

The Nationalist Movements of the Austrian Slavs in 1848: A Comparative Sociological Profile

by Stanley Z. PECH*

The year 1848 was unlike any other in the long and arduous saga of the Austrian Slavs. It was a year when the Austrian Slavs, like the rest of Europe, passed through a major social and political upheaval. However, the year held for them a very special significance: in 1848 they first emerged, as fledgling nations, from the backwater of Europe to stake out a claim for themselves as rightful members of the European family. As William H. Stiles, the United States chargé d'affaires in Vienna at the time put it: "Previous to that period," the Austrian Slavs possessed "no proper individuality, their political nationality was unacknowledged, and for centuries, consequently, they exercised no influence in the political councils of Europe. The storms of 1848 and 1849 raised them to consideration, and even power."¹ In recent years, Western historians have been diligent enough in providing the Western reader with the essential facts concerning the revolutions of 1848 in the Austrian Slavic realm. There is indeed ample material for a good copy: the fever of the March Days, the clashes and recriminations between Germans and Slavs, and Magyars and Slavs; the fervent preachments of the highpriests of the various Slavic nationalisms; the Slavic Congress in Prague flaring up into an uprising and aborted by the artillery of General Windischgrätz. These are the high points of the revolutions essential to an understanding of the events of that year. However, this understanding now needs to be broadened and refined in the light of new techniques and methodologies developed in the West. There is need for a structural analysis of the Slavic nationalist movements of 1848. There is the added potential benefit to be derived from cross-national comparisons to which these movements lend themselves. The present account seeks to construct a social profile of the Slavic nationalist movements of 1848 and to analyse and compare their strength.

I

In the mid-nineteenth century, the Austrian Empire counted seven Slavic nationalities in its multi-ethnic structure: Czechs, Slovaks, Slovenes, Croats, Serbs, Poles, and Ukrainians. The last three will not be treated here. For them the Austrian Empire was not the principal homeland: a majority of Ukrainians and Poles lived under Russia (a number of Poles also lived under Prussia), and a majority of Serbs under Turkey. This makes comparisons involving them problematical. Czechs, Slovaks, Slo-

* Department of History, University of British Columbia

¹ W.H. STILES, *Austria in 1848-49* (New York: 1852), 388.

venes, and Croats, on the other hand, were not so divided; they has no "home" other than the Austrian Empire. Their basic comparability derives from the following: 1) they experienced a revolution in 1848; 2) they lived under the same empire; 3) they were Slavic and shared the status of "subject" nationalities living under "alien" rule: the Czechs and the Slovenes under the Austro-Germans in the western half of the empire, and the Slovaks and the Croats under the Magyars in the eastern half of the empire; 4) they were passing through early stages of national awakening.

The largest of the four national groups were the Czechs who numbered, in the middle of the nineteenth century, approximately 4 million. The number of Slovaks in the same period was 1.7 million, that of the Croats 1.6 million, and that of the Slovenes a little over 1 million.² The total population of the Austrian Empire is estimated to have been 37 million,³ with the Austro-Germans the largest nationality (over 7 million) and the Magyars the second largest (4.5 million).⁴ The revolutionary stresses that brought on the upheaval in 1848 had been accentuated by the demographic pressures of the half-century preceding the upheaval. Since the beginning of the nineteenth century, the population of the empire had been increasing steadily — by 1850 the increase had amounted to one third as against the year 1800, a rate comparable to the other large states of Western Europe.⁵ While it is difficult to separate the growth rates for the different peoples of the empire, this much can be hypothesized from the evidence: the rate of growth of the Slavs was greater than that of the non-Slavs.⁶ In religious affiliation, Czechs, Slovenes, and Croats were at least 95% Roman Catholic. Roman Catholicism was also dominant among the Slovaks but there it was confronted with a numerically strong Protestant population (between 25% and 30%).⁷

The fact that the four nationalities being surveyed here had evolved through centuries as "subject" nationalities imparted to their social structures certain distinctive features — features that set them apart from Western Europe and left a special mark on their development as modernizing societies. The West European model, with France and Germany as a typical example, exhibited a social structure that was unencumbered (small exceptions aside) by the complicating presence of a different nationality: peasants, nobles, workers, entrepreneurs, bureaucrats, priests, bishops, all spoke the same language and belonged to the same nationality. This comfortable ethnic homogeneity was lacking among most of the Austrian Slavs. To generalize: the four nationalities had an "incomplete" social

² For the figures for Czechs, Slovaks and Slovenes, see the tables in Fran ZWITTER et al., *Nacionalni problemi v Habsburški Monarhiji* (Ljubljana: 1962), 212-219. For Croats, see the article "Hrvati" in *Enciklopedija Jugoslavije*, Vol. 4, p. 58.

³ *Uebersichts-Tafeln zur Statistik der österreichischen Monarchie* (Special Reprint of Fascicle X and XI of *Statistische Mittheilungen*, Vienna: 1850), 1.

⁴ ZWITTER, *op. cit.*, 216, 219.

⁵ George FASEL, *Europe in Upheaval: The Revolutions of 1848* (Chicago: 1970), 4.

⁶ Johann SPRINGER, *Statistik des österreichischen Kaiserstaates*, Vol. 1 (Vienna: 1840), 98.

⁷ *Slovenska jar: Sloveňsk povstanie 1848-49*, ed. by JÁN SLOBODA (Bratislava: 1971), 40, estimates the Slovak Protestants at one third.

structure; the lower portions of their social pyramid were Slavic while the upper portions were filled with members of the ruling nationality. How did the socio-ethnic edifice look in the specific cases? In the western half of the empire, the Czechs and the Slovenes each had their own peasantry, working class, artisanate, shopkeeper class, intelligentsia, lower clergy and lower bureaucracy. At the same time, their complementing higher classes, the nobility, the entrepreneurs and the higher bureaucracy, were German. The one point of difference between the Czechs and the Slovenes concerned the ecclesiastical hierarchy: in the Czech regions the hierarchy was entirely German whereas in the Slovene regions an influential segment of it was Slovene. This difference explains, in part, the divergent religious attitudes of the two peoples during the next century: the Czechs tended to embrace religious scepticism whereas the Slovenes evinced a vigorous religious spirit and lent strong support to movements of political Catholicism.

In the eastern half of the empire, the structure was more complicated. The Slovaks occupied the lower portions of the social pyramid, but the upper portions included, besides the Germans, also the Magyars. The Croats, on the other hand, held a position significantly different from the other three national groups. Of the four nationalities, they alone retained, in part, their own governing class: a segment of the nobility, of higher clergy and of higher bureaucracy in Croatia belonged to the Croatian nationality; the remaining segment was Magyar (or Magyar-oriented Croat) or German. The fact that the Croats retained a substantial foothold in the governing class gave them an advantage not enjoyed by the other three national groups: in the pre-industrial age when the nobility alone counted as a political class, they had at all times a political voice. They had never been reduced to a mere "nation of peasants." In that sense, they were the only one of the four groups that approximated the West European model of social development.

The Austrian Empire was not only a labyrinth of seemingly disarrayed social and ethnic parts. It also was a bewildering conglomerate of provinces and administrative divisions that disarrayed the ethnic parts still further. The existing administrative system had taken shape during the pre-nationalist age and bore no relationship to ethnic boundaries. As a result, not only did some nationality sometimes inhabit two or more provinces but it often shared each such province with a different nationality. Little useful purpose would be served by listing all the administrative divisions with their particular ethnic mosaics. Suffice it to say that for each nationality, one province usually stood out as a core of nationalist activism and attention will be focused on these. For the Czechs, this was the province of Bohemia which the Czechs shared with the Germans, the Czech-German ethnic ratio being 60% to 40%.⁸ For the Slovenes, it was Carniola which was over 90% Slovene, the Germans making up the balance.⁹ For

⁸ See the table in ZWITTER, *op. cit.*, 215.

