

PART I
SOME PRELIMINARY CONSIDERATIONS

Blank Page

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM

Among those studies in which the University of Chicago has undertaken to investigate the evolution and the present state of civic education in the various countries of the world, the writer of this book has been given the charge of elucidating in detail that big, historical experiment which was carried on in the field of civic education within the limits of the former Austro-Hungarian monarchy. In this vast empire, which concentrated more than fifty-one million inhabitants in an area of two hundred and sixty thousand square miles, were almost ten nations and twenty more or less divergent nationalities in political or moral bonds. These constituted two distinct states (Austria and Hungary), seventeen provinces or crownlands in Austria, an "associated country" with Hungary (Croatia-Slavonia), a "separate body" (city and harbor of Fiume) annexed to Hungary, and a province of colonial nature (Bosnia-Herzegovina)—all of them with distinct historical consciousness and more or less extended territorial autonomy. In this vast empire there was going on, during more than four hundred years, an effort to keep together this variegated mosaic of nations and people and to build up a kind of universal state, a "supranational" monarchy, and to fill it with the feeling of a common solidarity.

This experiment, which the greatest state of the European continent (leaving out of account Russia and the powers with colonies outside Europe) undertook with colossal military, economic, and moral forces through almost sixteen generations, was one of the greatest and most interesting attempts in world-history. Had this experiment been successful, it would have meant more from a certain point of view than all other efforts of state-building ever recorded. For, if the Habsburgs had been able really to unite those ten nations through a supranational consciousness into an entirely free and spontaneous cooperation, the empire of the Habsburgs would have surpassed the narrow limits of the nation state and would have proved to the world that it is possible to replace the consciousness of national unity by a consciousness of a state community. It would have proved that the same problem which Switzerland and Belgium have solved on a smaller scale among highly civilized nations under particular historical conditions should not be regarded as a historical accident, but that the same problem is perfectly solvable even on a large scale and among very heterogeneous cultural and national standards.

We can go even farther and say that this experiment of the Habs-

4 DISSOLUTION OF THE HABSBERG MONARCHY

burgs would have signified a higher and more promising principle of evolution, not only compared with the old national states but also with the English and American kind of confederative state. For the British Empire and the United States are in reality a continuation of the old national type. In the United States the unity of the Anglo-Saxon culture and hegemony is uncontested, whereas the greatest part of the commonwealth of British nations is still under Anglo-Saxon leadership and the non-European stock of this commonwealth is scarcely beginning to participate in the political life of the whole organism. Neither the United States nor the British commonwealth can be regarded as a supranational type of state life.

And again, if the Austro-Hungarian state experiment had been really successful, the Habsburg monarchy would have solved on its territory the most fundamental problem of present Europe, which is also the problem of the League of Nations. How is it possible to unite national individualities of very divergent ideals and traditions in such a way that each of them can continue its own particular life, while at the same time limiting its national sovereignty enough to make a peaceful and effective international co-operation possible?

This historical experiment in the society of nations under the patronage of the Habsburgs has proved unsuccessful. The centripetal forces of a supranational consciousness were more and more disintegrated by the centrifugal forces of national particularisms. In the unnational and patrimonial body of the Habsburg empire there arose always more distinctly several differentiated national embryo states which, under the formidable birth-pangs of the World War, split the once unified framework of the monarchy into six distinct states.

In spite of the tragic collapse of the Habsburg experiment, this problem of state organization has still a great theoretical and practical importance. For the question is, whether the Danubian experiment was due to fail because it was in its essence an organic, almost a natural impossibility, or because it was only a consequence of factors depending on will and insight which could have been avoided by a more advanced statesmanship, a more clear-sighted policy, and a better-organized civic education. The answer to this question will determine almost *sub specie aeternitatis* the fate of all future experiments intending to unite various and antagonistic national wills into a harmonious international order, protecting and supplementing the interest of each nation. This problem is not only a problem of the remote future but the vital problem of those states which were established on the ruins of the Habsburg monarchy, for these new states are not unified nation states but states resulting from the co-operation of different national elements. At the same time our problem is closely connected with the general problem of Europe. The saving of

that Continent, destroyed by the unbridled forces of nationalism, depends on whether or not we are compelled to accept national antagonisms as final necessities or whether we can eliminate these national rivalries or at least replace them by other methods.

We can even affirm that the unsuccessful experiment of the old Habsburg monarchy affects not only the European future but also those problems by which the Far East is menacing the European powers and the United States, because all these problems are intimately connected with a national conflict aggravated by racial and religious antagonisms.

CHAPTER II

THE DISSOLUTION OF THE HABSBURG MONARCHY WAS NOT A MECHANICAL BUT AN ORGANIC PROCESS

Before proceeding to examine the causes which made the attempt at consolidation of the Habsburg empire a failure, a word may be said in anticipation of objections that may be taken to my viewpoint. There will be those who will resolve this whole problem into a sham by asserting that the dissolution of the monarchy was not the result of inner forces, but that it was due exclusively to external factors which had nothing to do with the psychic and political structure of the empire. This point of view, which in a former book I termed the "Habsburg legend" and which is disseminated by the propaganda of very influential dynastic and feudal groups, represents the Habsburg monarchy as an innocent lamb, a victim of the antagonism of German and English imperialism which, arousing the World War, buried under its ruins the free and happy Danubian League of Nations.

This historical materialism *à la Habsburg* has been recently advanced by a naïve and superficial historical and sociological literature which, investigating the responsibility for the World War, looks only on the diplomatic side of the problem, its chief interest consisting in the inquiry whether the world-catastrophe was actuated by the diplomatic maneuvers of Berchtold, Poincaré, Izvolsky, or Grey, or whether the Serb government did or did not have a previous knowledge of the murderous attack at Sarajevo. Such a point of view, which sees in the world-catastrophe exclusive personal intrigues and responsibilities, makes the real problem appear both shallow and obscure. For however great may be the crime of the individual politicians and statesmen in setting the date of the world-catastrophe, it is sufficiently clear that these men did not do more than detonate that mass of dynamite which the social and national unrest of Central Europe had piled up during the last hundred years.

Therefore, if we wish to understand history more clearly both from the point of view of the present and the future, and if we really try to follow a constructive policy of peace, we must have an end of that sentimental pacifism which considers all wars simply as the private affairs of criminal kings and diplomats or of capitalistic interests, and does not understand that the real causes of modern conflicts lie far deeper in the impeded evolutionary processes of the masses checked by stupid or criminal internal policies. I have no place here to amplify this point of view; I wish only to say that the warlike liquida-

tion of the former Habsburg monarchy is no sane argument for the assertion that its collapse was purely a mechanical process and not the end of an organic development of almost two hundred years. We know not a single national or social crisis on a large scale in world-history which could have created a radical new equilibrium without awakening a series of international and warlike complications. This concatenation of the inner evolution and of outer warlike complications is also clearly demonstrated by the genesis of the other national states; and it is not a sane argument against the organic nature of English and French national unity to say that the movement toward unity of the moral and economic forces was very often protected in both countries by the militaristic and political centralization of the respective dynasties.

