
**Vienna Doctoral College for
European Historical
Dictatorship and
Transformation Research**

Content

Project Proposal

I. Abstract

II. Research Interests

III. Theoretical Framework

IV. Work Timetable

Literature with relevance for the project

V. Bibliography (a selection)

Appendix

CVs

VI. Cooperating Partners/CVs

VII. Abstracts concerning the research contributions
by the members of the steering committee

STEERING COMMITTEE AND FACULTY:

Univ.-Doz. Dr. Karin Liebhart,
Department of Political Science, University of Vienna

Univ.-Prof. Dr. Dr. Oliver Rathkolb,
Head of Department of Contemporary History,
University of Vienna – Speaker of the Steering Committee

Univ.-Prof. Dr. Oliver Jens Schmitt,
Deputy Head of Department of East European History,
University of Vienna

Univ.-Prof. Dr. Maria A. Stassinopoulou,
Deputy Head of the Department of Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies,
University of Vienna and
Vice Dean of the Faculty of Historical and Cultural Studies

Vienna, October 15, 2008

I. Abstract

The Doctoral College described here understands itself as part of comparative historical and social science dictatorship and transformation research with a European focus on “small” dictatorships and experiences with dictatorships. At its centre is the comparative analysis of, firstly, the causes for the establishment and functioning of dictatorships in several Central- and East-European states after the wave of democratisation resulting from the First World War, as well as, secondly, the engagement with the resulting political and socio-cultural models and their social consequences after the end of the regimes concerned, with a particular emphasis on the long term effects of “educational dictatorship” on political and historical perceptions of the individual citizen. The results should then be compared with selected other authoritarian and totalitarian developments and continuities, which set in after 1945 in East and South-East Europe, the Baltic States, as well as Spain, Portugal and Greece, and the reception of these regimes after their collapse. Which transnational similarities and even transfers, derived from which (pre-) conditions, can be identified and described? Which country-specific fragmentations thereby become visible and how can they be explained? It will be attempted to adopt an interdisciplinary approach to these questions from a historical, social science and political science perspective, as well as with a cultural and economic background. This will be based on an intensive engagement with the theoretical frame developed around the models of authoritarianism and totalitarianism and close connections with the current international scholarly discourse not just limited to the great dictatorships in Hitler’s Germany and Stalin’s Soviet Union and will be based on extensive empirical research on elaborated transdisciplinary theoretical ground. The central goal is a European comparative study, which first of all encompasses the developments of 1939-45 and, in the second part, developments after 1945 – both within the area of communist rulership as well as in Portugal, Spain, and Greece. Beyond this, it is also expected that the final analysis of all Ph.D. dissertations will engage with

international issues outside Europe, e.g. in South Africa, South America and South-East Asia,
– so that the fundamental theses developed from individual case studies can also be refined in
the light of international comparisons and correspondingly positioned within the scholarly
discourse.

II. Research Interests

Whilst in the last decades the examination of the “totalitarian dictatorships” (National Socialism and Communism) has intensified – particularly in the field of historical sciences, but also in political science – dictatorial experiences of the inter-war period have partly moved into the background, as for example is documented by the Dollfuß-Schuschnigg regime in Austria. At the same time, however, authoritarian pasts in East and South-East Europe after the First World War (e.g. Romania, Hungary, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania etc.), particularly in the field of social-scientific transition research, have since the end of the eastern bloc received new attention as research-relevant historical reference points.

In this sense, a central aim is the examination of the partly “repressed reference period of the inter-war time” (Oliver Schmitt), by which means the potential for comparisons across Europe is also increased.

That means that every member of the Doctoral College locates himself or herself as much in the theoretical part, as in the mutually developed historical mental map of dictatorships and democracies in Europe.

With the erosion of great empires and monarchies (German Reich, Tsarist Russia, Austria-Hungary, Ottoman Empire) in 1918, a wave of republics were founded in the successor states, of which however a considerable number were replaced by totalitarian systems within a few years and almost all by the 1930s. Whilst national states had already been newly founded in the nineteenth century from the territories of the Ottoman Empire, the year 1918 nonetheless also represented a caesura for these states (Greece, Serbia, Romania, Bulgaria). How did the conditions from which these dictatorial regimes emerged differ or resemble one another?

Which longer-term social, economic and political tendencies favoured their rise and which of these outlived the regimes' demise? What role did specific "specific developments" play and what other ways are there to explain the clear differences between the individual states? How can correlations, on the other hand, be explained?

The proposed Doctoral College devotes itself to these questions in interdisciplinary perspective and with particular consideration of gender and generation aspects. Empirical research foci are the authoritarian regimes of the inter-war period in Austria, Poland, Romania, Hungary, Greece and the Baltic States Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania. These are supplemented and lent further depth by comparative analysis of totalitarian developments or continuities after 1945 on the basis of select national case studies in East or South-East Europe (e.g. Romania, Hungary, Poland, Czechoslovakia) as well as in Portugal and/or Spain and Greece, whereby the latter is to be singled out in as much as a dysfunctional parliamentary democracy existed until the dictatorship of 1967.

For the contextualisation as also for the question of transfer analysis of the mechanisms and staging of dictatorships, Italian fascism and German National Socialism serve as an indispensable area for projection and comparison, whereby the question of transfer – from matters of ideology to concrete interventions in the establishment of dictatorial systems – must be accounted for. Critical engagement with the communist regime in Russia after 1917 and in East and South-East European states after 1945 and the differing temporalities in political transition phenomena also belong to the general areas to be reflected.

A further area of comparison are civil wars or conflicts resembling civil wars, which had come to an end in most of the states compared here before 1939. Greece and Yugoslavia represent a special case, since these civil wars broke out during World War II.

Attention should particularly be directed towards the historical examination of diverse

regimes' attempts to construct a "new man" and thus also to create a closed new society, with massive exclusion of other groups according to racist, or rather ideological, as well as partly religious criteria. In this connection, the topic of gender, but also the generation question are of particular importance. The results of reflection on the manipulation strategies of the totalitarian regimes can also then in turn be brought into the debate about continuity and discontinuity of authoritarian attitudes, e.g. in Poland where anti-Semitic prejudices were used to foster the nation building after World War I.

In this context, it is also important that the time before 1918 should not remain excluded as "a space void of history", but that the construction of national states and societies in the nineteenth century should be considered as a basis for totalitarian developments – just as much as the fact that the monarchies before 1918, despite having elements of parliamentarism, were themselves authoritarian regimes with firm mechanisms for education and elite recruitment. In this context, the dissimultaneity of developments must also be considered, e.g. in Greece, where the early introduction of general male suffrage in 1877 (Bulgaria 1879) and regularly occurring elections were undermined by strong clientelistic structures.

To the same extent as historical research on the causes of authoritarian regimes, scholarly reflection on the reasons behind the erosion and decline of dictatorial structures will form a cognitive interest of the Doctoral College. The periods directly after 1945 and after the end of the Cold War will be in the foreground, including historical transformation research on the early phase of the (re-)democratisation of dictatorships with above-mentioned national case studies.

Historical causal research will concentrate on several methodological areas, which should critically and comprehensively investigate most political-science or rather sociological models by means of case studies. The emphasis here will be on new social-historical, economic and cultural-historical approaches focussing on the effects of authoritarian polices on people and individuals in daily life and cultural behaviours as well as mentalities. Visualizations can

provide important information when analyzed by political iconography. To achieve greater depth, this will be followed in a second step by an examination of the forms of social processing of dictatorship-experiences in democratic transformation processes, and then of cultures of memory in a broad sense. Of great importance here are cultural-historical questions, such as the significance of “modernity” before a background of industrialisation and social changes within the framework of “first globalisation” (including the role of migration) for the formation of dictatorships, as well as the significance of economic indicators in the mentality-historical processes by which dictatorships were overcome.

On the level of comparing cultures of memory, new research on the original functioning and also the afterlife of dictatorial regimes in a democratic environment can certainly be found, as for example the unusual case-study of Spain-Poland documented by a group around the Leipzig historian Stefan Troebst. Ongoing research by Troebst and Maria Todorova on “Remembering Communism: Methodological and Practical Issues of Approaching the Recent Past in Eastern Europe” or also Cornelißen/Brand, Knigge/Maehlert and Landkammer are thus important points of reference for the Doctoral College.

III.I. Comparative transformation research from a political-science perspective

This research field of comparative political science was the subject of increased interest after the end of the bi-polar world order in 1989 and the system change in the former socialist one-party states of East, East-Central and South-East Europe. In social-science and particularly political-science research, these processes resulted in an intensified examination of issues relating to democratisation processes and consolidation with regard to the newly forming societies and political systems of the so-called “transformation states”.