⁹ Bogo GRAFENAUER, *Zgodovina slovenskega naroda*, Vol. 5 (Ljubljana: 1962), 172.

the Croats, it was Croatia (full name "Croatia-Slavonia") in which the Slavs comprised over 95% of the population (two thirds of which were Croats and one third Serbs) while the ruling Magyars and Germans together did not exceed 2%; certain other small groups accounted for the remainder.¹⁰ Croatia, it should be stressed, possessed a number of self-governing institutions in which the Croatian nobility, clergy and bureaucracy wielded considerable influence which helped cushion the German-Magyar rule. It even had an army which though subordinated directly to the emperor, was nevertheless an important symbol of Croatian national identity. In short, these social and institutional paraphernalia provided the Croats with defences and opportunities not available to the other Slavs. This made it possible for them, in the course of 1848, to wrest political control entirely from the Magyars and Germans and erect what amounted to their own state with its own government that recognized only the authority of the emperor in Vienna. None of the other three nationalities came close to generating this type of institutional power. In this connection, it may be noted that the people who exercised the least power from the institutional point of view were the Slovaks. They had been totally submerged through centuries in the existing Hungarian system of counties and no part of the Slovak territory enjoyed the status of a province. The Slovak territory was reasonably compact in ethnic terms but had no institutional support to lend it distinctiveness and distinguish it from the other areas of Hungary. This made the Slovaks the most vulnerable and the least visible of the four peoples.

After the Congress of Vienna, the Austrian Empire entered upon the first stages of industrialization. There were, however, marked regional disparities in the tempo with which industrialization proceeded, with the western half of the monarchy moving ahead more rapidly than the eastern half. Among the Slavic peoples, by the middle of the nineteenth century, only the Czechs had made significant advances along the road of modernization. By 1857, the agrarian sector in Bohemia had been reduced to the point where only some 55% of the population derived their livelihood from agriculture.¹¹ The above figure applies to all of Bohemia (both to its Czech and German-speaking areas); and it is not possible to say exactly what it would be for the Czech inhabitants specifically. However, it is known that the German-speaking areas of Bohemia were by far the more industrialized¹² and this would justify revising the figure, as applied to the Czechs, upward: 65% to 70% seems a more realistic estimate. At this same time, the agrarian sector in the three other Austro-Slavic regions

¹⁰ I. KARAMAN, "Ekonomске prilike u vrijeme hrvatskog narodnog preporoda," *Kolo*, New Series, Vol. 4 (1966), Nos. 8-10, p. 181.

¹¹ K. NOVOTNÝ and M. MYSKA, eds., *První kroky k vítězství* (Prague: 1966), 10.

¹² For the historical development of the ethnic regions of Bohemia, see the map in *Československá vlastiveda*, Part II, *Dejiny*. Vol. 2 (Prague: 1969), following p. 80. Compare with this the map depicting the industrial development of Bohemia before 1848, in *Atlas československých dějin* (Prague: 1965). No. 17 a.

continued to employ 90% or more of the economically active population.¹³ The economic growth was reflected in the expansion of the urban population, with similar regional disparities prevailing in the degree of urbanization attained. In the middle of the nineteenth century, the proportion of the urban population in Bohemia was just under 20%;¹⁴ for the Czech-speaking population of Bohemia this figure would have to be revised downward to some extent, perhaps to 15%. The Slovenes had at this same time an urban population of 4%¹⁵ while for the Slovaks and the Croats the figure was even less. (France had then an urban population of 26% and Germany 35%.)¹⁶ The major cities were few and not even their rapid expansion during the first half of the nineteenth century — some cities doubled in size during this period — had produced many large urban centres by West European standards. The largest one was Prague, the most populous Czech city and the capital of Bohemia. With a population of 118,000 in the middle of the nineteenth century (77,000 in 1800),¹⁷ it was the only city in the four ethnic regions to attain the 100,000 mark, an achievement placing it in a class with the major cities of Western Europe. The largest Croatian city was Zagreb, the capital of Croatia, with a population of 15,000¹⁸ (8,000 at the beginning of the century)¹⁹ and the largest Slovene city was Ljubljana (Laibach), the capital of Carniola, with a population of 17,000 (it was half this size in 1817).²⁰ The biggest city in what is today the Slovak ethnic region was Bratislava (Pressburg) which had a population, in 1848, of 40,000 (in 1805 it had been just under 22,000).²¹ However, Bratislava was then not a Slovak city in any meaningful sense of the term; the majority of its inhabitants were German and it was not the scene of any mass Slovak nationalist activity in 1848.²² The case of Bratislava was far from unique: many cities and towns throughout the Slavic regions of the Austrian Empire contained a large number of Germans, and sizeable

¹³ In Croatia as late as 1880 (the earliest year for which accurate statistics are available), 84.64% of the population derived their livelihood from agriculture; see *Enciklopedija Jugoslavije*, Vol. 4, article "Hrvatska," p. 196. For the Slovenes, the estimate for the middle of the nineteenth century is 89%; see article "Slovenija," *Enciklopedija Jugoslavije*, Vol. 7, 353. Much the same picture emerges for the Slovaks, from *Slovenská jar*, *op. cit.* 34.

¹⁴ See GRAFENAUER, *op. cit.*, 154.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*

¹⁶ J. GODECHOT, *Les Révolutions de 1848* (Paris: 1971), 90.

¹⁷ L. KÁRNÍKOVÁ, *Vyvoj obyvatelstva v českých zemích 1754-1914* (Prague: 1965), 105.

¹⁸ *Uebersichtstafeln zur Statistik*, *op. cit.*, 3.

¹⁹ F. SISIĆ, *Hrvatska Povijest*, Vol. 3 (Zagreb: 1913), 7.

²⁰ *Uebersichtstafeln zur Statistik*, *op. cit.*, 3. I. CHURKINA, "O nekotorykh osobennostiakh formirovaniia slovenskoi natsii," *Sovetskoe slavianovedenie*, No. 2, 1968, p. 16.

²¹ *Uebersichtstafeln zur Statistik*, *op. cit.*, 3, *Dejiny Slovenska*, ed. by L. HOLOTIK, Vol. 1 (Bratislava: 1961), 435. — For the overall economic trends in Eastern Europe, see I. T. BEREND and G. RANKI, *Economic Development in East-Central Europe in the 19th and 20th Centuries* (translation from the Hungarian) (New York and London: 1974).

²² In 1850, the ethnic composition of the population of Bratislava was as follows: Germans 70.6%, Jews 12.9%, Slovaks 10.09%, Magyars 6.18%, others 0.23%. See I. HOUDEK, "Bratislava v revolučných rokoch 1848-1849," *Acta Musei Civitatis Bratislavenensis: Bratislava*, Vol. 5 (1969), 169.

German minorities were to be found in Prague, Ljubljana and Zagreb.²³ Economic power in the cities and indeed throughout the monarchy was largely in the hands of Germans and German Jews. Germans typically constituted the urban élite which controlled municipal administrations and in general exercised a decisive influence over the Slavic substratum.

