

THE BROOKINGS INSTITUTION

WILL DEMOCRACY WIN? THE RECURRING BATTLE BETWEEN LIBERALISM AND ITS  
ADVERSARIES

Washington, D.C.  
Monday, September 17, 2018

**Opening Remarks**

JOHN R. ALLEN  
President, The Brookings Institution

**Panel 1**

STEVE INSKEEP, Moderator  
Host, "Morning Edition," NPR

NORMAN EISEN  
Senior Fellow, Governance Studies, The Brookings Institution

ROBERT KAGAN  
Stephen & Barbara Friedman Senior Fellow, Project on International Order and Strategy  
The Brookings Institution

**Remarks**

WILLIAM A. GALSTON  
Ezra K. Zilkha Chair and Senior Fellow, Governance Studies  
The Brookings Institution

**Panel 2**

LINDA WERTHEIMER, Moderator  
Senior National Correspondent, NPR

CHARLES BLACK, JR.  
President, Pentad Plus LLC

NORMAN EISEN  
Senior Fellow, Governance Studies, The Brookings Institution

MARC ROBINSON  
Professor of English and Theater Studies, Yale University

LAURENE SHERLOCK  
Owner, Greystone Appraisals LLC

ALEXANDER TOUSSAINT  
Deacon

\* \* \* \* \*

## P R O C E E D I N G S

GENERAL ALLEN: Ladies and gentlemen, good morning. Welcome to Brookings. I'm John Allen; I'm the president of the Institution. You are most welcome today, and for those coming in by webcast, we welcome you as well.

Today we're going to be discussing something concerning many of us at this moment in history. It's the growing tide of illiberalism, as it seems to be threatening increasingly democratic institutions and governments on both sides of the Atlantic. I think it's fair to say that we've learned that democracy is not inevitable and it needs to be understood, it needs to be nurtured, it needs to be cared for, and it needs to be guarded with great vigilance. Now this rising tide of illiberalism, some will wring their hands, some will gnash their teeth, but some will in fact be focused on solutions. And that's what we're about this morning.

Today we have two of our esteemed Brookings scholars here, authors and senior fellows, who have written on this subject, Bob Kagan and Norm Eisen, both of whom will discuss their new books, which basically detail democracy's role in battling and defeating illiberalism.

Bob Kagan is a senior fellow here at Brookings in the Foreign Policy research program. He is also a contributing columnist to the Washington Post. And his latest book, "The Jungle Grows Back: America and Our Imperiled World", considers the democratizing effect of America's presence around the world and advocates for its reassertion in an increasingly isolationist age.

Also with us today is another of our senior fellows, Ambassador Norm Eisen, who is out of our Governance Studies here at Brookings. And from 2009-2011 he served as President Obama's ethics advisor, ethics czar, and as the U.S. advisor to the Czech Republic in Prague from 2011-2014. And his new book, "The Last Palace: Europe's Turbulent Century in Five Lives and One Legendary House", tells the story of an ongoing century-long struggle between liberalism and autocracy through the lives of those who preceded him in the ambassadorial residence in Prague. A really unique story.

Now, we're truly delighted this morning to welcome NPR's Steven Inskeep, who

will be moderating this panel. Steven hosts NPR's Morning Edition and the podcast Up First. He's received multiple awards for his journalistic excellence, including the Robert F. Kennedy Journalism Award. And we're very happy to have you with us this morning, Steve.

Then after this panel, please remain, because Norm will join descendants of the four protagonists of his book, specifically four former inhabitants of the Prague ambassadorial residence, which he discusses in his book. And together for the first time they're going to be on a panel to discuss the human dimension of history. And moderating that panel and that discussion will be Linda Wertheimer, a Senior National Correspondent at NPR. Linda, it's wonderful to have you with us this morning. Brookings is really honored to have our friends from NPR -- and to welcome the network to us -- with us this morning.

And let me remind everyone here that we are on the record and we'll be going out live on our webcast.

So, now, for our first panel, let me welcome to the stage Bob Kagan, Norm Eisen, and Steve Inskeep.

Thank you very much. (Applause)

MR. INSKEEP: Good morning, everyone. That's for joining us today. Is the microphone working? You would think I would, now how to work this. Hi, good morning, welcome to everybody here. It's an honor to be talking with both of these authors. And, General Allen, thank you very much for the introduction; I really appreciate it.

I was delighted with this book, "The Last Palace", from one of the early pages in which Ambassador Eisen quotes his mother. He's telling his mother that he's going to be the ambassador to Prague, the United States ambassador to Prague, and one of the things she says is, what do you know about diplomacy. (Laughter) So I appreciate that. This is a very human story, which we're going to get to.

But I want to begin with Robert Kagan, who gives us something of an intellectual framework, I think for the topic of today's conference, today's discussions. "The Jungle Grows Back: America and Our Imperiled World" argues well, it's not precisely that we're the

indispensable nation, but what do you saying about the United States' role in the world when it comes to democracy and liberalism around the world?

MR. KAGAN: Well, thank you, Steve, for doing this. And it's great to be on the panel here with Norm, who I'm a huge fan of, and the book is wonderful, as I hope you all know already, but you should discover it soon.

I think we tend, especially these days to take for granted a certain kind of international system that has -- if you look at the great sweep of history, it's one of the rarest moments in that long history, combining not only a general peace among the great powers, economic prosperity, but also, as you say, incredible spread of democracy. And I think either we take it for granted or we assume that it's just in the nature of things to move in this direction of progress. We have a very enlightenment view of history, a teleological view. But I think history suggests, and as we're sort of witnessing right now, that's not the way it works. And I think it's very hard to separate causality here when you look at when this period began, 1945, and what was the nature of the international system that made this whole great success story possible. And it really was the role of the United States after World War II in establishing an international system based on democratic alliances, an open economic order, and certain basic rules of the road, which were more or less followed -- not always even by the United States, but nevertheless made possible this security order within which this liberal democratic world could take place.

And I want to hasten and say it's not because the United States was always systematically and consistently supporting democracy, but it did make this space available in which democracy could flourish.

MR. INSKEEP: Would you define the elements of that space? What is it that the United States did that made it possible for there to be greater freedom in the world?

MR. KAGAN: Well, I would say the most important thing the United States did was take two regions of the world that had been caught in an endless cycle of conflict and put an end to the conflicts in those regions. I'm talking about Europe and Asia. And specifically, dealing with Germany in such a way that this autocratic aggressive nation, which had caused so much

agony in the world through its treatment of its neighbors, became a peaceful democratic economic success story, in no small part due to the fact that the United States provided security in Europe and provided reassurance to both sides in that ancient conflict. And the same thing with Japan.

And with Germany and Japan anchoring the democratic peaceful and economically successful work, in a way that made everything else possible. And as long as they are those things, we'll still sustain this kind of international system.

MR. INSKEEP: Why do you think it's necessary to be saying this now?

MR. KAGAN: Because I think unfortunately that order is at risk of falling apart. And we think about, of course, China and Russia and Iran and we're right to do so, but in my mind the real threat is the collapse of the more fundamental foundations of that order. So if the United States were to pull out and away from both Europe and Asia, I don't think we can be as sanguine as perhaps we once were that Europe and Asia couldn't return to the past. And that's sort of what of what I mean by "the jungle growing back". The way the world looked in 1939, it isn't over. We could return to a world that looks more like that.

MR. INSKEEP: Before we bring Ambassador Eisen into the conversation I want to ask if the world order is really in that much danger? We could make a case that President Trump has pushed against the European allies, has spoken negatively about allies, but hasn't really changed that much in the NATO alliance and has pushed for them to contribute more to their own defense, which is something the Obama Administration did. We could make a case that in China and in Asia more generally, despite trade war and other things, the basic security structure has remained the same. Are you sure that this is really a moment of peril?

MR. KAGAN: Yeah. You know, history works in a funny way. If you'd been looking around the world in 1925 you would have said all those same things. And 10 years later it had all fallen apart. So one of the things we don't remember is how quickly things fall apart. There's a great line in the Hemmingway novel, they ask somebody how he went bankrupt, his answer was gradually and then suddenly. (Laughter) And that's the way of world orders.

So here are the elements that I find concerning, even though everything you say is true. And, by the way, my argument is not about Donald Trump. This has been going on for a while. These trends have been visible for a while, including the trend in the United States for --

MR. INSKEEP: I thought everything was about Donald Trump? I thought that was the new reality. (Laughter) No, go on, please.

MR. KAGAN: Including the fact that the American people I think for some decades have been less and less interested in playing this sort of historic role because of the burdens that it entails. But if you look at -- let's just take Europe for a second, which is a place we've taken completely for granted, don't worry, everything is going to be fine, at least Europe is secure. We see a return to nationalism, we see a return of autocracy in parts of Europe where there had been a growth of democracy, you see the return of suspicions, which never really left, among European powers. If you remember that what pulled Europe together and provided the basic foundation, which made the EU and the European Commission possible, at the end of the day it was this American security guarantee.

So if all the things that I'm talking about are happening in Europe and then we add to that an increasing distance between the United States and Europe, that to me is the sort of pulling out the final prop that has kept everything up.

MR. INSKEEP: So if I flip open your book there is a paragraph, to which you've already sort of alluded, "Among the worst horrors of recorded history occurred in the lifetimes of our grandparents. Just 75 years ago Hitler was rampaging across Europe." Which allows us to make a transition into "The Last Palace", which is a story of essentially the 20th century as seen through a building. It's a little architecture history. Is that a correct description? Why don't you describe, Ambassador for those who have not a chance to dip into this book, what is the building, what is the Last Palace?

MR. EISEN: Thank you, Steve. And to stimulate the same vexation as my overly long answers do when I come on your program live.

