



**DELHI UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY**

DUE DATE SLIP

Cl. No. V5931:10J:M5 H8

Ac. No. 213033

Date for release of loan

This book should be returned on or before the date last stamped below. An overdue charge of 10 Paise will be collected for each day the book is kept overtime.

THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY STUDIES IN
HISTORICAL AND POLITICAL SCIENCE

Under the Direction of the Departments of History,
Political Economy, and Political Science

SERIES LXV

NUMBER 2

NOBLE LANDOWNERS AND
AGRICULTURE IN AUSTRIA,
1815-1848

A STUDY IN THE ORIGINS OF THE PEASANT
EMANCIPATION OF 1848

By
JEROME BLUM
Instructor in History, Princeton University

BALTIMORE
THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS
1948

COPYRIGHT 1948, THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS

**PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
BY J. H. FURST COMPANY, BALTIMORE, MARYLAND**

To
THE MEMORY
OF MY PARENTS

PREFACE

This study is concerned with the role played by noble land-owners in effecting the changes that took place in Austrian agriculture during the years 1815-1848. The major emphasis of the work has fallen on five of the fifteen lands which made up the Austrian Monarchy during the period under consideration. These five lands are Bohemia, Moravia-Silesia, Lower Austria, Hungary, and Galicia. These were the lands in which the greatest part of the Monarchy's agricultural goods were produced, in which the institution of that servile peasant tenure known as hereditary subjection was the most pronounced, and where the new forces which developed in the 1815-1848 period evidenced themselves most clearly. It is natural, then, that they should receive the most attention in the following pages, although the other German-Slav provinces of the realm have not been neglected. The provinces of Lombardy and Venetia, however, have been omitted, although they were parts of the Austrian Monarchy in the period with which I deal, and although Lombardy was an extremely important agricultural area. The reason for this omission is that the techniques and institutions of North Italian agriculture were entirely different from those found in the rest of the Monarchy.

My first researches in Austrian economic history were undertaken with the encouragement of Dr. Kent Roberts Greenfield, then professor at the Johns Hopkins University. The present work was written under the direction of Dr. Frederic Chapin Lane. Professor Lane's keen and incisive criticisms and his wise suggestions have put me deeply in his debt. Professors Sidney Painter of Johns Hopkins, Robert R. Palmer of Princeton University, and Friedrich Engel-Janosi of the Catholic University of America read the entire study. Dr. Vladimir Gzovski, Chief of the Foreign Law Section, Library of Congress, read Chapter II, and Professor George Heberton Evans, Jr., of Johns Hopkins, read the bibliographical note. I am grateful for the valuable critical comments and suggestions I received from these gentlemen. Miss Lilly Lavarello edited and proofread the entire study with painstaking thoroughness. Mr. James E. King, Mr. M.

Hamlin Cannon, and Mr. Alfred Goldberg provided me with appreciated editorial assistance.

The research for and the writing of this study was done almost entirely at the Library of Congress. The gracious cooperation afforded me by the staff of this institution was of great aid to me. Special acknowledgments on this score are due Colonel Willard Webb, Chief of the Stack and Reader Division, and the members of his able staff, and Mr. Bernhard Goldberg and Mr. Floyd S. McPhearson of the Interlibrary Loan Unit.

JEROME BLUM

Princeton, N. J.
September, 1947

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. THE PHYSICAL, POLITICAL, AND ECONOMIC STRUCTURE OF THE AUSTRIAN MONARCHY.....	11
The geography of the Monarchy.....	11
The political power of the nobility.....	21
Economic development during the <i>Vormärz</i>	41
II. LAND TENURE IN THE <i>Vormärz</i>	45
The agrarian reform movement of the eighteenth century	45
The collapse of the reform movement.....	56
Noble tenure.....	61
Peasant tenures	68
Dues and obligations.....	68
Rights of the peasant.....	80
Agrarian reform during the <i>Vormärz</i>	87
Summary	88
III. THE NEW INTEREST OF NOBLE LANDOWNERS IN PROFITABLE AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTION.....	91
Improved transport facilities and expansion of markets	91
The new interest of noble landlords.....	95
Wool, sugar beets, and potatoes.....	97
Land reclamation.....	110
Agricultural credit	113
Schools of agriculture.....	127
Societies for the promotion of agriculture.....	132
IV. NOBLE LANDOWNERS AND THE METHODS OF FARMING IN THE NORTHWEST ZONE.....	145
Geography of the zone.....	146
Techniques of cultivation.....	149
Agricultural activities of noble landowners.....	160
An estate of the zone.....	167

	PAGE
V. NOBLE LANDOWNERS AND AGRICULTURAL LABOR....	171
The sources of agricultural labor.....	171
The supply of agricultural labor.....	172
In the Northwest zone.....	172
In Lower Austria.....	176
In other German-Slav provinces.....	180
In Hungary.....	182
Methods of increasing the <i>Robot</i>	184
Wages and productivity of hired labor.....	187
The inefficiency of <i>Robot</i> labor.....	192
VI. NOBLE LANDOWNERS AND THE AGRARIAN REVOLUTION	203
Agrarian reform a political issue.....	203
The noble program of agrarian reform.....	208
The government's program of agrarian reform....	222
The agrarian revolution.....	231
VII. CONCLUSIONS	239
APPENDICES	
1. Conversion Tables. Money, measures, and weights....	247
2. <i>Pfandbrief</i> of Galician Estates Credit-Anstalt.....	248
<i>Bankbrief</i> of proposed Bohemian Estates Real Mortgage	
Bank	249
BIBLIOGRAPHICAL NOTE.....	250
INDEX	277

CHAPTER I

THE PHYSICAL, POLITICAL, AND ECONOMIC STRUCTURE OF THE AUSTRIAN MONARCHY

THE GEOGRAPHY OF THE MONARCHY

One of the legacies of the era of the French Revolution and Napoleon was the consolidation of the realm of the Hapsburgs. For the first time since Rudolph was crowned Holy Roman Emperor in 1273 all the lands under the Hapsburg scepter were contiguous, forming a solid mass from northern Italy to the borders of the Ottoman Empire. Its greatest width, from Lago Maggiore on the west to the Transylvanian-Wallachian border near Kronstadt on the east, was 840 miles. Its maximum north-south distance—leaving out the long, narrow province of Dalmatia—was 440 miles from the Bohemian-Saxon border to the tip of the Istrian peninsula. The total area of the Monarchy was 12,140 geographical square miles.¹

During the period 1815-1848—called the *Vormärz* because it preceded the revolutions of March, 1848—the Monarchy was divided into fifteen separate lands. These fifteen, with their respective areas, were:²

	(Geographical Square Miles)
Lower Austria	360.03
Upper Austria (including Salzburg)	348.91
Styria	407.79
Carinthia and Carniola	369.79
Tyrol	532.61
Bohemia	943.72
Moravia-Silesia	497.19
Galicia	1593.11
Littoral	127.99
Dalmatia	232.33
Hungary	4160.68
Transylvania	997.82
Military Frontier	742.84
Lombardy }	825.62
Venetia }	

¹ For conversion tables of weights and measures see Appendix 1. In 1846 the Grand Duchy of Cracow, 22 geographical square miles in area, was annexed by Austria and incorporated into Galicia. This was the only territorial change that took place in the years 1815-1848.

² A. Ficker, "Gebietsveränderungen der österreichisch-ungarischen Monarchie 1790-1877," Bureau der k. k. statistischen Central-Commission, *Statistische Monatschrift*, IV (1878), 35.

The population of the Monarchy in 1846 was almost 37.5 millions.³ Each of the major national groups that made up this population—or, more exactly, linguistic groups, since the census of nationalities classified the individual according to the language he usually spoke—occupied a definite section of the Monarchy. But in each section there were minorities, sometimes very large ones, of the other major national groups. The German-speaking people were dominant in the provinces of Upper and Lower Austria, and in the largest parts of Tyrol, Styria, and Carinthia. Carniola was Slovene, as were the southern borders of Styria and Carinthia. The western edge of the Littoral was mainly Italian, while the interior of the province was Slovene in the north and Croat in the south. Dalmatia was peopled almost entirely by Croats except for a small Italian minority which was concentrated in the towns and islands along the coast. Lombardy and Venetia were Italian, as was the southern part of Tyrol.

The Czechs were the most numerous linguistic group in Bohemia and Moravia. There was also a large German-speaking minority, dwelling mainly on the edges of the provinces, in compact "language islands" in the middle of the Czech areas, and in the cities. Slovaks lived in the southeastern corner of Moravia. Silesia was populated by Germans, Poles, and Czechs, with Germans the most numerous, followed by the Poles and then the Czechs. Western Galicia was Polish while eastern Galicia was occupied mainly by Little Russians (Ruthenians). The nobility and the townspeople in both the eastern and western parts were Polish. Bukowina (the extreme southeastern section of Galicia which had been incorporated into that province in 1786) was peopled by Little Russians in the north and by Roumanians in the south. There was also a large German minority.

In Hungary, the Magyars were massed in the plain land, especially between the Danube and the Theiss Rivers. They were surrounded and outnumbered by Slavic and Roumanian peoples. The Slovaks formed a compact group in the mountainous northwest and north. Little Russians were the dominant

³ K. k. Direction der administrativen Statistik, *Statistisches Handbüchlein für die österreichische Monarchie*, ed. C. von Czoernig (Vienna, 1861), p. 35.

linguistic group in the northeast. Roumanians dwelt in the east, bordering on Transylvania. Serbs were the single most important group in the southeast of Hungary and Croats in the southwest. There was a sizable German minority, living mainly in the western counties and in the cities, but present also in other parts of the land. Roumanians were in the majority in Transylvania. Magyars formed a large minority, massed especially in the mountainous eastern frontier (these Magyars were known as Szeklars) and in the valleys of the Maros and Szamos Rivers in the central part of the province. There was also a German minority in the southeastern part of Transylvania, in and around the towns of Hermannstadt and Kronstadt.⁴

The Monarchy was the most continental of all the great states of Europe. Its only coastline was a relatively short one along the Adriatic. The most important river of the realm was the Danube. It entered the Monarchy on the western border at Passau, in Upper Austria, and for 1,313 km. coursed east through Upper and Lower Austria into Hungary, then south through the great Hungarian plain, and then east once more, leaving Austrian soil at Orsowa in the southeastern corner of the Military Frontier. Of the other rivers of the Monarchy the most important were the Elbe in Bohemia, the Vistula in eastern Silesia and western Galicia, the Dniester in eastern Galicia, the Po in Lombardy and Venetia, and the Adige in southern Tyrol and Venetia.

The outstanding physical characteristic of the Monarchy was its mountainous nature. Nearly 75 per cent of its total area was covered by the mountains, hills and highlands of its four mountain systems, the Alps, the Karst, the Bohemian-Moravian mountains, and the Carpathians. Almost the entire eastern half of Europe's great Alpine system lay within the Austrian borders. All of Tyrol, Carinthia, and Styria, the parts of Upper and

⁴ It is conventional and convenient, if not precise, to refer to certain groups of provinces collectively, their designation being that of the dominant linguistic group. By German provinces is meant Lower Austria, Upper Austria, Styria, Carinthia, and Tyrol; by North Slav provinces is meant Bohemia, Moravia-Silesia, and Galicia; by South Slav provinces is meant Carniola, Littoral, and Dalmatia. By the term German-Slav provinces is meant the German, North Slav, and South Slav provinces; by Hungarian is meant Hungary and Transylvania; by Italian provinces is meant Lombardy and Venetia.

Lower Austria that were south of the Danube, the northern parts of Carniola and the Littoral, and the northern borders of Lombardy and Venetia were covered by Alps, and Alpine spurs stretched far into southwestern Hungary. The barren Karst mountains covered the southern parts of Carniola and the Littoral, the western end of the Military Frontier, and all of Dalmatia. The ranges and highlands of the Bohemian-Moravian mountains filled a large part of those two provinces and pushed down into Upper and Lower Austria to the Danube. The Carpathians reached in a great arc, open to the southwest, from the Danube near Pressburg across Hungary and Transylvania to meet the Danube again at the Iron Gates at Orsowa. With the exception of its extreme southern and southeastern slopes this entire system was within the frontiers of the Monarchy. It was the most extensive of Austria's four mountain systems, covering 240,000 square kilometers, or about four times as much area as was taken up by the Austrian Alps.⁵ The northwestern Carpathians filled all of northwestern and northern Hungary, and sent spurs into Moravia, Silesia, and western Galicia. The northeastern Carpathians formed a long, narrow chain along the Galician-Hungarian border, merging into the southeastern Carpathians at the Transylvanian border. Here began the Transylvanian highland, trapezoid in shape and rimmed by mountains.

The largest share of the lowlands of the Monarchy was in the valley of the Danube. Four times during that river's long journey through the Hapsburg realm its valley widened out to form great basins. This happened twice in Lower Austria and twice in Hungary. Each of these basins took its name from the chief city located within it. Starting upstream, the first and smallest of the four was the Krems Basin in the western central section of Lower Austria, with an area of 550 square kilometers.⁶ Below it was the Vienna Basin in which lay the capital city of Vienna. This basin, running from northeast to southwest for about 100 kilometers, covered an area of some 2,200 square kilometers. It formed the lowland between the main ranges of the Austrian Alps and the Carpathians. That part of the basin

⁵ F. Umlauf, *Die österreichisch-ungarische Monarchie* (Vienna, 1897), p. 197.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 284.

that was south of the Danube was known in a narrower sense as the Vienna Basin, while the part north of the river was called the *Marchfeld* from the March River which flowed through it to the Danube.⁷

The first of the two Hungarian basins began where the Danube passed the western base of the great Carpathian arc at the Hungarian-Lower Austrian frontier. This was the Pressburg Basin, or, as it was more usually called, the Little Alföld (Lowland). It covered an area of approximately 8,800 square kilometers. The Danube split into three chief, and many smaller, branches in its passage through this lowland, forming numerous river islands. The northern and smaller part of the Little Alföld presented a variegated terrain, while the two thirds that was south of the Danube was mainly flat country.⁸ The Budapest Basin, or the Great Alföld, was the fourth and by far the largest of the four basins. Beginning where the Danube made its sudden turn to the south the Great Alföld extended over an area of 100,000 square kilometers. Roughly rectangular in shape it was bordered on the north and east by the Carpathians, on the west by Alpine spurs, and on the south by mountains of the Alpine and Balkan systems.⁹

The other large lowland of the Monarchy (aside from the Lombardy Plain which is not considered here) was in northern Galicia. It was part of the great Eastern European lowland. Other lowlands of lesser size but of much agricultural importance occurred in the valleys of the Elbe and Moldau rivers in Bohemia and the March River in Moravia.¹⁰

Beginning in 1869 the Austrian Agriculture Ministry in its reports of agricultural activity divided all the German-Slav lands into 99 separate districts. Each of these was termed a "natural" or "economic" district, by which was meant that in each individual district physical conditions and agricultural activity were similar.¹¹ Using these geographic-economic subdivisions as a basis Siegfried von Strakosch divided all the German-Slav prov-

⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 284-285.

⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 286-287.

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 288.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 302, 307.

¹¹ K. k. Ackerbauministeriums, *Statistisches Jahrbuch des k. k. Ackerbauministeriums für 1874* (Vienna, 1875), I, LXII-LXX.

inces into four chief zones of natural agricultural production. These were the Alpine zone, the Northwest zone, the Northeast zone, and the Karst or Littoral zone.¹²

The Alpine zone was divided into three distinct subzones: the true Alps, the eastern Alpine forelands and the northern Alpine forelands. All of Tyrol and Carinthia, 39 per cent of Styria, 35 per cent of Carniola, 20 per cent of Lower Austria, and almost 50 per cent of Upper Austria belonged to the true Alps subzone. The eastern Alpine forelands included 61 per cent of Styria (Middle and Lower Styria) and 40 per cent of Carniola (Lower Carniola). The northern forelands covered 53 per cent of Lower Austria and 31 per cent of Upper Austria.

The largest part of the true Alps subzone was over 700 meters above sea level, with elevations between 1,200 and 1,600 meters being more usual than lower elevations. About 5 per cent of the region was above the snow line. Rainfall here was the heaviest in the Monarchy. Annual precipitation at various points scattered through the subzone was 274, 197, 155, 142, and 116 cm., compared with an average of 74 cm. for the Monarchy. The growing season started in late spring and was short, with a delay of 4.1 days for every increase of 100 meters in elevation. Winters were cold with heavy snowfalls, and summers cool. Large temperature fluctuations within periods of a few hours were characteristic. There were wide local variations in climate depending upon the situation of the valleys and slopes. The damp, cool climate and the steepness of the mountains favored grass culture, pastureland and woods, so that this was a region of cattle raising and forestry.¹³

The Alpine forelands did not rise above 650 meters and the principal agricultural areas of this subzone had an elevation of around 200 meters. Conditions were more favorable for agricultural production than they were in the true Alps. The climate was more temperate and the land more fertile, so that cultivation of the soil ceased to be merely an adjunct to cattle raising and assumed primary importance. In the

¹² S. von Strakosch, *Die Grundlagen der Agrarwirtschaft in Österreich* (Vienna, 1917), pp. 15-16.

¹³ *Ibid.*, pp. 21-37.

eastern forelands spring came early but late frosts were common. Summer heat began in June bringing with it an often excessive and crop-damaging dryness. Autumns were long and warm, and winters cold with little snow but with frequent ice caused by freezes after siroccal rains. The northern forelands lay on the average of $1\frac{1}{2}^{\circ}$ north of the eastern forelands and were cut off from the south by the Alpine mass. The climate there was a transitional one between that of western Europe with its mild winters and wet, relatively cool summers, and the more continental eastern European climate that was drier with hotter summers and colder winters. Areas in the northern part of Lower Austria bordering on Moravia were among the driest in the Monarchy with average annual rainfall in some places there being as low as 33.2 cm.¹⁴ Despite the more favorable natural conditions that prevailed in the eastern forelands, the northern forelands were the more important agricultural region because of the proximity of markets.¹⁵

The Northwest zone included Bohemia, Moravia-Silesia, the northwest quarter of Lower Austria (*Viertel ober dem Manhartsberg*) and that part of Upper Austria that was north of the Danube (*Mühlkreis*). The geographical characteristics of this zone are discussed at some length in Chapter IV so that only a brief summary is given here. This zone was ringed by mountains except on the south and southeast. Inner Bohemia and Moravia were highlands. The zone's climate was a transitional one between the oceanic and the continental, with the climate of the interior being much less rugged than that of the mountain rim. Rainfall in the interior was relatively light but was unusually well distributed through the year for agricultural purposes, with about two-thirds of it falling during the growing season from April to the end of August. During the harvest months it slackened so that there were dry, sunny days to hasten ripening and harvesting.

Galicia formed the Northeast zone. This zone was situated on the border between the moderate climate of central Europe and the extreme continental climate. Going from west to east across the zone the winters became colder, drier and longer

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 38-40.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 40-43.

and the spring and early summer damper. The approach to the Russian border was heralded by late spring and early autumn frosts, shorter growing seasons, greater fluctuations between seasonal temperatures, an increase in the temperature variation between day and night, and an increase in sharp, dry winds. Average annual rainfall for the zone was 73 cm., approximately half of which fell from May through August, the four most important growing months. The rest of the rainfall was distributed fairly evenly throughout the year.

There were four separate subzones in the Northeast zone. Going from south to north the first subzone was that of the Carpathians which divided Galicia from Hungary and Transylvania. This subzone encompassed a fifth of the entire Northeast zone. In its western part its elevation began at 1,000-1,100 meters and, as the mass of the High Tatra, went up to 1,400-2,600 meters. The elevation of the eastern part was between 1,440 and 2,400 meters. The second subzone was the forelands of the Carpathians. This was a region of mountains and hills that covered about two fifths of the Northeast zone. Its elevation was between 400 and 1,000 meters. Stretching north and east from the forelands was the lowland subzone, rising only 170 to 200 meters above sea level. This subzone ran from the Silesian border along the Vistula, San and Bug rivers. It covered about a fifth of the entire zone. The last fifth was the Podolian plateau in the northeast on the left bank of the Dniester between Lemberg, Brody and Tarnopol. The average elevation of this plateau was around 300 meters.¹⁰

The Karst zone included southern Carniola, the Littoral, and Dalmatia. It was the most barren and unproductive region of the Monarchy. Its farmers could grow very little on its deforested, rocky slopes. Cattle raising was the principal agricultural activity, except on the sea coast in the south of the zone and in a few valleys, where grapes, olives, and chestnuts were grown. The zone's climate varied from the mid-European in its mountain interior to the Mediterranean on its narrow coastal plain. Average annual rainfall varied with the climatic variations of the zone but was generally heavier than the Monarchy's average, reaching as much as 300 cm. in some parts of

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 80-84.

the zone. The rain, however, was concentrated in October and November during the siroccal storms and in early spring before the fields could be seeded. Rainfall was light in summer, except for occasional downpours that did more harm than good, and summer droughts were not unusual. The general dryness of the region was aggravated by the Bora, the sharp, cold and excessively dry wind blowing from the northeast. The Bora sometimes came with cyclonic violence that was destructive to vegetation. In the northern Adriatic region the Bora was three times as frequent as the moist, warm Sirocco which blew from the south carrying with it clouds and rain from the sea. Another climatic factor that militated against successful farming was the frequency of sudden and severe temperature changes.¹⁷

Hungary formed a geographical unit that was separate from the rest of the Monarchy. The heart of this region was formed by the fertile basins of Pressburg and Budapest—the Little Alföld and the Great Alföld. Mountains shut off the lowland from the Adriatic so that its climate was a continental one without the modulating effects of the sea. The difference in temperature between day and night was large, as was the temperature difference between seasons. Late spring frosts were not unusual.¹⁸ Average annual rainfall was around 70 cm. Ordinarily, it was distributed fairly evenly throughout the year so that most of the year's rain fell during the months when the earth needed it the least, that is, from October to April.¹⁹ Excessive summer droughts were not uncommon. In the seventy-five years up to 1864 there were nineteen years in which crop failure was caused by drought and only three years in which excessive moisture or cold was the cause.²⁰

There were three sections of the Great Alföld. The poorest of the three was in the northeast, where the land was dry and

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 116-117, 125-132.

¹⁸ H. Ditz, *Die ungarische Landwirtschaft. Volkswirtschaftlicher Bericht an das königl. bayerische Staatsministerium des Handels und der öffentlichen Arbeiten* (Leipzig, 1867), pp. 33-35.

¹⁹ A. Winkler, *Ungarns landwirtschaftsgeographische Gestaltung* (Berlin, 1938), p. 17.

²⁰ Ditz, pp. 40-41.

sandy with long lines of dunes.²¹ Flatter and lower-lying country, covered with a thick layer of rich black earth, formed the central section of the Alföld. This great steppe was an extremely fruitful part of the lowland.²² The southern and third section, the Banat, which lay between the Danube, the Theiss, and the Maros rivers, was one of Europe's most fertile regions.²³

The low-lying land and the uncontrolled rivers that meandered through the region combined to create frequent floods and great swamp areas in both the Alfölds. Broad morasses bordered the Danube on its long course through the plains and stretched out on both sides of the southern Theiss and along the lesser rivers.²⁴ Some of the land that was thereby lost to cultivation was potentially of the greatest fertility. Heinrich Ditz in his report on Hungarian agriculture, told of a swamp area along the Save River that covered many square miles. The unregulated course of the river and of its tributaries kept the largest part of this area under water. The relatively small amount of high ground was planted annually but in nine out of ten years the crop failed because the summer floods inundated even this high land. But the crop that was successfully raised in one year out of ten was so good, according to Ditz, that it more than paid for the losses of the nine bad years.²⁵

The rich black soil that covered so much of the lowland was reportedly of an inexhaustible fertility. During the years 1815-1848 and beyond it was the least intensively cultivated part of the Monarchy.²⁶ A traveler in 1850 who had just

²¹ B. C. Wallis, "The peoples of Hungary: their work on the land," *Geographical review*, IV (1917), 465.

²² Ditz, p. 51.

²³ A. A. Paton, *The goth and the hun* (London, 1851), pp. 44-45.

²⁴ A. Fényes, *Ungarn in Vormärz*, transl. from the Hungarian (Leipzig, 1841), p. 17.

²⁵ Ditz, p. 14 n.

²⁶ Muhlenberg to Forsyth, Vienna, 8 August 1839 (MS, U. S. National Archives, Department of State, *Diplomatic dispatches*, Austria); M. von Schwartzner, *Statistik des Königreichs Ungern 1809-1811* (3 vols., Ofen, 1809-1811), I, 339; R. Bright, *Travels from Vienna through lower Hungary* (Edinburgh, 1818), p. 98; A. von Baldacci, "Über die inneren Zustände Österreichs. Eine Denkschrift aus dem Jahre 1816," ed. F. von Krones, *Archiv für österreichische Geschichte*, LXXIV (1889), 99.

returned from a trip through Hungary wrote of the land as follows:

Providence has blessed the plains of this land with a fullness of treasures which still lay buried in the ground. The traveler goes for days across a boundless prairie without finding a town, seeing only every once in a while grazing cattle and a few scattered huts in which their herdsman live. The virgin soil has been untouched by the plow and is still in its primitive state with grass the only plant it produces²⁷

The Military Frontier was a long narrow strip of land that reached from the shores of the Adriatic along the northern bank of the Save and then of the Danube to the Carpathians, forming the southern border of Hungary. Most of it was a part of Hungary geographically although it was a separate political unit. Its original purpose had been to protect the Hapsburg realm against Turk and plague. Both these dreaded calamities had lost their formidable character, but the Military Frontier was maintained.

THE POLITICAL POWER OF THE NOBILITY

The era of revolution had left its mark on the geographical configuration of the Monarchy, but Austria's rulers were determined that it should leave no trace on the country's social and political structure. Emperor Francis I who ruled from 1792 to 1835, the original of the *unsern guten Kaiser Franz* of Austria's anthem, was the bitter enemy of any and all changes. He was determined to rule as an absolute monarch. His hatred of innovation prevented many needed administrative reforms, while his deliberate policy of putting off decisions in the hope of being able to postpone action led to hopeless contradiction and confusion and ultimately to governmental impotence.²⁸ A. J. P. Taylor has given an analysis of the philosophy of government of Francis (and of those who ruled after him until 1848), as follows:

He knew only one duty, to maintain his personal authority; and he opposed change because any change would imply that his authority

²⁷ *Centralblatt der Land- und Forstwirtschaft in Böhmen*, I (1850), 110.

²⁸ For a characterization of the Franciscan administration see J. Blum, "Transportation and industry in Austria 1815-1848," *Journal of modern history*, XV (1943), 24-25.

had previously been ill-directed. . . . After all what need had the Empire of reform? It had come through the storm of the Napoleonic wars without disaster, and what was good enough to withstand Napoleon was good enough to drift along in peace-time. Francis drew from the experiences of Joseph II and Louis XVI the lessons that reforms, far from strengthening a monarchy, inevitably led to its destruction, and he believed that it was far better to keep in being a rotten, worm-eaten edifice than to experiment with it and bring it crashing to the ground.

One can hardly call this a creed of conservatism; it was rather a refusal to have any creed at all—a determination to keep on driving the motor despite all its creaks and groans, because if you once tightened a screw the whole thing would fall to pieces. Everything his ancestors had left him was to be preserved intact—confused, unfinished, and contradictory; the reforms and the failures to reform; reliance on the nobility and hostility to the nobility; preservation of the provinces and continuance of the central government, which aimed at eliminating the provinces. The Empire was to remain precisely as Francis had found it, its development arrested at 1792.²⁰

A paradox of the *Vormärz* regime was the coexistence in the German-Slav provinces of a centralized absolutist administration with its officials and soldiers everywhere in the land, and of a seigniorial form of society in which the courses of men's lives were determined by whether they were born of noble, burgher or peasant parents. The central government issued a steady stream of laws and ordinances by which the state was ruled but the legal privileges of its subjects were determined by those of the class of which they were a member. In Hungary the absolutist power of the central government was absent, for Hungary was a limited monarchy, so that the class structure was all the more pronounced.²⁰

The nobility of the German-Slav provinces were divided into two classes: the *Herrenstand*, or higher nobility, the princes, counts and barons; and the *Ritterstand*, the gentry. Although all members of the nobility enjoyed the same privileges, the members of the *Herrenstand* were accorded greater respect and were given preferment in the appointments to high posts in the government, the church, and the army.²¹

Among the privileges of the nobleman were his exclusive

²⁰ A. J. P. Taylor, *The Hapsburg monarchy* (London, 1941), pp. 29-30.

²⁰ A. Stern, *Geschichte Europas von der Verträgen von 1815 bis zum Frankfurter Frieden von 1871* (10 vols., Stuttgart and Berlin, 1894-1929), I, 219.

²¹ P. E. Turnbull, *Austria* (2 vols., London, 1840), II, 13-14.

right to bear a title, possess a coat of arms, and be free from military conscription. Noblemen had exclusive claim upon the offices of the court (most of these were reserved for the high nobility with only a few going to the gentry).³² Places and special endowments were kept for sons of nobles at the imperial military academies, and the *Theresianum Ritterakademie* was exclusively for noble youths. The greatest order of the Monarchy, the Golden Fleece, could be bestowed only upon members of the higher nobility.³³

More important than any of the above privileges was the special position accorded to the nobility in the ownership of land. Legally, non-nobles could own landed property but in effect it was a noble monopoly. This was especially true in Bohemia, Moravia-Silesia, and Galicia, but in Upper and Lower Austria, Styria, Carinthia, and Carniola most of the land was also noble-owned.³⁴ With ownership of the land went mastery over the peasants who dwelt on it and worked it. The peasants were the subjects of their landlord who wielded political, judicial and economic power over them (limited by the provisions of legal codes which defined the extent of the lord's powers). The peasants, in return for the lord allowing them to live on his land, paid the latter a host of dues, in labor, in kind, and in cash.³⁵

A privilege that accompanied ownership of landed property by nobles was the right to sit and vote in the provincial estates. Actually this meant little, since these bodies had been emasculated in the eighteenth century by the reforms of Maria Theresa

³² J. Springer, *Statistik des österreichischen Kaiserstaates* (2 vols., Vienna, 1840), I, 291-292.

The Hapsburgs understood the "good-will value" of titles, including empty ones. When Galicia came under Austrian rule many of the landowners there were given titles by the Hapsburgs. In addition, Galicia was made a separate kingdom which enabled the king to distribute functionless court offices with such sonorous titles as Arch Lord High Steward, Chief Marshall, Grand Master of the Chase, Grand Comptroller of the Royal Household, Grand Equerry, Royal Cupbearer, Royal Carver and the like. These purely honorary offices were never given to German nobles resident in Galicia but were reserved for the Polish aristocrats. J. G. Kohl, *Reisen im Inneren von Russland und Polen* (3 vols., Dresden and Leipzig, 1841), III, 148-150.

³³ J. C. Bisinger, *General-Statistik des österreichischen Kaiserthumes* (Vienna and Trieste, 1808), II, 179.

³⁴ See Chapter II for the discussion of noble and non-noble land ownership.

³⁵ This system of subjection is described at length in Chapter II.

and Joseph II. The government of the provinces was taken out of the hands of the landed nobility and turned over to royal officials residing in and governing from the chief city of the province and the main town of each of its administrative districts.³⁶ The only functions allowed the estates were either entirely meaningless or of very minor importance. They were convened to examine the laws and the proposed taxes which the central government submitted for their inspection. They could not reject any law or tax but they could submit their advice or petition for change to the monarch, or suggest legislation to him. Their other functions, which varied from province to province, dealt with such things as the selection of estates' committees, hiring and paying of estates' employees, administration of the estates' finances, supervision of schools established by the estates, and similar petty activities.³⁷ Still, the estates had a certain importance in that they provided a forum from which the nobility could express its class interest and in which views and opinions could be expressed and exchanged.

Despite the powerlessness of the estates, the central government after 1815 not only maintained these provincial assemblies in Lower Austria, Upper Austria, Styria, Carinthia, Galicia, Bohemia, Moravia, and Silesia, but after the final defeat of Napoleon reinstituted them in the provinces where they had been abolished during the French occupation. One reason for this policy was the maintenance of the tradition that was a mainspring of the Franciscan system.³⁸ Another reason was that Metternich believed that by encouraging the historical provincial privileges the government could combat the disruptive force of nationalism.³⁹ Still another reason was contained in Article XIII of the act signed at Vienna on 8 June 1815 creating the German *Bund*. The single sentence of this article stated that "in allen Bundesstaaten wird eine landständische Verfassung stattfinden."⁴⁰ The Austrian provinces

³⁶ H. Lacuen, *Tschechische Bodenpolitik* (Berlin, 1930), p. 27.

³⁷ Springer, *Statistik*, I, 264-266.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 253.

³⁹ Taylor, pp. 40-41.

⁴⁰ L. von Neumann, ed., *Recueil des traités et conventions conclus par l'Autriche avec les puissances étrangères, depuis 1763 jusqu'à nos jours* (Leipzig, 1855-1859), III, 8.

that were in the *Bund* were Upper and Lower Austria (the Archduchy of Austria), Tyrol, Bohemia, Moravia, Silesia, Styria, Carinthia, Carniola, and most of the Littoral.⁴¹ All of these provinces except the Littoral had provincial estates.⁴²

With the exceptions of Tyrol, Vorarlberg (the northwest tip of Tyrol which had its own assembly), and Silesia, each of the provincial assemblies consisted of three estates divided into four chambers. First there was the clergy of superior rank, the *Prälatenstand*. The second estate was formed by the nobility who were divided into two chambers, the *Herrenstand* and the *Ritterstand* (except in Tyrol where they met together in one chamber). The third estate, the *Bürgerstand*, formed the fourth chamber (the third chamber in Tyrol) in which sat the representatives of the cities. In Tyrol the peasantry was free, forming the fourth estate, and sent representatives to the provincial assembly. In tiny Vorarlberg there were just two estates, burghers and peasants. In Silesia only nobles sat in the estates, where they were divided into two groups, the dukes and the princes, and the lesser nobility.⁴³

The first estate, the *Prälatenstand*, was made up of those higher clergy who were designated by provincial law to represent the clergy of the province. The number of members of the *Prälatenstand* varied from province to province but was between ten and twenty in most of the estates.⁴⁴ The second estate, divided into the *Herrenstand* and the *Ritterstand*, was composed of those nobles who possessed the right of *Landstandschaft*, that is, the right to have a seat in the provincial assembly. As indicated above, this right went with the ownership by the noble of landed property. In Lower Austria, Styria, and Carinthia, however, non-landowning nobles could be admitted to estate membership if they had a certain amount of personal property and in Styria, Carinthia, and Tyrol even this qualification was waived under certain circumstances. In Galicia, on the other hand, *Landstandschaft* was granted only

⁴¹ L. de Tegoborski, *Des finances et du crédit public de l'Autriche* (2 vols., Paris, 1843), II, 140-141.

⁴² K. Hugelmann, *Die österreichischen Landtage im Jahre 1848* (Vienna and Leipzig, 1928), p. 6.

⁴³ Springer, *Statistik*, I, 256.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 256-259.

to those nobles whose income from landed property was above a certain minimum.⁴⁵

The number of individuals who were entitled to sit in the *Herrenstand* and the *Ritterstand* varied from province to province and with time. In Lower Austria in 1838 the number of families that belonged to the *Herrenstand* was 225, while 113 belonged to the *Ritterstand*. In Upper Austria in 1837 both noble estates together had only 81 members. In Bohemia the membership of the *Herrenstand* and the *Ritterstand* totaled over 300, and in Moravia the total was 71 in 1837. In Galicia in 1837 there were 5 princes, 70 counts and 10 barons in the *Herrenstand* and 206 members of the *Ritterstand* of which latter number only 145 had been given the right of *Landstandschaft*.⁴⁶ In Silesia the provincial assembly was composed only of four deputies, each of whom represented one of the four great princes of the province, plus one deputy representing the lesser nobility of Troppau and Jägerndorf, one of the four principedoms. Each of these four principedoms (Troppau and Jägerndorf, Teschen, Bielitz, and Neisse) had its own estates.⁴⁷

The third estate, the *Burgerstand*, was composed in its strictest sense of the residents of a city or market town who had been given the right of citizenship of that city or town and by virtue of that right could share in the privileges that had been granted the city or town in its charter. In general, however, all residents of the town or city were considered to be members of the third estate. The rights of the *Burgerstand* varied from place to place. The exact definition of these rights was contained in the city or town charter whose provisions were based on custom or on previous grants and concessions. Usually, the members of the *Burgerstand* had the right to operate a business in a town, own urban real estate, have their own magistrates, vote for their own community officials and committees, and take part in the administration of the community's funds.⁴⁸

The representatives of the *Burgerstand* who sat in the pro-

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 259.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 260.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 263-264.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 294.

vincial assemblies actually represented only the citizens of those royal cities and market towns which had been given the right of *Landstandschaft* as a corporate body in their charters. The number of cities and towns in each province which had been granted this right were: in Upper Austria, nine cities and one market town; in Lower Austria, fifteen cities and four market towns; in Styria, sixteen cities and twenty market towns; in Carinthia, four cities and eleven market towns; in Carniola, seven cities; in Bohemia, four cities; in Moravia, seven cities; in Galicia, one city; and in Tyrol, seventeen cities. Some of these places sent one delegate to the estates, some sent two, while in other cases several cities or market towns combined to send only one delegate.⁴⁹ These cities and towns as corporate units had the right to own landed property and exercised the same right over the peasants living on this property as individual landowners over their peasants.

The *Burgerstand* played a very minor role in the assemblies.⁵⁰ In Lower Austria, for example, burgher delegates were allowed only to stand and listen to the tax proposals of the government, and then, still silent, leave the chamber, submitting their routine approval in writing.⁵¹ Not until the 1847 meeting were they invited by the nobles to participate in the deliberations and debates.⁵²

In the Tyrolese provincial assembly the *Bauernstand* was composed of peasant delegates who represented the different districts of the province. They were required to be property owners and of a mature and trustworthy character. These delegates, who served for life, were chosen by electors, of whom there were two for each district, and who were themselves chosen by the selectmen of the individual districts.⁵³

The assemblies of all the provinces except Tyrol met in plenary session once a year. During the rest of the year business was handled by a permanent committee or council whose

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 261-262.

⁵⁰ A. Springer, *Geschichte Oesterreichs seit dem Wiener Frieden 1809* (2 vols., Leipzig, 1863-1865), I, 542; Hugelmann, 9.

⁵¹ A. Springer, *Geschichte*, I, 542.

⁵² A. von Arneth, *Anton Ritter von Schmerling* (Prague, Vienna, Leipzig, 1895), p. 44.

⁵³ J. Springer, *Statistik*, I, 263.

members were chosen by the assembly from its membership. The size of this committee and the number of its members from each estate varied between provinces. In Lower Austria, Carinthia, and Silesia it contained no members of the *Burgerstand*. The usual term of membership was six years, with members being paid salaries out of the funds of the assembly.⁵⁴ In Tyrol the committee was made up of 52 members, 13 from each estate. This council approximated the assemblies of the other provinces, passing on the royal proposals and carrying on the other business that was transacted by the full estates of the other provinces. The full estates were convened only on extraordinary occasions.⁵⁵

The provincial assemblies had been designed to serve as the organ through which the nobility as a unit participated in the government of the province. This had been their historic function. Their organization was such that the noble estate had been dominant (with the obvious and very minor exception of Vorarlberg). The members of the first and third estates who attended the meetings were few in number. Further, the prelates were often bearers of noble titles and by natural inclination favored the nobility, while restrictions reduced the importance of the burgher delegates. The powerlessness that was now the lot of the assemblies meant that the nobility had also become powerless as a class in the governing of the various provinces. The meaninglessness of the assemblies was recognized by their members so that their meetings were sparsely attended and their proceedings entirely routine until the last years of the *Vormärz*.⁵⁶ Then the assemblies of several of the provinces, and especially those of Lower Austria and Bohemia, became centers of an outburst of noble class discontent and agitation called the estates movement.⁵⁷

In contrast to the corporate powerlessness of the nobility was the potency of nobles as individuals, especially members of the higher nobility, in the conduct of the state during the *Vormärz*. The prominence they attained represented a recovery from the lean years of the reigns of Maria Theresa (1740-1780) and

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 268-271.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 267.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 297-298.

⁵⁷ The estates movement is discussed in Chapter VI.

Joseph II (1780-1790). Those hard times had begun in earnest in 1763 when Maria Theresa had instituted sweeping administrative reforms in provincial government centralizing the control of the provinces in Vienna.⁵⁸ During the ten years of Joseph's reign the power of the nobility had been even more severely limited and its privileges threatened with extinction. Destruction of the influence of the nobility in the government was fundamental to Joseph's theory of government.⁵⁹

Emperor Francis, on the other hand, identified the anti-revolutionary interests of the great nobles with those of the throne; thus it seemed wise—and also in keeping with old traditions—to give them the most important posts in the government, the army, and the church.⁶⁰ With the reaction that followed the final defeat of Napoleon the high nobility had even greater hopes for its future. Factors which the court had been compelled to take into consideration during the revolutionary era were no longer of importance. These nobles expected that, as had been the case before 1763, they would be in almost exclusive possession of all the high places of the Monarchy.

They were not disappointed. They surrounded the throne and maintained a far-reaching influence through their control of legislation, of the police and of the government bureaucracy, which latter control they acquired and kept through their control over promotions, pay raises, pensions, and the like. Their success made them all the more exclusive, class conscious, and demanding. It became customary for the members of the higher nobility to *tutoyer* one another as a demonstration of the cohesiveness of their caste. They adopted a proprietary attitude toward the highest offices. When in 1816 several bishoprics fell vacant Count Firmian, Archbishop of Vienna, informed the Emperor that the higher nobility in general hoped that he would not fill these posts with the sons of shoemakers, tailors, and peasants. Firmian told this story himself, regarding it as a meritorious action. Similar advice was given the Emperor by

⁵⁸ K. A. von Hock and H. I. Bidermann, *Der österreichische Staatsrath 1760-1848* (Vienna, 1879), pp. 17-18.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 23 n, 166.

⁶⁰ I. Beidtel, *Geschichte der österreichischen Staatsverwaltung 1740-1848*, ed. A. Huber (2 vols., Innsbruck, 1896-1898), II, 31.

other members of the high nobility when other posts had to be filled.⁶¹

This presumptuous attitude finally nettled the Emperor who decided that he would show the nobility who was master. Starting in 1817 he appointed many non-nobles to important government positions, and favored priests of humble origins in his appointments to bishoprics. This policy continued until 1826 when Count Kolowrat became a chief minister of state, and more important, the favorite of the Emperor. Kolowrat, who was of the highest Bohemian nobility, made no pretense of the fact that he was in complete sympathy with the aspirations of his peers, and the policy of favoritism of the high nobility was reinstituted.⁶²

Men of non-noble birth were not entirely overlooked, however, in the appointments to important offices. Beidtel stated that the high nobility permitted such persons to occupy offices at a high level as a sort of camouflage or window-dressing. Actually, the presence of these men within the government, he continued, was of no danger to the domination of the high nobility because these commoners owed their jobs and their chances of holding them to the favor of some highly placed nobleman. In the interests of their own security they had to ally themselves with the interests of their benefactors.⁶³

In the opinions of two unusually capable and intelligent contemporary observers, both important government officials and men of non-noble birth, the aristocratic control of the high places of the Monarchy had resulted in the conversion—or perversion—of the form of the Monarchy's government from an absolute monarchy to an aristocracy. Beidtel, who rose to a high position in the judicial system, in his study of the government of the Monarchy, wrote as follows:

. . . the bestowal of important posts upon the members of the high nobility resulted in an entirely different principle of government than that which had been intended by the court. Instead of the absolute monarchy which was the purpose of the Franciscan system, the government was in reality an aristocratic bureaucracy, or, if you will, dominion passed into the hands of an aristocratic bureaucracy.⁶⁴

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 234-235.

⁶² *Ibid.*, p. 235.

⁶³ *Ibid.*, p. 47.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 45.

Carl Friedrich Freiherr Kübeck von Kübau, son of a Moravian tailor, had entered government service as a young man, risen to a high post, and been ennobled. He confided to his diary in 1831 the following remarks on the nature of the government of the Monarchy:

In Austria, which very mistakenly is considered an absolute monarchy, the aristocracy always has been and still is the prevailing power. Now, no political form is less inclined to acquiesce to the absolute power of the head of the state or of the ruling dynasty than is the aristocratic. Also, at no time since the House of Hapsburg and Lorraine has ruled this state has the sometimes more and sometimes less open war of the monarch with the aristocracy been interrupted, no matter how close the relationship between ruler and aristocracy might seem to be.⁶⁵

In this unending warfare the nobility was now triumphant, Kübeck continued. He illustrated this by pointing out that in the previous century one of the most important measures taken by the throne to combat and weaken the aristocracy was the formation of councils to aid in governing. The members of these bodies were selected on the basis of ability and not birth, although the presidents of the councils were almost always of the high nobility. The president, however, was bound by the decisions of the members. These councils were entirely dependent upon the throne for their existence, were free of aristocratic influence, and worked always in the interest of the monarch, and hence in the interests of the state, with many beneficent results.⁶⁶

Now things were different, Kübeck stated.

Because of, and since, the French Revolutionary wars, and especially since Prince Metternich has become all-powerful, all this has changed. The Prince believes himself . . . called to combat the demon of democracy in Europe. It will only be possible for the judgment of an unbiased future to decide whether, how far, and through what means he accomplishes this task. . . .⁶⁷

The effects of this reactionary orientation were plainly seen in the councils. Now the noble presidents considered themselves

⁶⁵ M. von Kübeck, ed., *Tagebücher des Carl Friedrich Freiherrn von Kübeck von Kübau* (2 vols. in 3, Vienna, 1909), I, pt. ii, 378-379.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 379.

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 380.

the watchmen of these bodies and viewed the members as their personal councillors, rather than the Emperor's.

Whoever conducts himself independently and is true to his oath [wrote Kübeck], and has the misfortune to contradict the president, will be denounced by the latter to the Emperor as infected with the spirit of the revolution, with liberalism and Jacobinism. . . . The more intelligent, the more straightforward, the more untainted the man, the more dangerous. He will not be dismissed, nor imprisoned, nor put to death; but his intellectual influence has been destroyed and from then on he can be considered as nothing more than secretary of the president of the council, handling numerous petty annoyances. The independence, candidness and sincerity of the councils are thereby crippled.⁶⁸

Beidtel and Kübeck's views on the aristocratic domination of the government were apparently not shared by all their contemporaries, especially not by those whose opinions on this subject were represented by Baron Victor von Andrian-Werburg. Andrian-Werburg was a member of the Tyrolese nobility and the holder of an important office in the government at Milan. In 1840 he wrote a book he called *Oesterreich und dessen Zukunft*. It was published anonymously in Hamburg in 1842 and soon went into several editions because of the demand. The Austrian censors tried to keep it out of the Monarchy by employing unusually stringent punitive measures against its distribution, but this served only to make it more popular. It was passed from hand to hand, even in the court at Vienna. The Dowager Empress wrote enraged comments on the margins of the copy that she read, but she read it.⁶⁹

The book was a bitter attack on the centralization of the government, the bureaucratic control of the state from Vienna, and what Andrian claimed was the slighting of the noble class. The general opinion in Europe, he wrote, was that Austria was the Eldorado of the noble class: that in no other land did it enjoy greater power and more imposing and durable authority, that the government was its permanent protector, and that the nobility, in turn, was the most solid, the most fundamental foundation of the regime.⁷⁰ The general opinion of Europe

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*

⁶⁹ V. Bibl, *Die niederösterreichischen Stände im Vormärz* (Vienna, 1911), p. 39; V. Bibl, *Der Zerfall Österreichs* (2 vols., Vienna, 1922-1924), II, 39-40.

⁷⁰ V. von Andrian-Werburg, *Oesterreich und dessen Zukunft*, 2d ed. (Hamburg, 1843-1847), pt. 1, 25.

was in grievous error. The institution of the nobility in Austria, far from occupying this enviable position, actually was like a neglected plant that lived on in its forlorn fashion without importance, without a place assigned to it in the machinery of the state.⁷¹

Formerly the noble class had supplied the monarch with his lieutenants and advisors. In the times when Austria was imperilled by foreign foes, the noble class had shown an heroic fidelity. The provincial estates had aided in the ruling of the provinces, following the ancient privilege of self-government. Now the spirit had left these old estates, for they had fallen victim to pernicious centralization and bureaucratic rule. They were without power and, what was worse, without prestige, meeting each year before the eyes of the mob who amused themselves at the expense of the deputies.⁷²

The remedy Andrian proposed was the dissolution of the system of centralized government and bureaucratic omnipotence, and the return to a decentralized administration of the Monarchy. The basis of this new regime should be the revived provincial estates, with increased representation for burghers and peasants.⁷³ Above all, the noble class should be returned to its ancient position of power and preference so that it could serve as the cement with which the state would be held together. "A rich and independent nobility," wrote Andrian, "with political rights founded upon a constitution, will furnish the monarch, as well as the people, with a puissant principle of stability and thoughtful progress."⁷⁴

Actually, Beidtel and Kübeck on the one hand, and Andrian on the other, were talking about two different things. The former were assailing the monopoly of high policy-making posts by the members of the high nobility; Andrian, for his part, was bemoaning the loss of corporate power suffered by the nobles, who were appointed to high office arbitrarily and as individuals, and not as members of a class entitled automatically to these posts.

In Hungary the domination of economic, social, and political power by the nobility as a corporate body and as individuals

⁷¹ *Ibid.*, p. 38.

⁷² *Ibid.*, pp. 40-42.

⁷³ *Ibid.*, p. 188.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 202.

was complete. Elsewhere in the Monarchy and in Europe the nobility was a privileged and predominant class, but in Hungary it was the nation itself.⁷⁵ Other classes of society were present but they were not allowed to share in the privileges that went with being an Hungarian. Further, the ancient constitution upon which the nobility based its claim to pre-eminence also contained safeguards against royal absolutism. Hungary was a limited monarchy in which the nobility were partners of the throne in governing. The Hapsburg centralization and bureaucracy stopped at the banks of the Leitha.