The demographic development of Prague, as the largest metropolis, deserves a special comment. Although the city grew more or less steadily after the year 1800, the really important demographic transformation was not the growth itself, but the increasing proportion of newcomers who moved into the city from the surrounding countryside. In the first two decades of the nineteenth century, the proportion of these newcomers remained relatively stable — hovering near 6% of the total population. A change set in during the 1820s: the proportion of newcomers began to increase markedly, from 6.3% in 1818, to 15% in 1826, to 36.3% in 1834, and finally to 48.9% in 1850.²⁴ This meant that by the middle of the century nearly one half of the Prague population consisted of people who had severed their previous roots and come to the city in search of a new life. The mass of newcomers was Czech. They found work in the new textile and machine industries founded during the 1830s and 1840s, and in other forms of employment. Textile workers, about a thousand strong, became the largest distinctive group of the labour force in the capital city. Their rioting in 1844 announced the advent of an industrial age in Bohemia and attracted the attention of Europe, its effect reinforced by the rioting at almost the same time of Prague workers employed on the construction of a new railway.²⁵ One of the consequences of the influx of newcomers was to augment the Czech-speaking substratum in a city governed by the German élite. All this provided a setting calculated to raise the social and political fever of the capital city and goes far toward explaining the intensity of the upheaval that swept Prague during 1848.

The other three cities mentioned above were drawn less precipitously into the vortex of social and economic change. Zagreb may serve as an example of a city standing at the opposite pole of the socio-economic spectrum from Prague. Although its size had almost doubled in the half-century before 1848, the city had not acquired an industrial face in the process. In 1808, nearly 40% of its population consisted of nobles and clergy (!) and by 1848 these two groups, along with the intelligentsia, still accounted for one half of the total number of inhabitants.²⁶ City life in Zagreb, and in the eastern half of the empire as a whole, retained essentially a pre-industrial character as late as 1848. What passed for a town in the eastern half of the empire was different from what it was understood to be in the western half and in Western Europe. As one contemporary

²³ No reliable ethnic statistics exist for these three cities for the middle of the nineteenth century and the available estimates differ so widely that it is unprofitable to reproduce them here. As a rule, German historians claim a larger share of German inhabitants for each city than do the Slavic historians.

²⁴ KÁRNÍKOVÁ, *op. cit.*, 105.

²⁵ J. JNÁČEK, ed., *Dějiny Prahy* (Prague: 1964), 432-433.

²⁶ I. I. LESHCHILOVSKAIA, *Illirizm* (Moscow: 1968), 94.

observer described the town scene in the eastern half of the empire just on the eve of 1848: not only the small towns but also the larger cities there "consisted of nothing but settlements of ploughmen, vinegrowers, and shepherds in which respect they did not differ at all from the villages."²⁷ It is startling to realize that at the time of the outbreak of the 1848 revolution, Croatia — and also Slovakia — had not yet acquired a single mile of railroad.

II

How strong were the nationalist movements to which these structures gave rise and which broke into the open during the years 1848-1849, complete with leaders and programs? The nationalist movements of 1848 were the culminating point of the preceding half-century of "national awakening." This development had of course proceeded at a different pace in the case of the various peoples and by 1848 each movement had attained a different level of strength. How can this strength be measured? How did the movements compare in their ability to mobilize supporters? It is generally agreed that to be effective a movement requires "some kind of organization that enables certain persons to act as authorized spokesmen and representatives. This can take the form of committees, clubs, labour unions, or political parties".²⁸ Such clubs consist of individuals with the highest degree of commitment to a movement's objectives. In our context, organizations with such a commitment were the pre-March patriotic societies that had come into being during the 1830s and 1840s. The Czechs, the Croats and the Slovaks each had one such society: they were, respectively, the Czech Foundation (*Ceska Matice*, founded in 1832), the Croatian Foundation (*Matica Hrvatska*, 1842) and *Tatrin* (1844). These were nationalist societies comprising the highest echelon of nationalist élites. Although independent of each other, they had similar organizational structures and pursued identical objectives: to promote the native language and culture, and to foster the publication of books and newspapers in that language. With this comparability in mind, we can use the numerical strength of these societies as a comparative index of the strength with which the three nationalist movements entered upon the year 1848. On the eve of 1848, the Czech Foundation had a membership of 2329 (for the year 1847),²⁹ the Croatian Foundation 300³⁰ (for 1844, the last pre-1848 year available) and *Tatrin* (80 (1847)).³¹ Measured against the total population of each nationality as given earlier, this yields the ratio of 5.8

²⁷ Quoted in R.A. AVERBUKH, *Revoliutsiia i natsionalno-osvoboditelnaia borba v Vengrii 1848-1849* (Moscow: 1965), 5.

²⁸ "Social Movements," in *International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*, Vol. 14, p. 441.

²⁹ *Přehled československých dějin*, Vol. 1 (Prague: 1958), 688.

³⁰ J. RAVLIĆ, *Matica Hrvatska 1842-1962* (Zagreb: 1963), 40.

³¹ D. RAPANT, *Tatrin* (Martin, 1950), 11-12. For the patriotic societies of the various Slavic groups, see S.B. KIMBALL, *The Austro-Slav Revival: A Study of Nineteenth-Century Literary Foundations*, in *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society*, New Series, LXIII, Part 4 (Philadelphia: 1973).

per 10,000 for the Czech national movement, 1.9 per 10,000 for the Croatian, and a low 0.5 per 10,000 for the Slovak. It may be added that the membership in all three societies was growing.³² Evidently, the nationalist movements had acquired a momentum of their own, adding their weight to the forces that precipitated the collapse of absolutism in March 1848. The revolutions of 1848 may not have been inevitable but the forces that produced them had been unmistakably at work.

The Slovenes lacked a patriotic society before 1848 and consequently we cannot measure the strength of the Slovene movement on a basis strictly comparable with the other three. It may be assumed, however, that the absence of a patriotic society is itself evidence of a sort: it suggests the existence of a less developed nationalist movement. Nevertheless, the Slovenes were not without visible manifestations of progress on the nationalist front. Their patriots established a foothold in the Agricultural Society of Carniola, an organization of long standing. This was not a Slovene patriotic society for it counted both Germans and Slovenes among its members and its avowed purpose was improvement of agriculture, not promotion of Slovene nationalism. However, in 1842 the society appointed a moderate Slovene nationalist, Dr Janez Bleiweis, as its new secretary, and under him Slovene nationalist forces found elbow room within the society's framework. The success of the first modern Slovene newspaper, *Novice*, which Bleiweis launched in 1843 under the auspices of the society, afforded proof that Slovene nationalism was on the rise.³³ Still, the absence of a genuine patriotic society was a serious drawback; it meant that the Slovene élite entered upon the year 1848 with little organizational contact, strength and experience. In this it resembled the Slovak élite whose *Tatrin* offered too feeble a basis when the need for action arose. The Slovene and the Slovak élites were the weaker members in the group, the Czech and the Croatian ones the stronger. This distribution of pre-1848 strength corresponds, in fact, very closely to the performance of these nationalist movements during the year 1848.

What about the social hue of the elites? The membership rosters of the three patriotic societies contain occupational data that permit us to make cross-national comparisons. For the Slovenes, we must again resort to substitute material which furnishes a basis for an informed estimate. Surveying all four élites, one can perceive two social groups playing a dominant role: the intelligentsia and the lower clergy. The intelligentsia, as defined here, includes teachers, officials, writers, students, and professionals. The term clergy refers to both Roman Catholic and Protestant clergymen. The latter were numerically strong only in the Slovak élite. In the other three élites, the clergy was, with few exceptions, Roman Catholic.

³² The number of members of the Czech Foundation grew from 35 in 1832 to over 500 in 1839, to 2329 in 1847; see *Prehled československých dejin*, *op. cit.*, 688. *Tatrin* expanded from 23 in 1844 to 80 in 1847; see RAPANT, *op. cit.*, 12, who says that the membership lists were not always accurate. The Croatian Foundation expanded from 158 members in 1842 to 300 in 1844 (figures for the later pre-March years are not available); see RAVLIC, *op. cit.*, 34, 40.

³³ J. BLEIWEIS, *Zgodovina C.K. krajske kmetijske družbe* (Ljubljana: 1855), 11.

