

RECENT RESEARCH AND WRITING ON MODERN  
HISTORY OF THE BOHEMIAN LANDS,  
SLOVAKIA, AND CZECHOSLOVAKIA

A Colloquium

*The following discussion was sponsored by Bohemia on the occasion of the Tagung of Collegium Carolinum held in November, 1988, which drew an international assemblage of scholars to Bad Wiessee on the theme, "Great Britain, the United States, and the Bohemian Lands 1848-1838." The sponsors hoped that the exchange of views among a representative group drawn from the many participants at the Tagung would acquaint readers of Bohemia with a variety of important ideas and publications on Czechoslovak history that have appeared since about 1970. Those taking part in this Colloquium were asked to identify recent major trends and enduring problems in historical research on the country and its constituent peoples. The focus of the discussion here is the fifty-year period from 1890, when the Bohemian Lands and Slovakia were subject to Austria-Hungary, to the eve of World War II.*

*These proceedings were transcribed and edited by Stanley B. Winters and Eva Schmidt-Hartmann and then reviewed by the participants before publication. The participants were: Stanley B. Winters, Professor of History, New Jersey Institute of Technology (Newark, N.J.), president of the Czechoslovak History Conference and editor of T. G. Masaryk (1850-1937), Vol. 1: Thinker and Politician, who served as moderator; Dr. Mark Cornwall, Research Fellow in the History of East Central Europe, Wolfson College (Oxford); currently engaged in research on demography and political conflict in the Bohemian Lands from 1880 to 1950; Dr. Eva Schmidt-Hartmann, editor of Bohemia and of Biographisches Lexikon zur Geschichte der böhmischen Länder, and specialist in the history of political thought; Mr. Harry Hanak, Lecturer in International Relations, School of Slavonic and East European Studies, University of London, editor most recently of T. G. Masaryk (1850-1937), Vol. 3: Statesman and Cultural Force; Mr. Robert Luft, Wissenschaftlicher Mitarbeiter at Collegium Carolinum, now working on a study of Bohemian handicrafts from the second half of the nineteenth century to 1914 with Professor Dr. Ferdinand Seibt, and preparing a doctoral dissertation on the Czech members of the Austrian parliament before World War I; Owen V. Johnson, Associate Professor at the School of Journalism, Indiana University (Bloomington, IN), president of the Slovak Studies Association, author of a book and articles on Slovakia, and currently studying the interrelations between the growth of national identity and mass media, primarily newspapers, in Slovakia; and Ronald M. Smelser, Professor of Modern European History, University of Utah (Salt Lake City, UT), president of the German Studies Association, and now working in modern German social and political history but especially interested in German-Czech relations in the context of ethnic group relations and modernization.*

*The Colloquium was opened by Professor Winters, who asked its members to describe new concepts in their fields and comment on whether historical study of the Bohemian Lands, Slovakia, and Czechoslovakia has kept pace with the overall revolution in scholarly knowledge of the past twenty years.*

SMELSER: Let me open the discussion in just one respect in response to your questions. I'm not sure of the extent to which a knowledge gap exists with regards to studies of the interaction among other ethnic groups in Czechoslovakia, but so far as studies of the Czech-German interaction are concerned, I see a very positive development, really in the last twenty years. At first one new generation and now actually a second generation has come into the world of scholarship and has begun to see those ethnic relationships in much less partisan ways than was originally the case. It now views the interaction between those two groups in Bohemia more through the filters of sociological theories of minority interaction than in a partisan way. Several works come to mind that fall into that category including Rudolf Jaworski, *Vorposten oder Minderheit?* (1977), Andreas Luh, *Der Deutsche Turnverband in der Ersten Tschechoslowakischen Republik* (1988), and the essays in *Studies in East European Social History* edited by Keith Hitchins (1977, 1981). I think my own book, *The Sudeten Problem 1933-1938* (1975) would be illustrative of this more recent development.

HARTMANN: One should not, however, forget that you have been speaking about literature published outside of Czechoslovakia. By that, you have touched indirectly upon an interesting phenomenon, that is the particular kind of pluralism in the historiography of Czechoslovakia. We know presently at least three larger groups of historiographical writings in this field: Czechoslovak publications, the unofficial samizdat-publications (close to which stand and should probably be emphasized the Western publications in the Czech language), and, finally, the works by foreign historians of Czechoslovakia. Those three groups, even though increasingly paying attention to each other, still seem to be fulfilling relatively independent functions. Your example can illustrate this best: while during the 1950s and 1960s much was written abroad on the Czech-German problem in the Bohemian Lands it seems only recently that these questions were taken up by Czech authors in samizdat or abroad, but we can still find hardly any publications on this topic in Czechoslovakia. One of the most interesting studies on this topic from the Czech point of view is *Konfliktní společenství* (1989) by Jan Křen and Václav Kural, which will, by the way, be published soon by Collegium Carolinum in German translation.

