329.

6 Idem.

This example already shows that the notion of the “West” was hotly debated, charged with meaning and that these debates served as a frame for political and national identification. The following paper aims to explore some of these discussions during the First Republic and the German occupation. The two quotes in the paper’s title form two extreme poles of this discussion in the 1930s and stem from different national camps. By discussing these notions and analyzing their implications, this paper aspires to highlight the ideological content and function of this notion in the respective discourse. Especially the connection between a resentment against the West and antisemitism will be scrutinized in a case study.

II. Before going into detail, some general considerations regarding the notion of the “West” are in place. It is noteworthy, that the way this notion is formulated by an author or by a group, is telling more about the self-perception of this person or group than about the actual countries that are considered to pertain to the West, the countries of the classical liberal revolutions, England, the United States of America, and France. Thus, in his essay on the phenomenon of anti-Americanism, the historian Dan Diner underscores that this “*resentment seems not to be about certainly reasonable doubts about certain objectionable positions or policies of the United States, but rather seems to be the result of a warped explanation of the world, an affective rationalization of what is not understood in society.*”⁷ This way, it is characterized as a “hostile reaction to modernity, caused by fear.”⁸ All ideas and social changes that seem threatening towards the traditional way of life and the own in-group is projected on the West. This also implies that different traditions, different defining narratives of certain groups, react differently and give their projected picture of the West a distinctive touch. For nation states, the way the affiliation to the nation and its tradition are defined, impacts also the notion of the West. Diner points out: “*Anti-Americanism in Germany differs in certain aspects from the hostility towards the United States, which can be found in the classical countries of the West like England or France. From a German point of view, the USA not only stand solely for America, but for the ‘West’ as such, against which hostile traditions within German political culture formed during the 19th century.*”⁹ Against the liberal, civic nationalism of the West, an allegedly ‘deeper’ and more organic tribal nationalism is imagined. These two ideas differ in many respects, one important is the respective relation between individual and collective. In the Ernest Renan’s classical lecture on the question “*What Is a Nation?*”, the French scholar famously coins the metaphor of the “*nation’s existence*” as a “*daily plebiscite*”,¹⁰ thus binding back the nation to the individual’s will,

7 Diner, Dan: Feindbild Amerika. Über die Beständigkeit eines Ressentiments. München 2002, p. 8.

8 Idem, p. 9.

9 Idem, p. 39.

10 Renan, Ernest: “*What Is a Nation?*” In: *Becoming National: A Reader*. Oxford 1996, p. 41–55.

while rejecting theories that base nation in religion, language, geography or race. Especially in the latter is criticized as a regression of sociology to “zoology”.¹¹ Against these ideas, which are of course with their focus on the individual and equality connected to modern ideas, the tribal or “*völkisch*” notion of the nation always presupposes in the words of Carl Schmitt a pre-political “*homogeneity*”, that is necessary to form national identity, which includes “ – *if the need arises* – “the “*elimination or eradication of heterogeneity*”.¹²

Hannah Arendt as well underscored this difference between these two types of nationalism quite clearly and pointed out the more problematic nature of tribal nationalism. Even when the civic nationalism, based on Renan’s idea, was driven to its chauvinistic extremes, there was still a difference in comparison to the tribal nationalism, based on so called pan movements, which aimed to unite the ethnically defined members in one community, regardless of their statehood: “*This new type of tribal nationalism, more or less characteristic of all Central and Eastern European nations and nationalities, was quite different in content and significance – though not in violence – from Western nationalist excesses. [...] Chauvinist mystique still points to something that really existed in the past [...] and merely tries to elevate this into a realm beyond human control; tribalism, on the other hand, starts from non-existent pseudomystical elements which it proposes to realize fully in the future. [...] Politically speaking, tribal nationalism always insists that its own people are surrounded by ‘a world of enemies,’ ‘one against all,’ that a fundamental difference exists between this people and all others, and denies theoretically the very possibility of a common mankind long before it is used to destroy the humanity of man*”.¹³

This rejection of universalism and disdain towards the individual makes the tribal pan movements more dangerous and more inclined for a demonization of the West.

III. Although Arendt states that tribal nationalism was the prevailing form in Central and Eastern Europe, she also notes one exception, most interestingly not in the English, but only in the German edition of her book on the origins of total domination: The Czechs, who “*were indeed the most ‘Western’ nation in Eastern Europe*”.¹⁴ She refers to Tomáš Garrigue Masaryk, who already in his critique of tribal Pan-Slavism wrote contemptuously wrote of its “*zoological nationalism*” and “*zoological patriotism*”,¹⁵ echoing Renan’s views.