In comparison to the “third wave” of democratisation of South-East Europe, Latin America, Africa and Asia in the late-twentieth century (Huntington 1991), the system change (that is, the transition from one type of regime to another) in Central, East and South-East Europe was distinguished by the. “dilemma of coincidence“ - a simultaneous political, economic and societal transformation. In distinction to the likes of Spain, Portugal, Greece or Chile, the process involved not only a transition from dictatorship to democracy, but also a change from a centrally-planned and command economy to a market economy, and in some cases also the foundation of new nation-states (e.g. in the case of the Czech Republic, Slovakia, the three Baltic states or the successor states of the former Yugoslavia). This simultaneous rebuilding of all societal areas meant that those post-communist states formerly within the Soviet sphere of influence had to accomplish the change of system and consolidation under particular conditions.

In this context, so-called pre-political areas also increasingly came into view for transfor-

mation / transition and consolidation research. Not only the structure of political institutions and formally established processes, but in particular also the embedding of political processes in social contexts and structures, as well as the interpretation of all politically relevant social phenomena (such as economic situation, social structure, level of education, condition of the legal system, social and geographical mobility, social and ethnic conflicts, gender issues, life styles, collective memory of societies, the change of political cultures, political mentalities etc.) became the subject of research. In particular processes of

democratisation and consolidation of new political systems, but also the disintegration and new establishment of states in the East-Central-European region and in East and South-East Europe, are here at the centre of interest, along with phenomena such as the genesis of new nationalisms or processes of re-ethnicization in politics.

The attempt to find theoretical models of explanation for the system change, along with related phenomena and processes, lead to country-specific studies and to comparative works – mostly in the tradition of transition research, which, before 1989, was developed particularly for the analysis of South European and Latin American states. Fundamental economic, political and cultural conditions of the transformation process were taken into account. Most of these studies were focused on the construction and consolidation of an efficient structure of state institutions as the prerequisite and basis for a legitimate and stable democratic order. The significance of the institutional stability of a state as a guarantee for a democratic order and the constitutional state is shown not least of all by its inclusion as an important component of the Copenhagen Criteria laid down by the European Council in 1993. It was attempted to answer the question of stability by surveying attitudes to democratic institutions, such as acceptance and trust, by means of representative opinion polls.

The significance of these studies for the assessment of democratic consolidation and political stability of former one-party systems was subject to different evaluations in the social-sciences discussion. Thus Klaus von Beyme, whilst emphasising the significance of such studies for the investigation of the democratisation process in post-communist states, pointed also

to the shortness of the available time-series, which relativises the validity of the results since comparative data is lacking from the time of the one-party system. Max Kaase referred to the contradictory nature of initial results and painted a picture of ambivalent developments in the new democracies, particularly with regard to nationalist tendencies.

The supplementation of the available empirical studies through the analysis of models of historical development had already been suggested in the mid-1990s by Steven Brint. Starting out from the significance of interpretative traditions in contributing to the understanding of political cultures, he attempted to combine historical and anthropological approaches with quantitative results. This allowed a perspective change and greater insight into the influence of historical patterns on existing political cultures as Hilde Weiss and Christoph Reinprecht have documented in Central European case studies – an approach that is of less central interest within the framework of opinion-poll research. Respective results, however, should certainly not be accepted without reflection, but rather their sources must be historically contextualised and analysed.

III.II. Theories of Authoritarianism and Totalitarianism

A theoretical unit will be obligatory for all participants and aim to distil elements for the theoretical framework of the Doctoral College. This will start out from the comparative model of the Spanish political scientist, Juan Linz, who since his study, “An Authoritarian Regime: The Case of Spain“ (1964) argued for a distinction between “totalitarian dictatorships” (Italian fascism, communism, National Socialism) and authoritarian regimes and democracies as central developments of political systems. It will however also involve re-reading and interpreting classics such as Carl Joachim Friedrich, Zbigniew Brzezinski and Hannah Arendt (which in turn primarily focus on the “big” dictatorships), as well as Giovanni Sartori’s democracy theory.

In a critical sense, the term “totalitarianism” was first applied to Italian fascism, then to German National Socialism, before it was later carried over to the Soviet Union and also served consistently to justify the equation of both systems. Against the background of the start of the Cold War, the theory of totalitarianism also favoured an interpretation of National Socialism as a bulwark against totalitarianism of the Soviet mould.

Carl J. Friedrich and Zbigniew Brzezinski developed a definition of totalitarian rulership forms, which are distinguished by the following characteristics:

An ideology invested with “heilsgeschichtliche” tendencies that embraces all areas of public and private life

A hierarchically structured “Führer-Partei “ that presides over state and administration
Systematic terror towards social groups and individuals identified as opponents and enemies
Monopolisation of the media by the political leadership
Monopolisation of weapons by the political leadership
Political control of the economy

Despite the carefully positioned criticism that Friedrich’s theory has in the meantime attracted, further interaction with his work will undoubtedly be fruitful.

A critical examination of totalitarianism theory in its variations is necessary. The sustainability of the theory of totalitarianism is often explained by reference to its ideological functionality.

Giovanni Sartori’s (1993) constructive approach observed the degree of totalitarianism as variable and argued for the analysis of the concrete characteristics of each case (including the extent of repression and despotism, the degree of centralisation of the state party, the degree of independence of individual social groups, the ideology-led politicisation of civil society, the amount of force and mobilisation).

Particularly as a result of German unification and the engagement with National-Socialist as well however as communist pasts, totalitarianism research has received new stimulation – as the work of the Hanna-Arendt Institute for Totalitarianism Research in Dresden shows. Precisely in the German environment, there were often debates as to whether totalitarianism research does not ultimately trivialise National Socialism or, at the least, encourage its equation with communism. But it is exactly there that Steffen Kailitz is currently criticising “that deficits are apparent in the field of comparative political science. Thus the research of present dictatorships is neglected. Comparisons normally still restrict themselves to a few countries. In Germany there is still little by way of quantitative dictatorship research in order to “mea-

sure” a dictatorship, or carry out comparative research into the reasons for the genesis and decline of dictatorships”. We are well aware of the fact that there does exist a theory driven literature, but very few efforts to use comparable empirical data. Fundamental for the success of the doctoral college is thus not so much the actual interpretative weaknesses of existing totalitarianism theorems, but far more the possibility to build on their undoubted strengths, their precise description, and to develop further categories for comparative analysis. In this sense, Dirk Berg-Schlosser and Juan Linz have presented pioneering work: their models form a fundamental orientation-point for the Doctoral College in the sense of a comparative dictatorship research free of equation and summation. The critical engagement with totalitarian-theoretical approaches, moreover, must unconditionally develop an international perspective. Reference here might be made to the Polish fascism researcher, Jerzy W. Borejsza, who distinguishes between “total totalitarianisms”, such as National Socialism and Stalinism, the “partial totalitarianism” of Italian fascism and other “authoritarian regimes”, including “para-fascist” and “para-Nazi”. Or also Dietrich Berau of Tübingen University, who compares communism and National Socialism on the basis of their common roots in the First World War.

Despite the historical focus the college agenda should include empirical data from more recent sources like the British Democratic Audits, as well as further related developments, with a profound theoretical and empirical examination. In this context, for example, the German foundation Ettersberg provides additional evidence by encouraging comparative European research and conferences on this topic.

In the Vienna Doctoral College, this discourse – infused with post-modern and post-communist theory – should be intensified to achieve European historical dictatorship and democracy research, and brought into connection with historical and current international discourses.

Essential in this context is the continuation of the trend that was recently begun by the po-

litical scientist Dirk Berg-Schlosser, with somewhat more historically interfaced comparative studies on authoritarianism and democracy in Europe. Fundamental here is also the question of how far the societies in fact show authoritarian attitudes in the transition and democratisation phases, and how far these in turn affect the political culture of the young democracies. The Cold War and Communism has not erased previous perceptions as studies on political culture in post-communist countries have shown.

Through historical comparative research that is based on an intensive engagement with political-science approaches the breach with comparative European dictatorship research should be narrowed. A first historical approach was supplied by the study of the British historian, Mark Mazower, *Dark Continent: Europe's 20th Century* (1998), „Der Dunkle Kontinent Europa“ (2000), with its comparison of democratic, fascist and communist currents in the twentieth century and emphasis on the importance of “modern and rational organisational principles for society, industry and technology” for regime security.

Central for the success of the College is that, in its first phase, an intensive interaction between historians and political scientists takes place, whereby as many international experts as possible, who are involved in the debates, should be included. Despite the interdisciplinary character of the College, the methodological rigour of the respective discipline should be upheld in teaching and supervision.

The comparative empirical studies on individual fields should together be theoretically grounded and, above all, should work on common categories of comparability, which are themselves then appropriately structured by source study.

Every empirical case-study should encompass at least two national historical arenas. Since engagement with memory culture – with emphasis on developments since the end of the Cold War – should form a mainstream area of the work, intensive reflection on the negotiation of history and memory of dictatorships between the generations will be a fundamental

research area. Preliminary work from a team around the German historian Lutz Niethammer, based on the Mannerheim Generation Model (Generationenansatz) on the general theme, “Memory – Power – History”, with a focus on communism-memory of the “Grandchild-generation” born after 1989, will provide an important impulse.

