News from the United States and Canada

News from the United States and Canada

CONFERENCES

1972 Meeting of the American Historical Association

The eighty-seventh annual meeting of the *American Historical Association* was held in New Orleans, Louisiana, on December 28-30, 1972. Two sessions were of special interest to students of Habsburg history.

The first, chaired by Basil Dmytryshyn, of Portland State University, was devoted to "The First Partition of Poland: A Bicentennial View" and included the following panelists: Charles Morley, of Ohio State University, who presented a paper on "The First Partition of Poland in Polish Historiography;" Martin Katz, of the University of Alberta, who treated "The First Partition of Poland in Russian Historiography;" and Jaroslaw Pelenski, of the University of Iowa, who discussed "The Role of the Haidamaks in the Decline of Poland." The commentary was by Herbert H. Kaplan, of Indiana University. About fifty persons attended the session, and many took an active part in the subsequent question and answer period.

Each speaker approached the problem of the First Partition of Poland from a different direction. Morley noted that the partitions of Poland have produced four distinct schools of historical thought in Polish historiography: (1) the Cracow School in the nineteenth century, which argued that the fall of Poland was the fault of the Poles themselves; (2) the Warsaw School, also in the nineteenth century, which contended that the partitions were the result of external factors (namely, Prussia, Russia, and Austria); (3) the post-World War II "Stalinist School," which criticized many former Polish historians for their one-sidedness, unawareness of social conflict in history, and other shortcomings and errors; and (4) the post-Stalinist School, whose main proponents are Boguslaw Lesnodorski and Marian Serejski, who contend that Poland fell because of her geographical location, her multinational and multireligious population, her political institutions, her economic and social structure, and the mentality and life-style of the Poles. Morley's concluding observations were that present-day Polish historians seem convinced that the examination of the fall of Poland "has become for the moment essentially closed" and that there is consequently no need to search for scapegoats.

Katz limited his presentation to the views of some of the most

prominent historians of imperial Russia and of the Soviet Union, namely M. M. Shcherbatov, N. M. Karamzin, M. P. Pogodin, S. M. Soloviev, N. Ia. Danilevskii, V. O. Kliuchevskii, S. F. Platonov, A. A. Kornilov, M. N. Pokrovskii, B. G. Grekov, V. D. Koroliuk, I. S. Miller, P. N. Tretiakov, A. I. Baranovich, B. B. Kafengauz, and I. A. Bulygin. He contended that historians of imperial Russia and those of the Soviet Union are in general agreement that the acquisition of lands in Russia through the partition was consistent with the Moscovite role of "gathering the lands of the Kievan state." He also argued that Russian historians of both epochs (pre- and post-revolutionary) felt that Prussia and Austria were guilty of acquiring lands that were ethnically alien to them. Finally, he observed that, unlike their imperial counterparts (who emphasized only diplomatic, religious, and internal political motives), Soviet historians have argued that economic considerations were prime factors leading to the First Partition of Poland.

Pelenski focused his attention on the Ukrainian haidamaks. He traced the origin of the haidamak movement, provided an etymological interpretation of the term, chronicled the haidamaks' activities, and discussed their social composition, organizational structures, and program. He maintained that because Poland was unable and unprepared to cope with the haidamak insurrection, she was forced to invite Russian military intervention, which, in turn, by increasing Polish reliance and dependence on Russia, eventually contributed to Poland's downfall. Pelenski reasoned that the haidamaks brought disaster on both themselves and Poland, and in so doing helped imperial Russia to triumph.

The commentator, Herbert Kaplan, raised several pertinent questions. He urged scholars to examine anew all the diplomatic and political materials housed in such Soviet archives as the *Arkhiv vneshnei politiki Rossii,* the *Tsentralnyi gosudarstvennyi arkhiv drevnikh aktov,* and the *Leningradskoe otdelenie instituta istorii akademii nauk SSSR,* and to search for pertinent documents in the manuscript division of the Lenin Library and in other collections in the U.S.S.R. He also suggested that scholars reexamine sources in the *Deutsche Zentral Archiv* in Merseburg (which houses documents of the former *Geheime Preussische Staats Archiv*). Kaplan insisted that only a careful examination of these and other foreign archives can give us complete knowledge about the real causes of Poland's dismemberment and replace falsehoods and half truths with simple historical truth.[1]

At a session on "National Interest and Cosmopolitan Goals in the

[1]The editor wishes to express his appreciation to Basil Dmytryshyn, of Portland State University, for writing the above report.

Hungarian Revolution of 1848," chaired by R. John Rath, of Rice University, Istvan Deak, of Columbia University, lectured on "Louis Kossuth's Nationalism and Internationalism." Emphasizing the fact that Kossuth was both a sincere nationalist and a sincere liberal, Deak maintained that these convictions strongly reinforced each other. Deak pointed out that Kossuth was not a revolutionary but a reformer who was forced by events beyond his control to instigate revolution at home in 1848 and to seek alliances with revolutionary circles outside Hungary.

Laszlo Deme, of New College (Sarasota, Florida), presented a paper dealing with general aspects of the overall topic discussed by the panel. He pointed out that the Magyar and non-Magyar nations made similar mistakes. While the Magyars attempted to gain Habsburg assistance against the non-Magyar nationalities, the latter tried to liberate themselves with the cooperation of the court. Although the Magyars did not actually attack anyone either at home or abroad, the non-Magyar peoples in the lands of the Crown of St. Stephen made a grave tactical error by initiating hostilities against the Hungarian revolutionaries.

Radu R. Florescu, of Boston College, concentrated his attention on "The Magyar-Romanian Struggle of 1848-1849." Asserting that the Romanian Transylvanian revolutionary movement was the longest, bloodiest, and most destructive and complex of all the 1848 revolutions, he urged Western, Hungarian, and Romanian historians, none of whom have investigated its most important facets, to study it in detail. At the same time, he made a plea for both Romanian and Hungarian scholars to write the history of the revolution from a non-nationalist point of view and with greater objectivity than they have in the past.

Béla Király, of Brooklyn College, commented on Ferenc Deák's impact on the revolution. Concentrating on Deák's role in drafting the thirty-one fundamental laws promulgated by the Hungarian diet on April 11, 1848, as well as on his actions as minister of justice in the Hungarian revolutionary government, Király maintained that Deák made a substantial contribution to the coordination of national interests with cosmopolitan goals, not so much in the attainment of immediate results but in leaving a body of progressive ideas for future generations to follow.

The last speaker on the panel, Joseph F. Zacek, of the State University of New York at Albany, addressed the topic of "Czech Attitudes toward the Hungarian Revolution." Zacek pointed out that the attitude of the Czech liberals, strongly influenced by the attitudes and actions of the Magyar leaders toward the Slovaks, was generally negative throughout the revolution. The liberals found the Magyars' stand—at first privileged and finally separatist—dangerous and incompatible with the official program of Austro-Slavism which they

had adopted. The radicals, far less devoted than the liberals to maintaining the political integrity of the monarchy and far more revolutionary in their demands, found it increasingly difficult to criticize the Magyars; and ultimately, in the spring of 1849, they openly sided with them.