MR. INSKEEP: Speed it up, quickly. Come on. (Laughter)

MR. EISEN: He does this to me. I'm not very well suited to the rigors of live radio. If you'd permit to just say a word before I answer your question. This is an ambassadorial failing. I want to thank you for being here. I want to thank my Brookings brother, Bob Kagan, both for joining me for this, but also for welcoming me when I came to Brookings so warmly into our foreign policy family. I must thank our current President, John Allen, and our past President, Strobe Talbott, for their support of me and the book. I'm deeply grateful to that. Darryl West, who is the head of our Governance Studies Program, all of the protagonist descendants who are here for our second panel, thank you from coming from far and wide -- Bill Galston, who will comment as we exit this panel, which will be roughly coextensive the end of the answer to Steve's question. (Laughter) And, as we say in Hebrew (speaking in Hebrew), the best for last, I must thank my best friend, Dan Berger, who is here, who I spoke to every day in my Brookings life on all of my work, supports all the word, leads the thinking, the advising on our progress in open society work, and helped me in every way possible with this book. Thank you, Dan.

Okay, now I'm ready to answer.

MR. INSKEEP: One of the things I have to do on the radio when people do not answer the question is repeat the question. What's the building? (Laughter)

MR. EISEN: The building is the Petschek Villa, which is regarded as the most beautiful in Prague, which is saying something -- one of the most beautiful -- which is saying something in that ravishing city. When I was in the White House and getting ready to move as Ambassador to Prague, I discovered that this was the most lusted after real estate in the diplomatic corps. And, indeed, it is magnificent. It was designed by my friend, Mark Robinson's great grandfather, Otto Petschek, as a tribute to the Wilsonian Moment. One of my very light divergences of emphasis with Bob is on the importance of 1918, although he talks about it a lot in his book. Otto Petschek designed it as a combination of everything that was best in this moment of hope. When a small United States was created, Czechoslovakia assembled out of Austria-Hungary. And, indeed, as a tribute to Wilson's work at Versailles and (inaudible 38:31) has elements of those two things, as well as a lot of it is modern in it, Steve. I found a set of Frank

Lloyd Wright -- the first published set of Frank Lloyd Wright blueprints published in Germany when nobody knew who he was, heavily marked and annotated by the brilliant Otto Petschek who designed and constructed this house.

MR. INSKEEP: He's a businessman, right? He figured out how to make money off of World War I? (Laughter)

MR. EISEN: He did. He is one of those protean Jewish geniuses, less well known than his law school classmate, Kafka, Einstein, Freud, but of that generation. The explosion of talent so long repressed in the ghetto and expressing itself in the 19th century, post the 19th century liberalization of restriction on Jewish participation in society.

So he builds this wonderful building as a symbol. He intends it as a symbol of liberalism and then immediately the building serves that function because he starts encountering all the struggles of liberalism that Bob writes about so eloquently in his book and that my characters over the 100 years, from 1918, the end of World War I, to today, that the people I write about continue to struggle with. And he deals with it in the constriction of the building. It's a symbol of the problems of constructing liberalism. The jungle literally grows back in his backyard as he's tearing down and rebuilding.

MR. INSKEEP: And to skip ahead just a little bit, the family --

MR. EISEN: I promise this will be a shorter answer, and on top.

MR. INSKEEP: It's okay. It's okay. This is all on topic. It's all really useful and it's fascinating and rich detailed, which I appreciate by the way because you realize that history is a story of people and a story of a million small decisions. The general summary of things often can leave out a lot.

But in this case we have a country that comes out of the idea of national self-determination, sounds like such a good idea, but it turns out not to be that defensible a country, gets dismembered by Hitler, and what happened to the Petschek family?

MR. EISEN: Well, the Petschek family, its descendants, in of their various names, can now be found scattered across the United States and the world, not unlike my own



family and so many other European Jewish families. They flee -- I won't do a spoiler alert on Otto's struggles -- or I guess I won't reveal Otto's -- the ultimate end of his struggles, in some ways successful as a symbol of liberalism, but also exemplifying his challenges.

MR. INSKEEP: but he left the house for sure?

MR. EISEN: The house was left behind. The Petscheks fled in 1938 en masse in a train to the Eucharistic Congress in Budapest. I had the pleasure of getting to be friends with the last living original last occupant of the house, Eva Petschek Goldman, who passed in her 90s several years ago. And she visited me in the house and I asked Eva, is it true that the entire family chartered a rail car and in the midst of a scare the May crisis of 1938, when they thought that the German invasion that ultimately came in '39 was going to come, that you all left for a Eucharistic Congress for a Catholic Congress? I thought you were Jewish. And she thought looked at me like -- you know, she gave me that look like my mom often gave me, like you dummy. And she said, silly boy that was the only visa we could get. So they did all flee, they got out intact. One of the chilling moments for me in researching this book, Steve, was when I was in the Hoover Archives I often went to Northern California to visit my other adopted book cousins, the family of Shirley Temple Black, and I was in the Hoover Archives and I found a little book that the Nazis has printed up for the invasion, to give to their officers for the invasion of the British Islands. And in that book were listed all of the Petscheks who had fled as targets to be apprehended.

But they got out; they mostly ended up in America, some in Latin America. And, fortunately for the sake of my book they took their papers with them.

MR. INSKEEP: And the house was conveniently left vacant, as Germans ultimately took over?

MR. EISEN: Yes. It was not entirely vacant. One of the wonderful characters I discovered was Adolf Pokorny, the caretaker, the keeper, the major-domo, who preserved this house through Czechoslovak, Jewish, Nazi, German, Soviet and then American ownership and control. And Pan (phonetic 44:03) Pokorny stayed in the house. We found his surviving relatives

who remembered and visited and had pictures and notes and things. He stayed in the house and he protected the house, including the Jewish identity of the house. The Jewish artifacts were left in place, amazingly.

MR. INSKEEP: Throughout the Nazi period?

MS. EISEN: Amazingly. When Eva visited me she saw in the library we had the great German language Jewish encyclopedia, 13 magnificent scholarly volumes. One of the great achievements of Weimar scholarship. And she said that is the same encyclopedia that we used when I was growing up. Only 13 volumes. It only goes through the middle of the alphabet because when Hitler became chancellor the publication was suspended with volume 13.

MR. INSKEEP: Wow. Wow. That is amazing. There are high points, there are low points in the story of this house. What happened there in -- the high point is obviously when Norm Eisen was the ambassador. (Laughter)

MR. EISEN: Hardly, hardly.

MR. INSKEEP: But what happened in 1989?

MR. EISEN: Well, the house is kind of like an ocean liner that travels through the century. And I found myself, when I had the privilege of reading first the essay that gave rise to Bob's book, and then Bob's book reflecting that all the same events that he writes about can be viewed through the portholes of that ocean liner, through the windows of that house in the eyes of the people there. In 1989 the occupant of the house was one of our most famous citizen diplomats, Shirley Temple Black, who had been in Prague in that house the day -- this was so convenient for me as an author when I discovered this upstairs in my little Brookings writing cubby -- she has been in the house the day the Soviets invaded in 1968. And she completed the work. She decided then she would come back to Prague someday as United States ambassador and help end this terrible communist regime, completing the work of Ambassador Laurence Steinhardt, who fought the advent of the Cold War. And his day, another incredible thing, Steve, he was as famous a citizen diplomat as Shirley Temple Black was. He was on the front pages of newspapers regularly. A forgotten American hero who I have been pleased to reclaim. And

Shirley Temple Black completed that American mission that started with this house being rescued by Ambassador Steinhardt. She did help end the Cold War from the premises of that house and using that house.

MR. INSKEEP: Wow. So we have the story of this house, we have the story of this country. If I could summarize tons of history in a couple of sentences, created by the idea of national self-determination, undermined by the idea of national self-determination, right -- because there were Germans, ethnic Germans within the borders and Hitler was able to take advantage of that and pry the country apart -- fell under communist rule, communist rule fell, had a very famous poet as president. I mean a very different era. What's happening now? Let me ask you both what's happening now in that region of the world?

Robert Kaplan? Kagan -- excuse me. What am I saying -- Kagan. (Laughter)

MR. KAGAN: There's Kaplan (inaudible 47:42).

MR. EISEN: If Robert were here he would do -- he would say pretty much the same thing I'm about to say.

MR. INSKEEP: Mr. Kagan, so sorry. Please, go right ahead.

MR. KAGAN: It's so hard to keep Kagan and Kaplan.

MR. INSKEEP: It's to your benefit really, because --

MR. KAGAN: No, I know. He sells more books than I do. (Laughter)

MR. EISEN: Plus I'm married to a Kaplan, so now we're related. Can I have a loan?

MR. KAGAN: Oh, sure.

MR. INSKEEP: Whoa.

MR. KAGAN: Steve, when I was listening to you tell that story it began with an idea and then this idea, all of which has a certain truth to it, but it's amazing how we tend to leave out the geopolitics in these stories. And the interesting thing about Czechoslovakia and the Czech Republic is that Czechoslovakia and the Czech Republic are both beneficiaries and victims of strategic decisions. I have to say that the ideas are secondary ultimately. And that's

the last thing that any enlightenment person like us wants to hear, but Czechoslovakia existed in the first place not so much because of self-determination but because France wanted to build a bulwark in the East against the rise of another German threat.

MR. INSKEEP: That was an idea that could support their strategic aim, in other words?

MR. KAGAN: Right. But, you know, Wilson for a long period during the war was ambivalent about even the breakup of Austria-Hungary because he wanted to try to enlist Austria-Hungary and pull them away from Germany during the war, et cetera. So the French were the driving force behind setting up Czechoslovakia so that it would be a bulwark in the east because Russia had fallen away. That was the old bulwark in the east. And in a way the whole drama of the interwar period is what happens to Czechoslovakia because, you know, the question was if it was going to be a bulwark it had to be defended. And the big moment came at Munich when the decision was made whether to defend it or not. And lying behind all of this was the United States, either was it going to act or was it not going to act. And it's worth remembering that the Versailles Agreement was never intended to take place without the United States. And when the United States pulled out of Europe all these balancing efforts fell apart.