While it is true that the intelligentsia and the clergy were prominent in all four élites, their weight varied from case to case. From the material at our disposal it is evident that the intelligentsia had a larger share in the Czech and Croatian élites, while the clergy had a larger share in the Slovene and Slovak élites. The proportion of the intelligentsia and the clergy in the three patriotic societies was, respectively: 54% and 29% in the Czech,³⁴ 52% and 20% in the Croatian³⁵ and 30% and 59% in the Slovak society.³⁶ It is noteworthy that businessmen and other groups ranked after the intelligentsia and the clergy. The peasants as might be expected were hardly significant. The dominant role of the clergy in the Slovene élite can be gleaned from the list of subscribers to the above-mentioned newspaper *Novice*. Although *Novice* was intended to be a peasant newspaper, the peasants constituted only a small minority of its subscribers; nearly half of the subscribers (in 1847) were nationalist clergymen!³⁷ The influence of the clergy was noted by a Slovene historian of the last century; in relating the origins of the nationalist movement he observed that "The number of conscious (Slovene) patriots outside the ranks of the clergy was small."³⁸

The role of the nobility was important only in the Croatian élite. Its proportion in the Croatian Foundation was 7%, as compared with 1.5% in the Czech Foundation and zero in the Slovak *Tatrin*.³⁹ There were, to be sure, influential individual nobles active also in the Czech nationalist movement in its earliest stages. However, they were, as a rule, German-speaking "Bohemian patriots" who sympathized with the Czech movement without identifying themselves with the Czech nationalism. They were friendly outsiders "looking in" and withdrew from the movement in proportion as that movement acquired a clearly Czech nationalist stamp. The role of the nobility in the Croatian movement was completely different. Far from being outsiders looking in, they were anchored squarely in the very heart of the nationalist movement at all times, helping to give it shape and direction in a manner in which the Czech nobility never did. The Croatian élite, it should be pointed out, had an added feature all of its own; this consisted in a peculiar collaboration between the nobles and the intelligentsia. It was almost routine practice for the Croatian nobles who had the right to sit in pre-1848 county assemblies to allow themselves

³⁴ M. HROCH, *Die Vorkämpfer der nationalen Bewegung bei den Kleinen Völkern Europas* (Prague: 1968), 44. The percentages refer to the situation as it was in 1847.

³⁵ I have computed these percentages from a membership list containing occupational data, as reproduced in RAVLIĆ, *op. cit.*, 260-263. The Croatian Foundation was a successor to the so-called Illyrian Reading Room and the above list gives the names of members, 217 in all, of that reading room, for the year 1838-1839. It is the only extant list that contains occupational data and can give us an indication of the social structure of the Croatian Foundation.

³⁶ Computed from a list given in RAPANT, *op. cit.*, 12.

³⁷ In 1847 the total number of subscribers was 1522 of whom 230 were peasants and 689 clergymen. See GRAFENAUER, *op. cit.*, Vol. 5, 165.

³⁸ J. APIH, "Die Slovenen und die Märzbewegung von 1848," *Österreichisches Jahrbuch*, XIV (1890), 93.

³⁹ See Notes 34, 35, 36.

to be represented by members of the nationalist intelligentsia.⁴⁰ This gave the intelligentsia considerable influence over and above its numerical strength, but there was a reverse side to the coin: the intelligentsia fell into a state of dependence upon the nobles to some extent and acted as a conduit for noble influence.

A particular reference should be made at this point to the Slovak élite and to the problem that bedevilled the relationship between its members: the religious problem. Perhaps half of the clergymen in the Slovak patriotic society were Protestant (Lutheran), the remainder were Roman Catholic.⁴¹ Protestants, however, had acquired a commanding position during the years preceding 1848. Moreover, Protestants and Catholics were divided not only by religious convictions — which would have been serious enough to jeopardize the movement — but also by different attitudes regarding the conception of Slovak nationhood and literary language. The chasm separating the two religious groups proved difficult to bridge and Roman Catholics treated the Protestant initiatives with the greatest reserve. This was bound to have a damaging effect on Slovak efforts; how damaging, the events of 1848 were to bear out only too painfully. This added to the vulnerability of a nationalist movement that had already been rendered vulnerable on other counts. The Slovaks were the only one of the four nationalities that entered the year 1848 with a seriously disunited élite.

The élites as organized in the patriotic societies comprised the most highly committed or mobilized members of the nationalist movements. How did the élites draw the broader strata of the populations into the movement? How did the wider process of social mobilization take place? It is now increasingly recognized that the development of nationalism is related to the role of communications. A group of sociological theories assigns communications a prime place in the process of national awakening. One communications model in fact considers "the role of the intelligentsia...to be a necessary condition of all nationalist movements,"⁴² an observation which appears to receive support from the role the intelligentsia played in the four movements examined here. If one includes the clergy, as some historians do, in the concept of "intelligentsia" ("cler-

⁴⁰ On the role of the nobility in the Croatian nationalist movement, see LESHCHILOVSKAIA, *op. cit.*, 72-75.

⁴¹ RAPANT, *op. cit.*, 12. I have supplemented Rapant's data with those found M. SLÁVIK, ed., *Slovenski národovci do 30. októbra 1918* (Trenčín: 1945), Ch. III. For a basic monograph on the early stages of the Slovak nationalist movement, see J. BUTVIN, *Slovenské národno-zjednocovacie hnutie 1780-1848* (Bratislava, 1965). A new quantifying study of the Slovak pre-1848 patriotic intelligentsia is J. HUČKO, *Sociálne slozenie a povod slovenskej obrodenskej inteligencie* (Bratislava: 1974). This volume had not reached me at the time this study was completed.

⁴² A.D. SMITH, *Theories of Nationalism* (London: 1971), 87. One of the most influential exponents of the communications theory of nationalism is K.W. DEUTSCH, *Nationalism and Social Communication* (second edition Cambridge, Mass.: 1966). Deutsch inspired the Czech historian HROCH whose work (Note 34) is an important study comparing the origin of certain West and East (including Czech and Slovak) European nationalist movements.

ical intelligentsia"), then the importance of this social group in the genesis of Austro-Slavic nationalisms becomes overwhelming.

In this context literacy was an essential factor contributing to the success of any mobilizing effort mounted by the élites. How did the four nationalities rate on this count? Literacy statistics were not compiled in the Austrian Empire at the time we are discussing. In order to obtain a picture, we are obliged to rely on later census data that indicate the literacy of the generation that was born in the 1830s and was a school age in the 1840s. In this generation, the Czechs led the others. Their rate was 84.75% which was nearly three times as much as that of the Slovaks (30.2%), the Slovenes (28.62%) and the Croats (26.7%).⁴³ It is necessary to add that the Slavic populations in general were at a disadvantage vis-à-vis the Austro-Germans when it came to the use of their languages as a medium of instruction in schools. Only in the lower schools was teaching conducted in the language appropriate to the ethnic region. The language of middle and higher schools was German in the western half of the empire and German, Latin or Magyar in the eastern half. In other words, attaining a higher level of education generally compelled the individual concerned to leave the cultural ambience of his native language. The results of this process were often bizarre. For example, the Czech Karel Havlíček and the Slovene Bleiweis, both leading nationalists, were, in the early stages of their nationalist activity, more fluent in German than in their own native language — a situation by no means untypical of Slavic national awakeners.⁴⁴

The élites were keenly aware of the efficacy of the printed word as a medium through which they could best transmit their ideas and mobilize the larger non-élite mass; hence the pre-occupation of the patriotic societies with publishing. The printed word devised and disseminated nationalist symbols, awakened an interest in the past and created an awareness of shared leaders, thus ultimately engendering a sense of the community of language, culture and history. For maximum effectiveness, the printed word had to have periodicity and this pointed to the importance of the newspaper as a vehicle most suitable for communication. It was a portent of an approaching nationalist storm that the fifteen-year period preceding the revolutions of 1848 saw the foundation of the first modern national and nationalist newspapers in the case of all four nationalities. One such newspaper was founded in each case, under the auspices of or in association with, the patriotic societies.⁴⁵ Of the four, only one, the Slovak, re-

⁴³ M.N. KUZMIN, *Škola i obrazovanie v Čechoslovakii* (Moscow: 1971), 89, 159.

