

ASSIMILATION AND NATIONALISM IN EAST CENTRAL EUROPE DURING
THE LAST CENTURY OF HABSBERG RULE

by

ISTVAN DEAK

Paper No. 202
1983

Istvan Deak is a Professor of History and a member of the Institute of East Central Europe at Columbia University. He is author of The Lawful Revolution: Louis Kossuth and the Hungarians, 1848-1849 and numerous articles and essays. He also co-edited Eastern Europe in the 1970s.

**THE CARL BECK PAPERS IN
RUSSIAN AND EAST EUROPEAN STUDIES
Ronald H. Linden, Editor
4E-23 Forbes Quadrangle
University of Pittsburgh
Pittsburgh, PA
15260**

ASSIMILATION AND NATIONALISM IN EAST CENTRAL EUROPE DURING
THE LAST CENTURY OF HABSBERG RULE

by

ISTVAN DEAK

Paper No. 202
1983

Istvan Deak is a Professor of History and a member of the Institute of East Central Europe at Columbia University. He is author of The Lawful Revolution: Louis Kossuth and the Hungarians, 1848-1849 and numerous articles and essays. He also co-edited Eastern Europe in the 1970s.

The recent history of East Central Europe has been marked by wars, political and social upheaval, and extra-ordinary economic and technological advances. But few changes are likely to be of more lasting significance than the disappearance, step by step, of multinational states and their replacement by national ones. The Habsburg Monarchy, which once encompassed almost all of East Central Europe, was composed of eleven major¹ and scores of minor nationalities. Although the Habsburgs were German princes and the main monarchical institution, the Army, used German as its language of command, the ruling house showed no preference for any one nationality during the entire period of its existence. The multinational character of the Monarchy was weakened, but not eliminated by the Compromise Agreement of 1867, which divided the realm into two associated estates: the Austrian Empire (or Cisleithania) and the Hungarian Kingdom (or Transleithania). In the first of these states, the German element played the strongest role but was far from dominant, either politically, economically, or numerically. In the second state, the Magyar nation's numerical superiority was precarious at best, but its political domination was very real².

The Dual Monarchy was replaced in 1918 by a number of states whose claim to existence was based on the principle of national self-determination and ethnic unity, but only two of them, the Austrian Republic and the new, smaller Hungary, came close to being national states. Two others, Poland and Romania, resembled pre-World War I Hungary insofar as a single nationality exercised hegemony over politics and government. The other two, Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia, resembled the pre-World War I Austrian Empire (Cisleithania), in that in both of them one nationality, the Czechs and the Serbs respectively, although in

numerical minority played a very strong role, but were unable to subjugate the other nationalities.

World War II brought far fewer changes in political boundaries than had the first great war. But World War II brought something far more significant and tragic: it greatly hastened the elimination of two large and ancient ethnic groups -- the Germans and the Jews -- from East Central Europe.³

The numerical decline of the Germans and the Jews as separate ethnic groups predated the 1940's by a considerable extent. As a result of political centralization, incipient nationalism, and the lure of assimilation into the landowning nobility and the pressure of local authorities, the once powerful and privileged German communities of East Central Europe gradually weakened throughout the 19th century. Yet only in the 1940's did this process of dissolution take a catastrophic turn. A case in point is the Saxon community in Transylvania, dating from the twelfth and thirteen centuries. Prosperous, civilized and exclusivist, this community had lost the last traces of its once proud autonomy to the Hungarian state in 1867. The Romanian take-over of Transylvania in 1918 did not improve the political status of the Saxons there, which might explain why so many of them joined the SS in World War II or fled with the German troops 1944. This mass exodus, combined with post-war deportations to the Soviet Union, caused their numbers to decline radically. The last remnants of the Transylvanian Saxon community are now being systematically purchased from the Romanian authorities by the West German government.

The Jewish communities in the Habsburg Monarchy flourished as much as the German, thanks to the successful urbanization of the Jewish rural population and the influx of immigrants from Russia. But parallel emigration to the West, a declining birth rate, and the total assimilation of many into the Gentile world

caused the Jewish population to diminish in some parts of East Central Europe even before the end of the Habsburg Monarchy. The Holocaust and the creation of Israel in the 1940's put a virtual end to the Jewish community in the area. The annihilation of the Jews was initiated and, to a large extent, carried out by the Germans who, ironically, by this very act and others like it, facilitated the subsequent elimination of their own East Central European Diaspora. Millions fled with the German army in 1944/45 and other millions were expelled after the war. Today we are witnessing the final disappearance, through emigration or assimilation, of the remnants of the German and Jewish communities. Yet, these two linguistically and culturally related groups were once responsible for much of the culture and prosperity of East Central Europe.