LUFT: I think the most important work recently published in Czechoslovakia is by Otto Urban, *Česká společnost 1848-1918* (1982). In his excellent synthesis, Urban pointed mainly to the political and social development of the Czech nation within the Habsburg monarchy. It's a good mixture of fluid narrative and historical analysis. Urban's book none the less has been criticized in the Czechoslovak press and by historians of the Academy of Science. The book also includes the history of the Germans in the Bohemian Lands, but only if a connection exists to the Czech history. Until recently, there have been no detailed studies on the Germans of Bohemia, and the

nineteenth century is not in the center of Czech historiography nowadays. Urban was dealing a bit more with German affairs in Bohemia in the course of his work on the year 1866, and he will study further German-Czech connections in the sixties. Similarly, there are some interesting articles by Jiří Kořalka, "Palacký at Frankfurt 1840-1860," *Husitský Tábor* (1983-84), and "Palacký und Österreich als Vielvölkerstaat," *Österreichische Osthefte* (1986). He discusses Palacký's Czech national and patriotic concepts and his ideas about Czech-German relations. But I think it is still a problem that in Czechoslovakia the nationality and minority problems, especially the relations between Germans and Czechs, have only been studied for the period between 1848 and the seventies, and not afterwards.

WINTERS: Owen, you've dealt with significant aspects of historiography within Slovakia. Would you say that work there is deeper and more open than work on Slovakia done outside? You yourself made a fine contribution with your book, *Education and the Making of a Nation* (1985). What else is worth noting from outside Czechoslovakia itself on the history of Slovakia and its peoples?

JOHNSON: For one, Yeshayahu Jelinek's book, *The Lust for Power: Nationalism, Slovakia and the Communists, 1918-1948* (1983), deals with the issue of national assertion within the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia. For another, we have several volumes of collected essays from the Slovak World Congress. These vary in quality. We have an outstanding doctoral dissertation at Indiana University: "'At the Price of the Republic': Hlinka's Slovak People's Party, 1929-1938," by James R. Felak (1989), who has joined the faculty at the University of Washington in Seattle. Another dissertation is by Michael Kopanic at the University of Pittsburgh, on Slovak trade unions in the years 1918-1929.

CORNWALL: *The Slovak Dilemma* by Eugen Steiner (1973) is a general study found in most academic libraries and is most frequently cited.

JOHNSON: Steiner had much useful information that was available when the book was written, but history, unfortunately, is not his forte. Has there been much in German since Ludwig von Gogolák's three volumes, *Beiträge zur Geschichte des Slowakischen Volkes* (1963, 1969, 1972)?

HARTMANN: Yes, in fact it is in German that the most comprehensive study, of the Jewish tragedy in Slovakia to date was published in 1979. I am thinking of Ladislav Lipscher's study, *Die Juden im Slowakischen Staat*, which, even though already ten years old is still quoted as the most informative work on the topic. Jörg K. Hoensch's edition, *Dokumente zur Autonomiepolitik der Slowakischen Volkspartei Hlinkas* (1984), is another valuable publication concerning Slovak history in German. Karin Schmid's *Die Slowakische Republik 1939-1945. Eine staats- und völkerrechtliche Betrachtung* (2 vols., 1982) will surely become a standard work in its field.

WINTERS: We've discussed Slovakia; now, what about the Czechs in the Habsburg monarchy? Much was published before 1970 by Zdeněk Šolle, Jiří Kořalka, Jurij Křížek, Joseph Zacek, Stanley Pech, and others. Has there been much of significance since then from inside or outside? The encyclopaedic work by Bruce Garver, *The*

*Young Czech Party and the Emergence of a Multi-Party System* (1978), while concentrating on the Bohemian Czechs, was sensitive to the larger imperial context.

CORNWALL: On the question of nationality in the Bohemian Lands and the importance of demographic developments in the Habsburg period in determining national tensions, there have been significant recent works. I would mention especially Gary B. Cohen, *The Politics of Ethnic Survival* (1981) for understanding the Czech-German relationship in Prague. One of the most recent books to appear is Hillel Kieval, *The Making of Czech Jewry* (1988). Also, Z. A. B. Zeman's recent study of the formation of modern Eastern Europe, *Pursued by a Bear* (1989), contains a very useful chapter on what he terms the "politics of population pressure"; he emphasizes that it was in this society of inter-related national and demographic tensions that the first seeds of National Socialism were sown.

WINTERS: Also important for their comprehensive view of economic and nationality problems are parts of the massive *Die Habsburgermonarchie 1848-1918*, edited by Adam Wandruszka and Peter Urbanitsch, which have appeared since 1973, five volumes to date, with valuable chapters here and there on the Czechs and Germans of the Bohemian Lands. Have there been recent works which give Moravia treatment as detailed as that usually received by Bohemia and Slovakia?

LUFT: In Moravia, the political parties are discussed in a number of small studies in *Časopis Matice moravské* and other regional journals. See Jiří Malíř, *Vývoj liberálního proudu české politiky na Moravě* (1985); others like Jiří Pernes, Pavel Marek, Miloš Trapl, and František Kraváček have worked on the Moravian progressive movement (pokrokové hnutí) of the 1890s, on the Moravian Young Czechs, the Agrarian Party and also the Catholic party, which is normally not studied in Czechoslovakia. While in Bohemia we have only the book by the late Tomáš Vojtěch, *Mladočeši a boj o politickou moc v Čechách* (1980), which deals with parties.

WINTERS: But he doesn't carry into the period we're now discussing. There is your own article, too, in *Die Chance der Verständigung* (1987) on the great estate-owners party in Moravia, not to be too modest. There were several articles on changes in the electoral system in the Habsburg empire. Václav Pokorný had one in *Právněhistorické studie* (1983) and Dagmar Hudcová in *Minulostí Západočeského kraje* (1982). So there is a little material on the politics of the prewar period.

