

# RESEARCH TRENDS IN NORTH AMERICA ON THE HISTORY OF THE HABSBURG MONARCHY AND CZECHOSLOVAKIA: RESULTS OF A SURVEY \*

*By Stanley B. Winters*

## *Background to the Survey*

The transformations in East Central Europe in the past year have opened hitherto undreamed-of possibilities for historians to conduct research and cooperate with colleagues in that region and elsewhere. The new situation requires that scholars from all countries and of all persuasions examine their concepts and methodologies for erroneous and outdated assumptions. How quickly the new opportunities will be seized by the profession is an important matter that needs to be addressed. One essential starting-point is reliable information on the state of our profession. In preparation for the Bad Wiessee Tagungsprogramm of 22–24 November 1990, the writer distributed a "Survey of Current and Future Research" to historians in the field in the United States and Canada. This is a report on the results of the Survey and an interpretation of its possible significance. It seeks to place the results in the context of the overall academic and financial conditions for research on East Central Europe in North America at this time.

The Survey (a copy appears immediately below) was designed for ease of completion by being limited to a few questions on one side of a page. Faculty members at U. S. educational institutions are besieged with questionnaires and memoranda and discard most of them immediately; hence only ten questions were asked plus the respondent's name and address. Confidentiality of individual answers was assured. To facilitate replies, respondents were asked to note whether they wished to obtain the results, and a stamped return envelope was enclosed.

The Survey was sent to 142 persons. Of this number, 130 names were culled from the following sources: (a) American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies [AAASS], *Directory of Members 1988–89* (Stanford, CA, 1988); (b) Czechoslovak History Conference, *Membership Directory 1988–1990* (Cincinnati, OH, 1988); (c) Slovak Studies Association, *Membership List, updated* (Bloomington, IN, 1988); (d) *Austrian History Yearbook, East Central Europe*, and similar publications for names not listed in the above directories.

Others learned of the Survey through notices that appeared in the *AAASS Newsletter*, *Czechoslovak History Newsletter*, *Newsletter for Habsburg and Austrian History*,

---

\* This is a revised version of a paper presented to the Bad Wiessee Tagungsprogramm of Collegium Carolinum on 23 November 1990. The author is grateful to Professor Solomon Wank for valuable suggestions on revising the paper for publication.

*Perspectives: Newsletter of the American Historical Association*, and *Slovak Studies Association Newsletter*. Of the 142 Surveys that were mailed out, 4 were returned incomplete by retirees or others no longer active in the field, leaving a net effective distribution of 138. Four others were returned too late to be tabulated. A total of 81 were filled in and returned or 60.5 percent. For a numerical breakdown of the answers, see the Appendix.

Of the 81 respondents, most hold multiple memberships in professional associations concerned wholly or in part with Habsburg Austrian and Czechoslovak history. In fact, the Survey was mailed primarily, but not exclusively, to persons who had published in those fields or presented papers in recent years. They belong to the associations mentioned above and others such as the Conference Group for Central European History (focuses on German-speaking Central Europe), the American Association for the Study of Hungarian History, and similar groups. Many belong to the umbrella organization for scholarship in North America on the European lands east of Germany, the AAASS. In short, the respondents, apart from a handful of graduate students, are professionally active, as a glance at a sampling of their names below will indicate. Their comments may be accepted as fairly reliable evidence of the state of mind of scholars from the middle and older generations.

### *The Survey Form*

#### SURVEY OF CURRENT AND FUTURE RESEARCH ON THE HISTORY OF THE HABSBURG EMPIRE AND CZECHOSLOVAKIA

1. Geographic areas of interest (e.g., Bohemia, Hungary, Galicia)  
\_\_\_\_\_
2. Time periods (e.g., 1848–90, 16th century, 1945–present)  
\_\_\_\_\_
3. Most recent or imminently forthcoming publication (give full data)  
\_\_\_\_\_
4. Topics of *current* research or writing (e.g., Slovaks in Budapest, Austro-Sardinian War, the Little Entente Reexamined)
  - a. \_\_\_\_\_
  - b. \_\_\_\_\_
  - c. \_\_\_\_\_
5. Probable form of publication (e.g., oral report, journal article, dissertation)
  - a. \_\_\_\_\_ b. \_\_\_\_\_ c. \_\_\_\_\_ (As per No.4)
6. Locations of needed research materials (list as many as needed: Library of Congress, Marburg/Lahn, Hoover Institution)  
\_\_\_\_\_
7. Present outside financial support, if any (e.g., home institution, IREX, ACLS, or none)  
\_\_\_\_\_
8. Intended *future* research topics (e.g., urban renewal in Vienna 1860–1890)
  - a. \_\_\_\_\_
  - b. \_\_\_\_\_