The Hungarian nobility were the descendants of the conquering Magyar nation and of those who had been admitted into that nation in the centuries after the conquest. Every member of it, no matter how great or how lowly, had the same fundamental rights.⁷⁶ These privileges were the source of the inordinate and somewhat comical pride of the Hungarian noble, as John Paget, the English traveller, discovered.

"*Nemes ember vagyok!*" (I am a nobleman!) proudly answers the mustachioed Magyar when any question of freedom of speech or action is raised; and, as he does so, he twirls the cherished ornament of his upper lip, strikes together his long spurs, and seems to increase in stature on the announcement of his dignity. Whence flows this pride of rank? Not from the social position conferred by it, for I have seen a noble wear the livery of servitude; not from wealth, for many of them are as poor as the peasantry; not from high name or historical recollections, for the reputations of the greater number never extended beyond their native villages, and the ignorance of these at least is so great as to preclude the indulgence of such associations. No! from none of these—the ordinary attendants upon rank, and for which it is commonly respected,—does the pride of the Magyar arise; but from the solid advantages of civil and political privileges, which, if less poetical, are much more substantial considerations.⁷⁷

These rights were classified into two groups, the cardinal and the non-cardinal privileges. The cardinal privileges had been granted to the Magyar nation in 1222 by the *Bulla Aurea* of its then ruler, King Andreas II. They were three in number.

⁷⁵ H. Marczali, *Hungary in the eighteenth century*, trans. from the Hungarian by A. B. Yolland (Cambridge, England, 1910), p. 105.

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 102-104.

⁷⁷ J. Paget, *Hungary and Transylvania; with remarks on their condition, social, political and economical* (2 vols., Philadelphia, 1850), I, 237.

First, the person of the noble was inviolate so that he could not be arrested until convicted unless he had committed certain heinous crimes, nor could his house be entered by officers of the law without his permission. A second privilege was that the noble was subject to no one except his legally crowned king. No person or power other than the throne had any legal power over him. Third, the noble was free of all taxes, tolls and tithes. The only service he had to perform was to appear under arms when the noble *bann* or *insurrection* was called out upon the invasion of Hungary by an enemy.⁷⁸ The Golden Bull had granted a fourth cardinal privilege—the right to resist the king if he should attempt to impair the rights of the nobility. This right had been abrogated in 1687 on the grounds that wrong use might be made of it by ill-disposed persons.⁷⁹

The most important of the non-cardinal privileges was the exclusive right of the nobility (and the church) to own land. A concomitant of this privilege was that only nobles could exercise the right of lordship over peasants dwelling on the land. Other important non-cardinal rights were the exemption of nobles from having troops quartered on them; exclusive monopoly of all the high offices of the central government and of the governments of the several scores of counties (*comitatus*) into which the country was divided; trial only before special courts made up of noblemen; the right to sell on their estates certain articles whose sale was a government monopoly elsewhere; and the right to appear and take part in the county assemblies and the national Diet.⁸⁰

The proportion of the total population of Hungary that was noble and was therefore entitled to these privileges was large. The noble class had been greatly enlarged by the inclusion within it of non-Magyars, large groups having been admitted

⁷⁸ A. Timon, *Ungarische Verfassungs- und Rechtsgeschichte*, trans. from the Hungarian by F. Schiller (Berlin, 1909), pp. 582-583.

A German translation of the *Bulla Aurea* is given in "Die goldene Bulle Königs Andreas II. des Hierosolymitaners vom Jahre 1222," *Staatsgrundgesetze der österreichischen Monarchie* (Vienna, 1871), pp. 55-65.

⁷⁹ Sect. 2, Art. XXXI, "Die goldene Bulle," *Staatsgrundgesetze*, p. 65; "IV. Gesetzartikel des Landtages vom Jahre 1687," *ibid.*, pp. 92-93.

⁸⁰ M. F. von Mastiaux, *Versuch einer Darstellung der hungarischen Konstitution* (Leipzig, 1812), pp. 53-54; J. Springer, *Statistik*, I, 290-291.

especially during war periods when manpower was needed.⁸¹ All the children of a noble were themselves of the nobility. The Hungarian statistician Fényes estimated that at the end of the *Vormärz* there were 136,093 noble Hungarian families.⁸² The government statistical bureau in Vienna estimated that in 1846 there were in Hungary (including Transylvania) 336,807 adult male nobles (over 17 years old) out of a total adult male population of 3,690,973, or over 9 per cent.⁸³

Although all these nobles were possessed of the same rights and were equal before the law, there were actually sharp class distinctions separating them. The highest rank was the titled nobility—the princes, counts and barons—who were the magnates or peers of the realm.⁸⁴ In 1805 there were in Hungary 79 baronial families and 95 families of counts. In addition there were 297 non-Hungarian families of high nobility who also were magnates of Hungary.⁸⁵

The magnates were the great landowners of the realm. The greatest of them all was Prince Esterházy who owned 29 estates, with 160 market towns and 414 villages. His annual income from this principality ran from 800,000 to 1,700,000 florins.⁸⁶ Other great landlords were Prince Batthányi who owned 7 estates, Baron von Sina who owned 19, Count Károlyi who also had 19, and Count Széchenyi who had 18. The combined holdings of these five magnates covered 550 austrian square miles. A total of 328 austrian square miles was owned by 41 other families. Of the remaining many thousands of noble families only about 550 owned more than 5,000 yokes each.⁸⁷

The magnates had the monopoly of the chief offices of the state, church, and army. It was possible for one of their number

⁸¹ Marczali, *Hungary*, p. 104.

⁸² Cited in Ditz, p. 99.

⁸³ K. k. Direction der administrativen Statistik, *Tafeln zur Statistik der österreichischen Monarchie* (hereafter referred to as *T. S.*), 1846, part I, table 2, p. 2.

⁸⁴ Inclosure No. 3, "Explanatory remarks," Ponsonby to Palmerston, Vienna, 19 January 1848, Correspondence relative to the affairs of Hungary, 1847-1849, Great Britain, House of Commons, *Sessional Papers*, 1851, LVIII, 14.

⁸⁵ J. A. Demian, *Tableau géographique et politique des royaumes de Hongrie, d'Esclavonie, de Croatie, et de la grande principauté de Transylvanie*, trans. from the German (2 vols., Paris, 1809), II, 289-298.

⁸⁶ Ditz, p. 98 n.

⁸⁷ A. Hirsch, *Ungarns Grundbesitzverhältnisse* (Halle a. S., 1893), pp. 1-2.

to be chosen by his fellow nobles the Count Palatine of Hungary, whose office was next only to the King, of whom the Palatine was the direct representative. Since the reign of Maria Theresa, however, it had been customary to elect a member of the royal family to this position. Magnates alone were chosen by the throne to be the lord lieutenants of the counties and for the post of Ban of Croatia. They also had the exclusive right to fill the highest posts of the central government of Hungary, such as chancellor, members of the king's council and guardians of the Crown of St. Stephen (a very high rank in the bureaucratic hierarchy).⁸⁸

Below the magnates was the untitled nobility who formed the great mass of the nobility. This group fell into three divisions. First, there was the middle nobility, who were landowners. From this class were drawn the county magistrates and the delegates to the lower house of the Diet. Next, there was the group that was called variously peasant nobility, half-spurred nobility, and sandal nobility (because its members could not afford boots). These titles are indicative of the lowly economic position of the members of this group. It was said of these people that they owned only "a house and four plum trees." They were the most numerous class of the nobility and formed the mass of the electors who chose the delegates to the Diet. Finally, there was the landless nobility. The Hussars were frequently from this class, but its members were to be found gaining their livelihood in all sorts of capacities, and often very humble ones.⁸⁹

The Hungarian nobility, through their Diet, played an important part in the government of the land. This exclusively noble assembly was divided into four estates. The lords spiritual formed the first estate. The church organization as a political corporation, however, formed a part of the nobility in every respect.⁹⁰ The second estate was composed of the titled nobility, the magnates. The third estate contained the representatives of the untitled nobility, and the fourth estate was formed by the

⁸⁸ Paget, I, 113; Marczali, *Hungary*, pp. 113-114.

⁸⁹ Inclosure No. 3, "Explanatory Remarks," Ponsonby to Palmerston, Vienna, 19 January 1848, *Sessional Papers*, 1851, LVIII, 14-15; Ditz, p. 99.

⁹⁰ Marczali, *Hungary*, p. 110.

deputies of the royal free cities. This fourth estate was legally noble, for each of the free cities was viewed as a fictitious individual possessed of all the rights of a noble, without the individual citizens of the city having any of these rights or being considered noble by virtue of their residence in the city.⁸¹

These four estates were divided into two legislative chambers called Tables, the upper, or Magnates Table, and the lower, or Estates Table. The clergy and the magnates sat in the upper chamber, and the deputies of the untitled nobility and of the cities sat in the lower. The magnates had the right to appear in person and take part in the deliberations of the upper chamber. An absent magnate or prelate and a widow of a magnate could send a proxy who sat in the lower chamber where he could participate in the debates but could not vote.⁸² The deputies of the untitled nobility were chosen by the vote of the nobles of their counties. These nobles met at county assemblies, or congregations, to choose their deputies—there were two from each county although they had only one vote in the Diet—and to instruct them. The delegates selected were subject to constant instruction from their constituents during the Diet sessions and could be recalled and replaced if they were not satisfactory.⁸³ Each of the royal free cities also sent delegates, but they were not allowed to vote. Certain districts of Hungary and cathedral chapters and abbeys also had the right to send delegates to the lower chamber.⁸⁴

The Diet was supposed to be convened at the call of the King every three years, or more frequently if the welfare of

⁸¹ J. Springer, *Statistik*, I, 276-277.

⁸² *Ibid.*, p. 277.

⁸³ Paget, I, 105-106.

On an earlier page it was pointed out that over 9 per cent of the total male population of Hungary was of the nobility. The total population of Hungary was estimated at 13,182,700 in 1846. There is reason to believe that this was a somewhat inflated estimate. Using this figure as basis, however, one in every 40 inhabitants of Hungary had the suffrage. It is of interest to note that in England after the Reform Bill of 1832 one out of 30 inhabitants could vote; in France, according to the Electoral Law of 1831, only one out of 200 inhabitants could vote. F. B. Artz, *Reaction and revolution 1814-1832* (New York, 1934), p. 288.

⁸⁴ H. P. Brougham, *Political philosophy* (2 vols., London, 1846), II, 89; Inclosure No. 3, "Explanatory remarks," Ponsonby to Palmerston, Vienna, 19 January 1848, *Sessional papers*, 1851, LVIII, 14; J. Springer, *Statistik*, I, 277.

the nation demanded it. During most of the eighteenth century and until 1825 this requirement was more disregarded than it was observed.⁹⁵ Beginning with the Diet of 1825, however, meetings were held at the appointed interval until the end of the *Vormärz*.

The sessions of the Diet were opened with the presentation of the royal propositions. Unlike their fellows in the German-Slav provinces, these Hungarian noblemen could reject these propositions if they so willed. After disposing of the royal propositions the Diet directed its attention to legislation introduced by its members. Proposed legislation could originate only in the lower chamber. If this chamber voted favorably on the measure it was sent up to the Magnates Table for approval. The Magnates could suggest amendments which were sent back to the lower chamber for approval. If the two Tables failed to agree they could meet in a joint session in which the matter in dispute could be debated and then settled by a majority vote. Motions passed by both Tables became law when signed by the King.⁹⁶

Although those who had gained the citizenship of the free towns did not share in the noble attributes which adhered to the town as a corporate entity, the law guaranteed them valuable privileges within the limits of the town. Every citizen enjoyed personal freedom and inviolability. Like the noble the burgher could not be arrested without first being condemned. He could be tried only before a municipal court. If he were dissatisfied with that court's decision he could appeal all the way up to the throne.⁹⁷ The officials of the town were elected by the votes of the citizens.⁹⁸

The peasantry, who formed the great mass of the population, did not stand directly under the lordship of the King.⁹⁹ Rather, they were the subjects of the owners of the land upon which they lived. As such, they had no political privileges, although the law protected them by establishing norms by which the landlord had to abide in his relationship to his peasants.¹⁰⁰

⁹⁵ Brougham, II, 90.

⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 90-91; J. Springer, *Statistik*, I, 278-279.

⁹⁷ Timon, p. 591.

⁹⁸ Timon, p. 594.

⁹⁹ Marczali, *Hungary*, pp. 150-151.

¹⁰⁰ See Chapter II.

To summarize, in the German-Slav lands the nobility had been shorn of its powers as a corporate entity years before the *Vormärz* began, through the centralizing reforms of Austria's two great eighteenth-century absolutists, Maria Theresa and Joseph II. The nobility as a class had no real part in government, and the provincial assemblies which the nobility dominated were powerless bodies. On the other hand, the reactionary character of the Franciscan regime and the strong class consciousness and cohesiveness of the higher nobility had resulted in a revival of the power of the nobles in government within the framework of the centralized administration. This had been accomplished through the appointment of the members of the highest nobility to the positions of power in the state, church, and army. The members of the nobility had a near-monopoly of the ownership of the land in most of the German-Slav provinces. This meant that they were rulers of the peasants who were allowed to live on the land in return for servile dues paid to the landowners.

In Hungary the nobility had retained their power both as a corporate entity and as individuals. Hungary was a limited monarchy in which the centuries-old constitution defended the prerogatives of the nobility against the centralizing onslaughts of the Hapsburg rulers. The nobility had retained an important role in the government of the state through the Diet which was an exclusively noble assembly. The noble population was among the largest, if not the largest, in Europe. All of its members enjoyed the same fundamental privileges, but actually there was a complete class structure within the noble class, ranging from the great magnates of fabulous wealth and power to landless and impoverished laborers. The magnates were the ruling class of the state through their possession of the political power guaranteed them by their monopoly of the high offices of the state, and by their economic power. Only nobles could own land and, as in the German-Slav provinces, the peasants living on the land were the subjects of their landlords to whom they paid dues in labor, kind and cash.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT DURING THE *Vormärz*.

Within this pattern of social stratification and of repressive and reactionary absolutism aimed at making Austria Europe's bastion against change, the factors that were ultimately to disrupt the pattern were taking shape. Although the antecedents of these new factors can be traced back into the years before 1815 it was during the years of the *Vormärz* that they took a definite and firm form and began to have a major effect on the Monarchy's structure socially, politically and economically.

The major economic developments of the *Vormärz* were the increase in population, especially in urban population; the improvements and extensions in the means of communication; the establishment of large-scale factory industry; and, finally, both an agricultural revolution—a revolution in the techniques of agricultural production, and an agrarian revolution—a revolution in the way in which land was held. With the single exception of the agrarian revolution, which occurred at the end of the period, these basic changes were not completed by 1848. The *Vormärz* was a time of beginnings. The old traditional methods and forms in business organization, in industry, in transportation, and in agriculture, unquestionably accounted for more workers, more goods, more capital, and certainly more land during these years than did the new methods and forms that were ultimately to supplant them.

During the long years of war that ended only in 1815 the road system of the Monarchy had been neglected. With the return of peace the government entered upon an important highway building program. Local groups and private individuals (including many noblemen) were also active in road building and improvement, especially of secondary roads which were of immediate use to their builders in getting goods to market. In Hungary little progress was made in road-building, partly because of the lack of suitable building material in the treeless and stoneless Alföld.

The most important advance made in inland water transportation was the establishment of the Danube Steamship Company. This company, which had started regular runs in 1831 with one steamer, by 1847 was operating a great fleet of vessels.

It proved to be a primary factor in the increase of trade between Hungary and the German-Slav provinces. The company's growth was also responsible for making Pest a great Danubian port, second only to Vienna. A seagoing steamship company was also organized when in 1837 the Austrian Lloyd, sailing out of Trieste, was established. After a brief period of near financial disaster this enterprise was bolstered with Rothschild money and entered upon an era of quick and profitable expansion.

The first Austrian railroad was a horse-drawn line connecting Linz, on the Danube in Upper Austria, with Budweis, on the Moldau in Bohemia. This road had been started in 1825 and was completed in the early 1830's. In the latter years of that decade the construction of steam railroads was begun by private enterprises. In 1841 the government entered the field with plans for the construction of four trunk lines. By the end of 1847 there was more than a thousand miles of railroad in the Monarchy, most of it radiating out of Vienna.

Austrian factory industry was born in the years 1800 to 1850. During the war years in the beginning of this period certain industries, principally textiles, had prospered, especially during the Continental Blockade. In the post-war depression industrial activity lagged until the end of the 1820's. Then remarkable progress began to be made in factory industry, especially in the manufacture of cotton textiles. Other fields in which industrialization was especially notable were in the production of woolens, silk goods, and paper. This industrial development centered in Lower Austria and Bohemia. The power for these industries was supplied usually by water installations but steam prime movers were increasingly used as the period progressed. The manufacture of machinery was an unimportant industry in the Monarchy, so that most of the machines used in the shops and factories were imported. Agricultural industry, too, went through a remarkable development (described in Chapter III). These factories, which were engaged chiefly in processing beets for sugar and potatoes for brandy, were almost always owned by noble landowners.

Although the Monarchy was rich in coal and iron, and had abundant forests for fuel, its metallurgical industry was retarded. This was attributable chiefly to the organization of the industry into many small, inefficient units with antiquated

methods. These high-cost producers were protected by government tariffs. Still, the output of the industry showed a large increase as the *Vormärz* progressed. A large number of the plants, especially in the North Slav provinces, were owned and operated by the nobleman on whose land the ore was located.

The improvements in transportation and in the techniques of industry were stimulated by the increase in the size of the domestic market. Throughout this period the Monarchy underwent a steady and large increase in population. Most important from the viewpoint of the creation of markets, the ratio of the population increase in the cities was much greater than the ratio of increase of the population as a whole. Between 1818 and 1846 the population of the Monarchy had grown by over 25 per cent. In the same years the population of the twelve largest cities of the Monarchy had increased by almost 54 per cent.¹⁰¹

Manufacturing, transportation, commerce, all were of much more importance in 1848 than they had been in 1815. But never did they threaten the dominant position of agriculture in the economy of the Monarchy. The greatest part of the population earned its living from the land. Friedrich von Reden, using the rudimentary data on occupations contained in the 1846 census returns, estimated that 75.74 per cent of the total population of the Monarchy was agricultural, compared with 16.73 per cent living from trade and industry.¹⁰² In the census of 1869 the occupations of gainfully employed persons over fourteen were tabulated. The returns showed that in the German-Slav lands 67.2 per cent of the employed were engaged in agriculture and forestry and 24.8 per cent in trade and industry.¹⁰³ In Hungary the percentages were 68.7 per cent in agriculture and 12.2 per cent in trade and industry.¹⁰⁴

During the *Vormärz* the great mass of the Monarchy's agri-

¹⁰¹ This brief survey of the economic development of the Monarchy during the *Vormärz* is from Blum, "Transportation and industry," pp. 24-38.

¹⁰² F. von Reden, *Allgemeine vergleichende Finanz-Statistik* (2 vols., Darmstadt, 1853), II, pt. i, 37-38.

¹⁰³ K. k. Statistischen Central Bureau, *Statistisches Handbuechlein für das Jahr 1871* (Vienna, 1873), p. 5; H. Rauchberg, *Die Bevölkerung Österreichs auf Grund der Ergebnisse der Volkszählung vom 31. December 1890* (Vienna, 1895), p. 277.

¹⁰⁴ F. Schmitt and G. A. Schimmer, *Statistik des österreichisch-ungarischen Kaiserstaates* (Vienna, 1872), pp. 57-58.

cultural population were peasants who held their land from their landlords in return for a host of servile dues, among which was the obligation to till the demesne lands of the lord. Most of them used old methods of tillage, principally the three-field system with two fields in cereal and one field fallow. They put out their few cattle in common pastures. Their implements were of an antique design. Their holdings, and to a lesser extent the demesne of the lord, were usually broken up into many parcels scattered through the three fields.

But the capitalistic spirit that was transforming the industry and the transportation system of the Monarchy was also penetrating into its agriculture. A revolution in the method of land tillage was started in the years of the *Vormärz* with the introduction and extensive adoption of root crops and legumes, most of which were planted in the hitherto barren fallow field of the three-field system.¹⁰⁵ In some cases (predominantly on demesne land) the three field system was abandoned and crop rotation was introduced. A revolution in land tenure was effected in 1848 and 1849 when the law was changed to make a free man and a landowner out of the peasant.

The succeeding chapters of this study are concerned with descriptions of the methods of tenure and tillage that were in use in the Monarchy during the *Vormärz* and with the part played by noble landowners in effecting the changes that took place in these methods. The responsibility for the application of the capitalistic drive and method in industry and transportation and, therefore, the responsibility for the changes that were effected in these activities, lay with the men who organized and owned these activities. In agricultural activity a similar responsibility lay with the noble landowners. These nobles, who were the dominant—and in some parts of the Monarchy the only—landowners controlled the Monarchy's agricultural economy. It was their wealth that was at stake and theirs was the final decision upon the uses and applications of that wealth.

¹⁰⁵ "The agricultural revolution was simply the use of root crops and clover—unlike so many technical improvements, it really merits the name of revolution, because it at one blow doubled the productivity of the land and provided food for live-stock fattening." D. Warriner, *Economics of peasant farming* (London, 1939), p. 8. See also, V. G. Simkhovitch, "Hay and history," *Political science quarterly*, XXVIII (1913), 393.

CHAPTER II

LAND TENURE IN THE *VORMÄRZ*

There was a wide diversity in the forms of land tenure in use in the Hapsburg Monarchy on the eve of 1848. These differences existed not only between provinces but often there were important variations within a single province. The problem of presenting a coherent description and analysis of this basic aspect of agricultural life as it existed during the *Vormärz* is a difficult one. What is attempted here is a synoptic presentation of the systems of land tenure in use in most of the Monarchy at that time. This method of presentation is possible because these systems had similarities, the chief of which were that the right to own land was restricted, and that the peasant was the hereditary subject (*Erbuntertan*) of the landowner on whose estate he lived. The status of an hereditary subject meant that the peasant paid the lord dues and services in cash, kind, and labor, and that the lord exercised important judicial, administrative, and economic powers over the peasants who lived on his land.

These similarities existed in the tenurial systems of Upper Austria, Lower Austria, Styria, Carinthia, Bohemia, Moravia-Silesia, Galicia, Hungary and Transylvania. The lands named covered approximately 79 per cent of the area of the entire Monarchy and contained about 77 per cent of its population.¹ Scattered through all these provinces were free peasants, but their number in comparison with the great mass of the rural population was inconsequential.²

THE AGRARIAN REFORM MOVEMENT OF THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY

The land tenure system of these provinces had been profoundly affected by the intervention of the central government during the eighteenth century in the landlord-peasant relation-

¹ T. S., 1847, part I, table 1, pp. 1-4; table 2, p. 2.

² K. Grünberg, "Die Bauernbefreiung in Oesterreich-Ungarn," J. Conrad, L. Elster, et al., eds., *Handwörterbuch der Staatswissenschaften*, 3rd ed., II, 562.

ship. Actually, the record of state intervention began in the last half of the seventeenth century. The government had started its interference then for fiscal reasons. The crown had the power to tax only land held by peasants, while the demesne land of the lord was tax free. There was nothing to prevent the lords from expanding their demesne at the expense of peasant lands. When this happened the land was no longer considered taxable. To protect itself from serious diminution of its tax revenues that would result from a wide exercise of this practice of converting peasant land into demesne (known as *Bauernlegen*) the government of Emperor Leopold I (1658-1705) ordered that all land designated in the tax rolls as peasant land at a given date was taxable, no matter in whose hands it now was.

This measure was soon found to be ineffective. The state was compelled now to address itself to the problem of strengthening the peasants' position against the noble landlords in order to protect its sources of revenue. In addition to this fiscal motive the state was moved to act by the danger of agrarian uprising which had become real with the outbreak of the Bohemian peasant revolt of 1680. The crown issued a patent in that year designed to prohibit the worst of the excesses practiced by landlords on their peasants. Similar decrees were issued in 1713, 1717, and 1738.³ All these laws fell short of their principal objective. The lords still seized peasant land with consequent decrease in the government's tax revenues and with consequent increase in the share of the tax burden that had to be shouldered by those peasants who still held their land.⁴

By the second half of the eighteenth century the government, now headed by Empress Maria Theresa, recognized the entire failure of the negative policy of prohibitions. Positive measures had to be taken.⁵ Further, the simple fiscal reasons that had first stimulated the government to intervene in the lord-peasant

³ K. Grünberg, "Die Grundentlastung," Comité des k. k. Ackerbauministeriums, *Geschichte der österreichischen Land- und Forstwirtschaft und ihrer Industrien 1848-1898* (4 vols., Vienna, 1899; hereafter referred to as *G. L. F.*), I, 6-8.

⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 8-9.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 9.

relationship had grown far more complex. The age of enlightened despotism had dawned in Austria. The state, under the firm and capable leadership of Maria Theresa, had set out upon a policy of imposing uniformity, legal codification, and administrative efficiency upon the realm in order to aggrandize the central power at the expense of noble and provincial privilege. The peasantry was now considered by the rulers of the Monarchy to be of prime importance. The stronger the peasantry, the stronger the state, for this by far most numerous class of the population was the paramount source of both revenue and recruits; it was the class whose number the state wished to increase and whose material well-being it wished to improve.⁶

Under the influence of these considerations the government developed a policy of positive action with regard to the relationship between landlord and peasant that has been called *Bauernschutz*, that is, protection of the peasant. Professor Grünberg defined this policy as containing four facets: (1) the regulation of the peasant's obligations to his landlord; (2) the improvement of the peasant's rights of occupancy of his holding; (3) the improvement of the peasant's personal position before the law; (4) measures to preserve the peasant class and to keep peasant land in peasant hands, and consequently, the encouragement of small-scale agriculture as opposed to large-scale farming.⁷

The way had been readied for the implementation of the policy of *Bauernschutz* by a series of administrative reforms accomplished in the first part of Maria Theresa's reign which had strengthened the position of the state. The central government had brought the provincial administrations under its control. A relatively efficient bureaucracy, ruled from Vienna and

⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 9-10, A. Huber and A. Dopsch, *Österreichische Reichsgeschichte. Geschichte der Staatsbildung und des öffentlichen Rechts* (2d ed., Prague, Vienna, Leipzig, 1901), p. 258; Laeuen, *Bodenpolitik*, p. 28.

⁷ K. Grünberg, *Die Bauernbefreiung und die Auflösung des guts herrlich-bäuerlichen Verhältnisses in Böhmen, Mähren und Schlesien* (2 vols., Leipzig, 1893-1894), I, 125.

Grünberg points out that G. F. Knapp in his work on the emancipation of the peasants in Prussia (*Die Bauernbefreiung und der Ursprung der Landarbeiter in den älteren Teilen Preussens*) meant by *Bauernschutz* only the encouragement by the government of small scale peasant farms. In the Hapsburg Monarchy, according to Grünberg, this was only one of several facets of the policy. Grünberg, *Bauernbefreiung*, I, 125 n, 126.

scattered through the realm, carried out the policies of the government.⁸ These bureaucrats were the men in whose hands lay the duty of protecting the peasants from their lords.⁹

Another important advance made by the Theresan government was a basic change in the fiscal system. Noble land in the German-Slav provinces was now subjected to a tax. This reform was not accepted without a struggle, but the will of the central government triumphed. Full equality was not yet achieved; the land of the peasants was taxed more heavily than was noble land, "but the great principle of universal liability to the bearing of public burdens was laid down."¹⁰ The possibility of further extension of noble land at the expense of peasant land was prohibited by the issuance of laws which forbade seizure of peasant land by a lord without indemnification to the peasant of land of the same quality and quantity. In such exchanges the district office of the central government had to be notified. Persons violating these regulations had to return the land they had illegally seized and were liable to a double indemnity. Initially, these prohibitions were not applied vigorously but from about 1775 on they began to be enforced.¹¹

The administrative and fiscal reforms were essentials for the successful prosecution of the government program of peasant protection. As Grünberg pointed out:

The latter was unthinkable without the former. There can be no doubt that the attempts at government regulation of agrarian conditions in favor of the peasant class would have taken as lamentable a course as had previous attempts since 1680, if they had not been preceded by the creation of a bureaucracy loyal to and dependent only upon the state, and if—at least this is true up to the end of the 1760's—the state had not linked up its efforts for the energetic protection of its fiscal interests with the condition of the peasantry.¹²

Direct state intervention into the conditions of the lord-peasant relationship did not begin until the 1770's. At that time the state began to promulgate codes for the regularization of this relationship in the various provinces. These codes established firm norms to which all parties were required to adhere.

⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 143-147.

⁹ Grünberg, *Handwörterbuch der Staatswissenschaften*, II, 567.

¹⁰ J. F. Bright, *Maria Theresa* (London and New York, 1897), pp. 69-71.

¹¹ Grünberg, *Handwörterbuch der Staatswissenschaften*, II, 567.

¹² Grünberg, *Bauernbefreiung*, I, 152-153.

The codes implemented the government's policy of *Bauernschutz*. They fixed exactly the dues and services the peasant was required to pay his lord, especially the number of days of labor service (*Robot*) he had to perform and the conditions under which this work was to be done. Maximum demands of the lord were fixed. Regulations were laid down protecting the peasant's rights in the land he held. He was allowed a greater degree of personal freedom. The judicial powers of the lords were restricted. To ensure that the codes were carried out special offices of the central government in each province were charged with the duty of enforcing them.¹³

Silesia was the first province in which the government introduced a code (or *Robotpatent* as it was called) for the lord-peasant relationship. Peasant unrest in that land had led to outbreaks in the course of which peasants had rebelled against the performance of their obligations to their lords. A royal commission, ordered to study the situation, had advised the Empress that reforms protecting the peasant were badly needed.¹⁴ On 6 July 1771 a patent was issued for Silesia regulating the duties and obligations to one another of both lord and peasant. This decree, with certain alterations made in 1775, remained the basic law for Silesia until 1848. It was issued without any prior consultation with the provincial estates of that land. Their opposition to its terms went unheeded.¹⁵

In 1771 a commission was charged by the government to investigate the lord-peasant relationship in Bohemia. The estates in that province were, in the beginning, more successful than the Silesian estates, for they succeeded in holding back for a while arbitrary regulation by the central government. They were able to keep the entire affair dragging for some time until serious peasant disturbances, caused by dissatisfaction with this delay in regularization, forced action upon the government. On 13 August 1775, a *Robotpatent* for Bohemia was issued. On 7 September 1775, this code was extended to include the neighboring province of Moravia.¹⁶ A *Robotpatent* for Lower

¹³ B. Rieger, "Untertans- und Urbarialverhältnisse," E. Mischler and J. Ulbrich, eds., *Österreichisches Staatswörterbuch*, 2d ed., I, 48.

¹⁴ Grünberg, *Bauernbefreiung*, I, 162-163.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 173-175.

¹⁶ Grünberg, *Handwörterbuch der Staatswissenschaften*, II, 567-568.

Austria had already been put out on 6 June 1772. One for Styria and Carinthia was issued on 5 December 1778, and for Carniola on 16 August 1782.¹⁷ The basic patent for Galicia was promulgated on 16 June 1786.¹⁸

In Hungary the crown in the early 1760's began its attempt to protect the peasants against the encroachments and excesses of their lords. In 1764 Maria Theresa, as Queen of Hungary, asked the Diet of that land to pass laws alleviating the condition of the peasantry. The Diet refused, whereupon the Queen took matters in her own hands. In 1767 she issued a code—called an *Urbarium*—regulating the landlord-peasant relationship in Hungary. To make certain that the provisions of the *Urbarium* would be carried out she ordered that matters relating to the code were to be handled by special commissioners rather than the hitherto all-powerful county authorities.¹⁹

In addition to these measures of regularization, the government of Maria Theresa in the last years of her reign took a step in the direction of the complete abolition of the system of hereditary subjection and the conversion of the Monarchy's agriculture into an economy of small peasant farms. This step was the adoption of the so-called Raab system on estates belonging to the government.

The Raab system was named after its creator, Freiherr Franz Anton von Raab, councillor of the *Kommerzkommission*. The essence of his plan was that the landlord and the peasant were to come to an agreement by which the former relinquished the dues and services owed him by the peasant, and turned over to peasants his demesne land. The peasant was to pay the lord a cash rental, based upon the net income of the land held by the peasant as determined by the average of the previous ten years. Large farms conducted by landlords were to disappear.²⁰

The government realized that compulsory adoption by private landlords of this system would be a revolutionary attack upon the rights of private property. So it was decided to limit the

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 568.

¹⁸ *Vollständige Sammlung aller seit dem glorreichsten Regierungsantritt Joseph des Zweyten für die k. k. Erbländer ergangenen höchsten Verordnungen und Gesetze*, VI, 241-264.

¹⁹ Marczali, *Hungary*, pp. 191-193.

²⁰ Grünberg, *Bauernbefreiung*, I, 302-306.

system to estates belonging to the crown. It was hoped that the success of the experiment would encourage other landlords to follow the state's example and that thereby the state-desired goal of an independent peasantry would be achieved.²¹ Beginning in 1775 the system was applied to royal estates in the Northwest zone.²² In immediately succeeding years it was extended to crown estates in other German and Slav provinces.²³

The crown exerted a strong influence over the royal cities of Bohemia and these towns followed the government's lead and introduced the Raab system on the lands they owned. Some noble landlords also followed the state's example. An official report made in 1848 stated that there were lessees holding under the Raab system on 151 estates in Bohemia alone.²⁴ Field Marshall Alfred Windisch-Grätz, in a memorandum to the throne in 1850, estimated that the number of Bohemian peasant families holding their land in this manner totalled one hundred thousand.²⁵

The agrarian legislation of Maria Theresa had regularized rather than revolutionized. But her laws prepared the way for the sweeping reforms of Joseph II.²⁶

The contrast between the conservatism of Maria Theresa and the revolutionary ardor of her son is nowhere more clearly seen than in their respective handling of the agrarian question. The Empress had felt her way cautiously. She sought to improve the old system by removing its excesses. Joseph was not inter-

²¹ *Ibid.*, p. 302.

²² *Ibid.*, pp. 307-308.

²³ L. von Mises, *Die Entwicklung des gutsberrlich-bäuerlichen Verhältnisses in Galizien (1772-1848)* (Vienna, 1902), p. 69; A. Mell, "Die Anfänge der Bauernbefreiung in Steiermark unter Maria Theresa und Josef II," *Forschungen zur Verfassungs- und Verwaltungsgeschichte der Steiermark*, V, pt. 1 (1901), 200.

²⁴ H. Friedjung, "Freunde und Gegner der Bauernbefreiung in Österreich," *Historische Aufsätze* (Stuttgart and Berlin, 1919), p. 46.

²⁵ "Denkschrift des Fürsten Windisch-Grätz über die Grundentlastung," *ibid.*, p. 60.

It is likely that this figure is inflated. Windisch-Grätz was petitioning the throne on behalf of those lords whose demesne had been split up and leased to peasants, as under the Raab system. This land was lost to the lords by the emancipation of 1848. The larger the number of persons he claimed were affected the better Windisch-Grätz's case would be. He offered no evidence in the memorandum which supported this figure. His petition was unsuccessful.

²⁶ Grünberg, "Die Grundentlastung," p. 15.

ested in improvements. He wanted to throw out the old and replace it with an entirely new agrarian constitution. Refusing to make adjustments to existing forces, convinced of the reasonableness of his plans and of the inevitability of the triumph of the reasonable, he swept forward to failure.

The belief that the strength and well-being of his realm depended upon an increasing population was strong in the Emperor, who leaned heavily upon the great cameralist Joseph von Sonnenfels for advice. To the intellectual influence of Sonnenfels was added the teachings of the physiocrats. Joseph recognized the fiscal value of a free, landowning peasantry and was convinced of the accuracy of Quesnay's apothegm *pauvre paysan, pauvre royaume; pauvre royaume, pauvre roi*. But his interests in the peasantry did not stop with this fiscal evaluation. Joseph viewed himself as the first servant of his people and devoted his life to improving their well-being. He wanted sincerely to better the peasant's lot, to humanize his existence. And over and above the ideological and humanitarian concepts and drives of the Emperor was his political heritage—the state-making philosophy of enlightened despotism. He was determined to carry through the processes of centralization, uniformity and equality in all aspects of the life of his realm.²⁷

The first piece of important agrarian legislation issued during the sole rule of Joseph (he had ruled jointly with his mother from 1765 until her death in 1780 but he had always been subordinate to the Empress) was the so-called Penal Patent (*Strafpapent*) of 1 September 1781. This law had cut into the judicial and punitive powers of the lord over his peasants, extending the state's jurisdiction. The right of the peasant to enter complaints against his lord was protected.²⁸

Then, on 1 November 1781, the Emperor issued the great law known as the *Leibeigenschafts-Aufhebungspapent* (in reality a misnomer).²⁹ If he had done nothing else this one decree

²⁷ Grünberg, *Bauernbefreiung*, I, 314-315, 320-321.

²⁸ *Joseph der Zweyten Römischer Kaisers Gesetze und Verfassungen im Justizfache für Böhmen, Mähren, Schlesien, Oesterreich ob und unter der Enns, Steyermark, Kärnten, Krain, Görz, Gradisca, Tyrol und die Vorlande*, 1781, pp. 101-104.

²⁹ The law contained the phrase *von nun an wird Leibeigenschaft gänzlich aufgehoben*. Hence the name given the patent. Actually, there was no slavery for the Emperor to abolish (except for a very small number of gypsy slaves in

would have ensured for Joseph an undying fame. It was a short law but it effected a transformation of the old form of hereditary subjection in the Monarchy. The first of its sections guaranteed to the peasant the right to marry whomever he wished, providing he gave previous notice to his lord and got a registration form for which there was to be no charge. The second section stated that the peasant was free to leave the estate upon which he lived. He had to give notice to the local recruiting office and get a certificate from his lord (for which there was to be no fee) attesting that he had filled all his obligations. The third section ordered that the peasant was to be free to learn whatever trade or skill he wished and that he could go wherever his work took him. Fourth, the compulsory labor performed for the lord by peasant children was abolished, except for orphans without either parent. The next section declared that no additional services could be demanded of the peasant beyond those for which the peasant was still obligated.³⁰

This law was extended to Galicia on 5 April 1782.³¹ In 1783 it was extended to Transylvania,³² and in 1785 a similar decree was issued for Hungary.³³

During his short reign Joseph promulgated many more laws affecting both the institution of hereditary subjection and the systems of land tenure. One of the most important changes brought about by his legislation was a great improvement in the peasant's rights of occupancy of a holding. When Joseph

Bukowina). (K. Grünberg, *Studien zur österreichischen Agrargeschichte* [Leipzig, 1901], pp. 9-10.) Joseph's use of the word has been explained as a sort of imperial propaganda against the system of hereditary subjection. Ever since the middle of the century the reformers, in their fight against hereditary subjection, had used the hated word *Leibeigenschaft* in place of the usual—and accurate—term *Erbuntertänigkeit* (hereditary subjection). *Leibeigenschaft* appeared in official documents for the first time in 1769. (Grünberg, *Bauernbefreiung*, I, 92-94; G. F. Knapp, "Die Bauernbefreiung in Österreich und Preussen," *Grundherrschaft und Rittergut* [Leipzig, 1897], pp. 60-61.) Gradually, as the word continued to be used it came to mean the condition of being bound to the soil (*Schollenpflichtigkeit*) rather than its true meaning, chattel slavery. (Grünberg, *Bauernbefreiung*, I, 94). Hereditary subjection as Joseph found it in 1781, although it was an unfree status, was certainly not slavery. (Knapp, "Die Bauernbefreiung," p. 61.)

³⁰ *Vollständige Sammlung . . . Joseph der Zweyten*, I, 423-424.

³¹ Mises, p. 45.

³² Grünberg, *Handwörterbuch der Staatswissenschaften*, 569.

³³ *Vollständige Sammlung . . . Joseph der Zweyten*, V, 258-260.

succeeded to sole rule of the Monarchy, by far the largest part of the peasants in the German-Slav provinces had very insecure tenures. Their status was known as *uneingekauft*, which in substance meant that the peasant enjoyed the use of his holding only at the will of the landlord. The peasant did not have any right to this use and his holding was always subject to retraction by the lord. He was a *Wirt bis weiter*—he held his land only until further notice.³⁴ In contrast to this highly insecure tenure there was the *eingekauft* status. Here the peasant had an hereditary right to the use of the holding which, therefore, was not retractable by the lord except for certain offenses committed by the peasant. These offenses were not defined in the law so that the tenure of the *eingekauft* peasant had uncertain elements in it. The *eingekauft* form of tenure was achieved by purchase (hence the name) for which the usual peasant lacked the means.³⁵ The government of Maria Theresa had made efforts to promote the change to the *eingekauft* status for the mass of the peasantry, but had not used any compulsion, preferring to keep such matters on a voluntary basis. The effect of the legislation issued by the Empress aimed at facilitating this change had been small. Only a very small number of peasants had left the *uneingekauft* for the *eingekauft* status.³⁶

Joseph intervened in a characteristic manner. In 1785 he ordered that *uneingekauft* peasants should have life-long usufructuary rights in their holdings. In 1789 they were given an hereditary right to the use of their holdings. Other legislation had ruled that no peasant could be evicted from his holding except for certain definite offenses.³⁷ The *uneingekauft* peasant was no longer a *Wirt bis weiter*, having now a firm hold on the land he tilled.³⁸

On 20 April 1785, a decree was promulgated ordering that a land cadastre be made in the German-Slav provinces which was to provide full information on the area and yield of all

³⁴ Grünberg, *Bauernbefreiung*, I, 55.

³⁵ Knapp, "Die Bauernbefreiung," p. 65.

³⁶ Grünberg, *Bauernbefreiung*, I, 260-262.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 270-272.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 364-365.

productive land in these provinces.³⁹ The purpose of this survey was to achieve equality of taxation, as pointed out in the preamble of the decree:

Because the existing tax basis is not determined with equality and justice, neither as between the provinces nor as between individuals, and also because the foundations upon which the tax basis rests is insecure, and is disadvantageous to diligence, his majesty desires to establish such a tax basis by which—without increasing the present contribution which is indispensable for covering the state's needs—every province, every community and every individual occupant contributes his full share according to the nature of his land. . . .⁴⁰

By 1789 this cadastre, pushed through with great speed and containing many errors, was completed. The foundation was ready for Joseph to carry through what turned out to be his last great reform.

This was embodied in the patent of 10 February 1789.⁴¹ This law, which was to go into effect on 1 November 1789, ordered that the dues and services owed by the peasant to his lord were to be changed into a money rental. The amount of this rental was not to exceed 17½ per cent of the peasant's annual gross income from his holding. This arrangement was to apply only to peasants who lived on *rustical* land, that is, land entered in the land register of the province as peasant land, and who paid a land tax to the state of at least two florins a year. Peasants who lived on *rustical* land but whose land tax did not amount to two florins were excluded from the operations of this patent. Also excluded were the peasants who lived on *dominical* land, that is, land entered in the land register as demesne land upon which the lord paid the land tax. The law further stipulated that the same tax was to be levied on all land, lord and peasant, *dominical* and *rustical*. This tax was to be 12½ per cent of the annual gross income of the land. Thus, the *rustical* peasant who paid a land tax of 2 florins or more per year was to pay out 30 per cent of his annual gross income from his land to settle all his obligations

³⁹ *Vollständige Sammlung . . . Joseph der Zweyten*, V, 111-113. This cadastre is discussed briefly in my comments on the *Tafeln zur Statistik* in the bibliographical essay at the conclusion of this book.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 111-112.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, IX, 97-109.

to lord and state. The remaining 70 per cent was to be his own. This was pointed out in the text of the law as being a great improvement over the peasant's existing situation.

THE COLLAPSE OF THE REFORM MOVEMENT

Less than four months after this decree was to have gone into effect Joseph II died (20 February 1790) leaving behind an empire in confusion. War with Turkey had broken out and was going badly. The Austrian Netherlands had revolted successfully. At home the provinces were torn with discontent, for the privileged classes realized that their predominance was mortally threatened by the administrative reforms of Joseph. Hungary and Galicia were on the edge of revolt. In his efforts to centralize and homogenize his realm the Emperor had clearly overreached himself.⁴²

The decree of 10 February 1789 had raised particular opposition, especially in Hungary. Faced with the alternative of the dissolution of his state the Emperor realized he had to make concessions. Only a few weeks before his death he revoked all his reforms in Hungary except the *Leibeigenschafts-Aufhebung-patent*. His brother and successor, Leopold II, repealed the decree of 10 February 1789 in the other provinces but left the earlier reforms untouched.⁴³

In a patent issued in the spring of 1790 Leopold ordered that peasants could commute their obligations into a money payment by making voluntary agreements with their lords.⁴⁴ In Lower Austria this law seems to have had remarkable results. According to a report of the *Hofkammer* dated 27 January 1792, cited by Bibl, by 1792 the lords of sixteen hundred estates in Lower Austria had made agreements with their peasants to compound the *Robot* service into money.⁴⁵ In Bohemia, on the

⁴² Grünberg, *Bauernbefreiung*, I, 343-344.

⁴³ Grünberg, *Handwörterbuch der Staatswissenschaften*, p. 570.

⁴⁴ This patent was issued for Lower Austria on 6 April 1790, *Sammlung der Gesetze welche unter der glorreichsten Regierung des König Leopold des II. in den sämmentlichen K. Erblanden erschienen sind*, I, 84-96; for Galicia, Moravia, Silesia and Upper Austria on 19 April, *ibid.*, pp. 126-140, 141-153, 153-165, 165-178; for Styria and Bohemia on 5 May, *ibid.*, pp. 247-260; and for Carinthia on 10 June, *ibid.*, pp. 291-304.

⁴⁵ V. Bibl, *Die Restauration der Niederöstrerr. Landesverfassung unter K. Leopold II.* (Innsbruck, 1902), pp. 83-84. Bibl does not tell whether these

other hand, there seems to have been far less inclination to commute. A report submitted in March, 1794, by Baron Margelik, vice-president of the Bohemian *Gubernium*, dealing with fourteen of Bohemia's sixteen districts, showed that on 351 estates the *Robot* had been entirely commuted into a money payment and that on 108 other estates it had been partially redeemed. On 117 of these estates the commutation had been for perpetuity. But almost all of these 117 were under state supervision. Commutation for perpetuity had been agreed to on only 64 privately owned estates. On 270 others it was for a set time, usually one, three, or six years, and only rarely for a longer period. "This shows," wrote Baron Margelik, "how few [estate owners] are inclined to take part . . . in a permanent system."⁴⁶

The reaction against the agrarian reform movement was capped with the issuance of the Patent of 1 September 1798. This law allowed voluntary commutation to continue, but so enmeshed its procedure with formalities and conditioning factors that the permission meant virtually nothing.⁴⁷

The collapse of the agrarian reform movement can be attributed to a series of causes. The outstanding factor, however, in bringing about its fall was the strenuous and unrelenting opposition of the noble landowners. As has already been pointed out, the reforms of Maria Theresa and of Joseph had been aimed at replacing the large landed estates with small peasant farms. The degree of absolutism with which these two monarchs were able to rule and the administrative changes they had effected in the government enabled them to override the protests of the landowners and to approach their final goal. But the culmination of this movement, the law of 10 February 1789, proved too much for the government—harassed as it was with other troubles—to carry through over the opposition of the landowners.

commutations were for long periods, whether they included all the peasants on the individual estates, and whether all, or part of, the *Robot* was commuted.

⁴⁶ Cited in Grünberg, *Bauernbefreiung*, II, 477.

I am unable to explain satisfactorily this contrast between Lower Austria and Bohemia in the extent of commutations.

⁴⁷ J. V. Hueber, "Uebersichtliche Darstellung der bis zum Jahre 1848 in Kärnten bestandenem Unterthans-Verhältnisse," *Archiv für vaterländische Geschichte und Topographie* (published by the Geschicht-Verein für Kärnten), VIII (1863), 24; Bibl, *Stände*, p. 71.

G. F. Knapp has pointed out that the terms of this law were such that the landlord would be left without a labor force with which to conduct his own agricultural operations. The *Robot* of his peasants was to end. The indemnification he was to receive for it was not enough to cover the costs of the hired labor he would now need. Further, the wages demanded by hired laborers would certainly go up with the huge increase in the demand for their services. The prospect for the landowner was a gloomy one.⁴⁸ The solution of his troubles would be for him to give up his own farming activity and split up his demesne among peasant tenants, which was just what the state wanted him to do.

This state-approved solution of their troubles proved unpalatable to the landowners. A host of attacks on the new law appeared, notably in the lands where the large estate was dominant. The provincial assemblies were especially active in this agitation.⁴⁹ These writings expressed the vigorous discontent of the lords. They termed the law a despotic and unjust attack on their legitimately acquired rights "in the indisputable, purchased or inherited property of the lords which are recognized by all sovereigns."⁵⁰ In Galicia there was open talk among the nobles of revolt, and secret committees entered into relations with the Prussian and Polish governments. More moderate elements among the landowners of that province presented remonstrances to the government in which they warned of dire results if the law was applied. They prophesied that within a short time after its introduction the law would bring about the ruin of the nobleman, the peasant, and every other inhabitant, and the collapse of the Monarchy.⁵¹ A petition of the Galician estates, dated 7 July 1789, claimed that it was impossible to divide the demesne among the peasants because these peasants lacked the "*fundus instructus*" to cultivate the land they now held. The lord, according to the petitioners, should be regarded as the outstanding cultivator for he raised

⁴⁸ Knapp, "Die Bauernbefreiung," p. 67.

⁴⁹ Grünberg, *Bauernbefreiung*, I, 336-337, 337 n.; Bibl, *Restauration*, pp. 20-21.

⁵⁰ V. Bibl, "Das Robot-Provisorium für Niederösterreich vom 20 Juni 1796," *Jahrbuch für Landeskunde von Niederösterreich*, new series, VII (1908), 238.