HARTMANN: If we try to evaluate the studies on the development of political parties in both the Bohemian Lands and later in Czechoslovakia, then we have to admit that little has been done in this field so far. Considering Western societies, it is striking how little attention the party system as such has received from the Czech historians; the conference volume, *Die Erste Tschechoslowakische Republik als multinationaler Parteienstaat* (1979), with all its shortcomings, still seems to be most comprehensive survey of information. We are also lacking in comparative approaches, which would be so important for any study of political culture. The most interesting attempt was made by the late Stanley Z. Pech in his articles "Political Parties in Eastern Europe 1848-1939," *East Central Europe* (1978), "Right, Left, and Centre in Eastern Europe

1860–1940: A Cross-National Profile,” *Canadian Journal of History* (1981), and “Parliamentary Debates in Pre-1914 East Central Europe: A Comparative Age Profile,” *East European Quarterly* (1985).

WINTERS: The entire prewar era, particularly the years 1907 to 1914, is still underexplored in historical writing on Czechoslovakia, and also the Czech-German relationship of that time. We tend to write off the negotiations between the ethnic parties as fated to fail, but when doing my piece on Masaryk and Kramář for the TGM Conference in London, I was struck by the complex and highly personal nature of the politics. Intensely personal, with ancient feuds playing a significant role in political decisions. The late Czech historian Karel Kazbunda left a sizable manuscript on the Czech-German negotiations, unfortunately unpublished.

JOHNSON: An example of the complexity of the political parties, which may actually be a significant factor in why they haven't been dealt with, is Dušan Uhlíř's two articles in *Československý časopis historický* in 1968 and 1969 about the Agrarian party. These articles only dealt with about eight years of the history of the party and that only at a very high level.

WINTERS: There is a recent doctorate at the University of Pittsburgh, Dan Miller, who worked on the Agrarians, studied in Prague, and is coming up with a serious study of the early history of the Agrarian party under the Republic.

LUFT: But there is still a great deal to be done on the background of parties or organizations close to the parties. Peter Heumos has gone into the importance of these clubs and associations in his studies, especially in *Agrarische Organisation und nationale Politik in Böhmen 1848–1889* (1979), and the volume *Vereinswesen und Geschichtspflege in den böhmischen Ländern* (1986), published by Collegium Carolinum, dealing with semi-political “Geschichtsvereine” and other organizations. Some small Czech studies exist about the Agrarians, such as one by František Kraváček, “Organizační a podnikatelská činnost české agrární strany na Moravě na počátku 20. století (1896–1914),” *Hospodářské dějiny* (1982), but there is no fundamental research in this field of social networks and organizations.

SMELSER: This is extremely important, I believe, because one of the litmus tests both in prewar Bohemia and in the First Republic was when normal politics was the order of the day as opposed to when ethnic politics was the order of the day. Stated somewhat differently, when the emphasis is on political parties as class parties, as against, when the emphasis is on the umbrellas, the ethnic umbrella organizations, those unofficial and near parties, particularly in the prewar period. There is a lot here that needs to be done. Some work has been done on groups during the First Republic because ultimately many of the informal German organizations funnel into the Henlein movement. But as far as what goes on prior to the war is concerned, the old story, the Deutsche Schulverein, develops into other things.

That needs to be worked on with the use of some modern networks and theories of the state, so that we can look at the quasi-political structures alongside of the regular party system. It's precisely the existence of a shadow party system that tells us when

ethnic conflict is more important or when politics as usual is more important. That relates to what you were saying a few minutes ago about the negotiations between 1907 and 1914. Whether they were heading in a fruitful direction or whether they were leading to a dead end. Work in that area would, I think, help to shed light on the problem.

LUFT: There is no article or research about "Národní rada česká," which was the head organization of all Czech parties and institutions, founded in the year 1900.

JOHNSON: Again we have here the contrast, unfortunately, of the Czech case with the Slovaks, where there have been numerous publications about the various Slovak political parties, from the beginning of the century until 1918; for example, Milan Podrimavský, *Slovenská národná strana v druhej polovici XIX. storočia* (1983); and Vladimír Zuberec, "Formovania slov. agr. hnutia v r. 1900–1918," *Historický časopis* (1972). Especially useful are Michal Potemra's articles on Slovak political dynamics in the early twentieth century; e.g. *Historický časopis* (1979, 1980) and *Historické štúdie* (1976, 1977 and 1982).

WINTERS: We need to know more about the workings of the 1907 general elections in Austria and the electoral reform. The consensus is that they introduced into parliamentary politics social-class interests that overrode nationality appeals, particularly to the detriment of the Young Czechs. They opened the way for the Czech Agrarian and Social Democratic parties to step forward. But how much do we really know about how the electorate responded to the new system on the local level and how the parties themselves reacted to the reform and reshaped their structures and platforms accordingly? Conventional opinion holds that Parliament became more fractious and contentious than ever; there were sharp debates and discussions within the Czech and German camps in Bohemia, and an important election to Parliament occurred in 1911. Let's not forget that Masaryk had not held a deputy's mandate since 1893, and he used his new seat to great advantage after his election in 1907.