The elimination of the last Germans and Jews was accompanied by the systematic weakening, through educational policy and population transfer by means of industrialization and nationalist pressure, of most other ethnic minorities. Even in the two remaining miniature "Multinational Empires," Yugoslavia and Czechoslovakia, the trend is toward the creation of purely national states as sovereign components of these federal republics. In all of East Central Europe, there is only one major national minority left, the Magyars in Romania, numbering almost two million. Their official title in that country is "Romanians of the Magyar tongue," a turn of phrase which nineteenth century nationalists loved to apply to national minorities. Add to this the fact that our century has seen the disappearance of the classical linguae francae of the region -- Latin, German and Greek -- with neither Russian nor English able to fill the gap so far.

Clearly, then, multinationalism is a thing of the past in East Central Europe. Wars, genocide, forced resettlement, repatriation, flight, emigration and

assimilation have led to the virtual consolidation and separation of the national groups of the area.

The Monarchy, the Army, and Assimilation

The rise of national consciousness in East Central Europe dates from the late eighteenth or early nineteenth century. Each national group sought recognition of its political and social leadership by the other nationality groups, or the acceptance of its cultural and political goals and ultimately of its language and identity. In the nineteenth century, these goals were not pursued violently except in 1848-49 and even then on a small scale and inefficiently. It is true that terrible atrocities were committed in the war between Magyars, Croats, Serbs, and Romanians, but nothing like extermination was ever attempted. Louis Kossuth, leader of the Hungarian revolutionaries, and his fellow liberal nationalists, for instance, would have been quite content with the recognition by Hungary's national minorities of Magyar as "the language of diplomacy," i.e. as the language of the bureaucracy, national politics, the judiciary, and higher education. They were quite ready to cede language rights on the local level. Forced resettlement, the supremely efficient weapon of twentieth century governments for solving their minority problems, was recommended only once, by the Polish General Jozef Bem commander of the Hungarian revolutionary forces in Transylvania. Outraged by the stubborn resistance of one of the Habsburg Army's Romanian Border Guards regiments to the Hungarian cause, the Polish commander of the Hungarian army recommended the mass expulsion of the Romanian soldiers and their families from their ancient habitat. But Kossuth indignantly rejected the suggestion.⁴

The Hungarians refusal to engage in the policy of "resettlement" was typical of the relative leniency and decency of the nineteenth century, but even without

such ethical and humanitarian restraints, it would have been most difficult for any East Central European government or group to settle its minority question purely by force. The Habsburg Army as a peacekeeping force guaranteed that no national conflict would degenerate into open warfare, and if there was bloodshed in 1848-49, it was precisely because in that period the multinational Army itself had temporarily fallen victim to national passions.

Besides being the guarantor of peace among the nationalities, the Habsburg Army performed another remarkable function. By its very existence, it slowed the process of assimilation or nationality change. The career soldiers of the Habsburg Army were dispersed haphazardly from one end of the Monarchy to the other; they were rarely allowed to stay in one place for long (more for bureaucratic than for political reasons), and they were expected to be unconditionally loyal to the Ruler, their Commander-in-Chief. Francis Joseph resented nothing more than the manifestation of nationalist sentiments in his beloved officer corps. In reality, nationalism did exist among career officers and non-commissioned officers, but their devotion to the Ruler and to the Regiment -- which was the officers' true fatherland -- easily prevailed over the temptation of nationalism. Even in World War I only a handful of professional officers exchanged the a-national Habsburg cause for the Hungarian, the Czech, the South Slav, or the Romanian cause. Similar dedication to the a-national or, better, anti-nationalist ruling house was demanded of the ordinary soldiers and reservists and most particularly of the reserve officers. When, therefore, we measure the speed and extent of changes of national identity by individuals in the Habsburg Monarchy, we should bear in mind that the Monarchy's most important and prestigious institution, the Army, could not have cared less whether a recruit or reservist was a German, a Slav, a Magyar, or an Italian. What the Army wanted to

know was whether or not he was loyal to the Ruler. Thus, instead of fostering assimilation as did, for instance, the French or Russian army, the Army of the Habsburg Monarchy provided incentives for non-assimilation. This was most conspicuously so for those belonging to the educated classes. A member of this group might have yearned to change his national allegiance from, say, Ukrainian to Polish, in order to obtain a post in the Polish-dominated administration of Austrian Poland, but as a Leutnant der Reserve (a reserve officer), he knew that nationalist flag-waving would be frowned upon by the career officers in his regiment. Social acceptance by the officers, the most prestigious caste in the Monarchy, was often far more desirable than a bureaucratic post.