A further common research leitmotif for all studies lies in the significance of visual memory and the engagement with dictatorships through photographs and films. Mnemonics and the Visual Turn can in fact hardly be analysed separately today, since they influence and impress upon each other in the formation of history-images in cultural, but also in communicative, memory.

The theme of gender is commonly pushed forward in project applications, but then barely or only rudimentarily realised. In this sense it is particularly important to address this field, which has been almost entirely neglected in dictatorship research, in all of the College’s work and to implant gender as a research-structuring category. Among others the Women’s memory and history projects (Gender Studies Centre Prague or the Austrian studies of Johanna Gehmacher and others) can be used as starting points into this field.

In order to encourage from the start cooperation between individual works and also to interface new comparative questions from the field of political iconography or gender studies with new material, a theme-pool will be created in which all doctoral members, but also the faculty, can save concrete texts, documents and photos according to an organised key-word system. This would in turn be accessible to all. It would be ideal if guest lecturers were also involved in the Doctoral College’s theme-pool described below.

Whilst initially theories regarding institutions will be at the centre of research, the significance of culture as a central phenomenon of regime stabilisation and also of regime expansion will be particularly considered – not only restricted to the analysis of political com-

munication and propaganda in the classical sense, but also intensified through engagement with dictatorship as “political religion” and mass-phenomenon with a high emotionalization potential.

IV. Added Value and the Coherence of the Faculty and Work Timetable

Added Value and Coherence

The four faculty members will take care of three doctoral assistants each, but right from the beginning the cooperation and the group design of all 12 students is the overarching aim.

Therefore the steering committee decided to keep the faculty small and tried to reduce the core methodological orientations as a result from international doctoral colleges' experiences with extremely time consuming battles over theoretical supremacy. The steering committee is well aware that the procedure might limit the chances of getting accepted but shares this view that interdisciplinary work has to be focussed and limited otherwise it is just a label and hinders research driven studies.

But at the same time existing networks will be used and co-operations will be improved and enlarged to bring the top experts on the theoretical debates and the empirical individual studies of the doctoral assistants to Vienna and involve them in a permanent discourse as outlined in the semester agenda.

The core faculty is both on the theoretical level as well as on previous and ongoing research complementing each other expertise regarding in special areas and periods in European history as is documented in the CVs and the abstracts on research contribution. As to the

area expertise Karin Liebhart covers the Baltics and Central Europe including Austria, Oliver Rathkolb brings in the transatlantic early Post World War II dimension as well as new (partly published) research for historical perceptions and memory culture in the Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland and Austria, Maria Stassinopoulou has extensive published on Greece and Southeastern Europe and Oliver Schmitt is an expert for Romania and Eastern Europe and Southeastern Europe in general. From the methodological orientation, too, the four faculty members do not duplicate each other – Karin Liebhart is a political scientist and specialized on comparative analysis of memory politics and memory culture with a large variety of case studies throughout Europe, Oliver Rathkolb focuses on comparative new political as well as cultural and economic history, Maria Stassinopoulou is a cultural and intellectual historian specializing in the field of early modern and modern Greek history with a special interest in sociolinguistics and comparative civil war studies, Oliver Schmitt is focusing on social and cultural history in Eastern and Southeastern Europe.

In order to strengthen the international ties of the doctoral assistants the faculty members could and should try to initiate a “Co-tutelle-type-Dissertation” structure trying to get individual guest lecturers (professors) involved as second supervisors of the theses.

At the same time the proposed IK will be backed by in several Departments of the University of Vienna due to the faculty members. This guarantees access to a network of scholars throughout Europe and in the international community which will support the research of the students outside Austrian base.

The intellectual environment of the University of Vienna provides additional opportunities for the IK members since “Dictatorship – Violence – Genocide” is one focal point within the confirmed 2008 Strategy Plan for the Faculty of Historical and Cultural Studies. “Governance in Transition” is another important complementary focal point for the IK based at the Faculty for Social Sciences.

In the first preparatory period of six months the steering committee members will draft and publish a call for applications throughout Europe in leading media as well as on far reaching academic internet platforms. The final group of 12 doctoral assistants will be chosen from students already holding an MA who have drafted an excellent dissertation outline along the lines of the IK main topic and already have obtained top rate results in their previous studies in history, political science or other neighbouring social and human sciences. As to language German and English will be the teaching languages, the latter being the dominate language in the IK. Students who are only fluent in English must obtain German language skills as early as possible. In addition to the teaching languages applicants are required to provide evidence on fluent language skills in their fields of interest for their Ph.D. thesis. Letters of recommendation of MA and other academic supervisors will be tested by direct communication.

POSSIBLE PH.D. TOPICS COULD BE ARRANGED AROUND THE FOLLOWING ISSUES, BUT THERE HAS TO BE FLEXIBILITY ON THE BASIS OF THE CONCRETE DISSERTATION PROPOSALS:

KARIN LIEBHART AS FIRST SUPERVISOR AND MENTOR:

- * *Comparing Authoritarian and Totalitarian Regimes in Europe before 1939*
- * *The experience of authoritarian regimes and dictatorships in Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania. Representations in the contemporary political cultures of the respective states.*
- **The impact of political memory on the European integration process and European neighbourhood policy – Poland and Ukraine as examples.*
- **Visual representations of the authoritarian interwar period – Austria and the Baltic states compared*

OLIVER RATHKOLB AS FIRST SUPERVISOR AND MENTOR:

- **Austrian and Portuguese Dictatorships Compared: Origins in the Inter War Period and Memory Politics after 1945.*

**Central European Communist Dictatorships and*

Memory Politics in Hungary and Poland in Comparison

**Forgotten Dictatorships Between the Wars: Hungary and Poland.*

**Maria Stassinopoulou as first supervisor and mentor*

**“Dysfunctional Parliamentarianism?”*

Forms of Parliamentary Democracy until 1989 in Greece and Austria

** Cinema as a medium of radical protest in transition periods in Greece, Spain and Turkey*

OLIVER SCHMITT AS FIRST SUPERVISOR AND MENTOR:

**The Social structure of the Legionary Movement in Romania:*

a regional approach

** Gendering the Legionary movement: social mobilisation of women and gender images in Interwar Romania.*

Semester Agendas

First Semester

*INTRODUCTION INTO THEORY AND THE EXISTING KEY LITERATURE
AS OUTLINED ABOVE*

The complete group and the faculty will create a briefing book summarizing the most important key terms, definitions, models and theories, which will include the contributions of the guest lecturers. Each semester another group of 2 students will function as managing editors of this “book in progress”, which will be internet based.

Another internal important communication tool will be a closed e-learning platform with a public homepage for outside communication

Each week a basic text or book will be presented by one doctoral assistant, but has to be read and discussed by all. In addition to the traditional critical review techniques the main focus should be whether the models and theories can be applied on topics of the college group.

The individual topic will be discussed both by the group (students and faculty) intensively in the first week, then peer reviewed by 2 experts in the field, and then finalized.

After the working plan as been agreed upon the archival research plans will be drafted.

Approximately each month a top level academic expert should present a lecture on a specific theoretical or empirical topic and will be involved in seminar sessions of 2-3 days.

Since the students too should be involved in the selection of the guest lecturers this list is a first draft and incomplete:

- * Dirk Berg-Schlosser, Professor for Political Science, Philipps University Marburg
- * Mark A. Mazower, Ira D. Wallach Professor of World Order Studies Columbia University, New York
- * Juan Linz, Sterling Professor Emeritus of Political and Social Science, Yale University (due to his age only a video conference might be possible)
- * Jerzy W. Borejsza, Professor at the Institute for History at the Polish Academy of Science, Warsaw
- * Anton Pelinka, Professor of Political Science and Nationalism Studies, Central European University, Budapest
- * Hilde Weiss, Department of Sociology University of Vienna
- * Christoph Reinprecht, Department of Sociology University of Vienna
- * Tony Judt, http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Erich_Maria_Remarque
- * Erich Maria Remarque, Erich Maria Remarque Professor in European Studies at New York University and Director of NYU's, http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/New_York_University
- * Holm Sundhausen (Professor emeritus for Southeastern European History, Free University, Berlin)
- * Efi Avdela (Department of History and Archaeology of the University of Crete)
- * Yiannis Voulgaris (Associate professor of Political Sociology, Panteion University, Athens)
- * Armin Heinen (Chair for Modern History, University of Aachen)
- * Hans-Christian Maner ("Privatdozent" and senior researcher, Historical Seminar, Johannes Gutenberg University, Mainz)
- * Constantin Iordachi (Associate Professor, Central European University, Budapest)
- * Eva-Clarita Onken (Institute of Government and Politics, University of Tartu)
- * Éva Kovács (Ungarische Akademie der Wissenschaften/Budapest, Institut für Soziologie, Pécs/Kommunikations- und Medienwissenschaften)

Second Semester

Presentation of the strategy papers and working agenda for the individual Ph.D. projects in a seminar with faculty and guest from the peer reviewer group.

The research plan should include not only topics of individual interest but includes issues of interest to the overarching theme of the college, especially concerning political iconography as well as gender related issues.