The contributions of the panelists were followed by an animated discussion from the floor. Prominent among those commenting on the papers, especially the one by Deak, was Cornealea Bodea, of the University of Bucharest. Other persons, both in the audience and on the panel, discussed the nationalist policies of the Hungarians during the revolution from differing Romanian, Hungarian, and Czech points of view.

Conferences in 1973

Contributions to the field of Austrian history were made at various conferences in 1973. At the *Missouri Valley History Conference* at Omaha, Nebraska, on March 8-10, Marsha Lee Frey, then of the University of Oregon, presented a paper entitled "The Latter Years of Leopold I and His Court, 1700-1705: A Pernicious Factionalism." Miss Frey pointed out that during the last years of Leopold I's reign, the emperor's irresolution was mirrored in the increasingly factious and fractious imperial court, which was fragmented into various circles that often intersected and conflicted with each other. From 1700 to 1705 one of the most influential court circles in Vienna was the old ministerial party composed of the older ministers at court who has served Leopold since his early years as emperor. It opposed the war with France over the Spanish inheritance, advocated the consolidation of imperial rather than Austrian power, and believed that the Habsburgs' true interest lay in Italy, not in Spain. Another group, the reform party, made up of the younger members of the court, urged Leopold to fight for the Spanish inheritance and advocated extensive changes in the financial and military administration of the empire. Furthermore, each of the ministers had his own "circle of influence" at Vienna. These ministerial circles accurately reflected the fragmented court, which could not even reach agreement on the crucial issue of the Spanish inheritance. The divisiveness of the Viennese court in the early years of the war was particularly pernicious for the Habsburgs, because it greatly impeded the war effort, decreased their diplomatic effectiveness, and damaged imperial prestige.

The *Southwestern Social Science Association* met at Dallas, Texas, on March 22-24, 1973. One of the sessions, chaired by Radomír Luža, of

Tulane University, was devoted to "The Austrian Heimwehr." In a paper on "The Heimwehr and the Paramilitary Right in Austria before July, 1927," C. Earl Edmondson, of Davidson College, outlined some of the ideas developed more fully in a book soon to be published by the University of Georgia Press. Bruce Pauley, of Florida Technological University, presented a paper on "Hahnenschwanz and Swastika: The Pan-German Right in the First Austrian Republic." In it he traced the origins, membership, ideology, leadership disputes, and relative success of the Austrian National Socialist German Workers' Party, and compared them with those of the Heimwehr, the Landbund, and the Frontkämpfervereinigung. Of these groups the Nazis, by 1934, had become the most important, largely because they received financial support from Germany and because they were considered by dissident Austrians as the organization most likely to accomplish an *Anschluß* with Germany. Reinhart Kondert, of the University of Southwestern Louisiana, contributed a report entitled "The Great Disappointment: Schober and the Heimwehr, 1929-1930." He maintained that it was during the Johann Schober ministry from September, 1929, to September, 1930, that the Heimwehr was transformed from a strong political force into a weak and divided movement, largely because the chancellor managed to gain mastery over the organization by successfully replacing its leaders with more responsible men and by gaining control of its finances. John Haag, of the University of Georgia, offered comments on all three papers.

When the *American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies* convened in New York City on April 18-21, 1973, Istvan Deak, of Columbia University, presented a paper entitled "Hungary on the Eve of 1848" at a session on "Destruction, Revolution, or Reform," chaired by Ivo Lederer, of Stanford University.

In August, 1973, papers by scholars from Canada and the United States were presented at two different conferences in Poland. At *Jablonna* a conference on "Industrialization and Modern Technology in the Agrarian Countries of Central and Southern Europe, 1850-1918," was sponsored jointly by the *Polish Academy of Sciences* and the *International Committee on the History of Technology*. Scott M. Eddie, of the University of Toronto, reported on "Industrialization and the Export of Manufactured Products from Hungary during the Protectionist Period (1882-1913)." In *Warsaw,* Joseph F. Zacek, of the State University of New York at Albany, contributed a study on "Slovakia and the Czech National Revival—A Case Study" at the seventh *International Congress of Slavists.*

Wilmer H. Paine, Jr., of Tarkio College, spoke on "Local Governments versus the National Government: The Example of the Hungarian County Resistance, 1905-1906" at the annual *Western Slavic Association* meeting in San Francisco in October, 1973.

A few weeks later, on November 25-26, Béla Várdy, of Duquesne University, reported on "Some Main Trends in Interwar Hungarian Historiography" at the plenary session of the *Árpád Academy* held in Cleveland, Ohio. According to Várdy, although the dominant historical school in interwar Hungary was the *Geistesgeschichte* school inspired by Wilhelm Dilthey, many of the traditional schools survived and several new schools came into existence, the most significant of which was the so-called "ethnohistory school" led by Elemér Mályusz.

A *Conference on the Austrian Resistance Movement* was held at the University of Wisconsin at Oshkosh on December 6-7, 1973. In cooperation with the Dokumentationsarchiv des österreichischen Widerstandes, the Conference Group for Social and Administrative History, the College of Continuing Education, and the Departments of Political Science and Foreign Languages of the University of Wisconsin at Oshkosh sponsored the premier showing in the United States of the touring exhibit on "The Austrian Fight for Freedom against National Socialism in the Years 1939 to 1945." In conjunction with this exhibit, the Conference Group held a series of lectures and round tables at the Pollock Alumni House of the university. The scholars who presented papers were as follows: John A. Bernbaum, of the Historical Office of the United States Department of State, who spoke on "Austria in the Plans of the Grand Alliance;" Robert Schwarz, of Florida Atlantic University, who read a paper on "Austria's Socialist Workers: The Silent Resistance;" and Bruce Pauley, of Florida Technological University, who reported on "The Fascist Resistance: Anti-Nazism in Austria before *Anschluß*." The scholars who participated in the round-table discussions included Alfred Low, of Marquette University; Lewis Tusken, Willard Smith, Stephen Hintz, and J. Lucien Radel, of the University of Wisconsin at Oshkosh; Barbara G. Sniffen, associate editor of *Societas—A Review of Social History;* and Werner Braatz, chairman of the Conference Group for Social and Administrative History.

Each of the lecturers presented interesting views on the Austrian resistance. In discussing the role of the Fatherland Front as an agent of resistance to the Nazis prior to the *Anschluß,* Pauley observed that "the philosophy and policies of the Front were clearly designed to take the wind out of the Nazis' sails." Although racial anti-Semitism was

rejected, Pauley maintained, religious and cultural anti-Judaism were fostered, and Jews were identified with the hated philosophies of liberalism, individualism, and socialism.

Schwarz explained that in the immediate aftermath of the *Anschluß* "a good deal of workers' reaction, to judge by the response thereto in the *Völkischer Beobachter,* revealed no prima facie case of dissatisfaction." "But," he added, "very little can be made of this kind of feedback. Even if true, enthusiastic receptions of Nazi functionaries in the first flush of post-*Anschluß* intoxication is no sign of readiness to play ball with the Nazis in the future. The welcome which Hitler was accorded by thousands of Viennese, many of whom undoubtedly [were] workers and former card-carrying Socialists, while perhaps disturbing, is also no proof of success of the Nazi missionary project in subsequent months."