LUFT: This concerns my own research. There is much material on the 1890s with their very deep nationality conflicts, and also on the beginning of the parties, before the onset of the enlarged spectrum of Czech parties. But we do not have any studies for the following period, especially concerning the years 1907 to 1914. Only Jan Galandauer deals this period in his respectable biography of *Bohumír Šmeral* (2 vols., 1981–86). The general line of thinking is that the development was leading straight toward World War I. I believe that as far as internal politics were concerned, it was not clear that everything would be destroyed. Therefore it was open situation. But in another sense this period was a new situation, too, because there were so many changes in organizations, economic and social changes in Czech and also in German society in Bohemia in those times. Therefore, I think, it is a very important period. Also for understanding the First Czechoslovak Republic.

CORNWALL: Can I say that I am editing a book of essays at the moment for Exeter University Press on political and military aspects of the last years of Austria-Hungary? It contains an article by Lothar Höbelt on Reichsrat politics and the Austrian parliamentary system in the immediate years before the war with some useful basic infor-

mation about the Czech political parties; he also tries to evaluate the underlying trend of the system at this time, whether it was improving or was doomed! The same book will contain an article by Z. A. B. Zeman on the Austrian censuses with some bias toward the Czech-German administrative and political relationship in Bohemia.

JOHNSON: It seems to me this relates to the notion of political culture, an idea which has taken hold in Western historiography since 1968, but which I don't think has got very far with Czech and Slovak historians. It's another example of the isolation of Czech and Slovak historians from world trends in research since about 1970. There are four books on *Dějiny československé žurnalistiky* (1981, 1984, 1988, 1989) covering both the Slovaks and the Czechs. In a very basic way, they talk about the development of mass circulation newspapers, which are part and parcel of universal suffrage. But there has not been the effort to bring these various things together, something I think would help a great deal in interpreting developments in this period.

WINTERS: We move now to the wartime era. What has changed in our interpretation... and what works have appeared recently of significance about Czech and Slovak, and Bohemian and Moravian, developments during World War I? Are we bound still by the traditional interpretation of Masaryk and his adherents heroically going abroad and the people internally being oppressed and arrested and forming a modest underground movement? Then we have another interpretation based on the development of a hesitant revolutionary or resistance movement inside, and the germs of the later ideological struggle between the foreign resistance and the internal resistance. That's the classic model. Has anything come up to challenge that?

CORNWALL: Harry Hanak will probably correct me if I'm wrong, but I think that most of the material published in the West in the last twenty years has concentrated on the émigré resistance movement. There are still large gaps and much to be written about the actual situation in the Bohemian Lands; one of the few works which springs to mind is the two-volume *Innere Front* (1974) by Richard G. Plaschka, Arnold Suppan, and Horst Haselsteiner, which deals at rather excessive length with the military revolts of 1918. On the émigré side, the Czechs' relations with Britain in particular receive some attention in two rather uneven works published in the seventies: Kenneth Calder's *Britain and the Origins of the New Europe* (1976) and Wilfried Fest's *Peace or Partition* (1978). But perhaps the major contribution, a mine of information, is *The Making of a New Europe* by Hugh and Christopher Seton-Watson (1981), which adds much to our knowledge of the émigré movements during the war. There is of course also the controversial work by Josef Kalvoda, *The Genesis of Czechoslovakia* (1986).

WINTERS: Kalvoda's book has created a stir that ranges from outright condemnation and hysterical indignation to high praise from those who share some of his criticisms of Masaryk and Beneš. It's a book that can be ignored but it won't go away, not only for its sheer bulk, although its critics charge that the material has been selected and interpreted tendentiously.

JOHNSON: In the Slovak case there has been over the last ten or fifteen years a pretty direct and frank, objective analysis of Slovak developments during the war. The traditional interpretation was that the Slovaks were scared and entirely passive and did not

do anything, and that it took the Czechs, representing them in Vienna and Prague, to pull them out of this terrible deep hole. The two books by Marian Hronsky, *Slovensko na rázcestí: Slovenské národné rady a gardy v roku 1918* (1975) and *Slovensko pri zrode Československa* (1988), deal much more frankly with this period, as does the series in *Nové slovo* (October–November 1988) by Josef Butvin.

WINTERS: I call your attention to two books by Victor Fic: *Revolutionary War for Independence and The Russian Question* (1977), and *The Bolsheviks and Czechoslovak Legion* (1978). Very thorough and helpful works on the evolution of the Czechs in Russia and their relationship to the Bolshevik revolution.

CORNWALL: That's the Russian side. For the Czech army in Italy there have been a couple of articles published in English since the 1960s (in the series of East European Monographs of Columbia University Press) but they contain a lot of errors. My own research had dealt to some extent with the Czech Legion and émigré movement in Italy: my thesis, *The Undermining of Austria-Hungary* (1987), includes an account of the negotiations to set up the Legion and also discusses the organization of Allied propaganda – including Czech propaganda – against the Austro-Hungarian army.

HANAK: One of the books about World War I worth mentioning is Jiří Kovtun, *Masarykův triumf. Příběh konce války* (1987). Among other things that Kovtun has written about this period are the brochures *The Czechoslovak Declaration of Independence* (1985) and *Masaryk and America* (1988). Then there is Josef Kalvoda's book cited by Mark Cornwall. But to come back to the two volumes by Victor Fic, they are important because, apart from J. F. N. Bradley's book on the Czechoslovak Legion from 1965, there has been little else. In any case, Fic has new material and a new outlook and is free from the prejudice of much written in ČSSR. Another project is by Michael Kettle, who is writing a vast work on Allied intervention in Russia. Volume II, *The Road to Intervention, March–November 1918* (1988), has interesting material on the Czechoslovak Legion.