Start of the archival research, but including a research list of key topics which will be documented in an internal data base especially concerning political iconography as well as gender related issues.

6 special expert lectures with direct impact on 6 dissertation projects, with the key actors in the academic arena concerned.

Organization of a first doctoral exploratory workshop with young colleagues of the same MA level from other universities throughout Europe, to take place at the end of the second semester, including comments from experienced experts. The revised papers should be turned in for publication in international peer reviewed journals.

Third Semester

Another 6 expert lectures to provide content and reflexion in the area of interest of the second group of 6 Ph.D. projects

Archival research

Monthly workshops when the whole group should be back in Vienna and present and discuss preliminary findings

During the archival research the doctoral assistants will be integrated in a national sophis-

ticated academic university or research institution from the existing networks of the faculty and guest lecturers

Fourth Semester

Preparation of a Doctoral Conference with other young participants and experienced commentators aiming at the end of the semester. The results should be edited and published in a peer reviewed book before the end of their studies.

Last minute archival research (only 1-2 months)

Continuing the guest lectures and presentation from the faculty

Preparation of an international conference with some of the previous guest lecturers and the doctoral candidates with special focus on their dissertations.

The papers should be published, too as a peer reviewed book in the Vienna University Series “Contemporary History in Context” edited by Oliver Rathkolb

Fifth Semester

Each 2 weeks presentation and discussion of first complete chapters of the dissertations

These chapters should be edited and turned in for publication in peer reviewed international journals.

First teaching experiences at the University of Vienna

Main Focus is final writing

Start of a special mentoring program by the faculty members (each takes care of 3 mentees) to discuss and support the following career steps and career planning after the defense of the

Ph.D. thesis and the publication as a book (including post doc fellowships or research projects)

Sixth Semester

Permanent writing including presentation of finished chapters and text evaluation by faculty and peers

Not too time consuming teaching options at the University of Vienna

Final presentations, defense and final exams as well trying to find an academic publisher for the book

Job hunting

V. Bibliography (a selection)

Ágh, Attila (ed.) 1995: Democratization and Europeanization in Hungary. The first parliament 1990-1994, Budapest.

Antohi, Sorin, Trencsényi, Balázs and Apor, Péter 2007: Narratives Unbound: Historical Studies in Post-communist Eastern Europe, Budapest – New York.

Arendt, Hannah 1962: Elemente und Ursprünge totaler Herrschaft, Frankfurt am Main.

Backes, Uwe/ Jesse, Eckhard (ed.) 2005: Vergleichende Extremismusforschung, Baden-Baden.

Assmann, Aleida 2006: Der lange Schatten der Vergangenheit. Erinnerungskultur und Geschichtspolitik. München

Assmann, Aleida: Memory, Individual and Collective”, in: Robert E. Goodin/Charles Tilly (Hgg.): The Oxford Handbook of Contextual Political Analysis. Oxford: OUP, 2006, 210- 224.

Assmann, Aleida: Europe: A Community of Memory?. Twentieth Annual Lecture of the GHI. in: GHI Bulletin, No. 40, Spring 2007, 11- 25.

Berg-Schlosser, Dirk/ Raivo, Vetik (ed.) 2001: Perspectives of Democratic Consolidation in Eastern Europe (ed. with), New York.

Berg-Schlosser, Dirk/ Mitchell, Jeremy (ed.) 2002: Authoritarianism and Democracy in Europe 1919-39. Comparative Analyses London.

Besier, Gerhard 2006: Das Europa der Diktaturen. Eine neue Geschichte des 20. Jahrhunderts, München.

Borejsza, Jerzy W. / Ziemer, Kalus (ed.) 2006: Totalitarian and Authoritarian Regimes in Europe. Legacies and Lessons from the Twentieth Century, New York.

Brint, Steven G. 1994: In an age of experts. The changing roles of professionals in politics and public life, Princeton, NJ.

Carabott, Philipp/ Sfikas , Thanasis (eds.) 2004: The Greek Civil War. Eassays on a conflict of exceptionalism and silence. Aldershot.

Christova, Christiana 2007: Totalitär, modern oder postmodern: Deutungen des poststalinistischen Sowjetsystems im Wandel, Saarbrücken.

Cornelißen, Christoph/ Brand, Sabine (ed.) 2004: Erinnerungskulturen. Deutschland, Italien und Japan seit 1945, Frankfurt/Main.

Diamond, Larry/ Linz, Juan J./ Lipset, Seymour Martin (ed.) 1989: Democracy in developing countries. Asia, vol. 3, Boulder, CO.

Diamond, Larry/ Linz, Juan J./ Lipset, Seymour Martin (ed.) 1989: Democracy in developing countries. Latin America, vol. 4, Boulder, CO.

Diamond, Larry (ed.) 1996: The global resurgence of democracy, Baltimore, Md.

Friedrich, Carl Joachim/ Brzezinski, Zbigniew 1957: Totalitäre Diktatur, Stuttgart.

Diamandouros, P. Nikiforos e.a. (eds.) 2001, Parties, Politics, and Democracy in the New Southern Europe. Baltimore.

Drechsel, Benjamin 2005: Politik im Bild : wie politische Bilder entstehen und wie digitale Bildarchive arbeiten, Frankfurt/Main.

Gehmacher, Johanna (ed.) 2007: Frauen- und Geschlechtergeschichte des Nationalsozialismus: Fragestellungen, Perspektiven, neue Forschungen, Innsbruck.

- Gerlich, Peter/ Plasser, Fritz/ Ulram, Peter A. (ed.) 1992: Regimewechsel. Demokratisierung und politische Kultur in Ost- Mitteleuropa, Wien.
- Haerpfer, Christian W. 1995: Politische Partizipation. Österreich 1945-1995, Wien.
- Huntington, Samuel P. 1991: The third wave. Democratization in the late twentieth century, Norman, Okla.
- Heinen, Armin 1986: Die Legion "Erzengel Michael" in Rumänien - soziale Bewegung und politische Organisation. München .
- Heinrich, Horst-Alfred, Kohlstruck, Michael (ed.) 2008: Geschichtspolitik und sozialwissenschaftliche Theorie, Stuttgart
- Ioanid, Radu 1990: The Sword of the Archangel. Fascist Ideology in Romania, Boulder.
- Iordachi, Constantin 2004: Charisma, Politics and Violence: The Legion of the "Archangel Michael" in Inter-war Romania, Trondheim.
- Jesse, Eckhard (ed.) 1999: Totalitarismus im 20. Jahrhundert: Eine Bilanz der internationalen Forschung, Baden-Baden.
- Judt, Tony 2005: Postwar: A History of Europe Since 1945, London.
- Kaase, Max 1994: Ursachen, Prävention und Kontrolle von Gewalt, Bd. 4: Politische Gewalt und Repression, o.O.
- Katenhusen, Ines (ed.) 2003: Demokratien in Europa. Der Einfluß der europäischen Integration auf Institutionenwandel und neue Konturen des demokratischen Verfassungsstaates, Opladen.
- Knigge, Volkhard/ Maehlert, Ulrich (ed.) 2005: Der Kommunismus im Museum. Formen der Auseinandersetzung in Deutschland und Ostmitteleuropa. Cologne et al.
- Kühnl, Reinhard 1990: Faschismustheorien. Ein Leitfaden, Heilbronn.
- Landkammer, Joachim 2006: Erinnerungsmanagement. Systemtransformation und Vergangenheitspolitik im internationalen Vergleich, München.
- Lewis, Paul G. 1994: Central Europe since 1945, London.
- Lijphart, Arend (ed.) 1992: Parliamentary versus presidential government, Oxford.
- Maier, Hans (ed.) 1996: Totalitarismus und Politische Religionen: Konzepte des Diktaturvergleichs, 2 Bd., Paderborn.
- Mayntz, Renate/ Scharpf, Fritz W. (ed.) 2003: Die Reformierbarkeit der Demokratie. Innovationen und Blockaden, Frankfurt am Main.
- Mazower, Mark, 1999: Dark continent : Europe's twentieth century / Mark Mazower . -London.
- Mazower, Mark (ed.) 2000, After the war was over: reconstructing the family, nation and state in Greece, 1943-1960. Princeton.
- Merkel, Wolfgang/ Birle, Peter (ed.) 1999: Die Rolle von Verbänden im Transformationsprozeß, Opladen.
- Merkel, Wolfgang/ Puhle, Hans-Jürgen (ed.) 1999: Von der Diktatur zur Demokratie. Transformationen, Erfolgsbedingungen, Entwicklungspfade, Opladen.
- Merkel, Wolfgang/ von Beyme Klaus (ed.) 1999: Demokratie in Ost und West, Frankfurt am Main.
- Merkel, Wolfgang 1999: Systemtransformation. Eine Einführung in die Theorie und Empirie der Transformationsforschung, Opladen.
- Merkel, Wolfgang 2003: Demokratie in Asien. Ein Kontinent zwischen Diktatur und Demokratie, Bonn.
- Minkenber, Michael/ Beichelt, Timm (ed.) 2003: Cultural Legacies in Post-Socialist Europe. FIT Workshop Documentation, Frankfurt/Oder.
- Müller, Marion G. 2003: Grundlagen der visuellen Kommunikation. Theorieansätze und Analysemethoden", Konstanz
- Nora, Pierre 1998 : Zwischen Geschichte und Gedächtnis Frankfurt/Main.
- O'Donnell, Guillermo A. / Whitehead, Laurence/ Schmitter., Philippe C. (ed.) 1986: Transition from Authoritarian Rule. Latin America, Balimore, Md.
- Offe, Claus 1991: Das Dilemma der Gleichzeitigkeit. Demokratisierung und Marktwirtschaft in Osteuropa, in: Merkur Nr. 4/1991.

