

Introduction

HABSBURG CIVIL SERVANTS BETWEEN CIVIL SOCIETY AND THE STATE



Alexander Maxwell and Daša Ličen

The civil service looms large in memories of the Habsburg monarchy. As the Paris Peace Conference officially consigned the Habsburg Empire to history, many observers, both popular and scholarly, in both central Europe and the Anglophone world, viewed the monarchy's downfall through the lens of national liberation. Those who did not, furthermore, often viewed the collapse of hereditary dynastic rule as the overdue resolution of an increasingly unpalatable anachronism. The opprobrium heaped on the dynasty extended to its servants. Historiographical caricatures of oppressive bureaucrats have nevertheless faded with time. By the end of twentieth century, Habsburg scholars had developed a more nuanced view of the Habsburg civil service as the embodiment of a reasonably effective and reasonably liberal modern state apparatus, ultimately preferable to most of the hypernationalist and/or totalitarian regimes that succeeded it. Building on such novel approaches, this volume seeks to place Habsburg civil servants at the center of attention, focusing particularly on their independent agency as they balanced their official functions with participation in emerging civil society. This volume, treating civil servants above all as a social category, investigates how they simultaneously constituted and challenged the state.

Perhaps the most memorable description of the Habsburg civil apparatus comes from the socialist politician Victor Adler. At the 1889 Paris meeting of the international socialist movement, Adler characterized the monarchy as “Despo-

tismus gemildert durch Schlamperei.”¹ The German term *Schlamperei* translates poorly. The root word *Schlampe* originally denoted “a disorderly, untucked skirt,” and by extension “hussy” or “harlot”; the term *Schlamperei* evokes the disreputable, undignified disorder of a brothel.² Various Anglophone scholars have glossed Adler’s witticism as “despotism tempered with disorder,”³ “despotism softened by muddle,”⁴ and a “despotism mitigated by slovenliness.”⁵ Perhaps Adler, as a socialist politician of Jewish origins, can be forgiven his dim view of the Habsburg monarchy, whose judiciary had repeatedly harassed him with prosecutions, fines, and imprisonment.⁶ Yet even if Adler’s comment is best analyzed as political commentary, it has resonated in scholarly circles. It owes its success to more than wit. Several scholars have treated it as a commentary on the monarchy’s oppressive bureaucracy. Indeed, András Sajó has repeatedly characterized the monarchy as a “bureaucracy attenuated by sloppiness” (*Bürokratie gemildert durch Schlamperei*).⁷

Some of the hostility directed against Habsburg bureaucracy, of course, should be discounted as particular instances of a generalizable hostility toward the paperwork and red tape inherent to all bureaucracy. Complaints about the absurdity and facelessness of bureaucracy, after all, are hardly unique to Habsburg central Europe. As early as 1907, Max Weber characterized the “consequences of . . . comprehensive bureaucratization and rationalization” as dystopic: bureaucracy not only “reduces every worker to a cog in this bureaucratic machine” but makes each individual member within the bureaucracy “ask how to transform himself into to somewhat a bigger cog.”⁸

Bureaucracy, whatever its problems, nevertheless remains preferable to arbitrary despotism. Even Weber praised bureaucracy for its “purely technical superiority,” suggesting that “the fully developed bureaucratic mechanism compares with other organizations exactly as does the machine with the non-mechanical modes of production.”⁹ Bureaucracy can enable new forms of social control, but it is also indispensable for economic and social development.

The Habsburg civil service addressed the monarchy’s social problems. It enabled education, public transportation, a post and telegraph system, health services, and an independent judiciary. It proved indispensable to efforts to ameliorate poverty. In its final years, it tried to mediate fairly between rival nationalist movements. The horrors of the mid-twentieth century have done much to rehabilitate the monarchy; a century of hindsight has even generated a certain nostalgia for the Habsburg monarchy and its institutions. This rehabilitation of the monarchy has increasingly led scholars to more favorable views of the Habsburg bureaucracy.

Bureaucracy and Its Social Consequences

Recent scholarship has emphasized above all the extent to which the Habsburg Empire, in its final century, became a *Rechtsstaat*, that is, a state governed by

laws and regulations. It was not always so. Indeed, as Michael Hochedlinger eloquently observed, “specialists in the early modern Habsburg Monarchy are anxious not to use the term ‘state’ when addressing their subject.”¹⁰ Habsburg possessions during the sixteenth century have been described with phrases such as a “dynastic imperial conglomeration composed of widely scattered territories,”¹¹ and a “loose conglomerate of kingdoms and provinces, united only in personal union and thus lacking a true comprehensive name.”¹² Even scholars willing to describe the Habsburg lands as a “state” have done so with qualification: scholars have recently begun speaking of a “conglomerate state,” a concept Harald Gustafsson memorably defined as “a state composed of territories standing in different relations to their rulers, a state where the rulers found themselves in different relations to different parts of their domains[,] . . . a political, judicial and administrative mosaic, rather than a modern unitary state.”¹³

During the seventeenth century, military necessity pushed the Habsburg dynasty toward centralization. What Michael Roberts influentially if controversially called the “military revolution” meant that battlefield success required well-trained standing armies, which not only served as “social escalators” but whose expense and control required “new administrative methods and standards, and the new administration was from the beginning centralized.”¹⁴ By the seventeenth century, what Chester Dunning called “the acceleration of expenditures, coercive taxation, and the build-up of powerful bureaucracy, logistical infrastructure, and military forces” had transformed the Habsburg Empire into a fiscal-military state.¹⁵

Once the fiscal-military state apparatus had been firmly established, Habsburg monarchs gradually began expanding the reach of the bureaucracy into civilian spheres. Historians typically credit the reforms of Maria Theresa (1717–80) and above all her son Joseph II (1740–90) with establishing stable and predictable routines for civilian government administration. Joseph II believed the revitalized state apparatus should rely on regulations rather than arbitrary caprice, and he worked tirelessly to establish a centralized, efficient bureaucracy free of bribery, nepotism, and corruption. He increasingly disregarded patents of nobility, seeking to fill the ranks of civil servants with the most capable men. He demanded that civil servants work hard, but ensured that they received pensions and fixed salaries, calculated according to standardized formulae.¹⁶ Such reforms transformed a dynastic patrimony into what James Schedel has called “a hybrid monarchy,” in which “the ruler becomes the traditional Christian face of a monarchic state that actually operates on the basis of a rational process of governing.” Though often counted among the ranks of enlightened despots, Joseph II, according to James Schedel, was “no longer despotic because he had subjected himself to the rule of law, that is, to the *Rechtsstaat*.”¹⁷

The bureaucratic institutions founded during the Enlightenment continued to expand during the nineteenth century. However tumultuous the monarchy’s

political history, Wolfgang Göderle has noted, “its administrative history contains persistent strands of continuous development.”¹⁸ In 1811, the emperor Franz II/I, the first Habsburg emperor to be emperor of Austria as opposed to Holy Roman Emperor, introduced a civil code, the *Allgemeines bürgerliches Gesetzbuch*,¹⁹ only in part as an answer to the Napoleonic Code. During the Metternich era, the monarchy continued to foster bureaucratic regularity in the monarchy’s judiciary, police system, and state administration.²⁰ In the decades after the 1848 revolution and its associated upheavals, the state apparatus continued to expand, eventually reaching the remotest villages. By 1900 there were around 336,000 civil servants in the Austrian Crownlands,²¹ and the rapidly expanding bureaucracy in the Kingdom of Hungary grew from 265,447 in 1904 to 387,992 in 1914, accounting for “roughly 3.5 percent of the active labor force.”²² These figures, furthermore, exclude the broader population of watchmen, maids, porters, janitors, and other auxiliary employees supporting state officials.

The growing bureaucracy increasingly gave the state a presence in the countryside. The population of Vienna, of course, had long been subject to bureaucratic oversight: systematic administrative surveys of the imperial capital began as early as the sixteenth century. Yet John Spielman found that the advent of regular administration transformed the city from “a resource . . . to be tapped when needed” into “a part of the royal system itself.”²³ In the nineteenth century, similarly, the increasing regulation and administration of the countryside gradually transformed rural populations from subjects into citizens.²⁴

The governance of the Habsburg *Rechtstaat* took place at several levels. The highest administrators sat in Vienna, the imperial residence. Below that, individual provinces boasted their own administrations. Provinces were in turn divided into their own subdistricts. Hungary was divided into “counties” (*Vármegyék / Gespanschaften*), Lombardy-Venetia into “delegations.” Bohemia was divided into *Kraje / Kreise*, and after 1740 so were other Austrian provinces. After 1866, however, *Kraje / Kreise* were replaced with districts (*Bezirke*). These smaller administrative units oversaw municipal government at the local level. Since inhabitants of rural communes interacted with the state through its rural officials, the monarchy’s expanding presence thus drove officials from the comfort and convenience of provincial capitals to take up posts in backcountry hamlets. Some officials willingly sought professional opportunities in the countryside; others perhaps were forced there as punishment.²⁵ Either way, the expansion of the bureaucracy brought the capital closer to the provinces, and ultimately even to remote mountain villages accessible only by mule.