⁵¹ Mises, p. 80.

the greatest part of the goods produced, while the peasant grew barely enough to feed himself.⁵²

Another fear raised by the new law among the landowners was that it was only a step from it to complete freedom for the peasant from all his obligations. With the change of all the dues and services into a money payment the recognition by the peasant of his subjection to his lord would disappear. Then the peasant would refuse to make even this money payment. Already there had been refusals on the part of peasants in some districts, stirred by the prospect of complete freedom opened up by the new law, to perform the services they owed.⁵³

The fierce opposition aroused by the new law could not be downed. Joseph's early death saved him from certain defeat. He would have had to repeal the law for the German-Slav provinces just as he had had to recall it for Hungary. Leopold's action in cancelling the decree was inevitable.⁵⁴

Leopold, however, refused to be cowed into reaction. Immediately after Joseph's death the estates of every province had convened and had asked for the revocation of many of the reforms of Maria Theresa and Joseph. The throne made many concessions to these requests. But Leopold stood firmly against the demands for the abolition of the laws which had improved the peasant's legal status and his hold on the land. He had to give in to the clamor for the repeal of the law of 10 February 1789, but he refused to go back any further. The earlier decrees of his mother and brother dealing with the land problem remained in force.

The Emperor's decision here was conditioned by the danger of stirring up the potentially disruptive energies of peasant discontent if he dared to cancel out the reforms of his immediate predecessors. Rumors had already spread among the country people that there was a real danger of the restoration of the old thralldom. The ever suspicious peasant, taught by experience to be always ready to believe the worst, became overwrought. Peasant delegations came to Vienna to plead their case with the Emperor. Out in the land there were actual uprisings which were put down by the military.⁵⁵

⁵² Cited in *ibid.*, pp. 80-81 n.

⁵³ Bibl, *Restauration*, p. 19.

⁵⁴ Knapp, "Die Bauernbefreiung," p. 68.

⁵⁵ Springer, *Geschichte*, I, 29-30.

The peasants were apparently willing to accept the repeal of the 1789 decree. For one thing, the law had been in effect for only a few months when it was revoked and there had not been time enough for it to sink into the consciousness of the people.⁵⁶ Again, the peasant may well have realized that he was only losing a privilege of which he could not have taken advantage. For where was he to get the money to make the cash payments to his lord called for in the law?⁵⁷ No provision for credit facilities to aid him had been made in the decree.

Another factor which induced the government to abandon the policy of agrarian reform was the outbreak of the revolution in France. The course followed by the revolutionaries there cast a dark shadow across the belief in natural law and the faith in the enlightenment with its ideas of freedom and human rights.⁵⁸ By the time Leopold's son, Francis, ascended the throne in March, 1792, the Josephine spirit had largely disappeared except in the lower levels of the bureaucracy. It had been hurried on into limbo by what was happening in Paris. Now, in the highest councils of the government there were men who feared that the lightening of the peasant's burdens was a dangerous thing. These men looked upon the *Robot* as a good school for work and humble obedience. They believed that if the peasants were freed of their burdens the state would have on its hands lazy, idle subjects who would be a danger to the country's internal peace.⁵⁹

Soon after the close of the era of reform Karl Friedrich Kübeck, writing in his diary, described the peasant's condition as it then was. Kübeck, later to rise to great eminence in the government, was at this time (1802) a young, keen and ambitious minor bureaucrat in a district office in Moravia. The unit in which he worked was concerned with problems of peasant tenure so that his opportunity for observation was excellent.

⁵⁶ Grünberg, *Bauernbefreiung*, I, 352.

⁵⁷ Cf. Mises, p. 79 and n.

⁵⁸ Bibl, "Robot-Provisorium," p. 240.

⁵⁹ Bibl, *Stände*, pp. 65-66.

The view that a diminution or abolition of the *Robot* would have a pernicious moral effect upon the peasants and, hence, cause damage to the state, was also expressed by the Bohemian Estates in their First Desideria of 4 September 1790, to the throne. R. J. Kerner, *Bohemia in the eighteenth century* (New York, 1932), p. 298.

The picture he drew showed the peasant's status to be a harsh one.

The [peasants] still bear upon themselves the marks of the yokes and chains of their earlier slavery. They are subject to the jurisdiction of the manor, the obligations they owe to the lord can be wrung from them by force and punishment; disputes with the lord arising out of these obligations are not settled by regular judicial procedure but are summarily disposed of by government officials. The peasants are held to a definite servility to their lords in general, and the attitude of the slave still remains instinctive in them, as does the attitude of the slave owner in the noble, and that of the slave driver in the manor officials. . . . There still remains a great inequality in the burdens of property. The peasant has to give the tenth, *Robot*, and various fees to his lord. He has to contribute to all village disbursements. He has to provide horses to travellers carrying a government order (*Vorspann*), and he has troops quartered upon him. Besides all this, he has to pay to the state taxes and services to an extent that makes it seem as if he had no other burdens to carry. The lord has only to pay taxes to the state and receives the obligations paid him by the peasant.⁶⁰

Kübeck was accurate when he stated that the marks of his old servitude were still plainly to be seen upon the peasant. But the work of the great Empress and of her fascinating and brilliant son had left its mark, too. The peasant of the *Vormärz* lived under a government that shrank from reform or improvement in the peasant's status. Still, he far more closely approached freedom than had his grandfather in the days before Maria Theresa and Joseph adopted their policy of agrarian reform. The codes regulating the landlord-peasant relationship provided him with the protection of the state against excessive demands of his landlord. The state intervened in his behalf in judicial procedure. His right to occupy his holding and to transmit it to his heirs was greatly strengthened. Above all, he was guaranteed the fundamental human rights of freedom of marriage, freedom in the choice of his occupation, and freedom of movement.

NOBLE TENURE

In Hungary and Transylvania land ownership was a monopoly of the nobility and the church. In the North Slav provinces of Bohemia, Moravia-Silesia, and Galicia the nobles and the church

⁶⁰ Kübeck, *Tagebücher*, I, pt. 1, 88-89.

had a near-monopoly. In the German provinces of Upper Austria, Lower Austria, Styria, and Carinthia, noblemen and the church owned most of the land. In the period of inflation which shook the Monarchy during the wars with the French, members of the bourgeoisie in the German-Slav lands who had prospered were able to buy landed property.⁶¹ Recognizing land ownership as the mark of social prestige and anxious to put their dangerously fluctuating capital into something solid, they purchased estates. Moreover, land speculation proved profitable because of the demand and the steady depreciation in the value of money.⁶² A remarkable turnover in property resulted. Professor Engel-Janosi found that in sixty-five instances of estate transfers in Lower Austria during this period, twenty-seven owners held their properties for less than five years. One estate changed hands fifteen times in twenty-seven years, twelve of its erstwhile owners being members of the middle class.⁶³

Commoners were able to dodge the law's restrictions upon ownership of property by members of their class by resorting to simple artifices. Thus, in Bohemia burghers who owned urban property in one of the four royal cities could buy estates.⁶⁴ It was an easy matter for the enterprising bourgeois who wanted to own an estate to buy a small house in one of these cities and by virtue of this purchase become a citizen of the town. He was thus able to buy landed property. He would then sell the little house in town to another burgher who wanted to be a landowner. The house in town could be bought and sold over and over again with each temporary owner having the right to purchase an estate.⁶⁵

The state, concerned over the results of the speculation and its possible effects upon the landowning nobility, sought to enforce the restrictions upon land ownership.⁶⁶ Not a great number of estates, however, were transferred from noble to

⁶¹ Grünberg, *Studien*, pp. 138-139.

⁶² R. Sieghart, *Die öffentlichen Glücksspiele* (Vienna, 1899), p. 204; F. Engel-Janosi, "Über die Entwicklung der sozialen und staatswissenschaftlichen Verhältnisse im deutschen Österreich 1815-1848," *Vierteljahrsschrift für Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte*, XVII (1924), 100.

⁶³ Engel-Janosi, "Über die Entwicklung," p. 101.

⁶⁴ Springer, *Statistik*, I, 294-295.

⁶⁵ Sieghart, *Glücksspiele*, p. 204.

⁶⁶ Springer, *Geschichte*, I, 165.

bourgeois hands. The same economic factors which made the middle class crave landed property would have made the nobles refuse to part with it. The increase in the price of agricultural products during the period of inflation enabled the nobility to achieve a state of prosperity in which they could afford to turn down the alluring offers of the bourgeois buyers.⁶⁷

Many of the noble estates in the German-Slav provinces were entailed, rendering them inalienable by their occupants. The institution of the entail had been introduced into Austria around 1600. Through this instrument the glory and power of the family could be preserved against possible dissipation by future bearers of the family name. A large number of entails had been created during the seventeenth century, especially in the reign of Leopold I.⁶⁸ Statistics on the number of entailed estates and the area they included were not published until the latter part of the nineteenth century. The data issued then showed that in the German-Slav lands there were 292 individual entails. These entails covered 880 estates with a total area of 1,140,193 hectares.⁶⁹

Permission from the crown was necessary before an entail could be created (sect. 627).⁷⁰ The creator of the entail could designate the rule of succession to the property (sect. 619). The usual one chosen was primogeniture.⁷¹ Here the property went to the eldest male member of the senior line. If this line failed the heir was that male in the next senior line who was nearest in degree of kinship to the creator of the entail (sects. 619, 621). Other types of succession which the law allowed the creator to designate were the *majorat* and the *seniorat* (sect. 619). By *majorat* the property was inherited by the oldest male among those who were of the same degree of kinship to the creator of the entail. The line of descent played no part here.

⁶⁷ Grünberg, *Studien*, pp. 140-142. Grünberg is discussing conditions in Bohemia and Moravia-Silesia, but his argument is applicable to other provinces.

⁶⁸ W. von Medinger, *Grossgrundbesitz, Fideikommiss und Agrarreform* (Vienna and Leipzig, 1919), p. 65.

⁶⁹ K. T. von Inama-Sternegg, "Die Familien-Fideikommiss in Österreich," *Statistische Monatschrift*, IX (1883), 467-468.

⁷⁰ The numbers in parentheses in this paragraph and the succeeding one are the section numbers in the *Allgemeines bürgerliches Gesetzbuch für die gesammten deutschen Erbländer der Oesterreichischen Monarchie* (Vienna, 1811) from which the statement in the text is drawn.

⁷¹ Turnbull, II, 34.

Thus, it was possible for a distant cousin of the occupant to be the heir of the property, even though the occupant had sons. This was because the distant cousin was closer in degree of kinship to the founder of the entail than was the occupant's son, or if of the same degree of kinship as the son, was older. Succession by *seniorat* meant that the property went to the oldest living member of the family regardless of his line of descent or his degree of kinship to the creator of the entail.⁷² As a rule, women had no claim to possession unless the founder had specifically ordered that the entail could descend in the female line if the male line became extinct (sect. 626).

The holder of the entailed property had only a life interest in it (sect. 631). Heirs apparent could protect their interest by going into court and demanding an accounting of the stewardship of the occupant or requesting the appointment of a curator to operate the property (sect. 630). The holder, with the permission of the court, could borrow up to one-third of the value of the property, but had to amortize this indebtedness at the rate of 5 per cent per year (sect. 635). Creditors could not seize any of the land to satisfy their claims but had to depend upon the land's income for repayment (sect. 642). The law allowed the occupant of the entail to convert all or part of it into another form of capital (which still remained entailed), or exchange land or lease the property (sect. 633). For any of these transactions, however, he had to get the permission of all the known possible heirs and of the court. The entail was extinguished when there were no heirs. The property then became the outright possession of the last occupant who could dispose of it as he wished (sect. 645).

In Hungary up to 1848 *all* inherited landed property was inalienable. The possessor of an inherited realty had no rights of disposition over it, for, according to Hungarian law the property was the possession of the entire family. This principle had been established in 1351 by the decree of King Louis the Great known as the *Aviticität* law because of its elevation of the family principle. The law ordered that noble property must be passed on intact. If there was no direct heir the land went to

⁷² See F. Schlegelberger, ed., *Rechtsvergleichendes Handwörterbuch für das Zivil- und Handelsrecht des In- und Auslandes* (Berlin, 1927-1936), III, pt. v, 344.

collateral descendants of the initial holder of the land. It remained in the hands of the family so long as anyone of the male line was living. If the family died out the land reverted to the crown since all holdings in Hungary were fiefs or donations of the King. The crown could then grant the land to another person.⁷³

The provisions of the *Aviticität* led inevitably to endless lawsuits by persons who believed they were the rightful heirs to a property. According to Horváth there was scarcely a family in Hungary that was not engaged in some sort of legal process occasioned by this law.⁷⁴

Its unusual features attracted the attention of foreign travelers in the land.⁷⁵ John Paget, the Englishman who became an Hungarian landowner, provides the most accurate description among these travelers of the workings of the law. He reported that the restrictions on the alienation of inherited property were evaded, although apparently not always successfully.

... estates are sold every day; for a man can mortgage for perpetuity. Although the intention of the law is thus defeated, the title to the property is still insecure; for any member of the family obliged to sell, can at any time redeem the estate by paying the original purchase money, and the sums laid out in improvements. If, for instance, A. B. sold an estate for a thousand pounds to C. D. in the year 1800, any member of A. B.'s family, his nephew's or his cousin's descendants, in 1900, may pay back the £1000 together with the "ameliorations," and receive back the estate. In order to provide against this contingency, the sum is commonly entered in the title deeds as the double of that really given, and the purchaser runs up such a bill for improvements, and the law is so dilatory, that it is often ruinous to take an estate back again. Still thousands of these law-suits are commenced every year, to the benefit of the lawyers, if of nobody else.⁷⁶

⁷³ Timon, pp. 554-555.

I am indebted to Dr. Vladimir Gzowski, Chief of the Foreign Law Section, Library of Congress, for calling to my attention the existence of the same type of noble land tenure in Imperial Russia. See H. O. Klibanski, *Handbuch des gesamten russischen Zivilrechts* (2 vols., Berlin, 1911-1918), I, 201-208, II, 149-151.

⁷⁴ M. Horváth, *Fünfundzwanzig Jahre aus der Geschichte Ungarns von 1823-1848*, transl. from the Hungarian by J. Novelli (2 vols., Leipzig, 1867), I, 372.

⁷⁵ For example, Bright, *Travels*, pp. 110-111; Paget, I, 240 and n.; A. F. L. V. de Marmont, Duc de Raguse, *Voyage en Hongrie en Transylvanie, dans le Russie meridionale, etc.* (5 vols., Paris, 1837-1838), I, 389-391.

⁷⁶ Paget, I, 240 n.

A landowner could dispose freely of land which he had purchased, for the restrictions of the *Aviticität* did not apply to such property. The reasoning here was that the purchased property was the equivalent of the cash or other movable goods which the purchaser had paid for the realty, and owners of movable goods could dispose of them as they wished. But once the purchased land was inherited it became subject to the restrictions of the *Aviticität* since it was now considered part of the family patrimony.⁷⁷

The *Aviticität* law made it unnecessary before 1848—when the law was abolished—for Hungarian noblemen to entail their property. The entail, however, was known in Hungary and used to a slight extent. It had been introduced into that land in 1687. As in the German-Slav provinces permission from the crown was required in order to create an entail. The Hungarian lord could entail only the land he had himself acquired, that is, land which he had not inherited.⁷⁸ That little use of the entail was made is shown by the fact that of the 91 entails in Hungary at the end of 1893 only 26 dated before 1850.⁷⁹

The lord of an estate in the German-Slav provinces and in Hungary had important public and judicial functions with respect to the peasants who lived on his manor. He, or his agents, maintained public safety and security on his estate, announced and enforced the laws of the land, collected taxes, and performed other similar duties of a public nature. He provided courts of first instance, acted as judge, and punished offenders. In short, the lord of the manor provided the only judicial and governmental functions with which the rural population normally had any dealings.⁸⁰

The powers of the lord in the German-Slav provinces to punish offenders had been limited by the Penal Patent issued by Emperor Joseph II on 1 September 1781. The lord was not allowed to impose fines or beatings as punishment. He could sentence the peasant to be imprisoned up to eight days, keeping

⁷⁷ Timon, p. 377.

⁷⁸ J. von Jung, *Darstellung des ungarischen Privat-Rechtes* (2 vols., 2d ed., Vienna, 1827), I, 172-173; Marmont, I, 390.

⁷⁹ B. Földes, "Das Familienfideikommiss in Ungarn," *Jahrbücher für National-ökonomie und Statistik*, 3rd series, VII (1894), 828-829.

⁸⁰ Grünberg, *Studien*, p. 148.

him in irons and on a bread and water diet, or order that he do eight days of labor on public works, such as on the roads. The lord could not sentence the peasant to labor for him.⁸¹ In Hungary, where the provisions of the Penal Patent did not apply, the lord could levy fines, have peasants beaten up to 24 strokes with the cane, imprison culprits on a bread and water diet or in irons, or have them do labor for him up to three days.⁸²

In Carniola, the Littoral, the Salzburg and Innviertel districts of Upper Austria, the Villach district of Carinthia, and the Duchy of Cracow, the judicial powers of the lord had been abolished by the French during their occupation of these areas in the revolutionary and Napoleonic period. When these lands were regained by Austria (annexed in the case of Cracow) this power of the lord was not reintroduced.⁸³

All real property in the German-Slav lands was entered in a series of registers which were maintained in every province. These registers were known as *Grundbücher*. Their purpose was, first, to give an exact and reliable description of the realty with all the components, rights and obligations adhering to it; second, to record the proprietor as the legal possessor; and third, to record the rights that other persons might have in the realty.⁸⁴

The land registers for each province was divided into three separate series: the *Landtafel*, the *Stadtbuch*, and the *Grundbuch*. The *Landtafel* contained the register of the *ständische* properties. Ownership of such a realty entitled a person to a seat in the provincial estates (*Stände*). In Bohemia in addition to the *Landtafel* there was also a *Lehntafel* in which were registered the crown fiefs in that province. The *Stadtbuch* contained the description of the land owned by residents of the royal cities. In the *Grundbuch* were registered all peasant holdings.⁸⁵ Each of these books was arranged in four parts. First, there was the *Dienstbuch* or *Urbarium* which gave the

⁸¹ *Joseph der Zweyten . . . Gesetze und Verfassungen im Justiz-Fache*, 1781, pp. 102-103.

⁸² J. Mailath, *Das ungrische Urbarsialsystem oder des Grundherrs und des Bauers Wechselverhältniss in Ungern* (Pest and Leipzig, 1838), pp. 50-52.

⁸³ Grünberg, "Die Grundentlastung," p. 5.

⁸⁴ J. N. Rainer von Lindenbichel, *Handbuch zur Geschäftsführung der Wirtschaftsaemter überhaupt, und mit besonderer Rücksicht auf Inner-Oesterreich und Illyrien* (Klagenfurt, 1837), p. 71.

⁸⁵ A. Exner, *Das oesterreichische Hypothekenrecht* (Leipzig, 1876), pp. 14-15.

physical data about the property and all the rights adhering to it. Second was the *Gewährbuch* which contained the legal proofs of the rights of the present occupant to the property. The *Satzbuch* had entered in it the claims against the holding. The fourth book, the *Urkundenbuch*, contained the documents upon which were based the claims registered in the *Satzbuch*.⁸⁶

The use of the *Grundbücher* and the methods by which they were to be conducted had been prescribed by royal decrees in the course of the eighteenth century. The old Bohemian *Landtafel*, which dated back to medieval times, served as a partial model for this legislation. In 1794 a decree containing the most complete instructions laid down by the government up to that time on the *Grundbücher* system was issued for Bohemia and Moravia. This law was also applied to the other German-Slav provinces.⁸⁷

PEASANT TENURES

Dues and Obligations

The land occupied by the peasants was divided into units called by various names. A peasant might hold a full unit, or more probably, a part of a unit, down to a quarter or an eighth. Still smaller holdings were occupied by cotters.⁸⁸ The services and dues, especially the labor service, which were required of the peasant depended, in general, upon the share of the unit which he held. The peasant who occupied a whole unit was known as a *Ganzbauer*, the holder of a half unit was a *Halbbauer*, and so on. There were actually large variations between the amount and yield of land held by peasants of the same status. This variation was found not only between provinces and between different areas of an individual province, but even within a single manor. On such an estate one *Ganzbauer* might have 50 or more yokes of land in his possession while a neighboring *Ganzbauer* had only half as much. Yet the services and

⁸⁶ Lindenbichel, pp. 71-73.

⁸⁷ F. von Deym, *Ueber Kredit-Institute im Allgemeinen und das Hypotheken-Institut insbesondere. Nebst Vorschlägen zur Errichtung einer Real-Hypotheken-Bank im Königreiche Böhmen* (Prague, 1844), p. 11 n.; F. Schulte, *Die Bodenkreditinstitute der Österreichisch-Ungarischen Monarchie 1841 bis 1910*, Veröffentlichungen zur Statistik des Bodenkredits und verwandter Gebiete, II (Munich and Leipzig, 1912), pp. 8-9.

⁸⁸ See pp. 171-172 for figures on the number of peasants with full holdings and with lesser holdings in several provinces.

dues required of the two men were identical.⁸⁹ A committee of the Galician provincial assembly reported in the 1840's that:

At present, often in one and the same village the liabilities of the peasants are out of all proportion with the yield of the land they hold. There are many cases of two neighbors, each of whom performs three days of *Robot* each week, of whom one holds ten yokes of land and the other twenty yokes of the same fertility.⁹⁰

The type and the amount of the obligation the peasant owed his lord varied between the provinces and also within the individual province. The diversity of the obligations and their number were revealed during the process of emancipation after 1848. Thus, in Moravia 246 different types of money payments alone were reported.⁹¹ In Hungary the *Urbarium* issued by Maria Theresa regularizing the landlord-peasant relationship there, listed the following obligations required of the peasant occupying a full holding (called a *session* in Hungary), as follows:⁹²

52 days of *Robot* with four draught animals (*Zugrobot*) or 104 days of *Handrobot* (*Robot* without animals).

One long journey each year to be made jointly by the holders of every four sessions.

One *Klafter* of wood felled and chopped by two days of hand labor. The ninth of the peasant's produce, delivered.

The *Bergrecht*, a payment for having vineyard land.

Three days' hunting service for the lord.

One florin rent for each house.

Annual payment of two chickens, two capons, twelve eggs, $\frac{1}{2}$ *Maas* of butter, one-thirtieth of a calf, or, in lieu of this last, 3 kreuzer.

Payment of additional quantities of chickens, capons, eggs and butter, or in lieu of these, 48 kreuzer, when the landlord or landlady married, or if the lord was a clergyman, when he celebrated his first mass.

Payment of a "moderate and fair" aid to ransom the lord if he was captured.

⁸⁹ F. Heintl, *Die Landwirtschaft des österreichischen Kaiserthumes* (Vienna, 1808), I, 115.

⁹⁰ M. von Krainzki, ed., *Memoiren und Aktenstücke aus Galizien im Jahre 1846* (Leipzig, 1847), pp. 279-280.

⁹¹ W. Schiff, *Österreichs Agrarpolitik seit der Grundentlastung* (Tubingen, 1898), I, 16.

⁹² Mailath, *Urbarialsystem*, pp. 26-35. R. Townson, *Travels in Hungary, with a short account of Vienna in the year 1793* (London, 1797), pp. 109-131, provides an English translation of a part of the Theresian *Urbarium*.

Two florins annually for the privilege of distilling brandy, if the peasant had this privilege before the *Urbarium* went into effect.

Payment of an aid when the landlord, if a magnate or prelate, was summoned by the King to the Diet.

This list did not include the obligations of the peasant to church and state.

In the actual application of the *Urbarium* there were departures from its provisions, necessitated by local conditions and customs. Richard Bright, the English traveller who toured in Hungary in 1814 and 1815, made a copy from the books of an estate he visited of all the obligations to their lord for which the peasants of the estate were liable. On this particular estate the ninth of the peasant's produce was not collected. All the other obligations listed in the *Urbarium* were demanded and other ones besides. There were additional money payments to the lord for favors granted by him, for garden ground when the house and garden occupied more than a quarter of an acre, and for feeding additional cattle on the commons or in the forests. Additional labor services were demanded, too, such as four or five days of *Robot* for each additional yoke of pasture land, or three days of *Robot* and one fifth of the produce for each additional yoke of arable. On this estate, too, various other services were commuted into labor service at a fixed rate, as fifteen or twenty days of *Robot* in lieu of the long journey, or two days of *Robot* in lieu of the wood-cutting obligation.⁹³

The enormous contribution in labor and goods made by the peasantry was partially shown through the emancipation operation (only partially because no indemnification was paid for certain lesser dues owed the lord and for services rendered the church and state). In the German-Slav provinces, with the exception of Bukowina and Dalmatia, 2,625,512 peasants had performed annually 29,442,387 days of *Robot* with their own animals and implements, and 38,587,940 days of *Handrobot*. Those dues in kind which the peasant had paid his lord and for which the latter was to be indemnified amounted to 2,176,259 *Metzen* of grain, while their money dues totalled 5,850,916 florins. The tenth (*Zehent*) they had paid each year was

⁹³ Bright, *Travels*, pp. 115-118.

valued for purposes of indemnification at over four million florins.⁹⁴

After paying all his obligations to lord, state, and church the peasant had little left for himself. Tebeldi, writing in the 1840's, estimated that the average German or Slav peasant retained only about 30 per cent of his net income. He had to spend the rest as follows:⁹⁵

Interest on debts.....	14	%
Lord.....	24	
Church.....	6	
School.....	.75	
Community.....	4	
Insurance.....	.5	
State taxes.....	13.2	
Services to the state.....	4.25	
Illegal payments to minor officials.....	3	
Total.....	69.70%	

Zenker, in his study of the Vienna revolution of 1848, also gives 30 per cent as the share of his net income kept by the peasant, citing several contemporary statements and calculations to support his assertion.⁹⁶

In general, the obligations of the peasants fell into the following categories:

1. The labor service (*Robot*)
2. The tenth, or, in Hungary, the ninth
3. Lesser dues in labor, kind and cash
4. Money payments when holdings were transferred
5. Compulsory labor of orphans
6. Obligations to the state
7. Obligations to the church

These obligations will be discussed in this order.

The most important obligation the peasant owed his lord

⁹⁴ G. Marchet, "Grundentlastung," E. Mischler and J. Ulbrich, eds., *Österreichisches Staatswörterbuch*, 2nd ed., I, 60-61.

⁹⁵ A. Tebeldi (pseudonym of Carl Beidtel), *Die Geldangelegenheiten Oesterreichs* (Leipzig, 1847), p. 217.

⁹⁶ E. V. Zenker, *Die Wiener Revolution 1848 in ihren sozialen Voraussetzungen und Beziehungen* (Vienna, Pest, Leipzig, 1897), pp. 22, 248-252.

Tegoborski, in his study of Austrian finances, claimed that the peasant kept more than 30 per cent for himself. E. Denis, *La Bohème depuis la Montagne-*

was the labor service. This was generally known in the Monarchy as the *Robot*, from the slavic word *robota*, meaning work. The German words for this compulsory labor service, *Frone* or *Frondienst*, were far less frequently used.⁹⁷ The amount of *Robot* required of peasants of the same status varied between provinces. Within the provinces it varied according to the man's status, that is, whether he was a *Ganzbauer*, *Halbauer*, and so on. In all cases the *Robot* was supposed to be divided evenly through the year. The maximum the law allowed a peasant to perform per week was set at three days, although exceptions were allowed at times of pressing labor need.

In Lower Austria the *Ganzbauer* was required to perform 104 days of *Robot* with four work animals. If the *Ganzbauer* (or his predecessor on the holding) before the issuance of the *Robotpatent* for Lower Austria, had performed his *Robot* with only two animals, he continued to use just two. The holder of a half unit was also held to 104 days but with two work animals. The peasant with a quarter holding was responsible for 104 days of *Handrobot*. The cotter did 52 days of *Handrobot* if he held more than a yoke of land, and 26 days if he held one yoke or less. The landless laborer was held to twelve days annually.⁹⁸ In Carinthia and Styria the peasant performed 156 days of *Robot* annually if he had a full holding, 117 days for a three quarters holding, 78 days for a half holding and 39 days if he held a quarter holding or was a cotter.⁹⁹ In Upper Austria the maximum number of days of *Robot* exacted per year was only fourteen.¹⁰⁰

In Bohemia and Moravia-Silesia the *Robot* obligation of the

Blanche (Paris, 1903), II, 213 n., in discussing this discrepancy between Zenker's sources and Tegoborski wrote "Les conclusions de Zenker me paraissent modérées et vraisemblables."

⁹⁷ Grünberg, *Bauernbefreiung*, I, pp. 70-71.

⁹⁸ J. B. L. E. von Barth-Barthenheim, *Das politische Verhältniss der verschiedenen Gattungen von Obrigkeiten zum Bauernstande im Erzherzogthume Oesterreich unter der Ens* (2 vols. in 3, Vienna, 1818-1820), I, pt. i, 320-321, 325-328.

⁹⁹ F. X. Hlubek, ed., *Ein treues Bild des Herzogthumes Steiermark als Denkmal dankbarer Erinnerung an Weiland Se. kaiserliche Hoheit den durchlauchtigsten Erzherzog Johann*, published by the k. k. steiermarkischen Landwirthschafts-Gesellschaft (Graz, 1860), p. 114; Lindenbichel, pp. 41-42.

¹⁰⁰ A. Engelmayr, *Versuch zu einer systematischen Darstellung der im Lande ob der Enns im Unterthansache bestehenden Vorschriften* (Linz, 1824), pp. 11-12.

peasant was determined by the tax levied as of 1773 on the land he occupied. The gradations in the amount of tax paid corresponded to the divisions in other provinces between full, three quarter, half and quarter holdings and cotters. Thus, the peasant on whose land a tax of over 42 florins and 45 kreuzers was levied performed the maximum amount of *Robot* and was the analogue of the *Ganzbauer* in other provinces; if his tax was between 28 florins 30 kreuzers and 42 florins 45 kreuzers he had three quarters of a holding, and so on. The peasant with the full holding was responsible for 156 days of *Robot* per year with four animals. The man with a three quarter holding did 156 days with three animals. If he had a half holding he performed 156 days with one animal. Cotters did from 26 to 156 days of *Handrobot* depending upon the amount of tax assessed upon their holdings. Landless laborers were held to thirteen days.¹⁰¹ In Galicia the *Robot* obligation of the peasant was the same as in Bohemia and Moravia, except that the cotters and landless peasants there did six days.¹⁰² In Bukovina the peasant with a holding was legally required to perform only twelve days annually and cotters and landless peasants there did six days per year.¹⁰³

In Hungary, with the exception of the counties of Slavonia and the Banat, the peasant holding a full *session* performed 52 days of *Zugrobot* annually, or if his lord preferred, 104 days of *Handrobot*. The occupants of half, quarter, and eighth *sessions* did proportionately less. The cotter did eighteen days of *Handrobot* or nine days of *Zugrobot*, and the landless peasant was responsible for twelve days.¹⁰⁴ In the Slavonian counties of Posega, Sirmien, and Verocz the peasants were responsible for the same number of days of *Robot* but actually worked out only about half of their obligation and commuted the remainder. The rate of commutation was set by law at 24 kreuzer for each day of *Zugrobot* and 12 kreuzer for each day of *Handrobot*. In the Banat counties, Temes, Torontál and

¹⁰¹ A. Engelmayr, *Die Unterthans-Verfassung der Königreiches Böhmen* (2 vols., Vienna, 1830-1831), I, 94-95.

¹⁰² Mises, pp. 50, 52.

¹⁰³ M. B. Safran, *Die inneren und kulturellen Verhältnisse in der Bukowina 1825-1861* (Botosani, 1939), p. 124.

¹⁰⁴ Mailath, *Urbarialsystem*, p. 27.

Krasso, the same system was followed but with the rates of commutation set at 20 kreuzer per day of *Zugrobot* and 10 kreuzer for *Handrobot*.¹⁰⁵

In all provinces the laws paid considerable attention to the details of the *Robot*. The length of the working day was carefully prescribed and provisions made for allowances for time spent going to and coming from the work site. Additional days of *Robot* could be demanded under certain conditions which the laws defined.¹⁰⁶

The tenth (*Zehent*) in the German-Slav lands and the ninth (*Neunte* or *nona*) in Hungary were the most important of the payments in kind made by the peasant. In the German-Slav lands the *Zehent* was technically not a part of the system of hereditary subjection. The landlord did not collect the *Zehent* because he was the seignior of the peasant. The *Zehent* was a private property right which could be acquired by anyone, including peasants. Further, it was not a liability that rested on all land, but was taken only from land from which by private agreement or by custom a *Zehent* was to be paid. It was collected from demesne land as well as peasant land.¹⁰⁷ According to a delegate from Upper Austria at the Constitutional Reichstag in 1848, a large amount of the rights to collect the *Zehent* in that province was owned by peasants, many of them being elderly parents who had given up their holdings to their heirs and were dependent upon the *Zehent* payments for their livelihood.¹⁰⁸

Despite its name the *Zehent* was not a tenth part of the total product of the farmer. The laws for the individual provinces usually specified from which crops the *Zehent* was to be taken, with considerable variation existing between the provinces.

¹⁰⁵ J. N. Preyer, *Des ungrischen Bauer's früherer und gegenwärtiger Zustand, nebst einer Darstellung der Folgen und Wirkungen desselben* (Pesth, 1838), pp. 101-102.

¹⁰⁶ These provisions concerning the *Robot* are dealt with in pp. 184-185, 192-193, below.

¹⁰⁷ *Sammlung der politischen Gesetze und Verordnungen für das Erzherzogthum Oesterreich ob der Ens und das Herzogthum Salzburg*, I, 335-336; J. Bernardt, *Handbuch der provinziellen Gesetzkunde von Mähren und Schlesien* (Olmütz, 1848), p. 146; Barth-Barthenheim, *Das politische Verhältniss*, I, pt. ii, 83-84; Lindenbichel, p. 49.

¹⁰⁸ Speech of Delegate Wieser, session of 16 August 1848, *Verhandlungen des österreichischen Reichstages nach der stenographischen Aufnahme* (5 vols., Vienna, 1848-1849), I, 567-568.

Sometimes the *Zehent* was not actually a tenth part even of the crops from which it was collected, depending upon the agreement or custom. Such a partial *Zehent* was known as a *Dreiviertelzehent*, *Halbenzehent*, *Drittelzehent*, and so on, depending upon its size, being in some cases as small as a twentieth of a *Zehent*.¹⁰⁹ In some cases the land's occupant paid partial tenths to different people, each of whom had a right to this share, with the total of his payments adding up to a full tenth.¹¹⁰

In Lower Austria the list of products that were subject to the *Zehent* was an unusually full one. The law stated that the tenth was to be taken of all the products "which by and large are as a rule cultivated and produced in the customary methods of farming on the majority of peasant holdings." In substance, this meant the cereal crops. In addition, the law allowed the *Zehent* to be collected from other field crops and from dairy and poultry products.¹¹¹ In Upper Austria, also, most products were subject to the *Zehent*.¹¹² In Carinthia the *Zehent* was limited to cereals and vineyards.¹¹³ In Moravia the products upon which the *Zehent* was levied was determined by the contract authorizing the collection of this due, but the law prohibited it being taken from forage crops planted in fallow fields and guaranteed thirty years' freedom from paying the *Zehent* upon products grown on reclaimed land or on what had hitherto been common pasture land¹¹⁴ (the laws of other provinces contained similar restrictions). In Galicia the *Zehent* was not widely used and in Bohemia it was hardly known.¹¹⁵

In Hungary, in contrast with the German-Slav lands, the

¹⁰⁹ F. von Hauer, *Praktische Darstellung der in Oesterreich unter der Enns für das Untertansfach bestehenden Gesetze* (4 vols., 3rd ed., Vienna, 1824), III, 327; Lindenbichel, p. 48.

¹¹⁰ Engelmayr, *Versuch zu einer systematischen Darstellung*, p. 92; Lindenbichel, p. 48.

¹¹¹ Hauer, III, 327.

¹¹² Engelmayr, *Versuch zu einer systematischen Darstellung*, p. 94.

¹¹³ Lindenbichel, p. 48.

¹¹⁴ Bernardt, p. 147.

¹¹⁵ Rieger, "Untertans- und Urbarialverhältnisse," p. 55. Also, Marchet, "Grundentlastung," pp. 60-61, giving the break-down by provinces of the value of the *Zehent* as determined for indemnification purposes after the emancipation. This table shows that the value of the *Zehent* in Bohemia was 29,841 florins, and in Galicia, 171,691 florins. In Lower Austria, where the *Zehent* burden was the heaviest, it was valued at 1,629,988 florins. Moravia was in second place with the *Zehent* there valued at 553,194 florins.

Neunte was a seigniorial right, having been specifically granted as such by Louis the Great in 1351.¹¹⁶ The peasant was required to pay to his lord one-ninth of all his products, whether they were from the field, the pasture, the barn yard or the beehive. The only products which were exempt were those he raised in his garden and his meadow. The law allowed the commutation of the *Neunte* by a voluntary agreement between lord and peasant. In certain limited cases specified in the law the peasant could choose for himself the form (kind or cash) in which he wished to pay this due.¹¹⁷

In addition to the *Zehent* or *Neunte* the peasant had to pay various other and much smaller dues in kind, and many cash dues. The list of these minor payments in Hungary has been given earlier in this section. In the German and North Slav provinces these lesser annual payments included small quantities of cattle, animal products, field crops, and money. The amount of these payments was usually fixed by local custom. Some of the payments in kind could be commuted into money, with the rate of commutation prescribed by the law varying with the different provinces.¹¹⁸

J. A. von Helfert, in his memoirs, told of some of the dues paid by peasants on manors in the district of Bohemia which he represented at the Constitutional Reichstag in 1848-1849. On the estate of Hals nine peasants had to do duty as night-watchmen at the manor house. On many of the other estates of the district the peasants had to prepare a certain amount of oakum or commute this service into a money payment. One village community on the estate of Tachau had to spin $47\frac{3}{4}$ balls of flax from materials supplied by the lord, or, in lieu of this, pay the lord 1 kreuzer per ball. In another village of this estate each cotter had to spin 6 to 16 balls of flax and each peasant with a half-holding 24 balls. In still another village of Tachau each peasant had to prepare a certain amount of oakum, ranging from one-eighth to three *Pfund*, depending upon the size of his holding. In two other villages of this estate the

¹¹⁶ Timon, p. 597.

¹¹⁷ Mailath, *Urbanialsystem*, pp. 36-37.

¹¹⁸ Lindenbichel, pp. 33-36; Engelmayr, *Versuch zu einer systematischen Darstellung*, pp. 17-22; Bernardt, pp. 113-115, 117-118; Engelmayr, *Die Unterthans-Verfassung*, I, 128-130.

peasant with a full holding gave to the lord annually 1.5 *Metzen* of barley, 4 hens and 40 eggs, the occupant of a three-quarter holding gave .9 *Metzen* of barley, 3 hens and 30 eggs, and the occupant of a half-holding gave .75 *Metzen* of barley, 2 hens and 20 eggs. In a village on another estate the peasants paid the lord over four *Metzen* of rye, barley and oats and an additional 10 *Metzen* as commutation of an obligation known as *Hundshafer*. This last obligation dated back to the days when wolves roamed in the forests of the estate and raided the herds. Dogs were trained by the lord's foresters to kill these marauders. The peasants were required to pay for the upkeep of the dogs with a grain payment, hence the name *Hundshafer* (dog's oats). The wolves had long since disappeared and the dogs along with them, but the payment still continued, although in most places where it had persisted it had been commuted into a money payment. Besides these grain payments the peasants of this village made several annual money payments, many of these being commutations for dues in kind. Thus, as commutation for a cheese due the peasants paid 3 kreuzer 2¾ pfennig; for hens, 3 kreuzer 2⅓ pfennig; for eggs, 1 kreuzer ¼ pfennig; for morels, 1 kreuzer ¾ pfennig; for caraway, 4½ pfennig; for hazelnuts, 4 kreuzer ⅛ pfennig; and for mushrooms, 2 kreuzer 1⅙ pfennig.¹¹⁹

Among the lesser dues a particularly unpopular one was the *Bergrecht*, the right of the lord to collect a certain amount of wine or money in return for land used as vineyard by the peasant. What galled the peasant was that this payment was demanded even though the land in question had not been used as vineyard for many years.¹²⁰ The amount of money or wine paid depended, as in the case of most of the other lesser dues and services, upon the customary amount that had always been rendered by the occupant of the land.¹²¹

In addition to the dues and services paid by the peasant as the occupant of a holding, he had also to pay sizable amounts of money whenever a holding was transferred. This payment

¹¹⁹ J. A. von Helfert, *Aufzeichnungen und Erinnerungen aus jungen Jahren. Im Wiener konstituierenden Reichstag Juli bis Oktober 1848* (Vienna, 1904), pp. 71, 73.

¹²⁰ Zenker, p. 15.

¹²¹ Lindenbichel, pp. 36-37; Mailath, *Urbarsialsystem*, p. 41.

was known as the *Lehenwaare* or *laudemium* when both parties to the transfer were alive, and *Sterbelehen* or *mortuarium* in the case of the inheritance of a holding.¹²² In Lower Austria the law ordered that the *laudemium* or the *mortuarium* could not exceed 5 per cent of the value of the property transferred.¹²³ The *mortuarium* was levied on the net value of the personal property of the deceased as well as on the value of his holding.¹²⁴ In Upper Austria the *laudemium* and *mortuarium* could not exceed 10 per cent.¹²⁵ In Carinthia and Styria the *laudemium* was limited to 10 per cent and the *mortuarium* to 3 per cent.¹²⁶ In Bohemia and Moravia these payments were frequently not demanded. They were not part of the organic law covering the lord-peasant relationship. Where they were in force it was as the result of private agreements. When levied they could not exceed 10 per cent.¹²⁷ Transfer payments were not demanded of the peasants in Hungary.¹²⁸

Until 1781 the lords in the German-Slav provinces had the right to demand that minor children of their peasants who were not needed at home by their parents should work for the lord (*Zwangsgesindedienste*). These children were supposed to be paid in accordance with the work they did and could not be employed for more than three years unless the child was willing.¹²⁹ The age at which the children were to be considered suitable for employment by the lord was not specified but normally it was fourteen.¹³⁰ As already mentioned earlier in this chapter, this seigniorial right had been severely restricted by the Josephine decree of 1 November 1781. Now, the lord could demand this service only of orphans who had lost both parents (*Waisendienste*). All other children were released from the obligation. The orphans were to perform this duty because they were wards of their lord, who received no

¹²² *Allgemeines bürgerliches Gesetzbuch*, sect. 1142.

¹²³ Hauer, I, 158-159, 172-173.

¹²⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 158.

¹²⁵ Engelmayr, *Versuch zu einer systematischen Darstellung*, pp. 24-25, 35.

¹²⁶ Lindenbichel, pp. 62, 93.

¹²⁷ Engelmayr, *Die Unterthans-Verfassung*, I, 131; Bernardt, p. 70.

¹²⁸ Ditz, p. 107.

¹²⁹ Hauer, I, 148.

¹³⁰ Grünberg, *Bauernbefreiung*, I, 13.

other recompense for the duties of his guardianship.¹³¹ A few months later another decree announced that such orphans who were over fourteen years of age were to receive the same wage for their work as other laborers doing the same job.¹³² Orphans under fourteen received no pay but were fed, housed and clothed by the lord. After reaching his fourteenth birthday the orphan was required to work for three years but could not be made to continue in the employ of the lord after that period unless he was willing.¹³³

In Hungary the law said nothing of this compulsory service of minor children or of orphans. The lord was required to serve as the guardian of the orphan and administer his property, if he had any, but he was to receive no compensation for his services.¹³⁴

Besides the obligations he owed to his lord, the peasant in the German, Slav, and Hungarian provinces was also responsible to the state and the church for various services and payments. His services to the state were in addition to the taxes he paid the central government and the contributions he made to the community in which he lived for the maintenance of necessary local services.¹³⁵ He, or the community of which he was a part, was responsible for the building and maintenance of local roads and bridges.¹³⁶ He was also liable to be called upon to work on through roads.¹³⁷ He had to provide horses and a conveyance for a certain distance to persons having an order from public officials demanding this service, which was known as the *Vorspann*. A small fee was paid to the peasant

¹³¹ *Handbuch aller unter der Regierung des Kaisers Joseph des II. für die K. K. Erbländer ergangenen Verordnungen und Gesetze in einer sistematischen Verbindung*, I, 76.

¹³² *Ibid.*, note.

¹³³ Barth-Barthenheim, *Das politische Verhältniss*, I, pt. i, 299.

¹³⁴ Mailath, *Urbarsialsystem*, p. 55.

¹³⁵ Tebeldi, p. 203; Ditz, pp. 109-110.

¹³⁶ Barth-Barthenheim, *Das politische Verhältniss*, I, pt. ii, 77; Bernardt, p. 118.

¹³⁷ C. d'Elvert, *Geschichte der Verkehrs-Anstalten in Mähren und Oesterreich-Schlesien* (Brünn, 1855), p. 116; R. F. Kaindl, "Das Unterthanswesen in der Bukowina. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Bauernstandes und seiner Befreiung," *Archiv für österreichische Geschichte*, LXXXVI (1899), 626; Engelmayer, *Versuch zu einer systematischen Darstellung*, p. 16; Fényes, p. 112.

for this service.¹³⁸ He also had to permit soldiers to be quartered on him.¹³⁹

In Hungary the peasant was required to give a tenth of certain of his crops to the church, but this tenth was not required of the noble landowner. The products from which the tenth was given were wheat, rye, barley, oats, millet, maslin, wine, lambs, goats, and bees. This tithe was paid even when the seignior was a prelate and also received the *Neunte* from the peasants of his estate.¹⁴⁰ In other provinces the peasants were required to give some of their produce or perform *Robot* for the support of their local clergy.¹⁴¹

Rights of the peasant

The *Leibeigenschafts-Aufhebungspatent* of 1 November 1781, had ordered that the peasant was free to leave the estate upon which he dwelt provided he gave notice to the local recruiting office. He also had to get a certificate of discharge from his lord to show that he had fulfilled all his obligations.¹⁴² He could go anywhere in the Monarchy. He could not migrate to another country but neither could the members of any other class.¹⁴³

Actually, the restrictions on the peasant's freedom of movement were somewhat more complex. The peasant to whom he turned over his holding had to be acceptable to the lord.¹⁴⁴ He was free to move anywhere in the German-Slav provinces but if he migrated to the lands of the Hungarian crown he had to pay a departure tax (*Abfahrtsgehd*) of 5 per cent of the value of his personal property to his lord and another 5 per cent to the state.¹⁴⁵

¹³⁸ Barth-Barthenheim, *Das politische Verhältniss*, I, pt. i, 141; Townson, p. 41; Paget, I, 45-46; M. R. von Bauer, *Die Landwirtschaft in Mähren vor Aufhebung der Untertänigkeit 1781-1848* (Erlangen, 1907), p. 62.

¹³⁹ Bauer, *Landwirtschaft*, p. 62; Fényes, p. 212; Barth-Barthenheim, *Das politische Verhältniss*, I, pt. i, 141.

¹⁴⁰ Mailath, *Urbarsialsystem*, pp. 56-57.

¹⁴¹ Helfert, *Aufzeichnungen*, p. 74; Bauer, *Landwirtschaft*, p. 62; Kaindl, "Das Unterthanswesen in der Bukowina," p. 626.

¹⁴² *Vollständige Sammlung . . . Joseph der Zweyten*, I, 423.

¹⁴³ Grünberg, *Bauernbefreiung*, I, 362.

¹⁴⁴ Barth-Barthenheim, *Das politische Verhältniss*, I, pt. i, 175-176.

¹⁴⁵ *Handbuch aller unter der Regierung des Kaisers Joseph des II . . . ergangenen Verordnungen und Gesetze*, IX, 399-400.

In Hungary if the peasant wished to leave the estate upon which he lived he had to announce his intention to his lord on Michaelmas (29 September). He had to discharge all his obligations to the government and to his lord, and in turn, get paid for any improvements he had made to the land and buildings of which he had had the use. The value of these improvements was appraised by the lord and the county judge. The peasant left the estate with all his movables on the Feast of St. Gregory (12 March). He had to have a written permit from his lord in order to move, and if he planned to migrate to another county of Hungary he also had to have a permit from the government of his home county. If he lacked these licenses he was considered to be a runaway and subject to penal action.¹⁴⁶

The holding of the peasant—the land upon which he lived and from which he drew his living and which was entered in the tax records as a peasant holding—could not be divided. This legal indivisability was known as *Bestiftungszwang*. The law allowed division of a peasant's holdings under certain exceptional circumstances, but it was necessary to get permission of the government before the division could be carried through.¹⁴⁷ If a peasant holding fell vacant the lord was required to install another peasant on the holding, rather than incorporate it into his own demesne.¹⁴⁸

The purpose of these restrictions, which dated back to the reform period of the eighteenth century, was to protect peasant land from the encroachments of the lord and to make certain that the peasant would have enough to earn a living. The law was enforced in Lower Austria,¹⁴⁹ Upper Austria,¹⁵⁰ Styria, Carinthia,¹⁵¹ Bohemia and Moravia-Silesia,¹⁵² although it seems likely that its strict provisions were not entirely carried out.¹⁵³ In Galicia and Bukowina the restrictions upon peasant land division were disregarded.¹⁵⁴

¹⁴⁶ Mailath, *Urbarsialsystem*, pp. 49-50.

¹⁴⁷ Tebeldi, p. 199.

¹⁴⁸ Hueber, "Uebersichtliche Darstellung," pp. 19-20; Zenker, p. 7.

¹⁴⁹ Barth-Barthenheim, *Das politische Verhältniss*, I, pt. i, 155-156.

¹⁵⁰ *Oekonomische Neuigkeiten und Verhandlungen. Zeitschrift für alle Zweige der Land- und Forstwirtschaft, des Forst- und Jagdwesens im österreichischen Kaiserthum und dem ganzen Deutschland*, XXX (1825), 594.

¹⁵¹ Lindenbichel, p. 15.

¹⁵² *Ibid.*, pp. 217-218.

¹⁵³ Grünberg, *Studien*, pp. 216-217.

¹⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 218. See below p. 181.

