

The Open Court

A MONTHLY MAGAZINE

Devoted to the Science of Religion, the Religion of Science, and the
Extension of the Religious Parliament Idea

Founded by EDWARD C. HEGELER

VOL. XXXI (NO. 6)

JUNE, 1917

NO. 733

CONTENTS:

	PAGE
<i>Frontispiece: Maryan Langiewicz, a Polish Revolutionist of 1863.</i>	
<i>Austrian State Policy.</i> RUDOLF KOMMER	321
<i>United States: Crusader.</i> ROLAND HUGINS	336
<i>Sympathy for Poland in German Poetry.</i> MAXIMILIAN J. RUDWIN	342
<i>The Poles and their Gothic Descent (With illustrations).</i> PAUL CARUS	355
<i>The Polish Language.</i> LEONARD BLOOMFIELD	372
<i>A Woman of Poland.</i> MAXIMILIANUS GERMANICUS	375
<i>Our Illustrations</i>	383

The Open Court Publishing Company

CHICAGO

Per copy, 10 cents (sixpence). Yearly, \$1.00 (in the U.P.U., 5s. 6d.).

The Open Court

A MONTHLY MAGAZINE

Devoted to the Science of Religion, the Religion of Science, and the
Extension of the Religious Parliament Idea

Founded by EDWARD C. HEGELER

VOL. XXXI (NO. 6)

JUNE, 1917

NO. 733

CONTENTS:

	PAGE
<i>Frontispiece: Maryan Langiewicz, a Polish Revolutionist of 1863.</i>	
<i>Austrian State Policy.</i> RUDOLF KOMMER	321
<i>United States: Crusader.</i> ROLAND HUGINS	336
<i>Sympathy for Poland in German Poetry.</i> MAXIMILIAN J. RUDWIN	342
<i>The Poles and their Gothic Descent (With illustrations).</i> PAUL CARUS	355
<i>The Polish Language.</i> LEONARD BLOOMFIELD	372
<i>A Woman of Poland.</i> MAXIMILIANUS GERMANICUS	375
<i>Our Illustrations</i>	383

The Open Court Publishing Company

CHICAGO

Per copy, 10 cents (sixpence). Yearly, \$1.00 (in the U.P.U., 5s. 6d.).

JUSTICE IN WAR TIME

By

The Hon. Bertrand Russell

Cloth, \$1.00, paper, 50c

Pp. 250

PRESS NOTES

"Mr. Russell approaches his subject not as a pacifist, not as a militarist, not as pro-Ally or pro-German, but as a thinker, as a member of that hierarchy of pure intelligence which in time determines the issue of all matters of human passion and controversy. . . . one cannot resist the conviction that the final verdict will be as indicated in this great volume."—*Dr. Frank Crane.*

"This book is of genuine value to thoughtful readers."—*The Editor, Publisher and Journalist.*

"The author's views are marked by sanity and impartiality."—*The Milwaukee Sentinel.*

"By far the sanest, most practical and unprejudiced book which has been written about the war is that by the broad-minded, far-seeing Bertrand Russell. . . . too much cannot be said in praise of this book. . . . its value is inestimable. . . . Mr. Russell is one of those remarkable men who arise almost periodically to become a savior to their people, pointing out the way of salvation. . . . his mind is rare, clear and logical and his heart is full of sympathy and love."—*Detroit Times.*

"Mr. Russell is a strong writer, and *Justice in War Time* will make a strong appeal to many Americans. . . . he aims to present the facts accurately and with a sense of fair play."—*Detroit Saturday Night.*

The Open Court Publishing Company

122 SOUTH MICHIGAN AVENUE

CHICAGO





MARYAN LANGIEWICZ, A POLISH REVOLUTIONIST OF 1863.

Frontispiece to The Open Court.

THE OPEN COURT

A MONTHLY MAGAZINE

Devoted to the Science of Religion, the Religion of Science, and
the Extension of the Religious Parliament Idea.

VOL. XXXI (No. 6)

JUNE, 1917

NO. 733

Copyright by The Open Court Publishing Company, 1917

AUSTRIAN STATE POLICY.¹

BY RUDOLF KOMMER.

THE FOURTH OF AUGUST 1914.