An attempt was made in the Compromise Agreement of 1867 to weaken legally the multinational character of the Habsburg Army. According to the Agreement, the Hungarian side was to set up a supplementary national army, Honvéd, to be paralleled by a similar "national" force, the Landwehr, on the Austrian side. In practice, both national armies became almost as multinational as the much larger Common Army, for the simple reason that both Austria and Hungary were multinational states. What counted, however, was the fact that there now existed an armed force in the Monarchy whose language of command was not German but Magyar. There was one other important distinction. The Common Army officially recognized the multinational character of its forces by insisting that there be a "Regimental Language" added to the "Language of Command." The latter was German, of course, but the former was the tongue spoken by the majority of soldiers in the regiment. Both languages were to be mastered by the officers and sergeants of the regiment no matter what their own nationality. The Honvéd had no such agreement: there the two languages were the same and if the recruit did not understand Magyar, he was taught the

language, and fast. Thus, at least in theory the Honvéd was a powerful instrument for Magyarization. In practice, however, because of the strenuous opposition of Francis Joseph, the Honvéd always remained relatively small. It also proved itself staunchly loyal to the Austro-Hungarian cause.⁵

Who Assimilated and Why?

All through the nineteenth century, nationalist leaders attempted to win converts, to prevent desertion from their ranks, to increase the authority of their group over other nationalities, and to stop other groups from subjugating their nationality. That changes occurred as a result of all this and that the changes pointed toward the hegemony of a single nationality in any given province was an article of faith among the nationalists. What they disagreed on was whose nationality would win the contest, and they spent at least as much time and energy making dire predictions of inevitable national decline and disaster as in making hopeful prophecies. The changes were real, of course, but the only two peoples deeply affected by them were the Germans and the Jews. The nineteenth century witnessed what one might call the "nationalization" of the Jews in East Central Europe. Early in the nineteenth century only a minority of the Hungarian Jews spoke fluent Magyar. But 1880, 58.5 percent of all Jews indicated Magyar as their mother tongue, and in 1910, 77.8 percent.⁶ It can thus be argued that within a few generations most Hungarian Jews had switched their national identity to Magyar, since in Hungary the mother tongue was understood to imply complete devotion to a nationality. The Jewish community, in its majority "Reformed," strongly encouraged this national identification. Similar developments took place in Galicia, where the change was from Yiddish to Polish, and somewhat later in Bohemia, where many -- although far from all -- Jews adopted Czech nationality. As the Czechs gradually took control of the administration and economy of Bohemia an increasing number of Jews opted for the Czech cause, even while these areas were still under

Habsburg rule. This happened despite the Jewish community's overall cultural and political identification with the Bohemian Germans.⁷ The rule of thumb was simple: the Jews tended to integrate or to assimilate into the dominant nationality in any given province. By dominant nationality, we do not mean, of course, that every single member of that group was able to lord it over the others, but that the educated elite of the group held political power in the province. Such dominant nationalities were the Germans in the Hereditary Provinces (roughly today's Austrian Republic), the Magyars in Hungary, the Croats in Croatia-Slavonia, the Poles in Galicia, and the Italians on the shores of the Adriatic, as well as in the Trentino. The list of dominant nationalities was supplemented by the Czechs in Bohemia after the turn of the century. Jewish assimilation into non-dominant nationalities, no matter how large, such as the Ukrainians in Galicia, the Romanians in Transylvania, the Slovaks in Hungary, and the Slovenes in Austria was very rare indeed. Only after these nationalities had created their own educated elites, and after many had become dominant in the post-World War I successor states, did Jewish assimilation into these groups become less uncommon.