11 Idem, p. 48.

12 Schmitt, Carl: *The Crisis of Parliamentary Democracy*. Cambridge 2000, p. 9.

13 Arendt, Hannah: *The Origins of Totalitarianism*. San Diego 1973, p. 226.

14 Arendt, Hannah: *Elemente und Ursprünge totaler Herrschaft. Antisemitismus, Imperialismus, Totalitarismus*. München 1986, p. 481.

15 Masaryk, Tomáš Garrigue: *Russland und Europa. Studien über die geistigen Strömungen in Russland*. Jena 1913, p. 257.

But as well Edvard Beneš, one of the co-founders of the First Czechoslovak Republic and serving her for long years as foreign minister and later as president, often underscored the connection between Western ideas and the ideals of the Czechoslovak Republic. In a discussion with French intellectuals, he outlined his view quite clearly: “Primarily we are indisputably Westerners. Over the centuries, we have been in opposition against the Germans, the Austrians, so that by instinct we turned towards France and the West. Then, in the 19th century, our national renaissance originated in the ideology of the French revolution. We have been nurtured for 150 years by the ideology of the Western democracies”.¹⁶ Apart from the fact that the foundation and existence of the Czechoslovak Republic was of course closely connected to the Versailles treaty, with the French Republic and the United Kingdom as its main guarantors, thus giving the Czechoslovak foreign policy practical reasons to be interested in good relations, Beneš also underscored a deeper, more philosophical connection between the West and his country. Consequently, in his more theoretical writings, Beneš included the United States as well in what he saw as the Western project of democratization, drawing a panorama of great minds that serve as his political guides: “The French revolutionary Sieyès became through his well-known opus ‘What is the Third Estate?’ [...] one of the most distinguished pioneers of nascent democracy. On the other side of the ocean, it was Thomas Paine with his opus ‘Common Sense’, ‘Rights of Man’ and ‘Age of Reason’; I mention him especially because of his theoretical work, without forgetting the practical feats of the great pioneers of freedom and democracy, Washington, Benjamin Franklin, John Adams and especially Jefferson”.¹⁷

It is of course not a coincidence that Beneš mentions Paine in such a prominent role. Paine, who was on the left wing of the founding fathers was close to Beneš’s own political stance. Quite radical and quite early proposals for social reforms, as they are expounded in Paine’s “Agrarian Justice” are akin to what nowadays might be called an unconditional basic income: Paine proposed to “create a National Fund, out of which there shall be paid to every person, when arrived at the age of twenty-one years, the sum of fifteen pounds sterling, as a compensation in part, for the loss of his or her natural inheritance, by the introduction of the system of landed property”.¹⁸

While it is not possible here to go into the details, this shows that the critical view of the United States and the West on the left, which was since the early 1920s often coupled with a dogmatized anti-imperialism, was not uncontested. Diner

16 Beneš, Edvard: *Gedanke und Tat*. Band 3. Prag 1937, p. 13.

17 Beneš, Edvard: *Demokratie heute und morgen*. Zürich 1944, ps. 21.

18 Paine, Thomas: *Agrarian Justice*. In: *Complete Works of Thomas Paine*, Hastings 2018, s. 1509–1535.

mentions among the reformists Karl Kautsky¹⁹, one could add that also among the nondogmatic radical currents activists like Rudolf Rocker, an anarcho-syn-dicalist, who praised Paine as one the “*Pioneers of American Freedom*”. Rocker wrote a book with this title, in which he aims to show that the proponents of the American anarchist movement are “*deeply rooted and nurtured in the history and traditions of their country. For this reason, they regarded their ideas as a logical extension and development of those traditions*”.²⁰

To sum up, it is safe to say that the discourse on the West in the upper tiers (and presumably not only there) of the First Czechoslovak Republic was a very sympathetic one which was free of hostility. On the contrary, the republic was seen as a part of the West, as Beneš’s statements show. The Czech historian Jaroslav Hroch goes so far to claim Beneš’s contributions “*not only by his actions as statesman, but also by his philosophical and political thought helped energetically to found the ideal, moral and cultural values of Masaryk’s republic, which was without any doubt between the two World Wars one of the most democratic countries not only in Central and Eastern Europe, but also in the whole Western civilization*”,²¹ emphasizing how embedded the Czechoslovak Republic was and is still seen in the Western camp.