AT the beginning of the war there ensued, to talk the language of Nietzsche, such a wholesale revaluation of fixed values, such a recasting and remodelling of opinions, sentiments and ideas previously entertained, that the fourth of August may justly be called a day of discoveries. On that date that world-wide process of enlightenment set in which endeavored to prove to astonished humanity that most of their cherished notions on the relative worth of nations had been arrived at in a state of unprecedented delusion and aberration. In the course of a single afternoon old Russian revolutionaries joined their English friends in the conviction that Russia was in reality the embodiment of a noble and humane democracy, while English Balkan politicians proceeded equally swiftly to the canonization of Serbia, now rechristened Serbia. It is unnecessary to point out that these and other discoveries carried with them the consignment of Germany and Austria-Hungary to the lowest depths of human worthlessness. English, French, Russian and American representatives of art and science proved in detail and conclusively that Germany had never created or achieved anything worth mentioning in literature or the natural sciences, in philosophy or technique, or even in music. It all amounted to this, that for at least forty years Germany had successfully carried out one of the most gigantic swindles known in history, leading all nations by the nose, until the ever memorable fourth of August opened their eyes.

¹ A lecture delivered before the German Club of Los Angeles and translated by Kuno Meyer. The German edition of the lecture under the title *Der österreichische Staatsgedanke* may be obtained from the German Club of Los Angeles, 538 Bradbury Building (price 10 cents).

The purport of these remarks is merely to point out the necessity of carefully dating every utterance on European conditions. Before the fourth of August, or after—these are the datings giving to every thought, every opinion, every word a different significance and an opposite tendency. For that reason alone I wish to state emphatically that the views which I am going to set forth all originated in the time before the war. For me the fourth of August was not a day of discoveries. What I think of Austria I have expressed on innumerable occasions during the last ten years, and am now prepared to repeat. The war has played havoc with my sentiments; it has left my political convictions wholly unaltered.

THE MUCH-BELOVED AUSTRIANS.

During the last decades Austria-Hungary has been treated in public and popular opinion with half-ironical pity and sympathy. This curious attitude was perhaps never shown so clearly as during the first months of the war in London, where we "alien enemies" of Austrian extraction were almost fêted. God knows, it is no exaggeration to say that at that time we were more popular even than the Belgians, and that after the fall of Lemberg we almost began to suffer under this popularity. Of course all this affection was only meant for our supposed weakness, and I regret to have to add that it diminished in an alarming manner during the spring offensive of 1915, and must now, after the fall of Bucharest, have reached zero.

The imminent dissolution of the Austrian empire has long been a common topic of conversation. People talked about the natural collapse of an unnatural political fabric, and, still under the influence of the shibboleths of 1848, prophesied the victory of the centrifugal forces of the suppressed nationalities over the brutal centralizing tendencies of a reactionary bureaucracy and dynasty. Foreign politicians and historians loved to flourish the medieval notion that Austria was nothing but the appanage of the Hapsburg dynasty, an empire thrown and held together not by political and historical necessity, but by dynastic marriages. Every one knows the old saying: "Let others wage war! thou, fortunate Austria, marry!" This originally Latin sentence, dating from the time of Emperor Maximilian, the last knight, shows that even at the end of the Middle Ages Austria was taken somewhat ironically. But the inference that the Austrian crown-lands were held together for centuries merely by their character as the dowry of royal and imperial archdukes and duchesses is a false and absurd conclusion, a

cheap reversal of historical events. For Austria, Hungary and Bohemia did not unite because their dynasties intermarried, but the very opposite was the case: these dynastic marriages came about because there existed the necessary tendencies of union between the three countries.

Since the conclusion of the Triple Alliance the desire to discredit Austria-Hungary as a great political power has constantly been on the increase. Here I must remind you that at least four-fifths of popular opinion in the modern world are dependent on the English press, the English cables and the all-powerful English news agencies. Now so long as we Austrians were wholly harmless land-rats we were treated with that naive mixture of good nature, contempt and amiable condescension which the ruler of the waves doles out to all nations that have nothing to say on sea. But with the construction of the first dreadnought the old fairy-tale of the disruption of Austria was revived. Once again the chaotic jumble of nationalities was decried, which was not worthy of seeing the light of the twentieth century; jokes were cracked at the antiquated monarchy in the diseased heart of Europe; and again and again *fnis Austriae* was announced to all quarters of the world. That such ignorant and at bottom childish arguments were largely taken seriously is due to psychological reasons.

AUSTRIAN SELF-DEPRECIATION.