The need to send officials to the deep countryside often meant that individual civil servants relocated several times during their professional lives. Since the state apparatus operated similarly everywhere, officials could pursue their career anywhere. As they did, they found like-minded people with whom they could reminisce about their university years, commiserate about difficulties at work,

and gossip about mutual acquaintances. The civil service, in short, formed a specific social network extending across the borders of individual provinces, even if, toward the end of the century, efforts to accommodate multilingualism led to fractures on linguistic lines. To explain the origins of nationalism, Benedict Anderson memorably argued that “the development of a standardized language-of-state” helped officials experience fellow officials “as travelling-companions” with “a consciousnesses of connectedness.”²⁶ Following Anderson’s argument, the emergence of competing languages-of-state in different Habsburg possessions helped generate particularist national movements. Czech-speaking officials pursuing jobs in Czech-language offices felt the greatest sympathy toward other fellow Czech-speaking officials, rather than with German-speaking officials, to say nothing of officials speaking Hungarian, Italian, or Romanian.

The state bureaucracy expanded not only geographically but also socially. The bureaucracy’s egalitarianism should not be overstated: the cash-strapped monarchy could not initially pay lower-ranking or even mid-ranking officials sufficient salary to live comfortably. Yet even if applicants from poor families could not afford to join the service until the second half of the nineteenth century, officials from bourgeois backgrounds outnumbered the high nobility as early as the Metternich era.²⁷ By the end of the century, significant numbers of state employees hailed from increasingly humble backgrounds. Furthermore, the civil service was meritocratic: individuals could climb the career ladder only through efficient work.²⁸

By the end of the Habsburg era, furthermore, the state apparatus had also begun to include women, despite numerous obstacles preventing women from pursuing official careers.²⁹ Since women could only obtain a higher education in the Habsburg lands toward the end of the century,³⁰ women typically lacked the necessary qualifications for an official career. They mostly worked as stenographers or clerks, and never attained a higher rank. They were never formally accepted as officials with pensions but were employed through private contracts. Furthermore, women could work only when single: married women were summarily dismissed.³¹ Such barriers, however, did not prevent a steady increase of women in the service sectors of the Habsburg economy,³² and the state bureaucracy followed the general trend: by 1910 women comprised around 17.5 percent of all civilian government employees.³³

The increasingly bourgeois composition of the civil service changed the state’s character. Insofar as the expansion of civil service implied the expansion of the state, the civil service embodied the state. The emperor remained a locus of and symbol of state power, and the dynasty maintained many of its medieval accoutrements, including its traditional aristocracy. Nevertheless, the educated middle classes increasingly participated in the wielding of power not merely through the rise of parliamentary representation, but also because, in their capacity as civil servants, they directly exercised authority on the monarch’s behalf.³⁴

By the end of the nineteenth century, daily life in the Habsburg domains increasingly involved interactions with bureaucrats. Fredrik Lindström went as far as to suggest that bureaucrats represented “the essence of Austrianness,”³⁵ while Gary Cohen remarked with only slight exaggeration that “state or government authority in all its layers and guises was a near-omnipresent reality for the inhabitants of Austria during the last half-century of the monarchy.”³⁶ State officials regulated trade and agriculture, distributed passports, set and enforced standards, and oversaw licenses for various professional bodies. Officials were also encouraged to forge emotional bonds with Habsburg subjects. Peter Becker has even argued that Habsburg bureaucrats engaged in what Arlie Hochschild has variously theorized as “emotion work” or “emotional labour.”³⁷ Perhaps the most striking evidence of the bureaucracy’s social and cultural impact, however, is literary: the Habsburg lands produced famously nightmarish visions of bureaucratic absurdism through the work of Franz Kafka,³⁸ a novelist who in his private correspondence referred to both “the deep-seated bureaucrat in me,” and to “the consummate official inside of me.”³⁹ The importance of the bureaucracy to the everyday life of the monarchy’s citizens makes civil servants important not only to political history but also social and cultural history.

New scholarship foregrounding civil servants is all the more welcome because bureaucratic history has traditionally languished on the fringes of Habsburg historiography.⁴⁰ In central Europe, narratives of “national awakening” have long dominated the historiography of the nineteenth century. Since the traditional “awakening” metaphor implies that the nation has always existed, fully formed but merely “sleeping,” scholars have become increasingly dissatisfied with it: in the words of Ernst Gellner, “nationalism is not the awakening of nations to self-consciousness, it invents nations where they do not exist.”⁴¹ As scholars of Habsburg central Europe have increasingly sought what Valery Tishkov memorably called a “post-national understanding of the nation,”⁴² historiography has become progressively “marginocentric,”⁴³ focusing not on single nations but on ethnic interactions within a particular city,⁴⁴ a particular crownland,⁴⁵ or even a broader region not defined by administrative borders.⁴⁶

The turn away from nation-centered historiography has also made historians curious about social structures that operated independently of national projects. Recent studies have examined loyalty to the dynasty,⁴⁷ or pride in the imperial army.⁴⁸ These revised histories depict the monarchy not as the oppressor of small peoples but as a fair and neutral arbitrator between fractious nationalists,⁴⁹ conspicuously fair-minded in its official multilingualism.⁵⁰ Seen in this new light, the Habsburg state no longer appears as an unviable anachronism but rather an efficient, adaptable, liberal, but above all “modern” state. Gary Cohen thus recently suggested that studying Habsburg civil servants could illuminate the forces that for so long held the Habsburg lands together, as opposed to the nationalist forces pulling them apart.⁵¹

The idea of studying Habsburg officials, of course, is not new. Habsburg scholars have long written about imperial elites: the role of Metternich has hardly been neglected. Nevertheless, the first systematic analysis including the lower levels of the bureaucracy dates only to Karl Megner's 1985 analysis of the administrative corps. Megner's encyclopedic study compiled rich statistical material that still remains useful today.⁵² In 1991, Waltraud Heindl built on Megner's work with her outstanding investigation of the imperial civil service in the period before 1848. Heindl emphasized among other things the heterogeneity of official mentalities.⁵³ The following year, Gerald Stourzh published a seminal article re-considering Kann's narrative of the monarchy as a "multinational empire," noting the increasing importance of economic history and proposing an institutional approach to the study of the Habsburg monarchy.⁵⁴

While the 1990s and 2000s saw few studies of the Habsburg state apparatus,⁵⁵ the 2010s saw a flurry of new studies that created what Fredrik Lindström called a "sense of a new start"⁵⁶ in the study of Habsburg officials. Of these studies from the 2010s, however, two in particular stand out. John Deak's 2015 monograph analyzed the Habsburg bureaucracy from the perspective of state building. He suggested that the civil service acted as an independent power center within the Monarchy and traced its contribution through various historical periods. He found that the administrative apparatus was hardly the enemy of liberalism but instead an engine of the empire's steady modernization and even democratization.⁵⁷ In the same year, Iryna Vushko published on the creation of professional bureaucracy in Galicia from 1772 to 1867. By focusing on individuals, Vushko uncovered previously neglected internal conflicts within the civil service.⁵⁸

Rising interest in officials inspired the Institute of Austrian Historical Research at the University of Vienna, in collaboration with the Swiss Federal Archives in Berne, to establish a new scholarly journal, *Administristory—Journal for the History of Public Administration*. Since its first issue in 2016, Habsburg case studies have featured prominently on its pages. Contributors have studied land use in Bohemia, Galician railway administration, and Bukovinian jurisprudence, to name a just a few.⁵⁹ Important articles examining Habsburg civil servants have, of course, continued to appear in journals other than *Administristory*.⁶⁰

Indeed, imperial history generally is currently reevaluating the role of civil servants in imperial states. Benno Gammerl has also written a comparative study of the Habsburg and British Empires, asking how imperial bureaucracies administered multilingual and multinational populations.⁶¹ Tim Buchen and Malte Rolf's notable work on "elites in multi-national empires," focusing particularly on the Habsburg and Romanov domains, has popularized the concept of "imperial biographies."⁶²

Franz Adlgasser and Fredrik Lindström jointly edited the most recent milestone in the study of Habsburg officials. Their 2019 volume, *The Habsburg Civil Service and Beyond: Bureaucracy and Civil Servants from the Vormärz to the Inter-*

War Years, contains biographical studies of various individual administrators, but also collective biographies of various branches of the civil service. Such work sheds new light on the roles civil servants played in the state structure, emphasizing their importance for the state's effective functioning.⁶³ All these studies arose from and encouraged the aforementioned trend away from national narratives, directing attention instead toward imperial institutions, that is, toward the state.