In Hungary the lord was allowed, with the foreknowledge and under the supervision of the county government, to divide the land of his peasants in order to provide them with holdings of equal size or equal productivity. Thus, each peasant with a full holding would have the same amount of land in his holding, or else the productivity of each full holding would be equal although the amount of land held differed. The same would be true of the peasants who held half, quarter and eighth holdings. The lord could not make any divisions smaller than an eighth of a holding. Further, the total number of holdings could not be decreased by such a division.¹⁵⁵ The lord was required to put another peasant as quickly as possible on a holding that fell vacant.¹⁵⁶

The provisions of the *Bestiftungszwang* in the German-Slav land were virtually abolished by the decree of 18 December 1846. This law provided that peasants could commute their dues into a money payment which was merely the repetition of a long-standing decree.¹⁵⁷ But the law did contain something new. This was that the peasant, in lieu of a cash commutation or redemption, could turn over part of his holding to his lord. The law ordered that this was permissible only if the peasant had enough land left upon which to support himself. Actually, this provision, like the rest of the decree, had very little application. "But it had opened the long closed road to the enlargement of the landlord's demesne at the expense of the peasant."¹⁵⁸

The right of the peasant in the German-Slav lands to dispose of his holding as he wished depended upon whether or not he was of the *eingekauft* status. If he was *eingekauft* he could do whatever he wanted with the land he held. This permission had been granted by a decree of 1 November 1781, which stated that the *eingekauft* peasant could transfer, mortgage, sell or exchange his holding. The *uneingekauft* peasant was not allowed this freedom.¹⁵⁹

The right of the peasant, whether *eingekauft* or *uneingekauft*,

¹⁵⁵ Mailath, *Urbarsialsystem*, p. 15.

¹⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 17.

¹⁵⁷ The law of 18 December 1846, and its effects are discussed, below, pp. 230-231.

¹⁵⁸ Grünberg, *Bauernbefreiung*, I, 373-374.

¹⁵⁹ *Vollständige Sammlung . . . Joseph der Zweyten*, I, 422-423.

to occupy his holding had been secured by the reforms of Joseph II. The law protected him from arbitrary dismissal from his land by his lord. The only offenses for which he could be evicted were: disobedience of the lord and trouble making among the peasants; allowing the holding to go untilled or become desolated although warnings had been given by the lord for three consecutive years; running up debts exceeding two-thirds of the total worth of the peasant; persistent tax arrearages after less drastic efforts of the lord to collect the taxes had failed; failure for a period of three years to perform the dues and obligations owed to the lord; and smuggling in foreign wares. When a peasant was charged with any of these offenses the sentence of eviction could not be carried out until the district office of the central government had investigated and given its approval.¹⁶⁰

In Hungary this protection against arbitrary eviction was lacking until 1836. The new *Urbarium* of that year ordered that the peasant could be dispossessed if he was obviously incapable of rendering his obligations, if he was guilty of crimes dangerous to the community, or if he displayed repeated and harmful refractoriness in the performance of his obligations to his lord.¹⁶¹

The rights of the peasant in the German-Slav provinces to bequeath and to inherit his holding had been the subject of several laws issued by Joseph II. The tendency of his legislation had been to strengthen and to stabilize these rights and to limit the powers of the lord to intervene.¹⁶² Then, during Leopold's reign, on 29 October 1790, a new patent was issued superseding these decrees. The new law incorporated the provisions of the Josephine legislation. It declared that the provisions of the Patent of 11 May 1786, which established which persons were

¹⁶⁰ Barth-Barthenheim, *Das politische Verhältniss*, II, 211-217; Engelmayr, *Versuch zu einer systematischen Darstellung*, pp. 102-104; Bernardt, pp. 167-169; Engelmayr, *Die Unterthans-Verfassung*, I, 298-302; Hueber, "Uebersichtliche Darstellung," p. 19.

¹⁶¹ Mailath, *Urbarialsystem*, p. 88.

The *Urbarium* of 1836 is discussed in the next section of this chapter.

¹⁶² For example, Patent of 3 April 1787, *Joseph der Zweyten . . . Gesetze und Verfassungen im Justiz-Fache*, 1787, pp. 112-113; *Hofdekret* of 16 May 1788, *ibid.*, 1788, pp. 57-59; *Hofdekret* of 22 September 1788, *ibid.*, pp. 183-185; Patent of 25 June 1789, *ibid.*, 1789, pp. 63-64.

to have precedence in inheritance, were to apply to the peasants as well as to all other subjects. It ordered that the occupant of the holding could name his heir. If he died intestate the land went to his oldest son, unless the lord had some well-grounded objection to this son, in which case it went to the next oldest son. Failing male children the oldest daughter inherited. A possible heir was disqualified if he already had a holding, since the law forbade a peasant from having more than one holding. If the surviving spouse, male or female, had held the land jointly with the decedent the survivor took over the holding. The heir of the holding had to satisfy the claims of the other heirs. If the decedent left no descendants, his legal heirs, with the consent of the lord, could either select one of their number to take over the holding or else sell it.¹⁰³

On 26 May 1791, a special patent was issued for Bohemia. The law contained the provisions of the Patent of 29 October 1790, and also certain additional features. In the case of the surviving spouse taking over the holding the law ordered that if the holding contained 26 $\frac{2}{3}$ yokes or more of arable it could be divided between the surviving spouse and children who had reached their majority. An heir could alienate some of the land he inherited if the holding was too large or if some of its parcels were too distant, providing he had 13 $\frac{1}{3}$ yokes of arable land left. In the case of smaller holdings an heir could dispose of far-distant parcels providing he got back, either through purchase, exchange, or other means, as much land as he had alienated.¹⁰⁴

In Hungary the peasant had no rights in the disposition of the property he held from his lord. His role was that of the usufructuary. Upon his death the land went back to the lord,¹⁰⁵ although usually son succeeded father as holder.¹⁰⁶ An exception to this absence of testamentary rights of the peasant in the land he held was when the peasant had, himself, cleared and

¹⁰³ *Leopold des Zweyten Römischen Kaisers Gesetze und Verfassungen im Justiz-Fache für Böhmen, Mähren, Schlesien, Oesterreich ob und unter der Enns, Steyermark, Kärnthén, Krain, Görz, Gradisca, Triest, Tyrol, und die Vorlande*, 1790, pp. 50-51.

¹⁰⁴ *Ibid.*, 1791, pp. 43-45.

¹⁰⁵ Jung, *Darstellung*, I, 323.

¹⁰⁶ Bright, *Travels*, p. 111.

rendered tillable a piece of land. Such land was not considered part of the holding for which he performed dues and services. Instead, the peasant paid an agreed sum to the lord for the use of this newly-won land.¹⁶⁷ He had the right of disposing by will of one-half of such land.¹⁶⁸ This testamentary right was extended by the new *Urbarium* of 1836 which allowed the peasant to dispose by testament of all the land he had gained for himself.¹⁶⁹

Besides the land which the peasant held from his lord he had also certain legally defined rights in the forests and the common pastures of the estate in both the German-Slav provinces and in Hungary. These privileges were not connected with any rights of ownership, since both forest and common were the property of the lord. The only basis for the peasant's claim to the use of these areas was the right of servitude (easement)—the right to use for one's own advantage the property of another.¹⁷⁰

The peasants had the right to fill their needs for wood from the forests of the lord. In Lower Austria the peasant had to pay for the timber he cut but could glean the forest without charge. Wood could be taken only for the peasant's own use and not for resale.¹⁷¹ In the other German-Slav provinces the provisions of the law were similar.¹⁷² In Hungary the law stated for what purposes and when the peasant could glean or cut wood in the lord's forests at no cost. The peasant was also allowed to put his swine out to root for acorns but had to pay for this privilege.¹⁷³

The other chief easement concerned the pasturing of cattle. The peasant could pasture his animals in the forests, in the stubble of fields belonging to the lord or peasants, or on sowed fields belonging to the lord or peasants if the ground was frozen.¹⁷⁴ Swine, fowl, and in forested areas, goats, were not allowed to be put out.¹⁷⁵ The provisions for pasturing in

¹⁶⁷ Mailath, *Urbarialsystem*, p. 19.

¹⁶⁸ Jung, *Darstellung*, I, 323.

¹⁶⁹ Mailath, *Urbarialsystem*, pp. 133-134.

¹⁷⁰ *Allgemeines bürgerliches Gesetzbuch*, sect. 472.

¹⁷¹ Barth-Barthenheim, *Das politische Verhältniss*, I, pt. i, 193-194.

¹⁷² Cf. Bernardt, pp. 189-192.

¹⁷³ Mailath, *Urbarialsystem*, pp. 24-25.

¹⁷⁴ Barth-Barthenheim, *Das politische Verhältniss*, I, pt. ii, 40-42; Bernardt, pp. 191, 192-193.

¹⁷⁵ *Allgemeines bürgerliches Gesetzbuch*, sect. 499.

Hungary were generally similar to the ones in force in the German-Slav provinces.¹⁷⁶

In 1768 Empress Maria Theresa, in the interests of increasing the amount of land under the plow, had issued a law ordering that land used solely as common pasture in the German-Slav lands should be divided between lord and peasants. The lord was to keep one half for himself while the remaining half was to be divided among the peasants who pastured their animals upon it. A time limit of one year was given with which to comply with the law and punitive measures were to be taken against those who failed to do so. Despite this the law had little effect. On six occasions in the following years the order to divide the commons was repeated by government decree, with hardly any results. Finally, in 1806 the government gave up and contented itself with recommending but not requiring common division. Even when the laws had been obeyed and the common divided the practice was for the peasants to throw their shares together and continue to use the land as common.¹⁷⁷

In Hungary provisions for the division of the common were included in the 1836 *Urbarium*. Such division was to be carried out if the lord or the majority of the peasants demanded it. The law set a minimum size of 4 hungarian yokes and a maximum size of 22 hungarian yokes (the hungarian yoke was three quarters of the size of the yoke used in the rest of the Monarchy) for the amount of common that was to go to the individual *session* in the case of common division.¹⁷⁸

In time of need the peasant could turn to his lord and demand assistance.¹⁷⁹ The lord was supposed to supply his peasants with seed corn for their planting in case of crop failure. In Lower Carinthia this obligation of the lord was carried out at least twice in the first half of the nineteenth century, when in 1806 and again in 1817 the crops of the peasants failed.¹⁸⁰

The reforms of Joseph had erased almost all of the feudal

¹⁷⁶ Mailath, *Urbarialsystem*, pp. 22-23, 25.

¹⁷⁷ C. Peyrer, *Die Regelung der Grundeigentums-Verhältnisse* (Vienna, 1877), pp. 1-3; Schiff, *Agrarpolitik*, I, 245-246.

¹⁷⁸ Mailath, *Urbarialsystem*, pp. 109-111.

¹⁷⁹ Barth-Barthenheim, *Das politische Verhältniss*, I, pt. i, 194-195; Bernardt, pp. 184-189.

¹⁸⁰ Hueber, "Uebersichtliche Darstellung," p. 11.

monopolies of the lords in the German-Slav lands. The lord was enjoined from compelling his peasants, as he once had, to buy their food and drink from him, or to use his mills.¹⁸¹ In Hungary, however, some monopolies were maintained. These included the right of the lord to retail spiritous drinks and meat. His monopoly on wine selling extended over only part of the year. The law allowed peasants who produced wine to retail their product from Michaelmas to the Feast of St. George (29 September to 24 April). Peasants who did not make wine were allowed to retail this beverage only from Michaelmas to Christmas.¹⁸² Hunting rights were reserved for the lords alone in both the German-Slav provinces and in Hungary,¹⁸³ as was fishing in Hungary, and, in some instances, in the Northwest zone.¹⁸⁴

AGRARIAN REFORM DURING THE *Vormärz*

Earlier in this chapter it was pointed out that the era of agrarian reform had ended with the death of Joseph II. Not long thereafter the war with France began and for the next quarter-century all the energies of the state were engaged in this gigantic effort. The final victory confirmed the triumph of conservatism and intensified the hatred of reform, agrarian or any other kind, because it clashed with the old order.

As will be shown in later chapters, noble land-owners in all parts of the Monarchy during the *Vormärz* petitioned the throne to make basic reforms in the landlord-peasant relationship. In the German-Slav lands their requests, submitted usually through their provincial estates, were denied. In Hungary, however, where the Diet had more power than the noble assemblies of the other provinces, the demands of the lords met with success. In 1836 the Diet was able to issue a new *Urbarium* that superseded the provisions of the Theresan code. The reforms were far from revolutionary. In essence, they improved the status of the peasant so that his duties and rights more closely approximated those of the Northwest zone.

¹⁸¹ Barth-Barthenheim, *Das politische Verhältniss*, I, pt. i, 112; Bernardt, pp. 140-141.

¹⁸² Mailath, *Urbarialsystem*, pp. 17-18, 44-45.

¹⁸³ *Ibid.*, p. 47; Barth-Barthenheim, *Das politische Verhältniss*, I, pt. i, 112; Bernardt, pp. 140-141.

¹⁸⁴ Mailath, *Urbarialsystem*, p. 47; Bernardt, p. 149.

Several of the changes that were effected by this new law have already been mentioned: the protection against arbitrary eviction, the extension of testamentary rights, and the provisions for the division of the common. The most important reform was the abolition without indemnification of the lesser dues in kind which the peasant had paid—the eggs, poultry, lambs, etc.¹⁸⁵ The “long journey” was abolished, too, but in its place the peasant had to do two days of farm work for the lord.¹⁸⁶ Other reforms allowed the peasant to sell the right to use his holding and to include in the sale price a charge for the improvements he had made to the holding.¹⁸⁷ Fines were prescribed for lords who restrained their peasants from leaving the estate.¹⁸⁸ The children of peasants were given permission to leave the estate upon which they lived, and were not to be hindered by the lord in their choice of a livelihood. They did not have to get a license from the lord to leave, needing only a permit from the county government. The same privileges were extended to landless laborers, provided they had met all their obligations to their lord.¹⁸⁹ The size of the full holding in each county was set, in the interests of uniformity and equality.¹⁹⁰ The lord, or his officials, was prohibited from sitting on the bench in the lord’s court in cases in which the lord was a party. Instead, the judges had to be selected from neutral persons. If the lord’s court failed to act on a peasant’s plea for fourteen days after he had entered it he could take his case over the head of his lord to the county courts.¹⁹¹ The penal power of the lord was restricted. He was forbidden to sentence peasants to be beaten and he could not imprison them for more than three days. In cases calling for more severe punishments he had to turn the culprit over to the county authorities.¹⁹²

SUMMARY

During the *Vormärz*, then, in almost eight-tenths of the Monarchy the cultivator of the soil with few exceptions was held in a servile status, subject to the lord on whose estate he

¹⁸⁵ Mailath, *Urbarialsystem*, p. 122.

¹⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 126.

¹⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 84-85.

¹⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 83-84.

¹⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 89.

¹⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 90-106.

¹⁹¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 134-135.

¹⁹² *Ibid.*, pp. 137-138.

lived. His position had been greatly improved by the reforms of Maria Theresa and of Joseph II. Their laws had extended his rights greatly and had given him protection against excesses formerly practiced by his lord. His relationship with his lord had been regulated by codes issued by the throne in the latter part of the eighteenth century. The chief purpose of these codes was to regularize the relationship with the aim of establishing a more secure tenure for the peasant.

The aim of the reforms of the eighteenth century had been to replace the large landed estates with small peasant farms tilled by an independent peasantry who would form the backbone of the absolute state. The reform movement collapsed because of the determined opposition of the landlords. Their opposition was brought to a climax by the decree of 10 February 1789, which capped the Josephine policy. They succeeded in having this law withdrawn. Leopold, who followed Joseph on the throne, refused to cancel the other agrarian reforms of his predecessors but he and his son, Francis, abandoned the reform program. One reason for this abandonment was the continued opposition of the landlords. Another was the course of events in the French Revolution which threw all reform into disrepute.

Landownership in the lands where the peasant was the hereditary subject of the lord, was almost entirely a monopoly of the nobility and the church. Some land was owned by burghers. There was also a small number of free, landowning peasants. Many of the estates of the nobles in the German-Slav provinces had been entailed and so were inalienable by their occupants. In Hungary all noble land that had been inherited was inalienable. This was the law of the *Aviticität*, which had been laid down in 1351 and remained in force until 1848.

The lord of an estate normally provided all the judicial and governmental functions with which his peasants had any dealings. He exercised a limited judicial power over them, maintained public safety, collected taxes, and performed other similar duties of a public nature.

The size of the holding which the peasant held from the lord varied. Some of his obligations to his lord, especially that of the *Robot*, varied with the holding's size. He was required to perform a large variety of dues and services to the lord, and in addition had to render certain dues and services to the

state besides his taxes, and to the church. The extent of the obligations of the peasants varied considerably between provinces, and sometimes within an individual province. The amount of his obligations and the conditions under which they were to be demanded and paid were laid down in the codes regulating the lord-peasant relationship.

The peasant had certain rights guaranteed him. He had freedom of movement, although he had to meet certain provisions before he could leave the estate upon which he lived. He could settle anywhere in the Monarchy. He was free to learn any trade he wished and to marry whomever he wished. His holding could not be divided, neither by himself nor by his lord, except under certain exceptional circumstances. He could not be evicted arbitrarily from his holding. In the German-Slav lands he had extensive inheritance rights. He had rights in the use of the lord's forests and fields for wood and for pasture. The seignorial monopolies of the lord had been almost entirely abolished.

It is clear that the peasant of the *Vormärz*, held as he was in a servile status, was not a serf. He was bound neither to the soil nor to the body of his lord. He could leave the land when he wanted and go where he wanted within the Monarchy. He could settle on another estate under another lord. Nor was he the complete subject of his lord. The state had intervened, protecting the peasant and standing between him and his lord, providing him with recourse that the serf had lacked.

CHAPTER III

THE NEW INTEREST OF NOBLE LANDOWNERS IN PROFITABLE AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTION

IMPROVED TRANSPORT FACILITIES AND EXPANSION OF MARKETS

The increase in population, the growth of urban centers, the development of industry, and, above all, the extensions and improvements in the means of transportation, had deep effects upon the agricultural economy of the Monarchy during the *Vormärz*. The market for the products of agriculture was greatly expanded. This was accompanied by the development among many noble landowners of a new and deep interest in efficient and profitable agricultural production which, in turn, involved changes in the means of that production.

A graphic illustration of the effects of the development of transportation in creating and expanding the market for farm products is provided by the growth of trade between the lands of the Hungarian crown and the *Zollverband* (the tariff unit formed by the German-Slav-Italian provinces). The general character of this trade was the exchange of Hungarian agricultural products for the processed goods turned out in the more industrialized Cisleithan provinces. In 1831 the agricultural products shipped from Hungary into the *Zollverband* were valued for tariff purposes at 16,243,909 florins. This figure rose each subsequent year until by 1845 it was 32,266,510 florins, or just short of double what it had been fourteen years before.¹ Throughout this period the unit value at which the government evaluated commodities for tariff purposes remained the same so that the increase in the value of total shipments rose entirely from increased volume of trade.

A comparison of quantities of some of the most important

¹ T. S., 1841, table 42, p. 5 (contains series from 1831 on); 1845, part II, table 5, p. 22. The value of agricultural goods transshipped through Hungary (this consisted mainly of cane sugar) is not included in the totals given in the text above.

farm products shipped in the 1830's and in 1845 shows this increase. The annual volume of exports from Hungary of individual commodities during the 1830's was not published but the average volume of these goods shipped for the decade 1831-1840 is available.

TABLE 1
VOLUME OF FARM PRODUCTS SHIPPED FROM HUNGARY INTO
THE *Zollverband*²

Commodity	Average 1831-1840 (inclusive)	1845
Wheat	1,313,626 <i>Centner</i>	2,438,927 <i>Centner</i>
Maize	176,208 "	225,734 "
Rye	187,110 "	979,615 "
Oats	584,760 "	879,911 "
Barley	151,973 "	366,671 "
Rape seed	34,522 "	287,460 "
Oxen and steers	72,720 head	106,230 head
Poultry	2,019,037 ea.	2,496,962 ea.

The single most important transport factor in the growth of this Hungarian-*Zollverband* trade was the Danube Steamship Company (*k. k. privilegierte erste Donau-Dampfschiffahrts-Gesellschaft*). This organization began regular runs on the Danube between Vienna and Pest in 1831 with one steamer. By 1847 its fleet numbered 41 steamships and numerous smaller vessels. Its runs covered the length of the Danube and extended into that stream's navigable tributaries. In 1835 the line carried 38,529 *Centner* of freight; in 1847, 3,184,778 *Centner*.³

In the last decade of the *Vormärz* the steam railroad became an important carrier for all trade in the Monarchy. The *Kaiser-Ferdinands-Nordbahn*, running north from Vienna into Moravia, was the busiest line, carrying in 1846 over a third of all the freight shipped by rail in the Monarchy.⁴ Shipments on this line in 1846 amounted to 3,685,181 *Centner*, of which 1,016,734 *Centner* were agricultural products, as follows: 365,932 *Centner* of field crops (grain, vegetables, fruits, etc.);

² *Ibid.*, 1841, table 42, p. 6; 1845, part II, table 5, p. 25.

The increases shown in this table would undoubtedly be larger if the 1831 returns for the volume of these commodities were available and were used instead of the average for 1831-1840, in view of the fact that the value of these products had increased each year from 1831 on.

³ *Ibid.*, 1845, part II, table 8, p. 3; 1847, part II, table 8, pp. 6-8.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 1846, part II, table 9, p. 95.

292,719 *Centner* of victuals (meat, butter, cheese, etc.); 147,628 *Centner* of cattle, poultry and game; 120,327 *Centner* of beverages (brandy, whiskey, wine, beer, etc.); and 90,128 *Centner* of forest products.⁵

The extensive road-building, both public and private, that was done during the *Vormärz* was another vital factor in the expansion of markets.⁶ These roads led to the market towns, or the railheads or wharves, where the products of the farm could be sold or shipped. They were of special importance for cattle movements, the animals being driven long distances over the roads to market or railhead.⁷

The improvements in transportation and the consequent growth of markets for farm goods did not take place everywhere in the Monarchy nor did they proceed with equal speed in the regions affected. As has already been pointed out, the *Vormärz* was a time of beginnings. Up to 1848 there were large areas where it was impossible to get produce to market because of impassable roads and streams. This was particularly true of parts of the fertile Great Plain of Hungary. It was reported that it was not unusual for landowners there to leave a part of their crop (as much as one-third in good years) standing in the fields because shipping it to market was either prohibitively expensive or actually impossible.⁸ The Plain had very little wood in it and no stone so that the raw materials for road building were lacking. The roads, such as they were, were generally only cleared stretches with the packed earth of the Plain for roadbed. In fall, winter, and early spring the condition of such roads ranged from well-nigh to entirely impassable.⁹

The extremely high cost of overland transport resulting from such conditions was commented upon by Heinrich Ditz, in 1867,

⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 42-44.

⁶ Blum, "Transportation and industry," p. 27.

⁷ Jenifer to Calhoun, Vienna, 5 July 1844, MS, Diplomatic dispatches, Austria, I; Kohl, *Reisen*, III, 27-28.

⁸ Augsburg *Allgemeine Zeitung* 23 May 1841, p. 1141.

See also Muhlenberg to Forsyth, Vienna, 8 August 1839, MS, *Diplomatic dispatches*, Austria, I; F. List, "Über die nationalökonomische Reform des Königreichs Ungarn" (1845), E. von Beckerath *et al.*, eds., *Friedrich List, Schriften, Reden, Briefe* (10 vols. in 12, Berlin, 1927-1935), III, pt. i, 469.

⁹ Ditz, pp. 23-24.

in his report to the Bavarian government on Hungarian agriculture. He told of the inland town of Mágócs which was ten and fifteen miles, respectively, from the Theiss River ports of Szentes and Vásárhely. The distance from the latter towns to Pest by water was approximately 300 miles. In 1866 it cost 12 to 20 *kreuzer* to ship one *Metzen* of wheat from Mágócs to Szentes or Vásárhely by wagon. It cost only 41 to 43 *kreuzer* to ship that same *Metzen* from these ports to Pest via the Danube Steamship Company.¹⁰

The parlous overland transport facilities, in combination with low grain prices, explained why so much of the Great Plain lay untilled and was used only to pasture cattle. The landowner found that unless his fields lay along navigable streams or were near large cities cattle provided him with a greater profit than did grain, because of the high costs of getting the grain to market, while cattle could be driven to market.¹¹

These conditions were not limited to Hungary. Hönigsberg, writing in the *Oekonomische Neuigkeiten* on agriculture in Lower Austria in the first decades of the *Vormärz*, charged that bad roads were one of the greatest barriers to the agricultural development of that province. He wrote of them as follows:

. . . the peasant has to waste much time transporting just small loads and ruins his horses in doing it. The roads always were in a bad state of repair and the recent war with its passing through of marching troops and of artillery columns, had rendered them just about impassable.¹²

In a report of the government office of the Hradisch district in Moravia, written in 1831, one of the reasons given for the high rate of tax delinquency in the district was that Hradisch was the only district of the province that had no state roads. In spring and fall the local roads were bottomless, especially in the March River valley. The farmer was unable to get his goods to market, said the report, and so lacked the money to pay his taxes.¹³

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 24.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 305, 328-329; Freiherr von Bartenstein to C. C. André, in *Oekonomische Neuigkeiten*, XXV (1823), 349.

¹² G. A. von Hönigsberg, "Kurze Darstellung der Hindernisse, welche dem Ackerbau im Allgemeinen, und zu Unter-Oesterreich insbesondere im Wege sind," *Oekonomische Neuigkeiten*, XXI (1821), 21.

¹³ "Aus dem Berichte des Hradischer Kreisamtes vom 12 April 1831,"

The Austrian communications system as it existed at the end of the *Vormärz* had great gaps. In its development it was many decades behind contemporary England where the excellence of the means of transport and travel dazzled the foreign visitor.¹⁴ But in the years between 1815 and 1848 great advances had been made in transportation facilities in the Monarchy. There had been a several-fold increase in the total mileage of the road system. The steamship and the railroad had become permanent and important parts of the communications network. This growth in the means of transportation allowed the primary producer to reach new and greater markets for his goods.

THE NEW INTEREST OF NOBLE LANDLORDS

The development among many noble landlords of a new and deep interest in a more efficient and profitable agriculture was shaped by this expansion of markets. These landlords saw the opportunity created by the enlarged market for the profitable sale of the produce from their estates. Some of them actively engaged in the building and improving of means of transportation in order to increase the marketability of their products.¹⁵ It is likely, too, as Ignaz Beidtel has suggested, that the increasing enrichment of bourgeois tradesmen and industrialists led many a nobleman, in emulation, to apply capitalistic methods to his agriculture.¹⁶

The profitable marketing of agricultural products did not begin *ab ovo* in the period 1815-1848. Thus, in the Northwest zone the large-scale farm enterprise producing for the market (*Gutsherrschaft*) had, according to Grünberg, reached as high, or even higher, stage of development in the second half of the seventeenth and in the eighteenth centuries than in all Germany

Notizen-Blatt der hist.-stat. Section der k. k. mähr.-schles. Gesellschaft zur Beförderung des Ackerbaues, der Natur- und Landeskunde, 1862, no. 11, p. 86.

¹⁴ J. H. Clapham, *An economic history of modern Britain* (3 vols., Cambridge, Eng., 1926-1938), I, 75.

¹⁵ Blum, "Transportation and industry," p. 27.

Prince Metternich told George Ticknor in 1836 "he had found it for his personal interest to build a road, which cost him seventy thousand Spanish dollars, merely to open a market for his woods, the money he had expended being thus put out at an interest of eight percent." G. Ticknor, *Life, letters and journals of George Ticknor* (2 vols., Boston and New York, 1909), II, 4.

¹⁶ Beidtel, I, 391-392.

east of the Elbe.¹⁷ The expropriation of peasant land in those years and its inclusion within the demesne¹⁸ reflected the desire of landlords to increase their own production. This development of capitalistic agriculture was fostered in the decades immediately preceding 1815 by the prohibitive-protective tariff system established by Joseph II, and was given a great impetus by the long war period, and especially by the Continental Blockade.

During the *Vormärz*, however, the interest of noble landowners in profitable agricultural production attained a hitherto unreached point, and the effects of their activities in these years began to change the face of Austrian agriculture. New techniques and operations became firmly established. The adoption of new crops and agricultural industries, the efforts to improve the breed of cattle, the planting of the hitherto barren fallow field with restorative root crops and legumes, the introduction of crop rotation, and the use of improved farm tools were some of the results of this new interest of landlords. Finally, their recognition of the economic inefficiency of the existing system of hereditary subjection of the peasant and their demands for its reform was a basic factor in bringing about the agrarian revolution of 1848-1849.

The ways in which these noble landlords demonstrated their new interest and the resulting effects upon the agricultural economy of the Monarchy is the subject of the remainder of this study. The present chapter deals with the expressions of this interest as evidenced in the adoption of new products which offered profitable returns, in the reclamation of land for productive uses, in the demands for sources of credit with which to finance agricultural operations, in the establishing of schools by individual landlords to train skilled managers for their estates, and finally, in the organization of societies to promote the development of agriculture. Subsequent chapters describe the manifestations of this interest in the Northwest zone (Chapter IV), in the employment of labor (Chapter V), and in the bringing about of the agrarian reforms of 1848 and 1849 (Chapter VI).

¹⁷ Grünberg, *Bauernbefreiung*, I, 39.

¹⁸ See above p. 46.

WOOL, SUGAR BEETS, AND POTATOES

Among the new products that took firm root in the agricultural economy of the Monarchy during the *Vormärz* three were pre-eminent. These were wool, sugar beets, and potatoes. There were others, such as clover and other legumes and industrial plants such as rape, but none of these attracted the attention of landlords to the same extent as wool, sugar beets, and potatoes.

Sheep herding provided a highly favorable opportunity for profitable agricultural production. Raw wool was one of the most readily marketable products of the time, both at home and abroad. Upon it depended the domestic manufacture of woollens, a major element in the industrial development of the *Vormärz*,¹⁹ and it was the largest single item by value in the Monarchy's export trade until the 1840's when it was displaced only by raw silk and silk wares.²⁰ Further, the inadequacies of the existing transportation system had less effect upon wool than on many other farm commodities. Wool, unlike such products, was not dependent upon rapid transport to the market, but could be stored for an indefinite period while awaiting shipment or a better price.

The foundation of the wool-raising industry of the Monarchy had been laid during the reign of Maria Theresa as part of her plan to advance the Austrian economy. In 1773, 325 merino sheep had been imported from Spain and installed in a breeding station at Mercopail, in Croatia.²¹ Similar stations were set up later at Holics, on the Hungarian-Moravian border, and at Mannersdorf, in Lower Austria. The animals born at these stations were sold privately at first at a very low price. Later, they were sold off at public auctions.²² The stations provided the nucleus of the great flocks of blooded sheep that were raised in the Monarchy in later years.²³

¹⁹ Blum, "Transportation and industry," pp. 33-34.

²⁰ T. S., 1840, table 73 (contains series from 1823 on); 1841-1847, incl., tables of trade statistics.

²¹ Fényes, p. 87; Demian, *Hongrie*, I, 144.

²² J. Slokar, *Geschichte der österreichischen Industrie und ihrer Förderung unter Kaiser Franz I* (Vienna, 1914), p. 319.

²³ *Oekonomische Neuigkeiten*, XXV (1823), 169; XXVIII (1824), 515.

Despite these efforts in their behalf the interests of the landlords did not awaken for many years.²⁴ In the latter part of the eighteenth century Hungarian lords cared so little about sheep raising—or any other profitable agricultural activity—that they rented the pastureland of their estates at extremely low rates to German herders who led their flocks of blooded sheep from Germany to graze in the Hungarian plains. This practice centered around Stuhlweissenburg, south of Pest. The German herders formed an association to promote and protect their business, holding an annual meeting on Michaelmas at Stuhlweissenburg. They crossed their animals with the native stock and so served to improve the Hungarian breeds.²⁵

The Napoleonic wars and, especially, the Continental Blockade, provided the first great stimulus for Austrian wool production. The wars had brought great damage to the flocks of France and Spain and the Blockade had cut down on the continental importations of English woolsens. Austrian sheep raisers and woolen manufacturers seized the opportunity and produced not only for the domestic market but also built up a spirited export trade in raw wool and woolen goods. This export trade was further encouraged by the continuing depreciation of Austrian currency.²⁶ The Hungarian estate owners who had rented out their pastures to German herders now realized they could make more money by raising sheep themselves and one landlord after another stopped leasing his fields and built up his own flocks.²⁷ A high premium was paid for the better grades of wool, so lords outdid themselves in their efforts to improve the blood strains of their flocks. A contemporary account of the annual auction at the Holics breeding station in 1810 illustrates this intensity of interest in sheep.

On the 21st of August, the annual sale of improved sheep took place on the Royal Family estate at Holics, where his Majesty has, at so much expense, established and maintained the sheep-farm for improving the breed of sheep. On this occasion, 700 rams, and 3200 ewes, partly original Spanish, and partly sheep in a high degree improved were offered for sale. A great number of persons from the first nobility of

²⁴ Demian, *Hongrie*, I, 145.

²⁵ Ditz, p. 304.

²⁶ Slokar, p. 319; K. Hudeczek, *Österreichische Handelspolitik im Vormärz 1815-1848* (Vienna, 1918), pp. 57-58.

²⁷ Ditz, pp. 304-305.

Hungary, Bohemia, and Moravia, the neighboring landed proprietors, and those who wished to purchase, from the most remote parts of the empire, were collected on the spot. Many rams sold from 2,000 to 7,000 florins, (from £100 to £300 Sterling, at least); but one pure Spanish ram of three years old, and, in truth, surpassing anything which had been seen, in the quantity and excellence of its wool, sold for the immense price of 16,200 florins (at least £800). The purchaser of this ram was the well-known Dr. Joseph v. Hopfen, proprietor of the estate Idolsberg, near Krems. Although this price at first surprised all the bidders, yet, within a few hours, Dr. Hopfen had two separate offers of 25,000 florins from Hungarian noblemen which he refused.²⁸

The collapse of the Blockade in 1814 brought in its train the reappearance of British wool cloth on the continental market. Austrian mills could not compete. Their position was further weakened by the post-war depression and the Austrian monetary crisis. Many of them were forced out of business.²⁹ The wool growers, on the other hand, prospered, for British manufacturers, in order to meet the revived demand for their cloth, had to import large quantities of wool. Before the days of the Blockade Spain had been their chief foreign source. But the fierce struggles of the Peninsular campaigns had brought great havoc to the flocks of that land. Many of them had been wiped out, others had been sold abroad to raise cash and to prevent their confiscation or slaughter.³⁰ The 1815 and 1816 clip of German flocks was diminished by the effects of the war and by wet weather, thereby lessening German competition for foreign markets and compelling German manufacturers to come to Austria for wool. Finally, the domestic market depended upon the Monarchy's wool producers.³¹

The Monarchy's advantageous position on the raw wool market lasted until the other producing nations could catch up. That happened in 1819. Meanwhile, both in Austria and abroad the continued bull market for wool had attracted many to the raising of sheep. In lands such as Pomerania and Mecklenburg,

²⁸ Quoted in Bright, *Travels*, pp. 411-412.

²⁹ Slokar, p. 319.

³⁰ Cf. L. G. Connor, "A brief history of the sheep industry in the United States," *Agricultural History Society Papers*, I (1921), 103 (reprinted from the *Annual Report of the American Historical Association for 1918*).

³¹ G. von Gülich, *Geschichtliche Darstellung des Handels, der Gewerbe, und des Ackerbaus der bedeutendsten handelsreibenden Staaten unsrer Zeit* (5 vols. in 4, Jena, 1830-1845), II, 385.

where ten years before there had been no interest in wool production, large flocks were now kept. Then British manufacturers found that they had overproduced and at about the same time the English tariff on wool was increased. On top of everything a business crisis swept Europe in the spring of 1819 and forced a break in prices. The Monarchy's wool growers found their position precarious and had to retrench.³²

But sheep raising had become an integral part of the Monarchy's agriculture and remained the most important branch of animal husbandry throughout the *Vormärz*. The Monarchy's own woolens industry provided a growing market. Foreign demand continued, too, for Austria produced some of the finest wool on the Continent.³³ Agricultural journals devoted more space to sheep than to all other livestock. Special societies of sheep raisers were formed in Bohemia and in Moravia-Silesia and the general agricultural societies of the wool-producing provinces gave much attention to sheep raising in their meetings and journals.

The most important wool producing areas of the Monarchy were the Northwest zone and Hungary. The best grades were grown in the former region, especially in Moravia-Silesia,³⁴ while the Hungarian lords were the quantity producers. As already pointed out, the difficulties and consequent high costs of transportation, combined with the low grain prices that prevailed during most of the *Vormärz*, made it more profitable for the Hungarian lord to use his land for sheep pasture rather than for growing crops.³⁵ As a result, sheep raising in Hungary continued to grow in importance until the closing years of the *Vormärz*. This was shown by the increase in exports of raw wool from Hungary into the *Zollverband*. During the years 1823-1827, inclusive, the annual average was 170,720 *Centner*.³⁶ For 1831-1840, inclusive, this figure had increased to an average of 234,958 *Centner*.³⁷ For 1841 to 1844, inclusive, the annual

³² Cf. Augsburg *Allgemeine Zeitung*, 26 August 1820, Beilage No. 124, pp. 494-495.

³³ Cf. *Oekonomische Neuigkeiten*, XXX (1825), 527.

³⁴ *Ibid.*; C. d'Elvert, *Geschichte der k. k. mähr.-schles. Gesellschaft zur Beförderung des Ackerbaues, der Natur- und Landeskunde* (2 vols., Brünn, 1870), I, 334, 336; Bauer, *Landwirtschaft*, p. 119.

³⁵ Ditz, pp. 305-306.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 305.

³⁷ T. S., 1841, table 42, p. 6.

average was 248,491 *Centner*, or nearly half again as large as it had been in the 1820-1827 period.³⁸

Among the great wool producers of the Monarchy the Hungarian magnate Prince Esterházy was pre-eminent. In 1821 Franz Schubernigg, one of the chief officials of the Prince, wrote a description of his employer's sheep business. He reported that in 1819 the Esterházy flocks had produced 3,500 *Centner* of washed wool and that 53,000 lambs had been weaned. In that year the flocks had over 150,000 animals in them. They were divided between 110 sheep farms located on the many estates of the Esterházy realm. This wool empire was supervised by three district controllers, each of whom had 50,000 to 60,000 sheep in his care. Under each controller was a hierarchy of record keepers, sheep masters and shepherds. Each record keeper kept the pertinent data on 12,000 to 14,000 sheep, each sheep master supervised 1,500 to 1,800, and each shepherd guarded 250 to 300 animals. Additional labor was used at lambing and at other periods when work was heavy. A staff of three veterinarians looked after the health of the animals. One of their principal duties was to inoculate them. This practice had begun in 1805, and 680,000 sheep had received this treatment from that year through 1818.³⁹

In 1824-1825, of the 18,000 *Centner* of wool raised by 44 estate owners that were sold to the Vienna wool dealers, 4,000 *Centner* were from the Esterházy flocks alone.⁴⁰ In 1839 the American Minister at Vienna reported that the Prince's wool production was said to yield him an annual revenue of \$250,000.⁴¹

³⁸ T. S., 1841-1844, tables of trade statistics.

³⁹ *Oekonomische Neuigkeiten*, XXII (1821), 358.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, XXIX (1825), 336.

⁴¹ Muhlenberg to Forsyth, Vienna, 8 August 1839, MS, Diplomatic dispatches, Austria, I.

An anecdote was told of the meeting of Prince Esterházy and the famed English agriculturist, Coke of Norfolk, at the latter's estate. The Englishman proudly showed his flock of 2,000 sheep and asked the Prince if he could show as many. The Hungarian replied that he had more shepherds than Coke had sheep. *London Quarterly review*, LXV (1840), 257.

The scale on which the fabulously wealthy Esterházys lived was breathtaking in its magnificence, and, naturally, was the subject of many striking stories. Thus, an Hungarian lady told the British traveler, John Paget, "Les Esterházys font tous en grand: le feu prince a doté deux cents maîtresses, et pensionné cent enfans illégitimes." Paget, I, 38.

Sheep raising was not destined to retain its importance in the Monarchy after 1848. It had already begun to falter in the last years of the *Vormärz*. One reason for this was that the pastures and fallow fields on which the sheep had grazed were more and more being tilled and planted.⁴² Rising grain prices and improved transportation made it more profitable to raise cereals. The decisive factor, however, was the development of ocean transport and the entry into the European market in the 1840's of wool from Australia, the Plata region of South America, and the Cape region of South Africa. The wool growers of the Monarchy could not meet this competition.⁴³

The second of the new products of the *Vormärz* was the sugar beet. Unlike the raising of wool the growing and processing of sugar beets was destined to remain an important part of the Central European economy. Sugar-beet culture in the Monarchy began at the turn of the century. Experiments in the extraction of sugar from beets were made in Prague and Vienna in the 1790's.⁴⁴ In Bohemia Count Wr̄bna in 1800 had started manufacturing beet sugar from beets raised on his estate of Horōwicz. Several other noblemen followed his example, but all of them failed in their efforts to produce beet sugar at costs low enough to compete with the imported cane sugar.⁴⁵ Then the Continental Blockade was imposed, and in a short time the price of colonial sugar became so high that beet sugar could compete with it successfully. By 1810 a substantial Austrian beet sugar industry, centering in Bohemia, had been established.⁴⁶ When the Blockade collapsed and colonial sugar reappeared in quantity on the European market, beet sugar manufacturers once more found it impossible to compete. The industry had been economically possible only because of the high price of overseas sugar.⁴⁷ The disadvantageous position

⁴² C. von Kleyle, lecture on agricultural conditions in Austria, delivered 9 May 1857, *Ämtlicher Bericht über die im Mai, 1857 abgehaltene fünfzigjährige Jubelfeier der k. k. Landwirthschafts-Gesellschaft in Wien* (Vienna, 1858), p. 131; E. Baier, "Schafzucht," *G. L. F.*, II, 721-722; Ditz, p. 306.

⁴³ Ditz, pp. 306-307; Baier, "Schafzucht," p. 722.

⁴⁴ E. von Proskowetz, "Die Rübenzuckerfabrication und die Zuckerrüben-cultur," *G. L. F.*, III, 607; Slokar, p. 579.

⁴⁵ Bright, *Travels*, p. 231; Slokar, p. 579.

⁴⁶ Slokar, pp. 579-580.

⁴⁷ K. Weinrich, "Die neuesten in den böhmischen Rübenzuckerfabriken ein-

of the Austrian producer was worsened by the crop failure of 1816 which resulted in the price of beets, along with other farm prices, rising sharply. In a short time the sugar beet factories of the Monarchy had closed down.⁴⁸

A few years later, at the end of the 1820's, there came a renaissance in the industry. Technical improvements made in France which increased the percentage of sugar extracted and permitted profitable production were introduced into the Monarchy.⁴⁹ Soon thereafter the government lent its support to the new industry by a decree which freed the production of sugar syrup or raw sugar from domestic materials from the direct tax levied on all businesses and trades (*Erwerbsteuer*) for ten years. The initial impetus for this action had come from Count Franz Potocki, Galician landowner, who informed the government of his province that if he would be given exemption from the *Erwerbsteuer* he would build a beet processing plant and refinery on his estate. The provincial government endorsed his request and forwarded it to Vienna.⁵⁰ Officials there favored the proposal and on 11 January 1831, a ten-year exemption for beet sugar production in all provinces was decreed.⁵¹ The exemption was later extended and remained in force until 1849.⁵²

The first factory of the new era had been established in 1828 by Freiherr von Dahlberg on his estate of Datschitz, in Moravia. In its first year of operation the plant's production was slight but in 1829 it was increased considerably. By 1832 the local supply proved insufficient and the factory was moved to another location. In 1830 Dahlberg had built another and larger plant at Walleschau, a Bohemian estate which he owned.⁵³ In 1829 two other noblemen had built factories on their estates in

geführten Verbesserungen," *Neue Schriften der k. k. patriotisch-ökonomischen Gesellschaft im Königreiche Böhmen*, IV (1836), part ii, 1.

⁴⁸ Slokar, p. 580.

⁴⁹ F. Stamm, *Verhältnisse der Volks-, Land- und Forstwirtschaft des Königreiches Böhmen* (Prague, 1856), pp. 244-245.

⁵⁰ Slokar, pp. 596-597.

⁵¹ *Franz des Ersten politische Gesetze und Verordnungen*, XXIX, 5-6.

⁵² "Darstellung der Rübenzucker-Fabrikation der österreichischen Monarchie in den Jahren 1851 bis 1853," *Direction der administrativen Statistik im k. k. Handels-Ministerium, Mittheilungen aus dem Gebiete der Statistik*, III (1854), part iv, 2.

⁵³ Slokar, pp. 592, 593, 595, 601.

Bohemia; Count Czernin at Chudenitz and Ritter von Strohlendorf at Bězdiekau.⁵⁴

In 1830 Prince Anselm Thurn-Taxis hired Karl Weinrich to build a factory for him on his estate of Dobrawitz, in Bohemia. Weinrich told the story of this employment and of the training that had prepared him for it in an article which appeared in *Neue Schriften*, a publication of the Bohemian Patriotic-Economic Society.⁵⁵ He wrote that he had decided in 1828 to study beet processing with the view in mind of determining whether it could be conducted profitably in his home province of Bohemia. He read all the available literature and then visited factories in France to gain practical knowledge. Convinced that money could be made producing beet sugar in the Monarchy he returned home and opened a small factory at Rechtenbach, in Bohemia. His primary purpose here was to test and compare the different methods he had observed in use in France and try out new ideas of his own. He planned also to train young men to be managers of factories that were yet to be built. He wrote an article on the French beet sugar industry which was published in May, 1830 in the Augsburg *Allgemeine Zeitung*, and was reprinted two weeks later by the Prague journal *Bohemia*. Thurn-Taxis saw the article in *Bohemia* and his interest was aroused. He hired Weinrich to make a study of the feasibility of building a beet sugar factory at Dobrawitz. When Weinrich recommended its construction the Prince hired him to build the plant, and, after the plant was completed, to train workers for it and supervise its operation.

Weinrich reported that he had difficulties to overcome in putting up the factory. The machines and apparatus needed for the processing of the beets were not available in the Monarchy and their importation from abroad would have been expensive. He was thus forced to improvise, so that he was unable to follow his original plan of modelling this factory directly after French plants he had studied. Despite these difficulties, the factory was ready to operate in seven months with 80 to 100 workers trained to run it. Production during the first two years was low because of the small amount of beets available. Then sugar beet culture began to receive

⁵⁴ Stamm, p. 245.

⁵⁵ Weinrich, "Rübenzuckerfabriken."

more attention at Dobrawitz, and the factory's yield increased. By September, 1834, according to Weinrich, although the factory had processed only half the amount of beets of which it was capable of handling, the enterprise had yielded since its establishment a net profit of 29 per cent on the invested capital.

Soon after he had finished the Dobrawitz factory Weinrich was hired by another great Bohemian landlord, Prince Friedrich von Oettingen-Wallerstein, to build a plant for him on his estate of Königsaal, train the workers, and take over the supervision of the plant when it began functioning. Construction of this factory was begun in May, 1831, and it was in production before the end of the year.⁵⁶

Meanwhile, another Bohemian landowner had hired Weinrich to build a factory for him on his estate.⁵⁷ This plant was designed to handle 14,000 to 15,000 *Centner* of beets during the five-month-long processing season. The plant could also be used to process potatoes for starch and press rape seeds for oil. The owner reported that it had cost him 10,300 florins to set up the factory. In 1832, its first year of operation, the plant worked at two-thirds capacity because of a shortage of sugar beets.⁵⁸

Two factories were established in Galicia in 1830 by Franz von Mrozowicki, in association with his father and brother. Count Fresnel and Count Potocki were other early producers in this province.⁵⁹ In Lower Austria Count Colloredo-Mansfeld established a plant at his estate of Staatz under the direction of Dr. Julius Krause, one-time professor at the *Bergakademie* of Schemnitz, Hungary. Krause had spent eight months in the best factories of France studying the methods in use there and later went to Germany for the same purpose. The Staatz plant quickly won a reputation for its efficient operation and soon after its establishment the Bohemian Patriotic-Economic Society decided to send a representative there to study its methods.⁶⁰ In 1834 Archduke Karl hired Florenz Robert, a

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 2-5.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 5.

⁵⁸ A. J. Oppelt, "Relation über die . . . zu Swinatz im berauner Kreise, im Jahre 1832 neu errichtete Rübenzucker-Fabrik," *Neue Schriften*, IV (1834), part i, 1-6.

⁵⁹ Slokar, pp. 595-596; Proskowetz, "Rübenzuckerfabrication," p. 613.

⁶⁰ Slokar, pp. 599-600; Proskowetz, "Rübenzuckerfabrication," p. 613.

French expert in sugar beet manufacture, to build a factory on the great archducal estate of Seelowitz, in Moravia. This plant, when completed, proved to be a particularly important one. It was the center of much experimentation and it served for many years as a school for, and model of, beet sugar production.⁶¹

These pioneers of the industry were soon followed by many others, especially in the Northwest zone. In 1832 there had been 19 beet sugar factories in the Monarchy (1 in Lower Austria, 1 in Moravia-Silesia, 6 in Bohemia, 3 in Galicia, 5 in Hungary, 1 in Transylvania, 1 in Carinthia, 1 in Venetia). All were owned by noblemen save one in Bohemia and the one in Venetia.⁶² By 1836 Bohemia alone had 17 factories,⁶³ and by 1844 there were 89 factories in the Monarchy. It was estimated that these plants used 2,010,000 *Centner* of beets and that 6,700 yokes of land were used to raise this crop.⁶⁴ Ten years later the number of factories had increased to 114, processing (in 1853) 5,360,055 *Centner* of beets⁶⁵ with over 25,000 yokes used to grow this amount.⁶⁶ During these years the introduction of steam power into the industry had aided in greatly increasing individual plant capacity.⁶⁷ In 1844 the average amount of beets processed per plant had been 22,600 *Centner*. In 1853 it was 47,000 *Centner*.

As is so frequently the case with new industries business mortality was high. The official government statistical publication for 1841 reported that half the plants that had been organized since the revival of the industry had shut down. One reason for many of these failures, according to this report, was poor choice of location. Factories were started in areas where the soil was not suited for beet growing, so that they lacked a supply of raw beets. Still other plants had been organized with the expectation of buying the beets they processed. These enterprises had gone under because they were at the mercy of the market's vagaries. They either were unable to find enough beets or else the price was too high.⁶⁸ The entire industry was

⁶¹ Proskowetz, "Rübenzuckerfabrikation," p. 613.

⁶² Slokar, p. 602.

⁶³ *Ibid.*, p. 604.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 608-609.