The Austrian, from whatever mixture he draws his origin, is wholly lacking in pathos. National self-irony reigns in no country so universally as in Austria. Whenever a foreigner discusses Austrian problems with an Austrian, he will infallibly hear more or less ingenious witticisms at the expense of Austria. That this self-depreciation is no sign of weakness, but merely the expression of a peculiar national temper is shown among other things by the fact that it was quite common even in times of great magnificence and power. When it pleased the playful Hapsburger, Frederick III, to invent the vocalic conundrum A. E. I. Ö. U., standing for *Austriae est imperare orbi universo*, or 'all earth is our underling,' the mocking Viennese turned it into *Austria erit in orbe ultima*, or 'Austria shall be the least on earth.' Even the heroic wars against Napoleon were unable to change this lack of pathos, and the folk-songs centering around the noble figures of Andreas Hofer and Archduke Charles, like the older ones on Prince Eugene, all contain something kindly, homely and slightly humorous. A more modern phenomenon of the same kind is the reversal of the sentence of "boundless

possibilities." America was first called a country of boundless possibilities, and an American will always pronounce these words with justified pride. But when the Austrian applies them to his own country he takes them in another sense. Whenever the government commits some blunder the ironical phrase of the country of improbabilities or boundless possibilities is heard. That this kind of jocular self-criticism is not calculated to impress the foreigner favorably goes without saying.

Add to this the infinite complexity of the inner political conditions, which makes the understanding of the Austrian problem so difficult and explains the almost complete ignorance abroad about anything relating to Austria. I was therefore not in the least surprised when a highly educated American, who was familiar enough with all the details of the love affairs of Crown prince Rudolf and the catastrophe of Mayerlingk, asked me whether "Austrian" was to be numbered among the Slavonic or what my friend George Moore calls the "Romantic" languages.

INK-POTS, BILLINGSGATE AND MARK TWAIN.

Travelers from this country, like your grand Mark Twain, used to notice only certain grotesque and ephemeral phenomena on the Austrian surface, and passed on. Mark Twain's descriptions of the stormy sessions of the Austrian parliament are no doubt exact observations, but without the least understanding for the historical revolutions which accompanied them. To the artist Mark Twain every ink-pot hurled by a Czech delegate at the head of a German one denoted no more than the grotesque inkspots which it caused; every furious invective had only a literary interest for him; and the speeches lasting forty hours, which were then held, were to him but so many record-breaking performances. It remained altogether hidden from him that these outbursts of temper, often exceeding all bounds, signified the forced retreat of the ruling German nation before the aggressive demands of the younger nationalities. And yet an American ought to have been able to understand and appreciate these turbulent scenes. For they marked nothing less than the modern, democratic, constitutional and pacific settlement of deep-reaching conflicts between closely allied nations. The turbulent history of the Austrian parliament is an idyl of civilization compared with the bloody horrors enacted at the same time in the Balkans where similar national conflicts were settled in a somewhat more antiquated manner. You will perhaps understand me better when I ask you whether ten or twenty years of stormy parliamentary

scenes in Washington would not have been preferable to four years of civil war.

If during the fifties of the last century your statesmen had succeeded in allaying the growing passionate conflict between the North and South in a parliamentary way, if they had replaced the old-fashioned "militaristic" form of civil war by the civilized, peaceful and democratic form of parliamentary warfare, do you not think that wildly excited scenes in Congress and the Senate would have been inevitable? And thus, what people regarded as an evident weakness of Austria, as the unmistakable signs of decay, as the tragic symbol of political impotence, was in reality, paradoxical as it may sound, the revelation of an inward strength and soundness and the manifestation of a vigorous life. Every detension is more complicated than a primitive explosion, and it is the result of the highest art of diplomacy when latent civil wars are fought out in words. The invectives heard in the Vienna parliament were so to speak safety valves for relieving the warlike tension then reigning in Bohemia.

THE MALCONTENT EMIGRANT.

Lastly I must point out another source of error, the Austrian emigrant. It is but natural that people who leave their native country for their good cannot have an unbiased opinion on a condition of things which has proved unable to retain them. Every Austrian you meet in the wide world, while showing a deep and touching love for his old home, has in general some special grievance, as he is not inclined in a matter of fact way to make overpopulation, economical conditions, and the like, responsible for his exile. So he simply rails against the "government," adding as a rule some spiteful remarks meant to mask his homesickness. But he who desires to get a real insight into the national witches' caldron of Austria must first get rid of all such prejudices and superficialities. He must drop once for all romantic notions of Austria as the feudal heirloom of the dynasty and such-like lumber dating from the period of rococo. One simply can not see modern Austria while the imagination is shut up in a historical lumber-room. To designate contemporary Austria as a feudal state owned by the Hapsburg dynasty is an anachronism similar to branding the United States of America as a slave-owning state.