- Papailias, Penelope 2005, *Genres of Recollection. Archival Poetics and Modern Greece*. New York.
- Passerini, Luisa , 1987: *Fascism in popular memory : the cultural experience of the Turin working class*, Cambridge.
- Passerini, Luisa, Leydesdorff, Selma, Thompson, Paul (ed.), 1996: *International Yearbook of Oral History and Life Stories: "Gender and Memory"*, Oxford ,
- Plasser, Fritz/ Ulram, Peter A. (ed.) 1993: *Transformation oder Stagnation? Aktuelle politische Trends in Osteuropa*, Wien.
- Plasser, Fritz/ Ulram, Peter A. 1994: *Monitoring democratic consolidation. Political trust and system support in East-Central-Europe*, Berlin.
- Plasser, Fritz/ Ulram, Peter A./ Waldrauch, Harald 1997: *Politischer Kulturwandel in Ost-Mitteleuropa, Theorie und Empirie demokratischer Konsolidierung*, Opladen.
- Pollack, Detlef et al. (ed.) 2003: *Political Culture in Post-communist Europe, Attitudes in New Democracies*, Aldershot
- Pridham, Geoffrey (ed.) 1994: *Democratization in Eastern Europe. Domestic and international perspectives*, London.
- Reulecke, Jürgen et al. (ed.): 2003: *Generationalität und Lebensgeschichte im 20. Jahrhundert*, München.
- Rose, R./ Haerpfer Christian W. 1998: *New Democracies Barometer V. A 12-Nation Survey. Studies in Public Policy No.306*, University of Strathclyde, Glasgow.
- Rose, R./ Haerpfer, Christian W. 1998: *Trends in Democracies and Markets. New Democracies Barometer, 1991-1998. Studies in Public Policy No.308*, University of Strathclyde, Glasgow.
- Rose, R./ Mishler, W.T./ Haerpfer Christian W. 1998: *Democracy and Its Alternatives. Understanding Post-Communist Societies*, Oxford and Baltimore.
- Ruchniewicz, Krzysztof/ Troebst, Stefan (ed.) 2004: *Diktaturbewältigung und nationale Selbstvergewisserung. Geschichtskulturen in Polen und Spanien im Vergleich (= Monografie Centrum Studiów Niemieckich i Europejskich im. Willy Brandta; 12)*, Wrocław.
- Sartori, Giovanni, 2006, *Demokratietheorie 3. Aufl., unveränd. Nachdr. der Sonderausg. 1997*, Darmstadt.
- Segert, Dieter/ Machos, Csilla 1995: *Parteien in Osteuropa. Kontext und Akteure*, Opladen.
- Segert, Dieter (ed.) 1997: *Parteiensysteme in postkommunistischen Gesellschaften Osteuropas*, Opladen.
- Spiliotis, Susanne-Sophia (1998): *Transterritorialität und Nationale Abgrenzung. Konstitutionsprozesse der griechischen Gesellschaft und Ansätze ihrer faschistoiden Transformation 1922/24-1941*. München.
- Szücs, Jenő 1994: *Die drei historischen Regionen Europas*, Frankfurt am Main.
- Terry, Karl/ Schmitter, Philippe C. 1991: *Modes of Transition in Latin America, Southern and Eastern Europe*, in: *International Social Science Journal* (128).
- Veiga, Francisco, 1993: *Istoria G rzii de Fier 1919 - 1941*. Bukarest
- Vloes, David, *The Greek Civil War and the Politics of Memory in the 1980s*, in: Philipp Carabott and Thanasis Sfikas 2004
- Voglis, Polymeris 2002, *Becoming a Subject: Political Prisoners During the Greek Civil War, 1945-1950*. New York.
- von Beyme, Klaus 1994: *Systemwechsel in Osteuropa*, Frankfurt am Main.
- Waller, Michael (ed.) 1994: *Parties, trade unions and society in east-central Europe*, Ilford.
- Weidenfeld, Werner (ed.) 2001: *Jenseits der EU-Erweiterung*, Gütersloh.
- Weidenfeld, Werner (ed.) 2001: *Nizza in der Analyse. Strategien für Europa*, Gütersloh.
- Weidenfeld, Werner (ed.) 2001: *Shaping change – strategies of transformation. Result of the international survey*, Gütersloh.
- Weiss, Hilde / Reinprecht, Christoph 1998: *Ethnischer Nationalismus oder demokratischer Patriotismus in Ost-Mitteleuropa?. Empirische Analysen zur nationalen Identität in Ungarn, Tschechien, Slowakei und Polen*. Wien.

Winderl, Thomas 1994: Machteliten im Systemwechsel. Über Wandel und Kontinuität osteuropäischer Eliten, in: Südosteuropa (43).

Wippermann, Wolfgang 1997: Europäischer Faschismus im Vergleich 1922-1982, Frankfurt am Main.

Wippermann, Wolfgang 1997: Faschismustheorien. Die Entwicklung der Diskussion von den Anfängen bis heute, Darmstadt.

Wippermann, Wolfgang 1997: Totalitarismustheorien. Die Entwicklung der Diskussion von den Anfängen bis heute, Darmstadt.

Wolfrum, Edgar 2001: Geschichte als Waffe. Vom Kaiserreich bis zur Wiedervereinigung, Göttingen.

Wollmann, Hellmut (ed.) 1995: Transformation sozialistischer Gesellschaften. Am Ende des Anfangs, Opladen.

VI. Cooperating Partners/CVs

Karin Liebhart

Political Scientist; born in St.Pölten, 3 February 1963; Associated lecturer at the Departments Universities of Vienna and Innsbruck, the Jean Monnet Chair/ Comenius University Bratislava, the WSHE Łodz and the University of Montenegro. March - June 2008 Visiting Professor at the University of Vienna. 2003-2008 Researcher at the University of Vienna; 1996-2003 at the Social Sciences Department of the Austrian Institute of East and Southeast European Studies, Vienna; 1997-1998 Researcher at the Research Centre on „Discourse, Politics, Identity“, ÖAW, Vienna. 2003 and 2007 Evaluator for the European Commission (FP6 and FP7). Since 2006 Secretary General of the Central European Political Science Association (CEPSA); since 1995 Member of “AGORA (Section on Democracy Research)” of the Austrian Political Science Association (AUPSA). Numerous articles on European Integration and Enlargement, Comparative Politics, Political Cultures and Identities, Political Memory, Political Images, Symbols and Rituals and Gender Studies. Author/ Co-author of eight books, Co-editor of three books.

SELECTED PUBLICATIONS (SINCE 2004)

AUTHOR/ CO-AUTHOR

Nationale und europäische Gedächtnispolitiken nach 1989.

Vienna (forthcoming)

Europäische Bildpolitiken. Politische Bildanalyse an Beispielen der EU-Politik. Vienna (forthcoming) (with Petra Bernhardt, Leila Hadj-Abdou und Andreas Pribersky).

The Discursive Construction of National Identity. Second Edition (revised and updated version, first edition 1999). Edinburgh University Press

(forthcoming) (with Ruth Wodak, Rudolf de Cillia and Martin Reisigl).

Co-editor

Das andere und künftige Österreich im neuen Europa. In memoriam Felix Kreissler. Münster-Vienna. 2006 (with Helmut Kramer and Friedrich Stadler)

TOPIC RELATED ARTICLES IN SCIENTIFIC PUBLICATIONS AND JOURNALS

Divergierende Erinnerungskulturen und gedächtnispolitische Konflikte als Faktoren im europäischen Integrationsprozess: Das Beispiel der Baltischen Staaten Estland und Lettland. In: Ratkovic, Viktorija et a. (ed.): Gewalt – Kultur - Konflikt. Klagenfurt (forthcoming).

Repräsentationen Österreichischer Nachkriegsgeschichte im Jubiläumsjahr 2005. In: Carr, Gilbert/ Leahy, Caitríona (ed.): Sammelband Staatsvertrag. Dublin (forthcoming).

Vom Wesen der Frau. Austrofaschistische Rollenkonzepte und deren Implikationen für aktuelle Geschlechterbilder. In: Lehmann, Brigitte (ed.): Dass die Frau zur Frau erzogen wird. Frauenpolitik und Ständestaat. Vienna 2008. 171-179

The Commemoration Ceremonies of May 2005 – A Mirror of Conflicting European Memories? In: Findor, Andrej/ Lásticová, Barbara/ Wahnich, Sophie (eds.): Politics of Collective Memory. Cultural Patterns of Commemorative Practices in Post-War Europe. Vienna et al. 2007. 93-109 (with Leila Hadj-Abdou).