⁶⁵ "Darstellung der Rübenzucker-Fabrikation," p. 25.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 18. ⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 20. ⁶⁸ *T. S.*, 1841, table 41, sect. xvi.

hampered during the *Vormärz* by inadequate supply and poor quality of beets, caused partly by short crops and partly by inadequate understanding of the proper techniques of beet culture.⁶⁹

The processing of sugar beets held attractions for noble landlords other than the profit to be made from the sale of the syrup or sugar. One important advantage was that it enabled the landlord to hold his hired workers during the months when field work was at a minimum by employing them in the beet sugar plant.⁷⁰ Another advantage was the utilization of by-products, the residue after processing being used for cattle fodder and for fertilizer.⁷¹

The third important new crop of the *Vormärz* was the potato. Potatoes had been grown in Austrian territory in the seventeenth century by a community of Irish Franciscans near Prague and by Bohemian mountain peasants who borrowed the plant from their German-Silesian neighbors. Its culture did not spread for a long time because the peasants regarded the potato as fit only for animal food. With plants obtained from the Franciscans, some landlords raised potatoes in their own gardens and then gave them to their peasants in the hope of interesting them in potato growing. The peasants fed the tubers to their swine. Lords planted potatoes in open country so that they might be stolen by children and shepherds and their culture thereby spread, but this plan failed too.⁷²

The peasant of the Northwest zone would no doubt have continued to preserve jealously his right to refuse to eat potatoes as food suitable only for his kine, were it not for the famine years of 1771 and 1772. It was potatoes or starvation, then, and the peasant gratefully recognized the merits of the former.⁷³

In Galicia, according to tradition, potatoes were first intro-

⁶⁹ Slokar, pp. 605-606.

⁷⁰ Cf. *Verhandlungen der k. k. Landwirtschaftsgesellschaft in Wien*, 2nd series, V (1848), part i, 98.

⁷¹ Oppelt, "Relation," p. 15; W. Hecke, "Allgemeiner Theil," *G. L. F. II*, 20.

⁷² F. von Berchtold, *Die Kartoffeln* (Prague, 1842), pp. 14-15.

Brambor, the Czech word for potato, is derived from the name *Brandenburger*, according to Berchtold. He claimed that Bohemian peasants called all Prussian subjects *Brandenburgers* and that they had followed this practice with the potato.

⁷³ *Ibid.*, p. 15; W. F. Exner, ed., *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Gewerbe und Erfindungen Österreichs von der Mitte des XVIII Jahrhunderts bis zur Gegenwart* (2 vols., Vienna, 1873), I, 29.

duced at the end of the seventeenth century.⁷⁴ As elsewhere, they met with the resistance of the peasants who viewed them as animal food only.⁷⁵ Not until the last years of the eighteenth century did potato culture become more general.⁷⁶ In Bukovina the plant is reported to have been introduced by the German and Hungarian colonists who were settled there by imperial order in 1787. It remained an unimportant crop even among these colonists until the famine years of 1812-1814 gave a stimulus to potato raising. This development was furthered by the district government compelling farm communities to raise potatoes.⁷⁷ In Carinthia and Tyrol potato culture was so slight as late as 1804 that in June of that year the Carinthian Agricultural Society was unable to procure five *Metzen* of seed potatoes in either of these provinces.⁷⁸

In Hungary the plant was practically unknown until the 1770's. The lesson of the famine of 1772 persuaded the government to order potato cultivation and the royal commissioners were told to provide for the planting of this crop. Apparently little progress was made, for in compilations made in the early 1780's of Hungary's products the potato was not listed, and in reports of a great famine in northern Hungary in 1782 nothing was said of its being used.⁷⁹ In addition to the royal attempts to introduce potatoes the vegetable was brought into Hungary in the latter part of the eighteenth century by German colonists and by soldiers returning to the Military Frontier from service in Bohemia and Silesia.⁸⁰ Just as did his fellow in the other

⁷⁴ "Schilderung der Kartoffelbaues an der östlichen Seite Galiziens," *Oekonomische Neuigkeiten*, XXIX (1825), 33.

⁷⁵ Cf. *Die Gegenwart* (Leipzig), I (1845), 535.

⁷⁶ "Schilderung der Kartoffelbaues," p. 33.

Hupka, in his study of a region of western Galicia where the potato was extremely important in the nineteenth century, found that the returns of the Josephine cadastre of the 1780's for this region contained no reference to potato growing. S. von Hupka, *Über die Entwicklung der westgalizischen Dorfstände in der 2. Hälfte des 19. Jahrhunderts* (Teschen, 1910), p. 65.

⁷⁷ Bukowina Handels und Gewerbekammer, *Hauptbericht und Statistik über das Herzogthum Bukowina für die Periode vom Jahre 1862-1871* (Lemberg, 1872), p. 159.

⁷⁸ J. Burger, *Album zur Erinnerung an den 100jährigen Bestand der k. k. Landwirtschaft-Gesellschaft in Kärnten* (Klagenfurt 1865), p. 28.

⁷⁹ Marczali, *Hungary*, pp. 55-56.

⁸⁰ Demian, I, 97; K. von Czoernig, *Ethnographie der oesterreichischen Monarchie* (3 vols., Vienna, 1857), III, 217.

lands of the Monarchy, the peasant of Hungary at first scorned the humble tuber, and, according to Fényes, government and lord had to force him to grow it.⁸¹

Then the long years of privation brought on by the French wars and the famine years that immediately succeeded the peace made potatoes a permanent and important part of the agricultural economy of the Monarchy.⁸² In the North Slav lands, especially in Galicia, they became the mainstay of the peasant diet. An article on Galicia in the *Oekonomische Neuigkeiten* in 1825 reported that:

. . . the Galician is continually paying more attention to the cultivation of potatoes, either because potatoes give him a greater net return or because the potato is, so to speak, his daily bread. He manures and cultivates his potato land much better than his fields that are planted in grain. He raises the latter crop, so it seems, in order to sell it and so raise the money he needs to pay his taxes. . . . It is not unusual in Galicia to come across vast stretches planted solely in potatoes. There are estates whose records show harvests of 12,000 *Metzen* and over.⁸³

The German provinces and Hungary were far behind the North Slav lands in the amount of potatoes they grew, but in all the lands of the Monarchy the potato was an important staple.⁸⁴

The primary use of the potato was as a basic element of the peasant diet. Its next most important use was as the raw material of the distilling industry, and it was in this use of the vegetable that many noble landlords showed much interest. The distilling of potato whiskey started assuming importance after 1810.⁸⁵ From then on the increase in its production stood in close connection with the extension of potato cultivation. The North Slav peasant, especially, was inordinately fond of potato whiskey, and an enormous proportion of the total crop of the North Slav lands was used in its manufacture. Schnabel, in 1846, estimated that 25 per cent of the annual potato harvest of Bohemia was used by the distilleries.⁸⁶ A writer in the

⁸¹ Fényes, p. 70.

⁸² Elvert, *Geschichte*, I, 204; C. Fruhwirth, "Hackfrüchte," *G. L. F.*, II, 100.

⁸³ "Schilderung der Kartoffelbaues," p. 37.

⁸⁴ Cf. T. S., 1841-1847, tables of agricultural production; Fényes, p. 70.

⁸⁵ Bauer, *Landwirtschaft*, p. 140.

⁸⁶ G. N. Schnabel, *Statistik der landwirtschaftlichen Industrie Böhmens* (Prague, 1846), p. 81.

Oekonomische Neuigkeiten estimated in 1847 that 40 per cent of the Galician crop was used for the same purpose.⁸⁷

These distilleries became increasingly a chief source of income of the estates on which they were located.⁸⁸ Steam power and improved techniques were introduced so that individual plant capacity became much larger as the *Vormärz* wore on.⁸⁹ The great size of the industry was shown by the consumption tax reports. In 1841 distilleries of the German-Slav provinces produced 2,169,578 *Eimer* of potato whiskey and 626,162 *Eimer* of grain whiskey, using an estimated 15,778,750 *Metzen* of potatoes and 1,565,327 *Metzen* of grain.⁹⁰

Other and far less important industrial uses of the potato were for starch and meal. The potato starch industry had been started during the Continental Blockade and had persisted thereafter, especially in Bohemia, as an agricultural industry. The major use of the starch was its reduction to syrup, and, to a lesser extent, to sugar. The same machinery used to process the sugar beet could be used for starch manufacture. But the industry remained a minor one throughout the *Vormärz*. Potato meal manufacture was of even less importance.⁹¹

In the 1840's the Monarchy was invaded by the potato disease that was affecting most of Europe at this time and was destroying a large part of the vital potato crop. The blight entered the various provinces at different times during the early forties. It spread rapidly, reaching its destructive climax in the closing years of the *Vormärz*. Government estimates were that the 1847 crop was 27 per cent smaller than the crop of 1841.⁹² This setback was only temporary and the potato continued to be of prime importance in the years after 1848.

LAND RECLAMATION

Land reclamation was another activity which attracted the attention of noble landlords during the *Vormärz*. They sought to increase their production by increasing the extent of their

⁸⁷ *Oekonomische Neuigkeiten*, LXXIV (1847), 951.

⁸⁸ Elvert, *Geschichte*, I, 324.

⁸⁹ *Ibid.*; Schnabel, p. 81.

⁹⁰ T. S., 1841, table 41, sect. xv.

⁹¹ *Ibid.*, sect. xvi; *Oekonomische Neuigkeiten*, LXXVI (1848), 951.

⁹² T. S., 1841, table 37; 1847, part II, table 1, p. 3.

arable land and pasture. They reclaimed many thousand of yokes by draining ponds and swamps on their estates and through river control. This activity was of especial importance in Hungary where swamps covered vast areas and annual river floods forced thousands of yokes to be withdrawn from cultivation. Friedrich List, in 1842, wrote that in a single year the loss caused by floods in Hungary was estimated at 40 million florins, this apart from the huge waste of natural resources that the swamps represented.⁹³

Drainage and river control projects had been carried out by the government during the reigns of Maria Theresa and Joseph II in Hungary, Bohemia, and Lower Austria. Thereafter these activities were carried on by landlords, either as individuals or in associations, except for the regularization by the government of the Theiss River in Hungary.

Huge projects were started in Hungary around 1810. Archduke Karl and Prince Esterházy drained 10,000 yokes of the Hanság swamp east of the Neusiedlersee in western Hungary. Count Franz Zichy recovered 335,800 yokes of land through control of streams in the area of the Plattensee.⁹⁴ In 1811 the reclamation of over 5,000 yokes was completed on an estate lying south of Mohács that belonged to Duke Albrecht of Saxe-Teschen. The water, draining off, was used to turn mill wheels. Drainage from a reclamation project on the Festetics estate, Keszthely, was used for the same purpose.⁹⁵ Between 1811 and 1835 landowners reclaimed a total of almost 156,000 yokes from the Plattensee.⁹⁶ In 1828-1830 landlords in the neighborhood of the Palacsá swamp in Slavonia had canals dug to drain this area.⁹⁷ Other large-scale drainage projects were carried on in the Alibunaer Marshes in the Banat and along the Neusiedlersee.⁹⁸

The single most important project of the period was the

⁹³ F. List, "Die Ackerverfassung, die Zwergwirtschaft und die Auswanderung" (1842), *Schriften*, V, 514-515.

⁹⁴ Exner, *Beiträge*, I, 40.

⁹⁵ Bright, *Travels*, p. 514.

⁹⁶ Exner, *Beiträge*, I, 40.

⁹⁷ Fényes, p. 17.

⁹⁸ "Rückblick auf die fortschreitende Entwicklung des Handelsverkehrs in den Donauländern seit 1815," *Deutsche Vierteljahrschrift*, XII (1849), pt. ii, 284.

control of the Theiss River. In 1846 Count Stephen Széchenyi submitted a memorandum to the central government in which he stated that the yearly floods of the long, winding Theiss kept over 200 austrian square miles of potentially fertile land in the great Hungarian Plain from being tilled. His recommendations, based on the plans of the Venetian engineer Paliocapa, was to shorten the length of the river by half through numerous cut-offs, with dikes to hold the stream in its new bed. The government agreed to spend 100,000 florins yearly on this project and appointed Széchenyi as the commissioner of the undertaking. Before the events of 1848 and 1849 brought the work to a temporary halt, 192,000 yokes had been reclaimed.⁹⁹

In the Northwest zone many thousands of yokes of swamp-land and moor and innumerable ponds were reclaimed for agricultural use by noble landlords.¹⁰⁰ In the years 1832-1835 Prince Ferdinand Lobkowitz spent 24,000 florins draining an area of over 300 yokes on his estate of Eisenberg in Bohemia.¹⁰¹ Another Bohemian lord, Count Joseph Mathias von Thun-Hohenstein, at considerable expense controlled the Daubrawa River that flowed through his estate of Seehuschitz. His fields and crops had suffered often and much from the floods of this stream so he had the river bed widened and used the excavated earth for dikes to protect the lowlands.¹⁰² He drained many of the ponds that dotted his holding, reclaiming thereby almost 750 yokes. All told, there were around 14,000 *Klafter* of primary drainage canals on this estate and about four times as many secondary ditches that fed into the main system.¹⁰³ At Postelberg, one of the Schwarzenberg estates in Bohemia, most of the ponds had been drained in 1833, including one that covered 673 yokes.¹⁰⁴ On the Silesian estate of Seelowitz owned by Archduke Charles (who purchased it in 1819) there was

⁹⁹ Budapestester Handels- und Gewerbekammer, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Preise ungarischer Landesprodukte im neunzehnten Jahrhundert* (Budapest, 1873), p. xxviii; Exner, *Beiträge*, I, 40-41.

¹⁰⁰ Schnabel, pp. 128 n., 227.

¹⁰¹ J. G. Sommer, *Das Königreich Böhmen, statistisch-topographisch dargestellt* (16 vols., Prague, 1833-1849), XIV, 123-124; Stamm, pp. 100-101.

¹⁰² Sommer, XI, 315.

¹⁰³ *Ibid.*, pp. 315-316.

¹⁰⁴ J. Schimauscheck, "Topographische Beschreibung der Herrschaft Postelberg," *Neue Schriften*, VII, pt. ii (1841), 70.

much land reclamation, the largest single operation being the draining of a pond covering 1,200 yokes.¹⁰⁶

AGRICULTURAL CREDIT

The growth of the interest of landlords in profitable agricultural production brought with it as a concomitant the need for agricultural credit. Landlords busied themselves with plans and proposals for the establishment of new credit sources from which they could borrow to expand and improve their operations. The development in the latter half of the *Vormärz* of an organized demand for the redemption of the servile obligations of the peasant provided a particularly strong stimulus for landlords to importune the throne for permission to establish new credit institutions. The petitioners argued that a reform in peasant tenure was absolutely necessary and then pointed out that it could not be accomplished without additional credit facilities.

At the beginning of the *Vormärz* about the only sources of agricultural credit were private money lenders and certain governmental and religious foundations.¹⁰⁸ These sources, which fell far short of meeting the credit need, were augmented when in 1819 the First Austrian Savings Bank was opened in Vienna. In the years that followed, similar savings banks were established in many of the other principal cities of the Monarchy.¹⁰⁷ Although these institutions offered some assistance to landlords hungry for additional capital they were not the answer to the problem.¹⁰⁸ Their basic purpose was to promote the habit of saving among the poorer classes. Investment of their funds was of secondary importance. They were extremely cautious,

¹⁰⁶ M. Seidl, "Bericht an die k. k. patr.-ökon. Gesellschaft in Böhmen, über die Herrschaft Altenburg in Ungarn, und die Herrschaft Seelowitz in Mähren," *Neue Schriften*, III (1834), part ii, 54-55.

¹⁰⁷ W. Schiff, *Zur Frage der Organisation des landwirtschaftlichen Kredites in Deutschland und Österreich* (Leipzig, 1892), p. 79; J. H. Schwicker, *Statistik des Königreiches Ungarn* (Stuttgart, 1877), p. 550.

¹⁰⁸ Schwicker, pp. 551-552; A. Bráf, "Der landwirtschaftliche Hypothekarcredit in Österreich während der letzten fünfzig Jahre," *G. L. F.*, I, pt. ii, 583 and n.

¹⁰⁹ Deym, p. 56; *Grenzboten*, IV (1845), pt. ii, 232; Schiff, *Frage*, p. 80; Ditz, p. 159.

made difficult terms, and did most of their mortgage business in urban property.¹⁰⁹

A potential source of agricultural credit that was never realized during the *Vormärz* was the Austrian National Bank. This institution had been established in 1816 as a bank of issue. The primary purpose for which it had been organized was to effect the withdrawal from circulation of the paper money issued by the government during the war period. In addition to this function it was given extensive privileges.¹¹⁰ The Bank operated under provisional regulations until 15 July 1817, when its charters and by-laws received the approval of the government.¹¹¹ Paragraph 19 of the statutes stated that "if the position of the Bank's money resources at some future time allows a greater expansion of its undertakings, then it can make interest bearing secured loans on landed property."¹¹²

This limited provision was not utilized. The Bank's business consisted of the redeeming of paper money, discounting the drafts of the imperial treasury, and the discounting of commercial paper and the granting of loans to the business community. But it offered no aid to the credit-hungry landowner.¹¹³ Perhaps, as a writer in the *Oekonomische Neuigkeiten* suggested, the mortgage business was not profitable enough to attract the Bank's attention.¹¹⁴ Whatever the reason, the National Bank was of no assistance to the agricultural interest during the *Vormärz*. The privilege of making loans on real property was not even included in the renewal of the Bank's charter in 1841.¹¹⁵

¹⁰⁹ Deym, p. 56; *Grenzboten*, IV (1845), part ii, 232-233; Bräf, "Der landwirtschaftliche Hypothekarcredit," p. 583.

¹¹⁰ Sect. 6 of *Finanz-Patent* of 1 June 1816, *Franz des Ersten politische Gesetze und Verordnungen*, XLIV, 193; Provisional charter of the National Bank, 1 June 1816, *ibid.*, pp. 199-214; 22 June 1816, *ibid.*, pp. 238-240.

¹¹¹ *Ibid.*, XLV, 213-284.

¹¹² *Ibid.*, pp. 218-219.

¹¹³ "Plan zu einer Hypothekenbank, zur Unterstützung grösserer und kleinerer Grundbesitzer," *Oekonomische Neuigkeiten*, XXVIII (1824), 506-507; Petition of the Moravian Estates to the throne, 2 June 1847, *Grenzboten*, VI (1847), pt. iv, 27.

¹¹⁴ "Plan zu einer Hypothekenbank," p. 506.

¹¹⁵ Patent of 1 July 1841, *Ferdinand des Ersten politische Gesetze und Verordnungen*, LXIX, 161-239.

In 1855 the National Bank, at the order of the government, established a

A few of the greatest landowners of the Monarchy were able to borrow large amounts of money from the private bankers of Vienna. Around the end of the 1820's these landlords began the practice of negotiating loans from a banking house or a syndicate which took the lord's promissory note plus a large commission. The bankers then split up this original promissory note (*Hauptschuldverschreibung*) into a number of notes of smaller size (*Theilschuldverschreibung*) which they sold to private buyers.¹¹⁶

In 1836 a new development arose from this practice. In that year Prince Esterházy received permission from the government to pay off a loan he had contracted with private bankers through a lottery loan (that is, the selling of long-term bonds agreeing to pay money prizes in addition to the paid-in value to certain bondholders selected by lot). Esterházy's example was soon followed by other members of the high nobility who recognized this as an easy way to raise money.¹¹⁷ These private lottery loan bonds were traded on the Vienna bourse as ordinary securities. The number of issues, however, apparently was not large. The Vienna bourse quotations of 3 July 1848, listed only four; two Esterházy issues, one Windischgrätz, and one Waldstein issue.¹¹⁸

These methods of raising capital (the sale of parts of promissory notes and private lottery loans) were opposed by the Ministry of Justice as unsafe, with the public being deliberately misled into putting its money into insecure ventures. The Exchequer, on the other hand, argued that these practices were not unsafe or misleading. Rather, they offered a natural way for large landowners to raise capital, as well as a chance for small capital accumulations which would otherwise be idle to be put to work. These loans, continued the Exchequer officials, were made only to free landed property from oppressive burdens, and to provide it with capital under more favorable conditions. Landlords were given a chance to improve their

mortgage division with a capital stock of 35 million florins in silver to make loans to landowners. Preamble, "Erlass des Finanzministeriums vom 21 Oktober 1855," *Reichs-Gesetz-Blatt für das Kaiserthum Oesterreich*, 1855, p. 613.

¹¹⁶ Sieghart, *Glückspiele*, pp. 247-248.

¹¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 248.

¹¹⁸ F. G. Steiner, *Die Entwicklung des Mobilbankwesens in Oesterreich* (Vienna, 1913), p. 2.

holdings which they would not otherwise have had. Thereby, the way was opened to increased agricultural productivity.¹¹⁹

The number of landowners who were able to raise money in this manner was extremely small—probably not more than six or seven of the greatest lords of the Monarchy.¹²⁰ The credit needs of the rest of the Monarchy's landlords were unfilled.

Despite this shortage of credit sources the government refused, with one exception, the requests of landlords that they be allowed to start new credit institutions. The basic reason for these refusals was the government's fear of competition on the money market. State finances were poorly managed and the government was continually borrowing during the *Vormärz* to cover its deficits.¹²¹ The appearance on the bourse of the paper of new organizations might make it difficult for the government to find buyers for its issues.¹²²

The single exception to the refusals made by the government was the demand of the landlords of Galicia. In October, 1822, the Galician Estates in a petition to the throne described the hardships worked upon landlords by the lack of credit facilities. It asked that it be allowed to establish a mortgage bank modeled after the (Prussian) Silesian Credit-Union. The Emperor gave preliminary approval in 1824 and the planners of the bank drew up proposed statutes for its establishment and operation.¹²³ These were approved unanimously by the Estates on 19 October 1825, and were then forwarded to the throne for imperial approval.

The government hesitated for a long time before it acted. In 1826 the provincial government sent the Estates the report of the Vienna Savings Bank and certain affiliated organizations showing that these institutions lent money on property at 5 per cent and indicated that Galician proprietors who needed money should apply there. The Estates insisted that it needed its own bank. In 1827 and 1828 it repeated its requests to the throne and in 1829 the Emperor promised that he would soon

¹¹⁹ Sieghart, *Glückspiele*, pp. 248-251.

¹²⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 368-369.

¹²¹ A. Beer, *Die Finanzen Österreichs im XIX. Jahrhundert* (Prague, 1877), pp. 169-174.

¹²² Springer, *Geschichte*, I, 531.

¹²³ Bräf, "Der landwirtschaftliche Hypothekarcredit," p. 585.

settle the matter. But various government departments raised objections to the plans for the bank. The Estates in 1833 agreed to a government suggestion for a change in the proposed statutes and appointed a three-man committee to work with government representatives in making any additional change that the government might want. Vienna officialdom's qualms about the value of the paper it was planned for the bank to issue were quieted when the Estates, in 1837, agreed to act as guarantor. Finally, an Imperial Patent of 3 November 1841 approved the statutes and the bank was organized.¹²⁴

The initial capital of the new organization was made up of two provincial funds and totalled over 730,000 florins.¹²⁵ Membership in the bank, which was given the name of the Galician Estates Credit-Anstalt, was open to the owner of any estate entered in the *Landtafel* of the province who made a mortgage loan of at least 1,000 florins.¹²⁶ The bank's charter provided that it was to raise money by the issuance of bonds (*Pfandbriefe*) which were to bear 4 per cent interest, payable semi-annually. These bonds could be issued in denominations of 100, 500, 5,000 and 10,000 florins.¹²⁷ By the end of 1848 the bank had loaned a total of 9,463,000 florins since its organization.¹²⁸

In 1824 Franz Ritter von Heintl, Lower Austrian landowner and one of the Monarchy's outstanding agriculturists, presented to the throne for its approval a plan he had drawn up for the establishment of a mortgage bank. The institution he proposed was to be privately owned with capital raised by the sale of shares. Loans were to be made to landowners at 6 per cent.¹²⁹ Nothing came of this proposal.

In 1839, at a session of the Lower Austrian Estates, Baron Stifft suggested that pressure be brought upon the government to include in the impending renewal of the charter of the

¹²⁴ Schulte, pp. 43-44.

¹²⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 44.

¹²⁶ Sect. 2, Statutes of the Galician Estates Credit-Anstalt, in Deym, pp. 107-108.

¹²⁷ Sect. 6-11, *ibid.*, pp. 108-110. For the wording of the *Pfandbrief* see Appendix 1, below.

¹²⁸ Schulte, p. 50.

¹²⁹ "Plan zu einer Hypothekenbank, zur Unterstützung grösserer und kleinerer Grundbesitzer," pp. 507-510.

National Bank provisions for loans on real property. His motion was voted down, although the debate revealed that there were others who agreed with his views.¹³⁰ Six years later, at the 1845 meeting of the Estates, Ritter von Schmerling introduced a motion for the establishment of an Estates Credit-Anstalt. Schmerling argued that the current interest rate on land loans was higher than the return that the landowner made on his borrowed capital. Further, the lender insisted on the repayment of the principal in a lump sum, on call, so that the borrower had to make another loan in order to pay off the first creditor. Schmerling visualized the function of the proposed Credit-Anstalt to be the lending of money for long periods at a reasonable rate of interest and with plenty of time for amortization.¹³¹

The motion met with the approval of the Estates, and a committee was appointed to draw up statutes for presentation at the next session. This was done in June, 1846. The Estates approved the proposals and then voted to submit them to the throne for imperial permission to organize the desired Credit-Anstalt.¹³²

When the proposed statutes were presented to the throne they were accompanied by a memorandum written by Freiherr Anton von Doblhoff-Dier, who had served as a member of the committee which had drawn them up. His memorandum explained the motives which had inspired the Estates to take this step. He pointed out that it was the duty of the Estates to report to the Emperor the retarding effect of the lack of capital upon the development and prosperity of agriculture. It was evident, he continued, that the increased demands upon agricultural production had to be balanced by an equal amount of means devoted to increasing production. Agriculture needed as much encouragement and support as the other branches of the economy. It was especially necessary that suitable and adequate measures be taken to meet the increased need for capital. This basic condition for the simultaneous and equal development of agriculture with trade and industry could only be met by a regulated and certain supply of credit. Credit was the "life-giving principle" of the spirit of agricultural enterprise.

¹³⁰ Bibl, *Stände*, p. 286 n.

¹³¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 286-287.

¹³² *Ibid.*, p. 287.

It was necessary, however, the memorandum continued, that the borrower be in a position to repay his loan. So long as the borrower-lender relation was on an individual basis the risks taken by both parties were such as to dissuade them from getting together. The lender always took a chance that he would not get his payments in time, in which case he had to go to law, which entailed loss of time and money; or, he over-valued his security or the borrower allowed it to run down. If the borrower had gotten his loan from a man "who floated with the swells and the troughs of the money market" he might be called upon to repay at the most unexpected and unfavorable time. It was absolutely essential, therefore, for borrower and lender that a third party stand between them to assume all the risks and take care of troublesome contingencies. This function would be performed by the proposed Credit-Anstalt. Through its operation the lender would be certain to receive his interest and the repayment of his capital and the borrower could get loans at a fair rate of interest, with adequate time for repayment through amortization, and thereby be guaranteed continued and profitable possession of his property.

The belief that the issue of securities by the proposed Credit-Anstalt would have an adverse effect upon the money market had no basis in fact, the memorandum went on. Such an effect had not been experienced elsewhere when similar institutions had been organized and sold their notes on the bourse. Fundamentally, all that had happened was a shift of holdings from private notes of indebtedness to the notes of the Credit-Anstalt.

Then the memorandum turned to the connection between the Credit-Anstalt and the redemption of peasant dues and obligations. Its formation was essential if the regularization of peasant tenure, especially the redemption of *Robot* and *Zebent*, was considered as being no longer avoidable. Without the help of the facilities that a Credit-Anstalt offered this could not be accomplished. The memorandum concluded with the reminder that the government in 1841 had approved the organization of the Galician Estates Credit-Anstalt, after which the proposed Lower Austrian institution was modeled.¹³³

Despite this battery of arguments the Emperor refused to

¹³³ *Ibid.*, pp. 287-289.

grant his approval. His reply to the Estates was that the creation of a new, large credit institution would cause additional difficulties in the already uncertain conditions of the money market which, in turn, would threaten the life of the new institution itself. An additional reason given was that the Emperor could not give his permission for such an important measure without considering the rest of the Monarchy. If the proposal were recognized as beneficial it would be his duty to extend it to the different parts of the Monarchy, with appropriate modifications necessitated by local conditions.¹⁸⁴ The Estates had to content itself with this unsatisfactory answer.

At a general meeting of the Styrian Agricultural Society on 5 April 1832, it was decided to ask for imperial permission for Styrian landowners to become members of the Credit-Union of the Kingdom of Württemberg. Landowners wanted this new credit source so that they could borrow with greater facility than was now possible in order to improve their cultivation and to allow the redemption of the servile obligations of the peasant. The Württemberg Union, organized in 1826, had attracted the attention of Styrian landowners because of its favorable terms. Loans were made at 5½ per cent and, normally, fifty-two years was allowed for amortization.¹⁸⁵

The request was refused by the government on the grounds that the statutes of the Württemberg Credit-Union were such that participation by Austrian citizens was not possible without important changes in Austrian legal procedure. The Central Board of the Agricultural Society in its report to the membership on this matter concluded by recommending that a Credit-Union be organized as soon as possible within the Monarchy.¹⁸⁶

The directors of the Styrian Savings Bank, upon learning of the government's refusal to allow Styrians to become members of the Württemberg organization, decided to start making mortgage loans on farm property. They modeled their policies after those of the Württemberg Union with low interest rates and long-term amortization.¹⁸⁷ When this activity was reported

¹⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 317-318.

¹⁸⁵ *Verhandlungen und Aufsätze* (Styrian Agricultural Society), new series, VII (1835), 15; F. X. Hlubek, *Resultate der Wirksamkeit der k. k. Landwirthschafts-Gesellschaft in Steiermark, vom Jahre 1829-1839* (Graz, 1840), p. 128.

¹⁸⁶ *Verhandlungen und Aufsätze*, new series, VII (1835), pp. 15-16.

¹⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, VIII (1837), 35.

upon at a meeting of the Styrian Agricultural Society one of the members present pointed out that the Savings Bank could be used only by a few because the size of the loans that it granted were so small. Baron von Mandel, a chief official of the Bank, admitted this to be true, but said that it was necessary because the Bank had to be ultra-conservative with the money entrusted to its care.¹³⁸

The Bohemian Estates had petitioned the throne for the establishment of an Estates bank as early as 1790. Its motives were to make cheap credit available to landowners who were borrowing at usurious rates, and to relieve the tightness of money in the province. Permission was asked to set up a bank that could issue scrip in denominations of five to a hundred florins as well as make mortgage loans. Loans up to one third of the value of the property were to be made, with the borrower receiving his loan in the scrip. He could use his scrip certificates for certain kinds of payments in the province. The throne refused to give its permission for the creation of this institution.¹³⁹

A half century later, in 1844, the Estates published a book written by one of its members, Count Friedrich von Deym, telling of the need for a Credit institution and presenting proposed statutes for the establishment of a land mortgage bank in Bohemia.¹⁴⁰ The plans set forth by Deym followed the statutes of the Galician Estates Credit-Anstalt (which were printed as an appendix to the book) and many of his proposed articles used the same or similar wording employed in the Galician statutes. In 1845 the Estates approved Deym's proposals and petitioned the throne for permission to use them in the establishment of a Bohemian Estates bank.¹⁴¹

In Vienna this request was routed to Freiherr von Kübeck, president of the Exchequer, for his comments and recommendations. Kübeck referred to the fact that the government ran on a deficit budget that was made up by borrowing. The issue of paper by the proposed Bohemian bank might make it more difficult for the central government to find credit. Further, Kübeck wondered whether it was wise to give the Estates so

¹³⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 38.

¹³⁹ Bráf, "Der landwirtschaftliche Hypothekarcredit," pp. 584-585.

¹⁴⁰ Deym, *op. cit.*

¹⁴¹ Bráf, "Der landwirtschaftliche Hypothekarcredit," p. 587.

much financial power. Finally, he pointed out that the Estates had explained it wanted the bank in order to facilitate redemption of peasant obligations. The government must decide, said Kübeck, whether or not it was willing to cooperate in this redemption and, especially, whether it should allow it to be accomplished by the influence and financial power of the Estates.¹⁴² Kübeck's admonishments were heeded and the request of the Estates was denied.¹⁴³

The Moravian Estates, too, in the mid-forties decided to ask for approval to establish a credit institution under its auspices.¹⁴⁴ It was given permission to submit plans in detail to the Emperor for his consideration.¹⁴⁵ On 2 June 1847, the Estates forwarded the proposed statutes and regulations it had drawn up, together with a memorandum explaining why such an institution was needed.¹⁴⁶

This memorandum began by pointing out that agriculture had not prospered as it should have during the past thirty years of peace. One reason for this was the heavy tax that rested upon the land. A further cause was to be found in the great difficulties confronting the landlord seeking to borrow money on his estate. The memorandum pointed this out, as follows:

When, after the afflictions of a long war—afflictions from which landed property was certainly not the least sufferer—the great institution of the National Bank came into being, it was planned that its activities should include the giving of credit on landed property.

But this part of its original plan remained unfulfilled, and while the Bank offered ample supplies of credit to every other branch of economic activity, including stock-jobbing, land credit remained isolated and left to its own devices.

Landed property, without any support, had to compete with the high profits provided capitalists by the successive state loans, and with the quick profits which industry drew from its investment under the protection of the prohibitive-protective tariff system. All this was happening at a time when the wounds of a fateful epoch should have been healing, and when the many years of low prices of agricultural products had kept the estate owner's net to a minimum. . . .

¹⁴² Kübeck to Baron Gervay, Vienna, 25 October 1845, in H. Schlitter, *Aus Österreichs Vormärz* (Leipzig, 1920), II, 97-98.

¹⁴³ Springer, *Geschichte*, I, 531; Bráf, "Der landwirtschaftliche Hypothekarcredit," p. 588.

¹⁴⁴ Bráf, "Der landwirtschaftliche Hypothekarcredit," p. 587.

¹⁴⁵ Petition of the Moravian Estates to the throne, 2 June 1847, pp. 29-30.

¹⁴⁶ "Der mährische Landtag 1847," *Grenzboten*, VI (1847), part iv, 26.

If, in recent years the growth of capital resources, especially the development of savings banks . . . had afforded some relief to landed property, still, for all that, the interest rate in Moravia is higher even for the best-secured mortgages than in most of the lands of Germany. Even with the most excellent security the landowner has to contend with usurious terms.¹⁴⁷

The plight of the small landowner and of the peasant was even more lamentable, said the memorandum. The effect of this condition upon agriculture, and, consequently, upon the entire state was harmful. Further, there was no guarantee that the existing state of affairs would not worsen. Periodic economic crises that affected all of Europe, new competition from overseas, a possibly unsatisfactory solution of the problem of landlord-peasant relationships, all were gloomy factors darkening the future of agriculture. Much money would be needed especially to accomplish a workable and peaceful composition of the landlord-peasant relationship.¹⁴⁸

The memorandum concluded with the following peroration:

The most obedient Estates submit the proposed statutes for the approval of the All-High . . . Your Majesty will see from these documents that his most obedient Estates want to alleviate the tragic conditions of land credit and avoid the consequent threatening evils without calling in any outside help, without any claim upon the state, without privileges such as have already been given other organizations, but solely through the increase of its power.

Your Majesty will see that his most loyal Estates has no other intention than the desire to create from its own means an institution to save land credit from the most pernicious fluctuations, make it independent, and emancipate it; an institution which shall strengthen landed property and thereby save and preserve for the state its most solid support.

Your most obedient Estates hope that your Majesty . . . will provide as soon as possible the blessings of a credit union for the Margraviate of Moravia. It hopes it with complete confidence since it is only asking for landed property that which has long since and in fullest measure been granted to the other branches of the national economy. It should not be overlooked that no other interest will be encroached upon in establishing this institution, since the new credit union will not issue paper for the bourse or for stock-jobbing, but will put out only firm issues held in firm hands. Finally, experience teaches us more clearly and more emphatically each day that without a strong development of landed property the prosperity of the other branches of society

¹⁴⁷ Petition of the Moravian Estates, pp. 27-28.

¹⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 28-29.

is only an illusion followed closely by bitter disillusionment. The development of other interests can only be blessed when the foundation is firm; never when the foundation is weak.¹⁴⁹

The government refused this plea, giving the same reasons it had used in denying the request of the Lower Austrian Estates. These were that existing credit conditions would be harmed by this new organization and that consideration had to be taken of the interests of the rest of the Monarchy.¹⁵⁰

In Hungary the greatest obstacles to the development of agricultural credit were the privileges of the nobility and the system of noble land tenure, especially the *Aviticität*. Noble landowners were not under legal compulsion to keep their contracts, while *Aviticität* resulted in constant confusion and uncertainty as to the title of land.¹⁵¹ In his diary Count Stephen Széchenyi told of a conversation he had had with Prince Metternich late in 1825. It was the first time that the two had met. Széchenyi had only recently made his debut on the Hungarian national scene, and for the rest of his active life was to devote a major part of his activities to the promotion of the economic development of his country. Metternich told the young magnate that there could be no commerce without money and that money could not be gotten without laws that would protect the lender and ensure him his security and the return of his loan. "But," Metternich continued, "if we want to carry through such laws then the Hungarian nobility will complain 'To persecute us with commercial legislation is counter to our privileges.' But if the nobleman wishes to become wealthy he will just have to submit himself to commercial law, especially if he wants to carry on trade, for trade does not function without money."¹⁵²

Széchenyi felt himself called to the task of convincing Hungary's landlords that it was to their own benefit to relinquish their ancient privileges and customs. In 1827 he published a book called, simply, *Hitel (Credit)*. In it he pictured the backwardness of Hungary's economy, especially its agriculture, and ascribed this condition to the lack of capital and credit. He

¹⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 29-30.

¹⁵⁰ Bráf, "Der landwirtschaftliche Hypothekarcredit," p. 587.

¹⁵¹ *Budapester Handels- und Gewerbekammer*, p. xxviii n.; Paget, I, 131-132. See above, pp. 64-66.

¹⁵² M. Lonyay, ed., *Graf Stefan Széchenyi und seine hinterlassenen Schriften*, transl. from the Hungarian by A. Dux (Budapest, 1875), p. 36.

listed the barriers to the development of an adequate credit system and urged their removal. He recommended the establishment of legal provisions that would protect the creditor by facilitating and enforcing the repayment of loans.¹⁵³

Széchenyi's arguments, which he repeated and elaborated in his subsequent writings, found many sympathetic listeners among his fellow Hungarians, though some of them disagreed with the specific methods he advanced. Several advanced their own plans and proposals for the establishment of a banking and credit system. Count Emil Dessewffy in his book *Alföldi levelek (Letters from the Alföld)*, published in 1842, urged that a land credit institution be formed on the model of the Silesian Credit Union. Other schemes were set forth in 1841 and 1842 in books written by Johann Fogarassy, Ladislaus Kovach and Franz Farkas. Their plans involved the issuance of paper money. August Tréfört in articles in the newspaper *Pesti Hírlap* and in a brochure (1842), attacked these schemes and urged the establishment first of a mortgage bank and later of a credit mobilier which could assist both landowner and business man. Tréfört also published in *Pesti Hírlap* a criticism of the plan of the Italian, Corvaja, who had recommended the establishment of a large-scale savings bank which would lend money on mortgages.¹⁵⁴

The establishment of an agricultural credit institution was among the proposals presented to the Diet of 1843-1844. The bill failed to get through the Diet because it provided that the directors of the bank were to be selected by the central government. The deputies to the Diet feared that the bank under the leadership of a government appointee would become a political instrument, rewarding supporters of the Hapsburgs with loans and denying loans to anti-government landlords.¹⁵⁵

In the early weeks of 1845 Baron Kübeck was ordered by the throne to submit a report upon measures necessary for the improvement of Hungary's material welfare. The report was

¹⁵³ S. Széchenyi, *Ueber den Credit*, transl. from the Hungarian by J. Vojdisek (Leipzig and Pest, 1830).

¹⁵⁴ J. Kautz, *Entwicklungs-Geschichte der volkswirtschaftlichen Ideen in Ungarn und deren Einfluss auf das Gemeinwesen*, transl. from the Hungarian by S. Schiller (Budapest, 1876), pp. 156-159.

¹⁵⁵ F. Pulszky, *Meine Zeit, mein Leben* (4 vols., Pressburg and Leipzig, 1880-1883), I, 297-298; R. Sieghart, *Zolltrennung und Zolleinheit* (Vienna, 1915), p. 168.

soon made. Among the problems discussed in it by Kübeck was that of agricultural credit. He opposed the establishment of a state mortgage bank. His argument was that he had a poor opinion of the economic understanding and the business ability of the Magyar landowners, and he feared that the government would get into difficulties if it supported an agricultural credit institution for the benefit of such men, who would constantly be seeking special favors and privileges. He recommended that a private mortgage bank be formed.¹⁵⁶ In 1846 an attempt was made, apparently under the auspices of the government, to organize such an institution through an arrangement with the leading banking houses of Vienna. These firms were to lend money at 5 per cent to Hungarian landowners, paying out the loans in cash, and selling securities on the market to cover the amount of their loans. The bank was to be chartered initially for twenty years with a capital of one million florins. Nothing came of this scheme.¹⁵⁷

In nearly every province of the Monarchy, then, noble landowners sought to create new sources of agricultural credit. The existing credit facilities did not nearly suffice to meet their needs. Landowners of Galicia, Lower Austria, Styria, Bohemia and Moravia all sent petitions to Vienna, asking the Emperor's permission to establish provincial credit institutions. These requests were denied, with the single exception of that made by the Galician Estates. There, after almost two decades of negotiation between the Estates and Vienna, the Galician Estates Credit-Anstalt was founded in 1841. The chief reason for the central government's refusal of the requests of the landlords of the other provinces, and for its long delay in approving the establishment of the Galician bank, was its fear that the securities of these proposed institutions would compete with government securities. In Hungary, the system of *Aviticität* and the inability to compel lords to meet contractual obligations, were the greatest obstacles to a workable system of agricultural credit. In the Diet of 1843-1844 a measure to establish an agricultural credit bank failed to carry because a majority feared that one of the proposed statutes for the bank would enable it to be used as a political weapon by the Vienna government.

¹⁵⁶ Sieghart, *Zolltrennung*, p. 165.

¹⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 169.

SCHOOLS OF AGRICULTURE

With the rising interest in production for profit, landowners realized their need for men capable of efficient management of their estates. This was particularly true of the great landlords of Hungary and the Northwest zone. The vastness of many of the holdings in these regions required that they be run by men who were especially trained for this occupation. So some landlords, at their own expense, set about having a managerial class trained. They established schools on their own estates, providing land, cattle and buildings, hiring the teachers and supporting the students. Although the initial intent of the founders of these schools was to prepare men for employment on their own holdings the institutions were usually open to the public. Total enrollment, however, was limited.

The first agricultural school of the Monarchy had been started in 1779 by Samuel Thessedik, a Lutheran minister and student of agriculture, at Szarvar, a town of the Hungarian Great Plain. A noble of the vicinity gave 45 yokes of land to the school for its use in practical instruction. The institution lasted for 27 years, until 1806. Then Thessedik could no longer find financial support and the school was forced to close.¹⁵⁸

Meanwhile, the first agricultural school established and supported by a noble landowner had opened its doors. In 1797 Count George Festetics organized an institute on his estate of Keszthely, on the banks of the Plattensee, in Hungary. He called it the *Georgikon*. At first only pupils who were going to work for Festetics after their graduation were admitted, but soon it was opened to all. The chief course given was scientific agriculture which lasted three years for stipendiaries of Festetics, while outside students could choose a one- or two-year course.¹⁵⁹ The curriculum included courses in agriculture, natural history with botanical excursions, agricultural physics, chemistry and physiology, agricultural technology, estate management, pure and applied mathematics, agricultural arithmetic, agricultural architecture, veterinary medicine, Hungarian law, manorial law

¹⁵⁸ A. von Balás, "Landwirtschaftliches Unterrichtswesen," Kön. ung. Minister für Ackerbau, *Ungarns Landwirtschaft* 1896 (Budapest, 1897), pp. 472-473.

¹⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 473-475; Bright, *Travels*, pp. 361-363.

and Austrian civil and commercial law. In addition, there was instruction in English, French, and Italian.¹⁶⁰

A year after the school was founded a second course of study had been added for the sons of peasants and hired laborers. In the succeeding years special courses of study were added in agricultural and manorial law, gardening, agricultural engineering, horse breeding and equestrianism, and home economics for peasant girls.¹⁶¹

Festetics provided the school with a total of 901 yokes of land, complete with farm buildings and stock.¹⁶² The teachers were paid out of an endowment fund created by the founder. About a dozen of the pupils were pensioners of the Count who paid all the expenses of the three-year course they took. The remaining students paid for their board and lodging but received free tuition.¹⁶³ The average enrollment in the scientific agriculture course was around thirty.¹⁶⁴

From 1797 to 1848 the *Georgikon* employed a total of 97 teachers, of whom 47 had been former pupils of the school. In these same years 1,444 students had attended the scientific agricultural course. Almost every one of these men was a native of Hungary, and over half had come from the southwestern part of that land in which the school itself was located.¹⁶⁵ The nationalist fever of 1848 forced the school to close when in May of that year its students announced their intention to enlist in the ranks of the fighters for Hungarian independence.¹⁶⁶

Three years after the *Georgikon* had opened, the second agricultural school established by a nobleman was started. This school, also in Hungary, had a different purpose than that of the *Georgikon*, in that it sought only to educate peasants. The institution had been provided for in the will of a great landowner, Christopher Nákö Edler von Nagy-Szent-Miklós. Nákö's

¹⁶⁰ *Oekonomische Neuigkeiten*, XXV (1823), 103.

¹⁶¹ Bright, *Travels*, pp. 362-369; Balás, "Landwirtschaftliches Unterrichtswesen," p. 475.

¹⁶² Bright, *Travels*, pp. 369-372; Balás, "Landwirtschaftliches Unterrichtswesen," p. 477.

¹⁶³ Bright, *Travels*, p. 362; *Oekonomische Neuigkeiten*, XXV (1823), 103; J. G. Elsner, *Ungarn, durchbreiset, beurtheilet und beschrieben* (2 vols., Leipzig, 1840), II, 52.

¹⁶⁴ Elsner, II, 52.

¹⁶⁵ Balás, "Landwirtschaftliches Unterrichtswesen," p. 477.

¹⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 478.

testament ordered that a small school be founded on his estate in the southern part of the Great Plain to give agricultural training to the sons of his peasants. Twelve students were enrolled annually for a two-year course with all their expenses paid out of an endowment fund set up by the founder.¹⁶⁷

In 1818 Albrecht Casimir, Duke of Saxe-Teschen, one of the Monarchy's greatest landlords, opened a school on his estate of Hungarian-Altenburg, located on the border between Hungary and Lower Austria. His primary purpose was to train men to run his huge holdings in Hungary, Bohemia, Moravia-Silesia, and Galicia, but the charter of the institution specified that it was open to all.¹⁶⁸

The announcement of the school stated that the intent of the founder was that it should "not merely present theoretically a knowledge of agriculture and its associated industries, but it was far more to prepare the mind and character of its pupils for the carrying on of agriculture and the practical management of large agricultural complexes."¹⁶⁹ The average enrollment was twenty-six, of whom six were stipendiaries of the Duke. These six were sons of his officials who had distinguished themselves by their industry, ability, and character. In addition to their room, board, and tuition, they were given 120 florins a year. The remaining students were housed in the school building at a low charge.¹⁷⁰

The school year lasted twelve months. According to the 1820 announcement of the school the first year's course of study included agriculture, agricultural architecture, arithmetic and geometry, animal husbandry and veterinary medicine, botany, and the theory of brewing, distilling and cheese-making. In his second year the student studied forestry and advanced courses in agriculture, architecture, geometry and veterinary science. In addition, there was class and field work in agricultural arithmetic, and practical instruction in all aspects of farm work. The summer months were used for labor in the fields. The student participated in all the different activities involved in

¹⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, p.478.

¹⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 479.

¹⁶⁹ "Lehranstalt für Landwirthe zu Ungarisch-Altenburg," *Oekonomische Neuigkeiten*, XX (1820), *Beilage* no. 9, 66.

¹⁷⁰ Balás, "Landwirtschaftliches Unterrichtswesen," pp. 479-480.

running the school's practice farm, taking turns in being in charge of each activity. Pupils who wished to study a third year were given practical training on the farms and in the offices of the Hungarian-Altenburg estate itself.¹⁷¹

A short-lived school was organized and equipped in 1839 at Rohoniz, in western Hungary, by Counts Gustav and Casimir Batthányi and Count Ludwig Károlyi. Their primary purpose was to have managers trained for their own estates but they also wanted to contribute to the promotion of agriculture generally. So they made their school free to all comers. A one-year course in forestry and a two-year course in agriculture were offered. By its second year the school had about eighty students, but soon thereafter it was closed when the founders dissolved their arrangements for its support.¹⁷²

In Bohemia Prince Schwarzenberg, in 1801, had established a school on his estate of Krumau. The school offered a three-year course with instruction free. Each year four three-year fellowships were awarded on the basis of an examination in which preference was given to the sons of Schwarzenberg retainers. The winners, who were between fifteen and twenty years old, lived in the castle at Krumau where they were maintained at the Prince's expense and given a stipend besides. Upon satisfactory completion of their course of study they were hired to work for the Schwarzenbergs.¹⁷³ Franz Horský, outstanding practical agriculturist of the Northwest zone, who was the son of an official of Prince Lobkowitz, attended the Krumau school as a private student, and upon his graduation from it with honors was employed by Prince Schwarzenberg.¹⁷⁴

The first two years at Krumau were given over to preparatory studies. In his first year the student had classes in natural history and physiology, mathematics (arithmetic, algebra and geometry), German and Czech. In the second year he studied chemistry, agricultural architecture, veterinary medicine, natural science, and continued his language studies. In the last year the students were given specialized courses in agriculture, tech-

¹⁷¹ "Lehranstalt für Landwirthe," pp. 65-66.