What has been said about the Jews applies to the other national minorities as well, especially to the Germans, who, like the Jews, were without firm roots in East Central Europe. As for other minority nationalities, their rural way of life, their religious commitment, and the nationalist appeal of neighboring mother countries often acted as impediments to their assimilation into a dominant nationality. Still, whereas in 1846, the Ukrainians had made up one half of the population of Galicia, by 1890 they had been reduced to 43.1 percent,⁸ which is small wonder considering the post-1867 political and administrative domination of Galicia by the Polish nationality. Even more dramatic was the change in Hungary where, according to the historians László Katus and Péter Hanák, about 2 million non-Magyars were assimilated into the Magyar nation between 1850 and 1910. Hanák contends that between the 1780's and 1914, from two and a half

to three million non-Magyar inhabitants of the country became Magyars; more than one million of them were Germans, over 700,000 Jews, and 500,000 Slovaks.⁹ As a result, Hungary's Magyar population (not including Croatia-Slavonia) had grown from a bit over 40 percent in the first half of the nineteenth century to 54.4 percent in 1910. Such a statistical change is significant even if one takes into account the vagueness of the term "mother tongue," the possible nationalist bias of the census taker and the fearful attitude of the citizen making his declaration. (In fact, Austro-Hungarian statistics are remarkable for their accuracy and relative objectivity.) Undoubtedly, many people were on the borderline between nationalities. Again according to Péter Hanák, over two million of those in Hungary who in 1910 designated Magyar as their mother tongue also spoke a minority language, and 1.8 million of those who declared themselves non-Magyar also spoke Magyar. Millions must have used one language at home and another at the workplace. In half a million families, husband and wife were of different nationalities.¹⁰

The main sources of Magyar assimilation were, as noted above, the Germans, Jews, and Slovaks. The other nationalities of Hungary -- the Romanians, Serbs, Czechs, and Carpatho-Ukrainians -- yielded fewer "converts." Because the Jews, Germans, and Slovaks were among the more Westernized non-Magyar groups, and were more likely to have been born in or residents of cities, there must have been a definite relationship between assimilation and modernization.

The "Nationalization" of the Cities

Remarkably, despite massive assimilation, the demographic maps of East Central Europe show almost no change in ethnic boundaries until the 1940's. Several factors account for this seeming stability. First, the Jews are not shown as a separate nationality. Second, most ethnic maps only note those ethnic groups with an absolute majority in a given area. Hence, the German presence is shown in far fewer places than

it should be. And most importantly, maps are generally unable to indicate the ethnic composition of the cities. What they show is the situation in rural areas, yet it is the countryside that resists change the longest.

In Hungary or Galicia, where pre-World War I governments made strenuous efforts respectively to Magyarize or Polonize the countryside by means of school reform and other administrative measures, the non-Magyar or non-Polish rural population proved quite immune to such attempts. In fact, the ethnic changes that took place in the Hungarian countryside before World War I were more unfavorable than favorable to the Magyars. In the Liberal Age, i.e. between 1867 and 1918, explains C. A. Macartney, "the Magyars had gained only 261 communes from the non-Magyars, while losing 465 to them. Their chief gains (89) had been at the expense of the Slovaks; their chief losses, to the Romanians and Germans."¹¹ In Transylvania especially, Romanian villagers made some gains over the Magyars, even while under Magyar rule. This development, which greatly alarmed the Magyar leadership and gave rise to a flood of literature on the subject, can only be explained by the growing presence there of an aggressive and economically successful Romanian middle class. Interestingly, ethnic changes did not only occur between Magyars and non-Magyars while under Magyar rule. In Northern Hungary quite a few villages changed their ethnic character from Ukrainian to Slovak between 1867 and 1918. Still, the overall situation remained stable.

But if the ethnic composition of the rural areas did not change substantially, where did the ethnic transformation take place? The answer, obviously, is in the cities, whose ethnic composition began to come into line with that of the surrounding countryside in the nineteenth century. The rural population's "national conquest" of the city is just now coming to completion throughout the region.

Traditionally and historically, the East Central European cities were inhabited by aliens: Germans in Bohemia-Moravia, Slovenia, Hungary and Transylvania, Galicia and

Bukovina; Jews in the latter two provinces; Greeks and Serbs along the Danube in Hungary; Italians in Croatian inhabited Dalmatia and Istria. Of these groups, it was the Germans who predominated in most East Central European cities. Because Jews had traditionally been excluded from most major cities, their immigration into cities such as Vienna, Budapest, and Prague in the nineteenth century was a development of major significance. But as they were not identified as a separate ethnic group, but were usually counted as Germans, their immigration into the cities did not change the statistical situation there or, at most, only briefly confused the issue. Soon after entering the cities, the Jews transformed themselves into Magyars or Poles, unless they remained (or became) Germans, as in Vienna or Prague.