9. Your greatest research needs (in order of importance, e.g., released time, funding, language skill, access to archives)
  - a. \_\_\_\_\_
  - b. \_\_\_\_\_
  - c. \_\_\_\_\_
10. In your opinion, what are the major needs of the fields of Habsburg and Czechoslovak history today? (e.g., more opportunities for publication, greater academic recognition, archival access)
 

---



---
11. Your name, institution if any, mailing address, and mark X \_\_\_\_\_ if you wish to receive a copy of the survey report when published:
 

---

### *Interpretation of the Survey*

How reliable is the information in the Survey, and how should it be interpreted? In the absence of another recent comparable survey, we have no benchmarks for measurement. The valuable pioneering study, *Language and Area Studies: East Central and Southeastern Europe*, edited by Charles Jelavich (Chicago and London, 1969), represented the findings of nineteen experts in the humanities and social sciences on research needs in their fields. Its chapter on "History" reveals how many gaps remain to be filled more than two decades after it was published. The annual review of "Soviet and East European Studies: Research in Progress," which appears each autumn in the *AAASS Newsletter*, focuses on Slavic-speaking Europe, predominantly Russia and the Soviet Union. It lists research topics under broad subject headings ("Culture & the Arts," "Folklore," "History") but provides no quantitative data. Still, the modest present Survey has indications of reliability. For example, the five most popular geographic areas of interest chosen in Item 1 fall squarely under the rubric of East Central Europe, the area coverage of *Bohemia* and Collegium Carolinum, and show the correct targeting of the Survey recipients.

Item 2 shows the historians' overwhelming preference for research on 19th- and 20th-century topics. Only 20 choices (or 16 per cent) antedated 1800; over 50 per cent chose the 20th century. What accounts for this modernistic time bias? Convenience in work and accessibility of material come to mind: After 1800, the national revivals are well underway; nation-building gathers momentum, social structures take on trappings of modernity. Printed sources become more plentiful and are easier to read than manuscripts; secondary sources are numerous. Perhaps most important, historians of the modern era have twice as many job opportunities as those of earlier centuries. (See, for example, the employment listings in *AHA Perspectives* (November and December 1990) and *AAASS Newsletter* (May and September 1990). The job market, present and anticipated, is the most powerful influence on graduate-level specialization in the United States.

So far as scholarly publishing is concerned (Item 3), that too reflects a modernistic time bias. Of 66 listed recent or forthcoming publications, 55 (or 83 per cent) deal with the past two centuries. The bias is visible in the great variety of topics of current research (Item 4). Most numerous are the traditional subjects (diplomacy, politics,

nationality problems); however, topics from the "new social history" (the communications media, women and family, Jews, immigration) are quite evident and show the influence of broad trends in American historiography. As for Canada, one can only tentatively conclude that social history lags as a concentration. *Canadian Slavonic Papers*, its major outlet for historians of East Central Europe, contained thirteen articles in 1989 (vols. 1, 2, 3-4), of which seven had political themes, three literary-philological, and one each on bibliography, historic preservation, and the environment. The annual listing of over 600 "Canadian Publications on the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe for 1988" (*Canadian Slavonic Papers*, XXXI, Nos. 3-4 [1989], pp. 283-315) cited 12 items under "History - East Europe," of which two were on Czechoslovakia. Three of the thirteen Canadian doctoral dissertations in Slavic fields dealt with ethnic themes, none from East Central Europe. This may reflect the lesser numerical status of the Czechs, Slovaks, and Hungarians in Canada as contrasted to that of such large ethnic groups as the Ukrainians.