¹⁷² Balás, "Landwirtschaftliches Unterrichtswesen," pp. 480-481.

¹⁷³ Bright, *Travels*, p. 390.

¹⁷⁴ F. Horský von Horskýfeld, *Mein Streben, Wirken, meine Resultate* (Kolin, 1873), pp. 1-2. For Horský's subsequent career see pp. 159-160, below.

nology, and estate management. Here the students did practical work on the farms and in the sheep folds, stables, breweries, distilleries, offices, etc., of the great Krumau estate.¹⁷⁵

Schwarzenberg also started a forestry school to train the sons of his foresters to follow in their fathers' calling. The school closed in 1845 but young men destined for Schwarzenberg service were paid stipends while attending forestry schools elsewhere. Other forestry schools in Bohemia were established by Count von Bouquoi, Prince Liechtenstein, Prince Metternich, and Prince Fuerstenberg.¹⁷⁶

In addition to the activities of these individual landlords the Bohemian Estates took steps to provide improved agricultural education. Up to 1820 only one general course in this subject was offered at the University in Prague. In that year the Estates arranged to have this program greatly elaborated by increasing the number of courses offered at the University, and by adding a new curriculum in agriculture at the Prague Polytechnic Institute. These two courses of study, at University and Polytechnic, were complementary, with the former stressing the theoretical and the latter the practical aspects of agriculture. In addition to paying the salary of Professor Michna, who directed these curricula, the Estates also allocated a sum for the purchase of models of agricultural machines and implements.¹⁷⁷

At the 1847 session of the Bohemian Estates a motion was made that an agricultural school be established at the expense of the province. The proposal urged the purchase of a large estate at an approximate cost of 500,000 florins, on which the school would be established. The debate and vote on this motion, which was made on the last day of the 1847 meeting, were postponed until the next session.¹⁷⁸ The proposal was forgotten in the rush of events of 1848.

Early in 1848 Count Adam Potocki established an agricultural school in Galicia on an estate he owned near Cracow. He endowed it with 100,000 florins and promised an additional 4,000

¹⁷⁵ Schnabel, pp. 241-244.

¹⁷⁶ Stamm, pp. 293-295.

¹⁷⁷ "Erweiterung und Vervollkommenung des landwirtschaftlichen Unterrichts in Böhmen," *Oekonomische Neuigkeiten*, XXI (1821), 257-259.

¹⁷⁸ *Grenzboten*, VI (1847), part ii, 498.

florins annually for its operation,¹⁷⁹ but the school had a very brief existence.¹⁸⁰

Landlords, then, realized the necessity for training men to run their estates efficiently and profitably. This was especially true of great lords in Hungary and Bohemia where individual holdings often covered many thousands of yokes. Some of these landowners established and maintained schools on their estates at their own expense, and supported some of the students who were destined to work for them. Other students were admitted, so that the beneficent effects of this education upon agricultural practice were not restricted to the holdings of the school's founder. The curricula offered by these institutions covered a wide area and included practical work on farms furnished by the lord.

SOCIETIES FOR THE PROMOTION OF AGRICULTURE

The most striking evidence of the awakening of the interest of noble landowners in profitable agricultural production during the *Vormärz* was their formation of societies for the promotion of agriculture. By 1848 there were fourteen of these societies in the various provinces of the Monarchy, and many affiliated or subordinate organizations. Through these societies landlords sought to improve primary production by exchanging information and opinions, describing new and improved methods of cultivation, sponsoring experimentation, introducing new crops, supporting agricultural education, and by many other kindred activities.

Agricultural societies had first been organized in the Monarchy during the reign of Maria Theresa as part of the imperial policy for improving the agriculture of the realm. The government felt that its program for the advancement of primary production would be facilitated by organizations of private individuals who would serve as sources of information concerning the status and progress of agriculture in the various provinces. With this imperial encouragement, societies had been formed by 1769 in Lower Austria, Upper Austria, Styria, Carinthia, Carniola, Görz, Tyrol, Moravia, Silesia, and Bohemia.

¹⁷⁹ *Oekonomische Neuigkeiten*, LXXV (1848), 224.

¹⁸⁰ F. von Zimmerauer, "Der Land- und Forstwirtschaftliche Unterricht," *G. L. F.*, IV, 495.

All but four of these societies disappeared in the 1770's, when a shift in imperial administrative policy abolished the independent agencies that had handled economic matters in each province and so had been concerned with the agricultural organizations.¹⁸¹ The four that survived, in Carinthia, Görz, Silesia, and Moravia, had existences in little more than name for long periods before 1815.

One other agricultural society of the *Vormärz*, that of Bohemia, had been organized before 1800. All the others were founded after the turn of the century. The formation of these new societies and the revivification of the old ones were accomplished not at government instigation, but by individuals in each province who were interested in improving their agricultural production.

The title of the oldest agricultural society of the Monarchy was claimed by the Carinthian organization. The Society for Agriculture and Useful Arts had been established there by an imperial decree dated 13 November 1764. Its membership was small, numbering between ten and twenty. The regulations for the conduct of the Society stated that its purpose was the improvement of agriculture, and included provisions whereby the members agreed to report their own experiences and observations to the Society, share the knowledge they gained, and encourage peasants in the improvement of their tillage. The single qualification for election to membership was a proven skill in, or knowledge of, agriculture.¹⁸²

During most of its early years the Society was relatively inactive, and between 1770 and 1784 it was dormant. In the latter year it became affiliated with the provincial Estates and took a new lease on life. By 1795 it had over seventy members.¹⁸³ Then, in 1797, the French penetrated most of Carinthia and the Society went into a complete eclipse. In 1804 permission was granted for its reorganization and from that time on its role was an active one.¹⁸⁴ It was especially fortunate in having as one of its members from 1806 on, and as its chancellor from

¹⁸¹ Elvert, *Geschichte*, I, 29, 33-35.

¹⁸² Burger, *Album*, pp. 5-7.

¹⁸³ *Ibid.*, pp. 8-26.

¹⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 27.

1812 to 1820, Johann Burger, the Monarchy's most important agriculturist.¹⁸⁵

The second oldest society was the Agricultural Society of Görz, established by Maria Theresa in 1765, with an original membership of twelve. It held annual meetings and promoted agricultural development, paying special attention to sericulture, forage raising, and viticulture. One of its accomplishments was the introduction of potato raising into the Littoral. Then the war years interrupted its activities, and it was inactive until the return of peace when it was reorganized and entered upon an active existence.¹⁸⁶

The beginnings of the Moravian-Silesian Agricultural Society reached back to 1770 when the Agricultural Society of the Margraviate of Moravia was organized. For many years it limited itself to the original purposes for which it had been established, of which the chief ones were the making of reports to the government on agricultural matters and the conducting of essay competitions on agricultural subjects suggested by the government.¹⁸⁷ Its membership, never high, had dwindled by the end of 1800 to sixteen men, of whom only nine were active members.¹⁸⁸ A similar society had been formed in Silesia in

¹⁸⁵ Burger (1773-1842) is named by von der Goltz as one of the four men to whom goes the credit before all others for introducing scientific agriculture into Central Europe through their writings, teachings and experiments. Albrecht Thaer and J. G. Koppe worked in northern Germany, J. N. Scherz in western and southwestern Germany, and Burger in Austria. T. von der Goltz, *Geschichte der deutschen Landwirtschaft* (2 vols., Berlin, 1902-1903), II, 69-70.

Burger was a native of Carinthia and was a practicing physician there until around 1800 when he gave up medicine to devote all his time to scientific agriculture. (Thaer had also been a physician.) He bought a small estate in Carinthia on which to carry on his researches. He published several monographs, translated Sismondi's book on Tuscan agriculture, and introduced such agricultural implements as the horse hoe, extirpator and drilling machine into the province. In 1808 he was appointed to the newly-created chair of Agriculture at the Lyceum in Klagenfurt, capital of Carinthia. In 1819 he published his *Lehrbuch der Landwirtschaft* of which Thaer said no other work on agriculture had pleased him as much. Several editions appeared in the years that followed, and it was translated into Swedish, Polish, French and English. In 1820 Burger entered into government service, making land appraisals for the cadastre in the Littoral, Styria and Lombardy-Venetia. In 1830 he settled in Vienna, taking an active part in the work of the Agricultural Society there and serving as its secretary from 1838 until his death in 1842. Burger, *Album*, pp. 145-158.

¹⁸⁶ S. Richter, "Das landwirtschaftliche Vereins- und Genossenschaftswesen," G. L. F., *Supplementband*, pp. 605-606.

¹⁸⁷ Elvert, *Geschichte*, I, 35-44, 72.

¹⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 73.

1770. In 1776 it had twenty-five members; in 1800 it had nine, of whom only five were active.¹⁸⁹

By 1800, then, these two societies were hardly more than names. In 1801 a new, private society was formed in Brünn, called by its founders the United Friends for the Promotion of Natural Science and Geography.¹⁹⁰ In 1803 the moribund Moravian Agricultural Society petitioned the throne for permission to unite itself with this new group. During the next year this request was granted but the throne specified that it was allowing not the unification of the Agricultural Society with the United Friends, but, rather, the merging of the Friends with the Agricultural Society.¹⁹¹ The merger was not accomplished for a few years but meanwhile the Agricultural Society began to show signs of new growth, with increased membership and widened interests.¹⁹² By 1811 it had twenty-eight active members.¹⁹³ In that year the Moravian and the Silesian Society were fused, and the new organization was named the Moravian-Silesian Society for the Promotion of Agriculture, Natural Science, and Geography.¹⁹⁴ The new organization flourished and became one of the most important agricultural societies of the *Vormärz*. Its membership during this period was between three and four hundred.¹⁹⁵

The first agricultural society in Bohemia had been called into existence by imperial order in 1767, but it did not begin its formal career until 1770 with eleven active and four corresponding members. It followed the usual pattern of all the contemporary agricultural societies in being a quasi-governmental agency. Then, in 1788 a new society was formed when the throne granted a charter which greatly extended the scope of the activities allowed the old organization. This new society was known as the Patriotic-Economic Society of the Kingdom of Bohemia. For more than a score of years thereafter the plans and programs of the Patriotic-Economic Society remained little more than the pious wishes of a handful of men. In the second decade of the nineteenth century, however, it entered

¹⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 74-77.

¹⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 94.

¹⁹¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 93-94.

¹⁹² *Ibid.*, p. 103.

¹⁹³ *Ibid.*, pp. 110-111.

¹⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 110.

¹⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 243, 397.

upon a new era of activity that made it a leading agricultural society of the Monarchy.¹⁹⁶

The first agricultural society in Lower Austria had been started by imperial decree during Maria Theresa's reign. Organized in 1773 it lasted a decade and then disappeared. A quarter of a century later Franz Ritter von Heintl began to agitate for the formation of a society, and in 1807 he was successful in getting the throne's approval of his plans. The organization he formed was called the Agricultural Society of Vienna. It held one general meeting in January, 1808, and then collapsed. In 1812 it was revived and entered upon a highly active and fruitful career.¹⁹⁷

The first agricultural society in Styria, formed in 1764 by imperial order, had functioned until 1783 and then disappeared.¹⁹⁸ In 1819 a new organization was established, called the Styrian Agricultural Society. A chief participant in its founding was Archduke John, the Emperor's brother, who served as president of the society from its first establishment in 1819 until his death in 1859.¹⁹⁹ Imperial approval had been given for the formation of the Society in February, 1819,²⁰⁰ and its first general meeting was at Graz in March. The society busied itself immediately with the formation of local affiliates and by 1820 had set up eight of them in various districts of the province. Total membership in that year of the parent society and the branches was over 600.²⁰¹

The origins of the first agricultural society in Carniola went back to 1693. In that year the *Academia Operosum* had been founded in Laibach. This institution had concerned itself with natural science and agriculture. In 1725 it was dissolved, to be succeeded after a while by a Society for Agriculture and the Useful Arts. This new organization led a quiet existence until 1767 when it was accorded imperial recognition as part of the

¹⁹⁶ *Centralblatt der Land- und Forstwirtschaft in Böhmen*, I (1850), 5-6.

¹⁹⁷ Österreichische Land- und Forstwirtschaftsgesellschaft in Wien, 1807-1932. *Festschrift* (Vienna, 1933), pp. 17-20.

¹⁹⁸ *Oekonomische Neuigkeiten*, XIX (1820), 133.

¹⁹⁹ Richter, "Das landwirtschaftliche Vereins- und Genossenschaftswesen," pp. 564-565.

²⁰⁰ *Grundverfassung, Bestätigungsurkunde, und erste Verhandlungen der k. k. Landwirtschafts-Gesellschaft in Steiermark* (Graz, 1819), I, 1-9.

²⁰¹ *Oekonomische Neuigkeiten*, XIX (1820), 132.

Theresan program of establishing agricultural societies. It continued in this role until 1787 when the state withdrew its support and the Society declined into nonexistence. In 1807 it was renewed for a brief spell as the Carniolan Estates Agricultural Society, but this body, too, disappeared in the confusion of the war and French invasion. Soon after the Hapsburgs had regained the province in 1814 plans were made for the founding of a Carniolan Agricultural Society but the organization was not started until 1820.²⁰²

In Hungary, the initial impetus for the organization of an agricultural society for the entire kingdom came from the Magyar arch-apostle of economic development, Count Stephen Széchenyi. While attending the Diet of 1825 he persuaded several other magnates to join him in forming a Jockey Club, on the English model, for the purpose of racing horses and improving the breed. In 1828 the club was transformed into a society of horse breeders. At about the same time a Domestic Animal Exhibition Society had been organized in Pest. The two societies merged in 1830, forming the Hungarian Animal Husbandry Society, and electing Széchenyi as president.

In 1832 this new body spent 14,400 florins for the purchase of a farm for its headquarters and spent an additional 3,600 florins for necessary alterations and improvements. Meanwhile, the Society had not confined its activities to animal husbandry but was interested in all branches of agriculture. It was a natural step, then, when on 16 June 1835, its membership voted to change its name to the Hungarian Agricultural Association.²⁰³ In 1840 the Jockey Club was re-established as a separate society. In 1844 Transylvanian magnates, under the leadership of Count Dominik Teleki, formed the Transylvanian Agricultural Society.²⁰⁴

²⁰² Richter, "Das landwirtschaftliche Vereins- und Genossenschaftswesen," pp. 580-581.

²⁰³ Z. von Szilassy, "Landwirtschaftliche Vereine," *Ungarns Landwirtschaft*, pp. 458-460.

In 1821 the *Oekonomische Neuigkeiten* carried a report of the formation of an economic society by a small group of landowners and estate managers of Tolna County, in southwest Hungary. The new body was expected to have a highly beneficial effect upon the agriculture of that county. *Oekonomische Neuigkeiten*, XXII (1821), 246.

²⁰⁴ Szilassy, "Landwirtschaftliche Vereine," pp. 459, 460.

The Agricultural Society of Tyrol and Vorarlberg, was founded in 1838. Archduke John played an important part in its organization.²⁰⁵ He was also a central figure in the forming of the Agricultural Society of Upper Austria in 1845. This body apparently met with immediate and eager approbation, for by the time of its first general meeting in the year of its foundation it had 1,334 members.²⁰⁶ Four affiliates of this Society had been established in the Salzburg district of the province. In 1848 these four received imperial permission to break off from the parent body and form an autonomous body called the Agricultural Society of Salzburg. By October 1848 the four original units of this new society had increased to eleven and total membership was 600.²⁰⁷

Official permission for the establishment of an agricultural society in Galicia had been given in 1825 but the organization did not come into existence until 1845.²⁰⁸ In that year a committee of the Galician Estates invited a group of important landowners and agriculturists to participate in its formation, and on 3 July 1845 they established the Galician Agricultural Society in Lemberg.²⁰⁹ A similar society had been formed in the Duchy of Cracow. In 1846 when the Duchy was absorbed into the Monarchy this organization, known as the Agricultural Society of Cracow, extended its activities, which had hitherto been limited to the boundaries of the Duchy, over a larger area.²¹⁰

Besides these general agricultural societies other organizations concerned with some single branch of agriculture were established in various provinces during the *Vormärz*. Thus, there were societies devoted to gardening, sheep raising, pomology, sericulture and viticulture.

Membership figures are available for some of the societies of the German-Slav provinces. In 1847 these figures were:

²⁰⁵ Richter, "Das landwirtschaftliche Vereins- und Genossenschaftswesen," p. 587.

²⁰⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 560-561.

²⁰⁷ Simon Berger (delegate of Salzburg Agric. Soc.), Protokoll der dritten Sitzung, 21 March 1849, *Verhandlungen des landwirtschaftlichen Congresses gehalten zu Wien im Monate März 1849* (Vienna, 1849), pp. 64-66.

²⁰⁸ *Oekonomische Neuigkeiten*, LXXV (1848), 333.

²⁰⁹ Richter, "Das landwirtschaftliche Vereins- und Genossenschaftswesen," p. 613.

²¹⁰ *Ibid.*

TABLE 2

MEMBERSHIP, AGRICULTURAL SOCIETIES, 1847 ²¹¹

Society	Membership
<i>Lower Austria</i>	
k. k. Landwirtschafts-Gesellschaft	1644
k. k. Gartenbau-Gesellschaft	189
<i>Styria</i>	
k. k. Landwirtschafts-Gesellschaft	3154
Verein zur Beförderung der Seidenzucht in Steiermark	82
<i>Carinthia and Carniola</i>	
k. k. Gesellschaft zur Beförderung der Landwirtschaft und Industrie (Carinthia)	633
k. k. Landwirtschafts-Gesellschaft	915
(Carniola)	
<i>Littoral</i>	
k. k. Landwirtschafts-Gesellschaft	494
(Görz)	
<i>Tyrol</i>	
k. k. Landwirtschafts-Gesellschaft	2011
für Tyrol und Vorarlberg	
<i>Bohemia</i>	
k. k. patriotisch-ökonomische Gesellschaft	335
Schafzüchter-Verein	175
Pomologischer Verein	139
Gartenbau-Gesellschaft	459
<i>Moravia-Silesia</i>	
k. k. mährisch-schlesische Gesellschaft zur Beförderung des Ackerbaues, der Natur- und Landeskunde	361
Mährisch-schlesischer pomologisch-önologischer Verein zur Verbreitung und Veredlung der Obstbaumzucht und des Weinbaues	250

The activities of these societies extended into every branch of agriculture that was found in the Monarchy. It is possible here to give only a small sampling of the work they did. Practically all of them published general agricultural journals, and also books and monographs dealing with some special subject or containing the prize-winning essay in contests sponsored by the society. The contents of their journals and occasional publications were marked by the desire to promote agriculture in order to derive greater profit from it. They were replete with reports of new products or new species of old ones, improved cattle breeds, new implements or machines, fertilizers, veterinary medicine, and so on, through the gamut of agricultural

²¹¹ T. S., 1847, part II, table 13, pp. 1-2.

topics and materials. Articles that had appeared in other journals and which gave information that was considered of value to members were reprinted in the society's own journal. The societies kept in touch with one another, exchanging information, and sending representatives to one another's meetings.

Prize essay contests were a feature of their work that had persisted from the days of the Theresian agricultural societies. The prizes offered were medals and, often, cash awards. The subjects on which the contestants had to write dealt with some practical aspect of the agriculture of the province whose society was holding the competition. The Moravian-Silesian Society had an endowment fund established through the benefaction of one of its members, from which it gave awards for prize-winning essays of 120 florins or a gold medal for first place and a silver medal for second place.²¹² A partial list of winners of the contests sponsored by this Society showed that between 1830 and 1847 seven first and seven second prizes had been awarded. In addition, in 1840, a special contest, with a 1,000 florin first prize, was announced to celebrate the impending meeting of German agriculturists and foresters at Brünn. The subject announced was the progress of agriculture from 1740 to 1840. None of the entries were judged worthy of the award and the contest was announced again in 1845. Finally, in 1850 it was won by Professor C. Fraas of Munich.²¹³

Cattle shows were held under the auspices of the various societies. The Agricultural Society of Vienna, which held its first show in 1822, in 1829 conducted seventeen shows in various parts of Lower Austria, awarding prizes to winning entrants. It established a fund to buy prize cattle that were shown, in order to use them for breeding, the purchased animals being distributed by the Society among cattle raisers. In 1822-1824 the sheep flocks of Lower Austria were hit by an epidemic of the staggers and the Society offered a prize of 500 ducats for the best way to combat the disease.²¹⁴

Several of the societies played an important part in the de-

²¹² Elvert, *Geschichte*, I, 251-252.

²¹³ *Mittheilungen der k. k. mähr.-schles. Gesellschaft zur Beförderung des Ackerbaues*, etc., XXXVI (1856), 297-298.

²¹⁴ Richter, "Das landwirtschaftliche Vereins- und Genossenschaftswesen," pp. 534, 535.

vèlopmènt of the beet sugar industry in the Monarchy. In 1812, during the first period of beet sugar production, the Patriotic-Economic Society of Bohemia had sent Professor Franz Schmidt to Prussian Silesia to study the theory and practice of beet sugar manufacture with F. C. Achard, the world's outstanding authority. The next year the Society established a school in which instruction in the making of the sugar was given.²¹⁵

In 1830 the Vienna Agricultural Society set aside 1,200 florins for the study of beet sugar manufacture and sent Dr. Julius Krause²¹⁶ to France and Germany to study the industry in those lands. Upon his return 315 *Centner* of sugar beet seeds were imported from France and planted for experimental purposes on the Colloredo-Mansfeld estate at Staatz. In 1834 the Society published the results of Krause's investigations in a book entitled *Darstellung der Fabrikation des Zuckers aus Runkelrüben in ihrem gesamten Umfange*.²¹⁷

The Bohemian Patriotic-Economic Society planted sugar beet seeds in 1831 in the garden of the Pomological Association to supply Bohemian landowners with a good grade of seed. The Society also issued publications on the growing and processing of sugar beets and sought to keep Bohemian producers abreast of the latest developments in the industry.²¹⁸

The Styrian Society, determined to introduce sugar beet production into that province, commissioned Dr. F. X. Hlubek, professor of Agriculture at the Lyceum at Laibach, to study beet sugar manufacture and give instruction in it. In November, 1836, the Society announced the initiation of a program to educate the housewife in making beet sugar for her own needs. A two-day course would show the student how to process the beet for syrup and sugar and utilize the waste for vinegar, brandy, and cattle fodder. The man selected to give the instruction was sent by the Society to Pest to study the method of domestic beet sugar production that had been developed there.²¹⁹

The principal educational activity of the societies was through

²¹⁵ Slokar, p. 599.

²¹⁶ See above, p. 105.

²¹⁷ Österreichische Land- und Forstwirtschaftsgesellschaft in Wien, 1807-1932. *Festschrift*, pp. 24-25; Richter, "Das landwirtschaftliche Vereins- und Genossenschaftswesen," p. 534.

²¹⁸ Slokar, p. 599.

²¹⁹ Proskowetz, "Rübenzuckerfabrikation," pp. 614-615.

the media of their publications. The journals and books they published were directed at the landowning class and estate managers, but they did not neglect peasant education. Annual farm calendars containing elementary agricultural treatises and data were issued by the societies and sold cheaply to the peasants of the province, the Hungarian Agricultural Society printing 60,000 copies of theirs and selling them at 6 *kreuzer* each.²²⁰ The Moravian-Silesian Society had started putting out its annual peasant calendar in 1814. Both a German and a Czech calendar were issued.²²¹ The Styrian Society offered a prize of 200 florins for the best textbook on agriculture for use by peasant school children of that province, and offered an additional 100 florins for the best translation of the prize winner into Slovenian.²²² The Moravian-Silesian Society announced a peasant school textbook contest in 1848 with 500 florins and a gold medal for the winner.²²³

The alliance between the societies and formal agricultural education was close. The Agricultural Society in Cracow took a leading role in establishing an agricultural school at Czer-nichor.²²⁴ The statutes of the Moravian-Silesian Society gave as a special duty of the organization the training of estate managers.²²⁵ Both the Hungarian and Vienna societies took formal action urging the government to establish agricultural schools or add instruction in agriculture to existing institutions.²²⁶ Scholarly research was encouraged as when the Vienna Society commissioned Johann Burger to study and classify the grapes of the Monarchy.²²⁷ Investigators were sent to other

²²⁰ J. N. von Török (secretary, Hungarian Agric. Soc.), speech at 5th General Session, 19 Sept. 1846, *Ämtlicher Bericht über die X. Versammlung deutscher Land- und Forstwirthe zu Gratz in September 1846* (Graz, 1847), pp. 216-217.

²²¹ Elvert, *Geschichte*, I, 117. The titles of these peasant calendars from 1814 on are listed in *ibid.*, pp. 217-226.

²²² *Verhandlungen und Aufsätze* (Styrian Agricultural Society), new series, VI (1834), 34.

²²³ *Mittheilungen* (Moravia-Silesia Ag. Soc.), XXVI (1856), 298.

²²⁴ Richter, "Das landwirtschaftliche Vereins- und Genossenschaftswesen," p. 613.

²²⁵ Article 3, sect. 6, *Statuten der kaiserlich-königlichen mährisch-schlesischen Gesellschaft zur Beförderung des Ackerbaues, der Natur- und Landeskunde* (Brünn, 1815), p. 3.

²²⁶ Török in *Ämtlicher Bericht*, p. 217; Bibl, *Stände*, pp. 289-290.

²²⁷ Österreichischen Land- und Forstwirtschaftsgesellschaft in Wien, 1807-1932. *Festschrift*, p. 24.

provinces and other countries to study and report on methods and crops they observed. Libraries were built up, the Bohemian Patriotic-Economic Society having 4,000 volumes in its collections in 1845.²²⁸ Museums in which, among other things, models of new machinery and implements were displayed, were a frequent adjunct of the societies.

Probably the single most important activity of the societies was the continuous experimentation they sponsored either on the experimental farms they all had or on the estates of their members. Trials of new implements were held and comparative tests were conducted between old and new tools or machines to determine which was the most efficient. New crops were planted and new methods used to grow old ones, and the yields obtained were checked and compared. If a crop was found that was well suited for local conditions seeds were distributed. Tests were run on fertilizers, remedies were sought for cattle diseases, and so on.

The catholic interest of the societies in agriculture and the extent of their activities in experimentation, observation, and reporting is well illustrated by the volume published in 1840 by the Styrian Agricultural Society. Entitled *Resultate der Wirksamkeit der k. k. Landwirthschafts-Gesellschaft in Steiermark, vom Jahre 1829-1839*, it was a 158-page digest, compiled by Professor Hlubek, of the work of the Society and its members in the decade 1829-1839, as reported in the journal of the Society. Hlubek summed up these reports and findings in brief paragraphs, or even single sentences, giving volume and page reference to the original article. Often a paragraph was a digest of several articles. An idea of the variety of the work done is gained from the divisions of the book in which the summaries were grouped, as follows: fertilizers, agricultural implements and machines, cereals, forage crops, industrial crops, horse breeding, cattle raising, animal diseases, sheep herding, goat raising, bee keeping, sericulture, forestry, pomology and gardening, viticulture, agricultural industries, and agricultural architecture.

In the eighteenth century provincial agricultural societies were creations of the state, never became important, and

²²⁸ Schnabel, p. 235.

withered when state support was withdrawn. With the appearance of the new interest of noble landowners in profitable agricultural production, agricultural societies were revived or organized anew by the initiative of noble landowners acting as private individuals and they entered upon a period of extreme activity. By 1848 there were fourteen provincial societies dealing with general agriculture, and many specialized societies. The aim of these organizations was the promotion of agriculture. In their pursuit of this end they engaged in a multitude of activities, which included the publishing of journals, farm calendars and books, awarding prizes for essays on agricultural subjects, holding cattle shows, sponsoring agricultural education, and engaging in or sponsoring constant experimentation in all aspects of agricultural activity in order to determine the most efficient, and hence most profitable, methods of farming.

* * * *

The awareness of noble landowners in every part of the Monarchy of the opportunities for profitable agricultural production afforded by the growth during the *Vormärz* of population, urban centers, industry, and, especially, transportation, was clearly expressed by their activities. Nobles raised new products for which there was a ready and profitable sale, notably wool, sugar beets, and potatoes. They invested capital in improving the blood lines of their flocks and in building factories to process the beets and potatoes they grew on their estates. They drained swamps and ponds and controlled streams so that they could increase the productive area of their holdings. They attempted to establish sources of agricultural credit. They established schools to train managers for their estates. Their coming together to form societies to promote agriculture and the intensive activities of these new organizations was especially striking evidence of their desire to increase the return they received from their lands.

CHAPTER IV

NOBLE LANDOWNERS AND THE METHODS OF FARMING IN THE NORTHWEST ZONE

The efforts of noble landowners to apply new and more efficient techniques of production to their holdings were handicapped by the legal restrictions on the consolidation of land, the restraining hand of tradition, the inertia of the central government, the slothful nature of *Robot* work, and the conservatism and suspicion of the peasant. Yet the beginnings of the "agricultural revolution" (that is, the planting of root crops and legumes) in Austria are to be found during the years of the *Vormärz*, when agriculturists of the Monarchy began to cultivate root crops and legumes on an important scale, thereby increasing greatly the productivity of their land. This was done principally within the framework of the existing three-field system, that is, these new crops were grown on what had hitherto been the fallow field; but there were also cultivators who abandoned the traditional field system and introduced crop rotation. Improved animal husbandry and better farm tools and machines were concomitants of this development.

To understand and evaluate these changes a description of the agricultural economy in which they were happening must be presented. This description is limited here to one area, the Northwest zone of agricultural production.¹ This zone occupied a leading position in sheep herding, in the cultivation and processing of sugar beets and potatoes, and in agricultural education and organizations. It was, in proportion to its size, the outstanding agricultural area of the Monarchy, viewed from

¹ The description given in this chapter of the agriculture of the Northwest zone is limited to Bohemia and Moravia-Silesia. Those parts of Upper Austria and Lower Austria which were parts of the zone have been excluded. The source materials from which this description is drawn are on a provincial basis so that it would be extremely difficult, if not impossible, to separate the data concerning these districts of Upper and Lower Austria from the data on the rest of the two provinces of which they were parts. Their exclusion has no significant effect on this survey, since they formed less than 10 per cent of the total area of the Northwest zone and had only 6.4 per cent of its population. *T. S.*, 1846, part I, table 2, p. 1; part II, table 15, p. 7; table 16, p. 7.

the share of the total production of the Monarchy that it contributed, and from the efforts of its landowners to improve and increase the fruits of their fields and barns.

GEOGRAPHY OF THE ZONE

The Northwest zone was (with the exception of Lombardy-Venetia) the most densely populated region of the Monarchy. In 1846 official government statistics reported that there were 4,866 people per austrian square mile in the zone (Bohemia 4,877; Moravia-Silesia 4,815), while population density for the Monarchy as a whole was 3,229 per austrian square mile. The population of the two provinces in 1846 was 6,700,241 (Bohemia 4,409,792; Moravia-Silesia 2,290,449). This was 17.9 per cent of the Monarchy's estimated population.² The combined area of Bohemia and Moravia-Silesia was 1,379.9 austrian square miles (Bohemia 904.2; Moravia-Silesia 475.7) which was 11.9 per cent of the total area of the Monarchy.³

The mountain chains that enclosed the Northwest zone formed the rim of the Bohemian and Moravian basins. The rim was broken only to the south and southeast where the Moravian lowland opened into the river valleys of the March and the Danube. The mountains at the southern end of Bohemia also enclosed the *Mühlkreis* of Upper Austria (the district north of the Danube), and the *Viertel ober dem Manhartsberg* of Lower Austria (the northeast quarter of that province).⁴ Most of the mountains that ringed the zone were of medium elevation and were heavily forested.⁵

Bohemia and most of Moravia-Silesia belonged to the Bohemian Massif. The easternmost part of Moravia-Silesia, separated from the rest of the province by the March-Oder corridor, was part of the Carpathian mountain system. The Moldau-Elbe river system, flowing northward, drained 94.2 per cent of Bohemia, while 86.3 per cent of Moravia sloped southward to the Danube and was drained by the March river system. The

² *Ibid.*, part I, table 2, p. 1.

³ *Ibid.*, table 1, p. 4.

⁴ Strakosch, pp. 54-55.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 56.

rest of Moravia and all of Austrian Silesia tilted to the north and were drained by the Oder.⁶

Inner Bohemia was made up of a series of plateaus or terraces. The southern plateau, with an average elevation of 300 m., stretched to the southeast into Lower Austria. To the north was the mid-Bohemian plateau, lower in average elevation and, as the Bohemian-Moravian Highlands, reaching deep into Moravia. The northern plateau, still lower in average elevation, sank down to the fruitful river lowlands of the Eger and the Elbe. North of these lowlands was the fertile Saazer Plain. To the east of the Elbe were the Dauba and Gitscha plateaus.⁷

Inner Moravia, too, was a highland, between 300 m. and 500 m. in elevation. Descending from the Bohemian-Moravian Highlands at the Bohemian border was the Moravian Plateau, which sank gradually to the southeast into the lowlands of the March River, the most fertile part of the province.⁸

The zone had a mid-European climate that was a transition from the oceanic climate of the coastal lands to the continental climate of Eastern Europe. Variations in local climates and in rainfall were plentiful, depending upon elevation. In the mountain rim the weather was raw, frost-free months relatively few, the growing season short, and rainfall heavy. The average annual temperature in the Riesengebirge, the northern and coldest mountain frontier, was 0.9°C. at 1400 m., going from -7.3°C. in January to + 10.7°C. in July. Some of the mountain regions got as much as 120-150 cm. of annual rainfall, while in others the average was 90-130 cm.⁹

Inside the mountain barrier the climate was milder and the rainfall less heavy.¹⁰ The difference in harvest time between the mountains and the lowland was as much as six weeks.¹¹

⁶ B. Horak, ed., *Die Tschechoslovakische Republik. Jahrbuch 1928* (Prague, 1928), p. 5.

⁷ J. E. Födisch, *Heimatkunde* (Leipzig and Prague, 1880), pp. 1-4.

⁸ Bauer, *Landwirtschaft*, pp. 7-8.

⁹ Strakosch, pp. 52-53, 58-59; J. Adamec, "Die Landwirtschaft in Mähren," *G. L. F., Supplementband*, pt. i, 173.

¹⁰ Landwirtschaftlichen Central Comité der allgemeinen Landesausstellung in Prag 1891, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Landescultur des Königreiches Böhmen im Jahrhunderte 1791-1891* (Prague, 1891), pp. 8, 9-10; Bauer, *Landwirtschaft*, p. 8.

¹¹ Bauer, *Landwirtschaft*, p. 8.

The average temperature in the largest part of Bohemia was between $+6^{\circ}\text{C.}$ to $+8^{\circ}\text{C.}$, ranging from -3°C. to -4°C. in January to $+16^{\circ}\text{C.}$ to $+18^{\circ}\text{C.}$ in July. The vegetation period in the lowest and warmest areas lasted over five months, from late April into October, and was correspondingly less as elevation increased and average annual temperature decreased.¹²

The rainfall of the zone was distributed through the year in a manner that worked very favorably for agriculture, although the annual average rainfall was only about 64 cm. Approximately two thirds of this yearly rainfall fell from April to the end of August, precisely when the fields needed it the most. Then, starting in September, it slackened, and the dry, sunny days hastened the ripening and harvesting of the crops.¹³ The amount of rain varied among regions of the zone. In western and central Bohemia the annual average was between 50 and 60 cm. In eastern Bohemia it increased to 60-70 cm.¹⁴ In the low-lying plains of southern Moravia it was as little as 35 cm.¹⁵

Contemporary observers were struck by the intensiveness of agricultural production in the Northwest zone, especially in Moravia.¹⁶ The contrast between this zone and the rest of the Monarchy can be seen in some detail in the official government statistics. Of the total area of Bohemia and Moravia-Silesia 95.5 per cent was listed as productive in 1845. The comparable figure for the Monarchy was 84.6 per cent.¹⁷ The productive area was divided as follows:

¹² Landwirtschaftlichen Central Comité, pp. 8-9.

¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 10; Strakosch, p. 53; Adamec, "Die Landwirtschaft in Mähren," p. 173.

¹⁴ Landwirtschaftlichen Central Comité, pp. 9-10.

¹⁵ Adamec, "Die Landwirtschaft in Mähren," p. 173.

¹⁶ A. P. Thaer, report of a trip in Austria, *Möglichsche Annalen der Landwirtschaft*, II (1817), 470; W. Jacob, *Report on the trade in foreign corn and on the agriculture of the north of Europe* (London, 1826), p. 108; Tegoborski, I, 131. Jacob said of Moravia that "with the exception of some districts of the Netherlands scarcely any part of the Continent is so well cultivated."

¹⁷ T. S., 1845, part I, table 2, p. 1; part II, table 1, p. 1.

TABLE 3

PRODUCTIVE AREA, NORTHWEST ZONE AND MONARCHY, 1845 ¹⁸
(in lower austrian yokes)

	Bohemia & Moravia-Silesia	Monarchy	% of Total Prod. Area	
			Boh. & Mor.-Sil.	Monarchy
Arable.....	6,649,039	36,833,790	50.5	37.6
Vineyard.....	29,516	1,760,281	.2	1.8
Meadows & Gardens...	1,403,507	11,592,875	10.6	11.8
Pasture.....	1,146,283	12,379,643	8.7	12.6
Forests.....	3,959,300	35,238,009	30.0	36.0
Other *.....		228,036	...	.2
Total.....	13,187,645	98,032,634	100.0	100.0

* Olive, mulberry, chestnut groves, rice fields.

This table shows that more than half of all the productive land in the zone was tilled, while for the Monarchy as a whole not much more than a third of the productive land was so utilized. In no other region of the Monarchy was the ratio between arable and total productive area so high. The intensiveness of agriculture in the Northwest zone compared with the rest of the Monarchy is also indicated by the much smaller proportion in Bohemia and Moravia-Silesia of pasture to total productive area.

TECHNIQUES OF CULTIVATION

I have found numerical data as to the extent to which holdings were parcelled in the Northwest zone during the *Vormärz* for only one district of Moravia. This was the Iglau *Kreis*, the smallest of Moravia's six districts. This district was in the southwestern corner of the province, bordering on Bohemia. The cadastral survey completed in 1834 showed that there were 491,819 yokes in the district, divided into 595,870 parcels.¹⁹ The average size of the individual parcels was, therefore, about .83 yokes (slightly more than an acre). The average size of the parcels on individual estates ranged from almost .5 yokes on the estate of Budischau ²⁰ to approximately 1.4 yokes on the estate of Neustadt.²¹

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, part II, table 1, p. 1.

¹⁹ G. Wolny, *Die Markgrafschaft Mähren, topographisch, statistisch und historisch geschildert* (6 vols. in 7, Brünn, 1835-1842), VI, iv.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 116.

²¹ *Ibid.*, p. 305.

It seems certain, however, on the basis of contemporary statements and of studies made in later years, that the parcelling of peasant holdings in all parts of the zone was general and extreme. At a meeting of the Moravian-Silesian Agricultural Society in 1832, a speaker asserted that the fields of the peasants in the Moravian plainland were extremely parcelled and scattered, while peasant farms in the mountains were often consolidated.²² On the other hand, in 1831 the government office of the Hradisch district of Moravia reported that the peasant holdings in the mountainous parts of that district were cut into extremely small parcels.²³ To Adamec, writing in 1898, the impress of the land division of the pre-emancipation period was still plainly to be seen in Moravia. The farms of the peasant proprietors at the end of the nineteenth century were usually divided into a great number of small parcels. Many farms were in 40, 50 and even more pieces, with an average size of not much more than one-quarter hectare. Of the mountain areas, however, he reported that the peasant farms had long been consolidated.²⁴ In Bohemia, according to Schiff in 1898, there were farms of eight to twenty yokes, divided up into from six to thirty scattered parcels, and communities in which, in a total holding of 1,600 yokes, there were 6,000 parcels with 30 to 50 parcels to each landholder.²⁵

A survey made by the government in the 1870's showed that in Bohemia 75.4 per cent of all holdings were completely scattered, 0.4 per cent were partially scattered, and 24.2 per cent were consolidated. In Moravia-Silesia 72.4 per cent of all holdings were completely scattered, 3.4 per cent were partially scattered, and 24.2 per cent were consolidated.²⁶

Consolidation had occurred mainly on the demesne lands of the lord.²⁷ There is evidence, however, that demesne land, too, was parcelled and scattered at times. Some of the demesne

²² Elvert, *Geschichte*, I, 381.

²³ "Aus dem Berichte des Hradischer Kreisamtes vom 12 April 1831," p. 86.

²⁴ Adamec, "Die Landwirtschaft in Mähren," pp. 175, 176-177.

²⁵ Schiff, *Agararpolitik*, I, 329.

²⁶ K. k. Ackerbau Ministeriums, *Bericht über die Thätigkeit des k. k. Ackerbau-Ministeriums in der Zeit vom. 1. Jänner 1877 bis 31. December 1880* (Vienna, 1881), pp. 322-323.

²⁷ Bauer, *Landwirtschaft*, p. 103; Adamec, "Die Landwirtschaft Mährens," p. 175.

land of the Thun-Hohenstein estate of Teschen, in Bohemia, was parcelled among peasant holdings.²⁸ Up until 1811 lord and peasant land lay intermingled in the fields of Lobositz, a Schwarzenburg estate in Bohemia. In that year a land survey was made, and by exchange and purchase the demesne was consolidated, thus removing it from the system of compulsory tillage (*Flurzwang*) which had impeded the lord's efforts at agricultural improvement and innovation.²⁹ At about this time Count von Mittrowsky was carrying out a similar operation on his estate of Deutsch-Knönitz in Moravia (later purchased by Freiherr Emmanuel von Bartenstein).³⁰ During the seventeenth and the first half of the eighteenth centuries before the appropriation of peasant land by the lord (*Bauernlegen*) was made illegal, landlords had taken over peasant holdings that were scattered in as many as 40 parcels. In the years that followed, these parcels now part of the demesne, remained scattered and under the system of compulsory tillage.³¹

Beginning in 1769 the law forbade further extension of the demesne at the expense of peasant land.³² As a result, the proportion of demesne land remained constant throughout the succeeding years (allowing for minor variations caused, in the main, by new land taken under cultivation) until the abolition of this restriction near the end of the *Vormärz*. This conclusion is borne out by comparing the ratio of demesne land to total productive area in Bohemia, calculated from the land cadastre made during the reign of Emperor Joseph II³³ and the partial data on the cadastre of 1839 and its revisions given by Professor Schnabel.³⁴

In view of the constancy of these proportions over almost half a century, and in order to estimate the extent of demesne

²⁸ A. E. von Komers, *Skizzen über die Verwaltungs-Organisation von Grossgrundbesitz-Complexen in Böhmen* (Prague, 1873), p. 14.

²⁹ W. Medinger, *Wirtschaftsgeschichte der Domäne Lobositz* (Vienna, 1903), pp. 74-75.

³⁰ *Oekonomische Neuigkeiten*, XXVI (1823), 620.

³¹ *Mittheilungen der k. k. mähr.-schles. Gesellschaft zur Beförderung des Ackerbaues*, etc., XLIII (1863), 305.

³² Grünberg, *Bauernbefreiung*, I, 253.

³³ Summarized in J. von Roschmann-Hörburg, "Bericht über die Tätigkeit des statistischen Seminars an der k. k. Universität Wiens im Wintersemester 1883/1884," *Statistische Monatschrift*, X (1884), 460-461.

³⁴ Schnabel, pp. 68, 125, 190.

TABLE 4
RATIO OF DEMESNE TO TOTAL PRODUCTIVE LAND, BOHEMIA

	Josephine cadastre	1839 cadastre
Meadows	34.4	29.7
Pastures	37.4	32.1
Forests	76.2	77.1
All productive land.....	42.0	42.6

land in the Northwest zone during the *Vormärz*, I have computed from the Josephine cadastre the ratios of demesne to total productive land for all types of land in Bohemia, Moravia and Silesia. These ratios (shown in the last column of the following Table 5) have been applied to the figures given in Table 3 of the productive land in the Northwest zone in 1845.

TABLE 5
ESTIMATE, DEMESNE LAND, NORTHWEST ZONE
(in thousands of yokes)

	Demesne	All Productive Land	Ratio, Demesne to All Productive Land, Josephine cadastre
Arable	1,343	6,649	20.2
Vineyard	.2	30	.67
Meadows and Gardens.....	439	1,403	31.3
Pasture	397	1,146	34.7
Forests.....	3,151	3,959	79.6
Total	5,330.2	13,187	40.4

Some of the estates of the zone were of vast size. The largest was Krumau, in Bohemia, owned by the Schwarzenbergs (it had been in their family for almost 600 years). Its area was 216,235 yokes, or 21.6 austrian square miles.⁸⁶ A second Schwarzenberg estate, Wittingau, also in Bohemia, covered more than 14½ austrian square miles.⁸⁶ Other great estates in Bohemia were Pardubitz, owned by the throne, with an area of 12½ austrian square miles,⁸⁷ Leitomischel, the property of the

⁸⁶ Sommer, IX, 209, 212.

⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 67.

⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, V, 42.

Waldstein-Wartenburg family, which covered an area of almost 12 austrian square miles,³⁸ and Chotieschau with an area of $4\frac{2}{3}$ austrian square miles, bought from the state in 1822 by Prince von Thurn und Taxis.³⁹ The largest estate in Moravia was Hochwald, the dotation of the Archbishop of Olmütz. It was nine austrian square miles in area.⁴⁰ The imperial estate of Göding, covering nearly $5\frac{3}{16}$ austrian square miles,⁴¹ was next largest, while Kunstatt, the property of Baron Honrichs, and Seelowitz, owned by Archduke Karl, were each four austrian square miles in size.⁴²

The size of the peasant holdings of the Northwest zone varied not only from region to region of the zone but even within the individual estate. Generally, the full holding was largest in the low lands and decreased in size in the foothills and mountains. In Bohemia and Moravia, as a rule, the full peasant holding in the low lands was around 30 yokes, in the foothills around 25 yokes, and in the mountains 20 yokes. In addition, the peasant had rights in wood, meadow and pasture. Three quarter, half, and quarter holdings were in proportion to the size of the full holding of the various areas.⁴³ More than 75 per cent of all peasant holdings in the zone, according to Tebeldi writing in 1847, were quarter holdings.⁴⁴ Far outnumbering the peasants with holdings were the cotters and landless peasants. In the 1840's, in Moravia, the cadastral survey revealed that of the 207,861 peasant holdings, 132,493 were smaller than quarter holdings.⁴⁵

The usual method of tillage on both lord and peasant acreage of the zone was the three-field system.⁴⁶ In this system, in its pure form, there was a clear-cut and permanent distinction between the arable and the meadow and the pasture. The

³⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 168.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, VI, 105.

⁴⁰ Wolny, I, 141.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, II, pt. i, 362.

⁴² *Ibid.*, pt. ii, 76, 435.

⁴³ Grünberg, *Bauernbefreiung*, I, 51.

⁴⁴ Tebeldi, *Geldangelegenheiten*, p. 201.

⁴⁵ Bauer, *Landwirtschaft*, pp. 99-100.

⁴⁶ *Oekonomische Neuigkeiten*, XIX (1820), Beilage no. 2, p. 13; F. A. Brauner, *Böhmische Bauernzustände im Interesse der Landescultur und des Nationalwohlstandes* (Vienna, 1847), p. 54; A. P. Thaer, pp. 492-493; Schnabel, p. 83.

greatest part of the productive land (excluding forests) was arable and was used exclusively for growing crops intended solely for human consumption. Much smaller parts were set aside as meadow for raising forage for animals, and as pasture.⁴⁷ The arable was divided into three parts, with one part designated as the winter field, one the summer field, and one the fallow. Each part or field was put through a three-year course, that is, it served as a winter field, then summer field, then lay fallow, then winter field again, and so on through the cycle.⁴⁸ The winter field was sown with rye or wheat, the summer field with oats or barley. Rye was the favored winter grain of the zone. More than three times as much land was put into rye annually as was put into wheat.⁴⁹ The system did not allow the keeping of much cattle since it failed to provide the forage needed for their maintenance over the winter. Manure production was, therefore, inadequate, and, in addition, much was lost in the common since the cattle were not stall fed. In the pure three-field system with bare fallow the fields were inadequately manured, if they were manured at all.⁵⁰

The barren fallow was maintained because it provided a way to restore the land and prepare it for the next crop. Experience had taught that if this was not done crop yield would be insufficient to meet needs. By plowing, tilling, but not sowing a field its soil was freed of weeds and given a chance to recuperate.

But barren fallows could be partly or entirely dispensed with by planting the fallow field in tuberous or leguminous plants. The root crops, planted in rows, were cultivated during the growing season so that the land could be rid of the weeds and still produce a crop. These crops supplied human foodstuffs and raw materials for agricultural industries (for example, potatoes, sugar beets). They could also be used for animal

⁴⁷ A. D. Thaer, *The principles of agriculture*, transl. from the German by W. Shaw and C. W. Johnson (2 vols., London, 1844), I, 190-191, 192.

⁴⁸ R. André, *Darstellung der vorzüglichsten landwirtschaftlichen Verhältnisse* (5th ed., Prague, 1846), p. 160; J. Burger, *Lehrbuch der Landwirtschaft* (2 vols., 3rd ed., Vienna, 1838), II, 388; *Oekonomische Neuigkeiten*, XXIV (1822), 673-674.

⁴⁹ Schnabel, p. 76; G. R. Gleig, *Germany, Bohemia and Hungary visited in 1837* (3 vols., London, 1839), II, 232; Landwirtschaftlichen Central Comité, p. 131.

⁵⁰ Cf. André, p. 161; Schnabel, pp. 160-161.

fodder, either in their raw state or as the by-product of agricultural industries. This allowed the farmer to stall-feed his cattle. It also enabled him to keep more cattle over the winter because of the increase in his forage supply. Stall feeding meant that the manure was no longer lost in the pasture, and the increased number of cattle resulted in increased manure production. The manure could then be put on the fields with resulting beneficial effects on crop yield. "The root crops fattened the beasts and the beasts fattened the land" (Clapham). The legumes provided the nitrates the soil needed and at the same time served to supply fodder for the cattle.