The dissolution of the Habsburg monarchy and the establishment of new national states on its ruins was, in its essence, the same process which in many other states of Europe led to the state integration of those peoples having a common language and culture. The same fundamental causes working for unity in the nationally homogeneous states worked toward dissolution in the ethnographical mosaic of the Habsburg empire. Even the World War can only be fully understood from this historical perspective. The detonator of the European explosion was perhaps a capitalistic one, but its violence would have been unimaginable without the powder magazine formed by the unsolved and accumulating national and social problems of Central and Eastern Europe.

In whatever manner we may regard the Habsburg problem—whether we analyze its historical atmosphere, the mass psychology of its people, or the international complications arising from its national and economic conditions—from all these points of view we must come to the same conclusion, namely, that this vast historical drama was not the result of diplomatic quarrels, but grew out of the inevitable logic of a long series of social causes.

This conception is not merely an *a posteriori* assertion, but it was already alive many years, even decades before in the consciousness of all those who were capable of regarding the problems of the Danubian monarchy with sufficient intellectual force. Many of the best statesmen, poets, scholars, and publicists were unanimous in the understanding that the empire of the Habsburgs had become an anachronistic impossibility, that it was doomed to death or at least could have been saved only by a major operation. Such and similar declarations, even well-founded sociological analyses, are so abundant that I must limit myself to the most characteristic and conspicuous ones.

Mickiewicz, the great Polish poet, almost a hundred years ago wrote the following startlingly clear-sighted description of the Habsburg empire:

8 DISSOLUTION OF THE HABSBURG MONARCHY

This Empire counts thirty-four million inhabitants, but in reality it has no more than six million people; namely six million Germans keeping twenty-eight millions of other stocks in bondage. If one subtracts from these six millions the numbers of peasants, artisans, merchants, etc., who have no share at all in the government, there remain at most two million Austrians who rule all these masses. These two millions or rather their interests and opinions are represented approximately by a hundred families which are German, Hungarian, Polish, or Italian but which commonly speak French and have their capital largely outside the country. Using in their service two million bureaucrats and soldiers they rule through them the other thirty-two millions. That is a society modelled on the pattern of the English East Indian Company. . . . Ordinarily, people have a false idea of this Austrian Empire which never was a German, Hungarian or Slavish empire, but a kinship of all those who aim at drawing out the marrow of so many extensive countries rich in population.

Even more striking than this were the diagnoses and prognostications several times expressed by the great apostle and theoretical founder of the national idea, Giuseppe Mazzini. He clearly described the irresistible movement both of the Northern Slavs and the Southern Slavs toward unification. He prophesied that this movement, combined with the struggles for emancipation of the Greeks and the Rumanians, would inevitably destroy both the Austrian and the Turkish empires, "these two serpents which paralyze the heart of Europe." Already in 1843 he wrote that "in the Austrian Empire a movement of the Slav population is progressing" (he even foresaw the unification of Bohemia and Moravia with the Slovak tribes of Hungary) "for which nobody cares and which one day, united with our own efforts, will cancel Austria from the map of Europe. . . ."¹

In another direction, but scarcely less pessimistically, the situation of the monarchy was elucidated in 1822 by Charles Sealsfield, a brilliant German-American who fled before Austrian absolutism into the New World where he later wrote his powerful denunciation of the system of Metternich, an arraignment which is one of the most direct and penetrating documents of the empire of Emperor Francis. Sealsfield characterizes Austria as a "big agglomeration of provinces," and describes with vivid colors the exasperated public mind of the Slav majority against the German absolutist rule. He writes:

One can even hear the Bohemians gnash their teeth if one begins to praise English liberty. They are filled with unspeakable sorrow if their own country is mentioned, the battles which they were obliged to fight for a strange cause, the armies for which they furnish the soldiers and bear the costs and which in reality serve for their oppression. They feel depressed that they exist for a dynasty which remained foreign to them and

¹ These and many similar statements of Mazzini belong to the most miraculous products of political foresight. A luminous analysis of his theory and prognostication will be found in the book of Alessandro Levi, *La filosofia politica di Giuseppe Mazzini*, Bologna, 1917.

their wishes in spite of a rule of several hundred years, and which in its incapacity cares only how to subdue Bohemia and how to kill its national aims.²

This system, according to the opinion of Sealsfield, is untenable. The country as a unified whole is very near a crisis. Though it will not come to a general upheaval since the provinces are too sharply watched and the inner antagonisms are too great (the Bohemians would march against Hungary, the Poles against the Italians, and the Germans against both), the inner immorality of the system and its disregard for all loyal principles will ultimately destroy itself.

About ten years later the same *facies hippocratica* of the monarchy was seen by a Russian observer, by the Pan-Slav historian, Pogodin, who made several trips of investigation in Central Europe and gave an account of them to his government. He wrote:

The Slavs seem to be on the eve of a renaissance, the empire of the Danube must tremble even more than the Turkish empire in the face of twenty millions of a hostile race in its interior. Austria is a white sepulchre, an old tree which is rotten within, though it still bears leaves on the outside, but which the first blast of wind will uproot.

Again, ten years later, quite similar was the diagnosis of Charles Montalembert, the eminent French conservative statesman who spoke the following words (1846) on the tribune of the French Parliament: "The Austrian monarchy is a bizarre composition of twenty nations which justice could have maintained but which injustice will push into dissolution."

The same mood is reflected in the opinions of many other foreign observers. Napoleon III called Austria a corpse with which nobody can make a contract. At the other pole of social life Karl Marx fixed the death-sentence of the Habsburg empire: "The only circumstance," he wrote in 1860, "which legitimates the existence of Austria since the middle of the eighteenth century is its resistance to the advances of Russia in eastern Europe . . . a resistance helpless, inconsequent, cowardly, but tough." And, following the trend of thought of his master, Frederick Engels in 1888 made the assertion that the destruction of Austria would have been a misfortune for European civilization before the approaching triumph of the Russian Revolution; after which its annihilation becomes unnecessary, for Austria, becoming superfluous, will go asunder by itself.

Similar considerations were expressed from a quite different angle by the noted French historian, Louis Leger, who on a pamphlet published in 1866 and treating the problem of Austria, alluding to the oppressed nationalities, put the following significant motto: *Ave*

² This quotation and those which follow are a translation from the German edition (*Österreich wie es ist*, Wien, 1919), because the original English was not available.