### *Research Interests*

The information on research under Items 6-9 contains surprises. On one hand, it was to be expected that Czechoslovakia would be a major location for scholarly inquiry with two-thirds of the respondents to Item 6 pursuing Bohemian, Moravian, and Slovak works in progress. Austria, mainly Vienna, was another logical site. On the other hand, it is startling that most scholars see the United States as the country in which they will conduct their research. What accounts for this? Finances may be the key. The paucity of outside funding support (Item 7) inhibits many historians who would otherwise go to Vienna, Prague, Brno, Bratislava, Budapest, and other major centers for extended study. The vast holdings of North American university libraries therefore become viable options. In addition, access is more efficient than at most European libraries. Service is usually prompt, photocopying simple, catalogs fairly current. Books are shelved where they belong, and other books can be secured in a few weeks through computerized searches of national holdings and inter-library loan services. Lacking a stipend for study abroad, many scholars spend a summer at one of the great university libraries in the United States or Canada. This is especially the case of junior faculty members who are forming households and paying off debts.

During the boom years of collection building in the 1950s and 1960s, libraries accumulated impressive holdings on the Habsburg monarchy and the countries of Eastern Europe. The library of the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign has 480,000 volumes in Slavic and East European languages and 101,000 in German and other Western languages. Those on Czechoslovakia total about 46,000 volumes, on Hungary 21,000. For over fifteen years, the Russian and East European Center at Illinois-Urbana has sponsored a Summer Research Laboratory, which offers housing, library access, photocopying, and interdisciplinary seminars for eligible scholars. The University of Minnesota at Minneapolis has the private library of the late Robert A. Kann with its over 6,000 volumes on Austrian and German history and culture, plus other resources connected with the Center for Austrian Studies headquartered there in cooperation with the government of Austria. In nearby St. Paul, the Immigration

History Research Center has vast documentary, newspaper, and print collections on the migration of nearly all the non-German ethnic groups from the Austro-Hungarian empire.

Such collections, and the enormous holdings at the Library of Congress in Washington, D. C., and the New York Public Library, are enhanced through bequests from émigré scholars and former diplomats and politicians. Typical are the Masaryk-Beneš Collection (Berkeley, CA), the Otakar Odložilík Papers (Philadelphia, PA), the Štefan Osuský Papers (Stanford, CA), and the R. B. Lockhart Manuscripts (Bloomington, IN). With the return of civil freedom to Eastern Europe, would-be donors may wish to donate such memorabilia to their homelands, but the parlous condition of some major repositories there – for example, the National Library in Prague – may deter some bequests. Advanced research in North American libraries for many is a necessary substitute for study abroad, but it cannot replace the joys of discovery in an East Central European archive and the fellowship that develops over black coffee or hot tea with the archivists.

In Item 9, it was mainly the senior scholars who boosted released time for research to top position. They hear the clock ticking on their remaining productive years; they yearn for free time in which to fulfill their goals. Paradoxically, their senior status exposes them to time-consuming institutional tasks on search committees for new faculty, in deanships and administrative functions, and as officers in professional societies. Foreign colleagues who visit the United States are astonished at the heavy multifold demands on the scholar's time through essential duties such as classroom teaching, grading of student papers, office hours, research and publication, seeking grant support, and institutional and public service. A ceaseless stream of administrative memoranda floods one's desk. Frequent committee meetings punctuate hoped-for tranquil hours.

This yearning for released (free) time is so powerful that 60 per cent of respondents placed it as number one. Another surprise was the choice of greater academic recognition in Item 10 as the major need in the field. Second was more opportunity for publishing, but the two needs are intertwined: recognition of the East Central European field boosts the value of publishing while enhancing one's standing with his or her peers. Both help academic advancement. To some respondents, "recognition" means the repute of Austrian and Czechoslovak historical studies. The devotees of "the lands between" have long faced an uneven struggle with the Russian and Soviet titan to the east and the Germans, French, and British to the west for space in scholarly journals and panels at conferences. This has been an overriding reality ever since the East Central European and Slavic areas were established at Harvard and Berkeley in the 1920s.