Bernbaum pointed out that by the "fall of 1944, OSS reports from Austria described the underground as 'essentially a workers' affair with its roots reaching back to the period of Dollfuss and Schuschnigg.' According to the analysis of OSS observers, the socialists and trade union groups dominated Vienna while the communists led the partisan formations in southern Austria. The OSS concluded that the partisans in southern Austria were the 'nucleus of an Austrian Maquis that is slowly taking shape' and that they could be counted on as supporters of the Allied cause."

At the conclusion of each of the sessions, the members of the audience and the participants in the panels had ample occasion to view the touring exhibit of more than a hundred photographs concerning the Austrian resistance that comprised the touring exhibit prepared by Dr. Herbert Steiner and his staff.[2]

At the *American Historical Association* convention, held at San Francisco, California, on December 28-30, 1973, two sessions dealt with aspects of Habsburg history. On December 28, papers were presented by Lawrence D. Orton, of Oakland University, Victor S. Mamatey, of the University of Georgia, and Radomír Luža, of Tulane University, at a session on "Prague in European History: 1848-1948," Chaired by Dimitrije Djordjević, of the University of California at Santa Barbara. In his paper on "The German Response to the Prague Slav Congress of 1848," Orton maintained that the national rancors in Central Europe in the spring of 1848 reached a climax in the debate over the Slav Congress and greatly facilitated the triumph of the reactionary forces. Windischgrätz was able to move with ease against the isolated Slavs in Prague,

[2]The author wishes to thank Werner Braatz, of the University of Wisconsin at Oshkosh, for contributing this report on the conference on the Austrian Resistance Movement.

who had been vilified by the German and Viennese press. Later the embittered and desperate Slav liberals joined the conservatives in the Habsburg court to rout the radical nationalists in Vienna and Budapest who had maligned their efforts to secure equal national rights.

The contributions by Mamatey on "The Communist Coup in Prague in 1948: Preparation in Slovakia" and by Luža on "February 1948 and the Czechoslovak Road to Socialism: A Historical Perspective" offered fresh insights into contemporary Czech and Slovak politics and showed that there were striking similarities between conditions in 1848 and 1948. In both 1848 and 1948 the proposals of the Czechs and Slovaks hardly received a tolerant hearing before they were prematurely resolved by force from outside. The Cominform's denunciations and Stalinist pressures of 1948 recall the German demands for intervention and Windischgrätz's cannonades of the preceding century.

All three papers emphasized that events of the preceding eight years (the national awakening of the 1840's and the wartime experiences of the 1940's) contributed significantly to the crises of both '48's. But there were differences. A point made by Luža, and tellingly reiterated by Mamatey, was that in 1948 the proponents of the Czech and Slovak communist cause, in contrast to the bourgeois leaders of the Slav Congress in 1848, possessed the power and the decisiveness to implement their program. The Czechoslovak Communists comprised the largest government party after 1948. With careful illustration, Mamatey showed how in late 1947 they even engineered a successful "dress rehearsal" for a political coup. Orton emphasized, in contrast, the moderation and lack of political experience of the nineteenth-century Czech and Slovak leaders.

All three speakers stressed the decisive importance of the element of force in 1848 and in 1947 and 1948. In 1947 and 1948 the military, as well as the police, supported at least one segment of the Czech cause, the Communist. Both Luža and Mamatey emphasized the ability of the Czech and Slovak Communists in 1947 and 1948 effectively to mobilize mass organizational forces to intimidate their political rivals. They pointed out, in contrast, the "energetic" actions which Prince Windischgrätz had taken against street demonstrations in 1848. Even if the prince did not move on behalf of the Germans, who clearly desired martial actions, he certainly moved against the Czech nationalists and democrats. This observation corroborated Luža's statement that the radical popular mood of 1948 was far more realistic than the romantically colored theatrical antics, noted by Orton, of those "lovely Slav barbarians in German civilized Prague" a century earlier.

Moreover, the German element, whose role was crucial to Orton's argument and which perhaps influenced the place of the Czechs and

Slovaks in history to this day, had been neutralized by 1948. Hence the friendship openly manifested by the Czechoslovaks toward the "Russian Slav brother," emphasized by Luža and referred to by Mamatey, stands in decisive contrast to the rampant anti-Russian feelings of both the Czech and German bourgeois liberals in 1848. The contrast, of course, reflects the change in political realities from 1848 to 1948.

The three commentators on the program—Anthony De Luca, of California State University at Humboldt; Kenneth W. Rock, of Colorado State University; and Paul Zinner, of the University of California at Davis—also pointed out similarities and differences between the two '48's and posed incisive questions.[3]

On December 30, a joint session of the American Historical Association with the American Association for the Study of Hungarian History was devoted to the topic "Critical Social Thought in Twentieth-Century Hungary." Gábor Vermes, of Rutgers University at Newark, New Jersey, was chairman.

The first paper, "Oscar Jászi and the Critique of Nationalism," was presented by Richard Allen, research associate at Columbia University. Placing Jászi's personality and ideas in the framework of the Hungary of his days, Allen analyzed Jászi's writings and actions prior to leaving Hungary insofar as they concerned the nationality problem of Hungary and nationalism as a concept. This approach permitted Allen to draw a judicious balance between those aspects of Jászi's activities that could be explained by the context of his environment and those aspects which reflected a departure from the acceptable liberal interpretations of his contemporaries and were original.

Allen was followed by Mario Fenyö, of Catholic University of Puerto Rico, who spoke about "Literature and Politics in Hungary: The 'Nyugat' Generation." His presentation covered mainly the years that stretched from the founding of this important publication to the end of the Bethlen period of Hungary and concentrated on two main themes: an analysis of the various groups, and their ideas, that either published in or edited "Nyugat;" and an examination of the question of how and why a group of literary figures acquired a political importance in Hungary that was much greater than either the number of writers or the circulation of the publication would have warranted.

The last paper, "The Populist Critics: László Németh," was read by Marian A. Low, of John Jay College of the City University of New

[3]The editor wishes to thank Kenneth W. Rock, of Colorado State University, for contributing this report on the session on Prague in European history.

York. Low not only explained the personality and the numerous contradictions in Németh's writings and career but also skillfully placed him and his activities into the social-political milieu of the pre-World War II days in which Németh formulated his ideas.

George Barany, of the University of Denver, not only commented, mainly very favorably, on the three papers but showed very ably how the three papers presented three aspects of the same whole.[4]

Three other contributions of interest to historians of the Habsburg monarchy were presented at the San Francisco meeting. William B. Slottman, of the University of California at Berkeley, talked on "The Church of the Old Regime: The Habsburg Monarchy" at a joint session with the American Catholic Historical Association devoted to "Pre-Revolutionary Catholicism in Central and Western Europe." Paul P. Bernard, of the University of Illinois at Urbana, served as commentator at the same meeting. At the joint session with the Conference on Slavic and East European History, chaired by Herbert H. Kaplan, of Indiana University, Marianska Sasha Fousek, of Miami University, talked on "The Renaissance and the Reformation in Eastern Europe: Bohemia and Moravia;" while Béla Király, of Brooklyn College of the City University of New York, gave a lecture on "The Renaissance and the Reformation in Eastern Europe: Hungary." Jaroslaw Pelenski, of the University of Iowa, served as commentator.