⁴⁴ One of the leading members of the Czech nationalist movement of the time says of Havlíček and several other Czech nationalists that they spoke Czech "extremely unclearly;" quoted in E. BASS, *Čtení o roce osmačtyřicátém*, Vol. I (Prague: 1940), 208. For a similar situation among the Slovenes, see F. GESTRIN and V. MELIK, *Slovenska zgodovina od konca osemnajstega stoletja do 1918* (Ljubljana: 1966), 83, 88.

⁴⁵ They were: the Czech *Pravdivé Noviny* which began to appear in 1825 but assumed a militant nationalist posture only under the editorship of Karel Havlíček who took it over in 1845-46; the Slovene *Novice*, founded in 1843; the Croatian *Novine Hrvatske* (1835); and the Slovak *Slovenské Národné Noviny* (1845).

mained stationary in circulation during the pre-March period⁴⁶ while the other three showed a circulation increase, with the Czech newspaper registering an increase that can only be described as extraordinary, from 200 in 1846 to 1,500 in 1848.⁴⁷ The editor of the Czech newspaper was Karel Havlíček, of the Croatian, Ljudevit Gaj, of the Slovak, L'udovít Štúr, and of the Slovene, Dr Janez Bleiweis. It is interesting to note that the last three men were the principal nationalist leaders of their peoples at the time and are considered the "fathers" of their particular nationalist movements. As for Havlíček, he shared this honour with the Czech historian František Palacký. Nothing illustrates more tellingly the importance of communications to nationalism than the fact that the nationalist editors were the leaders of their national groups.

III

In March 1848 absolutism in the Austrian Empire collapsed and this ushered in the "revolutions of 1848," a period of constitutional government that lasted for over a year, until the emperor began to re-impose absolutism in the spring and summer of 1849. Among the most important constitutional innovations introduced by the liberal regime was the abolition of censorship in March 1848. This led to the foundation of new magazines and newspapers, making it possible for the Czech leaders to start a veritable avalanche of the printed word. On the eve of 1848 the Czechs had a total of 13 newspapers and periodicals; after March this number quadrupled, to 52.⁴⁸ Elsewhere, the expansion was more modest. In Croatia, the increase was from 5 in 1847 to 8 in 1848⁴⁹ while the corresponding Slovak figures were 6 and 8.⁵⁰ The Slovenes, starting from a low base of 1 newspaper in 1847 brought the number up to 6 in 1848.⁵¹ (After the

⁴⁶ The Slovak newspaper had a circulation of about 500 in the year in which it was launched; see Štúr's letter of September 6, 1845, as printed in *Listy L'udovita Štúra*, Vol. II, ed. by J. AMBRUŠ (Bratislava: 1956), 94. Subsequent complaints by Štúr about circulation indicate that it failed to grow; indeed, for a time at least, it appears to have slipped slightly; see Štúr's letter of August 3, 1846, in *Listy*, Vol. II, as cited, p. 143.

⁴⁷ The circulation figures for the Czech newspaper are given by Havlíček in an article published by him on December 28, 1849, and reproduced in Z.V. TOBOLKA, ed., *Karel Havlíček Horovskí; Politické Spisy*, Vol. II, Pt. 2 (Prague, 1902), 875. For a recent article on Havlíček, see B.K. KIMMEL, "Karel Havlíček and the Czech Press before 1848," in P. BROCK and H. Gordon SKILLING, eds., *The Czech Renaissance of the Nineteenth Century* (Toronto: 1970).

The Croatian newspaper was printed in 750 copies in the year of its first appearance (1835). This dipped to 400 in 1837 but then began to rise again steadily until the circulation reached 800 in 1848; see J. HORVAT, *Povijest novinstva Hrvatske 1771-1939* (Zagreb: 1962), 123, 133. The Slovene newspaper started with a run of 1,000 in 1843 and rose to 1,800 by 1848; see J. SLEBINGER, *Slovenski časniki in časopisi: Bibliografski pregled od 1797-1936* (Ljubljana: 1937), 5.

⁴⁸ M. LAISKE, *Časopisectví v Čechách 1650-1847* (Prague: 1959), 162, for the pre-1848 figure. For the 1848 figure, see F. ROUBÍK, *Časopisectvo v Čechách v letech 1848-1862* (Prague, 1930), Appendix No. 9 (this for Bohemia) and M. WURMOVÁ, *Soupis moravských novin a časopisu z let 1848-1918* (Brno: 1955), 4 (for Moravia).

⁴⁹ I. HERGESIC, *Hrvatske novine i časopisi do 1848* (Zagreb: 1936), 102-103.

⁵⁰ M. POTEMRA, *Bibliografija slovenských novin a časopisov do roku 1918* (Martin: 1958), 117.

⁵¹ SLEBINGER, *op. cit.*, 5-7.

return of the reaction in 1849 the number of newspapers began to drop again to pre-1848 levels.) Calculated on a per capita basis, there was, in 1848, one newspaper or magazine for 77,000 Czechs, 167,000 Slovenes, 200,000 Croats and 213,000 Slovaks. Clearly, the Czech élite had at their disposal the most highly developed network of communications — an advantage heightened by the fact that some of their newspapers appeared daily (six times a week) whereas the frequency of the newspapers of the other nationalities was not more than three times a week.

The strengths and the handicaps with which each Slavic group had entered upon the revolution became evident in the first days of freedom. The Czechs and the Croats promptly staged mass meetings, (in March in their capital cities) at which nationalist programs were adopted.⁵² In the other two ethnic regions, the adoption of nationalist programs was accomplished with less mass support. The Slovenes formulated their nationalist programs in March without the benefit of a single mass meeting — the only Slavic group to pass through the revolutionary year without mass demonstrations or rallies in support of nationalist objectives.⁵³ In Slovakia, the élite was slow in getting off the mark and encountered difficulties in mobilizing public opinion. A full-fledged nationalist program was not adopted until the beginning of May 1848 at a meeting in Liptovský Svätý Mikuláš, but public presence at this meeting was modest and the program failed to acquire the legitimacy and force sufficient to compel the Magyar authorities to heed it.⁵⁴

The opening stages of the revolutionary period demonstrated the advantage of a people having a body of nationalists with organizational experience and mutual contact who would seize the initiatives, and quickly and forcefully responded to the challenges of the moment. The pre-1848 patriotic societies consisted of such nationalists. However, accustomed as they had been to more genteel forms of struggle, these societies could not in themselves become the instruments of political activism at a time of revolutionary turbulence, and so new organizations were established to cope with new forms of struggle. The Czechs in Prague created in March a National Committee which served, until its dissolution after the June 1848 uprising in Prague, as a centre of Czech nationalist activity throughout Bohemia. Many members of the Czech Foundation became active in the National Committee which counted over a hundred members. In the National Committee, the intelligentsia prevailed, as it had done in the Czech Foundation, with 44% of the members belonging to this stratum. However, the proportion of the clergy was drastically reduced in

⁵² For the meeting in Prague, see my *Czech Revolution of 1848* (Chapel Hill: 1969), Chpt. 2. For the meeting in Zagreb, see R. HORVAT, *Najnovije doba hrvatske povjesti* (Zagreb: 1906), 112-113.