Politisches Gedächtnis und Erinnerungskultur – Die Bundesrepublik Deutschland und Österreich im Vergleich. In: Gehler, Michael/ Böhler, Ingrid

(ed.): *Verschiedene europäische Wege im Vergleich. Österreich und die Bundesrepublik Deutschland von 1945/49 bis zur Gegenwart.* Innsbruck. 2007. 468-490.

Authentischer Ort, „DDR-Disneyland“ oder „Pendant zum Holocaustdenkmal“? Checkpoint Charlie und das Berliner Mauermuseum. In: Jaworski, Rudolf/ Stachel, Peter et. (ed.): *Die Besetzung des öffentlichen Raumes. Politische Plätze, Denkmäler und Straßennamen im europäischen Vergleich.* Berlin 2007. 259-276.

Genderpolitische Perspektiven nach 1989. In: Bachmaier, Peter/ Schwarcz, Andreas/ Tcholakova, Antoaneta (Hg.): *Der Transformationsprozess in Bulgarien und der Weg in die EU.* *Miscellanea Bulgarica* 18. Vienna. 2006.195-203.

Bilder einer Ausstellung. Zur Visualisierung von Erinnerungspolitik in Deutschland und Österreich. In: Hofmann, Walter (ed.): *Bildpolitik-Sprachpolitik. Untersuchungen zur politischen Kommunikation in der entwickelten Demokratie.* *Studien zur visuellen Politik* Bd.3. Berlin. 2006. 25-35 (with Petra Bernhardt).

Verhüllen/ Enthüllen. Gedächtnispolitik als Politik des Vergessens? In: Feichtinger Johannes/ Großegger, Elisabeth/ Marinelli-König, Gertraud/ Stachel, Peter/ Uhl, Heidemarie (ed.): *Schauplatz Kultur – Zentraleuropa. Transdisziplinäre Annäherungen.* Innsbruck. 2006. 73-81 (with Andras Pribersky).

Cultural Patterns of Enlargement: Do Small Central European States Share Common Values? In: *Politics in Central Europe.* *The Journal of the Central European Political Science Association.* Volume 1. Number 1. November 2005. 55-68.

Vom Wiener Schwarzenbergplatz nach Wolgograd. In: Marschik, Matthias/ Spitaler, Georg (2005): *Das Wiener Russendenkmal. Architektur, Geschichte, Konflikte.* Vienna. 2005. 147-154.

Constructing a Common European Political Memory, in: Jankauskas, Algimantas/ Vilpisauskas, Ramunas/ Vinogradnate, Inga (eds.): *Central Europe Beyond Double Enlargement.* Vilnius. 2004. 52-61.
Cultural Patterns of the EU-Enlargement. Central Europe and the Balkans. In: *Institute of Political Studies/ Faculty of Social Sciences/ Charles University Prague* (ed.): *Globalization and Regionalization in East Central Europe and East Asia: Comparison.* Prague. 2004. 282-295. „Das Terrain genauer

beschrieben...“. *Disziplinüberschreitende Zugänge in der Politischen Kulturforschung am Beispiel von Gedächtnis und Identität.* In: Kramer, Helmut (ed.): *Demokratie und Kritik – 40 Jahre Politikwissenschaft in Österreich.* Frankfurt/M. et al. 2004. 351-372.

Die Mythisierung des Neubeginns: Staatsvertrag und Neutralität. In: Brix, Emil/ Bruckmüller, Ernst/ Stekl, Hannes (ed.): *Memoria Austriae I. Menschen-Mythen-Zeiten.* Vienna. 2004. 392-417 (with Andreas Pribersky).

In her post doctoral lecture (<http://dict.leo.org/ende?lp=ende&p=/gQPU.&search=lecture>) qualification (<http://dict.leo.org/ende?lp=ende&p=/gQPU.&search=qualification>) thesis (habilitation) 2007 on “National and European politics of memory after 1989” KL analyzed how selected European states and Europe as a whole deal with phenomena spawned by the politics of memory and the culture of commemoration. The author looked at the case of public conflict around the political history of Europe and its nation states with a temporal focus on the period since 1989 and the fall of the Iron Curtain. Against the backdrop of the European integration and enlargement process, she explored the respective politics of memory and its representations in the public space using Germany, Austria, Hungary, Poland, Latvia and Lithuania as examples.

In several research projects (among others “Film-Memory-Politics”, funded by the Austrian trans-disciplinary research programme TRAFO, “Cultural Patterns of the European Enlargement Process (CULTPAT)” funded by the EU FP5 (2003-2006), “Public Construction of Europe (PCE)”, funded by the Austrian research program NODE, “National and European Identities”, funded by the Austrian research program Cultural Studies) the researcher focused on political and cultural transformation processes (particularly in the Central, East and Southeast European region) due to the change of the European political landscape in the second half of the 20th century and the resulting impact on political cultures on both, the national and European level. KL also participated in several comparative research projects on the implications of transformation processes on gender issues in the former one-party states.

As to methodological skills and experiences KL is specialized in empirical qualitative research methods and interpretative approaches including discourse analysis, the analysis of visual representations and political iconography.

Oliver Rathkolb

Historian; born in Vienna, Austria, 3 November 1955; Schumpeter-Fellow at the Minda de Gunzburg Center for European Studies, Harvard University 2000-2001; Visiting Professor, University of Vienna, Austria 2001; 2002-2005 Research Director of the scientific internet platform www.demokratiezentrum.org, Visiting Professor, University of Chicago, 2003, 2005 – March 2008 Director of Ludwig Boltzmann Institute “European History and Public Spheres: Culture, Democracy and Media Studies” and 2005-2007 Professor at the Institute for Contemporary History of the University of Vienna. Since March 2008 Full Professor at the Department for Contemporary History at the University of Vienna and since October 2008 Head of Department.

More than 120 articles: Austrian and European contemporary political and cultural history, international affairs and on business history; Author of five books, Editor and Co-Editor of six/twenty studies. Co-Founder of a scientific quarterly “Medien und Zeit” (Media and Time), focusing on interdisciplinary questions of contemporary history and communications/media history; Managing Editor of “Zeitgeschichte” (Contemporary History).

SELECTED PUBLICATIONS:

Author:

Internationalisierung Österreichs seit 1945, Wien 2006

Die paradoxe Republik: Österreichs 1945 - 2005, Wien 2005 (awarded with the Donauland Book Prize “Danubius” and the Bruno Kreisky Political Book Prize)

Washington ruft Wien. US-Großmachtspolitik gegenüber Österreich 1953-1963, Wien 1997 (Böhlau Verlag)

Führertreu und Gottbegnadet. Künstlereliten im Dritten Reich, Wien 1991 (Verlag Deuticke).

„Es ist schwer jung zu sein”. Jugend und Demokratie in Österreich 1918-1988, Wien 1988 (Verlag Jugend & Volk).

Revisiting the National Socialist Legacy: Coming to Terms with Forced Labor, Expropriation, Compensation and Restitution, Innsbruck-Wien-Bozen-München 2002 (Studienverlag)
NS-Zwangsarbeit: Der Standort Linz der Reichswerke Hermann Göring AG, Berlin, 1938 – 1945, 2 Vol. Wien 2001 (Böhlau Verlag).

Gesellschaft und Politik in der Zweiten Republik. Berichte der US-Militäradministration aus Österreich 1945 in englischer Originalfassung, Wien 1985 (Böhlau Verlag).

AUTHOR OF 129 ARTICLES IN SCIENTIFIC PUBLICATIONS AND JOURNALS, TOPIC-RELATED ARE AMONG OTHERS:

Autoritäres Potenzial und demokratische Werte in Österreich 1978 und 2004, in: Österreichisches Jahrbuch für Politik 2005. Ed. by Andreas Khol, Günther Ofner, Günther Burkert-Dottolo and Stefan Karner. Politische Akademie, Verlag für Geschichte und Politik, Wien 2006. Oldenbourg Wissenschaftsverlag, München, 2006, 113 – 122.

Already in his Ph.D. thesis on US Political Propaganda in Austria 1945-1955 (1981) OR analysed aims and effects of US political and cultural transformation policies in Austria and Germany after the destruction of National Socialism and published on the background analysis of scientists for the Office of Strategic Services on this very issue of overcoming the totalitarian past

OR furthered his interest in the middle-range effects of dictatorial experiences and the transformation of post-war Austrian political culture in his “Habilitation” (published 1997) within the context of US Cold War policies and deepened his interest in the role of artists within the National Socialist regime (book on theatre and musical elites in 1991)

Already during the planning for an international peer-reviewed competition for a new Boltzmann Institute for European History the topic of dictatorship became a much more comparative European research interest.