PROPHECIES OF DISRUPTION.

English politicians have often goodnaturedly patted me on the

back—in the time before our first dreadnought—, have raved of the incomparable scenery of Austria, of her excellent pastry and coffee, of her exquisite waltzes, not without asking mournfully whether this melodious medley would not fall to pieces after the death of Francis Joseph. I have always answered this sympathetic question by saying that as a loyal Austrian I found it impossible to believe in the death of the emperor. As all foreigners are to the English either “crazy foreigners” or “dirty foreigners,” my answer put me into the former category, and the Austrian problem was settled. At the beginning of the war this theory of disruption was of course pounced upon by the whole anti-German press with a kind of satanic glee, and not one of the many journalists who are occupied in settling the rearrangement of Europe has yet grown tired of announcing again and again that the final disruption of Austria is by general desire fixed to take place next week. The Serbians, Croatians and Slovenes of Austria are supposed to wait with outstretched arms for the Serbians; the Poles, Ruthenes, Czechs and Slovaks tremble with impatient longing for the Russians; the Rumanians want to be joined to Rumania, the Italians to Italy, the Austrian Germans to Germany; and of the empire of Charles the Fifth, on which the sun never set, nothing will soon be left save the Capuchin tomb of the Hapsburgers, the cheque-book of the Rothschilds, and the eternal rhythm of some imperishable songs. After more than two years of a cruel war against terrible odds there is no trace of any irredentist movement, and the revolutions predicted in Hungary and Bohemia, on the coast and in Bosnia, have taken place in South Africa, India and Ireland.

Much might be said about the war and about the exertion and achievements of Austria, achievements which have slowly found an entrance into the political mind of England where the “Austrian resistance” is now reluctantly admitted. But if you merely glance at the map of central Europe and consider calmly and without prejudice the strategic position of Austria-Hungary as compared with the numerical and economic superiority of her many adversaries you will not cease to wonder at the strength and energy displayed. He who wishes to rate the military achievements of any European nation at their true value, must in the first place not commit the mistake of comparing them with those of Germany, for the Germans in this war form a heroic group by themselves. But if, for example, we compare Austria-Hungary with France, we shall soon recognize that the Austrian organism has proved itself far superior to the French. And in saying so I do not forget the

German help which Austria has enjoyed, though as regards actual assistance of troops, it was naturally strictly limited. No one will maintain that Germany has been able to place one, two, or three millions in the field for Austria, as England has done for her allies.

THE BETTER ALLY.

But you must not misunderstand me and imagine that we Austrians have any desire to belittle the German assistance. We know and feel deeply what we owe to Germany, and nothing perhaps illustrates this heartfelt recognition better than that often quoted story of the dispute between a German and an Austrian officer on the relative merits of the two armies. After much discussion to and fro the Austrian is said to have given in with a smile and the following genuinely Austrian words: "Well, yes, it is true, you have a better organization, but we have the better ally."

This story from the trenches not only illustrates the intimate and friendly relation of the two nations toward each other; it also furnishes us with a trenchant analysis of the Austrian temper and psychology. Still one must not commit the great error of rating Austria-Hungary by the Austrian smile or gesture. The time in which we live speaks the language of arms, and the success of the Austrian arms should suffice to draw attention to the immense cohesive power which must exist within the empire. This state-preserving power flows naturally from the conception of the Austrian state, as it lives to-day in Austrian statesmen of all nationalities, in the people itself, and in the dynasty—in short in Austrian consciousness.

HOME RULE IN AUSTRIA.

The idea underlying the Austrian state is national autonomy, i. e., unlimited self-government of the various nationalities, or to use an Anglo-Saxon expression, home rule. The political process leading to national autonomy is an infinitely complex and varied adjustment (*Ausgleich*) between the historical rights and privileges of the ruling nations and the national, political and economical demands and aspirations of the rising nationalities. The political life of Austria of yesterday, to-day and to-morrow consists just in this harmonizing process between the historical powers and the new national postulates; the adjustment (*Ausgleich*) between the Austria of Joseph II and the demands for autonomy of the Austria of Francis Joseph; the adjustment between the Germans and Czechs in the Sudetes, between Serbo-Croatians and Italians in the coast-