The dramatic ethnic transformation of the East Central European city took place in the nineteenth century with the massive immigration of "natives" from the countryside and the "nationalization" of the city's traditional inhabitants. Consider Prague, which in the early nineteenth century was an almost purely German city, but by 1910 had become an almost purely Czech one with the German and Jewish-German minority reduced to a mere 8.5 percent of the inhabitants!¹² Or the Italian-inhabited Dalmatian cities where, by the last decades of the nineteenth century, the Croats had obtained a majority of the seats in the municipal councils, except in Zara (Zadar)!¹³ Or Budapest, where in 1850 56 percent of the inhabitants were Germans and only 33 percent Magyars, but in 1910 almost 90 percent called themselves Magyars.¹⁴

The Magyarization of Budapest meant more than simply the assimilation of its old-time inhabitants; it also meant the Magyarization of its immigrants. Like all rapidly industrializing cities, Budapest attracted a mass of immigrants: in 1869 only 367 out of every 1000 inhabitants were native to the city; 482 had come from the rest of Hungary, 129 from the non-Hungarian provinces of the Monarchy, and 22 from outside the Monarchy.¹⁵ The new urban arrivals included Jews, Germans, Slovaks,

Czechs, but the majority were, of course, Magyar immigrants from the countryside.

The speed of ethnic change in the Hungarian cities varied according to the speed of industrialization. Some of the old Slovak-inhabited cities of Northwestern Hungary industrialized only slowly and their ethnic composition did not change. On the other hand, Újpest, slightly north of Budapest, changed from a small town of German winegrowers (90%) in 1830 to a bustling industrial city of Magyar-speaking proletarians (90%) in 1900. The immigrants were Jews, Germans, Czechs, and Magyars, but the assimilationist pull of the neighboring metropolis, Budapest, was so great that it quickly transformed almost all of the new arrivals into Magyars.¹⁶

Even more interesting were those cities which changed their ethnicity twice. The Northeastern Hungarian city of Kassa (Kaschau, Košice), for example, changed from German to Magyar to Slovak predominance in one-and-half centuries. The Transylvanian capital Kolozsvár (Klausenburg, Cluj-Napoca) underwent a similar transformation, although its Magyar element is still very strong. The ethnic composition of the cities reflected the dual impact of industrialization and political sovereignty. Nagyszeben (Hermannstadt, Sibiu), an ancient Saxon city in Transylvania, was 98 percent German in 1720 and only 2 percent Romanian with practically no Magyar inhabitants. Incessant Hungarian efforts to reunite Hungary and Transylvania -- the two belonged to the Hungarian Crown but were governed from Vienna as separate provinces -- finally bore fruit in the mid-nineteenth century and by 1910, in the last Hungarian census, the German population of Nagyszeben was down to 56 percent, the Romanian up to 21 percent, and the Magyar up to 19 percent. Following the Romanian annexation of Transylvania at the end of the First World War, the proportion of Romanians in the city increased rapidly. By 1956, Romanians constituted 65 percent of the population, Germans 31 percent, and Magyars only 4 percent.¹⁷ All this demonstrates clearly the irresistible power of the government bent on nationalizing the

city and disposing of peasant masses eager to work and live in the city. Data on Bratislava (Pressburg, Pozsony), once a German-Magyar-Jewish city and now almost entirely Slovak, or Fiume (Rijeka) in Yugoslavia, once Italian and now Croatian, or Lemberg (Lwow, Lvov, Lviv) in Galicia, once Polish-Jewish-German and now overwhelmingly Ukrainian, Russian, and Uzbek would only belabor the point.