Maria A. Stassinopoulou

Place and date of birth: Athens (Greece), 04.10.1961

Current Position (June 2002-): Full Professor (Chair) of Modern Greek Studies, Department of Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies, University of Vienna; Deputy Head of the Department of Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies; since October 2006 Vice Dean of the Faculty of Historical and Cultural Studies
Languages spoken: Greek: native speaker
English, French, German: fluent
Italian, Russian, Serbo-Croatian: reading knowledge
(Ancient) Greek, Latin (B.A. in Classics)

Visiting professor:

Spring term 1996, Goltsos Visiting Assistant Professor in Modern Greek History at the Department of History, Brown University, Providence, Rhode Island

Short term visiting professor:

At the universities of Athens, Birmingham, Brno, Crete (Rethymno), Cyprus (Nicosia), Hamburg

Research Coordinator:

Projects financed by the Austrian Science Fund, FWF:

2003-2007

Political discourse during the reign of George I. (Committee of Balkan Studies, Austrian Academy of Sciences, Vienna, P16595-G03)

2000-2003

Political terminology in Southeastern Europe: Greece 1843-1864 (Com. of Balkan Studies, Austr. Academy of Sciences, Vienna, in co-operation with J. Koder, P16333-G03)

Since 2005

Cataloguing and restructuring of the Archive of the Greek Community in Vienna, late 18th-1945 (project funded by the Greek Ministry of Culture and the City of Vienna)

HIGHER EDUCATION:

April 2001

Habilitation in Modern Greek Studies, University of Vienna October 1984-February

1990 Ph. D. Studies, School of Humanities, University

of Vienna. Ph.D. degree awarded with distinction October 1979-February 1984 B.A. in Classics (minors History and Linguistics), School of Philosophy, University of Athens

Scholarships, Grants Alexandros Onassis Public Benefit Foundation, Athens (1986-1988); Austrian Federal Ministry of Sciences and Research, Vienna (1984-86; 1988-89); Research Grant of the Austrian Federal Ministry of Sciences and Research 1992-93 (with a travel grant for the EHESS, Paris); Cotsen Travel Grant of the American Classical School at Athens Summer 2006

Membership in professional and learned societies President of the Austrian Society of Modern Greek Studies (Vienna) and member of the board of the European Association of Modern Greek Studies; member of the board of the Austrian Society of Byzantine Studies (Vienna); member of the Committee of Balkan Studies, Austrian Academy of Sciences (Vienna); of the Austrian Society for the Study of the Eighteenth-Century (Vienna); the Society for the Study of Modern Hellenism (Athens).

Maria A. Stassinopoulou is a cultural and intellectual historian specializing in the field of early modern and modern Greek history. She has published monographs, edited volumes and articles in journals and conference proceedings on intellectual and cultural transfer from the 18th to the 20th century, specializing on transfer phenomena between Western and Central Europe on the one hand and Southeastern Europe (particularly Greece) on the other.

She has recently co-edited two volumes: (together with Maria-Christina Chatziioannou), *Diaspora-Networks-Enlightenment* (in Greek), *Tetradia Ergasias* 28 (published by the National Research Institute of Greece). Athens 2005, 168pp., a collection of articles addressing the economic and cultural profile and the institutions of Greek-Orthodox migrants in Europe in the 18th and 19th century and (together with Ioannis Zelepos), *Griechische Kultur in Südosteuropa in der Neuzeit* (Beiträge zum Symposium in memoriam Gunnar Hering), *Byzantina et Neograeca Vindobonensia* 26, Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften 2008, 405pp., with articles covering the political, social, and intellectual history of South-Eastern Europe from the 16th to the 20th century.

Parallel to her research in 18th- and 19th-century social and cultural history Maria A. Stassinopoulou developed an early interest in cultural manifestations of political conflict in 20th century Greece. Already

her B.A. thesis discussed the language of leftist political periodicals from a sociolinguistic perspective and led to the publication, "Loanwords in the political terminology of the Greek left" (in Greek), *Glossologia* 5/6 (1986/87) 181-192.

Following this interest she taught courses at the University of Vienna on a wide array of subjects at the intersection between the politics of memory and cultural politics in particular during and after the Greek civil war (1946-49). She was one of the first to initiate historical research on popular Greek cinema, developed a research program which led to a collection of films at the University of Vienna and publications on ideological aspects of popular media and the usage of the past. Being a specialist on phenomena of transfer in intellectual and cultural history she firmly believes in the importance of interdisciplinarity and the creative potential of comparative angles in both research and teaching. This led to co-organizing, together with Gerhard Botz from the Department of Contemporary History and in cooperation with the Ludwig Boltzmann Institute for Historical Social Science and the "Balkankommission" of the Austrian Academy of Sciences a conference on Post Civil Wars: Comparing Austria, Greece and Spain (June 2007).

Her research interest in intellectual history and sociolinguistics is also documented by the FWF-projects on 19th-century political discourse (v. CV).

PUBLICATIONS ON FEATURE FILM AND SOCIAL HISTORY INCLUDE:

"Geschichten aus Griechenland. Zur Konstituierung eines Spielfilmkorpus für die Sozial- und Kulturgeschichte", in: *Filmkunst. Zeitschrift für Filmkultur und Filmwissenschaft* 148 (1995) 4-14

„What is history doing in cinema?“ (in Greek), in *Historica* 23/12 (1995) 421-436
"The Archive of the Union of Greek Cinema Technicians" (in Greek), in: *Archeiotaxio* 1 (1999), 50-53

"The Ottoman past in Greek cinema. Transfer of literary models and creation of new images" (in Greek), in: *Proceedings of the First European Conference of Modern Greek Studies, Berlin 1998*. Athens 1999, 149-161

"Cinema in Greek city space and film iconography of the Greek city in the interwar period: incompatible trajectories, differing speed" (in Greek), in: *Actes du IIe colloque international La ville à l'époque moderne*.

Dimensions méditerranéennes et balkaniques (XIXe-XXe s.). Athens 2000, 353-368

„Creating Distraction after Destruction: Representations of the Military in Greek Film“, in: *Journal of Modern Greek Studies* 18/1 (2000: Special Issue Greek Film) 37-52

"It happened in Athens": the relaunch of Greek film production during World War II", in: *Kampos. Cambridge Papers in Modern Greek Studies* 10 (2002) 111- 128

"Gefährliche Erbschaften. Griechische Antike im griechischen Kino", in: *Martin Korenjak, Karlheinz Töchterle (Hg.), Pontes II. Antike im Film*. Innsbruck u.a., StudienVerlag, 2002, 35-43

"Representations of war after the Civil War: Satire" (in Greek), in: *Proceedings of the Conference on Representations of War of the Film archive of the Greek Foreign Ministry*. Athens 2006, 255-262

"Légendes de la chute. La guerre civile grecque sur pellicule", in: *Théo Angelopoulos au fil du temps [Théorème 9]*. Paris. Presses Sorbonne Nouvelle 2007, 25-39

To appear: *Reality bites. A feature film history of Greece 1950-1963* (Peter Lang Verlag)

Univ. Prof. Dr. Oliver Schmitt

Date of birth 1973, Place of birth Basel

ACADEMIC CAREER:

1994 -2000

Study of Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies, East European History, Ancient and Medieval History and Greek Philology in Basel, Vienna, Berlin and Munich

2000

PhD in Southeast European History

2003

Habilitation in East and Southeast European History

2001 – 2004

Lecturer at the University of Munich, Department of East and Southeast European History

2004 – 2005

Research Professor at the University of Berne (Förderungsprofessur des Schweizerischen Nationalfonds)

since 2005

Professor of Southeast European History at the University of Vienna

since 2008

Member of the Junge Kurie of the Austrian Academy of Sciences and member of its Direktorium

Externally funded national and international projects (last 5 years) Socio-economic transformation in the Danube area 1686-1699, Schweizerischer Nationalfonds (CHF. 1,16 Mio.)