IV. This positive attitude towards the West in the Czechoslovak Republic did not go unnoticed by her enemies, and in the propaganda against her, resentment against the West played a major part from the outset, often mingled with antisemitism. The affinity between resentment against the West and antisemitism is no coincidence, of course: Both ideologies share the rejection of the as negative perceived sides of modernity and their projection on a culprit who is to blame. While the two ideologies are not identical, and as history has shown antisemitism has the greater destructive potential, often the boundaries between the two become blurry.

As modern antisemitism in Germany was enkindled by the fact that during the 19th century the Jews were emancipated and became citizens with equal rights, the German nationalist view on the Czechoslovak Republic focused on the legally enshrined Western ideal of equality. Alfred Rosenberg, one of the leading national socialist ideologues, already pointed at this in his commentary on the antisemitic forgery of the “*Protocols of the Elders of Zion*”. For him, out of “*the doctrine of the equality of humans arose the sinister triad of words, of which still today only*

19 Cf. Diner, D.: *Feindbild Amerika*, p. 71.

20 Rocker, Rudolf: *Pioneers of American Freedom. Origin of Liberal and Radical Thought in America*, New York 1949, p. 155–156.

21 Hroch, Jaroslav: *Filosofie Edvarda Beneše a hodnoty Masarykovy republiky. Živé hodnoty Masarykova Československa*. Brno 2009, p. 101–105.

few know how much misery it caused in the minds of millions: Freedom, Equality, Fraternity”.²² The modern Western state is for Rosenberg an abomination because while claiming to be nation state on the outside, “domestically, racial differences are not recognized and a formal notion of citizenship is being preferred over the protection of race and the people [Rassen- und Volksschutz]”.²³ Consequently, the foundation of the Czechoslovak Republic, which emphasized this formal notion of citizenship, was for Rosenberg “without any question” a “remarkable and not refutable example for the manner, the power and the success of the all-Jewish scheming [...]. Here the national Czech element joins forces with Jewish subversion”.²⁴

This division between Western nationalism and völkisch nationalism later, during times of the protectorate, gave birth to the trope of an allegedly “healthy national movement”, which was abused and led astray by “internationalist/masonic/Jewish” forces. This was, of course, not purely ideological motivated, but as well the practical attempt of the occupying force to split the Czech resp. Czechoslovak national movement and (for the time being) induce the ‘healthy’, that is pro-German, part to collaborate. However, the reasoning is also in line with the resentment against the West. One of the best examples of this trope can be found a pamphlet of the high-ranking SS officer in the Sicherheitsdienst (SD) Walter Jacobi. In 1942, he uses the allegory of the golem for the Czech national movement, which is transformed into a spineless tool of the West’s machinations: “Thus the Czech Maffia, a few years after the World War, ended in the claws of the Great-Orient of France. With this, the promoters of the Czech resistance during the World War sold themselves to the ideologically and morally fragile world of the West, which immunized Czech nationalism in the coming years from all healthy impulses. It was mortgaged and the recent past showed the political interest to be paid”.²⁵

One can safely say that the notion of the West played an important role not only in the self-perception of the Czechoslovak Republic, but also in the image that its opponents evoked. In the latter case, the notion was tainted by resentment against the West and modernity, and was charged with antisemitism. This overlap between resentment against the West and antisemitism will be the focus of the next part. In a case study, it will be discussed how the resentment can be radicalized to blatant antisemitism.

22 Rosenberg, Alfred: Die Protokolle der Weisen von Zion und die jüdische Weltpolitik. München 1923, p. 28.

23 Idem, p. 29.

24 Idem, p. 32.

25 Jacobi, Walter: Golem ... Geißel der Tschechen. Die Zersetzung des tschechischen Nationalismus. Prag 1942, p. 55.

V. The case of Emil Franzel (1901–1976) is interesting insofar as shows the potential of radicalization, that slumbers within the resentment against the West. A short overview of Franzel’s life and intellectual trajectory gives proof of his variegated views.²⁶ Born near Duchov in 1901, he was a Bohemian German, who later studied at the German University in Prague and at the University of Vienna history, and was influenced by his nationalist academic teacher Hans Hirsch. After his studies, from the mid-1920s to the mid-1930s, Franzel served as a party intellectual for the German Social Democratic Worker’s Party in the Czechoslovak Republic, but then, when the rise of nationalist and national socialist tendencies prompted a crisis of the party in the 30s, he became the mouthpiece and thought leader of a current called People’s Socialism [Volkssozialismus]. While this current consisted of several sub-currents which tried to react differently to the social and political situation, Franzel’s version went strongly to the right, embracing nationalism and glorifying medieval times and the idea of the empire [Reich], which deemed him a harbinger of a future society.