Conferences in 1974

In 1974 a number of scholars made contributions at an interesting variety of conferences. At the fourth *Consortium on Revolutionary Europe, 1750-1850,* held at Tallahassee, Florida, on February 21-23, Enno E. Kraehe, of the University of Virginia, read an article entitled "From Rheinbund to Deutscherbund." He emphasized the fact that the formula adopted to enable Prussia and Austria to enter the German Confederation "*with* their German provinces" was intended to be a genuine, realistic compromise to ensure the security of Central Europe. David H. Pinkney, of the University of Washington, was the chairman of the session in which Kraehe participated, and R. John Rath, of Rice University, was the discussant.

On the 10th of March Andrew G. Whiteside, of Queens College of the City University of New York, gave a lecture on "Georg Ritter von Schönerer" at the *Centre for International Studies at Cambridge*

[4]The editor wishes to thank Peter Sugar, of the University of Washington, for writing the report on the session on twentieth-century Hungary.

University. He pointed out that Schönerer founded and shaped the Austrian Pan-German movement and influenced Adolf Hitler and Hitler's entire generation in the German-Slav borderlands. Pan-Germanism, Whiteside emphasized, was a foreshadowing of the horrifying character of twentieth-century totalitarian regimes.

Also in March, 1974, Robert Schwarz, of Florida Atlantic University, spoke on "Nazism and the Austrian Working Class: The Silent Resistance" at the meeting of *Florida Teachers of History* at Florida State University. He pointed out that the efforts of Nazi propagandists to court the Austrian socialist workers after the *Anschluß* resulted in only temporary successes. In the end the Nazi propagandists themselves conceded virtual defeat in their efforts to win over the large mass of Austrian workers.

On March 22-23, the Spring Conference of the *American Catholic Historical Association* was held at St. Louis University. Zoltan J. Kosztolnyik, of Texas A & M University, presented a paper on "Church and State in Eleventh-Century Hungary" at a session on "Popes, Bishops, and Kings in the Middle Ages." His paper dealt with Hungaro-Papal relations from the time of the death of King Stephen I (1038) to the death of Ladislas I (1096). He emphasized the role of the royal court in the formulation of ecclesiastical policies.

The next month Blair R. Holmes, of Brigham Young University, discussed "The Habsburg Restoration in Austria and the European Scene, 1930-1938" at the twenty-seventh annual *Pacific Northwest History Conference* on April 25-27. In a paper dealing largely with the position of the Habsburgs, Holmes maintained that opposition to a Habsburg restoration decreased during the 1930's. Several states, he asserted, even contemplated the possibility of approving such a restoration if the Nazis ever provoked an extreme crisis in Austria. At one time Hitler also toyed with the idea of using the Habsburgs as puppets in Austria but soon abandoned the scheme.

At a *symposium at Brandeis University* on May 11-13, 1974, concerning "1914 in Psychohistorical Perspective," Solomon Wank, of Franklin and Marshall College, gave a brief summary of some of the psychological factors conditioning the decision of the Austro-Hungarian government to declare war against Serbia in July, 1914.

An *International Conference on Comparative Fascism* was held in *Bergen* on June 19-21, 1974, under the joint sponsorship of the sociology

department of the University of Bergen and of UNESCO. The United States was represented by four specialists on twentieth-century Austrian history. John Haag, of the University of Georgia, presented a paper entitled "'Pilot Fish' of Nazism: The Case of the Austrian National-Catholic Intellectuals, 1918-1938." Bruce F. Pauley, of Florida Technological University, contributed an article on "Nazis and Fascists: The Struggle for Supremacy in Austria, 1918-1938;" and Reinhart Kondert, of the University of Southwestern Louisiana, one on "Schober vs. the Heimwehr: The Decline of Austro-Fascism, 1929-1930." R. John Rath, of Rice University, reported on "The Dollfuß-Schuschnigg Regime—Fascist or Authoritarian?" Although Reinhart Kondert unfortunately was unable to attend the meeting, one of the other participants summarized the main points of his paper. Summaries of the papers presented at the conference will be published by Columbia University Press.

In August and September, 1974, in *Romania* and *Canada,* Istvan Deak, of Columbia University, presented papers of interest to the readers of the *Yearbook*. At the first *Romanian-American Historical Conference* at *Suceava* in August, he spoke on "Széchenyi, Wesselényi, and Kossuth, and the Romanian Question." At the *International Conference on Slavic Studies* at *Banff,* Alberta, the next month, he reported on "Graduate Studies" at a session devoted to "The State of Slavic and East European Studies Education in the United States: Critiques," chaired by Ivan Völgyes, of the University of Nebraska. Also at the Banff Conference Robert A. Kann, of Rutgers University, read a paper entitled "Trends toward Colonialism in the Habsburg Empire, 1848-1914" at a session dealing with "The Question of Colonial Policies in East-Central Europe, 1870-1918." The session was chaired by Stanley Pech, of the University of British Columbia; and Ivan Rudnytsky, of the University of Alberta, served as discussant.

At the eighth annual *Duquesne University History Forum* on October 30-November 1, 1974, Gábor Vermes, of Rutgers University at Newark, read a paper on "Count István Tisza and the Preservation of the Old Order" at a special session dealing with "Revolutionary and Counterrevolutionary Thought in Habsburg Hungary, 1914-1918," at which James Clarke, of the University of Pittsburgh, served as moderator. Tisza's conservatism and caution, which were especially evidenced prior to the outbreak of World War I, Vermes maintained, stemmed from a traditional and deeply rooted concern over the survival of Hungarian supremacy in the Danube Basin. At the same session Peter Pastor, of Montclair State College, in a contribution entitled "The

Democratic Alternative: The Revolutionary Beliefs of Mihály Károlyi," attributed the failure to implement Károlyi's revolutionary program largely to the adoption of alternative programs by the non-Magyar nationalities in the lands of the Crown of St. Stephen. Richard Allen, of Columbia University, was commentator for the session.

Nearly forty people attended the session on "The Diplomacy of Reaction: The European Powers and the Greek Revolt, 1821-1822," at the fortieth annual meeting of the *Southern Historical Association* held in Dallas, Texas, on November 7-9, 1974. Arthur G. Haas, of the University of Tennessee, was chairman of the session. After brief opening remarks by the chairman on the timeliness of the topic, Irby Nichols, of North Texas State University, contended in his paper "Hellas Scorned: The Ambassadorial Address to the Greeks" that Austrian and British Russophobia led to a pro-Turk stand, that Sultan Mahmud II was more benevolent than supposed, and that the failure of British Ambassador Strangford's own plan for Greco-Turkish reconciliation did not cost him the confidence of Castlereagh, whereas Austria's ambassador Von Lützow was recalled and replaced by Metternich. In the second paper, entitled "Metternich, the Papacy, and the Greek Revolution," Alan Reinerman, of Boston College, dealt with Metternich's efforts to keep Rome from supporting the Greek rebels as fellow Christians. That the papacy did not was determined not by Austrian pressure but by its own fear of revolution, its distrust of the Orthodox, and its fear of Turkish reprisals against Greek Catholics. The first commentator, Douglas Hale, of Oklahoma State University, acknowledged the original research of both papers but suggested that both might have provided a more general background; he also questioned the significance Nichols assigned to the Strangford episode, a question also raised by the second commentator, Enno E. Kraehe, of the University of Virginia. After discussing domestic factors influencing foreign policy and concluding that social science models generally add little to an understanding of the period under consideration, Kraehe praised the research of both papers but expressed doubt that fear of revolution was as important a factor as claimed in both papers. He also felt that Reinerman did not make proper distinctions when talking about the Orthodox Church.[5]

Papers of interest to specialists in Austrian history were presented at three other conferences in November, 1974. At the *Central Slavic*

[5]The editor wishes to thank Arthur G. Haas, of the University of Tennessee, for sending this report on the session at the Southern Historical Association meeting.