The recent study by Václav Čáda, *28. říjen 1918: Skutečnost, sny a iluze* (1988), is a popular history with some academic value. For the postwar period, and dealing with the relations between the Czechoslovak Republic and other powers, Svatava Raková, *Politika Spojených států ve střední Evropě po první světové válce* (1983) has little value. More significant is Bohumila Ferenčuhová, *Sovietské Rusko a Malá dohoda* (1988).

WINTERS: Very valuable for the Czechoslovak Legion (she calls it the Czech Legion) is the forthcoming book by Betty Miller Unterberger, *The United States, Revolutionary Russia, and the Rise of Czechoslovakia* (due in 1989), which uses U. S. government documents to great advantage. In addition Béla Király and others have been editing volumes in a continuing series on wars and armies in Central and Eastern Europe. Among them, for example, there is an essay by F. M. B. Fowkes, "The Origins of Czechoslovak Communism" in the book on *The Effects of World War I* (1983). He is trying to trace the roots of the split in Czech Social Democracy back to the war time era itself. We've got Gunther Rothenberg's book on *The Army of Francis Joseph* (1976).

And I'm impressed by articles by Victor Mamatey; for example, "The Czech War-time Dilemma: the Habsburgs or the Entente?" in another volume edited by Király, *East Central European Society in World War I* (1985). Now, Mamatey over the years, if you'll read his pieces in a compact sequence, tends to give the internal movement a weight which is not widely accredited to it. He's not writing off, by any means, the émigré outsiders, although in his great book published in 1957, *The United States and East Central Europe 1914–1918*, he clearly shows that Masaryk's influence was peripheral in the process that led to Wilson's decision. And if you look at his subsequent articles like the ones I've cited you'll see that he is saying that the attitude among the Czech politicians in Parliament as well as within the Czech public was a reasoned one. With some exceptions they were not totally accommodating to the Habsburg régime, but there was understandable caution under very difficult circumstances. This enabled the domestic leadership to play a role in moving the nation to take advantage of the breakdown of Austria-Hungary.

JOHNSON: One thing that should be mentioned is the series of volumes on the history of the army in Czechoslovakia, which deals among other things with the World War I period. Vojtech Dangl, a Slovak historian, has written about Slovak participation in the Habsburg army: "Rakúsko-uhorský militarizmus a protivojnové prejavy na Slovensku v rokoch 1910–1913" (Dissertation, SAV, 1979), which is a subject not normally dealt with, and he carries it up into World War I. There is one other useful book – I do not know the exact title – it was recently published in Hungary in English – about the development of some of the Communist movements in Hungary and Slovakia at the end of World War I, which is certainly part and parcel of the wartime experience.

WINTERS: We turn to the interwar era, whose features are vast enough to exhaust the time at our disposal. Do you have any thoughts on specific aspects of the era? For example, it's generally believed that the Czech parliamentary system was at the mercy of a very small group of leaders of the political parties and was also subject to manipulation or various forms of cooptation by the Castle (Hrad) Group, or to endless dickerings for partisan advantages. Yet there was continuity to the era despite the many changes that occurred after independence. You see the same names cropping up in different official positions. We note Beneš always there, and that intrigues me, that he survived during that time so consistently. Then, of course, the fact that Masaryk himself is not being elected by Parliament with the unanimity and adulation that we would expect from the general received opinion of his eminent place in the Republic. We'll open up with thoughts about the operations of the party system.

CORNWALL: There are the detailed articles by Uhlíř on the Agrarians which have already been mentioned, and I think I am right in saying that Uhlíř actually wrote a book on the subject twenty years ago which was published recently. However, there are signs of change in Czechoslovakia itself: more Czech historians in particular are being allowed to look at the Beneš papers, and Dr. Klimek has even been authorized to write the "official biography" of Beneš, which is clearly a step forward. Otherwise, up to now, as far as the party system is concerned, we have had to make do with bits and

pieces from Czech historians such as Vladimír Fic's *Národní sjednocení v politickém systému Československa - 1930-1938* (1983).

WINTERS: It's crammed with details, is very partisan, and yet has data difficult to get otherwise. He focuses on the petty interests, the squabbling, sectarianism, and anti-democratism within the Right camp.

JOHNSON: To some degree, Tagung volumes, especially *Die demokratisch-parlamentarische Struktur der Ersten Tschechoslowakischen Republik* (1975); *Die Erste Tschechoslowakische Republik als multinationaler Parteienstaat* (1979); and *Die 'Burg': Einflußreiche politische Kräfte um Masaryk und Beneš* (1973-74), probably give us the best pictures we have of interwar Czechoslovak politics, even if it is article by article, rather than as an integrated work.

LUFT: The party system, in particular, is covered in several volumes in this series, but the problem with these volumes is that most of the articles refer only to the existing research; but there is no new research, because the scholars had no chance at that time to use the archives in Czechoslovakia. Therefore it is necessary to find the point to start new research.

WINTERS: But how can we do it if, for outsiders and even for many Czech and Slovak scholars, the archives on the interwar period are largely closed? Mostly so far as political archives, those of the Foreign Ministry and of the President's Chancellery, are concerned.