In his most important book on this issue, *“The Revolution of the Occident”*,²⁷ he expounds this idea of reconciling national, tribal ideas with socialist ones by reviving the idea of the medieval empire. In doing so, he conjures the image of the West and of America as the big antagonist of the European Reich, as a superficial civilization as opposed to the ‘deep’ culture of the Europeans. His diatribes can be read as a confirmation of what has been discussed above as the difference relation of civic and tribal nationalism towards the West: *“Britons and Frenchmen are, thanks to their old bourgeois history, way better immunized against the transatlantic venom. Germans and Italians, who only recently jumped from feudalism into capitalism, and who still have to carry the burden of latifundia, Junkers and similar remnants of feudalism, will be the first to be tainted – and most gravely so – by Americanism”*.²⁸

Franzel’s resentment against the West predominantly is anti-American, as the United States are for him the current standard bearer of the West and the hotbed of modernism: *“The most peculiar and menacing development can be seen in the relation between Europe and America. [...] [America] is the pure culture for the germ of bourgeois world view [...] on which it can thrive unbridled and can present*

26 For a more detailed biography, see Keller, Thomas: Emil Franzel (1901–1976). Biografie eines sudetendeutschen Intellektuellen. Hamburg 2012.

27 The German notion ‘Abendland’, here translated as occident, is in itself an interesting construction which has different undertones than the English translation. While occident can be used as a synonym for the Western world, ‘Abendland’ focused more on the continental, Christian-Catholic Europe and serves as an antonym to the West.

28 Franzel, Emil: *Abendländische Revolution. Geist und Schicksal Europas*. Bratislava, 1936, p. 209.

itself to the eye of the beholder at its finest”.²⁹ The alleged lack of history in America, the absence of traditions, combined with the rise to power of the United States in the 20th century are for Franzel a nearly apocalyptic menace that threatens to destroy Europe and its culture: “[S]uch a continent outstrips Europe, [...] it shows the old world her own picture in a magnifying mirror, which distorts the picture in a grotesque way. It carries a germ of deadly virulence, that was mutated there, back to the organism from whence it originated, but which is bound to die, receiving now an intensified poison”.³⁰

It is important to note that this book was written in a phase in which Franzel deemed himself still an antifascist. But exactly in the resentment against the West, the transition towards more radical right-wing positions is prepared. In his worldview, he goes so far to split national socialism in two: From one part, the classical tribal and *völkisch* thought, the roots of national socialism can be salvaged and used for the future, while the other part, Hitler’s mass party, is itself painted as an excess of the West: “*The precursors of German national socialism still knew the danger. Their orientation was towards the East, they sought support of Asia’s old cultures and old family of peoples against the West, which pressed the occident*”.³¹ Franzel only criticizes that these early national socialists were more concerned with France than with the USA, in Franzel’s racist words they saw the danger “*more in the French “negroization” [“Vernegerung”] than in the yankeeization [Yankeesierung] of Germany*”.³²

In contrast, the mass movement of national socialism is seen as well as a result Western influences: “*Then, extremely fast, the conservative camp in Germany became bourgeois, national socialism as mass movement of petty bourgeois and as militant organization of the déclassé buried the conservative roots of a national, German socialism with its European attitude. The dilettantism of Alfred Rosenberg, proclaimed loudly by the loudspeaker of Hitler’s rhetoric and injected by the wiliness of Goebbel’s deceit into the people, all the more drew the German masses into the maelstrom of Westernization, of Americanization. The loudness, the blatantness, the extravagatness, the mass display [...] but also the zeal to level, to bring into line, to standardize, [...] all of this is not just ‘bourgeois’ as is all mass politics and mass organization since the French Revolution, but it is already American and proves every day by the poverty of its phantasy, that we have reached the end of an epoch, which began by the discovery of America by Columbus. America discovered us*”.³³

29 Franzel, Emil: *Abendländische Revolution. Geist und Schicksal Europas*. Bratislava, 1936, p. 202.

30 Idem, p. 203.

31 Idem, p. 209.

32 Idem.

33 Idem, p. 210.

All the modern moments of national socialism are projected on the West and condemned, while the tribal, völkisch moments are saved by this ideological maneuver. This division made it possible for Franzel, when he dissociated from Social Democracy, to start a collaboration with Otto Strasser, one of these early proponents of national socialism.³⁴

But his collaboration did not stop here: After the occupation of the Czechoslovakia, Franzel worked for German propaganda. He started to teach history at the police academy of the Protectorate and wrote articles for different police journals and newspapers. Franzel's biographer, Thomas Keller, suggests that the ideological common ground for this was "*ardent anticommunism*".³⁵ But I would argue that it was more the resentment against the West, mixed with antisemitism the eased this transition.