land, between Germans and Italians in the Tyrol, between Germans and Slovenes in Carniola, Carinthia and Styria, between Poles and Ruthenes in Galicia, and between Rumanians, Germans and Ruthenes in Bukovina. As you have grown up in the political ideas of Anglo-Saxondom, I venture once more to substitute the phrase more familiar to you: National autonomy for all nations in Austria means home rule all round. But while home rule applies merely to geographical units, national autonomy goes much further in working both for freedom and democracy, and takes account not only of geographical units, but also of national divisions within these units. Thus for several decades the kingdom of Galicia had home rule, but no national autonomy, for the Ruthenes were being opposed by the ruling nation, the Poles. For about the last twenty years the process of adjustment between Poles and Ruthenes is in operation; the Poles have been obliged to surrender in fierce but merely parliamentary battles privilege after privilege, the Ruthenes have effected one national demand after another. Long before the war the Ruthenian language was recognized as an official language of the country by the side of Polish, i. e., it became the language of schools, law courts, churches and administration generally wherever Ruthenes are to be found in Austria. In the same way the political power in the Galician diet has been shifted in favor of the Ruthenes, their economic organization starting from cooperative rural banks has developed on a national basis, and thus national autonomy in Galicia is no longer a Utopian program but a growing reality. It is only natural that this process of adjustment seemed to move far too swiftly for the ruling Poles on the one hand, and far too slowly for the oppressed Ruthenes on the other. No man surrenders privileges suddenly and willingly, nor is a rising pariah possessed of patience and psychological insight. The consequence was that both Poles and Ruthenes vented their displeasure against the Austrian government which with infinite patience endeavored to stand above the parties and especially above the nations in order to bridge over their historical contrasts. He only can be a judge, or rather a mediator, who has nothing in common with either party. So the Austrian government is neither Polish nor Ruthenian, neither German nor Czech, neither Italian nor Serbo-Croatian; standing above the nationalities it is Austrian. The seeming displeasure caused by the levelling process, which was too rapid for one, too slow for the other, was nothing but opposition from ill-humor. As soon as the fabric of the empire was threatened by danger from abroad, the strength and soundness of the political instincts of all nationalities showed

themselves, and although the Austrian interior is not yet completely furnished and equipped, the outer shell is compact and strong and has weathered the storm successfully.

THE REAL FRANCIS JOSEPH.

The development of Austrian policy during the last fifty years is indissolubly bound up with the person of Emperor Francis Joseph. There hardly ever was a great man further removed from his contemporaries than this most peculiar Hapsburger. To the whole world outside of Austria his real nature was veiled by the tragic fate of his family. The bloody end of his nearest relatives, the no less tragic fate of other Hapsburgers, and the no less painful extravagances of a number of others were known to everybody. People were familiar with all the court scandal of Vienna, Schoenbrunn and Ischl, and imagined they were doing justice to this unique personality by talking sentimentally of the old man on the throne who was spared nothing. Before I attempt a necessarily meager sketch of the astounding proportions of the personality of Francis Joseph I should like to explain why a serious appreciation of this most interesting political contemporary has so rarely been tried. In Austria itself it has become a tradition to begin the discussion of the historical role of a monarch, of his intellectual physiognomy and political profile, only after his death. Not as if it were forbidden to do so during his lifetime. What I am going to say now I might at any time have uttered at home in Austria; but I should not have done it. For we like to leave the emperor in the twilight of a remote veneration attaching itself rather to dynastic associations than to personal details; and when I say that the emperor to us is more of a symbol than an individual, I must confess that this distinction cannot count on a ready understanding in America. Such things cannot be explained: they are the result of tradition, constitution, temper, atmosphere and climate, if you like, and should be treated with tolerance.

HANDSHAKES AND FOOT WASHING.

When an American tells me with some pride of the hand shakes which the president of this republic exchanges with electors and visitors, I can only reply that our emperor, the head of one of the oldest dynasties of Europe, on a certain day each year washes the feet of twelve beggars. Both are symbolic actions and cannot be arbitrarily transplanted, as every symbol does not thrive in every

climate. Shake your president by the hand as much as you like, or as much as he can stand, and let us curve our backs as much as we like, or as much as our vertebrae can stand. These otherwise inexcusable remarks are merely meant to explain that Francis Joseph has not had his full share of appreciation because he is so far removed from public criticism. The intellectual structure of your president is known so well, because he is the center of daily discussion. The last president criticises the present one without hesitation, and the last but one does the same with both. All these and other possibilities of criticism exist as little in Austria as they do in England, and we have to take infinitely greater pains if we are to attempt a truthful, unsentimental and objective analysis of our sovereign.