10 DISSOLUTION OF THE HABSBURG MONARCHY

Caesar resurrecturi te salutant! And in a more comprehensive work, in 1879, he wrote this judgment: "Abandoned to the blind egotism of the Germans and the Magyars the Habsburg Monarchy could not solve the problem of the East. She will witness its solution against its own interests."

It may be objected that the assertions quoted above emanate from strangers and from the enemies of the monarchy, but we shall soon see that the friends of the empire did not think otherwise than its enemies. Let us continue our survey with the opinion of two Hungarian statesmen of whom the first cannot be counted among the enemies of the dynasty. Count Stephen Széchenyi, the conservative promoter of the Hungarian renaissance, whom his noted political antagonist, Louis Kossuth, called the greatest Hungarian, prophesied as early as 1813 the dissolution of the monarchy. When, after the battle of Dresden, he was convalescing in a Prague hospital, he exposed before his officer colleagues the probable future of the monarchy. Of this conversation, a court spy (these men of Metternich filled even the hospitals) reported to Vienna that the count before an audience consisting chiefly of Prussian officers made the declaration that in spite of its victories, Austria would go asunder "within a century because its parts are unequal and they separate more and more from each other."

Louis Kossuth, in 1881, was naturally more capable of describing accurately the pathology of the monarchy. The Viennese secret police sent an able *agent provocateur* to Turin in order to extract from the great man in exile his point of view concerning the international situation. The maneuver succeeded, and Kossuth, knowing not to whom he was speaking, gave his unveiled opinion concerning the future of Austria, which was later reported to the Viennese commissioner by the spy. According to this report, Kossuth predicted the approach of the Russian Revolution which he thought would be a deathknell for Austria. As Augustulus was the last Roman emperor, so Rudolphus would be the last Habsburg. That was an allusion to Crown Prince Rudolph who died in 1889. It can scarcely be doubted that if the catastrophe of Meierling of which Rudolph became a victim had not happened and Rudolph had remained alive, the prophecy of Kossuth would have been literally realized.

But even the guiding spirits of Austria were not more optimistic over the situation of the monarchy. One may say, in terms of recent psychology, that the whole policy of Metternich stood under a "dissolution complex," and this attitude fomented his almost monomaniacal struggle against democracy and liberalism. His wife, the princess Melanie, called him often the "Cassandra of the monarchy," for he was saturated with alarming news about the collapse of the empire. It is quite natural that in such a milieu the judgment of the more liberal and freer spirits was even more emphatically unfavorable to the

reigning system and its consequences. So in 1830, after the revolution of July, Grillparzer, the greatest poet of Austria, wrote the following really visionary lines:

The whole world will be strengthened by the unexpected change, only Austria will go to pieces by it. The shameless Machiavellism of the leaders who, in order that the reigning dynasty should remain the only connecting tie of the state, have fomented and nourished the reciprocal national antipathies of the separate provinces, is responsible for it. The Hungarian hates the Bohemian, the Bohemian hates the German, and the Italian hates them all, and as horses absurdly harnessed together, they will scatter in all directions as soon as the advancing spirit of the times will weaken and break the bonds.

This conviction of the grave danger facing the monarchy gained a deep statesman-like elucidation ten years later in a book anonymously published at Hamburg in 1842, which, under the title *Austria and Its Future*, gave a pitiless analysis of the formidable inner antagonisms of the monarchy. The author of this book was Baron Victor Andrian von Werburg, a chamberlain and a high official in the court administration, and later vice-president of the National Assembly. As one of the most cultivated aristocrats of his time, his opinion may be regarded as representative. Andrian was of the opinion that "Austria is a purely imaginary name which does not signify any compact people, any country, any nation . . . a conventional term of several nationalities sharply distinct each from the other." There are Italians, Germans, Slavs, Magyars, but there is no Austrian national consciousness. The idea of the state is annihilated by the principle of nationality. There arose a Slav, a Hungarian, and an Italian national feeling which consolidated itself more from day to day, rejected all foreign elements, and expanded with a prophetic vehemence. The system of these particularistic consciousnesses menaces the very existence of Austria. Only inertia succeeds in holding the monarchy together. "This state of mind is like the buried corpses in Pompeii which, preserved during many centuries, fall into dust and ashes as soon as a beam of God's free sun or a blast of wind touches them." How could such a state resist the growing consciousness of unity of the Slavs which begins to form a compact phalanx from Troppau to Cattaro?

Thoughtful men of later generations judged the future of the monarchy with the same pessimism. Ferdinand Kürnberger, the greatest Austrian publicist of the second half of the nineteenth century, agreed with these opinions, and he always regarded Austria as an anachronistic country and contrary to the spirit of Europe. He repeatedly emphasized the essentially Asiatic nature of Austria.

And lest these remarks be regarded as the impressionist utterances of exacerbated poets and publicists, I would call attention to the diagnosis of Ottokar Lorenz, the distinguished historian who, though a native Austrian, did not hide his deeply pessimistic opinions.

12 DISSOLUTION OF THE HABSBURG MONARCHY

He too talked of the second "sick man of Europe," and he never took the so-called new constitutional era of Francis Joseph seriously. On the contrary, he considered the various constitutional experiments to be like the experiments of England to remold the Turkish empire, because he was of the opinion that the old Austria had died as a consequence of the Revolution of 1848.

This pessimistic attitude also gradually took possession of the leaders of practical politics, and Count Taaffe, prime minister of Austria during two decades, called his own policy, with crude honesty, the policy of *Fortwursteln* ("to go on in the old groove"). That this policy would earlier or later demoralize the national forces was clearly understood by the enlightened elements of the state. Professor Masaryk, now president of Czecho-Slovakia, disgusted by the petty compromises without principle, called the Austrian parliament a *Tandelmarkt* (a "junk market"). And Ernest Körber, one of the last premiers of the monarchy "saw the situation of the monarchy as darkly as Metternich did after 1848."

This pessimistic public opinion penetrated even the circles of the Viennese court itself. General von Margutti, one of the leaders of the chief military bureau, narrates in his memoirs that beginning with his earliest youth he heard that the monarchy was not an up-to-date state, that it had no right to existence, and that it was only upheld by the personality of the old Emperor after whose death it would fall asunder "like an old barrel robbed of its hoops." This conviction exasperated and perhaps drove to death Crown Prince Rudolph himself. "I am only anxious to know as a silent observer," he once wrote to a friend, "how much time such an old and tough edifice as this Austria takes before it cracks in all its joints and falls asunder." The successor of Rudolph, Archduke Francis Ferdinand, heir apparent, was even more impressed by the approaching catastrophe, and endeavored in vain to avoid the fate which menaced not only the state but his own life. This feeling of an approaching disaster dominated the more clear-sighted elements of the army also. Conrad von Hötzendorf, later the chief of general staff during the war, emphasized for many years in his memoranda to the Emperor that the Italian and Jugo-Slav *irredenta* threatened the monarchy with collapse. Similarly, General Auffenberg as minister of war judged the situation in 1912. At the time of the Balkan crisis he uttered the following prophetic words to the German ambassador:

We need at least a half century of peace in the Monarchy to put the southern Slavs in order and this quietness can be maintained only by eliminating all the hopes of the southern Slavs for Russian protection, otherwise the Monarchy goes to pieces.³

³ *Die grosse Politik der europäischen Kabinette: 1871-1914* (Berlin, 1926), XXXIII, 372-73.