Anticommunism, while playing a role as well in Franzel's pre-protectorate writings, never is his central point of critique. He even sees Bolshevik communism – similar to national socialism – as an excess of the West. While deploring how the Americanism taints peoples in Europa until now untouched by Western thought, he notes that the Russians are among these victims as well, adding: "*(B) ut that is of secondary importance for us, insofar as by the detour of Moscow's communism the American demon [Ungeist] also enters Europe from the east*".³⁶ While the modern aspects of Bolshevism are decried as Western influence, Franzel is fascinated by other aspects of the Russian revolution and the Soviet Union: He sees her as an heir to the attempt to found a non-Western empire, as an anti-Imperialist force that supports the resistance of 'authentic' people.

A German social democrat in exile, Curt Geyer, already warned quite correctly in a critical review of Franzel's book of its authoritarian tendencies: "*It a free-floating book; with its ideology and its so-called theory one can do everything: Pan-Germanism without Hitler as well as a monarchy of the Habsburgs, authoritarian dictatorship as well as a German emperorship. [...] This is the way towards counterrevolution: To National Socialism, to Henlein or to Schuschnigg – it only depends on the geographical standpoint*".³⁷

And indeed, Franzel seemingly forgot his polemics against Rosenberg and the Nazi party, but not his resentment against the West, to which he added blatant antisemitic formulations when he started to write articles in a journal for the police of the protectorate. As already mentioned, the resentment against the West and an-

34 Cf. Keller, Th.: Emil Franzel, p. 44.

35 Idem, p. 70.

36 Franzel, E.: *Abendländische Revolution*, p. 209.

37 Klinger, Max [Geyer, Curt]: *Kapitulation vor der Konter-Revolution*. *Neuer Vorwärts*, No. 153, 17. 5. 1936, p. 5–8.

tisemitism share some traits as forms of rejection of modernity. But while within the resentment against the West antisemitic tropes are formulated often intricately, these formulations can turn quite overt when the circumstances change.

In his “*Abendländische Revolution*”, Franzel blames the treaties of Versailles and St. Germain to be the main reasons for the rise of national socialism. As in many other texts of this time, Woodrow Wilson is especially painted as the culprit, who lured Germany with his 14 points into peace negotiations, during which these points were not fulfilled: Franzel depicts Wilson as an “*American professor, who sees history as a field of action for puritan preaching of salvation, a human being without sense of tradition or organically grown relations, [...] full of theory and morals, a knows-it-all, who is in reality without a clue, badly informed and a pawn of bankers and the armament industry*”.³⁸ Dan Diner emphasizes the importance of this “Wilson legend” for the formation of an imaginary, outer foe of German nationalism: Wilson is seen as an representative “*of the power of money, of interest, of the stock market, of circulation, for capitalism as such. The linking of anti-Americanism and antisemitism catches the eye in this ideological phenomenon*”.³⁹

And really, this link was easily realized by Franzel in his later texts for German propaganda. He did not have to change much to blame the Jews for these phenomena when he wrote in 1944 an article on Versailles, in which he commented the creation of Austria in the following way: “*To the Germans in the Eastern March [Ostmark, i. e. Austria], the unification with the Reich was denied; six millions of German-Austrians were forced, against their declared intention, to form and sustain an ‘independent’ state under the control of Jewish financial powers, an occurrence which the history of the world has never seen*”.⁴⁰

But of course antisemitism was always accompanied in Franzel’s articles with resentment against the West, especially Great Britain, which he blames for every war and European unrest of the last 200 years and he adds also a verbal stinger against the Czechoslovak government in exile, that “*it is only the continuation of an old British tradition that today more than two dozens exile governments and circles of emigrants have been established in London, who try, in England’s pay, to disturb the unification and new order of Europe*”.⁴¹

In the last months of the war, Franzel’s articles also show the potential of projection that lies in the resentment against the West. While the Allied forces

38 Franzel, E.: *Abendländische Revolution*, p. 190.

39 Diner, D.: *Feindbild Amerika*, p. 74.

40 Franzel, Emil: *Der “Frieden”, der den grösseren Krieg gebar*. Zeitschrift für die Protektorat-spolizei, Jg. 14, No. 6, 1. 6. 1944, p. 104–107.