The Chauvinistic City

Central and East Central European nationalism has historically suffered from problems and handicaps barely known in the Western world. Unlike in the West, political and ethnic boundaries almost never coincided; nations were divided into several sovereign states, as were the Germans and the Italians; or they lived under foreign rule, as did the Slovaks of Hungary; or they formed a minority in their own country, as did the Magyars; or they combined several of the above features, as did the Romanians, Croats, and Serbs. East Central European nationalism took its inspiration from Western Europe but it differed radically from the latter. Unlike in the West, nationalism had grown up in protest against an unacceptable state of affairs and it preceded rather than followed social and economic transformation. East Central European nationalism suffered from denominational and cultural divisions (as in the case of the Serbs and Croats), from the painful memory of foreign rule, from nostalgic longing for the often mythical greatness of a distant past, from the alien ethnic composition of the city and sometimes of the entire ruling elite, from the dread of being overwhelmed by more powerful neighbors, and from the humiliation of relative backwardness and poverty. Yet the same Central and East Central European nationalism, whether German, Slavic, Magyar, Romanian, or Italian, became dynamic, expansionist, and generally successful in the course of the nineteenth century.¹⁸

This was the type of nationalism, at once fearful and triumphant, elegiac and truculent, with which the urban immigrant had to contend. Himself, unpolitical and

barely conscious of his own nationality, the immigrant Jew or peasant suffered a steady bombardment of assimilationist propaganda and coercion, often by fellow immigrants who had preceded him into the city. In truth, East Central European nationalism was to a large extent not the creation of the natives but of urban neophytes who sought to display their gratitude to their host nation or hoped, by becoming super-nationalistic, to gain social acceptance by the ruling nobility.

That there were grounds for gratitude is beyond doubt. Merely consider the following set of data. Prior to 1848, Jews were forbidden, at least theoretically, to settle in most Hungarian cities. Then came emancipation, thanks to the efforts of Magyar liberal nationalists, and within a few decades the situation had changed fundamentally. By 1900, one out of every four inhabitants of Budapest, a metropolis of close to one million inhabitants, was Jewish, and so was every other voter. Jews accounted for one-half of Hungary's medical doctors, journalists, and lawyers, and they owned an overwhelming proportion of the country's industry and mines. In the parliament sat 84 deputies of Jewish origin (22 percent of the total) and in the House of Lords, sixteen. By the end of Habsburg rule, the King had ennobled 346 Hungarian Jewish families and raised 26 to baronial rank.¹⁹

The success story of Hungary's German and Slovak urban immigrants, most of whom were peasants, was no less remarkable. Magyars always prided themselves on the fact -- and were roundly criticized for it by such hostile observers as the British journalist R. W. Seton-Watson -- that in multi-national Hungary almost every local official, ministerial bureaucrat and judge (ca. 95%) was a Magyar. Yet as the American-Hungarian political scientist Andrew Janos has recently demonstrated, an analysis of family names shows that at least one-third of these bureaucrats (one-half in the Ministry of Finance) were of non-Magyar origin and that their numbers were steadily increasing from 1890 onward. The same rule applies to parliamentary

deputies.²⁰ Considering that Jews only rarely became bureaucrats, the functionaries of non-Magyar origin must have been mostly of German and Slovak peasant background.

Similar examples could be multiplied for the Monarchy as a whole. Consider, for instance, the successful assimilation of Czech immigrants in Vienna. Still, the assimilationist pull of the Magyar nation was among the strongest in the period before the First World War. The reason for this lay in the attraction of the Magyar gentry and aristocratic way of life which the urban immigrant and nouveau riche industrialist or functionary attempted to imitate albeit in vain. What matters, however, is that the assimilated Jews, Slavs, or Germans in Budapest (or the assimilated Jews, Czechs, or South Slavs in Vienna, etc.) composed songs and wrote romantic poems in the language of their adopted nationality, and "when they founded factories," writes the Hungarian Zoltan Horváth, "they did so 'for the fatherland.'"²¹ There was indeed little difference in this respect between Ernst Lissauer, a German Jew in Vienna who composed the obnoxious "Song of Hate," directed against the enemies of the German nation in 1914 or the young Theodor Herzl, a Hungarian Jewish immigrant in Vienna and a German nationalist, or Jenő Rákosi, a Magyarized German in Budapest who, together with a whole coterie of assimilated Slavs and Germans, made propaganda for a "Hungarian Empire of 30 million Magyars."

Much to the chagrin of the native, landed elites of East Central Europe, the urban immigrants not only created much of the nation's new wealth; they also created much of its nationalist ideology. Paradoxically, therefore, even though it was the countryside that had imposed its nationality on the city, in the end, it was the city which dictated its own style of nationalism to the whole nation.