This insecurity of the future oppressed even the old Emperor in spite of the fact that those around him tried carefully to keep all alarming news from him. A documentary witness of this pessimistic mood is a testamentary provision of the Emperor of 1901 in which Francis Joseph established a family property in trust of sixty-million gold crowns the purpose of which was determined by the following words:

If in the course of events and in the historical evolution, the form of government of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy should suffer a change and, what God may prevent, the crown should not remain in our house, the order of succession for the family property in trust established by me should be determined by those principles of common right which are in existence in the ordinary code of law from June first, 1811.

The chief ally of the Dual Monarchy, the German government itself, was also haunted by the ghost of the approaching dissolution of the Danube empire. The German chancellor, Prince Bülow, in order to avoid possible dangerous conflicts in the case of the disaster of Austria, suggested in 1905 through his ambassador in St. Petersburg, a plan of a "Treaty of Disinterestedness" according to which both Germany and Russia would declare not to make an annexation in the case of collapse of the Danube monarchy.⁴

These many and various declarations and utterances, which all denounce the extreme uncertainty of the existence of the monarchy, cannot be a pure accident, but are a symptom and almost a symbol of a deeply rooted organic crisis. There can be no doubt that many of the better intellects clearly saw or felt that the monarchy was being pushed toward disaster by irresistible historical forces.

⁴ Quoted verbatim in *Der Krieg*, May, 1928.

CHAPTER III

THE DOUBLE WAR OF THE HABSBURG MONARCHY

Not only does the foresight of isolated men demonstrate that the dissolution of the monarchy was not a mechanical accident, but the final crisis, the final collapse itself, proved this truth even to the satisfaction of those who are distrustful of the more subtle, causal connections in social things.

There is, before all, the striking fact that the World War and the Sarajevo plot, which was its immediate cause, were in the closest connection with the outer policy of the Habsburg monarchy which again was determined by the social and national structure of the monarchy. At this place I cannot enter now upon the detailed analysis of this connection as this can only be done after the reader understands the statics and dynamics of the empire.

At this juncture I wish only to say that the monarchy's collapse was due not only to its struggles with foreign enemies, but in a no less degree to another war which the monarchy was constrained to carry on with its own so-called inner enemies, that is to say, with a very important mass of its own peoples. There is no fact, as far as I see, which could prove the inner organic dissolution of the Habsburg monarchy with such an almost symbolical force as this double war of the monarchy amid the frightful embarrassments of the world-crisis.

The history of this inner war of the monarchy has not yet been written as the most influential personalities of the old régime, who knew the warlike events the most intimately, do not like to lift the veil from the inner disintegration of the empire which would put in an unfavorable light the problem of war responsibility. On the other hand those elements who face this problem objectively or even with sympathy have naturally only a fragmentary knowledge concerning the facts since the official archives relating to this period are still closed.¹

In spite of these difficulties sufficient facts about the inner war of the monarchy became manifest to convince any objective observer of the inner motivation of the crisis. In this connection nobody can deny

¹ Recently an important book was published connected with this matter by Edmund von Glaise-Horstenau, the director of the Viennese War Archives, under the title *Die Katastrophe* (Wien, 1929). Though the author has a natural tendency to show the loyalty of the peoples of the former monarchy, he is far too conscientious a historian to shut his eyes to the symptoms of inner dissolution. Even the facts mentioned by him would suffice to show the seriousness of what I call the inner warfare of the monarchy. At the same time Glaise-Horstenau describes very vividly the growing economic misery and technical inefficiency of the Austro-Hungarian army which was due to a large extent to maladministration and corruptive influences.

that the warlike absolutism nowhere took such rigid and uncouth forms as in the Habsburg empire where not only all military operations were strictly withdrawn from the control of the parliamentary corporations, but the economic life, the administration, the judiciary itself was put under a rude military control.² The only official organ to supervise the foreign and military policy, the so-called "Delegations," were not even convened during the first three years of the war because the leading circles were aware that the critics from the Slavs and the Socialists would destroy the prestige of the monarchy. For the same reason the Austrian Parliament ceased to function during three years and when the young emperor, terrified by the many signs of dissolution, gave general amnesty to the so-called "traitors of the country" and called the Parliament together, declarations were heard which made the blood chill in the veins of the old Austrian patriots. Victor Bibl, the excellent Austrian historian with a very outspoken German tendency, writes:

The secession movement in Bohemia encouraged by this sign of feebleness lifted its head of Medusa now more and more audaciously and recklessly. The Czech representatives did not hesitate to praise openly in parliament those soldiers who deserted; they did not abstain from the menace that the destiny of Bohemia would be decided on the conference table of the Allied Powers and not in Austria. The culminating point of the national frenzy and of an open high treason was reached by a declaration of the Czechs on the Day of Epiphany in 1918 in which they manifested their conviction that the independence of their state could not be reached in a constitutional way and they claimed a participation in the peace parleys in order that they might fight in full liberty for their rights.

The patriotic exasperation of the German historian can be understood, but on the other side the young Emperor possessed sufficiently reliable information concerning the probable developments of the war to know that the inner crisis of the monarchy could not be solved any more by the violence of a victorious war, therefore he saw the only means of saving his throne in a compromise with the dissatisfied nations of his empire. On this point he was really right because the whole repertory of terror and violence was consistently and excessively applied in the first years of the war; the disloyal regiments were mixed with loyal German and Magyar soldiers; the greatest part Czech, Serb, and Rumanian middle classes was declared a treacherous *maffia* and was supervised by the military authorities;³ an interminable series of prosecutions for high treason were made (in Moravia

² As early as the spring of 1916 Baron Bolfras, the Adjutant-General of the Emperor, could make the characteristic remark: "The chief command of the army is now the exclusive government in our country."