Consider that it was the same Francis Joseph, who in 1848 as a young prince and emperor of eighteen years stifled a revolution, which was wholly unintelligible to him, in blood; who sixty years later introduced universal secret and direct suffrage with the unbending will of a biblical patriarch against the wishes of the ruling bourgeois parties. Consider further that the same monarch who during the first years of his rule sees in every tame liberal a traitor to the state, after a few decades puts his trust in socialism, and not only favors a moderate state socialism after the German pattern, but expects from social democracy a cooling down of the nationalistic fever. The same man who relentlessly subdues the Hungarian insurrection, the outbreaks in Lombardy and the Polish revolution, becomes in course of time the protector of the national renaissance, appoints a rebel who had been sentenced to death and hanged in effigy his minister, and becomes the faithful ally of the Hohenzollerns, who had destroyed the century old hegemony of the Hapsburg dynasty within the German empire. One must be blind not to see that this unique sovereign has seen more of political life than any other human being of our own time, and has digested and assimilated all the intellectual and political evolutions of the nineteenth century. The great wave of nationalism which overran Europe in that century has given a new direction to his whole mind and views, and the subsequent socialistic spring-tide found him fully prepared and sympathetic.

"Monarchic socialism" is the curious designation which has been applied to Germany and Austria, not by fantastic Germans and Austrians, but by coolly reasoning American scholars, who have devoted years of diligent study to this paradoxical marvel of our age. "Monarchic socialism" practised by a Hapsburger born in

1830, grown up under Metternich, having received his baptism of fire at Santa Lucia in the fight against national liberty, having suffered the bitter humiliation of the flight of the court of Vienna before the revolution of 1848, and who as a grown man was wont to see in democracy and socialism veritable emissaries from hell. The progress of this mind through all the political phases of the last century is assuredly one of the most astounding events of that period. For it is easy to be a democrat when one has been born an American, it is somewhat more difficult for a scion of the oldest dynasty in Europe.

FRANCIS JOSEPH THE CHIVALROUS.

It has often been pronounced one of the most inspired episodes in the life of Bismarck when after the battle of Sadowa he prevailed upon his king to deal so leniently with a wholly defeated Austria. It has rightly been extolled as a magnanimous action of the first order, as the outcome of an almost superhuman vision; and the national merit of having reconciled Austria has naturally been claimed for Bismarck. But to bring about a reconciliation two people are necessary. Psychologically, it was a far greater achievement for Francis Joseph to accept the result of the campaign of 1866 and to resist every temptation to take revenge. Certain historians have called him the chivalrous. If for no other reason he would deserve this epithet for having acknowledged himself unreservedly beaten after an unfortunate trial of arms. This noble resignation was by no means weakness; for even for the weakest among the great powers of Europe it is always possible to indulge in the desire for revenge by concluding alliances and by attempts at isolating and encircling the enemy. Indeed the banal psychology of Napoleon III counted on such a desire in Francis Joseph; but the latter did not repeat the all too human mistake of Maria Theresa. Unlike the Bourbons, the Hapsburgers forget what should be forgotten, and learn what has to be learned. It is owing to this frank submission to the verdict of history that Austria enjoyed half a century of peace. It is the tragic guilt of France that, unlike Austria, she has tried to reverse the defeat of 1870, that she has not acknowledged the issue of her duel with Prussia, that she has shut her eyes to the trend of European history. If Austria had acted like France, the last fifty years in central Europe would not have taken such a peaceful course, the democratic development of Austria within a monarchical setting would not have been possible, and we Austrians might now

have the doubtful pleasure of fighting against Hindenburg instead of by his side.

THE AUSTRIAN LEITMOTIF.

It would seem that it was the monumental victory of the national idea in Germany and Italy which converted the antinationalistic Hapsburger. For the year 1867 saw the satisfactory settlement (*Ausgleich*) with Hungary and thus the final conversion of an absolute monarchism into a constitutional dualism. This arrangement between Austria and Hungary gave the latter complete autonomy, the two parts of the empire sharing nothing between them but the dynasty, the army, and their foreign policy, while the share of either part in the common expenditure of the empire is settled every ten years. You see from this that the word *Ausgleich* has become a permanently recurring *Leitmotif* in the Austrian song of destiny.