Civil Servants as a Social Category

Increasing knowledge of how different branches of the Habsburg bureaucracy behaved, or how they interacted with each other, has problematized the “civil service” as a single object of study. The ever-growing ranks of cartographers, census takers, clerks, foresters, judges, military recruiters, policemen, postmen, sanitation inspectors, tax collectors, and telegraph operators did not form a homogenous social group. Differences in education and status meant that their social status varied, even apart from differences in formal rank or salary. Even within a single rank of state service, official lives varied considerably: Friedrich Höning's reference work, listing the names of officials in various branches of Habsburg state service, illustrates the bewildering diversity of official positions. Various officials at the sixth rank, for example, boasted the titles *Bezirkshauptmann*, *Cassa-Director*, *Central-Inspector*, *Chefredacteur*, *Director*, *Finanz-Director*, *General-Inspector*, *Kreisgerichts-Präsident*, *Landes-Schulinspektor*, *Leiter*, *Ober-Baurath*, *Ober-Bergnath*, *Ober-Finanzrath*, *Ober-Inspector*, *Ober-Postdirector*, *Ober-Staatsanwalt*, *Polizei-Director*, *Präsident*, *Rechnungsdirector*, *Regierungsrath*, *Sectionsrath*, *Statthaltereirath*, and *Vice-Präsident*.⁶⁴ As Wolfgang Göderle put it, “the description and analytical naming of a group as heterogeneous as that of the ‘officials’ is indeed difficult.”⁶⁵

We nevertheless contend that the civil service remains a coherent analytical category since officials, despite their heterogeneity, formed a social collective recognizable to contemporaries. Most obviously, they were servants of the state, and as such were expected to work within a centrally imposed hierarchy, follow a stable set of rules and regulations, and wear prescribed uniforms. Civil servants upheld and contributed to the state whose tax levies ultimately paid their salaries and pensions.

Soldiers, of course, were also employed by the state, also served the state, also owed obedience to a hierarchical institution, and also had to wear uniforms. Nevertheless, the line separating the civil service from the military, while sometimes porous, never vanished. Military officers cultivated a culture of honor that not merely excluded civilians but actively denigrated them. Indeed, military officers proved willing to disregard laws and regulations in the name of military expediency. John Deak and Jonathan Gumz have powerfully argued that World War I led to the monarchy's collapse in no small part because extrajudicial military

rule contradicted the principles of the *Rechtsstaat*, thus undermining the state's legitimacy and support.⁶⁶ The dynasty required a civilian bureaucracy to survive, and when the Habsburg military and the Habsburg bureaucracy could no longer work effectively with each other, catastrophe ensued.

Civil servants, no less than military officers, cultivated a professional ethos of their own, complete with its own values, habits, and cultural practices. Their family relations, their residence, and their general behavior mattered.⁶⁷ As typical of nineteenth-century bourgeois professionals, they prized education, work, reason, and progress.⁶⁸ Indeed, Göderle judged civil servants the central element of an emerging civil society in Austria.⁶⁹ Civil servants certainly proved enthusiastic participants in sport clubs, pedagogical associations, and archeological, theatrical, and various other voluntary associations that typified the bourgeois habitus in the nineteenth century.⁷⁰ Within voluntary associations, officials participated in the dissemination of liberal ideas concerning representative government, secular morality, a scientific ethos, hygiene, animal welfare, and so on.

Education seems to have been the most salient characteristic of a civil servant. Insofar as literacy distinguished lower officials from plowing peasants, the bureaucracy offered social mobility not only to the rising bourgeoisie but also to the sons of peasants, whose literate children could realistically aspire to abandon the plow for a job at a desk.⁷¹ Elite positions as a so-called *Konzeptsbeamter* required a university degree in juridical-political studies,⁷² but even relatively subaltern *Concipisten*, working in an office as cashiers, clerks, copyists, notaries, and stenographers, required a confident literacy. Indeed, even foresters, postmen, and railway officials had to be literate since, as Alison Frank put it, “the processing, organizing, producing, and distributing of paper lay at the heart of the management of empire.”⁷³ Composing and manipulating documents was central to the role of officials, and to their power.

Yet education was important to civil servants not only as a professional credential but also in the broader cultural sense captured by the German word *Bildung*. Waltraud Heindl described civil servants as “one of the most important, if not *the* most important, group of the *Bildungsbürgertum* in Austria.”⁷⁴ The concept of a *Bildungsbürgertum* has no real English equivalent, though it shares certain common features with what some British scholars call the “clerisy.”⁷⁵ Etymologically, the term *Bildungsbürgertum* means “education bourgeoisie.” Unlike the phrase “educated middle class,” however, the *Bildungsbürgertum* evokes Karl Marx's vision of the bourgeoisie as the social actor that displaced the landowning aristocracy and assumed political power as economic transformation brought about political change. British interpretations of Marx have, perhaps, led Anglophone theorists to focus disproportionately on factory owners and entrepreneurs as the quintessential “bourgeois” professions. Nevertheless, as a recent volume has argued, lawyers, bankers, doctors, professors, and schoolteachers all contributed to the emergence of the “global bourgeoisie.”⁷⁶ In Habsburg central Europe,

as in Russia, the educated professions taken together form not so much Stefan Collini's "absent minds,"⁷⁷ but rather something more resembling the potentially revolutionary "intelligentsia."⁷⁸ As a constituent part of educated public opinion, in short, officials had a political role apart from their professional activities.⁷⁹

Officials featured prominently in the debates that dominated the monarchy's political life. As members of the middle classes, officials obviously contributed to the monarchy's various nationalist movements. Peter Burian once argued that national conflict in central Europe focused on access to "office and school,"⁸⁰ the two institutions that defined the lives of civil servants. Yet state officials also promoted dynastic loyalism and were in particular instrumental to the cult of the monarch.⁸¹ Éva Somogyi rightly pointed to the dual "national and imperial identity" of officials in Hungary,⁸² and various case studies of Cisleithanian Crownlands have reached similar conclusions.⁸³ While civil servants thus belonged to the supposedly conservative and rigid state apparatus seeking to curb the liberal ideas emerging among the bourgeoisie, they simultaneously belonged to the liberal bourgeoisie, and as such sought moral and social improvement for themselves and their society. At times, they even challenged the state. Socially, they played a double role as supervisors of arising norms and prime movers in supporting new social values. They served the Habsburg dynasty, and in many ways constituted the monarchy. However, they also served society at large, and in many ways constituted civil society, a society increasingly imagined in national terms.

Civil servants, simultaneously part of the state but also part of civil society distinct from the state, thus problematize any sharp distinction between the two. In his well-known ethnography, anthropologist Bruno Latour followed various documents as they circulated through offices, observing how they were constantly altered by different actors. He concluded that a state bureaucracy arises from "a mountain of files and bureaucrats," since "all these documents need to be summarized, summed, subsumed somewhere."⁸⁴ Yet however tempting some may find it to view the Habsburg civil servants as pencil-pushing cogs in the faceless state machine, they also remained human beings, capable like all human beings of unpredictability and caprice. Historians must therefore recognize civil servants as historical actors with their own agency.

The notion of "agency," of course, conceals several difficult problems. How is agency informed by social structure? How does individual agency differ from collective agency? What are its limits? Lively sociological debates about the meaning and usefulness of the term have proved inconclusive.⁸⁵ Though we might provisionally define agency as a capacity to act through mutually transformative interaction with other agents, whether human or nonhuman, no systematic theory of agency can be offered here. However, we warn that while several scholars working in what might be called "subaltern studies" invoke some concept of agency while trying to "make the subaltern speak,"⁸⁶ we are not claiming for civil servants the status of heroic subaltern. We instead concur with William Sewell

that “agency should be understood as a pervasive feature of human social life, not as a badge of heroism.”⁸⁷

The present volume starts from the assumption that civil servants had the capacity for independent action. Individual chapters show that officials not only conformed to their professional and social expectations but used their power to change their circumstances as they thought best. They participated in public life not only in their professional capacity as administrators of a government that, as Proudhon noted, “registered, counted, taxed, stamped, measured, numbered, assessed, licensed, authorized, admonished, prevented, forbidden, reformed, corrected, [and] punished,”⁸⁸ but also in their private lives as patrons, consumers, audience members, association members, philanthropists, pamphleteers, activists, and, ultimately, as citizens.