Conference in St. Louis, Missouri, on November 8-9, 1974, William H. Paine, Jr., of Tarkio College, spoke on "The Zeysig Scandal and the End of Baron Dezső Bánffy's Political Career." Basing his conclusions on previously undiscovered German foreign office reports, Paine discussed the two-week period in September, 1905, when the sudden implication of Bánffy, a former Hungarian prime-minister, in three separate scandals ruined his political career.

Papers dealing with Habsburg history were read at two sessions of the seventh *Congress of the Czechoslovak Society of Arts and Sciences* at New York University on November 15-17, 1974. At a session dealing with "Selected Vistas on Old Bohemia," chaired by Stanley B. Kimball, of Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville, Joseph R. Goldman, of the U. S. Army, contributed an article entitled "Scepter and Spade: The Raab System and *Robota* Abolition in Bohemia and Austria, 1775-1780." Goldman stated that the Raab system contributed directly to the economic emancipation of the serfs on those cameral estates that were affected by the reform sponsored by Maria Theresa and that they served as a prelude to Joseph II's own emancipation of the peasants after 1781.

At a session devoted to "Czech Politics, 1848-1918," chaired by Stanley B. Winters, of the New Jersey Institute of Technology, Dagmar Horna-Perman, of Georgetown University, discussed the "Story of a Friendship: T. G. Masaryk and Charles Crane." The friendship between these two men, she asserted, had considerable influence on the formulation of the United States' policy toward Austria-Hungary and Czechoslovakia. Lawrence D. Orton, of Oakland University, reported on "The Echo in the Czech Lands of Bakunin's *Appeal to the Slavs.*" The publication of this appeal in January, 1849, he stated, unleashed a furious press debate in Bohemia. The government exploited the untimely publication of the *Appeal* to indict the entire Czech national movement, which it held accountable for Bakunin's opinions since he had proudly identified himself in the frontispiece as a member of the Czech-sponsored Slav Congress. Put on the defensive, the leading Czech spokesmen, František Palacký and Karel Havlíček, hastily disassociated themselves from Bakunin's views. The press polemics led to the drawing of a sharper distinction between Czech radicals and liberals and was a foretaste of the government's abandonment of the Czech moderates, who had supported the floundering monarchy during 1848, much as Bakunin had predicted. Other participants in this particular session were Bruce M. Garver, of Yale University, Josef Kalvoda, of St. Joseph College, and John F. Bradley, of the University of Manchester.

At the fourteenth annual congress of the *Hungarian Association* in

Cleveland, Ohio, on November 29-December 1, 1974, Zoltan J. Kosztolnyik, of Texas A & M University, gave his inaugural address as a full member of the Árpád Academy of Arts and Letters. Lecturing on "The 1046 Csanád Assembly and the Unforeseen Consequences of the Assassination of Bishop Gerard," he emphasized the fact that despite Bishop Gerard's murder his deputy managed to persuade the princes to support the Church, and thereby saved the work of "Christianization" inaugurated by King Stephen.

The *American Historical Association* met at Chicago, Illinois, on December 28-30, 1974. Although no programs were devoted specifically to Austrian history, a number of papers dealing with various aspects of the subject were presented at more general sessions.

In his presidential address, "Why East-Central Europe?" at the meeting of the Polish American Historical Association, held jointly with the American Historical Association, George J. Lerski, of the University of San Francisco, defended Oscar Halecki's thesis, as explained in his *Limits and Divisions of European History*, that the countries situated between Russia and Germany belong neither to Greek Orthodox or Soviet Eastern Europe nor to Germanic West-Central Europe. They should be treated separately under the designation of East-Central Europe.

At a joint session with the Conference of Slavic and East European History on "Balkan Peasant Movements before World War I," Elinor Murray Despalatović, of Connecticut College, reported on "Ante Radić and the Ideology of the Croatian Peasant Party." According to Despalatović, Ante Radić, the major ideologist of the party, believed that two different cultures existed in Croatia: the "foreign" culture of the elite (*gospoda*) and the indigenous culture of the people (*narod*), or the peasants. If the elite succeeded in modernizing Croatia along the pattern of Western Europe, he argued, peasant culture, and, with it, the Croatian nation would disappear. Radić tried to bridge the gap between the two cultures by attempting to awaken the elite to an awareness of the national significance of peasant culture and the peasants to the realities of modern economic and political life. By 1904 it seemed obvious to him that the peasants must be forced to engage in active political life so that they could finally assume political power and direct the modernization process to serve their own ends.

Istvan Deak, of Columbia University, talked on "The Reluctant Collaborator: The Case of Hungary" at a session on "Collaborationism in Europe, 1940-1945." He observed that immediately before and during World War II Admiral Nicholas Horthy's Hungary collaborated with National Socialist Germany. The degree of collaboration varied

according to the events of the war and the personal inclination of Hungary's prime minister, but there was no year when substantial Hungarian economic and political support was not given to Germany. The policy of collaboration was approved by most influential Hungarians ranging from the far-right to the moderate left and from government circles to the opposition. The causes for collaboration were as diverse as the personalities responsible for political, military, and economic decisions, but the most important single cause was the Hungarians' overwhelming desire to recover at least some of the territories lost after World War I. Undoubtedly, the Third Reich was the only great power conceivably interested in and capable of satisfying Hungary's longing for territorial restitution. But National Socialist Germany was also, without doubt, a dangerous ally, and many Hungarians wondered from the very start whether political and economic subservience was a price worth paying for territorial gain. Consequently, the same people who advocated and practiced collaboration with Hitler advocated and practiced some kind of opposition to German National Socialist policies. And while the extent of collaboration was significantly greater on the right and in the middle of the political spectrum than on the left, events were too complicated to lend themselves to many generalizations. For example, liberal Jewish business interests were more deeply engaged in collaboration with the Third Reich—for reasons of personal gain and racial survival—than some of the ultra-nationalist opposition groups on the far-right who, by disrupting Hungarian economic and political stability, indirectly weakened the German war effort. Furthermore, the very people who unhesitatingly supported Hitler, as long as German victory seemed assured, engaged in opposition and even in resistance activity when German defeat became clear. Again, some of those who at first were lukewarm to a German alliance fought on the Nazi side to the end after it became certain that Hungary would be liberated not by the Anglo-Saxons but by the Russians. In short, most influential Hungarians both supported and opposed the German war aims, while the proportion of unconditional collaborators was small and that of the unconditional resisters still smaller.