³ An excellent analysis of the war situation in this respect is given by Joseph Redlich in chapter iv of his *Österreichische Regierung und Verwaltung im Weltkriege* (Wien, 1925).

alone there were five hundred such prosecutions, and in the Rumanian and Jugo-Slav countries, especially in Herzegovina, a great number of the so-called "doubtful element" were brought into court on the same charge); without any serious judicial investigation many hundreds of persons were shot by the court-martial of nervous officers; the naïve religious Pan-Slavism of the unhappy Ukraine people which sometimes led to real treasons but more often only to a sentimental outburst of solidarity with the Russians drove great masses of the peasantry to the slaughter-house of the Austrian army in Galicia and in the Carpathians; entire villages were encircled and burned by the Austro-Hungarian regiments because they found the attitude of the population to be dangerous.

Generally speaking, the situation of the hinterland near the front cannot be imagined in sufficiently dark and terrifying colors. For instance, the descriptions of Dr. Vladimir Čorović, of the University of Belgrade, concerning the persecution of the population in Bosnia and Herzegovina cannot be read without horror, and Dr. Tresić Pavičić (later ambassador of Jugo-Slavia to the United States) made a vehement accusation in the Austrian Parliament of the brutal procedure by which he and many hundred of Dalmatians were treated by the Austrian authorities. Dr. Čorović gives a long list of cases in which men, women, and children were shot without any judicial inquiry. Also the custom of the taking of hostages in the civic population of the hinterland was carried on in an unheard-of measure and many hundred people became the victims of this crude kind of justice.⁴ Very reliable witnesses from the Hungarian side corroborate the description given above of the mass psychology during the war. Ladislav Fényes, the brilliant Hungarian publicist who during the war went with the army into Serbia in order to study the social and military situation and who was in intimate touch with the peasant population, narrates that in the hinterland near the front he always had the distinct impression of being in the territory of enemies. Execution without any trial was the rule; especially in the villages near Zemun the attitude of the population became so alarming that the commander of the army proposed to the government the urgent evacuation of the whole civic population.

Hermann Wendel, the noted German historian of the Jugo-Slav unity, described in a very pathetic way the calvary of the Southern Slav hinterland during the war and remarks sarcastically that finally the long-desired Jugo-Slav unity was created by the Habsburg "by the unity of the gallows, of the court-martial, of the internment-camps, and of the jail-cells."⁵

⁴ Dr. Vladimir Čorović, *Black Book* (Beograd-Sarajevo, 1920). In Serb.

⁵ *Der Kampf der Südslaven um Freiheit und Einheit* (Frankfurt am Main, 1925), pp. 707-17.

But all these bloody activities of the military absolutism were incapable of maintaining the inner cohesion of the monarchy. On the contrary, among the Slav and Rumanian population there was an intense hatred which no thinking observer could behold without being terrified. What from a moral point of view made the war of the monarchy more horrible and unbearable than in any other country was the fact that this war was carried on by the broadest masses of population without any inner motives, nay very often against their real national feelings, and only under the stress of physical constraint. These feelings were dramatically expressed by a leader of the Czechs in the following memorable words: "We must fight for our liberation from the yoke of the Hapsburgs in order to avoid in the future those terrible moral tortures which signify for us the necessity of fighting side by side with our enemies."⁶ At the beginning of the war several Czech regiments proved to be unreliable, indeed, they were very often in open treason. Especially the laying down of arms *en masse* became a common practice of the Czech soldiers. Out of these deserters was formed a Czech army of about 130,000 soldiers a part of which after the Russian Revolution became the only reliable armed force in the hands of the Allies in Russian territory. Not only on the Russian fronts but in the French and Italian trenches too one very often met Czech military formations. The Czech nation indeed accepted the admonition of its political leader, Mr. Kramář: "Not to undertake anything which could have the semblance of an approval of the war!" No, the Czechs themselves boasted that approximately one-half of their citizens who were in active military service, about three hundred thousand soldiers seceded to the enemies of the monarchy and a keen correspondent of the *Frankfurter Zeitung* wrote during the war that the souls of nine-tenths of the Czech people were in the camp of the Allies. And, when observing the growing symptoms of disloyalty, the supreme military authorities tried to check it by a severe example and, at the beginning of 1916, a court-martial sentenced Kramář to death, all of the more serious politicians and the Emperor himself clearly realized that this sentence could not be executed because by carrying it out all moral ties between the Hapsburgs and the Czech people would have been definitely broken.

Under such circumstances it was tacitly accepted that the Czechs could not be regarded as reliable combatant forces. But not only from a military point of view did the monarchy become undermined by the Czechs, they also did a greater harm by their vehement anti-Austrian propaganda in foreign countries. The London lectures of Professor

⁶ Even such a staunch pro-Austrian writer as Mr. Glaise-Horstenau, describing the new elements of the army after the terrible initial losses in trained soldiers, says: ". . . . These workers and peasants recently provided with the grey field-uniforms were far more cannon fodder than self-conscious fighters."

18 DISSOLUTION OF THE HABSBURG MONARCHY

Masaryk, the flaming book, *Détruisez Autriche-Hongrie*, of Professor Beneš (now foreign minister of Czecho-Slovakia), and the activity of the other members of the Czech emigration made a great impression on the whole world and became one of the chief causes, according to a tradition, of the intervention of President Wilson. The other dissatisfied national groups of the monarchy too did their utmost for the moral discredit of the Habsburg empire. As a matter of fact, all these dissolving tendencies were skilfully utilized through an enormous ruthless scientifically managed propaganda by the press agencies of the Entente and the reflecting waves of this campaign reenforced again the growing revolutionary dissatisfaction both in the trenches and the hinterland of the Habsburgs.

The resistance of the other peoples of the monarchy was not so well organized nor so vigorous as these peoples were far more feeble and stood on a lower degree of national consciousness. The majority of the Slovaks remained loyal and great masses of the Croats fought heroically, especially on those fronts where they defended the Croatian littoral against the Italian aggressors. On the contrary, the mood of the Rumanians in Transylvania became more and more inimical. Already, at the beginning of the war, many intellectuals escaped to Rumania (among them the whole editorial staff of the *Tribuna* of Arad) and under the leadership of Octavian Goga, later minister of interior in Rumania, they developed an exacerbated propaganda in books and pamphlets and open meetings against Hungary. As early as 1915, Rumanian sources estimated ten thousand Transylvanians who seceded, championed Rumania, and took up arms against the old country. This revolutionary activity naturally had a very widely spread repercussion in Transylvania, and the military authorities continued with double energy the persecution of the Rumanian *maffia*; and a Rumanian writer, Jon Clopotel, gives us statistics according to which during the first four years of the war, twenty-six thousand Rumanians of Transylvania made a more or less intimate acquaintance with the military prisons. Meanwhile, following the Czech example, Rumanian battalions were formed among the captives and it was asserted that to the end of the campaign about two thousand officers and nearly twenty-three thousand soldiers fought side by side with the Allies.⁷

And the more oppressive the war situation became, the more the great masses of population sank into a state of slow starvation, and the more the militaristic terrorism aggravated the hinterland: the more the war of the monarchy became a war of the two privileged nations, the Germans and the Magyars. Even the Poles, who at the beginning were friends of the monarchy, later abandoned entirely this attitude. The so-called *bread peace* with Ukraine in which substantial interests of the Poles were betrayed in the hope of getting foodstuffs

⁷ *Revolution of 1918* (Cluj, 1926). In Rumanian.

from there made the Pole a bitter enemy of the monarchy, both in the Parliament and on the battlefields, though at the beginning of the warfare Pilsudski energetically protected the cause of the Central Powers and made a raid against Russia. Now, in consequence of the hostile foreign policy of the monarchy, the rest of Pilsudski's legions went over into rebellion and one part of them was successful in leaving the country and joining the Allies on the Western Front to fight the Germans.