So then you get to World War II and the critical decision, which Norm and I were talking about before, of the American forces at Eisenhower's decision not to continue going eastward during the war, but to stop and divide the continent up into two. And then, of course, Czechoslovakia and ultimately Czech Republic are freed because of a fundamentally geostrategic shift. And this is sort of -- I have to punctuate his fascinating stories about Shirley Temple Black with my boring stories about geopolitics and geostrategy. (Laughter) So I'll stop any second now, but I do think we lose sight and underplay the importance of underlying power relationships in the fostering and strengthening of the ideas that we value. And if those ideas don't have power behind them they don't just win because they're better ideas. I think that's what we're learning.

MR. INSKEEP: Ambassador?

MR. EISEN: Well, on the two -- you know, Czechoslovakia has two daddies, and one is French and the other is American. And there is a fascinating transformation that Wilson undergoes in the course of the war in which he's lobbied by the Czechs, and specifically by his friend, Crane, who would later become the ambassador, and by Masaryk. And there is a professorial bond. In that moment of 1918 you have I think the beginning -- Hobsbawm writes about the short -- with some false optimism for all of the horrors he witnessed -- he writes about the short 20th century. If anything, I'm arguing for a long 20th century that begins in 1918 and that is still ticking forward. And you get a Transatlantic moment when Wilson, for all his flaws, brings a genuine idealism somewhat to the Realpolitik of the French. Benesh is amazed, is surprised at -- Benesh is furiously working the French and Masaryk is floating off in America, and suddenly you get the Washington Declaration, as it's known, and the Pittsburgh Declaration, the two founding Declarations that establish this new country. It came as a surprise to Otto Petschek, who, you are correct, made a big bet and potentially dangerous bet on the success of the west in World War I, but didn't count on a Slovak, didn't invest in any Slovak properties because everyone was surprised at the agglomeration of the Czech lands and the Slovak lands together. But in that moment -- and Bob writes very eloquently about this in the book -- in that moment there is a birth moment -- you could say 1917 -- another place where I agree with Bob is on the fundamental illiberalism -- we are somewhat revisionist in our views -- the fundamental illiberalism of the German regime. There has been a big historical push, we could debate it forever, about whether all sides were equally to blame for World War I. I do think that the transcended notion of Transatlantic liberal democracy was struggling -- anyhow, we agree on that, otherwise we have -- there are many other things that we disagree on. It's very entertaining at our period lunches, but we strongly agree on the illiberal nature of the Kaiser's regime and alliance. Of course, the czar was in our alliance, Bob, so we weren't perfect. I'm a little disposed to Czars however, since I was one.

MR. INSKEEP: Not only you.

MR. EISEN: My mother loved to say -- it's in the book that she loved to say when

they would call me the ethics czar, as John kindly mentioned, she loved to say it is the only time a czar has ever been good for the Jews. (Laughter)

So you have this birth moment -- I'm almost done -- you have this birth moment in -- I can't do this when we're on the air. That's the only reason I invited Steve. (Laughter) We have this birth moment in 1918 --

MR. INSKEEP: The radio program has already gone to the weather forecast. (Laughter) Go on.

MR. EISEN: You have a birth moment of this new idea in which the Realpolitik Bob describes is cross pollinated with American revolutionary ideas that are somewhat foreign to the European way of doing politics. And the struggle ever since in this long 20th century that I write about comes from the uneasiness of these two aspects of transatlantic democracy and liberalism in cohabiting. By the way, it's an uneasiness that the American experiment has wrestled with since the very beginning as well because we have our own discomforts with the full expanse of the liberal idea.

MR. INSKEEP: So we're talking about liberalism, or illiberalism as the hashtag would suggest, and talking also about power structures. Let me try to connect those if I can. First, if we're talking about liberal values, and not liberal in the way it's used in American politics but in a more global sense, what's a really short list of the values we're talking about? Free speech, what else?

MR. KAGAN: Well, the primary element of liberalism is that the rights of the individual supersede the rights of the state. I mean if you think about what World War I was about, we've completely forgotten it because we're not taught this anymore for some reason. Germany really stood for the primacy of the state, the primacy of the nation, and the individuals were supposed to serve that nation. That was their best calling. Liberalism is what Lock talks about and what the founders talk about, government is founded to serve the people, not the other way around. And so that means that the government's powers are limited, that individual rights are respected, free speech is one of those, the ability to choose and change a government by a

vote is a critical element of that. That's what liberalism means.

And, by the way, it's very young. It's two centuries -- two and a half centuries old. The rest of human history, with some very brief windows of exception, has not been about liberalism.

MR. INSKEEP: So that leads to my next question. You have suggested that support for these liberal values may grow out of the power structure, power relations, rather cynical decisions or self-interested decisions among nations. Is the global power structure endangering liberalism today and, if so, in what way? I'll ask you both.

MR. KAGAN: Well, I mean -- I'm sorry, Norm --

MR. EISEN: You first, Bob. Go ahead.

MR. KAGAN: You know, it's interesting. Let's go back to 1918. As a result of World War I and the victory of the liberal forces in World War I there was a spread of democracy in Europe. There were a number of nations -- Lithuania, Poland, et cetera, who began democratic experiments. Then the United States withdraws, the sort of western liberal powers are in disarray, and those liberal experiments, those democratic experiments go away by themselves. There's no war, there's no overthrow, just the idea fades. And that give us I think a sense of how much the overall power relationship in the international system affects the decisions and actions of peoples, even in smaller countries that are not involved.

So the fact that it isn't just cynicism, the fact that since 1945 the strongest power in the world has been the sort of original enlightenment power, then the original liberal power, has meant that liberalism has had power behind it. And so what we're seeing today, I believe, is not only the normal challenges that liberalism is inevitably going to face from basic factors of human existence and human nature, but also a retraction of American involvement and influence, by choice in our case rather than by necessity, which has been occurring pretty much sort of steadily ever since the end of the Cold War.

MR. EISEN: Part of the issue with the youth of liberalism, again where we diverge there, divergences of emphasis. I agree with the primacy of the American experiment,

but I think the British -- you point to Lock -- I think the British varieties of liberalism and the French more radical varieties, is abounded in checked liberalism that fears the full power of liberty, fraternity, and equality. And so we bound it. You know, I think the British and French variance are important, and they loom large here.

Part of the reason that I wrote the book and that I wrote the book I way I did -- and this is to Bob's point about the newness of the liberal idea -- I have a belief that stories are critical to moving people. And part of what we struggle with in liberalism is the narratives of liberalism are newer, they don't have the -- unlike biblical narratives, which are 3000 or more years old, they're newer narratives. We need stories. And so that's going to be a process. That's also part of anchoring liberalism.

I also think that ultimately the role of America is critical in this long 20th century that I write about, when America really comes on the international scene in a different way with Wilson's aspiration and, as Bob so eloquently describes, with a different set of imperial ambitions, a totally foreign idea of wanting what we want to project on the world as our values and actually welcoming a Germany and a Japan to do as well or better, as we do in that kind of empire of ideas.

One moment comes to mind on this. So the pattern that I describe is one of American advent, liberal flourishing in 1918, 1945, 1989, and then of illiberal autocratic, anti-democratic counter reaction, either immediately or as in the interwar period, gradually caused always by American withdrawal the absence of the vacuum that is created by America stepping back from this model, this Transatlantic model it has created. And then inevitably pulling America back in because we are so firmly anchored in this Transatlantic alliance. So we get also the Asian theatre. We can't hide, we can't avoid, and we fix it at the cost of enormous American blood and treasure. I think if there's a common solution the two of us are urging it' snot to withdraw because we're going to have to do it anyhow. It's going to be a lot more deadly and expensive for everyone.

There is a moment that I want to point to that illustrated this for me. There were



so many surprises as I wrote the book and so many things I discovered, like Eisenhower holding Patton back from liberating Prague, which in retrospect set the course of the Cold War, my German protagonist, General Toussaint -- whose grandson, Alexander is here -- begged Patton to come to Prague. He turned on the SS, he wanted Patton to liberate Prague, and Eisenhower blocked it, for reasons you'll have to read about in the book. And Eisenhower was a vexation to the Czechs in a number of ways.

But another one of those moments -- the book is peppered with them -- another one of those moments comes at the height of the Munich Crisis. And Czech President Benesh described this as his most crushing moment, equal with the capitulation lead by Chamberlain to Hitler's wicked, crazy, sick desires. And that was when FDR wrote the same letter -- at the height of the Munich Crisis he wrote the same letter to Benesh, the victim, and Hitler, the aggressor who sought to devour the Czechs, urging them why can't they get along. So that was a shameful -- FDR more than made up for it, but it was a shameful abdication of the moral leadership that Bob calls for.

MR. INSKEEP: Well, that leads to one more question and then I'm going to invite questions from the audience. By the way, someone is going to go around with a microphone as I call on you and you can ask questions. Formulate them a little more briefly than the Ambassador's answers (laughter).

MR. EISEN: Do not take me as your model in questioning. You'll be cut off.

MR. INSKEEP: No, I'm joking, I'm joking. You are quite eloquent and I appreciate it very much.

But I guess I would like to know what is one thing you would have the United States do at this moment in which the liberal model, if you can call it that, faces competition, for starters from China, where there are ever more technologically sophisticated methods of social control, where something like a million people have been sent to reeducation camps in weaker areas, where it sounds increasingly like people who are outside of it, reeducation camps are practically imprisoned in terms of being monitored all the time and all of their communication

being trackable. And that's a competing model that is more and more wealthy relative to the United States. What is one thing each of you would have the United States do?