Compounding the problem of recognition, two major learned journals – *American Historical Review* (AHR) and *Slavic Review* (SR) – offer only parched earth for East Central Europeanists seeking fertile soil for their articles. The editors of these journals seemingly have favored the mainstream world powers (China, France, Germany, Great Britain, Japan, Russia, and the United States) over the bygone Habsburg monarchy or cyclically quiescent and provincial Czechoslovakia. They prefer trendy subjects such as medieval sexuality, obscure symbolist poets, or Stalinist criminality to sturdy but unsensational studies of Bohemian



aristocratic estates or Vienna's housing and population. A survey of both journals, for example, showed that between 1974 and 1984, the *AHR* published not one article on Czech or Slovak topics, while the *SR* was somewhat better with 10 out of almost 200 articles in that same period. (See *Czechoslovak History Newsletter*, vol. 6, No. 2 [1983], pp. 2–3.) Their record on book reviews parallels this. In its 1989–1990 volumes, the *AHR* published about 2,050 reviews on world history, of which 28 discussed books about East Central Europe (Habsburg monarchy, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary), contrasted with 90 on Russia and the Soviet Union. The *Slavic Review* in the same interval published 300 reviews, of which 59 (excluding literature and language) dealt with East Central Europe.

To the justifiable question of how many manuscripts on Austrian and East Central European history those journals received (a figure one cannot easily ascertain), one answers that a self-fulfilling prophecy is at work: since the journals seemingly give such topics a low priority, authors send manuscripts elsewhere so as not to lose time in the lengthy reviewing process, with rejection after many months of editorial scrutiny or, if a piece is accepted, sometimes years before publication.

To sum up, the Survey voiced needs that deserve further discussion and even action, so that the futures of the rising generation of scholars and of our field are secured.

#### *The Respondents* (50 out of 81)

A sampling of the names of those who participated in the Survey follows: H. Agnew, C. Albrecht, J. Anderle, R. Austensen, M. Beckerman, E. Bosak, P. Brock, J. Bouček, F. G. Campbell, G. Cohen, R. Coons, Z. David, I. Deák, S. Eddie, F. Eidlin, J. Felak, P. Fichtner, K. J. Freeze, M. Fryšćák, D. Good, M. Hauner, K. Hitchins, W. Iggers, C. Ingraio, B. Jelavich, O. V. Johnson, H. Kieval, S. J. Kirschbaum, G. Lewis, R. Luža, P. Magosci, D. E. Miller, V. S. Mamatey, J. Mráček, M. Neudorfl, C. Nolte, C. Rogole, K. Roeder, N. Rudinsky, T. Sakmyster, H. G. Skilling, R. Smelser, G. J. Svoboda, W. Ullmann, B. Unterberger, S. Wank, R. Wegs, N. Wingfield, S. B. Winters, S. Wolchik.

#### *Conclusions*

While visiting Czechoslovakia in 1983, this writer was told by a historian whose name readers will instantly recognize, that "The best historical writing about my country is being produced in the United States." This was astonishing to hear, but one had to respect his opinion. In 1970, he had been consigned to the periphery of the historical profession, but thereafter he was able to follow books, journals, and conferences through colleagues outside the country. He saw the overall scholarly situation in the context of the dreary years of "normalization." Americans since the 1960s had access – even if sometimes limited – to Czechoslovak archives and libraries. The dollar was strong, travel cheap, and IREX and Fulbright grants abundant. Many scholars, notably émigrés, stayed away from Czechoslovakia because of lingering Cold War obstacles, but there was a steady flow of Americans and some Canadians, whose studies resulted in articles and books published in the next decade.

Today, the situation has changed. The former guardians of communist orthodoxy are on the sidelines. My friend and other one-time outcasts enjoy rejuvenated careers. From Munich, a forward-looking Collegium Carolinum spreads its influence across the oceans. In Japan, an Association for Habsburg Studies is active. American scholars will face increasing competition in pursuing topics that were once off limits to historians in East Central Europe or were ignored by those in Western Europe.