PUBLICATIONS (A SELECTION)

Levantiner- Lebenswelten und Identitäten einer ethnokonfessionellen Gemeinschaft im osmanischen Reich im „langen 19. Jahrhundert“ (Südosteuropäische Arbeiten 122). München 2005

Kosovo – Kurze Geschichte einer zentralbalkanischen Landschaft. Wien u.a. 2008

Ed. (together with Konrad Clewing) Südosteuropa. Von vormoderne Vielfalt und nationalstaatlicher Vereinheitlichung. Festschrift für Edgar Hösch. München 2005

Skanderbegs letzte Jahre- west- östliches Wechselspiel von Diplomatie und Krieg im Zeitalter der osmanischen Eroberung Albaniens (1464 - 1468). Südost- Forschungen 62 (2004/05) 56–123 (together with Guillaume Saint- Guillain),

Die Ägäis als Kommunikationsraum im späten Mittelalter. Saeculum 56 (2005) 215–225
Les Levantins, les Européens et le jeu d'identités in: Marie- Carmen Smyrnelis (Hrsg.), Smyrne, la ville oubliée? 1830-1930. Mémoires d'un grand port ottoman (Reihe „autrement“). Paris 2006, 106–119

Venezianische Horizonte der Geschichte Südosteuropas. Südost-Forschungen 65/66 (2006/07) 87 – 116

Skanderbeg reitet wieder. Wiederfindung und Erfindung eines Nationalhelden, in: U. Brunnbauer - A. Helmedach - S. Troebst (Hrsg.), Schnittstellen. Festschrift H. Sundhaussen. München 2007, 401 – 419
“Flucht aus dem Orient“? Kulturelle Orientierung und Identitäten im albanischsprachigen Balkan, in: F. Görner (Hrsg.), Stabilität in Südosteuropa – eine Herausforderung für die Informationsvermittlung. Berlin 2008. 12 – 27

Des melons pour la cour du Sancakbeg: Split et son arrière-pays ottoman à travers les registres de compte de l'administration vénitienne dans les années 1570, in: V. Costantini - M. Koller (Hrsg.), Living in the Ottoman Ecumenical Community. Essays in Honour of Suraiya Faroqhi. Leiden - Boston 2008, 437 - 452

VII. Abstracts concerning the research contributions within the IK by the members of the steering committee:

Karin Liebhart

Within the IK KL will address the controversial phenomena of memory politics and commemoration in selected European states (especially the Baltic states, Poland and the Ukraine), paying special attention to the use of the history of the 20th century and the commemoration of dictatorships and the transition to democracies in contemporary politics. She is mainly interested in analyzing the conflicting interpretations of political history and will focus on symbolical representations of the universe of the past as well as the patterns of interpretation ensuing from this conflict. The analysis of monuments and memorial sites, expositions of contemporary history, museums, the staging of memorial days, the rituals of commemoration and the ancillary scientific and political debates aims at a reconstruction and interpretation of processes of rewriting and revamping history and their concrete political implications. A synopsis of blueprints for a European memory and of national memories is to demonstrate the fragmentation and the differences of interpretation, which have characterized the process of European integration and enlargement in its political and symbolic dimension, which determine the mutual perception of political actors and are a repository of political arguments.

The approach is also committed to identify toeholds for shared points of reference within the individual cultures of commemoration.

Moreover KL will contribute to the analysis of visual representations linked to the controversial phenomena of memory politics in Austria, Poland, Ukraine, Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania on the one hand, to the images relating to transformation processes on the other. Political staging of commemorative events and transformation-related iconic images circulating in the political orbit indicate constellations of political power and reflect aspects of political cultures. Moreover, new stress fields of competing narratives in the complex arena of hegemonial and antagonistic interpretations of the past have an impact on the aspired construction of a common reference point for the EU integration process. High-impact discourse trajectories as represented in political images will be reconstructed to flesh out their „European“ significance.

Oliver Rathkolb (Speaker of the group)

Within the IK OR will integrate the results of recent research (2007/2008) on “Authoritarian and Totalitarian Experiences, Authoritarian Potential and Democratic Values in Poland, the Czech Republic, Hungary and Austria” including the theoretical models used for authoritarianism, anomia and new political authoritarianism as well as the analysis of the results for historical perceptions.

Based on a public opinion poll on authoritarian attitudes in the Czech Republic, Poland, Hungary and Austria in November and December 2008 developed jointly by a team of the Ludwig Boltzmann Institute for European History and SORA and funded by Vienna’s Future Fund, this presentation will try to shift the focus towards quantitative research combined with historical analysis and contextualisation. The basic aim of the public opinion poll was to analyse the interrelation between indicators for authoritarian disposition and the collective

communicative memory of past totalitarian experiences (from the inter-war period, World War II and the Holocaust and post-1945 communism until 1989) as well as indicators that relate to the democratic potential of these four national societies. A book in English will be published in 2009. The manuscript will be ready in December 2008 on the basis of extensive international research reports that are already complete, but as yet unpublished.

As director of the Ludwig Boltzmann Institute for European History 2005-2008 OR designed and supervised as team of experts as well as researched in the program line Holocaust and Communist Oppression Remembrance. Another project line initiated by OR for the Boltzmann Institute for European History and Public Spheres connects oral history interviews along the lines of the former Iron Curtain in ten small border towns. More details see <http://ehp.lbg.ac.at>” <http://ehp.lbg.ac.at>.

This includes both the comparative interpretation of research in political science and sociology on authoritarian perceptions and prejudices, as well as the democratic potential in these four states. With regard to memory culture and politics of history, previous studies in this field will be channelled into the IK. In concrete terms this implies an intensive discussion not only of the politics of history but also of the processes of cultural and particularly of communicative memory and political mises-en-scène, and of attitudes towards past dictatorships and their consequences. National museums or school text books for example are indicators for the mainstream historical consciousness of a society and at the same time manifestations of national narratives in terms of identity construction on the basis of historical perceptions.

It is possible to develop a European and/or extra-European comparative perspective based on the analytical category of the politics of history, which was used by historians such as Edgar Wolfrum or Michael Kohlstruck (who also struck out in the direction of the politics of memory) in their exemplary discussion of National Socialism, and on an analysis of historical perceptions with democracy related political implications.

Oliver Schmitt

Oliver Schmitt will cover aspects of Southeast European history especially in the periods between the two World Wars. His main focus will be on the extreme right-wing movement in interwar Rumania (Legionary movement) which is also the topic of a major research project he will start in 2009. He is already supervising a PhD thesis comprising a regional study of the Legionary movement in Bessarabia.

The central question of this project is a social history of the Legionary movement. Since the Rumanian archives were closed until recently, major works had to rely on propaganda material, a sample of autobiographical material, newspapers and diplomatic reports which allowed only an analysis of the leading group of this mass movement in the 1930s. Research concentrated on the analysis of the Legionary ideology, political actions and the major figures in Rumanian political life. Recent historiography was mainly interested in the involvement of leading intellectuals (such as Mircea Eliade, Emil Cioran, Constantin Noica) in the Legionary movement. Since the end of communism in Rumania, the Legionary movement has become an object of study for revisionist historians and journalists, as well as scholars following the traditional (communist) line of interpretation. Surprisingly, most studies rely on a very narrow text corpus, and archival research is only at its beginning.

The project aims first of all to collect relevant source material. Research in the State Archive of Chi in u (Republic of Moldavia) has shown that there is an enormous amount of sources, especially reports of the State Police (Siguran a) and the Rumanian Gendarmerie. Contrary to research on National Socialism in Germania or Italian Fascism, in the Rumanian case historians have to carry out basic work in the archives, especially in Bucharest. In a first step, a reconstruction of the social structure of the Legionary movement will be undertaken. This seems to be the most urgent desideratum. Contrary to existing works, the project prefers a regional approach which avoids analysing Rumanian history exclusively from a Bucharest perspective. A thorough analysis of the social structure of the Legionary movement provides the base for further examination within the methodological framework of the IK, especially

the gender aspect, i.e. the first political mass-mobilisation of women in Rumanian history, the images and realities of women in the movement, the changes of gender roles; a second important field of research are political songs as a mean of mobilisation; they will be analysed by O. Schmitt in the framework of a Lecture Series on the political songs in Eastern Europe planned together with the Institute for Slavic Studies at the University of Vienna. Although the Legionary movement was only briefly in power (winter 1940/41), it provides an example of one of the most successful movements of the extreme right in the inter-war period whose particularity lay in the central function of the Orthodox faith and Orthodox spirituality, which in the rapid dynamic of its evolution even became the core issue, i.e. the creation of a “new man” in an eminently Christian and national/racial dimension.

Maria A. Stassinopoulou

Maria A. Stassinopoulou will address in particular questions of political rhetoric and discourse and the effects of dictatorial regimes and post-dictatorial transitions on both intellectual networks and popular culture. While dealing with these phenomena in Southeast Europe, she will use as comparative angles on the one hand the transitions in Southern Europe (most specifically the civil war and transition experience in Spain) as well as the factor always evident in all questions regarding the politics of memory, political structures traditions, but also questions of minorities and territorial debates in Southeast Europe, namely Turkey (and the Ottoman Empire). Her expertise in sociolinguistics and cinematic representations will support the college’s ambition to widen up the array of Ph. D. topics and teaching subjects in order to include popular cultural phenomena and their subordinating and at the same time subversive potential, e.g. the importance of melodramatic narratives in a strongly catholic and a strongly Greek-Orthodox society (Spain/Greece) or the oral cultural tradition in South East Europe as a refuge for dissident thought. Feature films and later television programmes

not only play an important role in shaping collective memory but are one of the most potent media in the forming of linguistic uniformity (e.g. “silencing minorities”) and the representation and mental mapping of national landscapes (as such being of relevance in the populist discourse on territorial debates in the region) : Methods of critical historical approach of visual representation will thus be part of her teaching and research supervising agenda. She also will address in teaching questions of research barriers among national research agendas and disciplines and how these barriers also shape research output on politically fragmented regions. Because the college aims to include a large number of European societies and cultures she plans to undertake with the help of her doctoral students an data base and a collection (through internet support) of materials with subtitles in English, French or German. This should lead to a sustainable inclusion of “smaller” cultures and languages in the formation of subjects and method canones and thus to a truly European outcome for the project.