MR. KAGAN: Well, we came up with a pretty good model on how to deal with countries like that during the Cold War, and it was twofold really. One element of it was strategic, which was to deny countries are autocracies, military and strategic gains. That was the containment of the Soviet Union was about. And I think it is vitally important that we do not allow China to use its increasing military power to conquer Taiwan, to bully Japan, to basically take over, not in an economic sense, but in strategic sense, the entire East Asian region. That's the first part of, but it's not the only part of it.

And the other thing that we did successfully during the Cold War was that we helped create a flourishing liberal order that they were not yet part of, but which at a certain point they decided it was actually better to be part of than not to be. And that means in this case right now reasserting our support for our democratic allies rather than criticizing them and looking to squeeze the last dollar in every trade deal with them. That was not the way we dealt with our allies during the Cold War and it was a very successful model.

So what we need to do is to reenergize the democratic community. Right now I would say we are sucking energy from the democratic community by making it clear as a people that we're just not that interested anymore, even if we're going through the motions in some regard, we're just not that fundamentally interested in playing that role that we played for 70 years.

MR. INSKEEP: Is it possible we are reenergizing the democratic community in that here in the United States if the world is a chess board or if the country is a chess board it's like we've thrown the board in the air and we're waiting to see where all the pieces land? For better or for worse, we have a President who was essentially elected to do that. Is it possible that this is actually a reenergizing moment? I hear there are people who file lawsuits against the President of the United States (laughter), who argue in different ways, who are gaining attention for their points of view.

MR. EISEN: Another slight divergence, you might have a bit more of a skip in your step with my conclusion. Bob is I think a little more -- perhaps a little less optimistic or feels it's -- what do you think, Bob? It's up for grabs? It could either way?

MR. KAGAN: History would suggest that.

MR. EISEN: I believe that democracy will triumph. I'm fundamentally optimistic. And he doesn't come right out and say it, but I was a little scared when I finished reading "The Jungle Grows Back".

MR. KAGAN: How could you be scared of a book that is black and has the jungle (inaudible 1:07:24) (laughter).

MR. EISEN: As long as we're holding up books -- I'm doing it again, Steven.

MR. INSKEEP: Yes, you are.

MR. EISEN: As long as we're holding up books, you'll hear from Bill Galston, who also has a very wonderful, "Anti-Pluralism", about these issues. My wife was comparing -- I took them both home to read this weekend -- and she was comparing it to my book and --

MR. INSKEEP: By thickness?

MR. EISEN: -- reflecting how much smarter my colleagues are (laughter) in every way. So I'm fundamentally optimistic. And the pattern that I see over the past 100 years is one of the -- yes, democracy is over -- since this Wilsonian conception with France of the new -- and Britain, the UK -- of the new Transatlantic democracy model, the idealist model, since this was conceived and put into action democracy has had great surges, it has had its eclipses, it has had high and long noons, and it has short and long eclipses, the darkness of democracy, darkness at noon, in the title of the famous book, but the dawn always comes. And this weekend I'll have a long essay in the *New York Times* Sunday Review arguing about the mechanisms of democracy that make democracy stronger and the lack of those mechanisms -- I have a slightly different model with much less reason for disagreeing with Bob or Bill about how it works -- and the absence of those mechanisms in our adversaries that invariably drag them down.

It may be -- now, I don't know how long this night of democracy, this eclipse of

democracy in the United States at the moment -- a partial eclipse -- I don't know how long it will be, Steve. A lot will depend on the outcome. I'm not arguing in a partisan way for this, only for everybody voting and voting for accountability. A lot will depend on the outcome of the midterms, but I am optimistic.

MR. INSKEEP: You said it's a long essay in the *New York Times*? (Laughter)  
Was that right?

MR. EISEN: It is. They had to put it in the Sunday Review because I'm too long winded for the day edition.

MR. INSKEEP: There we go. So let me invite some questions from the audience. If you would just raise your hands. I'm just looking around. Right there, ma'am. Yes, you right there. And if you will wait for the microphone to come to you. Why don't you say your name so we get to know each other a little bit?

MS. FAZEL: Yes, I'm Marina Fazel, an African-American journalist. I would like your comments please about best course of diplomacy from the United States towards Afghanistan and Turkey and the way that in the future relations among all sides can go in a positive direction with the rise of China.

Also, is the experiment of democracy vis a vis our reactions as a human species towards globalism as different stage of iteration? Are we in need of a system of governance that is far more inclusive of all nation states that would serve the purpose of keeping us as cohesive and peaceful nations better than the form of democracy that's allocated to single nations?

Thank you.

MR. INSKEEP: Thank you. There are several questions there. If you'll forgive me, I'm going to pick one and ask our guests to focus on that, because you raised a fascinating idea that the world has changed in ways that humans are not ready for. There has been no time in the history of the world where we've had such an instant and massive global conversation, for example. Technology is different than it used to be, although it's been evolving in this direction for a very long time. Is there something about this moment that is so disquieting because we has

human beings have not evolved or adapted to it yet?

MR. KAGAN: I think that, you know, we have always used for technological solutions to our political problems. And I remember a time not so long ago, maybe two decades ago or less, when globalization, the communications revolution, the internet were supposed to be the things that brought us all together, strengthened freedom, would undermine autocracy. And as with all past technologies, the only element that screwed everything up was the human beings. And, you know, all of these technologies can be used for good and for ill. And what we're seeing is that not technology is the magic bullet. And I would say it's not the magic bullet for freedom and it's not the magic bullet for tyranny.

And this is sort of my point, it's not the inevitable victory of democracy or the inevitable demise of democracy, it's a struggle. It's always going to be a struggle because within human nature there is a struggle between all kinds of competing needs and desires. So what we're seeing are not technologies -- yeah, I'm sure in some respect we're incapable of comprehending, especially when we start talking about artificial intelligence, et cetera, et cetera, but what I think we have to understand is that whatever the technology is, there's going to be a struggle to use it between these contending forces.

MR. INSKEEP: Is the human struggle of the characters at the beginning of your book, early 20th century, the same as the human struggle we face today?

MR. EISEN: I'm going to amaze you. Yes. (Applause; laughter).

MR. INSKEEP: Thank you, ma'am. Thank you for your question. Let me take one from -- yes, this woman right here in the -- is it green you're wearing. Yes, yes. Whatever, green, blue, teal, whatever. Go ahead, say your name if you would.

SPEAKER: Hi, my name is Kiara (phonetic 1:13:34); I'm Dutch and Italian and I study at SAIS over there. And I would like to direct my question to Robert Kagan. You spoke about the American Security Guarantee as a sort of precondition for European democracy and liberalism. And my question is now that I think many Europeans feel that his security guarantee is not something that we can necessarily rely on anymore, what should Europe do to protect its

own liberalism and democracy?

Thank you.

MR. KAGAN: Well, that's an excellent question, and I get asked that question a lot by Europeans and particularly Germans, for whom this is the most fundamental issue. I've sort of been struck by the way my argument has caught people's attention in Germany. The answer obviously is that within each country the forces of liberalism have to fight back against these more sort of nationalist tribalist forces, just as we have that fight here. Unfortunately, again, I hate to be not the great optimist that Norm is, but the prospect that Europe is going to pull itself together as one great unit that is going to somehow stand in for the United States as the global supporter of liberalism, I'm afraid I'm pessimistic that that's what is going to happen. I think what we see in Europe is increasing division and increasing loss of faith in the European project, what we used to call the European project, and a Europe that is splintering and moving back toward its past in some way, which does raise very serious questions for a country like Germany because, you know, the German question has been the eternal question of Europe until it was set aside by this new security order. If that new security order is going away, we're going to return to the German question. And, you know, what can I say other than Europeans have to work to cooperate, they have to work to struggle for liberalism, et cetera, et cetera. But I'm not confident that they can pull it together.

MR. INSKEEP: Do you want to give a yes/no answer to this one also?

(Laughter) You can go longer also, Ambassador. Please.

MR. EISEN: Maybe. (Laughter) You know, if you look at the evidence only of it's a deep question and the question not only of what the Europeans must do, but what we in the United States can do. I just wrote a piece in the *Post* on this when the pro Transatlantic democratic forces are not in control of the executive branch, where foreign policy is principally directed, not exclusively -- that's what I wrote about -- it seems to me if you look only at the events of recent weeks, we had a big scare in Sweden. The Swedes muddled through. The EU, for the first time, has taken action against Orbon, the Poles may well veto, but it still is significant

that that has been done. There is countervailing evidence, there are the disturbing riots that have rampaged through Germany -- a debate about exactly what happened in those riots. But democracy -- you know, one of the great analysts of liberalism of the 20th century is Isaiah Berlin, and he talks a lot -- his is a philosophy I think of how democracy muddles through, and I believe it's a longer argument. But I think the overall in Europe, Turkey, Afghanistan, and China present a harder problem, but the picture we see is of a Europe muddling through.

I'll reflect on the area I know the very best, the Czech Republic and Slovakia, where I think democracy is under some pressure but is vibrant still in the Czech Republic, and in Slovakia when there were -- it seemed like they were going to take -- the country was going to take the next turn towards autocracy with the killing of investigative journalists, there were massive public uprisings which forced Prime Minister Fico out of office, although he replaced himself with a crony. There's an independent president there.

So, you know, I think there's going to be a muddling until -- to paraphrase Churchill -- the new world once again comes to the rescue of the old. That could start to happen very soon because if the House of Representatives changes hands -- I saw this a lot as ambassador -- the power of the respect with which even a single member of congress, even a minority member is afforded in Europe, I mean the House will become a node of new American support for transatlanticism.