The Ukraine policy, too, had no better result. After the Bolsheviki were evicted in the newly formed Ukraine state, the Central Powers protected the old reactionary elements against the Ukraine people and the intelligentsia, the old Czarist generals and officers. There came a period of cruel requisitions and foreign rule which made the great majority of the Ukraine people an enemy of the monarchy. Under these circumstances it is no exaggeration when Otto Bauer, the brilliant socialist historian of the period of the collapse, exclaims:

In this manner the circle was drawn. The Habsburgs began the war against the Jugo-Slavs, passed through it in the most vehement conflict with the Czechs, lost the Poles during the War and were incapable of winning the Ukrainians. All the Slav peoples now stood against the Habsburgs. All hoped for the victory of the Allies. Austria-Hungary led the war not only against external enemies but against almost two-thirds of its own citizens. The destiny of the Habsburg monarchy was sealed.⁸

As the war situation became worse and worse the leading circles were of the opinion that their awkward position was caused by the treachery of the unreliable elements. Bertrand Auerbach, the French historian of the collapse, quotes a hidden decree of the minister of war which ordered a severe supervision of all the soldiers not belonging to the German and Hungarian nationality with the charge of special control over the baggage and correspondence of the Slav soldiers. This vexatious procedure evoked vehement interpellations in the Austrian parliament.⁹ A state which puts under police supervision and under the control of its spies the majority of its fighting people! Could there be a more symbolical expression of the inner crisis of the monarchy? Perhaps this crisis would still have been bearable if at least the alliance of the two privileged nations of the monarchy had been a substantial one. But just the opposite was true. There arose in the Hungarian Parliament passionate and exasperated declarations that the leading military circles spared the other nationalities at the cost of Hungarian blood. At the same time in Austrian public opinion and in the Austrian Parliament, one heard excited complaints that agricultural Hungary lived in plenty while she let the other half of the monarchy cruelly starve!

⁸ *Die Österreichische Revolution* (Wien, 1923), p. 48.

⁹ *L'Autriche et la Hongrie pendant la Guerre* (Paris, 1925), p. 259.

At the end of the war when slow starvation became open hunger and the news of the abuses of the administration at home against the members of the soldiers' families embittered the fighting army, there began the dissolution of the fronts and the formation of so-called *Green Cadres*. These formations alarmed the military commanders because they were constituted from two highly undesirable elements: deserters who in compact groups, armed and often even provided with machine guns, tramped about and robbed, and a great number of soldiers on leave who with falsified documents avoided a return to their regiments. In the spring of 1918 even open mutinies occurred very often which the military authorities were incapable of checking by armed force. Serbs, Bosnians, Magyars, Slovenians, and Czechs refused, in many cities of the monarchy, to continue the military service.

This disorganization of the army was followed by the growing rebellion of the working population. Whereas at the beginning of the war the working mass had a kind of sympathy for it because the official ideology, accepted also by the socialist leaders, was that the Central Powers were fighting against Russian Czarism and the liberation of its oppressed peoples, later this hypothesis became untenable when military absolutism destroyed all the constitutional guaranties of the Dual Monarchy. An almost symbolical outbreak of this changed public opinion was the attempt of Frederick Adler, the socialist leader, against the life of the Austrian premier, Count Stürgkh who was killed by his bullet (October, 1916). The assassin, a man of high culture and moral ideas, took this desperate step in order to revolutionize the masses against the system of military absolutism and the war. The example of Adler was really a turning-point in the war history of the monarchy. From this date an open resistance of the working-classes had begun which found its culmination during the Russian revolutionary events. After the fall of Czarism the prophecy of Frederick Engels verified itself: Austria became superfluous in the opinion of the working-classes. Now a new political theory arose represented by the left wing of the party entirely in sympathy with Frederick Adler which with sufficient clearness declared even during the war that the right of self-determination for every people must be accepted even at the cost of the destruction of Austria. The disclosures of the socialist daily *Arbeiterzeitung*, about the bloody crimes of the war-absolutism, envenomed the whole situation still more; and, when Frederick Adler appeared before his judges, the socialist leader instead of being accused became the accuser and with a sincere moral pathos which exercised an enthusiastic influence far beyond the socialist camp, unveiled the moral bankruptcy of the whole Austrian system.

The moral indignation of a very great number of the middle classes found a passionate expression in one of the most interesting products of the war literature, in the tragedy of the Viennese poet and critic, Karl Kraus, entitled *Die letzten Tage der Menschheit* (written

in the fateful years from 1915 to 1917 but published, naturally, only in 1919). It is worth while to compare this terrible document of the anti-war literature, with *Le Feu* of Henry Barbusse. Though both works are animated by the same hatred of war, their attitude is entirely different and demonstrates the radically antagonistic nature of the French and the Austrian anti-war feeling. Barbusse described the war as a catastrophe, an anachronism, a result of bad human institutions, a hideous nonsense from both an intellectual and moral point of view, but his solidarity with the French cause is not questioned. Just the opposite was the attitude of the Austrian poet. He depicted the war simply as a criminal plot of military adventurers and of greedy business men, a conscious conspiracy of scoundrels and idiots against the people. There is no place for higher motives.

Not only the working-classes and the oppressed nationalities abandoned the old state but even among the German and Magyar military organizations grave signs of disintegration were witnessed in the last months of the war. Both the Magyar and the German regiments felt more and more distinctly that they were fighting for a foreign cause. Many Magyar regiments declared that they were not willing to continue the fight for the monarchy but they desired to defend the endangered frontiers of Transylvania, of their real fatherland. This attitude of a national disintegration became victorious over all the nations of the monarchy. At last even some German military formations collapsed under this ideology. Not bolshevized masses, not even Socialists, but military formation of the most loyal Crownland of Tyrol would not continue to fight, but returned to southern Tyrol because the poor soldiers realized that their homes, houses, wives, and children were endangered by the aggression of the enemy. Tyrol remained the real fatherland, whereas the Habsburg monarchy became a concept void of any sense.

