

that Joseph's brand of toleration was preserved only because Francis stopped its progress, ossified it, and gave far greater attention to the security of the state church.

PAUL W. SCHROEDER
University of Illinois, Urbana

DER ÖSTERREICHISCH-UNGARISCHE AUSGLEICH 1867: MATERI-ALIEN (REFERATE UND DISKUSSION) DER INTERNATIONALEN KONFERENZ IN BRATISLAVA 28. 8.—1. 9. 1967. Edited by *Anton Vantuch*. Bratislava: Vydavateľ'stvo Slovenskej akadémie vied, 1971. 1,076 pp. Kčs. 120.

The international conference which met in Bratislava in the late summer of 1967 to evaluate the Ausgleich of 1867 concentrated on five major themes: a retrospective assessment of its origins and significance, the reaction of great and small powers to its rather swift evolution, the social, economic, and constitutional problems of the period, the effects of the compromise upon the nationalities of the Habsburg domain, and a consideration of alternative federalistic programs. Predictably, the papers dealing with the attitudes of the peoples of the empire toward Dualism make up the larger part of the deliberations. Closing summaries were in agreement that much still needs to be done in investigating economic history, the role of the churches and political parties, the activities of the diets in the Austrian realm, German Austrian and Magyar liberalism, social structure, and education. György Ránki aptly warns, "We may be in danger of approaching our subject in too general a manner and of repeating facts well known to all without making any real progress" (p. 1045). Amid the repetitions, however, there is much of essential interest to students of Central and East European history.

Robert A. Kann's contribution insists upon judging the compromise according to the purposes of its creators, who wished to preserve the monarchy's position as a great power and to yield to an absolute minimum of social change. The ruling powers in Vienna and Budapest felt they were securing the necessary military muscle at a cost of granting limited constitutional liberties and of some decentralization of executive power. If Hungary suffered economic disabilities as a result, it was the upper bourgeoisie who paid the bill, not the magnates and gentry. As for a federalistic settlement, Kann obviously feels that the economic interests of the dominant classes were a colossal barrier to ethnic solutions before or after 1867. The same classes recognized in the alliance with the German Empire the best way to preserve their power. The renewed life which the alliance guaranteed Austria-Hungary permitted a minimum of national and constitutional protection in Austria and "did not entirely preclude the possibility of similar developments in Hungary" (p. 44).

Fran Zwitter in similar vein accents the conclusions of the German Austrian bureaucracy and of its sometime foes, the German Austrian Liberals, that a settlement with the Magyars was necessary to defend Germanism in Austria. Again, the elaboration of the thesis that provinces had an historic individuality persuaded Bohemian and Galician aristocrats that an agreement with their fellow nobles in Hungary would prevent the formation of ethnic unities that might bring on total dissolution. Deák's distaste for revolutionary solutions and his insistence upon one Hungarian citizenship, with territorial autonomy for Croatia, was the final determining factor.

Ránki is concerned that such emphases on the intentions and zeal of the prota-

gonists and creators of the compromise would slight "the objective elements in the historical process" (p. 1044). For him the historical determinants of the agreement were the problems raised by the revolution of 1848–49 and the bourgeois transformations which took place during that period. The Ausgleich was a form of the capitalist transformation of East Central Europe, and it was closely attended by the nationality question.

Conferees at symposia of this kind usually develop a specific topic that is suggested or offer the fruits of recent thought and research. Consequently there was no full debate of the positions mentioned above. Most of the contributions are of a high quality, and few fail to offer material to illuminate the complexities of passing judgment on the origins and significance of the events of 1867.

Július Mésároš offers a valuable statistical analysis of educational developments in both realms to stress the increasing opportunities for the non-Germans of Austria and the general deterioration of such chances for the non-Magyars of Hungary, with the exception of the Rumanians. Several participants suggested that he intensify his investigations by checking the contents of the textbooks employed and by distinguishing between public schools and those maintained by avowedly national educational associations. Erwin Melichar also provides worthwhile new material in a survey of decisions made by the Austrian Reichsgericht to carry out the spirit of article 19 of the *Staatsgrundgesetz*. He concludes that all but a few of the verdicts enhanced the rights of each *Volksstamm*, probably because the jurists regarded that article as immediately applicable, requiring no expository legislation. Hans Mommsen's paper on the effect of the Ausgleich on Austrian constitutionalism implies that such rulings ultimately were in vain, for the bargain struck in 1867 was a decisive factor in preventing the development of a functioning parliamentary system in Cisleithania. The non-Germans continued to accept decennial arrangements only in return for concessions. Taaffe, Badeni, and Beck were prisoners of a situation in which the strivings of the nationalities were the logical "illegitimate offspring" of the German-Magyar agreement.

Jan Havránek, Joseph F. Zacek, and Valentin Urfus ably describe the attitudes of Palacký, Rieger, and the high aristocracy of Bohemia to the crisis of the 1860s. With justice, however, Suzanne Konirsh challenged Urfus's claim, reinforced by Havránek, that the "Czech Declaration" of 1867 met with the spontaneous approval of the entire Czech people. Convincing social studies of all the empire's classes and lands are still lacking. Peter Sugar assesses with authority the reactions of the Croats, Rumanians, and Slovaks, and Vasilij Krestić does equally well by the Croat-Hungarian agreement of 1868.

By quoting a phrase from Stephen Fischer-Galati's Bloomington paper of 1966 (*Austrian History Yearbook*, vol. 3, pt. 2, p. 445), Joachim Remak almost enkindled a new debate over general Rumanian attitudes toward life under Francis Joseph. The exchanges were restrained, however, and a livelier series of objections followed papers by Remak and Fischer-Galati which provocatively asked if the empire truly was a doomed proposition.

Thanks to the large number of contributors (over forty) and to the fact that nationalities other than the German Austrians and Magyars are comprehensively treated, this collection is more satisfactory than the results of the symposia held in Graz in 1967 and 1968 published as *Österreich-Ungarn, 1867–1967* (Vienna, 1970).

WILLIAM A. JENKS
Washington and Lee University