The chapters below examine Habsburg civil servants from the whole of the nineteenth century, concentrating on how their professional and civil lives overlapped. Contributors examine officials of diverse professions and geographic locations. Individual chapters reveal the individual and collective agency they derived from their unique social position as servants of the state who simultaneously embodied bourgeois habitus. The contributions to this volume seek to enrich the field of Habsburg studies, finally, by examining civil servants as human beings, which in turn helps explore the convoluted question of where the state ends and the public begins.

How This Volume Came About

The immediate origins of this volume lie in a lively email friendship. In November 2017, Alexander Maxwell gave a talk at the University of Ljubljana, which an audience member later recommended to Daša Ličen. We began a collegial correspondence, reading each other’s work, recommending articles to each other, and eventually became friends. When the pandemic put an end to international travel, our plans to meet in person were dashed. As our discussions continued, however, they increasingly turned to the Habsburg civil service. In July 2021, we began toying with the idea of organizing a small online conference. We wrote the first draft of our call for papers in mid-August.

We initially imagined publishing papers as a themed issue of a scholarly journal. When we approached *Austrian History Yearbook*, Howard Louthan, one of the editors, suggested that we consider an edited volume for Berghahn’s series on Austrian and Habsburg Studies. We took the suggestion and mentioned the Berghahn series in our call for papers, “Habsburg Civil Servants: Beyond the State Apparatus.”

The conference, held on Zoom on 28–31 January 2022, attracted more interest than we had dared to hope. The final schedule included twenty-four papers

from scholars in Europe, North America, and Australasia; we listed panel times in four different time zones. Contributor affiliations included Bratislava, Budapest, Cluj-Napoca, Florence, Graz, Jena, Ljubljana, Melbourne, Munich, Newcastle (NSW), New Haven, New York, Notre Dame (Indiana), Prague, Rovereto, Vienna, Urbana-Champaign, Wellington, and Warsaw. Contributors included both graduate students and established scholars. Discussion was lively. We thank all participants for helping make the event a success, though we particularly praise Peter Becker and John Deak for asking such thoughtful and thought-provoking questions. We should also take this opportunity to thank our funders.⁸⁹

The overall quality of the conference papers also exceeded our expectations, presenting us with the desirable problem of deciding which papers to include in the present volume. We first decided to restrict the focus of our book to the Habsburg monarchy itself, which excluded some interesting studies considering Habsburg officials on a broader European stage. Oliver Zajac, for example, looked at contacts between Habsburg officials and the exiled Polish intelligentsia after the 1830 November Uprising, showing that as Polish patriots slowly realized the extent of Polonophile sentiment among Galician officials, they began to court those officials as potential allies. Christos Aliprantis, by contrast, explored how the Austrian secret police infiltrated exile patriot circles, hoping to win the disaffected or disillusioned for the imperial cause. These two papers illustrate the complexity of “loyalty” in the Age of Revolutions: both patriots and monarchists sought converts among the ranks of their opponents. Enthusiasm for these two papers inspired Alexander Maxwell to pitch them as a themed section of the journal *Central Europe*, a journal published by the London School of Slavonic and East European studies.⁹⁰ Both papers were published in 2023.

Other conference participants published their work in other venues. Sven Mörsdorf analyzed the agency of individual diplomats in the Habsburg foreign service by evaluating how Oskar Prochaska interacted with other historical actors during the “Prochaska affair” of 1812; he published his work in the *Hungarian Historical Review*.⁹¹ Marijan Dović discussed the impact of censors on Slovene literature; his work appeared in *Slavica Tergestina*.⁹² Rachel Trode considered official responses to a 1906 strike in Sarajevo’s Tobacco Factory, exploring the diverse ways civil servants interpreted and managed tense social conflict; her work appeared in the journal *Central European History*.⁹³ Megan Richardson contrasted the bureaucracy depicted in Franz Kafka’s fiction with the ideal bureaucracy envisioned by Weber; her work appeared as a “Springer Brief.”⁹⁴ Other participants may have published work that escaped our attention. We apologize for any omissions.

The chapters of this volume, meanwhile, address many different types of officials in many different contexts. Nevertheless, we have grouped them roughly into three main sections, addressing three main themes: the complexity of nationalism, the maintenance of the monarchy, and the role of officials in the

monarchy's collapse. Each of these three themes is addressed in three separate chapters.

The first three chapters in this book consider the interaction between civil servants and various aspects of the early “national awakening” process. Though nationalist historiographies often presuppose the monarchy and its officials were hostile to national aspirations, all three narratives assign civil servants a complex role in a more nuanced narrative. All three chapters thus show how closer attention to state officials contributes to the ongoing problematization of traditional nationalist historiography.

In the first chapter, Hugo Lane discusses how Habsburg officials in Galicia contributed to Polish/Ruthenian estrangement. After sketching the relative social distance between German-speaking Habsburg officials and the province's Polish-speaking elites, Lane suggests that police director Leopold von Sacher and governor's assistant Franz Krieg von Hochfelden judged Ruthenian peasants more appreciative of and loyal to the dynasty than local Polish nobility. They thus sought to promote Ruthenian distinctiveness, in part by creating a separate censor for Ruthenian books; Lane traces the fate of several key manuscripts through different competing censors. By the 1848 Revolution, Polish/Ruthenian conflict had become a staple of Galician politics, but that conflict arose partly from imperial support for early Ruthenian patriots.

If Lane's contribution suggests that Habsburg officials influenced nationalist narratives, Alexander Maxwell's chapter shows how nationalist concepts influenced Habsburg officials. Maxwell documents the many Habsburg officials who believed that the monarchy's Slavs all spoke the same language, namely the “Slavic language.” Linguistic diversity was endemic to the monarchy, and the bureaucracy developed a complex terminology for discussing which linguistic varieties enjoyed which rights in which contexts. A surprising variety of job adverts, legal regulations, police notices, and similar documents posit a single Slavic language, or characterize particularist varieties as “dialects.” Several Slavic intellectuals propounded the idea of a single Slavic language under the banner of “Pan-Slavism,” often distinguishing the literary or linguistic Pan-Slavism they advocated from a “political Pan-Slavism” in supposed league with Romanov Russia. While the monarchy and its officials remained implacably opposed to this political Pan-Slavism, linguistic Pan-Slavism evidently found some resonance in the Habsburg bureaucracy, suggesting unexpected intellectual exchange between the monarchy's officials and its Pan-Slav intelligentsias.

The lives of Habsburg officials, of course, cannot be understood solely in terms of a dichotomy between nationalism and loyalism. In their chapter, Judit Pál and Vlad Popovici sketch out imperial biographies of several Transylvanian officials and document their multiple identities. During the 1848 Revolution, some high-ranking individuals proved willing to swear allegiance to the Romanian nation at the celebrated national assembly in Blaj / Balázsfalva, while previ-

ously and subsequently claiming membership in the Hungarian nation. Others juggled both Saxon and Imperial identities. Several, furthermore, balanced multiple nonnational identities: over the course of his life, Károly Torna was not just a civil servant but a noble, a parliamentarian, and an archeologist; Ioan Corbu was also an atheist, a socialist, and an astronomer. Specifically problematizing the conceptual frame of “national indifference,” Pál and Popovici argue that theories of multiple identities help uncover the complexity of individual life experiences.

Indeed, the next three chapters direct attention away from nationalism and the monarchy’s struggle to contain it, examining instead how officials upheld the monarchy’s political legitimacy, environmental productivity, and social stability. Different Habsburg officials had different tasks, and each of these three chapters focuses sharply on a particular class of civil servants. In each case, officials played a key role in the state’s interactions with different elements of Habsburg society.

Dynastic loyalty dominates the fourth chapter, in which Marco Jaimes sketches how school officials and attorneys in Bohemia and Moravia upheld the cult of the monarch. School principals and educational administrators professed their monarchism by petitioning for the privilege of naming schools after Franz Joseph, organized jubilee celebrations, and the like. Jaimes sees in such demonstrative performances a sense of loyalty to the monarchy as a whole. State attorneys, meanwhile, policed discontent by prosecuting cases of *lèse-majesté*. Authorities often responded to insults with leniency. Examining which incidents provoked harsher punishments, however, reveals which elements of the monarch’s public image authorities felt most central to the monarchy’s preservation.

Officials regulated and cultivated not just monarchy’s reputation but also its natural environment. Drawing on environmental history, Wolfgang Göderle describes how foresters introduced the mongoose to a viper-infested national park on an island in the Adriatic. Correspondence between Vienna and Dalmatia illustrates the interplay between the capital and the provinces. Göderle also explores the lowest levels of the civil service: first through statistical analysis, but then by examining the role of seasonal workers and other menial laborers who have left only fragmentary traces in the monarchy’s archives.