JOHNSON: We are already seeing an opening of relevant archives. It first happened in Slovakia to foreign researchers. I have already mentioned the work by Felak on the Hlinka party in the 1930s. James A. Rogerson did a dissertation at the University of Chicago, "Slovak Republicans and Slovak Populists 1923-1925," in 1980. Unfortunately, he has left the profession so has not made any effort to publish it. Both of these people had access to relevant party materials, not only to archives in Slovakia, but also in Prague.

LUFT: And the same applies to Nancy Wingfield. She worked in Czech archives and her dissertation will be published next year. She has also used newspapers. Her dissertation was "Minority Politics in a Multinational State. The German Social Democrats in Czechoslovakia," Columbia University, 1987. The book is an overall review of the German Social Democratic position.

HARTMANN: But even without access to archives, I believe there is still plentiful material which has not so far been used for the study of the workings of the Czechoslovak party system in the First Republic. As an example, Peter Heumos' recent articles can be quoted: "Die Arbeiterschaft in der ersten Tschechoslowakischen Republik. Elemente der Sozialstruktur, organisatorischen Verfassung und politischen Kultur," *Bohemia* (1988), and "Konfliktregelung und soziale Integration. Zur Struktur der Ersten Tschechoslowakischen Republik," *Bohemia* (1989). In both studies, Heumos uses available information for an analysis, achieving new insights by application of the theoretical frameworks used in studies of Anglo-American and German social and

political-culture history. His studies show how important it is to use theoretical concepts critically instead of just attempting to gather facts in an unreflective manner.

JOHNSON: We should mention a book published by the Hoover Institution, Zdeněk Suda, *Zealots and Rebels* (1980), a survey history of the Czechoslovak Communist party. It provides a good overview of interwar developments and is a basis for further research.

HANAK: Also, there is the book by Jacques Rupnik, *Histoire du Parti Communiste Tchécoslovaque* (1981).

WINTERS: Is that as comprehensive a book as Suda's?

HANAK: Yes, it is, but it deals primarily with the period after 1945.

SMELSER: We're discussing the First Republic and political parties, so just to augment what we've said so far, I will refer to the German parties of that time. I've already mentioned several important studies. One could add to that an important one, J. W. Brügel, *Tschechen und Deutsche* (1974). That marks a culmination of the earlier more partisan kind of study, I think mainly. From that point on, you get other, more balanced works like Gregory Campbell's, *Confrontation in Central Europe* (1975), which put the German-Czech relationship in a somewhat larger picture that included relationships with the Weimar Republic. It's a very important work.

JOHNSON: Speaking of Gregory Campbell we must mention his article in *Slavic Review* (Spring, 1985): "Empty Pedestals," with comments by Roman Szporluk and Gale Stokes, who address basic questions about interwar politics.

CORNWALL: At the other end of the spectrum from Brügel we have, for example, Alfred Bohmann's *Menschen und Grenzen* (1975). I was quite amazed that these kind of views were still being churned out until very recently; but then you find that Bohmann himself was a not unimportant official in the Henlein party in the late thirties.

WINTERS: Let us not forget *A History of the Czechoslovak Republic*, edited by Victor S. Mamatey and Radomír V. Luža (1973), since then translated and published in German and French. It has become the standard, almost mainstream account of the interwar period and onto 1948.

SMELSER: But Mamatey-Luža is not a coherent history, it's a collection of essays. Not nearly as comprehensive is Jörg K. Hoensch, *Geschichte der Tschechoslowakischen Republik 1918 bis 1945* (1966). So Mamatey-Luža hold the field.

WINTERS: It has a certain continuity. The narrative has chronological order in the essays by Mamatey and Václav Beneš, and the other essays have a chronological framework.

JOHNSON: One could mention, while discussing political history, the volume edited by Jaroslav Pecháček, *Masaryk, Beneš, Hrad: Masarykovy dopisy Benešovi* (1984), which has useful original materials.

HANAK: It has always seemed to me that one way of judging the interest in a country by non-native historians is to look at general histories. Most important ones, like Marmatej and Luža, were written many years ago, but more recently there is the important text book by Jörg K. Hoensch, *Geschichte Böhmens* (1987), which compresses much into 560 pages. Highly prejudiced, but a curiosity none the less is *Kratkaja istorija Čechoslovakii*, by A. Ch. Klevanskij, V. V. Maržina, A. S. Mylnikov and I. I. Pop, published in 1988 in the series of the history of foreign socialist countries by the Institute of Slav and Balkan Studies. While on this subject, *Hilfswissenschaften* one may call it, I find *Československé dějiny v datech* (1987) very useful.

WINTERS: Věra Olivová's work *The Doomed Democracy: Czechoslovakia in an Disrupted Europe* (1972), which was a translation of a book originally in Czech, is still provocative. The title is a bit deceptive because the first third of the book is on the period 1918–1919 and the last third deals with '37–'38. The internal development of the republic gets slighted; that just wasn't her main goal.