Under such circumstances and such a military situation, it was too late when, in October, 1918, the government of Mr. Hussarek made an official declaration that the aim of the Emperor and his cabinet was to rebuild the monarchy on a confederative basis. If this idea had been announced clearly and openly about two years earlier, it would perhaps have saved the monarchy. But at that time it signified nothing: all the peoples of the monarchy refused the program of the government. The spokesmen of the Czechs, of the Poles, and of the Jugo-Slavs did not hide their real intentions any longer. The famous manifesto of the Emperor of October 18, which can be regarded as a real liquidation of the monarchy, did not alter the situation. The sovereign declared in it that Austria should be transformed into a confederative state (*Bundesstaat*) in which every nation should form an independent community on its national territory. At the same time the manifesto promised the unification of the Polish territories and a particular status for the harbor of Trieste. The monarch made an ap-

peal to all his nations that they should co-operate in this vast work by electing their national councils. "In this way our fatherland should be reconstructed as a confederation of free peoples out of the tempests of the World War."

From the German side this imperial manifesto was denounced as a "pitiful surrender," as "a digging of the grave of the monarchy," as "a suicide of the dynasty." But these statements are manifestly untrue. The manifesto was not a cause of the dissolution but only the fixing of the date of this dissolution, the acknowledgment of the fact that the old monarchy had lost all its entire cohesion. Its effect, however, was rather a beneficial one as the inevitable process of disintegration became legalized by the authority of the throne which made it possible for the entire bureaucratic staff of Austria to co-operate without violating their oath of loyalty in the creation of the new national states. And at this juncture one who can grasp the real meaning of the whole historical process will see more in the imperial manifesto than the tragi-comical vacillations of the Habsburg Romulus Augustulus. On the contrary he will see in this manifesto the last point of a logical series, a kind of *List der Idee* (the "trickery of the Idea") in the sense of Hegel. The half-conscious, half-unwilling incarnation of this historical process, the Habsburg dynasty has incubated, if I may say so, the eggs of the national states and even gave the first help in the science of flying to these fledglings of national liberty by giving them the opportunity to utilize the old administration and bureaucracy of the dynasty in building up their national states. In this manner the imperial manifesto made the way free by avoiding unnecessary revolutionary convulsions.

Otherwise, as a more critical observer could have foreseen, the manifesto was entirely unfit to obtain the intended *Bundesstaat*. The nations disgusted by the war-absolutism, under the sway of their leaders in the emigration, had no interest at all in the maintenance of the Habsburg monarchy, the less because the insincerity and lack of seriousness of the whole document was manifest. The Slav nations rejected it in a rather contemptuous way. The national council in Prague and in Zagreb asked for complete independence.

Not only the Slavs, but even the privileged Germans manifested no better feeling toward the Habsburg state. When the German deputies proclaimed the Austrian German state at the end of October 1918, the president of the German parties opened the meeting with these memorable words:

History made us Germans the founders of the old state of Austria, and we have given to this state through centuries in unbroken fidelity and in unselfish sacrifice our best in culture and in economy. We take leave of this state without thanks in order to put our national strength on itself and to build up hopefully out of its inexhaustible well a new commonwealth serving our people alone.

This same feeling also took hold of the other privileged nation of the monarchy, the Magyar. The Hungarian national council in its first proclamation of October 26, 1918, announced as its chief aim the saving of the Hungarian state, but greeted at the same time the newly formed Polish, Ukraine, Czech, Jugo-Slav, and Austrian states, and emphasized the necessity of co-operating with them very closely both economically and politically.

Aside from the imperial manifesto there is another symbolic document of the spontaneous disintegration of the Habsburg monarchy. When it became obvious that the newly formed national councils rejected not only the old Austria but also the Habsburg rule, the young Emperor in order to save his throne made an appeal to the soldiers on the fronts and asked them to give a plebiscite whether they wished a republic or a monarchy, because the official circles cherished the hope that the fighting army was more propitious for the Emperor than the disenchanted population at home. This curious plebiscite—unique in history!—also came too late, for in the majority of the disintegrating fronts it could not be carried on. But many regiments gave a vote, mostly in favor of the republic.

Before closing this necessarily very cursory chapter demonstrating that the World War was not the *cause*, but only the final liquidation of the deep inner crisis of the monarchy, I beg to quote the conclusions of two eminent Austrian historians, both loyal to the former Austria and representing the best of its tradition. (By this I hope to avoid the suspicion that my presentation of the facts was one-sided or artificial.) Victor Bibl wrote this:

The death struggle of the Danube Monarchy has come to its end. She was—we have seen it—gravely sick for a long time, sentenced to collapse. "We were compelled to die," said Ottokar Czernin, "we could choose only the manner of death and we have chosen the most terrible." One can dispute whether we could really have chosen and whether the end could have been even more terrible. But this is absolutely correct: *the Habsburg Empire was no longer capable of life, it had become an anachronism.*¹⁰

And Alfred Francis Pribram expressed the following weighty opinion:

I trust that you gathered from my statements that Austria-Hungary broke down in consequence of the disastrous war. She might, but for the War, have existed as a great power, for many years longer. The World War was therefore the immediate occasion for the downfall of the Monarchy. But the deeper causes of its collapse lay in the irreconcilable antagonism of the different nationalities which aimed at an independence incompatible with the idea of imperial unity and of the ascendancy which the German had enjoyed for hundreds of years.¹¹

¹⁰ *Der Zerfall Österreichs* (Wien, 1922), II, 558. Italics mine.

¹¹ *Austrian Foreign Policy, 1908-18* (London, 1923), p. 128.

CHAPTER IV

ESSENCE AND POSSIBILITIES OF CIVIC EDUCATION

Though the description of the facts which I have arranged above concerning the process of dissolution of the Habsburg monarchy may be fragmentary, they are, as I hope, sufficient to prove that the dissolution of the empire was not a mechanical accident but only the end of a long organic process.

In this negative experiment the problem of civic education manifestly plays an important rôle since, for centuries, there were not lacking conscious endeavors to fill the citizens of the monarchy with such ideas and sentiments as should promote the harmonious co-operation of the ten nations and the many nationalities of the empire and which should develop and foster loyalty toward the common state.

We must seek the means and methods of such a civic education not only in the system of public teaching (from the elementary classes to the universities), but also in other more efficacious factors. For instance in the collaboration of religious forces; in the intellectual and moral training of the army; in the ideology of press, literature, and science, influenced by the state; in the historical traditions maintained by the state; and in that social directive which the imperial court and the upper classes connected with it gave to the bourgeois society so appreciative of their favors.