Two papers of interest to historians of the Habsburg monarchy were presented at the joint session with the Conference Group for Central Europe on "Military Service and Nobility: Central European Models" chaired by Harold Deutsch, of the National War College. Thomas M. Barker, of the State University of New York at Albany, discussed "Nobility and Proprietary Colonelcies in Austria, 1618-1740." After examining some theoretical considerations involving the concept of the nobility as a class, he delineated six cognitive aspects of nobility and

discussed regimental proprietary colonelcies. He argued that with the passage of time the various functions of the colonelcies became differentiated.

In a paper on "Nobility and Military Careers: The Habsburg Officer Corps, 1740-1914," Gunther Rothenberg, of Purdue University, examined the transformation in the social origins of the Habsburg officer corps, especially in the senior ranks, from the accession of Maria Theresa to the outbreak of World War I. Pointing out that the higher commands in the army were almost exclusively in the hands of the higher nobility in 1740, he maintained that by 1914 the generalcy and the general staff were composed overwhelmingly of officers from the bourgeoisie or from recently ennobled families. Moreover, with regard to entry and promotion, the Habsburg officer corps had become the most open and liberal of all the armies of Europe. Rothenberg showed that this change resulted originally from Maria Theresa's resolve to create a professional officer corps, one in which the prestige of service compensated for loss of the opportunity for financial gain which had motivated the earlier military entrepreneurs. At the same time, the ever-growing size of the armies and the rapidly increasing demand for technological expertise created a need for large numbers of educated officers, a need which the old nobility could not meet. While members of the dynasty and the upper nobility continued to serve in the army and on occasion held high command positions, their relative numbers steadily declined. Although this process was temporarily halted during the pre-March era and again during the decade of neo-absolutism, the process was irreversible and accelerated after the introduction of universal military service in 1868. Robert A. Kann, of Rutgers University, was commentator for the session.

The Austrian Republic was the subject of a paper presented to another gathering at the American Historical Association meeting. David C. Large, of Smith College, discussed "The Heimwehr in Austria" at a session on "The Social Bases and the Politics of Counterrevolutionary Paramilitarism in Postwar Europe, 1918-1924," chaired by Harold Gordon, of the University of Massachusetts at Amherst.

Conferences in 1975

At a session on "Problems in Periodization: Aesthetic and Literary Considerations" at the *Southeastern Medieval Association Conference* on March 7-8, Paula Sutter Fichtner, of Brooklyn College of the City University of New York, used Maximilian I's interest in the cult of Hercules to illuminate her description of the transitional position which

the emperor occupies in history. His political interest in Hercules, she stated, probably derived from his efforts to incorporate Burgundian legend into the mythology of the House of Habsburg after he became Mary of Burgundy's heir.

Arthur Neal Mangham, of Rice University, read a paper entitled "Social Indicators and Voting Behavior in the Austrian Elections of 1907: The German Districts" at a Phi Alpha Theta session devoted to European history at the annual meeting of the *Southwestern Social Science Association* held in San Antonio, Texas, on March 26-29, 1975. Frederick R. Zuber, also of Rice University, presented a paper on "Mussolini and Dollfuß: A Study in Rightist Diplomacy" at a session on European intellectual history chaired by Gordon Craig, of Stanford University. George Mosse, of the University of Wisconsin at Madison, served as discussant. At a session on "Germany: From Revolution to Conquest" Maurice Williams, of Notre Dame University (Cranbrook, British Columbia), talked on "German Imperialism in Austria, 1938."

Charles H. O'Brien, of Western Illinois University, spoke about the Church in the Habsburg monarchy at a special session on "The Church in the Old Regime" at the spring conference of the *American Catholic Historical Association* in Boston, Massachusetts, on April 4-5, 1975.

At the *Western Social Science Association* meeting in Denver, Colorado, on May 1-3, 1975, the topic of a panel presented under the auspices of the Rocky Mountain Association for Slavic Studies was "Modernization in the Habsburg Monarchy in the 1850's." Kenneth Rock, of Colorado State University, was panel chairman; and Peter Hidas, of Dawson College, Lawrence Orton, of Oakland University, and George Barany, of the University of Denver, participated. Hidas, speaking on "The Economic Impact of Franz Joseph's Administration on Hungary 1849-1853," stressed the positive aspects of the economic rejuvenation initiated by the "liberal-centralist" Schwarzenberg cabinet, which believed that a healthy Hungarian economy was vital to post-1848 imperial pacification and consolidation. Vienna promoted justice, security, and economic prosperity for all classes and nationalities; Hungary was to be neither exploited nor colonized but was to participate equitably in the division of labor within the empire and ultimately in a Central European common market dominated by Austria. An economic boom occasioned by government investment, railway and waterway construction, the lack of significant foreign competition, and a demand for Hungarian agricultural products induced by the Crimean War magnified the impact of the administra-

tion's financial and economic measures in Hungary. By the mid 1850's Hungary was on the brink of industrialization.

While Hidas emphasized the positive economic achievements of the ministry in Vienna before 1853, Orton, in a paper entitled "Obstacles to Modernization: Galicia in the 1850's," focused on the factors retarding modernization in "the poorest and most neglected economically of Austria's possessions." Blight, famine, and disease, plus the dislocations of 1846-1849, reduced Galicia's overwhelmingly agricultural population by over eight percent between 1847 and 1857. "Servitudes" (the peasantry's right to use pastures and forests retained by the nobles after the 1846 emancipation), the tenacious persistence of dwarf holdings, the *szlachta*'s opposition to higher taxes, Galicia's geographical isolation, the changes in Austrian tariff policies, and the lack of adequate railway construction all hindered economic development. The government's desire to create a single economic unit within the monarchy facilitated the penetration of Hungarian, Czech, and German manufactured goods into the province, while Vienna's abandonment of Galicia to a "tamed" *szlachta* consigned the province to economic stagnation and exploitation for fifty years.

Barany praised the careful research and the objectivity apparent in both presentations and also commended the marshaling of economic evidence. He suggested that political factors, such as the realities of neo-absolutist power, Vienna's desire to attain supremacy in Central Europe, the complexities and self-contradictions inherent within Habsburg society, plus the global economy, might also have retarded modernization. He pointed out that the Hungarian economy had certainly benefited from the demands of the Crimean War and asked whether, if Galicia's population rose "sharply" after 1857, conditions might not have improved there too. He encouraged both authors to pursue their inquiries by suggesting that the achievements of the neo-absolutist era in the Habsburg lands could only be assessed from the comparative perspectives of 1848 and 1867.[6]

Another session at the Western Social Science Association also dealt with Habsburg history. Concerned with "Liberalism and Nationalism in Late Nineteenth Century Austria," it was moderated by Klaus Michael Seibt, of Brigham Young University. James A. Zabel, of the School of the Ozarks, presented a paper on "The Austrian *los von Rom* Movement;" and Harrry R. Ritter, of Western Washington State College, gave one on "Liberal Historians and the Problem of German Nationalism in Austria." William J. Greenwald, of Arkansas State

[6]The editor wishes to thank Kenneth W. Rock, of Colorado State University, for sending the above report on the session on "Modernization in the Habsburg Monarchy."

University, and Bruce Frye, of Colorado State University, served as discussants.