But the truth is I do agree with Bob in this regard. We don't know. And it's up to us, everybody in this room, starting with those of you who vote here to vote for accountability, irrespective of party, and for the Europeans and everybody to fight the fight. If we do that I believe the evidence of my study is if we fight the fight with all we have, we will win.

MR. INSKEEP: Is there a question from someone way in the back? Anybody way in the back? Where? I'm going to go the back though. Whose hand is that up in the back? I only see a hand here. Yes, with the watch on. Yes, waving your hand, stand up. That's fine, yes. (Laughter) All I saw was a hand, hopefully there is a body attached.

MR. NADEL: Yeah, there is. Mark Nadel. You mentioned the well noted

successes we had in Germany and Japan. Contrast that with the failure so far in Iraq and Afghanistan of bringing stable democracy. In one case we had enormous competence, in the other case enormous incompetence. But one big difference is Germany and Japan were ethnically homogenous, Germany, after they destroyed their Jewish community, Japan had always been. So to what extent is the gain in liberalism due to -- you mentioned tribalism, but tribalism -- you know, ethnic conflict, which may be, you know, hard wired -- to what extent is that vis a vis economic insecurity and other factors that have been mentioned?

MR. KAGAN: Well, I think it's wrong to look at both the success in Germany and Japan retrospectively as cake walks, so to speak. They didn't feel that way at the time. No one would have looked at Germany in 1945 and say, boy, there's a democracy waiting to happen. (Laughter) Nor would they have looked at Japan in that period. And so setting aside the complexities of Iraq or Afghanistan, or any other, it's wrong to assume that what we accomplished in Germany and Japan could only be accomplished in Germany and Japan. What is the difference? I hate to say the difference. One of the major differences, we went into Germany and we never left. We went into Japan, and we're still there today. We went into Korea, and we're still in Korea today, and South Korea is a flourishing democracy. Now, you know, that's not a great lesson because obviously we can't go everywhere in the world and stay. But more than just the staying, it's the ongoing commitment to dealing with problems that don't just vanish overnight. And that was certainly the case in Germany and Japan.

So it's a habit of American foreign policy because we're not an empire and we're not taking countries with the hope of ultimately either settling in them or owning them forever, Americans desire is to get in and get out. And sometimes we're getting out in the middle of while we're getting in. And that doesn't necessarily lead to the best outcomes that we're looking for.

By the way, I sympathize with that impulse. In a way it's a good impulse. We're not looking to expand our territory, we did that already in the 19th century. But it does make it harder to accomplish the kinds of things that we did in Germany and Japan.

MR. INSKEEP: Please join me in thanking our panelists. (Applause) Okay, last



word, yes or no. (Laughter)

MR. EISEN: We'll see.

MR. INSKEEP: Okay, there we go. I need now to bring in Bill Galston, Senior Fellow in Governance Studies at the Brookings Institution. He is going to continue our discussion. Come right on up and we'll step down.

MR. GALSTON: I'm reliably informed that my 10 minutes has become five minutes. (Laughter) So, I will do my best and let me make some very brief remarks in the form of a short series of points.

Point number one, which is a point of agreement with Robert Kagan: whatever we've learned over the past 25 years, I think we've learned that there is no end of history. And to be more precise, there is no magical invisible hand, divine or human, that is moving us in the direction of ever-increasing democracy. There is a distinction between liberalism, which is a body of ideals, and progressivism, which is a set of assumptions about the direction of history. You can be a liberal without being a progressive and you can be a progressive without being a liberal. That's a very important lesson that we've had to relearn the hard way.

Point number two of agreement with Bob Kagan: power matters, but power is not the only thing that matters. America's protective canopy after World War II had two crucial ingredients. Ingredient number one was military power and a credible commitment to use it. But commitment number two was to a body of ideals and, you know, as a teacher of mine once said, the sight of justice without a sword is a sorry sight. And ideals without power in back of them are also a sorry sight. And for a long period, we had both. I will say as an editorial matter that if you fight unnecessary wars, it becomes harder to fight necessary wars. If you fight wars without end, it becomes more difficult to engage in the kinds of limited military actions that are so often necessary to defend, democracy.

The third point I want to make is that liberal democracy, as it has flourished and grown since the end of the Second World War, now has two kinds -- faces two kinds of threats. Threat number one is external and if you look at Europe, let's take Europe, there is a Russian

threat, there is a Chinese threat that is stealthier, but not to be underestimated, and there is also pressure from the failed states and the failed non-states both of the Middle East and of Sub-Saharan Africa.

And if you think Europe has faced a refugee crisis, just wait until Sub-Saharan Africa becomes uninhabitable, which is in the process of becoming. What's going to happen then? You know, you have a continent with countries -- Europe with countries that are not only growing in population, but in a number of cases are declining in population. And then you have exploding populations in areas that are becoming uninhabitable. What happens then?

But there are also internal threats to democracy. Poor economic performance, overreach. You know, the European Union bet too much on internationalism and forgot about the forces of nationalism. It bet too much on the ideas of multiculturalism and, you know, underestimated the force of the power of cultural particularity. And those misjudgments and overreaches contributed, in my view, which I express at somewhat great length in my book, to the rise of illiberal populism in Europe, but alas not only in Europe.

And I guess to tie off this point, I would say that we assume that nationalism and one thing and -- is one thing, liberalism is another, and that liberal nationalism is an oxymoron. That is false. It's false conceptually and it's false historically. Liberal nationalism was the original form of liberalism. And in my judgment, it is just as viable a form of liberal democracy as liberal internationalism. And so, we should not go overboard in our denigration of nationalism.

My fourth and final point has to do with the illustrative nature of Ambassador ISAAN's chosen subject. Let us look at what used to be Czechoslovakia. What do we see? Well, we found that the Velvet Revolution was followed very quickly by the Velvet Divorce. The Czechs and the Slovaks, although they're not all that different, suffer from what the Freudians call the narcissism of little differences. They could not live together, right? The force of nationalism was too strong for Czechoslovakia. At least the separation was peaceful, but let us not forget that these two nations separated.

And secondly, what has happened to the country whose first Post-Communist

President was Václav Havel? His Office is now occupied by Miloš Zeman who has publicly cited Xi Jin Ping as a model of effective governance and has called the conflict in Ukraine a civil war. Right? What a fall there was, my countryman. And so the Czech Republic is exemplary, alas, in many, perhaps too many respects. Thank you for your attention. (Applause)

SPEAKER: Okay. I'm going to invite Linda Wertheimer and my honorary book family to come to the stage now and Lettie why don't you say where you want everyone, please?

SPEAKER: Okay. We know where our seats are.

SPEAKER: Do we? (Laughs)

SPEAKER: You're at the end.

SPEAKER: I -- I'm totally clueless, I confess.

SPEAKER: You're where you were. She's at the end.

SPEAKER: I'm down there?

SPEAKER: Yeah.

SPEAKER: Yes.

SPEAKER: Okay.

SPEAKER: You're next to me.

SPEAKER: Okay.

SPEAKER: Charles is here, I was here.

SPEAKER: And let's put Alexander here. Yeah. Alexander, you sit next to (inaudible). Alexander, come down here. I'll help with the German if necessary.

SPEAKER: You take -- this is like Chinese in Germany.

SPEAKER: If you think I'm longwinded in English, wait until you hear me in German. (Laughter)

SPEAKER: Okay, great.

And I'll invite those who are standing. We now have the speaker seats in the front and a few other fill-ins, so please do come and have a seat.

MS. WERTHEIMER: Now, that -- are we going to speak in the order in which we

are sitting?

SPEAKER: Whatever order you prefer.

MS. WERTHEIMER: Okay. That's fine. I'm Linda Wertheimer and I come to you -- where is it?

SPEAKER: It's the button --

MS. WERTHEIMER: There, okay. I'm Linda Wertheimer. I am the, I guess, longest-serving (laughs) person at National Public Radio still on the air.

SPEAKER: (Laughs)

MS. WERTHEIMER: And that's been a wonderful adventure and one of the things that happens is that people like Norm call me up and give me an opportunity to do something like this, which is quite a wonderful thing to be able to do. I'm -- I just want to mention the people who we are -- who we're talking to today, just so you get the sense of who they are.

Now, there was a man named Toussaint, Rudolf Toussaint, right?

SPEAKER: Toussaint.

MS. WERTHEIMER: Toussaint, who was the German who took command. He was running, essentially, Prague and he lived in the palace. And his grandson -- great-grandson --

SPEAKER: No, grandson.

MS. WERTHEIMER: -- grandson is here today. And it is his -- he is the closest -- one of the closest -- I mean, all of the interesting thing about this panel is that everybody does reach back to those extraordinary days between the interwar period.

And Alexander -- this is Alexander Toussaint and we'll talk to him in a minute. Laurene -- (clears throat) excuse me. Laurene Sherlock is the granddaughter of the Ambassador Laurence Steinhardt, who was the first Post-War Ambassador.

And Charlie Black, who is right here in the middle, Charlie Black is the son of Shirley Temple Black, who was the Ambassador -- well, she served, actually, for a relatively -- through a relatively interesting period of time. (Laughter) And we'll get to that.

And then we have Marc. Marc, Marc, what have I got here in my notes? Marc Robinson. He has had a very, very distinguished career at Yale. He is a professor of -- among other things, he teaches about films and he is -- and plays and he, we can -- as we keep hearing about this fabulous building that -- the palace. If everything had turned out as Otto intended it to turn out --

SPEAKER: (Laughs)

MS. WERTHEIMER: -- he would be living in the palace. (Laughter)

SPEAKER: He would, yes. (Laughter)

MS. WERTHEIMER: It would be his palace. But we Americans basically got a hold of it and never gave it back. (Laughter) So, let's just start in a kind of a -- I suppose, in a way we're starting chronologically with Marc Robinson.