To an increasing extent during the *Vormärz* these types of plants were being introduced into the three-field system on the fallow field. The most usual fallow crops that were raised were potatoes, sugar beets and clover. The introduction and rise to importance of potato and sugar beet culture in the Monarchy's agricultural economy has been discussed in Chapter III. As was seen there, both these crops first assumed basic importance in Austria during the years of the *Vormärz* and a major part of this development took place in the Northwest zone.

Clover was the most important of the legumes that were raised. It was grown as early as 1784 on the Schwarzenberg estate of Lobositz, in Bohemia, and met with such success that by 1787 it had been introduced on all the Schwarzenberg holdings. Until 1789 Lobositz imported its seed from a Schwarzenberg estate in Styria but from that year on enough seed was produced at Lobositz to meet all local needs and to provide neighboring estates.⁵¹ Elsewhere in the zone it seems to have been raised on a minor scale at the turn of the century. Its advance was slow. By the 1820's, however, progress in its adoption was reported, and with the increasing cultivation of the fallow its use in the Northwest zone increased.⁵²

Among the fallow crops of lesser importance rape was outstanding. By 1790 this plant was well known in Bohemia. Its cultivation spread, promoted by the use of seed drills and cultivators, and stimulated by the invention of an improved

⁵¹ Medinger, *Lobositz*, pp. 69, 70.

⁵² F. Kallus, *Die Landwirtschaft in unteren Egerland (Nord-Böhmen)* (Breslau, 1898), p. 97; Landwirtschaftlichen Central Comité, p. 102; Bauer, *Landwirtschaft*, p. 116.

lamp that used rape oil, and by the growing knowledge of the value of oil cakes for live-stock feeding.⁵³

The introduction and development of fallow crops was viewed by contemporaries as the index to the agricultural progress of the Northwest zone. Franz Diebl, one of the Monarchy's outstanding agriculturalists, professor of agriculture at Brünn, and author of many monographs on agricultural subjects,⁵⁴ wrote in 1852 that when he entered upon his life's work fifty years before, agriculture (in Moravia) was at its lowest stage, with barren fallow everywhere and no forage culture. In the years since then, barren fallow had given way to green fallow, grasses and root crops had been introduced, and animal husbandry had benefited from all this.⁵⁵ Franz Gezek von Rittersfeld, an estate manager in Moravia, also characterized the agriculture of around 1800 as being at a very low level compared with the end of the *Vormärz*, and viewed the introduction and adoption of fallow crops as an evidence of the great progress that had been made.⁵⁶ Schnabel wrote in 1846 that the advances in cultivation "had led above all to the happy result" not only of increasing Bohemia's grain production but also of having a large area given over to raising large amounts of root crops, industrial crops, and forage.⁵⁷

The planting of fallow crops was most common on demesne land.⁵⁸ Landlord interest in the raising of these crops, as reflected in contemporary agricultural publications, was high. Professor Diebl pointed out, with respect to the introduction of these new products, that the landlord had fewer handicaps to struggle with than had the peasant farmer. The latter usually lacked the necessary knowledge and capital, and, further, was restrained by indolence, prejudice and tradition.⁵⁹

⁵³ Landwirtschaftlichen Central Comité, pp. 146-147.

⁵⁴ Biographical sketch and bibliography in Elvert, *Geschichte*, II, 280-289.

⁵⁵ *Mittheilungen* (Mor.-Sil. Agricultural Soc.), XXXII (1852), 81-82.

⁵⁶ Quoted in Elvert, *Geschichte*, I, 393-394.

⁵⁷ Schnabel, p. 83.

⁵⁸ Cf. Sommer, I, 40, 66; XI, 316, 317; XIV, 133; *Oekonomische Neuigkeiten*, XXVIII (1824), 514.

⁵⁹ *Mittheilungen* (Mor.-Sil. Agricultural Society), XXXII (1852), 82. An exception to this was the *Kubländchen*, a fertile valley of the upper Oder in northeastern Moravia, where much cattle was raised. Here, the peasants raised clover, fertilizing their fields with gypsum. Wolny, I, xliv.

Other old methods of cultivation were used to a slight extent in mountainous parts of the Northwest zone. First, there was field grass husbandry, called *Egartenwirtschaft* in Austria and Southern Germany. This method of cultivation was closely linked with animal husbandry and was the most common type of tillage in the Alpine zone of the Monarchy. Its essence was rotation between arable and meadow. The details of the system varied with local conditions. Generally, one half of the arable was planted in grain and the other half in grass, for three or four years, then the halves were rotated.⁶⁰ A more extensive variation of this system was the rotation between arable and pasture land. Such fields were known as *Trischfelder* or *Drieschfelder*.⁶¹

Another method used was the burning of a forested area, spreading the ashes as fertilizer, and growing a grain crop on the land for one or two years. Then it was allowed to go to grass until the brush grew so high that it could no longer be used for pasture, whereupon it was burned over again.⁶²

The area on which these methods were employed was very small. In Bohemia in the 1840's *Egartenwirtschaft* was used on slightly more than 20,000 yokes, another 20,000 yokes were rotated between grain and pasture as *Drieschfelder*, and only 331 yokes were burned land. This totaled up to about 1 per cent of the arable of the province.⁶³ In Moravia the proportion was apparently larger than in Bohemia, but the area on which these methods were used was still very small compared with the total arable.⁶⁴

The complete abandonment of the three-field system in favor of crop rotation began during the early years of the *Vormärz*. Here the fields were thrown together and the same land was made to produce, alternately, food for human consumption and animal fodder; the area given over to each crop, the amount and species raised, and the order of rotation of the crops being determined by the local climate and soil, with each crop de-

⁶⁰ Strakosch, p. 33; V. Zailer, *Die Land- und Alpenwirtschaft in den österreichischen Alpenländer* (Vienna, 1903), pp. 56-57.

⁶¹ J. Wessely, *Die österreichischen Alpenländer und ihre Forste* (Vienna, 1853), p. 207.

⁶² Stamm, p. 109; Zailer, pp. 65-66.

⁶³ Cadastral returns cited in Schnabel, p. 73.

⁶⁴ Bauer, *Landwirtschaft*, p. 106.

signed to prepare the soil for the one that followed it.⁶⁵ In 1813 the Bohemian Agricultural Society had issued a book by Ludwig Fischer on crop rotation.⁶⁶ In 1814-1815 the newly appointed manager of Prince Karl Auersperg's estates in the Cžaslau and Chrudim districts of eastern Bohemia shifted the demesne from the three-field system to convertible husbandry.⁶⁷ In early 1818, Freiherr Emmanuel von Bartenstein reported to the Moravian-Silesian Agricultural Society that he had introduced an eight course and an eleven course rotation on the two demesne farms of his estate of Deutsch-Knönitz in southern Moravia.⁶⁸ During 1817, Albrecht Phillip Thaer, son of the great German agriculturist Albrecht Daniel Thaer, traveled in Moravia. In the report of his visit which was published in his father's journal, the *Möglinsche Annalen der Landwirtschaft*, he told of the use of multi-course rotations on estates owned by Count Lamberg, Baron von Fochtel, the von Wiessenborn brothers, Prince Dietrichstein, and Prince Lichnowsky. He found that on one of the estates of Count Lamberg crop rotation had been practiced for twelve years.⁶⁹ After seven years of experimenting with multi-course rotations⁷⁰ Rudolph André, director of the Moravian estates of Prince Salm, in 1822 settled upon a six course rotation for use on the farms he supervised.⁷¹ A rural official of Cerhenitz, Bohemia, reported the use of crop rotation in 1818,⁷² and a traveler in 1820 wrote that "convertible husbandry was in full flower" at Blattna, the estate of Freiherr Hillebrandt in southeastern Bohemia.⁷³ By the end of the 1820's it seems to have become a well established method of cultivation in Bohemia.⁷⁴ It was used chiefly on demesne land. Schnabel listed 170 Bohemian estates on which it was practiced during the 1840's, and he estimated that in that

⁶⁵ Thaer, *Principles*, I, 191.

⁶⁶ Kallus, p. 71. The book's title was *Entwurf und Anleitung zur Fruchtwechselwirtschaft*.

⁶⁷ *Oekonomische Neuigkeiten*, XXI (1821), Beilage no. 1, p. 6.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, XXVI (1823), 609.

⁶⁹ A. P. Thaer, pp. 480, 481, 488, 489, 491, 493.

⁷⁰ *Oekonomische Neuigkeiten*, XXVI (1823), 624.

⁷¹ *Ibid.*, XXV (1823), 162.

⁷² Kallus, p. 71.

⁷³ *Oekonomische Neuigkeiten*, XXI (1821), Beilage no. 1, p. 6.

⁷⁴ *Landwirtschaftlichen Central Comité*, p. 104.

province there were 300,000 yokes (approximately 7 per cent of the total arable) on which convertible husbandry was used, of which area 260,000 yokes were demesne and 40,000 yokes peasant land.⁷⁵

Where crop rotation was practiced it was not necessarily used on all the demesne of the individual estate. At Seelowitz, in Moravia, it was used on only a small part of the demesne arable. All the rest was under the three-field system.⁷⁶ Other instances of this were the Bohemian estates of Chudenitz⁷⁷ and Postelberg.⁷⁸ On the other hand, convertible husbandry was practiced on all the demesne of other estates, as, for example, Deutschbiela, in Bohemia, owned by Freiherr von Bartenstein,⁷⁹ Paskau, in Moravia, owned by Count St. Genois-d'Aneaucourt,⁸⁰ Teltsch, the large estate of Count Leopold von Podstatsky-Liechtenstein in Moravia,⁸¹ Freiherr von Vockel's Moravian estate of Zdislawitz,⁸² and the estates in the zone supervised by Franz Horsky.⁸³

To Horsky (1801-1877) belongs the greatest credit for the introduction and spread of convertible husbandry in the Northwest zone.⁸⁴ He was the son of an official on an estate of the Lobkowitz family in Bohemia. In 1818 he was admitted to the agricultural school established by the Schwarzenbergs at Krumau. Three years later he completed the course with the highest distinction and entered into the service of Prince Schwarzenberg. By 1829, he had become the manager of one of the Schwarzenberg estates on which he immediately began to introduce innovations designed to increase productivity, notably fallow crops and land reclamation. In 1836 he was appointed manager of Libejic, a larger Schwarzenberg estate, and the supervisor of seven other estates belonging to his employer. Now he abandoned the three-field system and began to use convertible hus-

⁷⁵ Schnabel, pp. 84-86.

⁷⁶ *Neue Schriften*, III, pt. ii (1834), 60.

⁷⁷ Sommer, VII, 211.

⁷⁸ Schimauscheck, "Topographische Beschreibung," pp. 74-76.

⁷⁹ *Neue Schriften*, III, pt. i (1833), 49-52.

⁸⁰ Wolny, I, 374.

⁸¹ *Ibid.*, VI, 499.

⁸² Elvert, *Geschichte*, II, 162.

⁸³ Horsky, pp. 9-10.

⁸⁴ Kallus, p. 7; Fruhwirth, p. 58.

bandry. He invented new, and modified old, agricultural tools and machines (the peasants at Libejic soon after his arrival there started calling him "the experiment maker"), improved cattle strains, introduced new crops, planted fruit trees along the edges of the fields and roads, laid out hop gardens, and built roads. In 1845 he published a monograph on crop rotation based upon the results he had obtained at Libejic. Immediately, he was flooded with offers to supervise estates of other noble landowners. With the permission of Prince Schwarzenberg he assumed the supervision of sixteen estates belonging to four successful petitioners for his services, in addition to the seven Schwarzenberg estates under his control. On all of them he introduced convertible husbandry and the agricultural tools and machinery he had found so useful.⁸⁵

AGRICULTURAL ACTIVITIES OF NOBLE LANDOWNERS

The preference of landlords throughout the Monarchy, during the *Vormärz*, for sheep herding over other branches of animal husbandry has already been discussed in Chapter III. As was indicated in that place the wool raisers of Bohemia and Moravia-Silesia were leaders in this branch of the Austrian economy. No other area of the Monarchy produced wool of as fine a quality as was raised in the Northwest zone. Moravian wool was of an especially fine grade and commanded top prices at European wool markets.⁸⁶

The preference of landlords of the Northwest zone for sheep over other domestic animals was evidenced by the size of their flocks. In Bohemia, in 1837, the lords owned 0.26 per cent of the 100,723 goats in the province, 1 per cent of the 244,272 swine, 4.9 per cent of the 160,277 horses, and 7.8 per cent of the 1,252,974 horned cattle. But they owned 51.8 per cent of the 2,228,587 sheep.⁸⁷ In Moravia, too, the number of sheep owned by the lords exceeded that owned by the peasants.⁸⁸ The flocks of the lord were usually of a strain superior to that of

⁸⁵ Horsky, pp. 1-6, 10.

⁸⁶ *Oekonomische Neuigkeiten*, XXX (1825), 527; Augsburg *Allgemeine Zeitung*, 1825, *Beilagen* no. 140, 321. See also Elvert, *Geschichte*, I, 334-336.

⁸⁷ 1837 census statistics cited in Schnabel, pp. 144-145.

⁸⁸ Bauer, *Landwirtschaft*, pp. 119-120.

the peasant flocks,⁸⁹ but the coarse wool of the countryman's sheep found a ready market among small local weavers.⁹⁰

An outstanding example of the success enjoyed by the sheep herders of the zone was afforded by Freiherr von Bartenstein. He owned a small estate in Bohemia on which his only market crop was sheep wool. His flock numbered 1,200 in winter and, after lambing, 1,500 in summer. All his sheep were stall fed. He had only 188 yokes of arable and 13½ yokes of meadow, but on this area he raised all the fodder his animals required.⁹¹ The wool clip from his flock drew top prices. On the Vienna market in the fall of 1824 he got 275 florins per *Centner* for the 28 *Centner* he had up for sale. This wool, according to the market report published in *Oekonomische Neuigkeiten*, was "unqualifiedly one of the best, if not actually the best wool in [Central Europe] and, therefore, in the world."⁹²

With the exception of sheep herding and the activity of some noble landowners in stock improvement, described below, animal husbandry in the Northwest zone was a neglected activity, just as it was in most of the Monarchy. The individual peasant generally had only a few head and these were usually poor specimens. From spring until fall they were pastured on the commons. These fields were viewed as waste land, and since they were common property no one individual felt responsible for them and they were left untended. The cattle were turned out in the wet weather of early spring and their hooves trampled down the young grass before it was fairly grown. As one observer put it the grass was "more trodden-down than eaten-up." Rooting swine dug up the turf. By the end of May the cattle could get only meager fare at best from the dry, dust-covered pasture. Their manure was lost and infectious animal diseases were spread. After harvest they were put out in the stubble, and during the winter they were fed straw, some hay, and grain tailings.⁹³

⁸⁹ Cf. Sommer, I, 40, 81, 115; VII, 212-213; Wolny, I, 111, 126, 139, 145, 148.

⁹⁰ Bauer, *Landwirtschaft*, p. 120.

⁹¹ *Neue Schriften*, III, pt. i (1833), 46-47, 50.

⁹² *Oekonomische Neuigkeiten*, XXIX (1825), 48.

⁹³ *Ibid.*, XXVII (1824), 93; XXVIII (1824), 514, 515; *Brünner Zeitung*, 1817, p. 721, quoted in Elvert, *Geschichte*, I, 218-219; Bauer, *Landwirtschaft*, p. 114.

The results of these poor practices were readily discernible. The British traveler, Parson Gleig, who toured Bohemia in 1837, was struck by the sorry appearance of the cattle he saw in the fields.

Each particular bone in each particular brute's carcass sticks up in melancholy distinctness, and in point of size the animals themselves are mere dwarves. I have seen a man ploughing with a couple of heifers, positively neither taller nor stouter than a pair of Lincolnshire calves of three weeks old.⁹⁴

Some of the noble landowners of the zone, however, were actively engaged in improving the breed of their own livestock, and indirectly, the stock of their peasants, by importing and breeding pure-blooded cattle and stall-feeding them. Freiherr von Vockel, who lived in southern Moravia, imported blooded animals which he used to build up his own herd. He also sold some of his pedigreed stock to his neighboring landlords and so was largely responsible for improving the breed of horned cattle in his entire area.⁹⁵ Other landlords of Moravia-Silesia also imported blooded stock from Switzerland, Tyrol, and from Styria, and used them to build up pedigreed herds.⁹⁶ Between 1810 and 1826 the number of blooded cattle in Moravia-Silesia rose from 30,613 to 51,591, an increase of over 68 per cent, while the number of common cattle decreased from 394,453 to 391,180.⁹⁷ In Bohemia, Schnabel made a survey of the efforts of landlords to improve their cattle and found that throughout the province there were estate owners who had imported pedigreed animals from the Alpine regions and had built up pure-blooded herds.⁹⁸ One of the first things that Horsky did when he became manager of Libejic in 1836 was to buy blooded Alpine stock. Every year, or second year, thereafter, he bred his cows with pedigreed bulls to keep the strain pure.⁹⁹

As mentioned above, the importation of superior cattle and the development of blooded herds by landlords were not with-

⁹⁴ Gleig, II, 238.

⁹⁵ Elvert, *Geschichte*, II, 159-160.

⁹⁶ *Oekonomische Neuigkeiten*, XXV (1823), 174-175, 179; XXVIII (1824), 155; Wolny, III, 245.

⁹⁷ Elvert, *Geschichte*, I, 217, 218.

⁹⁸ Schnabel, pp. 170-181; cf. Sommer, I, 81; XIV, 124.

⁹⁹ Horsky, p. 4.

out a salutary effect upon the herds of the peasants. Schnabel reported that the breed of peasant cattle in many districts of Bohemia had been improved because the lords permitted the blooded bulls of their herds to be used by peasant breeders.¹⁰⁰ Thus, Count Joseph Mathias von Thun-Hohenstein allowed the peasants on his estate of Sehuschitz, in northeastern Bohemia, to use the pedigreed Swiss and Tyrolean bulls of his herd for breeding with their small, native cows.¹⁰¹ Prince Schwarzenberg, too, extended a similar privilege to his peasants at Libejic, and also instituted cattle shows for their stock and presented awards for the best animals.¹⁰²

The promotion of fruit raising was another aspect of agricultural production in which noble landowners were especially interested. In both Bohemia and Moravia-Silesia pomological societies had been organized during the *Vormärz*. Many landowners had planted thousands of trees on their holdings and had built tree nurseries.¹⁰³ Some of these landlords sought to increase and improve peasant fruit production, which stood at a low level, by awarding prizes for the best fruit raised and by giving their peasants cuttings of the improved stock they themselves had.¹⁰⁴

The usual agricultural tools used by the farmers of the zone were little, if at all, changed from the implements used for generations before them. The plows in use varied from region to region of the zone. They were of simple design and construction.¹⁰⁵ Gleig wrote that the plows he saw in Bohemia seemed to him to be the same as the one pictured in the edition of Virgil's *Georgics* he had used as a student.¹⁰⁶ Seeding was done by broadcasting, and the seed was covered over usually by a light wooden harrow.¹⁰⁷ The sickle was a commonly used

¹⁰⁰ Schnabel, pp. 165, 171, 175, 177-179.

¹⁰¹ Sommer, XI, 317.

¹⁰² Horsky, p. 5.

¹⁰³ E. g., Sommer, VI, 107, 154, 349; X, 236; Wolny, III, 151, 175, 244, 287, 328; Elvert, *Geschichte*, I, 161, 163.

¹⁰⁴ Landwirtschaftlichen Central Comité, p. 177; Sommer, X, 236.

¹⁰⁵ P. Leser, *Entstehung und Verbreitung des Pfluges* (Münster, 1931), pp. 282-294; Schnabel, p. 87; *Oekonomische Neuigkeiten*, XIX (1820), Beilage no. 1, p. 3 and note 14.

¹⁰⁶ Gleig, II, 233.

¹⁰⁷ F. Sitensky, "Die Landwirtschaft im Königreiche Böhmen während der fünfzigjährigen Jubiläumsperiode der Regierung Seiner Majestät des Kaisers

tool, though the scythe was also popular.¹⁰⁸ Winnowing was done almost always with a shovel. Only in a few places were windmills of a simple design used for this operation.¹⁰⁹

The activities of many landlords in promoting and using improved implements offered a contrast to this general picture of antiquated and inefficient methods.¹¹⁰ The journals of the agricultural societies carried many reports of demonstrations and tests of new tools and machines conducted under noble auspices.¹¹¹ By the end of the *Vormärz* improved models of plows, extirpators, seed drills, seed rakes, harrows, rollers, and other tools were in use on demesne land. Several threshing machines were also being employed.¹¹² A McCormick reaper was in use in Moravia in 1849.¹¹³

The invention by Franz Veverka, a Bohemian peasant, of a new plow, called the *Ruchadlo*, was an outstanding development in agricultural tools. Veverka's cousin, a blacksmith, built the first model in 1827. It proved superior to the plows in use and quickly became popular in the Northwest zone and in neighboring lands.¹¹⁴ Horsky, among others, adopted and improved it for use on the estates he managed.¹¹⁵

The interest of lords in the Northwest zone in improving their live stock, and their use of stall feeding, increased their requirement for forage crops and their supply of manure for use in fertilizing their fields.¹¹⁶ The importance of the cycle of forage crop raising, stall feeding, and greater manure production in increasing agricultural production has already been pointed out. It seems clear from the evidence, however, that

Franz Joseph I," *G. L. F. Supplementband*, 33; J. Rezek, "Die Entwicklung des landwirtschaftlichen Maschinenwesens," *ibid.*, III, 40-41.

¹⁰⁸ André, p. 144; *Verhandlungen und Aufsätze* (Styrian Agricultural Society), new series, VI (1834), 37; Medinger, *Lobositz*, p. 77.

¹⁰⁹ Sitensky, "Die Landwirtschaft im Königreiche Böhmen," p. 33.

¹¹⁰ Schnabel, pp. 86, 87; Elvert, *Geschichte*, I, 298-299.

¹¹¹ For example, see Elvert, *Geschichte*, I, 297-298, for a list of such reports from the journal of the Moravian-Silesian Agricultural Society, dealing with threshing machines, harrows, plows, seed drills, etc.

¹¹² Schnabel, p. 87.

¹¹³ Rezek, "Die Entwicklung des landwirtschaftlichen Maschinenwesens," p. 48.

¹¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 24; Landwirtschaftlichen Central Comité, pp. 125-127.

¹¹⁵ Horsky, p. 10; Landwirtschaftlichen Central Comité, p. 127.

¹¹⁶ Cf. *Neue Schriften*, II, pt. i (1833), 49; pt. ii (1834), 59; Horsky, p. 4; Schnabel, p. 84.

in this period the landlords of the Northwest zone were less interested in this aspect of the cycle than they were in producing root crops for use in agricultural industry, notably beet sugar refining and potato brandy distilling. When Prince Karl Anselm of Thurn und Taxis hired Karl Weinrich in 1830 to build a sugar beet factory for him on his estate of Dobrawitz in Bohemia, he also started raising sugar beets on his demesne there to meet the needs of the factory.¹¹⁷ In the Olmütz (Moravia) Chamber of Commerce District, in 1852, 70 per cent of the 2,712 yokes planted in sugar beets belonged to the lords, and over 79 per cent of the 566,023 *Centner* harvested from the acreage was from the fields of the lords. The average yield of the lords' fields was 236 *Centner* per yoke, while that of the other fields was 143 *Centner* per yoke. Further, the beets produced on the lords' lands were of a better grade.¹¹⁸

The Northwest zone led all the other areas of the Monarchy in the growing and processing of sugar beets. The large land complexes of Bohemia and Moravia-Silesia were especially well suited for this industry. The soil favored beet culture and adequate supplies of labor and fuel were available. The individual estates were large enough to ensure a supply of beets for the factory, and the landlords were wealthy enough to build expensive plants and invest sizable amounts of money in the enterprise.¹¹⁹ In 1846, of the estimated total amount of beets processed for sugar in the Monarchy, the Northwest zone accounted for over 60 per cent.¹²⁰ A government study published in 1854 estimated, on the basis of yields for 1851-1853, inclusive, that during these years an average of 25,233 yokes were planted in sugar beets in the Monarchy, of which area 18,680 (74 per cent) were in Bohemia and Moravia-Silesia.¹²¹

In 1846 there were 44 factories in the zone processing sugar beets (some extracted the syrup only while further refining was done at another plant).¹²² Many of these installations used steam engines in their operations. At the end of 1851, of the

¹¹⁷ Sommer, II, 39; see above, pp. 104-105.

¹¹⁸ "Darstellung . . . Rübenzucker-Fabrication," p. 16.

¹¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 12; T. S., 1841, table 41, sect. xvi.

¹²⁰ T. S., 1846, part II, table 4, p. 96.

¹²¹ "Darstellung . . . Rübenzucker-Fabrication," p. 18.

¹²² T. S., 1846, part II, table 4, p. 95.

486 steam engines in the zone, developing 6,872 HP, 112, developing 1,008 HP, were used in beet sugar manufacture.¹²³

The other important agricultural industry conducted by the landlords of the Northwest zone was the distilling of potato brandy. In Moravia, between 1797 and 1806, inclusive, the average annual production of potato brandy was 44,832 *Eimer*. By 1841, output had increased over ten times, with 455,413 *Eimer* being produced in that year.¹²⁴ These distilleries became a chief source of revenue to their noble owners. Duke Albert of Saxe-Teschen had sixteen distilleries on his Silesian estates, the largest one, in which steam engines were utilized, bringing him an annual net profit of 20,000 florins.¹²⁵ Count Larisch-Mönnich imported expensive distillery machinery from abroad, and on one of his Silesian estates he had eleven of these machines capable of processing 800 to 1,000 *Metzen* of potatoes daily.¹²⁶ Schnabel estimated that one quarter of all the potatoes harvested in Bohemia were used in the production of brandy.¹²⁷

The distilling of potato brandy was of more importance in estate operation than was beer production. Brewing was one of the lords' monopolies but, generally, they rented out the privilege.¹²⁸ Bohemia, however, was the center of hop production of the Monarchy. In 1846, of the Monarchy's total production of 41,310 *Centner*, 34,500 *Centner* were grown in Bohemia. Moravia-Silesia, in second place, was far behind with a production in 1845 of 2,200 *Centner*.¹²⁹ Hops were raised in gardens used only for that purpose.¹³⁰ In the 1840's there were over 9,700 yokes of these gardens in Bohemia, most of them being in the northeast section of the province.¹³¹

¹²³ "Die Dampfmaschinen der österreichischen Monarchie zu Ende des Verwaltungsjahres 1851," *Mittheilungen aus dem Gebeite der Statistik*, I (1852), pt. iii, 22, 28, 30, 34, 35.

¹²⁴ Elvert, *Geschichte*, I, 324.

¹²⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 204-205.

¹²⁶ *Ibid.*, II, 267.

¹²⁷ Schnabel, p. 81.

¹²⁸ Elvert, *Geschichte*, I, 206.

¹²⁹ T. S., 1846, pt. II, table 1, p. 6.

¹³⁰ H. W. von Pabst, *Der landwirtschaftliche Pflanzenbau* (Darmstadt, 1844), p. 290.

¹³¹ Schnabel, pp. 120-124.

AN ESTATE OF THE ZONE

By way of conclusion it seems appropriate to describe an estate of the zone. The one described here is Postelberg, one of the holdings of the Schwarzenbergs. The account is drawn almost entirely from a description of that estate written in 1841 by its manager and published in a journal of the Bohemian Patriotic-Economic Society.¹³²

Postelberg lay at the eastern end of the Saazer district, in the northwestern section of Bohemia. It was nine and one-half german miles northwest of Prague and seven german miles from the northern frontier of the province.¹³³ From the twelfth to the fifteenth centuries it had belonged to a Benedictine monastery. In 1420 the monastery was destroyed during Hussite fighting. After a brief interlude the estate was given by the King of Bohemia to Peter von Weitmühl. It stayed in the Weitmühl family until 1600, when it was purchased by the Sternbergs, who sold it in 1637 to Count von Waitzenau. The Waitzenaus kept it for two generations, then, their fortunes shattered by the Thirty Years War, they sold it to Count George Ludwig von Sinzendorf. His son and heir sold it in 1692 to Prince Ferdinand von Schwarzenberg for 554,000 florins. In 1703 the new owner entailed the estate and it became a part of the vast primogeniture of the Schwarzenberg house.¹³⁴

Postelberg covered an area of 19,729 yokes.¹³⁵ It was mainly level country, with many gentle slopes but only a few hills. The Eger River coursed through its southern end while the Kommutauer Brook wound through it from west to east, finally emptying into the Eger near the town of Postelberg. The banks of the Eger were high and steep in many places but were of crumbly earth. During high water the banks were washed out so that expensive earthen and stone walls had to be built to protect the fields. Still, in spring when the melting snows fed the river, or when it was swollen by heavy rains, the stream overflowed and the river valley lay under water. But when the water receded it left behind a rich and fertile alluvium.

In earlier days there had been many large ponds on the estate, one of them covering 673 yokes. During the *Vormärz*

¹³² Schimauschek, "Topographische Beschreibung," pp. 68-84.

¹³³ *Ibid.*, p. 69. ¹³⁴ Sommer, XIV, 65-66.

¹³⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 301.

this pond, and most of the others, had been drained and the reclaimed land used for arable or meadow. Two subterranean tunnels had been dug as part of this drainage program, one 98 *Klafter* and the other 87 *Klafter* in length.¹⁸⁶

There were 17,561 yokes of productive land in the estate, according to the Josephine cadastre. This land was divided between lord and peasant as follows:

TABLE 6
DEMESNE AND PEASANT LAND, POSTELBERG¹⁸⁷
(in yokes)

	Demesne	Peasant	Total
Arable	3,713	10,489	14,202
Meadow and Garden.....	1,224	685	1,909
Pasture.....	519	339	858
Forest.....	591	...	591
Total	6,047	11,513	17,560

Most of the demesne was in nine farms. Three of these farms were rented out in their entirety, and on the remaining six the landlord worked the largest part and rented out the rest.

The chief farming activity of Postelberg was the raising of cereals. Rye and barley were the favored crops. Far less of wheat and oats was produced. Clover was grown, mainly in the river lowlands. Here the extensive meadows of the demesne produced much green fodder of excellent quality. Fruit tree culture was actively pursued by the lord. There were 18,000 apple, plum, cherry and pear trees on his demesne, and a tree nursery was maintained as part of his establishment.¹⁸⁸

The usual method of cultivation on both lord and peasant land was the three-field system with naked fallow. Since the major meadows of the complex, however, lay in the river lowlands where they were in danger of being flooded and the hay lost—a not infrequent occurrence—there was always the danger of a fodder shortage. To offset a possible shortage developing, the estate manager explained, a part of the fallow fields were planted with clover and lucerne. On three of the six farms operated by the lord, however, insufficient forage was produced when they were put under the three-field system with cultivated

¹⁸⁶ Schimaushek, "Topographische Beschreibung," pp. 70-71.

¹⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 74.

¹⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 72.

fallow. So they were put under systems of convertible husbandry. On one of three farms a seven-crop course was used, on the second a nine-crop, and on the third a ten-crop course. Potatoes were a feature in all three rotations used.¹³⁹

The yield in leading crops for both lord and peasant acres was:

TABLE 7
YIELDS OF DEMESNE AND PEASANT FIELDS, POSTELBERG¹⁴⁰

	Demesne	Peasant	Total
Wheat (<i>Metzen</i>)	2,503	4,983	7,486
Rye "	15,794	41,270	57,064
Barley "	11,426	28,670	40,096
Oats "	2,588	7,189	9,777
Hay (Centner)	14,223	8,960	23,183
After-math "	7,267	4,899	12,166

The horned cattle and sheep owned by the peasants were of the common native breed while those of the lord were of pure stock. Sheep far outnumbered all the other animals combined. Contrary to the general situation in the zone, the peasants owned more sheep than did the lord. Goats and swine were kept only by the poorer peasants. The number of cattle owned is shown in the following table.

TABLE 8
CATTLE OF LORD AND PEASANTS, POSTELBERG¹⁴¹

	Lord	Peasant	Total
Horses	32	319	351
Cows	200	1,608	1,808
Oxen	48	970	1,018
Sheep	2,500	6,532	9,032
Pigs		836	836
Goats		422	422

The forested area of Postelberg was small—only 591 yokes—and could not meet the local demand for wood. There were peat and coal deposits, however, on the estate and these were drawn upon for household use, and for the local brewery, distillery, and brick oven.¹⁴²

¹³⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 74-76.

¹⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 76.

¹⁴¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 76-77.

¹⁴² *Ibid.*, p. 78.

The returns for 1853 on the tax on sugar beets used for sugar show that there was a beet sugar factory at Postelberg. The plant was apparently a new one,

The markets for Postelberg's products, especially for its grain, were Kommutau, about 25 kilometers distant, and Leitmeritz, over 35 kilometers and a six-hour ride from the estate.¹⁴³ Included within the boundaries of the estate were 26 villages and one free town.¹⁴⁴ In 1840 the estate's population, excluding those residents of the free town who were not under the lord's jurisdiction, was 4,875.¹⁴⁵

The peasants of the estate were divided into two large classes: those who cultivated cereals and those who raised hops, forage and root crops. The former group, who were in the majority, lived on the higher land of the estate, while the latter had their holdings in the river lowlands. The second group practiced a more intensive cultivation and were, generally, more prosperous than their grain-growing fellows, although sometimes unfavorable market conditions caused a reversal of this condition.¹⁴⁶

The demesne land on which the three-field system was used was worked by *Robot* labor, while only hired labor was used on the lands of the lord on which convertible husbandry was employed. The commonly used plow was the local primitive model, but on demesne land when the lord had to supply the plow, he furnished the plowman with a *Ruchadlo*.¹⁴⁷

The peasants annually performed 30,264 days of labor with teams (*Zugrobot*) and 50,173 days of hand labor (*Handrobot*) for the lord. In addition, they paid him each year money dues of almost 14,000 florins and, in dues in kind, 2,384 *Metzen* of grain (195 *Metzen* of wheat, 1,381 *Metzen* of rye, 480 *Metzen* of barley, 328 *Metzen* of oats). Apparently, some of the peasants had commuted all or part of their *Robot*, since the lord received 29,030 florins annually for *Robot* indemnification.¹⁴⁸ In 1835 the peasants, at their own expense, had built a barracks to house a squadron of cavalry, so relieving themselves of the duty to billet these troops in their own homes.¹⁴⁹

since it does not appear in the returns for the previous year. *T. S.*, new series, II, 1852-1854, part ii, table 4, p. 66.

¹⁴³ Schimauscheck, "Topographische Beschreibung," p. 72.

¹⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 73.

¹⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 79.

¹⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 72.

¹⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 76.

¹⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 78-79.

¹⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 80.

CHAPTER V

NOBLE LANDOWNERS AND AGRICULTURAL LABOR

THE SOURCES OF AGRICULTURAL LABOR

There were two sources of agricultural labor in the Monarchy; the compulsory *Robot* and hired day labor. The extent to which each source was used varied with local conditions from province to province. Usually, the individual peasant was both *Robot* worker and laborer hired by the day. This was especially true of those peasants who had small holdings or were entirely landless. Such men were compelled to place themselves on the labor market in order to support their families. Sometimes peasants commuted their *Robot* with money payments and then hired themselves out as laborers. Finally, there were rural workers who stood outside the system of hereditary subjection. These free men lived in Hungary and in those provinces of the Monarchy where the system of hereditary subjection did not obtain.

Occupational data compiled before, during, and immediately following the *Vormärz* are not detailed enough to permit the direct determination of the size and structure of the farm labor force of the Monarchy.¹ Information is available for four provinces on the number of peasants with holdings. It indicates that the majority of such peasants had quarter-holdings or less. These peasants must have been available for hired day labor. Only a relatively small number had full or even half holdings. The size of a full holding varied from province to province and within the individual provinces, but a full or half holding was of sufficient size to require the full-time labor of its occupant. In Lower Austria there were, according to an account written in the 1840's,² 133,048 peasant holdings, of which:

¹ T. S., new series, VIII, 1855-1857, part II, table 2, p. 127. Detailed occupational data were not collected until the census of 1860. K. k. Statistisches Central Bureau, *Statistisches Handbuchlein für das Jahr 1871*, p. 5.

² Tebeldi, *Geldangelegenheiten*, pp. 200-201.

20,442 were full holdings of 24-89 yokes
 27,119 were half-holdings of 10-19 yokes
 23,356 were quarter-holdings of 5-10 yokes
 62,131 were smaller holdings.

The cadastral survey for Moravia showed that in the 1840's there were in that province: ³

6,766 peasants with full holdings
 3,242 peasants with three-quarter holdings
 26,935 peasants with half holdings
 38,425 peasants with quarter holdings
 132,493 peasants with smaller holdings.

In Hungary, Schwartner, writing in 1809, reported that there were 1,426,579 peasant holdings, divided as follows: ⁴

226,000 full and half holdings
 417,215 quarter holdings
 783,364 smaller holdings.

In Styria before the emancipation in 1848 there were 149,380 peasant holdings, of which number:

11,302 were full holdings
 21,080 were half holdings
 25,725 were quarter holdings
 91,273 were smaller holdings.⁵

In addition to the peasants listed in the above tabulations there were peasants in each one of these provinces (as well as in all the other provinces of the Monarchy) who had a house but no land, and still others who had neither house nor land, and lived as boarders in some other peasant's home. This lowest stratum of peasant society was entirely dependent upon wages for its support. Finally, the sons and daughters of the peasantry were available for hired labor.

THE SUPPLY OF AGRICULTURAL LABOR

In the Northwest zone

The chief source of agricultural labor for the lords in the Northwest zone was the *Robot* of the peasants.⁶ It was legally

³ Bauer, *Landwirtschaft*, pp. 99-100.

⁴ Schwartner, I, 204; Tebeldi, *Geldangelegenheiten*, p. 200.

⁵ Hlubek, *Ein treues Bild*, p. 106.

⁶ F. X. Hlubek in *Oekonomische Neuigkeiten*, LXXIII (1847), 245; Bauer, *Landwirtschaft*, p. 143.

possible for the peasant to commute his labor dues into a payment in money or kind or to redeem them perpetually with annual cash payments on their capitalized value. But such commutations or redemptions were rare in the Northwest zone.⁷ The peasant with a full holding performed 156 days of *Robot* labor each year with four work animals. Men with lesser holdings were held to the same number of days but with fewer animals, depending upon the size of their holdings. Cotters did from 26 to 156 days of *Handrobot*, while landless peasants were held to 13 days a year.⁸

Labor in addition to that rendered by *Robot* workers was needed at various times, especially during the harvest season. This labor was provided by cotters, landless peasants, and peasant children working for hire,⁹ and by migrant workers who descended from the hills and mountains into the lowlands and followed the harvest back to their highland homes.¹⁰

Although data are lacking to determine the size of the farm labor force in the Northwest zone, it is possible to estimate the size of the rural population after 1830 from available information. The typical form of agricultural settlement in the zone was the nucleated village in which lived the people who tilled the land around the village. Some of these settlements had populations of two to four thousand. In a survey made by the Austrian Ministry of Agriculture during the 1870's it was found that 10,813 (85.5 per cent) of the 12,646 agricultural settlements in the Northwest zone were nucleated villages (the other settlements were either individual farmsteads or street villages).¹¹ For purposes of estimating rural population I have considered persons living in settlements of less than 5,000 as the rural population, although some of the towns of 5,000 and over had a large agricultural element.¹² In view of the difficulties and inaccuracies inherent in this type of estimate, the calculations presented here are intended only to be suggestive.

⁷ Grünberg, *Bauernbefreiung*, I, 367-368; see above, p. 57.

⁸ Engelmayr, *Die Unterthans-Verfassung*, I, 94-95.

⁹ Grünberg, I, 51.

¹⁰ *Oekonomische Neuigkeiten*, XIX (1820), *Beilage* no. 1, p. 4.

¹¹ K. k. Ackerbauministeriums, *Bericht . . . 1877-1880*, pp. 322-323.

¹² For example, the town of Budweis. Sommer, IX, 3.

TABLE 9

 URBAN AND RURAL POPULATION
 NORTHWEST ZONE, 1831-1846¹³

	1831	1846	Absolute Increase	Percentage Increase
Total population	6,025,846	6,700,241	674,395	11.2
Population in towns of 5,000 and over	356,057	452,377	96,320	27.1
Population outside towns of 5,000 and over	5,669,789	6,247,864	578,075	10.2

Table 9 shows that town population grew almost 2.7 times faster than did rural population. The size of the urban population, however, was still too small to alter materially the existing population distribution between town and country. Despite the large ratio of increase of urban population its net effect on the increase of total population was just a little more than 1 per cent. Of the total population increase of 674,395 persons 85.7 per cent (578,075) was accounted for by the increase in rural population, and only 14.3 per cent (96,320) by the urban increase. Rural population, although its rate of increase was slower than urban, was growing at a remarkable rate, and continued to be the dominant element in the population of the Northwest zone.

A final, and, for the present study, the most important conclusion is that the supply of agricultural labor available for hire in the Northwest zone increased during the years 1831-1846. Legal restrictions on subdivision of peasant holdings (*Bestiftungszwang*) operated against the increase of landed peasantry. Even when the law was evaded and holdings subdivided, the end result was the creation of small parcels not large enough to support their occupants. The new members of the increased rural population were persons whose only recourse was to work as wage laborers. Many went to the cities but many more stayed on the land.

The superfluity of agricultural labor in the zone was evidenced by the large numbers of migratory farm laborers who annually left its boundaries to work in other provinces.¹⁴ Some

¹³ T. S., 1831, table 1, 2; 1846, part I, table 2, pp. 1, 5-6.

¹⁴ E. Vieland, *Die sociale Geschichte der Revolution in Oesterreich* (Leipzig, 1850), p. 44.

of them never returned to their native home, deserting the agricultural life to settle in cities, as in Vienna, where they formed an important part of that metropolis' growing industrial proletariat. One district of the capital was inhabited almost exclusively by these Bohemian migrants. A large number of the newcomers, estimated by one observer in 1848 at 6,000, were engaged in construction work.¹⁵ Still other Bohemian farm workers had left the land to take employment in the building of the new railroads that were started in the latter years of the *Vormärz*.¹⁶

Despite this draining off of casual farm workers, complaints of labor shortage in the Northwest zone were rare. The reservoir of *Robot* workers limited the demand for hired labor,¹⁷ and landlords could find enough agricultural workers willing to work at a very low daily wage.¹⁸

Still, there were complaints and some evidences of labor shortages at various times and places. A protest was voiced in 1811 in the pages of the *Oekonomische Neuigkeiten* over the number of workers being drained off the land into factories and workshops.¹⁹ The effect of industrialization upon the labor market was described thirty years later by the German traveler, J. G. Kohl, who visited Bohemia in the early 1840's. Kohl pointed out that certain of the northern districts of that province were much more industrialized and had a greater density of population than did southern districts which were much more agricultural in character. He continued as follows:

How remarkable the difference must be is best illustrated by the amount of the daily wage in the different regions. While the daily wage in the Leitmeritz district in the north amounted to five to seven groschen, in the Tabor district in the south it was from two to four groschen. These were the figures at the time of my visit, but I was assured by persons well acquainted with the situation that these figures can be considered as constant averages.²⁰

¹⁵ *Verhandlungen* (Vienna Agr. Soc.), 2d series, V, pt. i (1848), 92.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 93; F. Diebl in *Mittheilungen* (Mor.-Sil. Ag. Society), XXXII (1852), 82; Violand, p. 44.

¹⁷ Bauer, *Landwirtschaft*, p. 144.

¹⁸ Dispatch from Prague in *Grenzboten*, IV (1845), pt. ii, 581; Violand, p. 44.

¹⁹ Quoted in Bauer, *Landwirtschaft*, p. 145.

²⁰ J. G. Kohl, *Reise in Böhmen* (Dresden and Leipzig, 1842), p. 38.

In 1811 a labor shortage appeared for the first time on the Bohemian estate of Lobositz, one of the Schwarzenberg holdings in that province. The introduction of fallow crops had increased labor requirements. At the same time the estate's own labor had become less tractable than it had been in the past. Circulars were distributed in neighboring communities advertising for harvest hands and promising suitable wages and free lodging. This practice was continued in succeeding years, and the circulars were sent to an ever-widening circle of villages, especially to mountain settlements where the harvest season came later than it did at Lobositz. In 1812 soldiers were detailed to work in Lobositz's fields at harvest time. Fifty men and three non-commissioned officers were employed, being paid and boarded by the estate. After ten years of this practice the military refused to supply the troops because they were needed for the maneuvers and troop concentrations held in the autumn.

Lobositz and its neighboring estates, meanwhile, found that they were competing for labor. Workers had become aware of this bidding for their services and were demanding higher pay. To stem this movement the managers of estates in the area met in 1819 and agreed on a regularization of wages.²¹

Prince Johann Adolph von Schwarzenberg, great Bohemian landlord and a leading agriculturist, attended a meeting in Vienna in January, 1848 at which hired farm labor was being discussed. After listening to the complaints by Lower Austrian landlords of a labor shortage in their province he remarked:

I am astonished that there are complaints of a labor shortage in Lower Austria since, as a matter of fact, so many people leave Bohemia to work [in Lower Austria] that Bohemian employers are actually in a tight spot. These migrant workers often return to their homes in very bad shape.²²

In Lower Austria

In contrast to the Northwest zone, the labor shortage in Lower Austria seems to have been acute. The landlords of that province were dependent upon the thousands of migratory workers who came into Lower Austria each year to fill their labor requirement. If the migrants had not put in their appear-

²¹ Medinger, *Lobositz*, pp. 187, 188-189.

²² *Verhandlungen* (Vienna Agr. Soc.), 2d series, V, pt. 1 (1848), 91.

ance essential farm work would not have been accomplished and crops not taken in.²³

The majority of the seasonal migrants who came to work in Lower Austrian fields were from the Northwest zone, especially from Moravia-Silesia. Many also came each year from Styria, one observer estimating their total number at ten thousand. There was migration within the province, too. At vintage casual labor descended from the hills and mountains of the *Waldviertel* to work in the vineyards of the lower-lying sections. These people knew just when to come and where to find employment.²⁴ Herdsmen from Switzerland were apparently employed, too.²⁵

At the already referred to conference on farm labor, held at the general meeting of the Vienna Agricultural Society in January, 1848, Lower Austrian landlords, estate managers, and guests from other provinces exchanged views and experiences. The question that was up for discussion was, "What means does the landlord have of guaranteeing himself the labor he needs?" Count Colloredo-Mansfeld, presiding at the conference, posed the problem in the following words:

Complaints about the difficulties of getting necessary agricultural labor are frequently heard. The farmer, unlike other employers, cannot hire a constant number of workers throughout the year. There are certain seasons when he needs lots of labor while at other times he can do with a considerably smaller number. And therein lies the rub. I therefore ask the conference to give its views and opinions on this subject.²⁶

Emerging clearly from the discussion which followed was the fact that these Lower Austrian landlords annually faced the problem of a labor shortage and were dependent upon migratory labor. Ritter von Kleyle, pointing out that harvest in the mountains came later than it did in the lowlands, suggested that the landlords in the mountains and those in the lowlands reach an understanding to supply each other with needed labor. Thereby the same workers could gather in both the mountain and the lowlands harvests.²⁷ But Count von Beroldingen scouted

²³ Hönigsberg, "Kurze Darstellung," p. 20; *Verhandlungen* (Vienna Agr. Soc.), 2d series, V, pt. 1 (1848), 92-93.

²⁴ *Verhandlungen* (Vienna Agr. Soc.), 2d series, V, pt. 1 (1848), 92.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 95.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 90.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 90-91.

the efficacy of such understandings or of any other type of previous arrangement.²⁸ Such agreements would not help, he claimed,

. . . because the shortage is too great and the migrant laborers find employment in railroad building and the like, where they are well paid. I must admit, important as this question is, that I know of no thorough-going solution to remedy the existing labor shortage.²⁹

Other landlords, though, seemed to have had better luck with migratory labor and told of getting workers from Bohemia, Moravia-Silesia, Styria and from within Lower Austria itself.³⁰

Some complained about the quality of hired labor, especially of female workers. The women, so it seemed, were getting fancy notions and yearning after luxuries. They were not content with the more menial tasks, such as tending the barnyard animals. The Abbot of Holycross said that the women workers in his area preferred to work in the kitchen. Above all, however, they wanted to go to Vienna, being drawn there by the more pleasurable and comfortable life of the city.³¹ Ritter von Stettner said that the peasant women in his neighborhood showed the same inclinations.³² Colloredo-Mansfeld added that a chief plaint of landlords was that workers did not work as hard as they used to, and that female workers yearned after luxuries and would do no grimy work.³³

Colloredo-Mansfeld was the only speaker at the meeting who claimed to have found a solution to the labor problem. While others bemoaned the shortage of workers he said he always had enough and usually he had an excess. His formula was good pay and good keep. "I believe," he said, "that whoever values labor properly and pays properly . . . will always have workers, even in [Lower] Austria." When he needed a certain number of workers he sent for them, and because they knew he was a good employer they always came.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 93.

²⁹ *Ibid.*

³⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 92-94.

³¹ *Ibid.*, p. 95.

³² *Ibid.*

³³ *Ibid.*, pp. 95-96.

A similar complaint about female workers was made by the manager of the Bohemian estate of Postelberg. Schimauscheck, "Topographische Beschreibung," p. 79.

Further, he claimed he had reduced his dependence upon migratory workers by having his own people trained in the use of the scythe in lieu of the sickle, so increasing their productivity. For his threshers he depended upon the poorer people of his neighborhood.⁸⁴

One possible factor which brought about this labor shortage in Lower Austria was that, as Friedjung points out, during the eighteenth century far more *Robot* work had been commuted into money payments in Lower Austria than in the north Slav lands.⁸⁵ During the first half of the nineteenth century, however, commutation was infrequent, according to Bibl.⁸⁶

A second reason for the labor shortage is found upon making the same analysis of Lower Austrian population statistics as was made above for the Northwest zone. The same assumption is made that persons living outside towns of 5,000 and over were the rural population. The nucleated village form of agricultural settlement was not as common in Lower Austria as it was in the Northwest zone. In the 1870's, of the 3,170 agricultural settlements in the province, 1,790 (56.5 per cent) were of the nucleated village type.⁸⁷

TABLE 10
URBAN AND RURAL POPULATION
LOWER AUSTRIA, 1831-1846 ⁸⁸

	1831	1846	Absolute Increase	Percentage Increase
Total population	1,324,974	1,531,034	206,060	15.6
Population in towns of 5,000 and over	340,835	474,776	133,941	39.3
Population outside towns of 5,000 and over	984,139	1,056,258	72,119	7.3

This tabulation shows clearly the strong trend toward urbanization in Lower Austria and reflects especially the growth of Vienna in these years. The increase in this city's population between 1831 and 1846 accounted for almost two-thirds of the

⁸⁴ *Verhandlungen* (Vienna Agr. Soc.), 2d series, V, pt. 1 (1848), 94, 99.