FOOTNOTES

¹They were, in order of numerical significance (in 1910): Germans 24.2%, Magyars 20.3%, Czechs 13%, Poles 10%, Ukrainians 8.1%, Serbs and Croats (together) 7.6%, Romanians 6.5%, Slovaks 4%, Slovenes 2.5%, Italians 1.6%, and others 2.2%. In 1910, the Monarchy's population totalled 49,458,000.

²The "Austrian Empire" (this was not its official name, nor was "Cisleithania") numbered 28,572,000 inhabitants in 1910, of whom 35% declared themselves to be Germans. Hungary (or "Transleithania") had 20,886,000 inhabitants -- including associated Croatia-Slavonia -- 48.1% of whom stated that their mother tongue was Magyar.

³Austro-Hungarian statistics and those of the so-called Successor States only rarely list Jews as a separate nationality; nor would the great majority of Jews in Hungary, Austria, Czechoslovakia, etc. have considered themselves to be of "Jewish nationality." Jews were commonly counted as Germans, Magyars, Czechs, or Poles, even when their religion and culture were distinctly Jewish and their mother tongue was Yiddish. In fact, Yiddish was commonly counted as German, and so, when a Jew in, say, Galicia, decided to declare himself a Pole by nationality and/or language, he was removing himself statistically not from the Jewish nationality but from the German. The same does not quite apply to the enormous number of Jews in Hungary who changed their nationality from "German" to Magyar in the course of the nineteenth century. Some of these Jews originally spoke German, others spoke Yiddish. All this does not mean that Jews were hard to identify in East Central Europe. Only a minority of the most assimilated went sometimes unrecognized or, at least, did not admit to being of Jewish origin. The proportion of Jews who were able to "pass" was probably highest in Hungary, somewhat less in Austria and Bohemia, and lowest in Poland and Romania.

⁴For a brief English-language summary of this episode, see Istvan Deak, The Lawful Revolution; Louis Kossuth and the Hungarians, 1848-1849 (New York: University Press, 1979), p. 272.

⁵On the nationality question in the Habsburg army, see, among other, Gunter A. Rothenberg, The Army of Francis Joseph (West Lafayette, Ind.: Purdue University Press, 1976) and, The Military Border in Croatia, 1740-1881 (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1966). On the crisis in the Army in 1848-1849, see Alan Sked, The Survival of the Habsburg Empire: Radetzky, the Imperial Army, and the Class War, 1848 (London and New York: Longman, 1979), and Istvan Deak, "An Army Divided: The Loyalty Crisis of the Habsburg Officer Corps in 1848-1849," Jahrbuch des Instituts für Deutsche Geschichte, Universität Tel-Aviv, VIII, 1979, pp. 208-241.

⁶Andrew C. Janos, The Politics of Backwardness in Hungary, 1825-1945 (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1982), p. 117.

⁷See Gary B. Cohen, The Politics of Ethnic Survival: Germans in Prague, 1861-1914 (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1981), p. 273, et passim.

⁸See C. A. Macartney, The Habsburg Empire, 1790-1918 (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1969), p. 649.

⁹See László Katus, "A népesedés es társadalmi szerkezet változásai," in Endre Kovács (ed.), Magyarország története, 1848-1890 (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1979), p. 1151; and Péter Hanák, "Magyarország társadalmi szerkezete a századforduló idején," in P. Hanák, (ed.), Magyarország története, 1890-1918 (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1978), pp. 416-417.

¹⁰Ibid., p. 419.

¹¹Macartney, The Habsburg Empire, pp. 726-727.

¹²Ibid., pp. 643-644.

¹³Ibid., p. 646.

¹⁴Hanák, p. 417.

¹⁵Károly Vörös, Egy világváros születése (Budapest: Kossuth, 1973), p. 65.

¹⁶Hanák, p. 417.

¹⁷Ernst Wagner, Historisch-Statistisches Ortsnamenbuch für Siebenbürgen (Köln-Wien: Böhlau-Verlag, 1977), p. 76.

¹⁸For a fine survey of East Central European nationalism, see Peter F. Sugar, "External and Domestic Roots of Eastern European Nationalism," in P. F. Sugar and Ivo J. Lederer (eds.), Nationalism in Eastern Europe (Seattle and London: University of Washington Press, 1969), pp. 3-54.

¹⁹Janos, p. 117, et passim.

²⁰Janos, p. 112.

²¹Zoltan Horvath, A magyar századforduló (Budapest: Kossuth, 1961), p. 56.