41 Franzel, Emil: *England und der “dreihundertjährige Frieden” Europas*. Zeitschrift für die Protektorat-spolizei, Jg. 14, No. 8, 1. 8. 1944, p. 104–107, p. 145.

approach the borders of the Reich, and the fall of Berlin becomes a question of months, Franzel's pieces turn more and more delusional. Gleefully, he comments the end of the British world power, as he analyzes the growing strength of the United States among the Allies, and sees Germany still in a better position than Great Britain, because the former *"can loose everything in this war or gain everything. [...] England can lose everything what it has got left to lose, but it cannot win anything"*.⁴²

These delusions peak in an article in January 1945. Franzel greets the new year with the title *"A new round begins"*, assesses the situation optimistically as *"each Sunday, new units of the German Volkssturm report for duty"*, and becomes more and more frankly antisemitic, writing that *"Roosevelt's press Jews, confronting Europe's living walls cannot anymore blow the trumpets of Jericho, but have to play a muffled chamade of retreat"*.⁴³ The article, written during the Battle of the Bulge, ends with big hopes for the new year and steadfast loyalty to the leadership: *"The German people and with it Europe has a leadership which stands up to the requirements of total war, which knows how to calculate with all eventualities and how to wield all weapons. The blow in the West was not the last, but the first word in the great round of the world war which starts in 1945"*.⁴⁴

This was, however, Franzel's last article for this journal. He survived the war, was displaced in 1946 to the German Federal Republic and started a new career as journalist and historian within the catholic *"Ackermannsgemeinde"* of the Sudeten German association. His radicalization during the 1930s and 1940s never posed a problem to him, and it would be interesting to trace how the resentment against the West is reflected in his post 1945 works. However, this is beyond the scope of this study.

VI. This article sought to drive home three points: Firstly, the role of the notion of the West plays in different types of nationalism; that the within a civic type of national integration the West is seen as an example, whereas in a tribal type of integration it is considered an enemy. Secondly, how kindred a resentment against the West and antisemitism can be, that the former can act as a cover for the latter. And thirdly, how easily the resentment against the West can be radicalized towards blatant antisemitism.

The questions of the relation towards the West and what it stands for was hotly debated during the First Czechoslovak Republic, by her defenders as well

42 Franzel, Emil: Das Ende der britischen Weltmacht. Zeitschrift für die Protektoratspolizei, Jg. 14, No. 12, 1. 12. 1944, p. 222–225.

43 Franzel, Emil: Eine neue Runde beginnt. Zeitschrift für die Protektoratspolizei, Jg. 15, No. 13, 1. 1. 1945, p. 1–2.

44 Idem.

as her foes, making the latter a productive backdrop for a closer examination of these issues. But the relevance of the discussion on the West is not restricted to that period. Dan Diner wrote his repeatedly quoted essay on anti-Americanism in the wake of September 11 2001, since then a lot has changed. The resentment against the West, however still flourishes, and even forms in many respects and in many forms a powerful ideological force that can bridge other ideological differences. Many contemporary authoritarian states and movements have a self-definition as the opponent of “Western decadence” in common, be it Putin’s Russia, the Islamic Republic of Iran or Hamas. These movements are also closely connected to the rejection of the individual and the disdain towards universalism that Arendt describes. Unfortunately, it seems that more studies of and discussions on these phenomena will be necessary to confront these challenges.

***Mezi „nesporně západním“ a hrozivým „transatlantickým jedem“.
Pojem „Západ“ v diskusích o koncepcích Evropy a první republiky.***

Příspěvek se zabývá rolí, kterou koncept občanského, „západního“ pojetí státu hrál v narativech první Československé republiky. Nejprve rozlišuje mezi etnickým (völkisch) a občanským pojetím národní integrace a zdůrazňuje roli, kterou v těchto koncepcích hraje pojem „Západ“ a antiamerikanismus, zejména v útocích z pozice etnického nacionalismu proti občanskému. Při podrobném zkoumání těchto útoků je zdůrazněna jejich antisemitská tendence. Konečně vývoj spisů Emila Franzela, německy mluvícího intelektuála, který začínal na levé straně politického spektra a putoval doprava, slouží jako případová studie vývoje od resentmentů vůči Západu k otevřenějším formám antisemitismu.