Academic historians in the United States are profoundly affected by national economic conditions and Federal policies toward higher education and humanistic scholarship. The country has long-standing and underestimated problems, and short-sighted, if not inept, national leadership. Universities, especially those publicly funded which sprouted after World War II, face substantial readjustments. The enormous national debt and perennial Federal budgetary woes have caused the central government to shift many fiscal burdens to the states and middle-income taxpayers. Public colleges and universities in the Northeast face lower enrollments and severe budget cuts. Higher education is especially vulnerable because it lacks a vocal mass constituency like those of industry, labor, and war veterans. Similar conditions exist in Pennsylvania, California, and other states. Private universities, some with large endowments and generous alumni, are less immediately affected but must be prudent.

Other agencies concerned with historical scholarship suffer. The American Council of Learned Societies has suspended its travel grant program, which enabled historians to attend conferences at Harrogate, Leuven, and Bad Wiessee among others. The Canadian Federation of Humanities has reduced by 50 per cent its funding for the Canadian Association of Slavists, whose journal, *Canadian Slavonic Papers*, now one year behind in publication, has raised its subscription rate by 40 per cent. Historians will continue their work, but probably under more difficult conditions than they have known for many years.

Within the next five years, a sub-generation of leading historians in the Habsburg and East Central European fields will be retiring from full-time academic employment in the United States. These include men and women who were trained in the 1950s and 1960s and advanced the field when forerunners like Hans Kohn, Arthur J. May, Robert A. Kann, and S. Harrison Thompson passed away. When this sub-generation leaves, it is highly improbable that their positions will be filled with comparable specialists. Great pressure from faculty in other fields of history will be exerted for the appointment of a historian of, say, China, Sub-Sahara Africa, women studies, technology or business, or African-America. Even worse, a replacement in history may be sacrificed to the demands of faculty from management, engineering, marketing, law, or computer science. The stronger job market for such professional and vocational fields could compel an administration to make such decisions. This process, essentially one of attrition whereby less valued departments are down-sized, is already taking place at many institutions.

The prospect is that we may see a decline in the number of academically connected historians in our field, although the profession as a whole may hold up somewhat because of the employment of public historians, archivists, and related professionals. Talented graduates will leave history for more available jobs. One recalls the military historian J. Zorach, who became a lawyer; James Rogerson, historian of Slovak

politics, who became a librarian; John E. Monego, a specialist on medieval and early modern Bohemia, today a business consultant; and Vojtěch Mastný, who turned to Soviet and strategic studies. The United States has no independent history research institutes such as Collegium Carolinum or the Historical Institute (Historický ústav) of the Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences, or specialized centers as in Austria and Germany, that could take up the slack when university employment shrinks. Nor does it have an entire academic division like the School of Slavonic and East European Studies at the University of London that could provide opportunities to lecture on history and related subjects, while sponsoring advanced degree candidates.

Viewed realistically, the demand for instruction in Habsburg and East Central European history at American universities has never been great. A major institution like Columbia University, with its Institute on East Central Europe, has rarely employed more than a handful of full-time, tenured faculty members to staff it. Visiting scholars from Poland, Yugoslavia, and Hungary, teaching at modest salaries, have filled the void. Even Otakar Odložilík could not secure tenure at Columbia. Contrast this with Columbia's flourishing Harriman Institute devoted to Soviet studies through an ample endowment. At Rutgers University, the late Robert A. Kann was a one-man advocate for Austrian, Hungarian, and East Central European history. No one replaced him upon his retirement in 1976. Whether Indiana University will replace Charles and Barbara Jelavich with comparable specialists is problematical. The support of Slavic ethnic groups in the United States for endowed chairs lags far behind their enthusiasm for picnics, folk festivals, and cultural events. Canada has its Chair of Ukrainian Studies at Toronto, achieved after a mighty controversy. A Chair of Slovak History and Culture at Ottawa is supposed to be filled soon, if a candidate who meets its varied qualifications can be found. (See *AAASS Newsletter*, January 1991, p. 16.) The ranks of Canadian historians specializing in Slavic East Central Europe were weakened in the 1980s with the death of Stanley Z. Pech and the retirements of Peter Brock and H. Gordon Skilling.

