

inalco  
**CREE**  
Centre de recherche  
Europes-Eurasie

연구소    национални    मन्त्रालय    מנהל    מורחיק  
**inalco**  
Institut national  
des langues  
et civilisations orientales

2 juin/June 2017  
15.30 – 17.00  
3 juin/June 2017  
9.30 – 12.45

INALCO  
65, rue des Grands-Moulins  
75013 Paris

**Atelier/Workshop**  
Salle/Room 423

Contact:  
etienne.boisserie@inalco.fr



## Winners' historiographies? Des historiographies de vainqueurs ?

Etienne Boissarie (Inalco, CREE)

Gabriela Dudeková (Historical Institute of the Slovak Academy of Sciences)

Rudolf Kučera (Masaryk Institute AV ČR, Prague)

John Paul Newman (Maynooth University)

Kamil Rusała (University of Krakow)

Tamara Scheer (Ludwig Boltzmann Institute for Historical social sciences, Vienna)

Rok Stergar (University of Ljubljana)



# Post-Habsburg Slavic Narratives of WWI Research Group

All European historiographies have deeply renewed World War One studies and thought in the last fifteen years. The adoption of new tools and objects has led to new analysis of on going processes within societies. This process is, however, much easier to analyse in countries that were not shaken by new political organizations or new borders at the end of WW1. For its part, the study of the Habsburg Empire as a whole during the war has in many ways been impeded by its splitting between “national” historiographies based mainly on the new countries’ national narratives and paradigms.

This specific situation continued – in various configurations depending on the country or period – up until the 1990s at least. One can nevertheless observe a real transformation in the perspectives, and crossed histories from Becker-Krumeich for the French-German front to Labanca-Überegger in the Austro-Italian case can be considered interesting examples of the wealth that common, multilateral approaches can bring. This perspective opens up new questions and incorporates new

dimensions into the study of social and cultural processes. This then enriches the analysis in a broader perspective. Even though Austria-Hungary as a belligerent is to be considered as one single unit, its splitting led to parallel or diverging narratives that hardly help understand the dynamics at stake and necessitates that type of exercise.

Considered from a long-term perspective, political and diplomatic approaches and quantitative economic approaches have long been dominant. They related to the building of purely “national” historical paradigms, deeply rooted in the immediate post-war period. Under different forms and partly modified by post-WW2 perspectives, they kept some specific features that left them partly comparable to other historiographies up to the 1970s-1980s. Since then, various types of structural changes have occurred, modifying the institutional and intellectual context and leading to significant inflexions. In the last fifteen years in particular, each historiography has seen new types of approaches and focused on brand new

themes: social history, micro studies, gender or wider analysis of specific parts of the populations (children, refugees, wounded soldiers, urban population, etc.), or propaganda, taking into account a broader perspective, sometimes looking beyond specific nationalities, territories or political ideologies. Such transformations help rethink former approaches and open so far un- or less-observed fields of research. In a comparative approach of the main trends those Slavic historiographies underwent, it will be of great interest to observe the possible inflexions of formal paradigms – whether national, social or economic – to study to what extent they have been included in the global history of WW1 and the place they occupied in the main trends of the respective historiographies of Central Europe. How has social and cultural history been included – or not – in the conventional political narrative of war? Finally, how can this process lead to a shift in the analysis of the main moves that shook the Habsburg monarchy's Slavic societies in the last months of the war? If we take into account the need to look beyond the end of the fighting as such, this reflexion needs to be extended to the immediate post-war period. After what could be considered as a brief survey of the process, we will deal with those evolutions, observe their variants, consider both rhythms and possible “white pages” as well as possible evolutions in a comparative perspective. In our perspective this reflexion on new tools and objects is the most important part of the panel. This reflexion will lead to a precise

evaluation of the field 100 years after the end of WW1.

In many ways, it would then be necessary to observe their different scales, possible links and common features, if necessary in diverging ways. For this purpose we propose to gather researchers, all specialists in WW1 and Slavic territories and populations in the Habsburg Lands. They will answer those questions keeping in mind the three dimensions studied:

- The historiographical building process in its political and ideological environment,
- Major current trends, including topics, sources, tools and possible shifts in paradigms,
- Open questions and research directions, including to what extent the ongoing process of building new states at the very end of WW1 can be observed as an extension of phenomena dependent on the situation created by the war?

The discussions will be organized in three main directions: long-term perspective; elements of continuity/discontinuity and possible reorientation that occurred after the regime changes of the late 20<sup>th</sup> century and more specifically in the last fifteen years or so; and perspectives of new concerns and open issues. This common approach and reflexion can lead to a synthesis organized according to the main developed focus. They will then propose an overview including the latest Slavic narratives of WW1 into the global dynamics of that field of research.

---

Joint programme in association with



## WORKING PROGRAMME

## Winners' historiographies? Des historiographies de vainqueurs ? Paris, Inalco, 2-3 June 2017

### **Session 1**

**Friday 15.30-17.00**

#### **Hypothesis, methodological framework and Interwar period**

- Opening speech and overall schedule of the working programme, global overview and hypothesis on a common historiographical frame
- The Interwar period: Forging centripetal narratives in a multinational context, (re)inventing a national historical frame
- The influence of the Carnegie Foundation on war narratives

### **Session 2**

**Saturday 9.30-11.00**

#### **WW1 in the main narratives of the “socialist” era**

- WW2 and its (possible) influence on the former historiographical paradigms
- Writing social and economic history of WW1 in the socialist context
- Influences and transfers between western and eastern historiographies from the 1960s to the 1980s

### **Session 3**

**Saturday 11.15-12.45**

- Articulating political and social history of the Habsburg empire in the long term: position of the problem
- Research perspectives
- Conclusions