

tions at the time of his death. Of the three, Jenks asserted, it was Francis Joseph who evidenced the most distinct signs of growth and understanding, at least in the 1879-1907 period of his reign.

#### THE AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION CONVENTION AT PHILADELPHIA, PA., DECEMBER 28-30, 1963

On the afternoon of December 28, at a panel discussion on "The United States and Central Europe, 1900-1920," which was presided over by Arthur J. May, of the University of Rochester, Margaret Sterne, of Wayne State University, talked on "United States Presidents in the Eyes of Austro-Hungarian Diplomats, 1901-1913." She emphasized the fact that while Austrian diplomats were occasionally critical of American policies, they were in general on excellent terms with the United States government.

George Bárány, of the University of Denver, read a paper on "Wilsonian Central Europe: Lansing's Contribution." He contended that Secretary of State Robert Lansing played a much greater role than has hitherto been assumed in the American decision to support the transformation of East Central Europe into an area of independent nation states at the close of World War I. As early as the period between the summers of 1917 and 1918 he promoted the idea of breaking up the Habsburg monarchy as an anti-German political alternative to President Wilson's efforts to make a compromise and to procure a separate peace with Austria-Hungary. His attitude was considerably influenced by the rapid disintegration of Russian military power on the Eastern front. He believed that the disappearance of a strong Russia as a counterweight to the German *Drang nach Osten* necessitated the creation of a new balance of power in Central Europe.

Of the two commentators on the program, Victor S. Mamatey, of Florida State University, pointed out the great differences between the relations between Austria-Hungary and the United States during the two different eras described by the two speakers. He agreed with Bárány that Lansing had a greater influence on Wilson than is commonly thought. Joseph P. O'Grady, of LaSalle College, expressed disagreement with Bárány's implication that the United States was interested in Central Europe before 1914. He asserted that much research still needs to be

done to get the full picture of exactly what influenced President Wilson to make the decisions which he did in regard to Central Europe in 1917 and 1918.

At the joint session of the American Historical Association and the Conference Group for Central European History on December 30, of which Oron J. Hale, of the University of Virginia, was chairman, two papers were presented which dealt wholly or in part with Austrian history. William E. Wright, of the University of Minnesota, maintained, in a paper on "The Philosophes and Joseph II: Theory and Practice of Enlightenment," that the philosophes admired Joseph II less than Frederick II and Catherine II, not merely because he offered them no fulsome praise, but also for good and substantial reasons. Despite many points of agreement, there were basic differences between them. Joseph accepted the theory of the state as an instrument for good and extended it in practice to include a secret police force designed to constrain men to accept the state's benefactions. He did this just as the philosophes were forsaking coercive "enlightened despotism" and becoming more liberally inclined. Joseph wished to purge the Church of Roman and traditional influences which militated against the Enlightenment and intended to make Catholic salvation attractive to his Austrian subjects. The philosophes, on the other hand, wanted to destroy the Church. Thus, differences arose between Joseph II and the philosophes largely because the policies which the Austrian ruler put into practice differed fundamentally in some ways from those which were advocated by the philosophes.

William O. Shanahan, of the University of Oregon, talked on "Enlightened Influences on Austro-Prussian Military Practice, 1760-1790." He pointed out that Joseph II had ambitious plans to improve his army, even though his enthusiasm was largely that of a dilettante. He had a great yearning for military glory and busied himself with deciding such matters as precisely where fortresses were to be built, but a single week of war turned his stomach. In actual fact, Joseph II did little that was constructive to build up a good army in the Habsburg monarchy.

Maintaining that nearly all the chief philosophes were dead before Joseph II put his reforms into practice, the commentator on the program, Walter M. Simon, of Cornell University, took

issue with Wright's thesis that there was considerable antipathy between Joseph II and the philosophes. He insisted that the physiocrats approved more of Joseph's policies, for instance, than they did of those of Frederick the Great's. He maintained that Joseph did much more in the way of actually carrying out the principles advocated by the philosophes than Wright admitted.

On Monday afternoon, December 30, two papers dealing with the Habsburg monarchy were presented at a session dealing with "Borderlands of Eastern Europe: Areas of Ethnic Conflict." Gunther E. Rothenberg, of the University of New Mexico, read an essay on "The Croatian Military Frontier and the Rise of Yugoslav Nationalism." He asserted that the prevailing theory that the Croatian Military Frontier was a stronghold of dynastic loyalty needs to be restudied. As early as the latter part of the eighteenth century and to an increasing degree in the nineteenth century, he maintained, the peasant-soldiers of the Frontier, Croats as well as Serbs, became aware of their ethnic ties with other South Slav people in and outside the Habsburg monarchy. To be sure, the *Grenzer* supported the Habsburgs against the Hungarian revolution, but this was an uneasy partnership which, after 1850, became extremely strained and, after the Compromise of 1867, broke down. The gradual dissolution of the institution was regarded as a "sell-out" to Budapest, and extreme Croat elements staged an armed rebellion on the Frontier. The last century of the Military Frontier revealed deep-seated conflicts between South Slav aspirations and the governing circles in the Habsburg empire which the Austrian government was unable to reconcile.

Ivan L. Rudyntsky, of LaSalle College, discussed "The Carpatho-Ukraine: A People in Search of their Identity." The development of a national consciousness in the area was long delayed, he said. In fact, since most of the populace adopted Magyar nationalism during the latter part of the nineteenth century, it is remarkable that the Carpatho-Ukrainians avoided absorption by the Hungarians, especially since during the years just before 1914 the Magyars seemed to have extirpated the last remnants of Ruthenian nationalism. Nonetheless, although they had considerable success in doing so, the Hungarians were never able completely to "magyarize" the people. As a consequence, after the birth of the Czechoslovak Republic and parti-

cularly after 1938-39 the Carpatho-Ukrainians finally became fully aware that they had a national identity of their own.

In his comments, Michael B. Petrovich, of the University of Wisconsin, impressed on the audience the great need for detailed studies of single communities in East-Central Europe like Andrew F. Burghardt's and Gunther Rothenberg's. The history of this part of Europe can never be fully understood until such area studies are made for each distinct region in the area.

### PRIZES, FELLOWSHIPS, SCHOLARSHIPS, AND RESEARCH GRANTS

Josef Anderle, of the University of North Carolina, has received a University of North Carolina Research Council grant for 1964-65 for a study of the Hungarian and Polish involvement in the 1938 Munich crisis.

Herman Freudenberger, of Tulane University, received a research grant from the Inter-University Committee on Travel Grants for work in Czechoslovakia.

Stanley B. Kimball, of Southern Illinois University (Alton), was awarded a research grant from the Alexander von Humboldt Stiftung, Bad Godesberg, Germany, for 1964-65 for research in Europe on the Slav reawakening.

Klemens von Klemperer, of Smith College, received a Fulbright grant for 1963-64 to work in the archives of the German Foreign Office in Bonn on the foreign policy of Chancellor Ignaz Seipel.

Herbert Kupferman, a graduate student at New York University, was awarded a Fulbright scholarship to Austria for 1964-65 to collect material for his doctoral dissertation on the Mainz League.

Peter Larmour, of Stanford University, and his wife Rhonda received Canadian government fellowships for research in Vienna during the summer of 1964 on twentieth and sixteenth century Austrian history, respectively.

Richard R. Laurence, a graduate student at Stanford University, received an Austrian Government fellowship, as well as an additional grant from Stanford University, for research in Austria