Since 1867 the inner political life of the two groups of lands has been guided by wholly different ideas. Under the guidance of Francis Joseph Austria has pursued the ideal of national autonomy, while Hungary remained faithful to the old phantom of a uniform national state, trying to magyarize the Slovaks in the north, the Rumanians and Germans in Transylvania, and the Croatians and Slavonians in Croatia. It was natural that the King of Hungary should have endeavored to counteract these tendencies, and for years he has been working to bring about universal suffrage in Hungary, so that the suppressed nationalities might have breathing space. This struggle for democratizing the Hungarian parliament, a struggle which the monarch has to carry on against an aristocracy insisting on their privileges and against a bourgeois oligarchy, must seem a mystery to Americans, who are wont to see in emperors and kings tyrants opposed to parliamentarism. But it is really time that the American conception of European kings, which seems to date from the war of Independence, should be modernized a little. The naive notion that an end of the present war could only be expected from a wholesale republicanizing of Europe would not then have spread like an epidemic.

The dualism of Austria-Hungary produced in the brain of the murdered archduke and heir to the throne the grand idea of an Austro-Hungarian-South-Slavonic trinity. The South-Slavonic group would have embraced Croatia, Slavonia, Bosnia, Herzegovina, Dalmatia, and possibly also Carniola and parts of Carinthia. If this creative thought had ever taken shape, only Hungary would have suffered a *diminutio capitis*, as it would have been relieved of

Croatia and Slavonia. If then in such a stupid and wholly aimless murder any logical meaning could ever be discovered it ought to have been committed by a Hungarian and not by a Serbian.

ADJUSTMENT AND THE NATIONAL ROSTER.

Immediately after the creation of an autonomous Hungary national evolution began in Austria itself. The rapidity of this process was naturally different with each single nationality, who are thus nearer or further, as the case may be, from the ideal of complete national autonomy. In Bohemia the emancipation of the Czechs, who forty years ago were almost completely denationalized, has proceeded so rapidly and victoriously that the German minority, which formerly exercised an unlimited political and economical rule, has for a considerable time been threatened in its national existence. A division of the country in two for administrative purposes will restore the balance.

These shiftings of ascendancy and the violation of minorities resulting from them have produced in the younger generation the idea of a national roster, that is to say, a complete separation of nationalities in the electoral lists. The German electors are entered in German, the Czech in Czech lists. Thereupon each group elects a certain number of delegates according to its numerical strength, so that the electoral struggle is confined to members of the same nationality. In that way even the smallest national minority would be represented, the application of the crude principle of majority would be eliminated at least in the elections, the friction between the various nationalities would be essentially lessened, and the real struggle confined to parliament. The realization of this valuable political idea has for some time been on the program of the leading intellects of all parties and nationalities, and will no doubt be carried out after the war.

The ultimate difficulties in the solution of the conflict between Germans and Italians, and between Poles and Ruthenes, are to be found in the strife for the location of the universities to be founded. Here both national and local sentiments come into play, which time will assuage. A full and harmonious balancing of three national groups has been successful in the small duchy of Bukovina, where Rumanians, Ruthenes and Germans live peacefully side by side on equal terms. Their three languages are the official languages of the country in schools, law courts and administration. Naturally every other national group in this petty crownland, which on account of its seven or eight nationalities is called a miniature Austria, has

the full right to the use of its language. But the judges and officials of the country are not obliged to transact business in any but the three languages mentioned above. I will spare you statistics. Lord Beaconsfield has said that there are three kinds of lies: simple lies, damned lies, and statistics. This saying has at least a threefold application in the case of Austrian statistics. For Bohemia, e. g., we have the statistics of the government, of the Czech, and of the German parties, and so on for every crown land.

THE SOCIALIZATION OF THE NATIONAL PARLIAMENT

Universal suffrage introduced in 1907 was intended among other things as a cooling application to the national fever heat. The socialists became the relatively strongest party of the first absolutely democratic parliament, but were unable to lay at once the nationalistic ghosts. But the process of healing will undoubtedly go on rapidly, since sooner or later the class feeling will oust a hyper-national sensitiveness, in order finally to make room for a sentiment embracing the whole state. However, the morbid irritability of the single nationalities of Austria must first be allayed. For according to Bernard Shaw a healthy nation is just as little conscious of its nationality as a healthy man of his bones.

But without speculating what the future may bring, one might have justly and emphatically said long before the war that Austria is the one state of Europe, perhaps the one state containing so many nationalities in the world, which does not, like Switzerland, sacrifice the individuality of its separate nations to the rigid ideal of unconditional uniformity. There is no enforced Austrian state language, there are merely territorial languages, belonging to the Romance, Slavonic or Germanic groups.