⁵³ For the circumstances surrounding the formulation of the Slovene programs, see F. ZWITTER, "Slovenski politični prerod XIX. stoletja v okviru evropske nacionalne problematike," *Zgodovinski Casopis*, Vol. 18 (1964), 110-111. See also I.B. CHURKINA, "Politicheskaia programma Matii Maiara v 1848 godu," *Sovetskoe Slavianovedenie* 1969, No. 5.

⁵⁴ J. BUTVIN and J. HAVRÁNEK, *Dějiny Československa* (Prague: 1968), 220-221.

this élite group, to a mere 4%, as compared with 29% it had had in the Czech Foundation in the last year before the revolution. It appears that the revolution had pushed the clergy into the background. Its place was taken by the bourgeoisie (burghers, artisans, businessmen) whose share in the National Committee was 42%.⁵⁵

After June 1848 the vacuum created by the demise of the National Committee was filled by the newly founded Slavic Linden (*Slovanská Lipa*), a nationalist pressure group consciously seeking political change. The Slavic Linden was led by intellectuals and bourgeoisie, with some members of the National Committee passing into its ranks.⁵⁶ The clergy played no major role. Politically, the Slavic Linden was somewhat to the left of the National Committee and, unlike the latter, acquired some of the characteristics of a political party: it had its own newspaper, an elected executive, a headquarters (in Prague), and local branches. By the beginning of 1849 it counted 49 branches throughout Bohemia, forming a network reaching into all corners of the province, with a total estimated membership of 2,000.⁵⁷ Among rank and file members of the Slavic Linden were peasants and people of the humble stations in life.⁵⁸ The Slavic Linden was in fact the only nationalist organization of the four nationalities to reach into the non-élite strata, showing a widening circle of nationalistically mobilized population. None of the other three nationalities could point to this level of national awakening, and none devised the kind of network through which the nationalists could communicate and operate in an organized fashion.

The Croatian nationalist movement operated with instruments essentially different from those employed by the Czechs. The Croatian élite relied less on the spontaneous organs such as Czech National Committee and more on Croatia's existing institutions of self-government which it revived and re-shaped to suit the new post-March conditions. After March, the Croats acquired their own provincial government, the Ban's Council, which managed the affairs of the country throughout 1848-1849. The Croats were the only Slavic group to become, for the duration of the 1848-1849 revolutionary period, masters in their own house, recogniz-

⁵⁵ A list of members of the National Committee, with occupational data, is found *Národní Noviny*, 14 April, 1848. The role of this committee is discussed in PECH, *op. cit.*, 76-79, 115-121.

⁵⁶ The Slavic Linden executive in Prague had 50 members. Their names, with incomplete occupational data, are printed in *Noviny Lipy Slovanské*, 11 April, 1849. I was able to identify the occupations of 42 of the members; of these 33 belonged to the intelligentsia, 6 were merchants, 2 were liberal nobles, and one was a liberal Protestant clergyman.

⁵⁷ See my "Czech Political Parties in 1848," *Canadian Slavonic Papers/Revue canadienne des slavistes* XV (1973), 484-485. For a map showing the geographic distribution of the branches, see *Atlas československých dejin* (Prague: 1965), No. 19j.

⁵⁸ Thus, in one branch in a city, only one member out of 150 enjoyed the status of "burgher." In another, a majority were "poor artisans," still another consisted largely of "cottagers and poor agricultural workers;" see *Národní Noviny*, 30 December, 1848 which contains an account of the congress of Slavic Linden branches held in Prague. This account offers some fragmentary data on the occupations of members of a few individual branches.

ing the authority of none but the emperor. Their nobility continued to be active and influential in the existing arrangements. The only new non-governmental nationalist political or quasi-political organization to which the élite gave rise in the post-March period was the Croatian version of the Slavic Linden. It was inspired by but independent of the Czech Slavic Linden. It was founded in Zagreb, was led by moderately left-oriented intellectuals, and acquired a newspaper of its own. However, it was never too active and never succeeded in building a network of branches throughout the Croatian regions. Only one major branch was set up outside of Zagreb.⁵⁹ The total membership of the two branches was no more than a few score and the organization never reached into the non-élite strata.⁶⁰ The effectiveness and power of the Croatian nationalist movement derived more from the existing institutional structure and the participation of the nobility than from the mobilization of the wider segments of the population.

The Slovenes and the Slovaks could offer little to match the Czech and the Croatian examples. Among the Slovenes, the revolution gave rise to the Slovene Society of Ljubljana founded in April 1848 which became the largest and most influential body of Slovene patriots of the revolutionary period. Its slogan was "Everything for Religion, Emperor and Nationality" and doubtless expressed the influence of clergymen who, according to a police report, formed the largest social group within the 400-member society, with the intelligentsia accounting for the rest.⁶¹ The slogan captures the spirit of the society sufficiently to contrast it with the Czech National Committee which was secular minded and in which the clergy had hardly any role to play. At the same time, it deserves to be noted that the thrust of the Society's efforts was cultural more than political. It did not become a centre of political activity and did not regard itself as much more than a patriotic interest group.

The position of the Slovaks was the least satisfactory. At no time after March 1848 did they form anything resembling the Czech National Committee or even the Slovene Society of Ljubljana. As a consequence, their movement was without an organized thrust and without a single direction. Only the political newspaper, the *Slovenskije Narodnje Novini* continued to function as a voice of Slovak nationalism but it was compelled to suspend publication in June 1848 under Magyar pressure and with its passing, the last channel of communications through which the élite could address itself to the mass had been destroyed. The Slovak people were thus left without a political newspaper for the greater part of the revolutionary era — a handicap to which none of the other three nationalities was subjected. Furthermore, in June 1848, Magyar authorities declared

⁵⁹ See "Slavenska Lipa," *Enciklopedija Jugoslavije*, Vol. 7, 220-221.

⁶⁰ The Slavic Linden in Zagreb had 80-90 members; *Noviny Lipy Slovanské* January 20, 1849. The other major branch, Zadar, is said to have had 200 members; see V. ŽACEK, "České a jihoslovanské Slovanské lipy v roce 1848," *Literární Archiv* VI (1971), 227.

⁶¹ J. MAL, "Ljubljana in leto 1848," *Glasnik Muzejskega Društva za Slovenijo* XIV (1933), 123. See also J. APIH, *Slovenci in 1848 leto* (Ljubljana: 1888), 133.

martial law over much of Slovak territory — charging the Slovak leaders with “Pan-Slavic” subversion and forcing many of them into exile — and this paralysed the Slovak movement still further.⁶² The clergy (Protestant) continued to dominate what was left of the life of the Slovak movement after June.⁶³

The organizational strength of the élites and the degree to which they were able to mobilize the wider segments of the populations were tested at the elections to the various representative assemblies that took place during 1848 — the first such modern elections to be held in the history of the Austrian Empire. Until 1848, public life in the empire had borne a German or, in the eastern half, German-Magyar character and this was bound to favour German and Magyar candidates in the election contests even in the Slavic-speaking areas. Conversely, success at the polls of the Slavic candidates could be regarded as evidence of a relatively high degree of mobilization among the Slavic electorate. The right to vote was more liberal in the western than in the eastern half of the empire, and even in the former, segments of the lower social classes were excluded. Nevertheless, it must be acknowledged that everywhere a large number of “common” people enjoyed the right to vote and the election results can serve as a rough expression of popular sentiment vis-à-vis the nationalist movements.