The Petschek Palace was built between the wars by a Czech family who were immensely rich, notably as Europe was struggling to rebuild in the aftermath of the First World War. The Petschek family had coal, which was huge, and that made them very, very rich. Otto, the builder of the palace, spent huge amounts of money buying, among other things -- he felt that it was a beautiful big building. It would be a beautiful big building, but it needed beautiful big trees.

So, he bought old trees, huge old trees, and had them dug up and roots bound and wrapped and loaded onto box cars where they were -- they had to lie down because they were such big trees -- and taken to plant in his garden. And, of course, the most recent occupant of that house and person who walked in that garden was our own (laughs) Norm Eisen. And I was privileged to see it myself when we went to Prague and went to visit Norm.

It was -- the garden, Norm says, was Gaelic, British, and Teutonic all at once. It was a landscape created for linguistically German, legally Czech, culturally European Jew. And Marc Robinson's career at Yale has reflected his antecedent's interest in the arts. So, let me just ask you first of all, when did you first see the Petschek Palace?

MR. ROBINSON: I first went in 1986. I was living in Poland at the time and

decided to make up for my mother's indifference and inability to visit and go to see it and report back. And then I went again two other times in the late '80s and early '90s.

MS. WERTHEIMER: What do you remember? Do you remember...?

XXX091718.Brookings.Will Democracy Win\_S1R2xxx

...hearing about it in your family, was it a -- was it something in your family lore that you talked about?

MR. ROBINSON: Not at all.

MS. WERTHEIMER: Really?

MR. ROBINSON: In fact, that was what planted the seed, the desire to make up for that, to find out everything that either my grandfather chose not to talk about or my mother simply didn't know. My mother, actually, was the youngest of the 54 people who went to that Eucharistic Congress in Budapest. She was born six weeks before the family went into exile. But she has no idea -- she had no idea where she was during the first months of her life and didn't know, actually, who took care of her because her mother, my grandfather's wife, decided to stay behind with the other men in the family and close up the business.

So, it was a big mystery and again, my mother, I think, respecting her father's wish not to open up that very painful period simply didn't ask any questions. But nothing was stopping me from doing that, so I did and I went and I kept asking.

MS. WERTHEIMER: But you didn't just go as a tourist and wander around. You did -- like, you did a tremendous amount of research. You interviewed everybody that you could find who was alive who had been there for the great moments of the palace.

MR. ROBINSON: That's right. My grandfather was obvious -- obviously still alive and his three sisters were still with us. And while my grandfather was very reticent about the period, his sisters were actually eager to share the information and the memories that they had living there as children.

In my grandfather's case, actually, he simply erased his past not only because the experience of exile was painful, but I think that in moving to New York in the '30s, he

encountered a great deal of antisemitism and chose to kind of blank it over that period. So, he was a kind of -- and he did speak about this, not really having any identity, not feeling any kind of closeness to his Jewish identity, distant from his Czech identity as many German-speaking members of the Prague community were, and I wanted some kind of personality there.

So, I kind of filled it in in outline form by speaking to his siblings and also to other Petscheks. It's a very vast family, some of whom don't speak to each other. (Laughter) My grandmother once unironically referred to the Jewish Petscheks (laughter) as though she had nothing in common with them. (Laughter)

MS. WERTHEIMER: One of the people that -- you were incredibly generous, I understand from Norm --

SPEAKER: Microphone.

MS. WERTHEIMER: -- to share your research with him. Well, you were engaged in --

SPEAKER: Microphone.

MS. WERTHEIMER: -- filling in that --

SPEAKER: Louder.

MS. WERTHEIMER: -- (inaudible) you were filling in that outline, weren't you, Norm? The outline that he created when he did all this research, which you got to see and to use.

MR. EISEN: Well, I have to thank Marc and all of my book family who are here for their generosity. I should abuse my NPR privileges further to do just a few quick words. My research assistants, Kelsey and Andrew, who helped so much on this book and live the book with me, my editor, Dominic Alioto, who insist that I write about my mother instead of myself (laughter) in this book, the other members of the extended family who are here, my Brookings colleagues who are here, so many people in this room particularly who have stayed behind now for the gossip (laughter) who were a part of this book. Marc, I'm so appreciate to you, but really to everybody on here.

When I started writing the book, Linda, I went to seek advice from a more experienced author, Michael Lewis, because I realized I had gotten myself into a bit of a pickle. I've known Michael for many years. I had sold Dominica this proposal and received my advance when I realized I had virtually none of the information I needed to deliver (laughs) on what I had contractually obligated myself to do with Crown. And so I went and Michael informed me that writing a book is -- actually, diplomacy is excellent training because you need to get people to talk to you. Something you're very good at.

And so I went to see all of the people you see up on stage and over a period of time we developed a friendship and a trust. I'm very gratified that family -- I haven't heard a single complaint and only praise. So, I know my adopted book family well enough to know that you would tell me if I erred. So, I feel good about that.

And Marc was so generous because I didn't -- I gradually worked my way over to him and then when I met him, I discovered that for Otto and Martha and Vicky Petschek and the other -- the two twins, Rita and Eva, and the -- sorry, the two twins and Eva, who was called the third twin, that -- for the four children and the parents, that Marc had the motherlode because he had interviewed everyone when they were alive. And he had pictures and documents, but those interviews just really enabled me to get inside the heads of people.

I didn't use everything because the children had some reservations different, that the children of the children had different -- and the grandchildren of the children had some reservations, but there was ample material even avoiding the reservations to be able to tell the story. And the same thing was true with each of my other colleagues on the panel.

MS. WERTHEIMER: One of the things, I guess, that we all -- that I certainly wondered about is that this -- the palace is a palace. I mean, it is an extraordinary building. You walk into it and it has the sense -- because it has these long, curved carters that curve sharply enough that you don't see the end of them. It feels as though it just kind of goes on and on and on, and it is huge. But the -- and it's very, very ornate and very beautiful.

And one of the things we -- I learned in this book was that after the Petschek



family fled without most of their possessions, everything was still there, that the German Army appropriated all the fur coats. And there must have been dozens of them, huge numbers of beautiful outfits and handbags and shoes and whatnot from the closets of the women in the family.

And I was just -- I was thinking, what an odd thing it is that you were -- as I say, you have had a very distinguished career, you're a professor of -- how do we say -- dramaturgy. (Laughs) Yeah. Theatre studies at Yale, everybody, you know, I mean, a very interesting life. But when you read about all of this stuff and through your great-grandparents was so rich, did you ever just have a kind of little twinge that -- (laughter)

MR. EISEN: Yes, I probably should have said that envy was what really (laughter) prompted my great curiosity in the family, real estate envy. (Laughter) But I would say, even more than the beauty of the building or the various luxury items that were confiscated were the far more personal things that remained in the house. Really, everything that the family couldn't bring with them immediately or have shipped out in small packages later remained in the house. One of my great-aunts describes the day before going into -- going to that train, being told by her mother to pack one suitcase and trying to decide what she'd bring with her. And she decided to bring her set of Temple Shakespeare and some theatre programs that she loved. Another sister decided to bring some dresses, just spring dresses, nothing for various other climates.

And so when I did go to visit the house, I was asked, actually, by one of my great-aunts if I would go to the music room and look in the cabinets because her piano scores -- she was a wonderful pianist and teacher of piano -- were all still there. And indeed, they were with her own handwritten notations on them. One of the books in the library was in English a book on American banking methods and it had in Otto's handwriting the German translations of the English words that he didn't know. So, those things actually were far more of a kindling spark in my then-later obsessive curiosity about the history.

MS. WERTHEIMER: Now, when (inaudible) --

SPEAKER: Microphone.

MS. WERTHEIMER: Oh, I did it again, didn't I? It's not, you know, we have these engineers at NPR. They turn your microphone on. (Laughter) I'm used to -- (laughs) I'm used to somebody else doing that.

The thing that -- one of the things that was fascinating about the story is, you know, as time passes and the next person comes in and that is -- that was the Toussaint -- your ancestor, who was a General? Yes, in the German Army. Not a member of the Nazi party, but a very -- apparently, a very accomplished military man who came into the palace kind of the way -- in much the same way -- and it's -- I thought this was very interesting. That the period between the wars when the palace was built, the Petschek family -- it was begun in 1924, Otto died in 1934, and in 1938 the Petschek family left Prague and in 1941 Rudolf Toussaint arrived in Prague, arrived at the palace.

Now, he had a very difficult set of negotiations to carry out, as indeed did the -- many of the people who followed into the palace. Getting hold of the palace turned out to be quite a difficult thing to do. German soldiers were living in it. They had wrecked parts of the place, they had carried off or sold many of the treasures in the place. But he saw that there was so much still there that he felt he could protect it. And that, I think, is a -- that was an extraordinary thing to try to get hold of it and protect it.

So, let me ask you the same first question: have you been to the palace? What was your impression of it?

MR. TOUSSAINT: Yes. I went with Norman first time to the palace.

MS. WERTHEIMER: The first time was visiting with Norm?

MR. TOUSSAINT: Yes.

MS. WERTHEIMER: What did you think of it?

MR. TOUSSAINT: From the first moment, I saw how beautiful the palace is and then I understood how strange it would have been for my grandparents during the war. They were living in a beautiful palace, but surrounded by terror outside its walls. I could see how the

beauty of the palace was a part of my grandfather's prison.

MS. WERTHEIMER: A part of his prison? Don't you mean that he had -- that's an interesting way to put it. You -- did you hear about it when you were a child? Did your family talk about the Petschek Palace?

MR. TOUSSAINT: My grandfather passed away when I was five, so he never personally told me anything about the war or the palace. My grandmother rarely spoke about it, either. Everything was too painful. Sometimes when I was walking with her in Munich and ask her about the war, she would talk about it. Most of the things I know about the war and the palace I know from my father. He was 22 when he was visiting the palace and he told me about playing chess there with my grandfather. As he had been fighting on the frontlines in Russia, life in the palace was much better, so he met -- made the best out of his short home visit.