As the monarchy industrialized, subaltern social classes proliferated, creating new administrative challenges. Zdeněk Nebřenský’s chapter examines trade inspectors charged with overseeing working conditions in the monarchy’s factories. Trade inspectors protected public health, and particularly the health of workers and their families. They served as intermediaries between striking workers and factory owners. Over time, inspectors acquired new powers to regulate the quality of canteens and factory housing. Nebřenský depicts trade inspectors as a stabilizing force within the monarchy, even if their small numbers meant that their overall impact inevitably remained limited.

While the central chapters of this volume show that the monarchy’s politics involved questions other than the interplay of competing nationalisms, the final

chapters return to the role played by officials at the monarchy's end. Franz Joseph posed as neutral arbiter between essentially loyal national communities, perhaps most famously articulated in the title of his 28 July 1914 declaration "to my peoples."⁹⁵ The civil service attempted to play the same role. Nevertheless, Habsburg officials became increasingly suspicious of national sentiment. They particularly directed their hostility toward Slavic expressions of national feeling, which were presumed unsympathetic to the monarchy.

Prague police, for example, struggled to remain evenhanded in ongoing disturbances between German student societies and Czech crowds over symbolic control of the city center, and particularly the boulevard Na příkopě / Am Graben. In a chapter examining such protests around the year 1900, David Smrček argues that police officials seeking to maintain order struggled to appear evenhanded in the face of boisterous crowds. As criticizing the police proved an easy path to popularity, elected politicians, whether Czech or German, often openly sided with protestors over the monarchy's civil servants. While the police mostly maintained its professionalism, Smrček highlights the case of František Rosenfelder, an individual policeman who vehemently criticized Czech hotheads in a Prague pub, despite being Czech himself.

Military officers unable to remain evenhanded proved even more damaging to the monarchy's stability. John Deak's chapter considers Dalmatian officials and their reaction to effusions of south-Slavic patriotism. Though civil servants responded with restraint and equanimity, military officers, concerned about the Balkan wars, increasingly saw military threats in any effusion of national feeling. Public demonstrations and even school textbooks led military officers to accuse civilian officials of complacency in the face of potential disloyalty; civil servants in turn upbraided military circles for exceeding their authority out of paranoia. When the outbreak of war in 1914 strengthened the military's hand, their misguided efforts to crack down on dissent ultimately proved catastrophic for the monarchy's legitimacy.

Though war and revolution had undone the Habsburg dynasty and its empire by 1918, imperial officials found their authority persisted independently of the monarch who had ostensibly bestowed it. J. Alexander Killion views the transition to republican rule through the imperial biography of Hans Loewenfeld-Russ, a senior official in the Austrian Nutrition Office. Loewenfeld-Russ dealt with office politics and death threats to keep supplies coming during the war, and he helped maintain central authority during the difficult situation between the monarchy's collapse and the establishment of the First Austrian Republic. Noting that military histories remember generals but unjustly forget the ordinary soldier, Killion suggests that Loewenfeld-Russ's efforts similarly deserve commemoration, since officials helped maintain life and social continuity even in the darkest times. Killion's eulogy for Loewenfeld-Russ, perhaps, applies to Habsburg civil servants as a whole.

Alexander Maxwell is an associate professor at Victoria University in Wellington, New Zealand. He completed his PhD at the University of Wisconsin, Madison, in 2003. He taught in Swansea, Wales, and Reno, Nevada, before accepting a permanent position at Victoria University. He is the author of *Choosing Slovakia* (IB Tauris, 2009), *Patriots Against Fashion* (Palgrave, 2014), and *Everyday Nationalism in Hungary* (De Gruyter Oldenbourg, 2019). He has guest edited themed issues of *Nationalities Papers*, *Nationalism and Ethnic Politics*, the *New Zealand Slavonic Journal*, and the *Journal of Nationalism, Memory, and Language Politics*. He is currently writing a book about the language/dialect dichotomy in government administration.

Daša Ličen is an assistant professor at the University of Maribor and a researcher at the Research Centre of the Slovenian Academy of Sciences and Arts. She works in the fields of cultural anthropology, ethnology, and history, specializing in late Habsburg Trieste. She is currently working on her postdoctoral project, entitled *For Beasts, Against Animals: Towards the Long History of the Animal Rights Movement*, in which she examines the rise of the animal rights movement as a means of class differentiation.

Notes

1. See “Morgen-Sitzung, Donnerstag den 18. Juli,” *Protokolle des Internationaler Sozialisten-Kongress zu Paris, abgehalten am 14. bis 20. July 1889* (Nürnberg: Wörlein and co., 1890), 43.
2. *Deutsches Wörterbuch von Jacob und Wilhelm Grimm*, 3rd edn. (Berlin: Academy of Sciences, 1899), 9:434–39, at 9:438.
3. Mieczysław Maneli, *Freedom and Tolerance* (New York: Octagon Books, 1984), 264.
4. Godfrey Hodgson, *A New Grand Tour: How Europe’s Great Cities Made Our World* (London: Viking, 1995), 184.
5. Walter Moore, *A Life of Erwin Schrödinger* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 12.
6. Peter Kulemann, *Am Beispiel des Austromarxismus: Sozialdemokratische Arbeiterbewegung in Österreich von Hainfeld bis zur Dollfuß-Diktatur* (Hamburg: Junius, 1973), 73.
7. András Sajó, “Law and Legal Scholarship in the Happiest Barrack and among the Hungry Liberated: Personal Recollections,” *Poznań Studies in the Philosophy of the Sciences and the Humanities* 36 (1994): 219–33, at 223; “The Role of Norms in the Reproduction of Social Disorder: A Hungarian Rhapsody” in *Gesellschaft und Gerechtigkeit*, ed. Matthias Mahlmann (Baden-Baden: Nomos, 2011), 394–423, at 394.
8. Max Weber, “Debattereden auf der Tagung des Vereins für Socialpolitik in Wien 1919 zu den Verhandlungen über ‘Die wirtschaftlichen Unternehmungen der Gemeinden,’” in *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Soziologie und Sozialpolitik* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1923), 412–423, at 413; English translation by Jacob Mayer, see “Appendix I: Max Weber on Bureaucratization in 1919,” in Jacob Mayer, *Max Weber and German Politics: A Study in Political Sociology* (London: Faber and Faber, 1956), 125–31, at 126.

9. Weber, "Debatterededen," 413; cited in Mayer, "Appendix I," 126.
10. Michael Hochedlinger, "The Habsburg Monarchy from 'Fiscal-Military State' to 'Militarization,'" in *The Fiscal-Military State in Eighteenth-Century Europe*, ed. Christopher Storrs (London: Routledge, 2009), 55–59, at 56.
11. Hillay Zmora, *Monarchy, Aristocracy and State in Europe, 1300–1800* (London: Routledge, 2001), 56.
12. Hochedlinger, *Austria's Wars of Emergence*, 9.
13. Harald Gustafsson, "The Conglomerate State: A Perspective on State Formation in Early Modern Europe," *Scandinavian Journal of History* 23, nos. 3–4 (1998): 189–213.
14. Michael Roberts, "The Military Revolution, 1560–1660," lecture at Queen's University Belfast, 1956, reprinted in *The Military Revolution Debate: Readings on the Military Transformation of Early Modern Europe*, ed. Clifford Rogers, (London: Routledge, 2018), 13–36, at 20 (new administrative methods), 23 (social escalators).
15. Chester Dunning, "Were Muscovy and Castile the first Fiscal-Military States?," *Quaestio Rossica* 1 (2014): 191–97, at 191; William Godsey, *The Sineus of Habsburg Power: Lower Austria in a Fiscal-Military State, 1650–1820* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018); Hochedlinger, "Habsburg Monarchy," 55–94; Godsey and Maťa, *Habsburg Monarchy*.
16. Heindl, *Gehorsame Rebellen*, 172–95; Heindl, "Beamte, Staatsdienst und Universitätsreform," 35–53.
17. James Schedel, "The Mother of It All: Maria Theresa and the Creation of Hybrid Monarchy," in *Marija Terezija: Med razsvetljenskimi reformami in zgodovinskim spominom*, ed. Miha Preinfalk and Boris Golec (Ljubljana: Slovene Academy of Sciences, 2018), 13.
18. Göderle, "Materializing," 455.
19. *Allgemeines bürgerliches Gesetzbuch*, 3 vols. (Vienna: K.K. Hof- und Staatsdruckerei, 1811).
20. Cohen, "Our Laws," 106–7.
21. Heindl, *Josephinische Mandarine*, 31.
22. Andrew Janos, *The Politics of Backwardness in Hungary, 1825–1945* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1982), 94; Janos cites László Buday, *A megcsönkített Magyarország* (Budapest: Parthenon, 1921), 44.
23. Spielman, *City and the Crown*, 77–80
24. Heindl, "Bureaucracy," 37.
25. Deak, *Forging a Multinational State*, 56.
26. See the discussion in Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities* (London: Verso, 1983), 55–56.
27. John Deak, "The Austrian Civil Service in an Age of Crisis: Power and the Politics of Reform, 1848–1925" (PhD diss., University of Chicago, 2009), 69–70.
28. Gary Cohen, "The Austrian Bureaucracy at the Nexus of State and Society," in Adlgasser and Lindström, *Habsburg Civil Service*, 49–65, at 53.
29. Nawiasky, *Frauen im österreichischen Staatsdienst*.
30. Katalin Szegvári and Andor Ladányi, *Nők az egyetemeken* (Budapest: Felsőoktatási Pedagógiai Kutatóközpont, 1976); Renate Flich, *Wider die Natur der Frau? Entstehungsgeschichte der höheren Mädchenschulen in Österreich* (Vienna: Bundesministerium für Unterricht und Kunst, 1992); Gertrud Simon, *Hintertreppen zum Elfenbeinturm: Höhere Mädchenbildung in Österreich; Anfänge und Entwicklungen* (Vienna: Wiener Frauenverlag, 1993); James Albisetti, "Female Education in German-Speaking Austria, Germany and Switzerland, 1866–1914," in *Austrian Women in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Cen-*