JOHNSON: There is a Slovak book which deals with some of these issues on the relationship between domestic and international politics, Jozef Klimko, *Politické a právne dejiny hraníc predmníchovskej republiky (1918–1938)*, published by Veda (1986). What needs to be mentioned are pioneering works in the fields of economic, social, and national history. There is an excellent work by František Dudek on the sugar industry, *Monopolizace cukrovarnictví v českých zemích do roku 1938*, published by Academia (1985). Zdeněk Deyl's work on social policy, *Sociální vývoj Československa 1918–1938*, also was published by Academia (1985). And then a book, *Narysy novitojji istoriji ukrajinciv Schidnoji Slovaččyny*, by Ivan Vanat, especially the second volume, published in Prešov in 1985, looks at conditions among the Ukrainians of Czechoslovakia. An important source for the interwar period is recent memoir literature. Miloš Krno, a Slovak writer, has written a book about growing up in Central Slovakia, *Hory, rieky, ľudia* (1984). Karel Douděra, not a historian but a journalist, wrote *Republika na úvěr* (1981). In the West we have a couple of books about the lives of Slovak figures who are in politics. They draw very heavily on the original writings of their subjects. In particular I will mention two books by František Vnuk: one dealing with the life of Konstantín Čulen, *Životopis Konstantína Čulena* (1984), and another with the life of Alexander Mach, *'Mat' svoj štát znamená život' ...: Politická biografía Alexandra Macha* (1987).

WINTERS: Should we consider the considerable writing on local and regional history, and social history, which have a long tradition in Czechoslovakia?

JOHNSON: In that connection, one book worth noting is Milan Krajčovič, *Slovenská spoločnosť v Uhorsku* (1986), a concise study of Slovak development in the nineteenth century which takes in the whole of Slovak society.

HARTMANN: On looking through Czechoslovak historical journals during the last ten years or so, it struck me that the significance of local history has been recognized there, particularly in the field of industrial relations. There is a clear parallel to the developments observed in the West, which can be described as a turning away from

national history to the history of smaller, traditionally closely connected areas. *Slezský sborník* is an example of a journal which offers most valuable new materials.

SMELSER: These local studies represent both an opportunity and a danger, depending on how they are done. I don't know about those in Czechoslovakia, but if the pattern is the same as that in some Western countries, if these studies bring forth new interpretive models and test them out in microcosm, then they could be important building blocks for future syntheses. On the other hand, many local studies often tend to be antiquarian. In that respect they don't contribute much to a general historical understanding.

JOHNSON: The second route is the one followed by most Czech and Slovak local studies. They sometimes have useful information, but one of the reasons they have been relatively easy to publish is precisely that they have not employed theoretical models.

LUFT: In Czechoslovakia the most important things are now published in small regional journals, the journals of archives and faculties, especially in Moravia, but also in Bohemia. *Časopis Matice moravské*, *Minulostí Západočeského kraje*, *Pražský sborník historický*, *Documenta Pragensia* and other "sborníky" are very interesting. On one hand, they contain a lot of material from local archives, and for historians from abroad it's not possible to go to every archive. These articles are often very descriptive and have no modern scientific thoughts and theories. But on the other hand, even in these small journals younger scholars try to take one or the other new idea or method from abroad and test it in articles on Czech history. Therefore in regional and local journals there are a lot of very interesting items on social development, on the development of parties, and so on.

WINTERS: The articles in the periodical *Husitský Tábor*, to cite another example, have occasionally gone beyond the nominal time frame to examine the medieval legacy in many later aspects of Bohemian history. I'm also interested in writings published in the limited editions of 300–500 copies that are produced by institutes of the Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences. Many of their essays are not mere hack work; while they may pay their respects to orthodoxy, they often deal with important, rather unexplored topics. *Historická demografie* and *Historická geografie* have been published for several decades, with some volumes intensely local in focus but others devoted, say, to the evolution of Prague and its metropolitan region or to European population trends. There also is *Práce dějin přírodních věd*, which carries engrossing essays about scholars, scientists, and faculty associated with institutions throughout the republic, and how they built the network of scientific agencies and educational vehicles in the country. The quarterly *Dějiny věd a techniky* is rather slim in each issue, but over its twenty years has projected vignettes that help us understand the emergence of Bohemian and Czech science and technology under Habsburg Austria and after independence. The Slovaks have their own history of technology journals, with which I am not as familiar. So there are rich lodes of information for outsiders; most items have abstracts in German or English. But because of their scarcity, or great cost through book dealers, many libraries do not acquire them.

JOHNSON: Two important things need to be said in this regard. One is the scholarly record of these journals, as a forthcoming review in the *Austrian History Yearbook* about *Hospodářské dějiny* will point out. Since these journals do not go through much of a scholarly clearance and review process, they are uneven. There are some very good articles, but then there are others that are not. The second thing, and you have actually alluded to it, is that these journals are enormously difficult to get. Most Western libraries are able to obtain them only on exchange. They are not listed in bibliographies in the way that other journals and books are, so if you do not have them in your own university library or at the Library of Congress or the British Library, it is very difficult to find out what has been published.

LUFT: I think it's not the traditional position of political history which is interesting in Czechoslovakia today. It's in the surrounding fields. It's the history of arts, culture. It's ethnography. There are, for example, *Český lid*, the Czech journal of ethnography, and *Etnografie dělnictva*. They contain much social and ethnographical material, very interesting studies which are only small as far as the number of pages go, but there is a point of remarkable new research, and new ways, also historiographically.

JOHNSON: I would mention in particular a Slovak journal, but of the same type as *Český lid*; it is *Slovenská etnografia*, which at the beginning of 1988 had an issue devoted to the Gypsies in Slovakia. It has perhaps two dozen articles on various aspects of their life. The Gypsies have been an understudied aspect of the history of Czechoslovakia and this goes a long way toward addressing that shortcoming.