### *Prospects*

Lest this report end on too dim a note, one should mention assets that North Americans typically bring to historical studies. They often have fresh viewpoints, uncluttered by ancient wrongs, hostile nationalisms, and tormented personal or family involvements. They have learned to use the computer, or at least the word processor; they have marvelously varied software available. They are aware of, if not much practicing, quantitative methods and the new social history. They can see the Habsburg monarchy and the Successor States from a different perspective than European colleagues, although not necessarily more penetratingly. They approach T. G. Masaryk without being blinded by his halo, and they appraise Edvard Beneš objectively, even clinically. The entry of women into East Central European history, long a largely male preserve, is expanding. For Americans, work in the field is mainly a labor of love.

Barring an unlikely swift economic recovery in the United States, we can at best expect a continuation of present levels in American scholarship in the coming decade.



At worst, there will be a decline due to retirements, changing university priorities, and fewer young people commencing graduate studies in history. One bright spot is a reorganized *Austrian History Yearbook* under new editorial direction. This will fill the vacuum created by its episodic appearance in recent years. A youthful *East European Politics and Societies*, now in its fifth year, publishes on Habsburg, Ottoman, and Russian topics from 1800 onward and commands respect. *East Central Europe* has published over 40 articles on Czechoslovak and Habsburg subjects since it began in 1974. During "normalization" it served as a vehicle for Czech historians such as J. Maček, A. Klíma, J. Havránek, and Z. Šolle, among others who had limited opportunities in their homeland. No major reorientation toward East Central Europe can be expected at the *American Historical Review* or *Slavic Review*; however, their sponsoring associations are more aware of the field than ever because of the promotional efforts of groups like the American Association for the Study of Hungarian History and the Czechoslovak History Conference. The latter has an international membership of over 100. It was recently incorporated and links North American and overseas colleagues.

Continued scholarly contributions from the United States and Canada depend, not upon independent historians, but on those with professional and university affiliations. Otherwise, it is difficult to gain access to the flood of publications with their findings and interpretations. Even active scholars at small institutions, distant from large libraries and periodicals collections, find it difficult to stay current. Hardly anyone can tackle a thorny subject in Habsburg or East Central European history without cooperation from others in the new transnational community of scholars. The continued free flow of knowledge and economic recovery offer the best hope for the future of our field.

## APPENDIX

*Results* (Responses to each question as numbered in the Survey):

### 1. *Geographic areas of interest* (Most respondents listed one or more):

- 36 Bohemia, Bohemian crownlands, Moravia, Czech lands, Prague
- 27 Czechoslovakia, Czecho-Slovakia
- 25 Austria, Habsburg monarchy, Austria-Hungary, Vienna
- 17 Hungary
- 9 Slovakia
- 7 East Central Europe, Eastern Europe
- 5 Galicia
- 3 Poland
- 3 Transylvania
- 3 Slovenia
- 2 Croatia
- 1 Germany
- 1 Yugoslavia
- 1 Trieste
- 1 Tyrol

2. *Time periods* (A great variety of dates and periods have been grouped below. Most respondents listed several periods.)

<i>Time period</i>	<i>Number choosing</i>	<i>Rank</i>
1400–1620	4	13
1620–1780	10	4–5
1780–1815	6	9–12
1815–1848	9	6–8
{ 1848–1867	4 }	1
{ 1848–1914	20 }	
19th century	6	9–12
1914–1919	6	9–12
1919–1938	18	2
1938–1945	12	3
1945–1948	10	4–5
1948–present	6	9–12
19th and 20th centuries	9	6–8
20th century	9	6–8

3. *Most recent or imminently forthcoming publication* (Includes books and articles according to region and time period.)

Czechoslovakia (1918–present)	18
Habsburg Austria (19th–20th centuries)	7
Bohemia (19th century)	5
Habsburg Austria (18th century)	4
Bohemia (20th century)	3
Czechs-Slovaks in USA	3
Germany (20th century)	3
Austria (post-1918)	3
Hungary (20th century)	3
Galicia (19th century)	2
Jews of Bohemia, Slovakia (19th century)	2
Slovakia (19th century)	2
Slovakia (20th century)	2
Poland (contemporary)	2
Hussite Bohemia	2
Others (1 each, Croatia, Yugoslavia, Transylvania, Bohemia 18th century, East Central Europe)	5
	<hr/> 66

4. *Topics of current research or writing* (This information is difficult to quantify because of its variety. No topics precisely duplicated others. Almost all respondents listed one project, most listed two or three. Rough categories follow.)