From May 1-3 the *Midwest Slavic Conference* met at Cleveland State University. Stanley B. Kimball, of Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville, presented a paper on "Slovene Pan-Slavism, 1861-1881. From Moscow to Zagreb" at a session dealing with "Slovenes and Other Slavs" chaired by Carole Rogel, of Ohio State University. At a session on "Southeast European Historiography," of which James F. Clarke, of the University of Pittsburgh, was chairman, Steven Béla Várdy, of Duquesne University, discussed "East European Studies in Interwar Hungary." He attributed the great upsurge of East European studies in Hungary during those years to the Treaty of Trianon and the consequent rise of Hungarian revisionists.

At the tenth *Conference on Medieval Studies of the Medieval Institute of Western Michigan University* at Kalamazoo on May 4-7, Zoltan J. Kosztolnyik, of Texas A & M University, discussed "The Church and the Hungarian Court under Coloman the Learned" in a session on "Church and State." He pointed out that the aim of King Coloman's legislative policy was to strengthen the ties between Hungary and Rome. However, since the pope was unwilling to tolerate any interference in ecclesiastical matters by the king, Coloman had to renounce his right to assert power over the Church.

The sessions at the fourteenth *International Congress of Historical Sciences* at San Francisco, California, on August 22-29 dealt with practically everything but Habsburg history. However, Stanley B. Kimball, of Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville, did present a paper there on "Support by Social Classes of Literary Societies during the Nineteenth Century—The Austro-Slav Revival."

Kimball also offered a report on "The Slavs of Utah" at the annual meeting of the *American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies* at Atlanta, Georgia, on October 8-11, 1975. At the same meeting a session on "Czech Baroque and the Concept of 'Temno,'" was chaired by Stanley Z. Pech, of the University of British Columbia, and Joseph Zacek, of the State University of New York at Albany, contributed a paper on "Czech Baroque Nationalism." Joseph Anderle, of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, was discussant. An entire session of the conference was devoted to "The Czechoslovak Struggle for National Independence, 1914-1918, and Its Influence on Czechoslovak Politics from 1918-1939." It was chaired by Stanley B. Winters,

of the New Jersey Institute of Technology. Bruce M. Garver, of Yale University, presented a paper on "The Czech and Slovak Domestic Resistance to Austria-Hungary, 1914-1918;" Jonathan Zorach, of Columbia University, one on "The Legionnaires;" and F. Gregory Campbell, of the University of Chicago, one on "The Émigré Leadership." Dagmar Horna-Perman, of Georgetown University, was discussant.

At the fourteenth *Central Slavic Conference* at the University of Kansas on November 7-8, 1975, a special session was devoted to "Great Statesmen of Nineteenth Century Hungary." Wilmer H. Paine, Jr., of Tarkio College, served as chaiman for the session. Istvan Deak, of Columbia University, read a paper on "Louis Kossuth" and Béla K. Király, of Brooklyn College of the City University of New York, one on "Francis Deák." George Barany, of the University of Denver, was the discussant.

A session of the *Southern Historical Association* was devoted to "The Austrian Right from 1919 to the Anschluß" during the Washington meeting on November 12-15, 1975. About forty persons attended. C. Earl Edmondson, of Davidson College, discussed "The Heimwehr under Starhemberg," and Frederic B. M. Hollyday, of Duke University, kindly substituted for John Haag, of the University of Georgia, reading the paper he had submitted entitled "Blood on the Ringstrasse: Vienna's Students, 1918-1933." Max H. Kele, of Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, was the commentator. He first raised the question of the Association's traditional sessions and procedures and then recommended the prior examination of all papers to enable a panel to offer more meaningful critiques. In the general discussion there was some agreement that Starhemberg escapes general classification and that the Heimwehr's role depended on specific years and upon close examination of its regional organizations. There was also debate about whether Arno Mayer's typologies can be applied to Austria during these years.[7]

Only a single session at the 1975 convention of the *American Historical Association* at Atlanta, Georgia, on December 28-30 was devoted to Habsburg or recent Austrian and Hungarian history. That session, held jointly with the American Association for the Study of Hungarian History, dealt with "Hungarian Foreign Policy in the

[7]Appreciation is due to William A. Jenks, of Washington and Lee University, for this report on the session on the Austrian Right. Jenks was chairman of this session.

Interwar Period, 1918-1941." Stephen Borsody, of Chatham College, served as chairman. Peter Pastor, of Montclair State College, read a paper on "Hungary between Wilson and Lenin: The Foreign Policy of the Revolutionary Regime of Mihály Károlyi;" Eva Balogh, of Yale University, one entitled "From Isolation to Alliance: Hungarian Foreign Policy in the 1920's;" and Thomas Sakmyster, of the University of Cincinnati, one on "Miklós Horthy, Hungary, and the Coming of the European Crisis, 1932-1941." The commentators were Anna M. Cienciala, of the University of Kansas, and John Lukacs, of Chestnut Hill College.

PRESENTATION OF FESTSCHRIFT TO ROBERT A. KANN

Robert A. Kann, professor of history at Rutgers University and one of the original members of the United States Committee to promote Studies of the History of the Habsburg Monarchy, was presented with a *Festschrift* by colleagues and friends at a reception held on November 12, 1975, at the Austrian Institute in New York. Fritz Cocron, director of the Institute, welcomed the guests and recalled that on the previous October 22 Kann had received from Consul General Robert Marschik, acting on behalf of the Austrian government, the Great Golden Badge of Honor for Service to the Austrian Republic. Stanley B. Winters, professor of history at the New Jersey Institute of Technology, presented the *Festschrift*.

Winters described the book as an international tribute to Kann's devotion to scholarship, his contributions to Austrian and modern history, and his renown as a teacher and a lecturer. He noted the coincidence of the presentation of the *Festschrift* with Prof. Kann's forthcoming seventieth birthday in February, 1976, and his retirement from the Rutgers faculty in the summer of 1976 after twenty-eight years of service. Kann expressed his appreciation to Cocron and the Austrian Institute for their hospitality and to the co-authors of the *Festschrift* for their thoughtfulness. Champagne was served to the guests, who toasted Prof. and Mrs. Kann while sampling Viennese delicacies.

The *Festschrift*, entitled *Intellectual and Social Developments in the Habsburg Empire from Maria Theresa to World War I*, was edited by Stanley B. Winters and Joseph Held, published by the *East European Quarterly*, and distributed by Columbia University Press. The ten co-authors and their essay topics include: Hans Wagner, University of Salzburg (the beginnings of a modern welfare state under Joseph II); Béla K. Király, City University of New York (Hungarian responses to Napoleon's Proclamation of 1809); Wayne S. Vucinich, Stanford

University (the evolution of Croation Illyrism); Herman Freudenberger, Tulane University (aristocratic entrepreneurship in Bohemia and Moravia); Keith Hitchins, University of Illinois at Urbana (Romanian nationalism in mid-nineteenth-century Transylvania); Adam Wandruszka, University of Vienna (Carl Moering's North American journey); Stanley B. Winters, New Jersey Institute of Technology (Austro-Slavism, Pan-Slavism, and Russophilism in Czech political thought); Solomon Wank, Franklin and Marshall College (foreign policy dialogues between Aehrenthal and Goluchowski); Erika Weinzierl, University of Salzburg (Aehrenthal and the Italian university question); and Joseph Held, Rutgers University (Hungarian intellectuals around the *Nyugat* periodical). The book has a selected bibliography of Kann's writings, an index, and extensive notes.[8]

NEW COURSES

In 1974 Thomas L. Sakmyster introduced a new course on the Habsburg empire at the University of Cincinnati.