MS. WERTHEIMER: Now, the -- his father, the General --

SPEAKER: Microphone.

MR. TOUSSAINT: Linda.

MS. WERTHEIMER: I do -- I just can't -- I'm sorry.

MR. TOUSSAINT: It's okay.

MS. WERTHEIMER: His father, the General, did have the experience on more than one occasion of hearing that his son who had been killed or that he had been taken prisoner and he didn't know, you know, so these were obviously very precious times when Rolf -- was that the son's name?

MR. TOUSSAINT: Rudolf is my father, yeah.

MS. WERTHEIMER: When Rolf was able to come and see his parents, and it didn't happen very often. And one of the things that is extremely interesting to me is that your life has been a very different sort of life. You didn't follow your family into a military career. Instead, you were trained as a theologian, ordained as a deacon in a Catholic church, and you work with Mother Teresa's Missionaries of Charity.

Now, could you just talk to us about why you went in this direction?

MR. TOUSSAINT: I -- immediately after I graduated high school, I realized that the horrible regime change is always possible. And because of this I decided not to go to the military, even though it was obligatory this time. My father supported my decision, so I went straight into studying law at University in Munich.

When I was a teenager, I didn't believe in God. My father had left the church after the war and my family, boarding school, and city were mostly extremely liberal and agnostic. But then while studying law, I felt a call to study theology and read the Scriptures, inspired in part by a book that I found while I was traveling in Australia called "Jesus Wasn't A Carpenter." Studying Old Hebrew felt good because reading the original language made me feel closer to the time and the event. Once I finished studying theology in university in 1998, my father died and I began to work with Mother Teresa's charity. Then after I married and survived cancer, I became an ordained deacon, which I do in my personal time.

Throughout my life, the more I read the Scripture and prayed, the greater my faith became. But on one hand, I still feel like a poor sinner, maybe like everyone else. But on the other hand, I feel saved through faith as God's child.

Maybe my translation is difficult to understand, but I have tried my best.

(Laughter)

MR. ROBINSON: Can I ask --

MS. WERTHEIMER: Great.

MR. ROBINSON: Can I ask, because I am privileged to have Alexander as my friend and there -- the experience of the two of us walking through that house was absolutely extraordinary, I think, for us both. Why don't you tell them who your Hebrew teacher is and who you study the Hebrew Bible with? Your best friend.

MR. TOUSSAINT: Yes, my best friend. It's my best friend, Professor Reznikoff (phonetic 0:18:54) from Blesburg (phonetic 0:18:55).

MR. ROBINSON: And who is he, Alexander?

MR. TOUSSAINT: Yeah, my best friend, he is a priest and he knows 10 oral

Semitic languages and he -- I was learning Hebrew from him, mostly. Yeah.

MS. WERTHEIMER: It's an extraordinary -- I mean, I just found this, as we heard from Norm, the stories make everything come alive in a most -- in a -- really, quite a dramatic and interesting way.

Now, the next person who -- to occupy the palace was Laurence Steinhardt; he was the Ambassador, he was involved in politics, he helped elect Franklin Roosevelt in 1932. He arrived in Prague in 1945. He was a man that Norm noted in the book had decades of practice in saving the day. And the idea was that as the country and, of course, Prague were poised on the brink of every dreadful thing that could happen in the wake of the war, it was his job to prevent the wars from happening and to encourage the development of democracy and so forth.

His writ was huge to maintain the possibility of democracy to keep the Russians from taking over. And then in his spare time, sort of as a hobby, he decided he would save the palace. The Russians apparently had been far worse to the palace than the Germans had been. The Toussaint family had preserved much of it and preserved many of it -- most of its treasure. But the Russians did things like roll a grand piano down the grand staircase, which hardly worked at all. (Laughter) Made a huge -- made couple of huge dents along the -- in the walls, along the way. Not to mention, of course, completely wrecking the piano.

He was living in a -- in something which passed for a palace, but apparently was very close to uninhabitable. And he had a very difficult time trying to get the State Department to allow him to find a way to rent the palace, buy the palace, get the palace somehow into under American control, and that's what he did. He apparently was a ferocious anti-communist and in his last months in Prague, he ran out of the Petschek Palace a kind of Underground Railroad, getting people out as the Russians were coming in.

Now, you are his granddaughter?

MS. SHERLOCK: Yes.

MS. WERTHEIMER: And Laurene Sherlock has in some way, I suppose, moved in a similar direction to her father in that she is a -- she's a savior of treasures, as well.

MS. SHERLOCK: Oh. (Laughter)

MS. WERTHEIMER: Works with antiques and is a person who -- she understands the value of this -- of -- she serves the appraisal needs of individuals, organizations, and institutions in Washington here and in the Mid-Atlantic region.

So, have you seen the palace?

MS. SHERLOCK: Yes, in -- yes. I was privileged to see it through my own eyes and through the eyes of my mother, who lived there from '45 to '48. In 1996, the trip was arranged through the auspices of my cousin sitting in the audience, Peter Rosenblatt, who knew the Ambassador at the time, Jenonne Walker. And so it was an honor to see it and certainly from the aesthetic standpoint that runs (laughs) genetically through my family, it's an astounding, astounding establishment. The vision of one man in optimism and it's just marvelous to see.

MS. WERTHEIMER: Did you -- do you know why your grandfather (inaudible)

MS. SHERLOCK: Well, (laughs) there's optimism, then there's pragmatism. The living facilities at the time of his arrival were very compromised. So, the chancery basically was an office complex in a rabbit warren of offices and I remember my mother saying that you would be dressing for an event you had to go to and somebody would open a door and walk right through because they were cohabitating in the chancery. It was necessary to find something a little bit more (laughs) appropriate to live in with some privacy. So, there was a motivating factor (laughs) there. Really, a motivating factor.

But I think when my grandfather first saw the Petschek Palace, it harkened back to some -- in some ways, the -- to a certain extent, the background in which he grew up, as well as the historical aspect to this magnificent building.

And in seeing it with my mother in 1996, I had one series of impressions, several of which have already been stated. But my mother, who had left the palace in 1948 at the age of 21, I looked -- we stepped with Mr. Walker in the ballroom. Which, for those of you who understand, Czech glass is magnificent, the chandeliers are superb. And my mother said very quietly, "The last time I was in this room, I was 21 years old and I was dancing at my 21st

birthday party under these chandeliers." And I looked at my mother's face and 60 years of age just washed away.

The house has that kind of effect on you. I don't know how else to express that.

MS. WERTHEIMER: One of the stories that your grandfather told us, we're  
(inaudible) (laughter)

SPEAKER: (Inaudible)

MS. WERTHEIMER: One of the stories --

SPEAKER: I think it automatically turns off the --

MS. WERTHEIMER: That is what it --

MS. SHERLOCK: Yeah.

MS. WERTHEIMER: -- does, yes.

SPEAKER: The genies of engineering, it's your --

MS. WERTHEIMER: So, maybe I should just --

SPEAKER: It's your payback.

MS. WERTHEIMER: -- keep my thumb there.

SPEAKER: All the karma.

MS. WERTHEIMER: (Laughs)

SPEAKER: All those years of being (laughter) --

MS. WERTHEIMER: Right.

SPEAKER: -- coddled by --

MS. WERTHEIMER: You're right.

SPEAKER: -- engineers.

MS. WERTHEIMER: You're right. (Laughter) Your grandfather described a scene which was just amazing. He said, you know, all of it, the sort of song about location, location, location, of course. The Petschek Palace is on rising ground above the city. You have extraordinary views, especially from the upstairs rooms of this spread. It has huge gardens that are beautiful now. But what Mr. Steinhardt found was, he said that the lawn in the back glittered

like diamonds. You want to tell the rest of the story?

MS. SHERLOCK: Well, in between the -- (laughs) thank you. (Laughs) We're technically challenged up here. In between the departure of General Toussaint's family and the arrival of the Steinhardt family, there was a period of time when Russian Soviet troops occupied the house. And Norm has spoken very glowingly about Bob Gorney, who was the caretaker through this whole line of history. And he watched as these resident military would take the fine china and throw it up in the -- into the air and skeet shoot and the glassware and the bottles of wine.

And so you ended up with a lot of destruction. The chandeliers in the dining room were shot at and shot up. And so when my grandfather arrived, this was the condition he found.

MS. WERTHEIMER: But didn't he just -- he cleaned it up.

MS. SHERLOCK: Well, he sure did. Sure did. Ordered all the tulips, (laughs) just got to work.

And raised the flagpole, I might add. Put the American -- oh. Put the American flagpole up very high. I mean, his mission statement was to bring the presence of democracy to the forefront in Czechoslovakia at the time. And so up with the flagpole and up with the flag very high, symbolic.

MS. WERTHEIMER: Okay. The most modern occupant of the building apart from Norm (laughter) was Shirley Temple Black. Shirley Temple Black was, as you all know, Shirley Temple in her early life. She first saw the palace in 1968. Now, you know, those of us who are living with young people who talk about what a terrible, terrible time we have had in the last couple of years in this country, I always tell them, "You should have been here in 1968." 1968 was a terrible year all over the world, I think.

Anyway, that she was there in 1968, she saw riots, she escaped from the city in extraordinary fashion. When the Soviets drove their tanks into Prague, this was. Twenty-one years later she came back to the palace as the Ambassador appointed by George H.W. Bush.



Now, none of us, I think, would have thought of Shirley Temple as an Ambassador unless she were just, you know, there to sort of shake her tiny little hands at -- with (laughter) famous people and completely charm them, which she certainly did all her life. But she turns out to have been one tough cookie.

Now, tell us about -- tell us what -- you want to tell the story about your mother and her motorcade leaving Prague?