- turies: Cross-Disciplinary Perspectives*, ed. David Good, Margarete Grandner, and Mary Jo Maynes (New York: Berghahn, 1996), 39–57; Ilse Brehmer, *Geschichte der Frauenbildung und Mädchenerziehung in Österreich: Ein Überblick* (Graz: Leykam, 1997); Marie Bahenská, *Počátky emancipace žen v Čechách: Dívčí vzdělání a ženské spolky v Praze v 19. století* (Prague: Libri, 2005); Orsolya Kereszty, *Nőnevelés és nemzetépítés Magyarországon, 1867–1918* (Sopron: Nove, 2010).
31. Heindl, *Josephinische Mandarine*, 147–54.
 32. Appelt, “Gendering,” 115–32.
 33. Fehrer, *Frau als Angestellte*, 23.
 34. Julia Bavouzet, “A Prosopographical Survey of the High Civil Service Corps of the Ministries in the Hungarian Part of the Dual Monarchy,” in Adlgasser and Lindström, *Habsburg Civil Service*, 167–186, at 172.
 35. Fredrik Lindström, “The State and Bureaucracy as a Key Field of Research in Habsburg Studies,” in Adlgasser and Lindström, *Habsburg Civil Service*, 13–49, at 43.
 36. Cohen, “Our Laws,” 106.
 37. Becker, “Decency and Respect,” 80–95; Arlie Russell Hochschild, *The Managed Heart: Commercialization of Human Feeling* (Berkeley: University of California, 1983); Arlie Russell Hochschild, “Emotion Work, Feeling Rules, and Social Structure,” *American Journal of Sociology* 85, no. 3 (1979): 551–75; Arlie Russell Hochschild, “Can Emotional Labour Be Fun?,” in *So How’s the Family? And Other Essays* (Berkeley: University of California, 2013), 24–31.
 38. Michael Löwy, “Paper Chains: Bureaucratic Despotism and Voluntary Servitude in Franz Kafka’s the Castle,” *Diogenes* 51, no. 4 (2004): 49–58; Iain Munro and Christian Huber, “Kafka’s Mythology: Organization, Bureaucracy and the Limits of Sensemaking,” *Human Relations* 65, no. 4 (2012): 523–43; Torben Beck Jørgensen, “Weber and Kafka: The Rational and the Enigmatic Bureaucracy,” *Public Administration* 90, no. 1 (2012): 194–210; Randy Hodson, Andrew Martin, Steven Lopez, and Vincent Roscigno, “Rules Don’t Apply: Kafka’s Insights on Bureaucracy,” *Organization* 20, no. 2 (2013): 256–78; Burkhardt Wolf, “Kafka in Habsburg,” *Administrative Science Quarterly* 61, no. 1 (2016): 193–221.
 39. Richard Heinemann, “Kafka’s Oath of Service: ‘Der Bau’ and the Dialectic of Bureaucratic Mind,” *Proceedings of the Modern Language Association (PMLA)* 111, no. 2 (1996): 257.
 40. Heindl, “Bureaucracy,” 48–51; Deak, “Austrian Civil Service,” 18.
 41. Gellner, *Thought and Change*, 168; see also Lindström, “State and Bureaucracy,” 14; for a defence of “awakening” terminology, see Alexander Maxwell, “Contingency and ‘National Awakening,’” *Nationalism and Ethnic Politics* 26, no. 2 (2020): 183–201.
 42. Valery Tishkov, “Forget the ‘Nation’: Post-nationalist Understanding of Nationalism,” *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 23, no. 4 (2000): 628.
 43. Marcel Cornis-Pope, “Introduction: Representing East-Central Europe’s Marginocentric Cities,” in *History of the Literary Cultures of East-Central Europe*, ed. Marcel Cornis-Pope and John Neubauer (Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2006), 2:9–11.
 44. Peter Fassler, ed., *Lemberg-Lwów-Lviv: Eine Stadt im Schnittpunkt europäischer Kulturen* (Cologne: Böhlau, 1993); John Czaplicka, ed., *Lviv: A City in the Crossroads of Culture* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2000), 13–170; Margit Feischmidt, “Zwischen Abgrenzung und Vermischung: Ethnizität in der siebenbürgischen Stadt Cluj (Kolozsvar, Klausenburg)” (PhD diss., Humboldt University, 2001); Jeremy King, *Budweisers into Czechs and Germans: A Local History of Bohemian Politics, 1848–1948* (Prince-

- ton, NJ: University Press, 2002); Harald Binder, Anna Veronika Wendland, and Yaroslav Hrytsak, "Forum: A City of Many Names: Lemberg/Lwów/Lviv/L'vov—Nationalizing in an Urban Context," *Austrian History Yearbook* 34 (2003): 57–109; Eleonóra Babejová, *Fin-de-siècle Pressburg: Conflict and Cultural Coexistence in Bratislava, 1897–1914* (Boulder, CO: East European Monographs, 2003); Holly Case, "A City between States: The Transylvanian City of Cluj-Kolozsvár-Klausenburg in the Spring of 1942" (PhD diss., Stanford University, 2004); Nancy Wingfield, *Flag Wars and Stone Saints: How the Bohemian Lands Became Czech* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2007); Daša Ličen, *Meščanstvo v zalivu: Društveno življenje v Habsburškem Trstu* (Ljubljana: Založba ZRC & Studia Humanitatis: 2023).
45. Larry Wolff, *The Idea of Galicia: History and Fantasy in Habsburg Political Culture* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2012); Dominique Kirchner Reill, *Nationalists Who Feared the Nation: Adriatic Multi-Nationalism in Habsburg Dalmatia, Trieste, and Venice* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2012); Jeroen van Drunen, "A Sanguine Bunch": *Regional Identification in Habsburg Bukovina, 1774–1919* (Amsterdam: Pegasus, 2015).
 46. Tomasz Kamusella, *Silesia and Central European Nationalisms* (West Lafayette, IN: Purdue University Press, 2007); Robert Nemes, *Another Hungary: The Nineteenth-Century Provinces in Eight Lives* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2016).
 47. Peter Urbanitsch, "Pluralist Myth and Nationalist Realities: The Dynastic Myth of the Habsburg Monarchy—A Futile Exercise in the Creation of Identity?," *Austrian History Yearbook* 35 (2004), 101–41; Cole and Unowsky, *Limits of Loyalty*; Paula Sutter Fichtner, *The Habsburgs: Dynasty, Culture and Politics* (London: Reaktion, 2014).
 48. István Deák, *Beyond Nationalism: A Social and Political History of the Habsburg Officer Corps, 1848–1918* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990); Laurence Cole, *Military Culture and Popular Patriotism in Late Imperial Austria* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014).
 49. Gerald Stourzh, *Die Gleichberechtigung der Nationalitäten in der Verfassung und Verwaltung Österreichs, 1848–1918* (Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1985); Pieter M. Judson, *Guardians of the Nation: Activists on the Language Frontiers of Imperial Austria* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2006).
 50. Rosita Rindler-Schjerve and Eva Vetter, "Linguistic Diversity in Habsburg Austria as a Model for Modern European Language Policy," in *Receptive Multilingualism*, ed. Jan ten Thije and Ludger Zeevaert (Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2007), 49–70; Michaela Wolf, *The Habsburg Monarchy's Many-Languaged Soul: Translating and Interpreting, 1848–1918* (Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2015); Tamara Scheer, "Habsburg Languages at War," in *Languages and the First World War: Communicating in a Transnational War*, ed. Julian Walker and Christophe Declercq (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016), 62–78.
 51. Cohen, "Austrian Bureaucracy."
 52. Megner, *Beamte*.
 53. Heindl, *Gehorsame Rebellen*.
 54. Gerald Stourzh "The Multinational Empire Revisited: Reflections on Late Imperial Austria," *Austrian History Yearbook* 23 (1992): 1–22.
 55. On financial administration and higher officials in the time of Maria Theresa, see Peter G. M. Dickson, "Monarchy and Bureaucracy in Late Eighteenth-Century Austria," *English Historical Review* 110, no. 436 (1995): 323–67; Peter G. M. Dickson, *Finance and Government under Maria Theresa, 1740–1780*, 2 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon, 1987); on the changes in the Habsburg bureaucracy from the 1750s, especially in terms of its