HARTMANN: I am glad that you mentioned another example of a reasonable new opening in the so-called "official" historiography in Czechoslovakia. It seems to me that, in fact, there are great differences in the quality of publications and variations in the type of publications which are produced in Czechoslovakia. Apparently, it is possible to produce good historical writing and have it published even in the Pre-Perestrojka country of "real-socialism." Maybe we should reexamine our thinking of those systems, maybe more depends on the qualities and engagement of individual men and women than we tend to admit. Maybe we should give up the concept of "official historiography" and find other terms, allowing for more differentiation.

WINTERS: Wouldn't it be premature to abandon the concept of "official historiography" at this time? There exists a plurality of institutions, research centers, and practitioners, all functioning within definite constraints but expressing various shades of orthodoxy. Closest to the official historiography are the institutes and divisions of the Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences. They sponsor the "official" journals such as *Československý časopis historický*, *Historický časopis*, *Slovanský přehled*, and the like, including the occasional volumes of limited circulation mentioned earlier. But, as Robert Luft said, but, there are the smaller regional journals, university publications, museum and archival periodicals, and the lesser publishing houses; all provide "legitimate" opportunities for scholars, to reach small audiences to be sure, but still a chance to appear in print. There are also the virtually semi-legitimate samizdat publications which manage to find their way out of the country.

JOHNSON: One factor that comes into play here is the way the historical profession is organized within Czechoslovakia. The leading institutes within the Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences and the Slovak Academy of Sciences or the history faculties generally are conducting research according to some kind of plan. The plan is especially directed in Slovakia toward the synthetic volumes, so that opportunities for doing individual original research on interesting topics – this opportunity often falls only to those people who are in more local positions. Thus we get these very detailed local studies, but we don't get the substantial overviews of individual scholars that weigh and interpret the material in those studies.

I would introduce the term "professional historiography." The "official" is generally written to serve political ends or meet political plans. Professional historiography is written by historians primarily for an audience interested in history on its own merits. It's important to note the recent statement by Jaroslav César and others in "Návrh dlouhodobé koncepce historiografie," which appeared in *Československý časopis historický* (1988, No. 3) and several other journals. It addresses many of the shortcomings or gaps in research on Czechoslovak history over the last ten or fifteen years. One of the issues they feel needs to be addressed much more is developments in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, including research on the non-Communist parties and on the important political leaders. I suspect that there is strong support for making such studies possible, particularly because this collective statement is signed by historians holding influential positions within the profession. These trends were supported by discussions at the Sixth Congress of Czechoslovak Historians, held in Prague in February, 1989.

WINTERS: We'll need to close soon. I wonder, Ron, whether you could elaborate on a point you made earlier about how we might view Czechoslovak history in a comparative way; that is, by considering some of the models that have been put forth for the process of nation building and other aspects of the country's development.

SMELSER: This would be valuable in two respects. Eva, you hinted at one when you said that perhaps one way of partly compensating for the lack of raw material in looking at party history would be to examine models that have been used to study political parties in the West. I think this could be done in a larger sense – to look at the development of Czechoslovakia both before World War I, within Austria, and afterward. And secondly, valuable in the sense that I think, since both old Austria and independent Czechoslovakia were multi-ethnic or polyglot states, their various successes, and particularly their failures, in dealing with that complexity have value today for people who are looking at the problems of nation building.

This very briefly, by way of illustration: there are four sorts of areas where I think theories could be applied here. One is modernization theory. I think that one of the ways of de-emotionalizing the whole Czech-German antagonism in the late nineteenth century is to look at it from the modernization perspective. An important work, Cynthia Enloe, *Ethnic Conflict and Political Development* (1973), sheds light on what modernization does to heighten ethnic identity. Secondly, I would mention, generally, the theme of minority politics. Numerous recent studies deal with minorities living in societies under majorities. A particularly provocative book, one which hasn't

received enough attention, is by Geoff Densch, who wrote *Minorities in the Open Society: Prisoners of Ambivalence* (1986). He offers lots of insights that can be applied to the past and the present.

Third, a theory that could help here is "reactive ethnicity." That is, the way members of a specific ethnic group who have experiences outside the core area, then transfer certain ideas and experiences back home that help with the task of achieving national identity. Here two works are important: Raymond Hall, *Ethnic Autonomy* (1979) and Meyer and Hannon's collection, *Ethnic Development in the World System* (1979). Finally, migration. After all, modern urban and industrial development ushered in mass migration within the Bohemian Lands. I'm thinking of the Czech migration into German areas in the 1880s. The period also witnessed migration out of the Bohemian Lands to America. And particularly in the case of the Slovaks, a return migration from America to Slovakia. Here a wonderful study is Ewa Morawska, *For Bread with Butter: Life Worlds of East Central Europeans in Johnstown, Pennsylvania 1890-1940* (1985). She is careful to develop the whole life-system in East Central Europe first and then take it across the Atlantic. So these four categories offer models and perspectives one can employ to deal with the Czechoslovak experience.

WINTERS: This may be a fitting note to end on because we are opening entirely new topics: modernization, demography, population movements, assimilation and acculturation, and others which might well be subjects for future colloquia. Thank you, colleagues and friends, for participating.