The elections yielded the following results. In Bohemia, they demonstrated a high degree of responsiveness of voters to the Czech nationalist movement. In the election to the Bohemian diet in June 1848 the proportion of Czech deputies elected was just over 60% (the remainder were Germans) — a figure corresponding closely to the estimated proportion of the Czech population in the province. The election to the Imperial Parliament held in the same month brought similar results, with the Bohemian voters sending to Vienna 55 Czech as against 35 German deputies.⁶⁴ In Croatia, the elections to the diet (June 1848) were a clean sweep for the nationalist candidates. This was due, in part, to the militancy of the Croatian authorities who saw to it that only committed to the Croatian cause could stand as a candidate.⁶⁵ Because of this, the election results are not very meaningful. In the Slovene regions, the electoral behaviour of the voters was less affected by nationalist sentiment. The election to the diet of Carniola produced “numerous” Slovene deputies⁶⁶ but not nearly the decisive majority the size of the Slovene population of Carniola (90%) would warrant. Similarly, only about half of the deputies elected to the Imperial Parliament in ethnically Slovene territory were

⁶² BUTVIN-HAVRÁNEK, *op. cit.*, 221.

⁶³ Of the four Slovak members who sat on a special 7-man council formed in the fall of 1848 to conduct resistance to Magyar authorities on Slovak territory, 3 were Protestant clergymen; F. BOKES, “Slovenská národná rada z rokov 1848-1849,” *Historický Casopis* XIII (1965), 214.

⁶⁴ PECH, *Czech Revolution*, 104, 167.

⁶⁵ J. HORVAT, *Politička povijest Hrvatske* (Zagreb: 1936), 176.

⁶⁶ J. APIH, “Die slovenische Bewegung im Frühjahr und Vorsommer 1848,” *Österreichisches Jahrbuch*, XVI (1892): 201.

actually of Slovene orientation; the other half were German or bilingual without specifically Slovene leanings.⁶⁷ Finally, the nationalists in the Slovak regions failed completely: the first modern Hungarian Parliament, elected in June 1848, did not have a single Slovak deputy. This was attributable, in part, to Magyar electoral pressures. But the principal reason was the underdeveloped nationalist sentiment of the Slovak mass. Slovak leaders were themselves not unaware of this and fielded only a few candidates.⁶⁸

The nationalist leaders realized that much of their effectiveness depended on the success with which they mobilized the support of the largest social group: the peasantry. To achieve this, they experimented with the publication of newspapers written and edited specifically for the peasantry. However, the results of this effort proved disappointing. The only peasant newspaper that proved successful was the Slovene *Novice* but even in this instance, no more than 15% of its subscribers belonged to the class for which it was primarily destined.⁶⁹ Clearly, *Novice* could maintain itself only because of the support of non-peasant readers, particularly the clergy. Publication of peasant newspapers was tried also by Croatian (Summer 1848) and Czech (Spring 1849) leaders but both ventures failed for lack of reader support.⁷⁰ A more technically oriented newspaper was devised and launched for the Slovak peasants but it likewise proved short-lived (1848).⁷¹ These failures have usually been attributed to a lack of national consciousness on the part of the peasantry, and doubtless there is more than a grain of truth in the observation. After all, the peasantry had only just emerged, in 1848, from the last vestiges of serfdom. A large number of peasants was still illiterate and could not be expected to display a degree of political and nationalist commitment of the kind evinced by the élites. Plainly, the peasant's most immediate and active concerns involved his own social problems rather than the problems of nationalism. At the same time, it should not be forgotten that the peasants were the authentic traditional bearers of the national cultures and folklore and it would be implausible to maintain that such traditions had failed to engender varying degrees of national consciousness or even of interest in the nationalist movement. There is, in fact, good evidence to show that although the peasants turned their back on peasant newspapers, many of them followed the great nationalist press, such as the Czech *Národní Noviny* (successor, since April 1848 to *Pražské Noviny*

⁶⁷ ZWITTER, "Slovenski politični...", 128.

⁶⁸ D. RAPANT, *Slovenské povstanie roku 1848-49*, Vol. I, Pt. 1 (Martin: 1937), 212.

⁶⁹ See Note 37.

⁷⁰ The Croatian one, entitled *Prijatelj Puka*, appeared in Zagreb as a weekly supplement of *Slavenski Jug*, from 9 August to 29 November, 1848; see "Slavenski Jug," *Enciklopedija Jugoslavije*, Vol. 7, p. 221.

The Czech one was *Sedlské Noviny*, published in Prague between April 1, 1849 and 30 June, 1849. It is now available in J.K. TYL, *Spisy*, XIV, ed. by F. STREJCEK and H. HRZALOVÁ (Prague: 1953).

⁷¹ "Noviny are hospodárstvo, remeslo a domáci zivot," published from 5 April 1848 to 27 September, 1848; see F. RUTKAY, *Daniel G. Lichard a slovenské novinarstvo jeho doby* (Martin: 1961), 81 ff.

ny).⁷² It is probable that such newspapers offered them a more direct opportunity of identifying with the nationalist leaders. The quality and intensity of the peasants' commitment to nationalism did not and could not equal that of the élites, but not a few of them were prepared to support the élites in the capacity of followers. However, this differed from one ethnic region to another. Peasant support for the nationalist élites was the most widespread in the Czech regions. The authorities in Bohemia were not oblivious to the support from the peasants the Czech leaders enjoyed; a confidential police report of May 1849 noted that Czech leaders could count on Czech peasants in resisting unpopular government measures.⁷³ In the other three ethnic regions, the peasantry seemed mobilized to a lesser degree, the least, to judge from the election results, in Slovakia.

The apathy of the Slovak peasant seemed more marked than that of his Czech, Slovene and Croatian counterparts. Indeed, the Slovak movement as a whole was so weak that a brief digression concerning this weakness appears warranted. Certainly, a major weakening factor was religious discord. Although a majority of Slovaks were Roman Catholic, the Protestants occupied the highest rungs of power in the élite and were, for all practical purposes, the moving spirits of the revolution of 1848 in Slovakia — a situation calculated to displease the Roman Catholics. The great triad of the movement, L'udovít Štúr, M. M. Hodža and J. M. Hurban, were all Protestants, the latter two were practising Lutheran clergymen. The group that adopted the nationalist program of May 1848 consisted almost entirely of Protestants.⁷⁴ At the grass roots, the climate was similar: the areas inhabited by Protestants manifested a more active nationalist sentiment during the revolution than those inhabited by Roman Catholics — hardly a favourable omen in a people that was in majority Roman Catholic. It is not surprising that some Roman Catholic Slovaks regarded the movement of 1848 as a Protestant plot.⁷⁵

Furthermore, the Slovaks lacked a major centre of national culture and their geographic setting in general hindered rather than aided the growth of communications and the development of nationalism. The river valleys amid the high peaks of the Tatra Mountains had an isolating effect. "We are an unfortunate people," lamented one Slovak leader, "in that we live only in our valleys — isolated from one another," and contrasted it with the advantage the Czechs possessed in having a centrally located city, Prague, which was "like the heart of the [Czech] body."⁷⁶ The net-

⁷² The influence of Havlicek on the peasants was striking. He advised them how to vote and what type of deputies to choose and they followed his advice quite readily; see PECH, *Czech Revolution*, 105, 284.

⁷³ *Ibid.*, 258.

⁷⁴ L. VON GOGOLÁK, *Beiträge zur Geschichte des slowakischen Volkes*, Vol. 2: *Die slowakische nationale Frage in der Reformepoche Ungarns 1790-1848* (Munich: 1969), 263.

⁷⁵ D. RAPANT, *Slovenské povstanie roku 1848-49*, Vol. II, Pt. 1 (Martin: 1950), 344. According to Rapant, Slovak national consciousness was the most highly developed in the Turcian County; RAPANT, *op. cit.*, Vol. III, Pt. 1 (1956), 351. This was also a region in which the Protestants were especially strong.