Jan Hus and Hussitism	1
Bohemia (17th century)	1
Bohemia (18th century)	1
Bohemian Lands (19th century to 1914)	
law, politics, biography	5
economy, society, Jews, education	5
nationalism	3

## Czechoslovakia (1918–1938)

labor, women	5
housing	2
Prague Jews	4
military, Russian intervention	2
general, political	7
music, composers	3
Czech historiography	2

## Czechoslovakia (1939–90)

(1938–45) resistance, liberation, diplomacy	6
(1945–48) politics, diplomacy	3
(1968–90) politics, women, diplomacy, technology	10

## Slovakia

(19th century) nationalism, agriculture, literature	3
(20th century) politics, women, literature, Czech-Slovak relations	7

## Biography

T. G. Masaryk	3
Others	4

## Bibliographical and historiographical surveys and reference works

On Austro-Hungarian nationality questions, Slavic studies, 1618–1914, 1914–1988	8
--	---

## Habsburg Austria, Austria-Hungary

(16th century) political, intellectual	2
(17th–18th centuries) politics, culture, biography	8
(1800 to 1914) biography	1
politics, administration	9
society, education, military	4
Vienna (1800–1914) education, youth, culture	4
Austria (1918–38)	1
Austria (1945–90)	2

## Hungary

(19th–20th centuries) landowning, political, general	4
(20th century) feminism, diplomacy, anti-Semitism	3

## East Central Europe, Eastern Europe

Jews (19th–20th centuries)	1
Agrarianism (1918–39)	2
mass media	1
intelligentsia	1
from 1945 to 1990	2
political leadership today	1

## Immigration

Slavic into U.S.A.	1
into Czechoslovakia	1

Origins of World War I	1
Yugoslavia	
South Slavic literature	1
biography	1
Croatia	2
Poland	
Ukrainians in Galicia, Galician peasants	3
Nazi Germany, social policy	1
Total number of current projects	<hr/> 142

5. *Probable form of publication of above projects*

Journal article	49
Book	45
Oral report	23
Chapter in book	15
Ph. D. dissertation	9
M. A. thesis	1
	<hr/> 106

6. *Locations of needed research materials* (Many respondents named specific archives but only those in the U.S.A. are listed below; otherwise the major city or the country is given.)

Czechoslovakia	47
North America	
Universities	22*
Library of Congress	19
National Archives	9
Hoover Institution	7
New York Public	4
Moravian Archive	1
North America sub-total	<hr/> 62
Austria	20
Hungary	8
Germany	8
Great Britain	7
Poland	5
Israel	2
Yugoslavia	2
Soviet Union	1
Spain	1
Italy	1
Leo Baeck Institute	1
Private papers	1

\* Universities named were Chicago, Columbia, Harvard, Illinois, Indiana, Minnesota, Pittsburgh, Princeton, Toronto, Wisconsin, Washington.

7. *Present outside financial support* (This refers to funds beyond the individual's income from employment. Several persons listed more than one source.)

None	47 (58 per cent of respondents)
Home institution	19 (23.5 per cent)
IREX	7
Outside grant	5 *
SSHRG Canada	2
Private employer	1
Hungarian Government stipend	1
Hoover Institution	1
Fulbright Award	1
National Endowment for the Humanities	1

---

\* Includes Humboldt Foundation, Stiftung Volkswagenwerk, Warren Research Fellowship

8. *Intended future research topics* (Among those who provided no specific topic, several wrote "undecided," while others indicated they would continue working on current projects listed under Item 4)

