THE HISTORY OF THE PRAGUE JOURNAL
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Michael Wögerbauer

The study reconstructs the history of the Prague journal, "Der Kranz" using, for the first time, filed documents. The author succeeds in proving that "Der Kranz" was founded as early as 1820 by Václav Rodomil (Wenzel Richard) Kramerius, modelled upon other projects. Only in July, 1821, however, did it become an official journal, Willibald Schießler taking the post of editor. "Der Kranz" may be characterised as a predominantly entertaining journal in typical Biedermeier fashion, with a lot of space devoted to glorifying Bohemia’s past. Due to clashing personalities and conflicts with the Vienna court censor, editors changed frequently. In December 1822, Schießler was forced to retire because of a conflict with Chief Constable Sedlnitzky. His successor, Adolf Gerle, stood alone at the helm until 1824, when the “more dependable” Karoline von Woltmann became co-editor. Since, on a personal level, there was a great deal of disagreement between them, Gerle elected to leave the journal in March of the same year. As to Woltmann’s departure and the end of the literary ambitions of the “Kranz”, sources give different explanations. Because Viennese and Prague authorities consciously delayed decisions, none of the successor projects could be realized. Only after 1827 did a new generation of journals come into being: the sophisticated “Monatsschrift des vaterländischen Museums” and the rather more entertaining “Bohemia”.

CONTEMPORARY HISTORY IN THE CZECH REPUBLIC
AS A PROBLEM

Notes on: Zeitgeschichtsschreibung in Tschechien. Institutionen, Methoden, Debatten (Historiography on the Most Recent Past in the Czech Republic. Institutions, Methods, Debates) by Martin Schulze Wessel

Jiří Pešek

These remarks on Martin Schulze Wessel’s meritorious study represent an attempt at looking at the problem of contemporary history from a different angle, resulting from Czech research traditions and a broader approach to the research field. They deal with current Czech cultural history on one hand and with the most recent history of the universities on the other and ask why these circles, active in research and in publishing their results as they are, are not being recognized in Czech as well as German contemporary history. In a second part, the author points out that apart from the Institute of Contemporary History (Ústav pro soudobé dějiny) in Prague and the Silesian Institute (Slezský ústav) in Opava there is also the Prague-based