But an inquiry exclusively devoted to these factors would not be sufficient to solve the problem in which we are interested. Though a conscious civic education can do a great deal, still it cannot accomplish more than to direct and enforce certain forces which result from the statics and dynamics of the state at a given moment under the law of sociological determination. The division of wealth, the sphere of activity of the individual citizens delineated by the constitution, the co-operation and struggle between the classes, the problems of international relations, the degree and extension of public culture, the religious-ethical surroundings, and the continuity of the historical traditions are the factors of primary importance which determine in a given epoch and society the quality and efficaciousness of the civic consciousness. This consciousness can without doubt be directed, influenced, and modified to a certain degree by a careful educational activity of the state, exactly as the gardener can modify and influence the right development of his trees by improving the soil, by pruning the branches, and by altering to some extent the climatic relations. But in spite of this still the general conditions of the soil and climate will be decisive for the development of the trees in all cases where there

is no possibility of creating a purely artificial kind of environment, transferring the plant from the normally natural conditions into a hot-house atmosphere.

This analogy illustrates sufficiently the possibilities of civic education. Against those mass psychological tendencies which emanate from the real economic, moral, and political structure of society even the most careful and detailed civic education will lead to failure. A spontaneous loyalty cannot be created where the real interests of the people are constantly sacrificed to this so-called loyalty. National solidarity cannot be fostered where the progress of one nation is sacrificed to the interests of the other. Harmonious co-operation among classes cannot be established where the exploitation of the laboring-classes keeps the masses in constant dissatisfaction. No democratic civic education is possible where the real type of life is a dictatorship or the rule of caste.

Therefore, if we wish to measure the real force and results of civic education, we must study before all else those forces which have determined the social and political life of the Habsburg monarchy. We must know precisely the flood and speed of a river before we are entitled to judge those technical equipments by which we wish to modify its flood in the interest of certain aims. We must know exactly the centripetal and centrifugal forces which emanated from the inner structure of the monarchy before we can have a right conception of how a conscious statesmanship endeavored to strengthen the centripetal forces and to check the centrifugal ones by utilizing the possibilities of a civic education.

Many of us are inclined at the present day—especially under the sway of an extremely formulated theory of historical materialism—to contemplate this problem exclusively from the point of view of present-day interests and of a purely materialistic reasoning. But to put the problem in such a manner would be too restricted and short-sighted. The scale of values and world-view, which was constituted in a given historical co-operation in the continuity of many generations in the consciousness of the leading factors, influences the historical events sometimes deeper than the purely materialistic and rational interests of the recent past.

Therefore, before we investigate the most important centripetal and centrifugal forces which determined the fate of the monarchy in order to understand the real rôle of the bulwarks of civic education amid their irresistible flood, we must try to bring the reader in touch with those traditional forces, judgments of values and mass impulses, which we might say constituted the river-bed of the currents just mentioned. A mechanical recapitulation of the history of the monarchy would not be of much use even if we would have sufficient space (which is not the case) for it in the frame of this inquiry. Dates and facts alone give us

no close touch with the reality if we do not understand the psychological structure by which those dates and facts were determined and qualified. This psychological structure depended in the Habsburg monarchy more on the will and aims of the dynasty than perhaps in any other modern state because this empire remained, in its essence from the very minute of its birth until the hour of its death, an absolutistic system. Therefore, if we try to understand the political aims of the most outstanding and powerful Habsburg emperors and investigate the ways and means which they employed, we shall come nearer to the reconstruction of the social and moral atmosphere of the whole historical complex. This we shall try to do in the next part of the book.

But before undertaking this task I must face a probable objection. In our historical reconstruction the accent will very often be put on Hungary, and some of my readers will perhaps see in this attitude a kind of national bias and will be of the opinion that I ascribe a disproportionate importance to the Hungarian evolution compared with the rôle given to the other nine nations of the monarchy. I think, however, that this criticism would not be to the point, for, in the problem of the unity of the Habsburg monarchy, Hungary took an exceptional position from the beginning, being the only country of the empire over which the Habsburg absolutism did not become triumphant, which never lost completely its state independence, which was a continuous source of international complications for the Habsburgs, which created later the dualistic constitution of the monarchy, the exceptional power of which made a confederative rearrangement of the nations impossible. On the one side the centralized mechanical unity of countries and provinces which lost their historical independence (Austria in the proper sense): on the other side the more or less independent Hungarian state which never abdicated from its national sovereignty. On the one side a conglomerate of nations and countries in a bureaucratic militaristic and capitalistic frame; on the other side a united territory where the rule of the feudal classes continued. On the one side a continuous though sometimes impeded progression toward the realization of a state of various nationalities¹ on a confederative

¹ The terms *nation* and *nationality* are very ambiguous in the sociological and political literature. Very often they are used in the same sense denoting a multitude of people of the same history, tradition, language, literature, and custom. Sometimes, however, we find a slightly different meaning for each term: "nation" means a fully mature nationality which has reached its complete independence as a state building organism; "nationality," on the contrary, means a struggling national entity which under the sway of a dominant nation has not yet reached its complete independence. In this sense some writers in the former Austro-Hungarian monarchy spoke of the two dominant nations whereas the other nations were regarded only as nationalities. That was especially the attitude of the Magyar nationalists who regarded only the Magyars as a real nation. All the other peoples constituting Hungary were called nationalities, a kind of second-rank nations. That is the reason why I shall speak of "Magyars" and not "Hungarians" (this distinction does not exist in the Hungarian language in which there is no adequate expression for the term

basis; on the other side the fiction of a united nation-state which tried to unify and assimilate all its various nations. Reduced to a few sentences this was the fundamental antagonism which determined in the last analysis the fate of the monarchy. The chief actors of the great drama were, on the one side, the dynastic forces and on the other, the Magyar ruling classes. All the other nations, even the other privileged nation of the monarchy, the Germans, played only a second or a third rôle in the big historical experiment. That is the reason why I am compelled to emphasize in the next part the psychological situation of the Hungarian nation in a seemingly disproportionate manner.

“Hungarian,” a Latin derivative) whenever I speak of the ruling nation in Hungary as opposed to the other nations which lived in the former Hungary. Though the racial unity of the ruling nation is more than doubtful (Professor A. Vámbéry, the great student of the early ethnical origins of the country called the Magyars “the most mixed people of Europe”) the denomination “Magyar” assumed more and more a racial and linguistic significance and became the expression of a common political front against the non-Magyar nations, the so-called “nationalities.” By this the former situation changed radically since, before the Constitutional era, the idea of the *Hungarian Nation* (“*Natio Hungarica*”) covered all the noblemen though they belonged to the non-Magyar nations. Even the Nationality-Law of 1868 interpreted the political nation as embodying all the nations of the country.

Blank Page

PART II
THE HISTORICAL ATMOSPHERE