In 1973-1974 Peter Loewenberg taught a seminar on the First Austrian Republic at the University of California at Los Angeles. The following year a two-quarter course on the Austro-Hungarian monarchy and the Successor States was inaugurated at the same university. It was taught by Eric Kollman in 1974-1975 and by Istvan Deak in 1975-1976.

In the spring semester of 1973-1974 Wilmer H. Paine, Jr., introduced a course in the history of Eastern Europe at Tarkio College that dealt largely with the Habsburg monarchy and the Successor States. It was taught simultaneously via telelecture to students at three other campuses.

RESEARCH AND LIBRARY COLLECTIONS

In 1964 Saint John's University (Collegeville, Minnesota) announced the formation of a Monastic Manuscript Microfilm Library, a research library where filmed copies of all medieval manuscripts still existing in European libraries would be deposited for the use of scholars. In the spring of 1965 the photographic team, led by Rev. Oliver L. Kapsner, began its work at the Benedictine monastery of Kremsmünster, where more than 400 codices were filmed. In 1973 the first major phase of the project, involving the filming of some 30,000 manuscripts and 100,000

[8]The editor wishes to thank Stanley B. Winters, of the New Jersey Institute for Technology, for submitting this item of interest.

papyri in Austrian libraries, was completed. Information about these holdings can be obtained by writing directly to the Monastic Manuscript Microfilm Library, Saint John's University, Collegeville, Minnesota 56321.

A decade ago the University of Minnesota created an Immigrant Archive (recently renamed the Immigration History Research Center) to serve as a depository for ethnic materials. Since then over 20,000 books, 2,000 reels of microfilm, nearly 3,000,000 pages of manuscripts, and 130 newspapers pertaining to 22 different ethnic groups from southern, eastern, and central Europe have been collected. These materials have provided sources for numerous studies on groups who immigrated to the United States and Canada.

The Hungarian American Collection at present comprises some 300 books, 26 serial titles, 6 newspaper titles, and 7 manuscript collections: the papers of Dezső Balogh, 1938-1965; the papers of Lajos Egri, 1888-; the papers of the Gábor Baross Aid Society, of St. Paul, Minnesota, 1890-1970; the papers of the Workingmen's Sick, Benevolent, and Educational Federation, Avenal, New Jersey Branch, 1922-1942 (microfilm); the records of the Hungarian Reformed Church, of Cleveland, Ohio, 1890-1944 (microfilm); the archives of the Hungarian Evangelical Reformed Conventus of Budapest, 1904- (microfilm); and material on emigration from the Hungarian Prime Minister's Archives, 1895-1917 (microfilm). A concerted effort is being made to expand the collection sufficiently to enable scholars to write the authentic history of the Hungarians in North America. Persons and organizations possessing old records are urged to deposit them in the Immigration History Research Center rather than allow them to deteriorate or be discarded. "Naptárak," newspaper files, parish jubilee albums, memoirs, private files, family papers, and books published by or about Hungarian immigrants will all be welcome additions to the collection. Anyone having or knowing about such materials is invited to contact the Immigration History Research Center, University of Minnesota, St. Paul, Minnesota 55114.

SPECIAL RESEARCH PROJECTS AND PUBLICATIONS

The Institute on East Central Europe of Columbia University was awarded a special research grant for 1973-1975 by the National Endowment for the Humanities to subsidize editing and publishing the Ottoman domesday books. The project involves preparatory research, preparation, interpretation, and publication of the late sixteenth-century domesday books for the Ottoman provinces of the Danubian

empire. The principal investigator of the project is Tibor Halasi-Kun, of Columbia University. Other participants are Gustave Bayerle, of Indiana University; Allen Z. Hertz, of McGill University; and Gyula Kaldy-Nagy, of the University of Budapest.

Nikola Pribić, of Florida State University, Elizabeth Pribić-Nonnemacher, of the University of Illinois at Chicago Circle, and Dolph Owings, of the University of Arkansas in Little Rock, are translating the transcript of the trial of the Sarajevo assassins from Serbo-Croatian into English. The document was edited by Vojislav Bogićević, then director of the State Archive of the Republic of Bosnia-Hercegovina, and was published in 1954 under the title *Sarajevski atentat: izvorne stenografske bilješke sa glavne rasprave protiv Gavrila Principa i drugova, održane u Sarajevo 1914 g.* [The Sarajevo Assassination: The Authentic Stenographic Notes of the Main Hearing against Gavrilo Princip and Others, held in Sarajevo in 1914]. Before this document was prepared an accurate stenographic transcript of the trial had never been published, although two versions have been available. The first was published in German in 1919 under the pseudonym of "Pharos," later determined to be Father Puntigam, confessor to Francis Ferdinand. It is a considerably abridged and very corrupt version. In 1930 Albert Mousset published an edition in French. Considerably better than Pharos', it still contains substantial omissions, additions, and errors which compromise its usefulness as a source document. The provenience of those versions as well as of Bogićević's was examined by Fritz Würthle (see *Austrian History Yearbook,* Vol. II [1966], pp. 136-152), who concluded: "Whoever wishes to follow all the details of the trial can confidently resort to the Bogićević edition. It is a useful and basic work in which the full text, as well as the interrogations of the defendants and the witnesses and the speeches of both the state prosecutor and the defense attorney, are correctly reproduced" (p. 151).

The American Hungarian Studies Foundation (P. O. Box 1084, New Brunswick, New Jersey 08903) has recently established a Hungarian Research Center. The Center wishes to offer assistance to scholars and students of Hungarian-related studies by making available its library (some 25,000 volumes, of which 6,000 are currently catalogued), by publishing the *Hungarian Studies Newsletter* and other reference materials, and by offering a place at the Center to selected scholars and graduate students. For further information about the Center and about the *Hungarian Studies Newsletter,* write to Béla C. Máday, 4528 49th Street, N. W., Washington, D. C., 20016.

Edited by Charles Schlacks, Jr., and sponsored by the University Center for International Studies of the University of Pittsburgh, a series of new journals was initiated in 1973. Three of these journals are of great

value to students and scholars interested in Central and Eastern Europe. They are *East Central Europe, Southeastern Europe,* and *Byzantine Studies.* Another journal, *Canadian-American Slavic Studies* (formerly *Canadian Slavic Studies*), has been published by the University of Pittsburgh since 1972. Information about these journals can be obtained by writing to the Publications Office, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, 15260.

The first issue of *The Canadian-American Review of Hungarian Studies,* a semi-annual journal concerned with Hungarian studies, was published in October, 1974. The *Review* is edited by Nandor Dreisziger, of the history department of the Royal Military College of Canada, Kingston, Ontario K7L 2W3. The business manager is Ferenc Harcsar, 908-1356 Meadowlands Drive East, Ottawa, Ontario K2E 6K6. The *Yearbook* staff welcomes this important addition to Central and East-Central European studies in Canada and the United States.