None	31
Czechoslovakia (1939-90)	
political culture	2
CSR-USA relations	2
role of the media	2
expulsions, Czech-German relations	2
historiography of technology	1
religion	1
the army	1
Czech image of German question	1
post-1968 "normalization"	1
overview of the period	1
upheaval of 1989-90	1
	<hr/> 15
Habsburg monarchy and Austria-Hungary	
statesmen's careers	4
the 1786 Civil Code	1
economics and politics	1
the Foreign Office	1
economic thought	1
W. Wilson's concept of the monarchy before 1914	1
a history of the monarchy	1
	<hr/> 10
Slovakia	
Slovaks in the emigration	2
labor, women	2
Slovak Question	1
role of mass media	1
labor 1939-45	1
Czech-Slovak relations	1
	<hr/> 8



Czechoslovakia (1918–1938)		
music, composers	2	
economic history	1	
press	1	
political parties	1	
transportation	1	
political culture	1	
	<hr/> 7	
Eastern Europe		
national communism	2	
political parties	2	
leadership	1	
diplomatic relations	1	
	<hr/> 6	
East Central Europe		
the Jews	2	
Silesian politics	1	
nationalism	1	
bibliography	1	
	<hr/> 5	
Germany		
education in Austria, East-West Germany	1	
Germans from Eastern Europe	1	
landowning 1880–1914	1	
	<hr/> 3	
Miscellaneous		
Prague	2	
Slavism, Pan-Slavism	2	
Hungary	2	
Bohemian Lands 1800–1914	4	
Bohemia 17th century	2	
Jan Hus and Hussitism	2	
Poland	1	
Ukraine	1	
	<hr/> 16	
Total number of research topics		<hr/> 70

9. *Greatest research needs* (Rated by respondents in order of importance, then weighted on a 3, 2, 1 basis.)

<i>Research need</i>	<i>1st</i>	<i>2nd</i>	<i>3rd</i>	<i>Weighted score</i>
Released time	45	11	1	158
Funding help	19	23	8	111
Access to archives	5	17	9	58
Language skills	3	5	2	21
Access to research libraries, journals	2	2	0	10
Interviews as sources	1	2	0	3
Full-time job	0	1	0	2
Family situation	0	0	1	1
Research assistance	0	0	1	1
Better training in auxiliary sciences	0	0	1	1

10. *Major needs of the fields of Habsburg and Czechoslovak history today*

<i>Need</i>	<i>Times mentioned</i>
Greater academic recognition	21
More opportunity for publishing books and articles in mainstream journals	18
Improved archival access	12
More research fellowships	9
More collaborative research work and symposia	6
Attract more graduate students, increase interest	6
Place field in wider European context	5
Increased funding for travel to sources, meetings	4
Greater professionalism, higher quality in research and publication	3
Wider public recognition of region and field	3
More released time for research, writing	3
Opportunities to discuss research with colleagues	3
Launch research in new fields (women, culture)	3
Summer funding for research, writing	2
Language training for graduate students	2
Modernize the approach to the field	2
Improved textbooks and classroom materials	1
A major research center and community of scholars	1
Greater access to secondary sources pre-1848	1
Improved information flow among scholars	1
Long-range statistical and computerized resources	1
Cataloging of library backlogs in Slavica	1
Consensus on major research topics for inquiry	1
Liberation from "Soviet studies" rubric	1
Translations of European-language works	1
No more studies on Austria's fin-de-siècle!	1
Open a debate on Czechoslovakia's founding and existence	1
Greater objectivity toward Slovak history	1
Demystify Czech and Slovak history	1
Greater knowledge of the Slovak role in all ramifications	1

11. *The respondents* (As determined from information they provided):

University faculty*	48
Four-year college faculty	16
Academically unaffiliated, unidentified	8
Library or research center	6
Graduate students	3
	<hr/> 81

\* Some "universities" do not have doctoral programs in history, not to mention Habsburg Austrian or Central European history. Even on the undergraduate (four-year) level, courses on Danubian Europe are rare.

In the United States, the designation "university" has been bestowed even on one-time teacher training schools that were upgraded to four-year liberal arts colleges. Upon the introduction of graduate level courses for the Master of Arts degree, they applied for, and often were granted, the name "university" in order to attract more students and feed local egos.

(For available courses and faculty, see AAASS, *Directory of Programs: Soviet and East European Studies 1990-1992* [Stanford, CA, 1990].)