- relationship with the state/politics on the one hand and citizens on the other, see Heindl “Bureaucracy.”
56. Lindström, “State and Bureaucracy,” 15.
 57. Deak, *Forging a Multinational State*, 96, 111, 132, 226.
 58. Vushko, *Politics of Cultural Retreat*.
 59. Josef Löffler, “Grundherrschafliche Verwaltung, Staat und Raum in den böhmischen und österreichischen Ländern der Habsburgermonarchie vom ausgehenden 18. Jahrhundert bis 1848,” *Administratory* 2, no. 1 (2017): 112–39; Nadja Weck, “Staat, Raum und Infrastruktur: Wie die Eisenbahn nach Galizien kam,” *Administratory* 2, no. 1 (2017): 230–48; Walter Fuchs, “Litigious Bukovina: Eugen Ehrlich’s ‘Living Law’ and the Use of Civil Justice in the Late Habsburg Monarchy” *Administratory* 5, no. 1 (2020): 235–48.
 60. Notable contributions include Göderle, “Administration,” 61–88; Garstener, “Historicizing Bureaucratic Encounters,” 5–12.
 61. Gammerl, *Subjects, Citizens, and Others*.
 62. Buchen and Rolf, *Eliten im Vielvölkerreich*; Malte Rolf and Benedikt Tondera, “Imperial Biographies Revisited,” *Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas* 68, no. 2 (2020): 270–81.
 63. Adlgasser and Lindström, *Habsburg Civil Service*.
 64. Friederich Hönig, *Der Staatsbeamte: Jahressbuch für die k.k. österreichischen Civilbeamten*, vol. 5 (Vienna: Perles, 1880), 6 (*Chefredacteur, Sectionsrath*), 31 (*Cassa-director*), 43 (*Rechnungsdirector*), 45 (*General-Inspector, Ober-Inspector*), 67 (*Vice-Präsident*), 79 (*Kreisgerichts-Präsident*), 83 (*Director*), 105 (*Central-Inspector*), 140 (*Landes-Schulinspektor, Regierungsrath*), 143 (*Finanz-Director*), 175 (*Polizei-Diretor*), 201 (*Ober-Baurath*), 230 (*Ober-Staatsanwalt*), 357 (*Bezirkshauptmann, Statthalterei-Rat*), 391 (*Ober-Finanzrat*), 405 (*Ober-Bertgrath, Ober-Postdirector*), 424 (*Präsident*).
 65. Göderle, “Administration,” 63; see also Cohen, “Austrian Bureaucracy,” 52.
 66. John Deak and Jonathan Gumz, “How to Break a State: The Habsburg Monarchy’s Internal War,” *American Historical Review* 122, no. 4 (2017): 1105–36.
 67. Andrea Pokludová, “The Legally Trained Civil Servants in Moravia and Silesia 1848–1918,” in Adlgasser and Lindström, *Habsburg Civil Service*, 97–108, at 99.
 68. For more on the rise of the bourgeoisie and its life in the long nineteenth century, see Eric Hobsbawm, *The Age of Capital* (New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1975); Ernst Bruckmüller, “Nove raziskave zgodovine avstrijskega meščanstva,” *Zgodovinski časopis* 45, no. 3 (1991): 369–89; Allan Mitchell, Gus Fagan, and Jürgen Kocka, eds., *Bourgeois Society in Nineteenth-Century Europe* (Oxford: Berg, 1993).
 69. Göderle, “Administration,” 63.
 70. Leonore Davidoff and Catherine Hall, *Family Fortunes: Men and Women of the English Middle Class 1780–1850* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987); Pieter Judson, “Whether Race or Conviction Should be the Standard: National Identity and Liberal Politics in Nineteenth-Century Austria,” *Austrian History Yearbook* 22 (1991): 76–95; Mitchell, Fagan, and Kocka, *Bourgeois Society*.
 71. Bavouzet, “Prosopographical Survey,” 177; Pokludová, “Legally Trained Civil Servants,” 108.
 72. Heindl, *Gehorsame Rebellen*, 102.
 73. Alison Frank, “The Bureaucracy of Honor: The Habsburg Consular Service and the History of Emotions,” *Administratory* 3, no. 1 (2018): 164–84, at 165.
 74. Heindl, *Gehorsame Rebellen*, 331.

75. Ben Knights, *The Idea of the Clerisy in the Nineteenth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978).
76. Christof Dejung, David Motadel, and Jürgen Osterhammel, “Worlds of the Bourgeoisie,” in *The Global Bourgeoisie: The Rise of the Middle Classes in the Age of Empire*, ed. Christof Dejung, David Motadel, and Jürgen Osterhammel (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2019), 1–14, at 2; see also the fuller discussion on 8–9.
77. Stefan Collini, *Absent Minds: Intellectuals in Britain* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006).
78. On Habsburg intelligentsias, see László Péter, Robert Pynsent, and Romain Pasquier, eds., *Intellectuals and the Future in the Habsburg Monarchy 1890–1914* (London: Springer, 1988); on the Russian intelligentsia, see Stuart Tomkins, *The Russian Intelligentsia: Makers of the Revolutionary State* (Westport, CT: Greenwood, 1957); Richard Pipes, *The Russian Intelligentsia* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1961); Daniel Brower, “The Problem of the Russian Intelligentsia,” *Slavic Review* 26, no. 4 (1967): 638–47; Andrei Sinyavsky, *The Russian Intelligentsia*, trans. Lynn Visson (New York: Columbia University Press, 1997); Vladimir Nahirny, *The Russian Intelligentsia* (London: Routledge, 2018).
79. Gary Cohen, “Nationalist Politics and the Dynamics of State and Civil Society in the Habsburg Monarchy, 1867–1914,” *Central European History* 40, (2007): 241–78.
80. Burian, “State Language Problem,” 87.
81. Cole and Unowsky, *Limits of Loyalty*; Waltraud Heindl “Zum cisleithanischen Beamten-tum: Staatsdiener und Fürstendiener,” in *Die Habsburgermonarchie 1848–1918*, Band 9: *Soziale Strukturen*, ed. Helmut Rumpler and Peter Urbanitsch (Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2010), 1157–209; Waltraud Heindl-Langer, *Gehorsame Rebellen: Bürokratie und Beamte in Österreich* (Vienna: Böhlau, 2013); Paula Sutter Fichtner, *The Habsburgs: Dynasty, Culture and Politics* (London: Reaktion, 2014), esp. chap. 6; Scott Moore, *Teaching the Empire: Education and State Loyalty in Late Habsburg Austria* (West Lafayette, IN: Purdue University Press, 2020).
82. Somogyi, *Hagyomány és átalakulás*, 165.
83. Stanisław Pijaj, *Między polskim patriotyzmem a habsburskim lojalizmem. Polacy wobec przemian ustrojowych monarchii habsburskiej (1866-1871)* (Kraków: Historia Iagellonica, 2003); Mihai-Ştefan Ceaşu, “Die Bukowiner Rumänen Zwischen 1914–1918: Vom Loyalismus zum Irredentismus,” *Anuarul Institutului de Istorie* 43–44 (2006): 139–50; Rita Krueger, *Czech, German, and Noble: Status and National Identity in Habsburg Bohemia* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009).
84. Latour, *Science in Action*, 94.
85. Sharon Hays, “Structure and Agency and the Sticky Problem of Culture,” *Sociological Theory* 12, no. 1 (1994): 57–72; Bob Jessop, “Interpretive Sociology and the Dialectic of Structure and Agency,” *Theory, Culture and Society* 13, no. 1 (1996): 119–28; Mustafa Emirbayer and Ann Mische, “What Is Agency?,” *American Journal of Sociology* 103, no. 4 (1998): 962–1023; John Meyer and Ronald Jepperson, “The ‘Actors’ of Modern Society: The Cultural Construction of Social Agency,” *Sociological Theory* 18, no. 1 (2000): 100–120; Anneli Eteläpelto, Katja Vähäsantanen, Päivi Hökkä, and Susanna Paloniemi, “What Is Agency? Conceptualizing Professional Agency at Work,” *Educational Research Review* 10 (2013): 45–65; Stephan Fuchs, “Beyond Agency,” *Sociological Theory* 19, no. 1 (2001): 24–40; Steven Hitlin and Glen Elder, “Time, Self, and the Curiously Abstract Concept of Agency,” *Sociological Theory* 25, no. 2 (2007): 170–91; Colin Campbell, “Dis-