⁷⁶ *Národní Noviny*, 31 May, 1848, article by Hurban.

work of roads and postal services and transportation facilities was sparse, much sparser than, for instance, in the Czech regions. It took considerably less time to traverse a distance in Bohemia than it did to traverse the same distance in Slovakia.⁷⁷ Bratislava was in 1848 a predominantly German city, on the fringes of Slovak ethnic territory. Although Štúr's *Slovenske Národnje Novini* was published there, the city was far from dominant in Slovak national life. Of the 8 Slovak newspapers appearing in 1848, only 3 were published in Bratislava.⁷⁸ The cultural facilities of the Slovaks were dispersed, with no city standing above the others as undisputed national leader.

When it came to a centre of national culture, the other three peoples were in a better position. The Slovenes, it is true, faced a hostile geographic environment in their mountainous terrain, but had at least a reasonably active centre in the city of Ljubljana, situated in the heart of the Slovene ethnic territory. Of the 6 Slovene newspapers appearing in 1848, all but one originated in Ljubljana.⁷⁹ The position of the Croats and the Czechs was again superior to that of the Slovenes. The Croats had their undisputed capital and nationalist centre in Zagreb, with 7 of the existing 8 Croatian newspapers published there,⁸⁰ and with all major cultural institutions located there. While the Czechs had the most vigorous national centre of all, in Prague, to which not only the Czechs but also most other Austrian Slavs, looked for leadership. Of the 41 Czech newspapers published in Bohemia, 33 were appearing in Prague, and they were the ones with the nation-wide circulation.⁸¹ Prague was already then becoming the towering symbol of Czech nationalism.

To sum up the strength of the Austrian Slavic nationalist movements: the Czechs and the Croats belonged in one category as the stronger pair, while the Slovenes and the Slovaks were the weaker. Within each pair, however, there were marked differences. The Czech movement derived its strength principally from a large popular base, created by more highly developed communications. The Croatian movement had a more restricted popular base but compensated for this by having at its disposal an administrative structure rooted in the traditions of self-government. This, combined with the foothold the movement had in the governing class, the nobility, gave it a ready-made leverage of political influence which was denied to the other three nationalities. To formulate it in slightly different language: the strength of the Croatian movement was derived from the traditional social and political features; that of the Czech movement was more clearly associated with the features of modernization. The latter was born in a society that could be described as early industrial,

⁷⁷ See the map in *Atlas československých dějin* (Prague: 1965), No. 19f; this is an ingenious map comparing the speed of travel in the Czech and Slovak regions in the year 1827.

⁷⁸ POTEMRA, *op. cit.*, 117.

⁷⁹ ŠLEBINGER, *op. cit.*, 5-7.

⁸⁰ HERGEŠIĆ, *op. cit.*, 102-103.

⁸¹ ROUBÍK, *op. cit.*, Appendix 6 and 9.

the former in a society that was essentially pre-industrial. A few data will illustrate this. On the eve of 1848, Croatia was without a railroad and with only 4 steam engines operating on its territory.⁸² Bohemia (with Moravia) had over 500 kilometers of railroads⁸³ and some 360 steam engines.⁸⁴ (For the sake of comparison, it may be noted that at this same time Slovakia was, like Croatia, without a railroad and with only 3 steam engines⁸⁵ while Slovenia was more advanced, with 25 steam engines⁸⁶ and a stretch of railroad a little under 100 kilometers.⁸⁷ (The number of steam engines in Britain then was 30,000 and in France 5,000.⁸⁸ Britain had more than 4,000 kilometers of railroad.)⁸⁹

The Slovenes and the Slovaks were weaker on several counts. Their nationalist élites were less well organized. The Slovak élite was especially hampered by the Protestant-Catholic differences which constituted a unique element not present in the other three movements. Also, alone of the nationalities being surveyed here, the Slovaks had no institutional forms that would lend their ethnic territory a certain visibility and a possible leverage for political action; and, after June 1848, no political press. Furthermore, the Slovak mass appears to have been the least mobilized into the national movement: the Slovak élite had little impact on the rest of the population. In some of these respects, the Slovenes were in a better position than the Slovaks. They had at least the provincial institutions of Carniola which could be made to serve as an instrument with which to advance the nationalist cause. Their élite was not rent with religious discord. During the year 1848 it succeeded in producing at least a modicum of organizational life (Slovene Society of Ljubljana) and also a political or quasi-political press that functioned throughout the 1848-1849 constitutional period. The circulation figures for the Slovene and Slovak newspapers offer unmistakable evidence that the Slovene nationalist movement was reaching a larger proportion of its constituency than the Slovak one.⁹⁰

The élites were the ideologues of the nationalist movements, disseminating their views chiefly through the press which they controlled. This former was dominant in the Czech and the Croatian (here linked closely with the nobility) élites, the latter in the Slovene and the Slovak ones.

⁸² R. BIČANIĆ, *Doba manufakture u Hrvatskoj i Slavoniji 1750-1860* (Zagreb, 1951), 344.

⁸³ See the map in *Školni atlas československých dějin* (Prague, 1959), No. 25.

⁸⁴ *Československá vlastivěda*, Part II, *Dějiny*, Vol. 2 (Prague, 1969), 93.

⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, 104. The first railroad came to Slovakia in the latter part of 1848.

⁸⁶ GESTRIN-MELIK, *op. cit.*, 50.

⁸⁷ R. PAVLOVČIČ, *Zgodovinski atlas Slovenije* (Buenos Aires, 1960), No. 69. Also GESTRIN-MELIK, *op. cit.*, 64-65.

⁸⁸ GODECHOT, *op. cit.*, 103.

⁸⁹ *Československá vlastivěda*, *op. cit.*, 104.

⁹⁰ The circulation of the Slovene *Novice* in 1848 was 1,800 copies which yields a ratio of one copy for 556 people. The circulation of the Slovak *Slovenskije Národnje Novini* may be assumed to have been 500 copies in 1848 which yields a ratio of one copy for 3,400 people. For the circulation figures, see Notes 46 and 47.

Page 355, last paragraph, lines 1 and 2 should read :

The social and occupational groups that made up the preponderant strain of the nationalists élites were the intelligensia and the clergy. The

Kindly paste the slip over the incorrect two lines in Social History, No. 18.

The élites were the ideologues of the nationalist movements, disseminating their views chiefly through the press which they controlled. This suggests some possibilities for future research. It would be desirable to know in what ways the social structure of the élites was reflected in the political ideologies of the nationalist movements.⁹¹ It would be also interesting to discover in what ways the élites helped shape the emerging political cultures — the revolutions of 1848 constitute the beginning of modern political life among the peoples of the Austrian Empire — and to what extent this contributed to the enduring pattern of political culture as it crystallized in the coming generations. In our own century, down to the outbreak of World War II, the Czechs gained a reputation for supporting centre and left-of-centre political movements; the Croats displayed political vagaries but a certain centrist mixture of liberal and conservative seemed to hold the most sway; while among the Slovenes and the Slovaks militant right-wing clericalist movements proved the most dynamic. This pattern seems to mirror, to a considerable extent, the dominant social classes in the nationalist élites as they existed in the middle of the last century. With the present popularity of the study of political cultures, it should not be long before social scientists interested in the Austrian Slavs turn to the middle of the nineteenth century as the time “when it all began.”

⁹¹ I have attempted to compare the ideology of the press of the four nationalities in S.Z. PECH, “The Press of the Habsburg Slavs in 1848: Contribution to a Political Profile,” *Canadian Journal of History/Annales canadiennes d’histoire*, X (1975): 35-49. However, I did not attempt to relate the ideology to the social structure of the élites.