This complex synthesis of ancient and new, conservative and radical elements is the only free and flexible form in which numerous isolated fragments of different nations can lead an individual and thriving existence. And this constitution, this idea, which is Austria, will sooner or later have to be taken over by the other great empire of multiplex nationalities, Russia, and finally also by the third Babylonian chaos, the Balkan.

THE AUSTRIAN MIGRATION OF NATIONS.

Since the beginning of the war the dissolution of Austria has been so often and so lovingly figured on colored maps, more particularly of course in England, that even unbiased observers have begun to ask themselves whether a neat division of Austrian nation-

alities would not be a desirable solution of the problem. Quite apart from a chronic economic paralysis which would accompany such a breaking-up of the monarchy, apart also from the political problems which the erection of about a dozen of new kingdoms would carry with it, the independence of such a number of small states even for ten years is quite inconceivable. Does anybody seriously believe that the tendencies of expansion on the part of Russia have been sterilized by her alliance with puritanical England? And even if the great powers of the second Holy Alliance should be inclined, after Germany's descent to hell, to lead the life of angels, saints or territorial hermits, will the newly founded petty states of Hungary, Czechland, Slavonia etc. be able and willing to do so? Will they not tear and rend each other as the Balkan nations have been wont to do? And finally, is it possible to separate them from one another? Is there even one single nation in Austria which could constitute a geographical and political unit? Are they not all dovetailed like different geological deposits in the strata of a mountain? And even if by neglecting the small minorities a more or less neat separation were possible, how long would the new frontiers remain national frontiers? In over-peopled Europe an incessant migration of nations takes place, a constant diffusion and interpenetration, which makes any separation illusory from the outset. At the end of antiquity and throughout the Middle Ages the Germanic longing for Italy influenced all that happened in Europe. To-day the opposite tendency is noticeable. While Italy is now invaded only by German tourists, the Italians themselves move steadily northward. In Transylvania the oppressed Rumanians are constantly gaining new territory, in Bukovina the Ruthenes are spreading, and in Moravia, Silesia and Lower Austria the Czechs are ousting their former lords and masters, the Germans, peaceably but effectively. Vienna, German Vienna, the German imperial city on the German Danube, contains to-day some hundred thousands of Czechs and will perhaps in a generation be a bilingual city. A German heart bleeds at this thought, but that can alter nothing in a historical process. These migrations have economic and biological causes and are fated and irresistible. One cannot shut up the nationalities of Austria, or of the Balkan, or of Russia, within Chinese walls; and Bismarck's well-known saying cannot be beaten: If Austria did not exist, she would have to be invented.

A. E. I. O. U.

In conclusion I should like to add a few words on the foreign

policy of Austria and her attempts in the direction of social reformation. The colonial policy of Austria is her Balkan policy; other colonies are not even dreamed of in Austria. It is merely an economic colonization, since the Balkan states are the natural market for Austrian productions. Austria is unconscious of any desire of political expansion. It is this Balkan policy which has produced the antagonism of Russia; for its most vital demand is the deliverance of the Balkans from Russian imperialism. As regards the problems of social reform, Austria like the rest of Europe owes an enormous debt of gratitude to Germany. Austria was the first European nation which in 1887 followed the epoch-making example of Germany by introducing governmental labor insurance. The nationalization of railroads, the taking over by municipalities of electric car lines, the telephone, gas and electricity, stock-yards, of the importation of meat etc., are some of the items of that German and Austrian political socialism, which, as already said, has been called monarchical socialism by American admirers.

If finally I am to sum up the fundamental components of Austrian policy, this may best be done by repeating the three main items of the inner political, the foreign and the socialistic program: national autonomy, a Balkan policy on an economic basis, and a well-tempered state socialism.

UNITED STATES: CRUSADER.

BY ROLAND HUGINS.

"Let us be very clear, and make very clear to all the world what our motives and objects are."

—President Wilson, April 3, 1917.

AMERICA strikes. For three perturbed years she has stood outside Armageddon, watching, irresolute. Now she swings her vast resources of men and materials into action. She smashes a blow at Germany, the foe of democracy, of law, of small nations. She makes battle for the rights of humanity.

America is fighting without passion, without hatred. She fights to build the future, not to avenge the past. For herself she demands no indemnities, no territories, no compensation. Her hands are clean. She gives herself freely. She has nothing at stake but honor, nothing to gain but the peace of the world.

At the beginning a number of radical pacifists called this a