- tinguishing the Power of Agency from Agentic Power: A Note on Weber and the “Black Box” of Personal Agency,” *Sociological Theory* 27, no. 4 (2009): 407–18.
86. Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, “Can the Subaltern Speak?” in *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture*, ed. Cary Nelson and Lawrence Grossberg (London: Macmillan, 1988), 271–313; see also Walter D. Mignolo, “On Subalterns and Other Agencies,” *Postcolonial Studies* 8, no. 4 (2005): 381–407; Rosalind Morris, ed., *Can the Subaltern Speak? Reflections on the History of an Idea* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2010); Graham Riach, *An Analysis of Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak’s Can the Subaltern Speak?* (London: Macat, 2017).
 87. Sewell, “Agency,” 1.
 88. Pierre-Joseph Proudhon, *Idée générale de la révolution au XIXe siècle* (Paris: Garnier frères, 1851), 341; cited from *General Idea of the Revolution in the Nineteenth Century*, trans. John Robinson (London: Freedom Press, 1923), 293–94.
 89. The event was funded by the Slovenian Research Agency as part of the research program “Ethnological, Anthropological and Folklore Studies Research on Everyday Life” (P6-0088) and the research project “For Beasts, Against Savages” (Z6-4613). Video recording was done by Aleš Oblak of the firm Audire.
 90. Alexander Maxwell, “Rebels into Loyalists, or Loyalists into Rebels? Habsburg Officials and Their International Contacts during the Age of Revolutions”; Oliver Zajac, “Austrian Bureaucrats and Polish Revolutionaries as Allies? Czartoryski, Galicia, and Plans for a Future Polish Uprising 1831–1846”; Christos Aliprantis, “The Austrian Political Police Abroad in the Age of Revolutions, 1830–1867,” all in *Central Europe* 21 (2023), pp 1–7, 8–19, 20–35.
 91. Sven Mörsdorf, “The Prochaska Affair Revisited: Towards a Reevaluation of Austria-Hungary’s Balkan Consuls,” *Hungarian Historical Review* 11, no. 2 (2022): 305–28.
 92. Marijan Dović, “Slovenian Literature and Imperial Censorship after 1848,” *Slavica Tergestina* 26 (2021): 268–95.
 93. Rachel Trode, “The Sarajevo Tobacco Factory Strike of 1906: Empire and the Nature of Late Habsburg Rule in Bosnia and Herzegovina,” *Central European History* 55, no. 4 (2022): 493–509.
 94. Megan Richardson, *The Right to Privacy, 1914–1948: The Lost Years* (New York: Springer, 2023).
 95. “An meine Völker,” *Wiener Zeitung*, no. 174 (29 July 1914), 1; “Népeimhez” *Belügyi közlöny* 19, no. 36 (29 July 1914), 491–93; “Mým národům,” *Čech* 39, no. 200 (29 July 1914), 1.

Bibliography

- Adlgasser, Franz, and Fredrik Lindström, eds. *The Habsburg Civil Service and Beyond: Bureaucracy and Civil Servants from the Vormärz to the Inter-War Years*. Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2019.
- Appelt, Erna. “The Gendering of the Service Sector in Late Nineteenth-Century Austria.” In *Austrian Women in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries: Cross-Disciplinary Perspectives*, edited by David Good, Margarete Grandner, and Mary Jo Maynes, 115–32. New York: Berghahn, 1996.
- Becker, Peter. “Decency and Respect: New Perspectives on Emotional Bonds between State and Citizens.” *Administrory* 3 (2018): 80–95.

- Buchen, Tim, and Malte Rolf. *Eliten im Vielvölkerreich: Imperiale Biographien in Russland und Österreich-Ungarn (1850–1918)*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2015.
- Burian, Peter. “The State Language Problem in Old Austria.” *Austrian History Yearbook* 6 (1970): 81–103.
- Cohen, Gary. “Our Laws, Our Taxes, and Our Administration: Citizenship in Imperial Austria.” In *Shatterzone of Empires: Coexistence and Violence in the German, Habsburg, Russian, and Ottoman Borderlands*, edited by Omer Bartov and Eric D. Weitz, 103–21. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2013.
- Cole, Laurence, and Daniel Unowsky, eds. *The Limits of Loyalty: Imperial Symbolism, Popular Allegiances, and State Patriotism in the Late Habsburg Monarchy*. London: Berghahn Books, 2007.
- Deak, John. *Forging a Multinational State: State Making in Imperial Austria from the Enlightenment to the First World War*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2015.
- Fehrer, Rosemarie. *Die Frau als Angestellte in Wirtschaft und Verwaltung Österreichs. Ihr sozialer Aufstieg seit dem letzten Drittel des 19. Jahrhunderts*. Linz: Trauner, 1989.
- Gammerl, Benno. *Subjects, Citizens, and Others: Administering Ethnic Heterogeneity in the British and Habsburg Empires, 1867–1918*. London: Berghahn, 2017.
- Garstenauer, Therese. “Historicizing Bureaucratic Encounters.” *Österreichische Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaft* 32, no. 1 (2021): 5–12.
- Gellner, Ernst. *Thought and Change*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1964.
- Godsey, William, and Petr Maťa. *The Habsburg Monarchy as a Fiscal-Military State: Contours and Perspectives 1648–1815*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2022.
- Göderle, Wolfgang. “Administration, Science, and the State: The 1869 Population Census in Austria-Hungary.” *Austrian History Yearbook* 47 (2016): 61–88.
- . “Materializing Imperial Rule? Nature, Environment, and the Middle Class in Habsburg Central Europe.” *Hungarian Historical Review* 11, no. 2 (2022): 445–76.
- Gustafsson, Harald. “The Conglomerate State: A Perspective on State Formation in Early Modern Europe.” *Scandinavian Journal of History* 23, nos. 3–4 (1998): 189–213.
- Heindl, Waltraud. “Beamte, Staatsdienst und Universitätsreform. Zur Ausbildung der höheren Bürokratie in Österreich (1780–1848).” *Das 18. Jahrhundert und Österreich Jahrbuch der Gesellschaft zur Erforschung des 18. Jahrhunderts* 4 (1987): 35–53.
- . *Gehorsame Rebellen: Bürokratie und Beamte in Österreich*. Vienna: Böhlau, 1991.
- . “Bureaucracy, Officials, and the State in the Austrian Monarchy: Stages of Changes since the Eighteenth Century.” *Austrian History Yearbook* 37 (2006): 34–57.
- . *Josephinische Mandarine: Bürokratie und Beamte in Österreich*. Band 2, 1818 bis 1914. Vienna, Köln and Graz: Böhlau, 2013.
- Hochedlinger, Michael. *Austria’s Wars of Emergence: War, State and Society in the Habsburg Monarchy, 1683–1797*. London: Pearson, 2003.
- Latour, Bruno. *Science in Action, How to Follow Scientists and Engineers through Society*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1987.
- Megner, Karl. *Beamte. Wirtschafts- und sozialgeschichtliche Aspekte des k. k. Beamtentums*. Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1985.
- Nawiasky, Hans. *Die Frauen im österreichischen Staatsdienst*. Vienna: Deuticke, 1902.
- Sewell, William. “Is Agency a Useful Historical Concept?” *Journal of Social History* 57, no. 3 (2024): 436–40.
- Somogyi, Éva. *Hagyomány és átalakulás: állam és bürokrácia a dualista Habsburg Monarchiában*. Budapest: l’Harmattan, 2006.

Spielman, John Philip. *The City and the Crown: Vienna and the Imperial Court, 1600–1740*. West Lafayette, IN: Purdue University Press, 1993.

Vushko, Iryna. *The Politics of Cultural Retreat: Imperial Bureaucracy in Austrian Galicia, 1772–1867*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2015.