MR. BLACK: I guess you're referring to the 1968 exit?

MS. WERTHEIMER: Yes.

MR. BLACK: That was very -- she was very pleased to get out. (Laughter) She had a couple of very tough days. She found herself in a limousine at the front of a couple of hundred car cavalcade heading out of Prague and heading to the West German border. And she was in, actually, the lead car and there was a car following us, the Embassy station wagon with the American flags on it. She told me that as they drove along, you know, people would rush past the soldiers that were along the line and kiss the flag and rush back in. It was a very, very tough time.

But at some point, she was in the passenger seat at the front of end and the driver who was Czech had left and had gone somewhere and he was no longer -- I'm mixing that story, aren't I? But anyway, the -- she ended up having to drive the car (laughter) herself. He waved her over to the driver's side and -- so, she took off and the car behind her, the flag car, was supposed to lead the cavalcade. So, it pulled past her and took off. Very competitive, Tauros, she didn't have any of that. So, she gunned it and got back in front of him and can -- (laughter) and that was the way it went the rest of the way to West Germany.

Was that the story you were after? (Laughter)

Very, very, very typical of her.

MS. WERTHEIMER: -- had a -- she was recognized, obviously. Because, you know, even though she was a grown woman, by this time she still had all of that same sweet face that we all saw in the movies. And she was recognized everywhere she went. She must have

been, I was just saying, one of the most famous women in America and I would not be surprised if she still is one of the most famous American women.

But she -- her experience in Prague attracted her very much to the ideas that they -- that were being raised by politics there, Dubček in particular. And she was very concerned about them and she followed everything that happened and she got more and more involved. She set up an -- her ambassadorial training program, which went on for quite a long time and sort of something like what the -- what Harvard -- the Harvard Kennedy School does for beginning members of Congress.

Anyway, she got ready for her career in diplomacy. And is -- do you think it was that time in Prague that sent her on a diplomatic mission?

MR. BLACK: There is no question that the experience in 1968, she was sort of ripe for it, always a hard worker from (laughs) the ripe old age of three. (Laughter) She had the value of hard work and -- as a satisfaction ingrained in her. And she was looking to make a difference in the world and in peoples' fortunes. And certainly, the events and the War Stop Act Invasion of Prague in '68 and her happening to be there, part of her charmed life, I guess, charmed invasion. (Laughs)

She drew inspiration from that and she very shortly found herself -- found her way to the United Nations in 1969 and she had a lot of activity in the General Assembly and then in the Stockholm conference on the environment. She built her career piece by piece, worked hard, did the ambassadorial seminar during the Reagan years, trained virtually every Ambassador that went out to the world for those eight years.

She was a very hard worker and when President Bush contacted her and suggested that he'd like her to be Ambassador in Czechoslovakia, she was thrilled. And what a fortuitous time to have headed out to Prague and to Eastern Europe at this moment in history. And she's -- she had a very natural affinity for Václav Havel and for the other dissidence, she -- they were instant friends.

She, of course, had preceded herself (laughs) as a little girl and was in -- greatly

endeared in Czechoslovakia. During the previous visit in '68, a lot of people came up to her -- and even later, during the time of the communist domination of the state before the Velvet Revolution -- people would come up and would surreptitiously show her or hand her their Shirley Temple fan club cards. She was -- (laughter) she -- everybody knew her, most of them had grown up with her, so they were very comfortable with her. They -- yeah, she was another Sri Linka Lakova (phonetic 0:35:18) it was very simple. And -- but she was, as you suggested, a very tough adversary for the communists and she was determined that she was going to find a way to support the dissidence and support the movement and to bring down that piece of the iron curtain and so.

MS. WERTHEIMER: There's a story about that, her going to her demonstration.

MR. BLACK: Yes. She would instruct her Staff at the Embassy to go nowhere near it and then she and my father would head on down. (Laughter) It was important for her. Many people saw her, not just the secret police, but many of the dissidence saw her and knew that she was there not just as a person, but she was looking and watching on behalf of the American people. This was, you know, what was happening there was not going to go quietly.

MS. WERTHEIMER: So, Norm, what do you think of your period living in the palace?

MR. EISEN: Well, the most wonderful -- one of the most wonderful parts of my period living in the palace was to be able to serve as the vessel for the fifth character in the book, my mother, a Czechoslovak Jewish Holocaust survivor, to be able to send her son back after having been deported to Auschwitz from Czechoslovakia by the same occupying regime to send me back to live in a Jewish home that had once been occupied by those same forces and to represent the most powerful and the most indispensable nation on earth, as you heard in my conversation with Bob and Steve earlier.

That was a wonderful, (laughter) a wonderful thing as a turn of history. I'll be uncharacteristically brief since we're going to go to a little Q and A when we finish. That was a wonderful turn of history, a wonderful transatlantic story particularly when I discovered the

Swastikas. Under the tables, Alexander and I looked at some of them when we were there together. To think that I was there and lighting the Sabbath candle, Sabbath candles on that same table. And I heard many of mother's stories as a result -- that I had not before heard, as a result of my being there talking to her every day.

And then I learned so many other wonderful stories and I met my adopted book family here. Dan Burger , who I mentioned to all of you before, came and visited me, I don't know, four or five times to help me begin excavating in, like, a intellectual moncase (phonetic 0:38:17). "Norm, you have to -- there's a larger story here," and part of that story was representing the values of liberal democracy. That was the third strand, representing -- fighting those values, and as you'll read in the book, my mother emerged as my best advisor in guiding me as I fought for American values.

At one point, came very close to getting PNG'd persona non grata thrown out of the country because of my vigorous defense of LGBTQ rights. But it's all of a piece. As my mom pointed out to me in urging my advocacy she said, "Do you think it is a coincidence that the Jews and the gays and the Roma, the gypsies are still being targeted?" I write in the book about with her advice how I fought for those three groups and others. We had a kosher Iftar dinner in the palace, others who were also being targeted.

So, those were three of the takeaways. And what a wonderful privilege when I left to start to put this book together and to work with everybody here on the stage in doing that, to capture those stories while people were still living. I was too late to talk to the twins, Rita and Ena, I was too late to talk to Vicky, but I still was able to talk to and befriend Eva, so we had one of the children who survived.

And then, of course, I benefitted from the memories, the experiences, everybody on stage with me. Had a deep relationship with at least one person who lived in the palace. Generally, a child or a grandchild of the protagonist, so I benefitted enormously from that.

MS. WERTHEIMER: Now, questions from the audience, but also if anybody on the panel -- (laughs) thank you. If anybody on the panel wants to question, we'll certainly like,

honor that, as well. So, there's a hand right back there. With the Wyatt Earp mustache.

SPEAKER: Thank you. I'm Ian Winchop (phonetic 0:40:31), retired member of the Foreign Service. There's been a lot in recent years about efforts strongly backed by United States government to make restitution to owners of property, of Jewish property that have been occupied by the Nazis and later by the Soviets. I wonder if you could perhaps give us a little story about those efforts and what was the result of those, as far as this building.

SPEAKER: Well, the -- everybody who's on the panel here had some role in the preservation and restitution of the building. And I write about it; it's an ongoing theme in the chapters. Ultimately, the surviving Petschek children did receive a settlement. It was set up by Ambassador Steinhardt and the building was preserved. Unlike the first occupants who rated it, General Toussaint preserved the building and he followed Mr. Bockorny's instructions.

Bockorny wanted to keep everything where Otto Petschek had it. (Laughter) And the General went along with that or could not -- the building could not have been preserved without him. I think it's telling that all of the German occupiers in Prague -- and I write candidly about his complicity on how despite his resistance, he was drawn in to the evil of the regime. But he was the only one that they let live, the Czechs, when they put all the Germans on trial because they had and I have Czech documents of the time expressing gratitude for, among other things, his preservation of the building.

And then, of course, Ambassador Black, Charlie's mom, began this modern push to preserve not just the building, to oversee the reparations, which were ultimately after many decades being set up first by Ambassador Steinhardt and then finally delivered on, but to also engage in the act of reparation and preservation of the memories. Of the cultural, not just the physical heritage, but of the cultural heritage of the building. And I have a letter that Ambassador Black wrote to Eva Petschek saying, "Please tell me the story."

It took me to come along to actually get the story and I think I'll just end our panel and pass it back to Linda by thanking everybody here for their effort. Now, right or wrong, it's preserved between Boards, (laughter) so I'm already getting little notes for corrections to the -- to

a future edition. They're minor, thankfully, minor corrections, so far. But it's preserved now and I want to thank everybody here for that. And, of course, thank all of you who have spent the morning with us and now you're a part of this tradition --

MS. WERTHEIMER: (Laughs)

SPEAKER: -- of keeping these stories alive. And finally, Linda, since you can't thank yourself, (laughter) I want to thank you for anchoring this fascinating panel. I learned some new things here today.

MS. WERTHEIMER: Well, I'm very impressed. Thank you very much. This is -- this has been a wonderful, a wonderful experience to hear from all of these people. And I hope that you all have enjoyed it and keep in mind what a great resource Brookings is that it provides us with all these opportunities. Thank you all very much.

SPEAKER: Thank you, everyone. (Applause)

\* \* \* \* \*

CERTIFICATE OF NOTARY PUBLIC

I, Carleton J. Anderson, III do hereby certify that the forgoing electronic file when originally transmitted was reduced to text at my direction; that said transcript is a true record of the proceedings therein referenced; that I am neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to the action in which these proceedings were taken; and, furthermore, that I am neither a relative or employee of any attorney or counsel employed by the parties hereto, nor financially or otherwise interested in the outcome of this action.

Carleton J. Anderson, III

(Signature and Seal on File)

Notary Public in and for the Commonwealth of Virginia

Commission No. 351998

Expires: November 30, 2020