⁸⁵ H. Friedjung, *Österreich von 1848 bis 1860* (2 vols., Stuttgart and Berlin, 1908-1912), I, 343; see above, pp. 56-57.

⁸⁶ Bibl, *Stände*, p. 71.

⁸⁷ K. k. Ackerbauministeriums, *Bericht . . . 1877-1880*, pp. 322-323. Thirteen hundred settlements were individual farmsteads and 80 were street villages.

⁸⁸ T. S., 1831, tables 1, 2; 1846, part I, table 2, pp. 1, 5.

increase in urban population of the province. Of the increase in total population (206,060) 65 per cent took place in towns of 5,000 and over. This was in marked contrast with the situation in the Northwest zone where, as demonstrated above, urban increase was a minor factor in total population increase. The considerably smaller increase in Lower Austria's rural population both absolutely and relatively, as compared with urban increase, meant that the workers who would have been available for hire on the farms were being drained off to the towns where they formed the labor reservoir of the burgeoning factory industry of the province.

In other German-Slav Provinces

Other lands of the Alpine zone also suffered labor shortages. The manager of a Carinthian estate, addressing a session at the general meeting of the Carinthian Society for the Promotion of Agriculture and Industry on 20 May 1845, told his audience:

The agriculture of Carinthia has made great progress in the last fifty years. Hundreds of yokes now produce a higher yield, wastes have been reclaimed, many common pastures have been split up and converted into meadows. But during this time our population has increased by only 3% and in recent years it has actually decreased. This is the basic reason why the wages of our hired labor is so high. Not infrequently the prime costs in grain production run over 80%. We are forced to rely upon migrant labor to make ends meet. . . .³⁹

In Upper Austria, where peasant holdings were often large and prosperous, some being 200 yokes in size, peasant employers were faced with the labor problem. These peasants had their own hired men and women who lived with them. According to one observer they seemed to maintain unnecessarily large establishments. He told of a farm of 160-170 yokes, with seven horses and thirty head of horned cattle, where there were nine hired men and five hired girls (including one kitchen maid) living with the peasant and his wife. In addition, this farmer hired two day laborers for a large part of the year. The writer explained that this seemingly over-large permanent staff was necessary because casual labor was scarce, and the

³⁹ Address by *Wirtschaftsverwalter* Khackl, *Mittheilungen* (Carinthia Agr. Soc.), II (1845), 91.

farmer had to depend upon his permanent workers to perform practically all the farm work throughout the year.⁴⁰

In Styria the peasant with a full holding was supposed to do 156 days of *Robot* each year, and those with smaller holdings proportionately less. According to Hlubek, however, there was widespread commutation so that by 1848 on many estates the *Robot* (and *Zehent*) was paid in money.⁴¹

In Galicia, as in Bohemia and Moravia-Silesia, the *Robot* was the chief source of farm labor.⁴² The *Robot* obligation of the Galician peasant was the same as that which prevailed in the Northwest zone, except that the Galician cotter and landless peasant were responsible only for twelve days a year.⁴³

There was a steady annual increase in Galicia in the over-all number of days of *Robot* performed by the peasantry. This arose from the practice of dividing peasant holdings. Although such division was legally prohibited it was an old tradition of the Galician peasantry and the law could not dissuade them from following it. The practice was viewed with satisfaction by landlords since it increased the total number of *Robot* days that was paid them by their peasants. Mises cites statistics which, he points out, are not exact but which reflect this condition. In 4,687 Galician communities in 1789 there were 266,118 peasants with holdings who were responsible for 34,825,805 days of *Robot*. (This last figure and the subsequent figures on *Robot* days in this paragraph are for *Handrobot* days. The *Zugrobot* performed by Galician peasants was converted into *Handrobot* for the purposes of this calculation. The ratio of the conversion is not given by Mises.) By 1820 the number of peasants with holdings had risen to 301,561 and the *Robot* days to 37,785,525. By 1847 the number of peasants with holdings was 334,367 and the *Robot* days for which they were responsible now amounted to 37,947,243.⁴⁴

In Bukowina the *Robot* legally required of the peasant was about the lightest in the Monarchy. The peasants with holdings had to perform only twelve days a year, while the cotters

⁴⁰ *Oekonomische Neuigkeiten*, XXX (1825), 629.

⁴¹ Hlubek, *Ein treues Bild*, pp. 114, 119.

⁴² Hlubek in *Oekonomische Neuigkeiten*, LXXIII (1847), 245.

⁴³ Mises, pp. 50, 52.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 97-98.

and landless peasants were supposed to do only six days annually.⁴⁵ But with the spread of capitalistic agriculture in Bukowina, landlords found that they did not have enough labor to meet their requirements.⁴⁶ They turned to the government and demanded an increase in the number of *Robot* days they could exact. They wanted to have their peasants do the same amount as the peasants of Galicia.⁴⁷

The government felt that the landlords had some justice in their request. This was shown by a chancellery report on the subject, part of which stated:

Certainly, economic conditions in Bukowina have changed materially in the course of time. This land fifty years ago was mainly only pasture and forest. Since then, through land clearing it has increased in arable, and also in population. On the estates, which now have far more fields to be tilled, an increased need for labor has appeared, which the present small *Robot* obligation does not meet.⁴⁸

Since permission to increase the *Robot* was still not granted,⁴⁹ individual landlords made special contracts with their peasants by which various dues and services were remitted in return for the performance of labor days. The number of *Robot* days performed annually as the result of such agreements ran from 28, 32, 50, 60 to as high as 73 days.⁵⁰

In Hungary

In Hungary, according to J. N. Török, secretary-general of the Hungarian Agricultural Society, there was a shortage of farm workers. In a speech to the delegates to the tenth convention of German agriculturists and foresters in 1846 he claimed that this shortage was a chief hindrance to the advancement of agriculture in Hungary.⁵¹

A major factor in causing this condition was the thinness of Hungary's population. The great sparsity of the settlement

⁴⁵ Safran, p. 124.

⁴⁶ Grünberg, *Studien*, pp. 75-76.

⁴⁷ Kaendl, "Unterthanswesen," p. 633.

⁴⁸ Quoted in Safran, pp. 129-130.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 130; Kaendl, "Unterthanswesen," 650-651.

⁵⁰ Kaendl, "Unterthanswesen," pp. 651-652.

⁵¹ *Amtlicher Bericht . . . X. Versammlung deutscher Land- und Forstwirthe*, p. 219.

of the land struck contemporary observers forcibly.⁵² Density of population there, according to government estimates for 1846, was only 2,545 persons per austrian square mile, compared with 4,866 in the Northwest zone, 4,428 in Lower Austria, and 3,229 for the Monarchy as a whole.⁵³

The sources of agricultural labor in Hungary were the *Robot* and hired day labor. The *Robot* burden of the Hungarian peasant was lighter than it was in most of the German-Slav lands. The peasant with a full *session* performed annually 52 days of *Robot* with work animals or 104 days of *Handrobot*. Peasants with part *sessions*, down to one-eighth, did proportionate amounts of *Robot*. Cotters were responsible for eighteen days and landless peasants twelve days each year.⁵⁴ In addition to their *Robot* work most of these peasants, or members of their families, worked for hire.⁵⁵

Besides the peasants who were under the system of hereditary subjection there were, in Hungary, free, landless agrarians who were dependent upon wage work for their livelihood.⁵⁶ This free, rural proletariat had long existed in Hungary but its growth had been stimulated by the resettlement of the land after the final expulsion of the Turks at the beginning of the eighteenth century. Some landlords, especially in the Great Alföld, instead of apportioning some of the newly won land to peasants kept it all for themselves as demesne. The peasants, who settled in villages on the lord's land, worked for wages or shares and had no land of their own.⁵⁷ Other landlords maintained the system of hereditary subjection, giving their peasants holdings in return for the usual dues and services.⁵⁸

The village was the typical form of agricultural settlement in the Hungarian lowland.⁵⁹ Some of these villages had from 5,000 to 11,000 inhabitants, and a great many of them had

⁵² Bright, *Travels*, p. 98; List, "Ackerverfassung," p. 515.

⁵³ T. S., 1846, part I, table 2, p. 1.

⁵⁴ Mailath, *Urbarsialsystem*, p. 27.

⁵⁵ E. Kún, *Sozialhistorische Beiträge zur Landarbeiterfrage in Ungarn* (Jena, 1903), p. 77.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 79.

⁵⁷ J. Mailath, *Studien über die Landarbeiterfrage in Ungarn* (Vienna and Leipzig, 1905), p. 17.

⁵⁸ Kún, p. 75.

⁵⁹ List, "Ackerverfassung," pp. 515-516; Paget, I, 286.

more than 2,000.⁶⁰ In addition, the market towns and cities were often peopled with large numbers of agricultural workers.⁶¹ In the census of 1857, 42,457 persons were counted in the market town of Hold-Mező-Vásárhely. A breakdown of the male working population of the town showed that of the 10,655 gainfully employed adult men, 8,819 were engaged directly in agriculture.⁶²

Hungarian landlords also used migratory labor. Each year at harvest time workers came down from the Carpathians of Slovakia and hired themselves out as mowers and threshers. In southwestern Hungary migrant Croats supplied seasonal labor.⁶³

METHODS OF INCREASING THE *Robot*

There were various legal and illegal practices common to most of the Monarchy in the management of the *Robot* by landlords which enabled them to increase their labor supply. In Bohemia and Moravia-Silesia, the peasant who did less than three days of *Robot* per week could be compelled to work up to three days at a fixed daily wage which varied according to season.⁶⁴ Peasants who were held to *Zugrobot* with two, three, or four animals, could be compelled to do one to three days of paid hand labor each week from *Johannis* (24 June) to *Wenceslai* (28 September). Their daily wage for this work was fixed at 1½ pounds (austrian) of bread.⁶⁵

In Hungary the landlord, when his need for labor was most pressing, could compel his peasants (except cotters and landless peasants) to double their weekly *Robot*. These extra days, however, had to be credited to each peasant's annual *Robot* obligation, and so were not additional.⁶⁶ The law required that all work in excess of the *Robot* should be paid for in cash and at a fair wage. Extra days worked in one year could not be credited against the next year's *Robot* but had to be paid for.⁶⁷ Hungarian landlords, or their agents, in their judicial capacity

⁶⁰ T. S., 1846, part I, table 2, pp. 13-16.

⁶¹ Ditz, pp. 64-65.

⁶² *Ibid.*, pp. 66-67.

⁶³ J. von Csaplovics, *Gemälde von Ungern* (2 vols., Pest, 1829), II, 121-122.

⁶⁴ *Robotpatent* of 11 August 1775, in Grünberg, *Bauernbefreiung*, II, 260.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 259.

⁶⁶ Mailath, *Urbarialsystem*, p. 27; Townson, p. 113.

⁶⁷ Mailath, *Urbarialsystem*, p. 28.

could punish peasants guilty of minor offenses by sentencing them to work on the demesne for not more than three days. This sentence could not be given during a time of pressing labor need.⁶⁸ In the German-Slav provinces sentences to penal labor given by landlord courts could be worked out only on public works.⁶⁹

The *Robotpatent* for Galicia forbade the exacting of *Robot* days above the number allowed by law, specifically banning certain labor services traditionally performed in addition to the *Robot* (for example, mowing the lord's meadows, acting as night watchman, etc.).⁷⁰ The loss in labor that resulted was of serious consequence to the landlords.⁷¹ They agitated for relief and were able to have the law amended to resemble the Bohemian *Robotpatent*. Peasants who did less than three days a week could be compelled to work up to that amount at the going wage for hired labor. This compulsory wage work could be demanded only at hay mowing and at planting time.⁷²

Illegal extortion of *Robot* from the peasants seems to have been a fairly widespread habit. The inferior legal and personal status of the peasant kept him from being able to protect himself from these excesses of the landlord. Richard Bright, the English traveler, wrote of this practice in Hungary as follows:

The lord can legally claim only one hundred and four days' labour from each [full peasant] in the year; yet who can restrain him if he demands more? There are a multiplicity of pretexts under which he can make such demands, and be supported in them. The administration of justice is, in a great degree, vested in his own hands. There are many little faults for which a peasant becomes liable to be punished with blows and fines, but which he is often permitted to commute for labor. In fact, these things happen so frequently, and other extorted days of labour, which the peasant fears to refuse, occur so often, that I remember, when in conversation with a very intelligent [estate] Director, I was estimating the labour of each peasant at 104 days—he immediately corrected me and said I might double it.⁷³

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 51.

⁶⁹ Decrees of 21 November 1785, and 9 February 1786, *Vollständige Sammlung . . . Joseph der Zweyten*, V, 357-358, VI, 51-52.

⁷⁰ Sects. 31, 52, *Robotpatent* of 16 June 1786, for Galicia, *ibid.*, VI, 251-252, 258.

⁷¹ Mises, p. 55.

⁷² *Ibid.*, p. 55 and n.; *Hofentschliessung* of 8 August 1786, *Vollständige Sammlung . . . Joseph der Zweyten*, VI, 335-336.

⁷³ Bright, *Travels*, p. 115.

In Bohemia and Moravia-Silesia landlords often compelled their peasants to pay a labor rent for the right to gather wood and straw in the lord's forests or graze cattle on his pastures.⁷⁴ Hans Kudlich in his memoirs told of the village of Dorf-teschen, which belonged to a Count Renard, where there were 28 peasants, each with a quarter-holding of barren, stony land. From the end of June to the end of September they were forced to perform five days of *Robot* with two draft animals each week. During the rest of the year the number of *Robot* days to which they were held was determined by the need and arbitrary whim of the lord. At harvest time the full day's work of two people was counted as only one *Robot* day.⁷⁵ In some places in Moravia the unpaid compulsory labor of orphans, although forbidden by law, was demanded by landlords.⁷⁶

The whip, wielded by estate supervisors, played a formidable role in forcing peasants to work. Estate officials in Bohemia and Moravia-Silesia were called *karabátník* by the peasants, for *karabát* is the Czech word for whip.⁷⁷

At the Constitutional Reichstag in 1848, Michael Bodnar, a peasant delegate from Bukowina, asserted that as a rule the *Robot* demanded there was 150 days a year and often even more, although the legal annual limit was twelve.⁷⁸ At a later session, on 17 August 1848, Ivan Kapuszcak, a peasant delegate from Galicia, rose to his feet to protest against the proposal to indemnify landlords when the peasants were emancipated. His speech was an impassioned condemnation of the excesses practiced by the landlords of Galicia. He told his listeners, in part:

The landlords have the prescriptive right to demand *Robot* of us peasants. That is undeniable. But have they been satisfied with that? No, and again no! If we had to do 300 days of *Robot* instead of 100, if we had to do *Robot* three, four and, in fact, often every day in the week, and if the landlord counted this as one day—I ask you, gentlemen, should the peasant or the lord receive indemnification?

⁷⁴ Grünberg, *Bauernbefreiung*, I, 237.

⁷⁵ H. Kudlich, *Rückblicke und Erinnerungen* (3 vols., Vienna, Pest, Leipzig, 1873), I, 51.

⁷⁶ Bauer, *Landwirtschaft*, p. 144.

⁷⁷ J. Svátek, *Culturhistorische Bilder aus Böhmen* (Vienna, 1879), p. 176.

⁷⁸ *Verhandlungen des österreichischen Reichstages*, session of 11 August 1848, I, 503.

But it is said "The lord has treated the peasant with affection." That's right. Who considers it affectionate treatment if, after the peasant has worked the whole week through, the lord extends his hospitality over Sundays and holidays; that is, he has the peasant put in irons and thrown into a cattle stall, so that he will be even more industrious in performing his *Robot* during the coming week.⁷⁹

WAGES AND PRODUCTIVITY OF HIRED LABOR

When agricultural labor was hired its wage and method of payment varied extensively with local conditions. This fluctuation in wages between provinces is seen in the figures on the "lowest daily wage" (*geringster Tagelohn*) that were reported each year in the official statistical publication of the Monarchy.

Tables 11 and 12 show that the lower limit on wages moved upward in almost every province between 1830 and 1847. The only exceptions were Galicia and Dalmatia. Inspection of Table 11 reveals that the annual fluctuations were usually slight, so that the upward trend was gradual.

The differential between full money wage and cash and board also increased between 1830 and 1847, except in the Karst zone, where it decreased.

The variation between the lowest daily wages paid in the different provinces illustrates local labor conditions. The lowest wages in the realm were paid in the Northwest and Northeast zones. The plentiful labor supply there allowed employers to set a cheap price on hired hands. In contrast, in the provinces of the Alpine zone, where there was a labor shortage, wages were much higher. In Hungary the increase in the average lowest wage paid between 1830-39 and 1840-47 was the highest in the Monarchy (2.9 kr. or 16 per cent).

In addition to the workers who were paid a daily wage there were others who worked on shares. Threshers, customarily, were paid in this fashion. In Bohemia their usual share was about one-fourteenth of the grain they threshed.⁸⁰ In Carinthia threshers were paid a tenth, in lower Styria a thirteenth, and in the Marchfeld of Moravia four-thirtieths of the grain they threshed.⁸¹ In Hungary migratory Ruthenian and Croat workers

⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 585-586.

⁸⁰ *Oekonomische Neuigkeiten*, XXIX (1825), 234-235; Medinger, *Lobositz*, p. 174 n.

⁸¹ Burger, *Lehrbuch*, I, 340.

TABLE 11

LOWEST DAILY WAGE, 1831-1847 **
(in *kreuzer*)

Upper figure is full money wage.
Lower figure is wage with board.

	1880	1831	1832	1833	1834	1835	1836	1837	1838	1839	1840	1841	1842	1843	1844	1845	1846	1847
<i>Alpine zone</i>																		
Vienna.....	24	24	23	23	23	23	24	24	24	24	24	24	24	24	24	24	24	24
Lower Austria.....	20	21	23	23	22	24	24	23	23	23	24	24	23	22¾	23	24	24½	26
	12	13	13	14	13	15	14	14	14	13	14	14	14	13¾	13	14	15	15
Upper Austria.....	20	18	19	19	19	19	20	20	20	20	21	20	20	21	22	23	24	25
	10	8¾	8½	9	9¼	9	10	9¾	9¾	10	11	11	11	12	12	12	12½	14
Styria.....	19	18	18	18	18	19	17	18	16	20	18	19	20	20	20	22	21	26
	10	9	10	10	9¾	10	9	9	8½	9¼	9	10	10	11	11	11	12	14
Carinthia and Carniola...	22	23	23	24	24	24	24	24	24	24	24	24	24	26	25	25	26	26
	12	12	13	13	12	12	12	13	13	13	13	12	12	14	14	13	13	14
Tyrol.....	28	28	28	28	29	29	30	30	31	30	31	30	30	30	31	31	33	34
	13	14	13	13	14	14	15	16	16	15	16	15	15	15	15	16	17	17
<i>Northwest zone</i>																		
Bohemia.....	13	13	13	13	13	13	13½	13½	14	14	15	13	13	14	14	15	15½	16¾
	7½	7¾	7¾	7¾	8	7¾	7¾	8	8	8	8¾	8	8½	8¼	8¾	8½	9	9½
Moravia-Silesia.....	13	12	13	13	13	13	13	13	13	14	13	14	14	14	14	14	15½	16
	8	8¼	8½	8	8	9	8	8	8	8½	9	9	9¼	9½	9	9	9½	10
<i>North-east zone</i>																		
Galicia.....	11	12	12	12	12	12	11	11	12	12	12	11	12	12	11½	11	11¾	13¾
	7	7¼	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	6¾	7	7	6½	6½	6¾	7¼
<i>Karst zone</i>																		
Littoral.....	30	27	29	29	30	30	27	30	30	29	29	30	30	31½	30	29	35	34
	18	16	17	17	17	17	16	16	16	16	16	18	17½	19¼	18	17	20¾	18
Dalmatia.....	38	33	32	32	32	32	31	30	32	31	29	30	30	30	30	30	30	29
	18	18	18	18	18	18	17	17	18	19	18	18	17	17	17	17	17	16
Hungary (without Transyl- vania and Mil. Frontier)	13	16	17	19	20	19	19	18	20	20	20	20	20	20	21	21	22	24
	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..

** T. S., 1831-1847, incl., tables of average market price.

TABLE 12
AVERAGE LOWEST DAILY WAGE, 1830-1839, 1840-1847
(in *kreuzer*)

	Full money wage		Cash and board	
	1830-39	1840-47	1830-39	1840-47
Alpine zone				
Vienna	23.6	24	...	...
Lower Austria.....	22.6	24	13.5	14.1
Upper Austria.....	19.4	22	9.4	11.9
Styria.....	18.1	20.75	9.5	11.0
Carinthia and Carniola.....	23.6	25	12.5	13.1
Tyrol.....	29.1	31.25	14.3	15.75
Northwest zone				
Bohemia	13.3	14.5	7.8	8.7
Moravia-Silesia.....	13	14.3	8.3	9.3
Northeast zone				
Galicia	11.7	11.8	7	6.8
Karst zone				
Littoral	29.1	29.9	16.6	18.6
Dalmatia.....	32.3	29.75	18	17.1
Hungary (without Transylvania and Mil. Frontier).....	18.1	21	...	...

TABLE 13
AVERAGE DIFFERENTIAL BETWEEN FULL MONEY WAGE AND CASH AND
BOARD WAGE, 1830-39, 1840-47
(in *kreuzer*)

	1830-39	1840-47
Alpine zone		
Lower Austria.....	9.1	9.9
Upper Austria.....	10	10.1
Styria	8.6	9.75
Carinthia and Carniola.....	11.1	11.9
Tyrol.....	14.8	15.5
Northwest zone		
Bohemia	5.5	5.8
Moravia-Silesia.....	4.7	5.0
Northeast zone		
Galicia	4.7	5.0
Karst zone		
Littoral	12.5	11.3
Dalmatia.....	14.3	12.65

took their pay for mowing, reaping, and threshing in grain.⁸³ When Paton, the English traveler, toured along the Theiss River in central Hungary in 1850, he found that the harvesters received as pay an eighth part of the wheat they cut.⁸⁴

Another method of remuneration was to allow the peasant the use of a piece of land in return for his labor on the demesne. Prince Schwarzenberg, at the January, 1848, meeting of the Vienna Agricultural Society, told of this practice being followed in Bohemia, and Thädäus Krzisch, of Hungary, added that this method of payment for labor was in use in many places in that land, including Holitsch, the royal estate of which he was the director.⁸⁵

The hired laborer was much more efficient than was the *Robot* worker, a fact generally realized during the *Vormärz*, as will be seen in the next section of this chapter. Contemporary data on the productivity of hired labor show that the amount of work performed per day by the hired hand in the Monarchy compared favorably with that done by contemporary agricultural workers in the United States performing similar tasks. The Austrian plowman, with a well-built plow and a pair of good horses, could plow an average of about $1\frac{1}{4}$ acres in a day. If he used oxen he did about one-fourth less unless he changed his oxen, in which case he could put in a longer day and could thereby accomplish as much as could be done with horses.⁸⁶ The rate of plowing in the United States was "more nearly one acre than two acres per day" with either oxen or horses.⁸⁷ An Austrian sower could sow by hand from $9\frac{1}{2}$ to $11\frac{3}{4}$ acres in a ten-hour day.⁸⁸ A moderate performance in the United States was not less than ten acres per day.⁸⁹

In tests made in Styria in 1836 it was found that a man using a scythe, with two followers could reap, bind, and shock just about an acre of grain in ten hours.⁹⁰ Workers using a sickle

⁸³ Csaplovics, *Gemälde*, II, 121.

⁸⁴ Paton, *Goth and bun*, p. 26.

⁸⁵ *Verhandlungen* (Vienna Agr. Soc.), 2d series, V, part 1 (1848), 91, 93.

⁸⁶ André, *Darstellung*, pp. 130-131; Burger, *Lehrbuch*, II, 338.

⁸⁷ L. Rogin, *The introduction of farm machinery in its relation to the productivity of labor in the United States during the nineteenth century* (Berkeley, 1931), p. 16.

⁸⁸ André, *Darstellung*, p. 143.

⁸⁹ Rogin, p. 206.

⁹⁰ *Verhandlungen* (Styrian Agr. Soc.), new series, IX (1839), 53-56.

in the same tests were able to perform only 60 per cent of this amount.⁹¹ The results obtained in these tables were, according to F. X. Hlubek, professor of agriculture at the Joanneum at Graz and agricultural writer and editor, in close agreement with the actual experiences of estates in Bohemia, Moravia-Silesia, Upper and Lower Austria, and Carinthia.⁹² In the United States it required one day of man labor to reap, bind, and shock an acre of wheat with the scythe. Using a sickle, only one-half to three-fourths of an acre could be completed in the same time.⁹³

American hand threshers were apparently more productive than their Austrian counterparts. The latter, using the so-called Bohemian flail, in a nine to ten hour day could thresh out $2\frac{1}{2}$ to $3\frac{1}{2}$ bushels of heavy (winter) grain and $3\frac{1}{2}$ to $5\frac{1}{6}$ bushels of light (summer) grain.⁹⁴ Burger reported that on his own farm his workers threshed an average of 2.3 bushels of winter grain per day. In Moravia threshers separated and cleaned in an $8\frac{1}{2}$ hour day an average of 2.4 bushels of heavy grain and 4.1 bushels of light grain.⁹⁵ The usual performance of threshers in the United States was seven to eight bushels a day from grain yielding around twenty bushels to the acre, and five to six bushels with the lower yields prevailing in the older sections of the country in the first decades after the formation of the Union.⁹⁶

Landlords were interested in increasing the productivity of the individual laborer. This was evidenced by their interest in labor-saving agricultural implements and machinery. The agricultural journals carried many reports of tests held on noble estates to determine the efficiency of these new tools. The work of the provincial agricultural societies in this direction had already been described in Chapter III.

Scattered reports indicate that some of these labor-saving implements and machines were finding acceptance. Hlubek wrote in 1840 that threshing machines of various designs were

⁹¹ *Ibid.*

⁹² Hlubek, *Resultate*, p. 18.

⁹³ Rogin, pp. 125-130.

⁹⁴ F. X. Hlubek, *Die Landwirtschaftslehre in ihrem ganzen Umfange* (2 vols., Vienna, 1846), I, 531-532.

⁹⁵ Burger, *Lehrbuch*, I, 339-340.

⁹⁶ Rogin, p. 180.

used widely in Styria, even by small farmers.⁹⁷ According to Schnabel, multiple-shared plows, sowing machines, seed drills, and other new implements were in use in almost every district of Bohemia.⁹⁸ Török in 1846 claimed that as a result of the educational activity of the Hungarian Agricultural Society almost all the better-run Hungarian estates used sowing machines and many were beginning to adopt mechanical threshers.⁹⁹

THE INEFFICIENCY OF *Robot* LABOR

The productivity of the *Robot* worker was far inferior to that of the hired laborer. This inferiority was partially the result of the law, quite apart from the natural inclination of forced labor to be idle or inefficient. The legal definitions of the *Robot* for the different provinces stated that it was to be measured by time and not by task.¹⁰⁰ The length of the work day was carefully defined. In Lower Austria it was ten hours, with a two-hour rest period starting at noon. During the months when the days were too short for ten hours of outdoor work, the *Robot* was to be done from daybreak to sundown, with the two-hour rest period retained.¹⁰¹ In Bohemia, Moravia-Silesia, and in Galicia the *Robot* work day was seven hours from 1 October to 31 March and ten hours from 1 April to 30 September. At harvest time the work day could be extended by two hours.¹⁰² In Hungary the work day was from sunrise to sundown.¹⁰³

Actually, the time spent working was often considerably less than the legal work day, because the time spent going to and coming from work was included by the law in the work day for the German-Slav provinces.¹⁰⁴ In Hungary this time could

⁹⁷ Hlubek, *Resultate*, pp. 11-12.

⁹⁸ Schnabel, p. 87.

⁹⁹ *Ämlicher Bericht . . . X. Versammlung deutscher Land und Forstwirthe*, p. 217.

¹⁰⁰ In Bohemia and Moravia-Silesia task work could be used if the peasant agreed. *Robotpatent* in Grünberg, *Bauernbefreiung*, II, 264.

¹⁰¹ Barth-Barthenheim, *Das politische Verhältniss*, I, pt. i, 344.

¹⁰² *Robotpatent* for Bohemia in Grünberg, *Bauernbefreiung*, II, 262; sect. 1, *Robotpatent* for Galicia, *Vollständige Sammlung . . . Joseph der Zweyten*, VI, 242-243.

¹⁰³ Mailath, *Urbarialsystem*, p. 28.

¹⁰⁴ Barth-Barthenheim, *Das politische Verhältniss*, I, pt. i, 344; *Robotpatent* for Bohemia in Grünberg, *Bauernbefreiung*, II, 262; sect. 1, *Robotpatent* for

be deducted for nine months from February through October if it was not more than one to one and one-half hours. If the time spent was greater the county government decided how much was to be deducted. During the short days of November, December, and January the peasant had to travel back and forth on his own time. If the work site was a half day or more distant from the peasant's home he could be required each month to spend four consecutive days at the site without returning home, but with time spent going and coming included in the four days.¹⁰⁵

The effects of this provision allowing travel time to be deducted were recounted by a Bohemian observer, as follows:

. . . there are many estates in Bohemia that are so spread out that some of the *Robot* workers have to travel two miles [austrian] and sometimes even farther, before they get to the demesne. By the time they get there it is almost noon, and in the afternoon they have to leave betimes to avoid arriving at their homes late at night. So their entire day's labor amounts to four, or at the most, five hours.¹⁰⁶

The inefficiency of the *Robot* worker was a well recognized fact. Landlords, agriculturists, and publicists of the *Vormärz* were outspoken in their opposition to the *Robot* on this economic ground, and, as the period wore on, demanded that the institution be abolished. In 1820 a writer in the *Oekonomische Neuigkeiten* said that "there is just one opinion held by experienced persons about the disadvantages of the *Robot*, and all that can be said for or against it, has long since been said."¹⁰⁷

Franz Ritter von Heintl (1769-1839) was a successful Vienna lawyer who had been ennobled and had bought estates in Moravia and Lower Austria. He wrote prolifically on economic subjects. His greatest interest was in the agricultural development of the Monarchy and in 1807 he had organized the Vienna Agricultural Society.¹⁰⁸ In 1808 he published a book on

Galicia, *Vollständige Sammlung . . . Joseph der Zweyten*, VI, 242; Lindenbichel, p. 44.

¹⁰⁵ Mailath, *Urbarialsystem*, p. 28.

¹⁰⁶ *Austria* (Leipzig), II (1833), 143.

¹⁰⁷ L. Fischer, "Entwurf der Bestimmungen zur Reluirung der *Robot* auf der Herrschaft N," *Oekonomische Neuigkeiten*, XIX (1820), 123.

¹⁰⁸ Elvert, *Geschichte*, II, 198-203.

Austrian agriculture in which he pointed out that fields worked by *Robot* labor could be expected to give a smaller yield than other fields. In view of this reduced yield, and the overhead costs of the *Robot*, he argued that most estate owners would find it profitable to allow their peasants to commute their *Robot* into money payments, and to hire workers to till the demesne with tools and animals belonging to the lord. "My own properly equipped draft team is more valuable and more useful to me in my husbandry than ten *Robot* draft teams."¹⁰⁹ He recommended that *Robot* work be used during periods of labor shortage, as at harvest and vintage. For less pressing periods the *Robot* should be commuted and the money used to hire workers. Good hired labor, said Heintl, was over four times as efficient as *Robot* labor. He argued that lord, peasant and state would be better off.

Even if the peasant commutes his *Robot* day at only one-fourth the customary local daily wage the landlord is still provided with enough income to pay for the necessary hired labor. He is able to choose his own hired hands, which he cannot do with *Robot* workers. A selected hired laborer does more than four of the usual type of *Robot* workers. So with one-fourth the number of workers the given task will be better done and the workers will be more content. Further, the peasant by hiring himself out can earn his *Robot* commutation money in one quarter of a day and have left for himself three quarters of his day's wages which he can use to improve his own position. Lord and peasant, then, both gain, and the profit of the state is no less considerable because now its labor force will be used more efficiently and more work will be done in the given period.¹¹⁰

The writer of an article published in the *Oekonomische Neuigkeiten* in 1820, attempted to determine the cash value of *Robot* work in order to provide a guide for commutation. In comparing *Robot* work and hired labor (done with the lord's animals and implements) he pointed out that the *Robot* day was shorter because of the time lost in going to and coming from work, that *Robot* work was performed with less effort, poorer animals and equipment, less good will and no interest in the outcome. On the basis of computations he made for a Bohemian estate, identified only as N—, he concluded that two-twelfths of the *Zugrobot* day was lost in going to and

¹⁰⁹ Heintl, *Landwirtschaft*, I, 130-131.

¹¹⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 131-132.

coming from work. During the time he was on the job the *Robot* worker did one-third less than the hired laborer did. The poorer quality of the work the *Robot* worker did do and the other disadvantages of *Robot* work (he does not name them) reduced its value by another twelfth. One *Zugrobot* day, then, was worth five-twelfths of a hired laborer's day, or, one day's work by a hired laborer was worth about $2\frac{1}{2}$ days of *Zugrobot*.

Handrobot he found was not as inefficient. Time lost in going to and coming from work was less (the oxen of the *Zugrobot* worker were slow) and the hand worker was not handicapped by inferior animals and implements. He determined that one day of hired labor was worth two days of *Handrobot*.¹¹¹

A few months after the appearance of this article in the pages of the *Oekonomische Neuigkeiten*, a series on Lower Austrian agriculture by George von Hönigsberg began in that journal. Hönigsberg, an estate owner who had lived on the land for twelve uninterrupted years, undertook to defend the *Robot*. He warned his fellow landowners that if the *Robot* were abolished they would be unable to get the labor they needed to work their lands. Their estates would go to ruin or else they would have to sell off parts of their land at any price.¹¹² Apparently he believed that the landlord would not be able to afford hired labor, especially since wages would most likely go up with the abolition of the *Robot*. He assailed the argument that the *Robot* was the greatest existing barrier to agricultural progress.

... one is forced to marvel [he wrote] at the holy zeal of almost all writers on this subject, and one must perforce believe that all that is needed is one authoritative decree [abolishing the *Robot*] and agriculture would make extraordinary progress. But a more careful investigation and knowledge of the true state of affairs would show—aside from the injustice of making an attack on private property, for what right has the state got to take something from one person and give it to another—that a still more real danger exists, to wit; a landlord if he were robbed of the *Robot* would be compelled to leave his land untilled.¹¹³

¹¹¹ Fischer, "Entwurf der Bestimmungen," pp. 124-125.

¹¹² Hönigsberg, "Kurze Darstellung," pp. 14-15.

¹¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 14.

But Hönigsberg admitted that *Robot* work was poorly done. "Fields worked by *Robot* labor are inferior in yield . . . and in this wise are disadvantageous to agriculture." His remedy, however, was for the government to force peasants to do their *Robot* efficiently.¹¹⁴

An answer to the argument that the abolition of the *Robot* would leave the landlord without any labor had already been given in an article in the *Oekonomische Neuigkeiten* of a year before. This author, a Bohemian who signed his article only with initials, claimed that against every peasant who would do nothing if his *Robot* obligation were redeemed, he could cite estates, districts, provinces, even entire nations, where *Robot* redemption had worked successfully. In the Archduchy of Austria, Salzburg and Upper Austria were good examples. In Bohemia it was a common experience that peasants freed of their servile burdens were much more prosperous and industrious than their unfree neighbors. Abroad, France, Germany, England, the Netherlands, were examples of nations which prospered with a free peasantry. "Above all others the United States of America will prove satisfactorily, that where there is unlimited freedom of person and property such an unbelievably quick advance takes place as has never been seen in all the previous history of the world."¹¹⁵

Two years later the author of another piece in the *Oekonomische Neuigkeiten* looked abroad for the proof of the superiority of free labor over forced. He cited examples of specific estates in northern and eastern Europe on which the peasants had been freed, and which, thereafter, thrived as never before. His conclusion was that agriculture never reached a high degree of development when it was conducted by unfree workers.¹¹⁶

In 1817 Rudolph André published his manual on practical farming. In 1819 a second, enlarged edition was put out to be followed in the succeeding years by several more editions.¹¹⁷ André (1792-1825), the son of Christian Carl André, who was the founder and first editor of the *Oekonomische Neuigkeiten*,

¹¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 15.

¹¹⁵ *Ibid.*, XIX (1820), 215.

¹¹⁶ *Ibid.*, XXIII (1822), 239-240.

¹¹⁷ The edition used here is the fifth, published in 1846.

distinguished himself as an agriculturist at an early age. In 1815 he published his first book, on sheep raising, and in 1817 his agricultural handbook. In the writing of both these books he had the close cooperation of his father. In 1817 he was appointed director of the estate of Raitz in Moravia, owned by Prince Salm. Before his early death he had published two other books on agricultural subjects and was associate editor of the *Oekonomische Neuigkeiten*.¹¹⁸

In his manual André began the section on the productivity of labor with draft animals by explaining that the data that followed applied only to non-*Robot* labor. If the work were being done as *Robot* one-quarter to one-third less work should be expected per team. If one third less was accomplished this was evidence that the *Robot* peasants had very poor animals, or had come a long way to get to their work, or were working under poor supervision. The landlord should be satisfied if the *Robot* worker accomplished only one-quarter less than his hired workers.¹¹⁹

In his discussion of cartage André stated that ten *Centner* of manure was the usual load for a two-horse cart belonging to the lord. The cart of the *Robot* worker, pulled by two or three horses, carried, according to André's personal observation, six to seven *Centner* at the most.¹²⁰ Two or three horses belonging to the lord could haul one *Klafter* of wood, but if the horses of *Robot* workers were used four were required for the same load.¹²¹

André's evaluation of the productivity of *Robot* labor compared with hired labor was considerably higher than that given by an anonymous writer in the magazine *Austria* in 1833. In describing *Robot* labor in Bohemia this writer stated that it was only two-fifths as productive as non-*Robot* labor.

It is not exaggeration when I maintain that at the most two men with four horses doing free work do as much work as can be done by five men with ten horses doing *Robot* work.

As a result, only two-fifths of the agricultural working force are put into use, and if we realize that every peasant has to spend a third of his

¹¹⁸ Elvert, *Geschichte*, II, 140-141.

¹¹⁹ André, p. 130.

¹²⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 133.

¹²¹ *Ibid.*, p. 136 and n.

time doing *Robot*, around one fifth of the entire national strength that is applied to agriculture is lost. If one realizes further that with this part of the lost labor power an equally great amount of products could have been raised, the conclusions reached are that in five years an entire harvest is lost, and that Bohemia loses one fifth of its entire [agricultural] income every year.¹²²

In Hungary Count Stephen Széchenyi attacked the *Robot* in his book *Hitel (Credit)*, first published in 1827. He claimed that the amount of work done by the *Robot* worker with his bad plow, his weak animals and his rickety cart, could be done in one third the time by hired laborers using the lord's own good implements and strong animals. The use of *Robot* workers in road building and drainage was even more wasteful. In a drainage operation Széchenyi reported that the paid laborer did thirteen times as much work as the man who was doing compulsory labor.

He estimated that Hungarian peasants performed thirty million *Robot* days each year for their lords. Assuming that only one-third of this work was wasted—he characterized this as a very conservative assumption—ten million labor days were lost annually. This huge waste explained why Hungary was still covered with swamps and wastes. He argued that there was no shortage of workers in Hungary; the trouble was that so many hours of *Robot* work was wasted. If the *Robot* were to be abolished and the energies of Hungarian labor be applied in an understanding manner he prophesied that Hungarian agriculture would make great forward strides.¹²³

Soon after the appearance of the book on credit Széchenyi addressed himself to his fellow magnates. He asked them just what *Robot* work was, and then proceeded to answer the question himself.

What is the *Robot*? "Work that is scamped" goes the common saying. Everyone knows that our *Robot* workers accomplish less in three days than hired day workers do in one. Leaving aside much more important considerations I am thinking here only of your own interests. Do you think your fields thus cultivated by *Robot* labor give the good harvests with which heaven rewards intelligent labor? Do you realize

¹²² *Austria* (Leipzig), II (1833), 143-144.

¹²³ Széchenyi, *Credit*, pp. 94, 96-97.

that—measuring what you receive by what you are entitled to receive—the peasant gives you 100 days of work that are worth scarcely 30 days to you. Bear in mind that to cancel out two-thirds of a year's labor of an entire people is a monstrous suicide.¹²⁴

In the 1840's Count Casimir Batthyáni, in collaboration with the Hungarian Agricultural Society, offered a prize of 200 ducats (900 florins) for the best essay on the injustices and injuriousness of the *Robot* and *Zehent*. The prize was split among three winners. One of the winners showed that the *Robot* was a great misfortune for the peasant. After he had performed all his *Robot* for lord and state, and with time lost because of bad weather, he had no more than fifty days left in the year in which to do his own work. *Robot* work was disastrous for the landlord, too, because it was so poorly done that the yield of his estate declined. In contrast, there were many examples of an important increase in landlord income when the peasants were allowed to commute their *Robot* into money payments. The *Zehent* acted as a deterrent to proper cultivation of their own fields by the peasants because it was based on gross rather than net yield.

A second winner used many examples to prove that lord and peasant gained by the abolition of *Robot* and *Zehent*. The third winner attributed the extensive nature of Hungarian agriculture to the system of the *Zehent*.¹²⁵

Anton Springer, in going through a manuscript collection of memoirs and surveys on the *Robot* question written in the years 1836-1847 by such members of the high nobility and great landowning class as Counts J. M. Thun-Hohenstein, F. Deym, and L. Stolberg, found that the various writers had repeated in their reports the following passage almost to the word:

The peasant is impeded in the use of his own holding by his compulsory subjection, especially in that the *Robot* had accustomed him to fritter away his work day and do poor work. The lord, for his part, is dependent upon this *Robot*, and has to use this low quality labor; he cannot attempt a rational improvement of his tillage nor provide his own equipment, since it is not profitable to him. In addition, the cus-

¹²⁴ Quoted in S. Sugenheim, *Geschichte der Aufhebung der Leibeigenschaft und Hörigkeit in Europa bis zum die Mitte des 19en. Jahrhunderts* (St. Petersburg, 1861), pp. 482-483.

¹²⁵ Kún, pp. 95-96.

tomary way in which the *Robot* is performed infects both the lord and his labor, so that even with his hired labor time-wasting and imperfectly done work is not avoided to the extent to which it should and could be avoided.¹²⁶

In November, 1843, a special session of the Lower Austrian estates was convened to consider a proposal made by Wilhelm Freiherr von Walterskirchen to abolish the *Robot* and *Zehent*.¹²⁷ In the course of his defense of the proposal, Walterskirchen, one of the great landlords of the province, told his fellow nobles that everyone who was acquainted with the actual state of affairs knew that the natural inclination of the *Robot* worker was to do as little as possible in the time he was supposed to be working.¹²⁸ Later in the debate Anton Freiherr von Doblhoff-Dier, important landowner and model farmer, said that the *Robot* had outlived its usefulness and now was nothing more than a school of moral degeneration and indolence and the source of permanent dissatisfaction.¹²⁹

The Galician estates, too, were discussing the question of *Robot* abolition at this time. When the problem of the rate of commutation was brought up a commission of members of the estates recommended that a low value be set "because the work done by *Robot* is not equal to that done by hired labor."¹³⁰

In 1847 the *Oekonomische Neuigkeiten* published an article by its then editor, F. X. Hlubek, discussing the merits of the Patent of 18 December 1846 which dealt with *Robot* commutation. Hlubek attacked the *Robot* from an unusual angle. He calculated that on the basis of the area of arable in the German-Slav provinces and the area one draft animal could till, there was a superfluity of work animals in the German-Slav lands. This excess amounted to almost 700,000 animals. He estimated that the maintenance costs of these surplus animals was 60,000,000 florins annually. This was an enormous drain on Austrian agriculture. Furthermore, the development of other branches of animal husbandry was hindered by this situation, so that Austria had to import beef cattle.

¹²⁶ Springer, *Geschichte*, II, 381 n.

¹²⁷ See pp. 213-215, below.

¹²⁸ Bibl, *Stände*, p. 194.

¹²⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 197. See above, p. 60 and note, for a directly opposite opinion, expressed 50 years before, of the moral value of the *Robot*.

¹³⁰ Kraiński, p. 270.

The cause of this superfluity of draft animals, Hlubek continued, and therefore the cause of the evils that followed in its train, was the labor waste of the *Robot*. Instead of tilling three quarters to one yoke daily the *Robot* worker with his animals tilled only one quarter or, at most, a half yoke. This accounted for a huge waste of animal power and explained the presence of the 700,000 excess work animals. The small yields and the crop failures that were frequent occurrences in Austrian agriculture were also attributed by Hlubek to the inefficiency of *Robot* work. A glance at a field tilled by *Robot* workers was all that was needed to realize the cultivation was done so poorly that it was a mockery of proper theory and practice.¹⁸¹

The low value landlords placed upon the *Robot* is evidenced when the rates at which they allowed their peasants to commute this service during the *Vormärz* are compared with the data, presented in Tables 11 and 12, on the lowest daily full money wage paid hired labor. The hired laborer did not supply draft animals, yet often the commutation rate for *Zugrobot* was less than the lowest wage of hired labor, and this wage was several times greater than the commutation rates paid for *Handrobot*. The peasants of the village of Mauthdorf, on the Bohemian estate of Tachau, commuted 156 days of *Robot* with two animals and over 3,000 days with one animal at 14.4 kr. and 17.2 kr. per day, respectively, and 416 days of *Handrobot* at 6 kr. Another group of peasants on this estate commuted their *Robot* with two oxen at 13.2 kr. per day.¹⁸² The average lowest daily wage in Bohemia for the period 1830-1847 was 13.9 kr. A Styrian landlord in 1827 accepted a commutation rate of 6¼ kr. per day for *Handrobot*. Six years later on this same estate some more *Handrobot* was commuted at 3½ kr. In 1845 and 1846 on neighboring estates *Handrobot* was commuted at 2¼ kr.¹⁸³ The average lowest daily wage paid hired labor in Styria for the years 1830-1847 was 19.4 kr. In Galicia during the early 1830's *Handrobot* was commuted at 4 kr., *Robot* with two animals at 10 to 10½ kr., and with four animals at 20 to 20½ kr.¹⁸⁴ The average lowest daily wage in Galicia dur-

¹⁸¹ *Oekonomische Neuigkeiten*, LXXIII (1847), 245-246.

¹⁸² Helfert, *Aufzeichnungen*, pp. 71-72.

¹⁸³ *Oekonomische Neuigkeiten*, LXXIII (1847), 254.

¹⁸⁴ *Ibid.*

ing the 1830's was 11.7 kr., and in the 1840's 11.8 kr. In Carniola in the years 1835-1840 the *Handrobot* commutation rate was from 2 to 8 kr., and *Robot* with animals was commuted at 10 to 18 kr.¹³⁵ The average lowest daily wage in Carinthia and Carniola for the period 1830 to 1847 was 24.3 kr.

The *Robot* was the chief source of agricultural labor in the Monarchy during the *Vormärz*. It was supplemented by the hired day labor of peasants with small holdings, cotters, landless peasants, peasant children, and migratory labor. The adequacy of the labor supply varied between provinces. The lords of the Northwest zone and Galicia had sufficient labor available to meet their needs. In the Alpine zone, and especially in Lower Austria, there was an acute farm labor shortage. In the last-named province this shortage seems to have been mainly attributable to the movement from the land into towns, chiefly into Vienna. In Hungary, too, there was a farm labor shortage.

The lords resorted to both legal and illegal means in an attempt to increase the labor provided them by the *Robot*. But the inefficiency of *Robot* labor was increasingly recognized during the years of the *Vormärz*. This inefficiency rose from two causes. First, the legal provisions regulating the *Robot* materially shortened the length of the work day. Second, the *Robot* worker, doing forced labor as he was, had no reason to be interested in working efficiently. Landlords and agricultural writers expressed freely their discontent with the low quality of the *Robot* and their desire to end the *Robot* system and use free hired labor only. They realized that hired labor was much more efficient and that they would therefore benefit by substituting it for *Robot* labor. This realization was a chief cause—possibly, *the* chief cause—in making many landlords advocates of agrarian reform.

¹³⁵ *Ibid.*

CHAPTER VI

NOBLE LANDOWNERS AND THE AGRARIAN REVOLUTION

The realization of the economic loss involved in the existing landlord-peasant relationship was only one of several motives which created partisans of agrarian reform out of noble landowners. The opposition of the provincial assemblies, inspired by varying motives but all directed at ending the absolutist centralism of the regime and re-establishing provincial political independence; the unfolding of German, Czech, Polish and Magyar nationalism; the dark fears of peasant revolt; all were factors in this phenomenon. Whether enlightened economic self-interest had a greater over-all importance in this development than did provincial or nationalist ambitions, or whether the hobgoblin of a jacquerie outweighed the other considerations, or whether all were of equal importance, are questions which did not affect the outcome. The significant fact is that the noble landowners, who were the ostensible beneficiaries of the system of hereditary subjection, had entered the lists against it.

AGRARIAN REFORM A POLITICAL ISSUE

The cause of agrarian reform offered itself as a ready-made issue by which mass support could be won for the revolutionary programs which led up to the Revolution of 1848. Basically, there were four political programs in the revolutionary movement in the Monarchy and each of them had attracted noble supporters. First, there was the bourgeois liberalism that was so important in the '48 revolutions in other countries. In Austria it was overshadowed by the second basic program. This was the development of the feeling of national self-consciousness by the different peoples of the Monarchy. This appeared earliest and strongest among the non-German nationalities but it was felt by the Germans, too. Combined with these two programs, but with their own separate existences, were the other two basic platforms. One was the general and deep

hatred by all classes and all nationalities of the bureaucratic centralism by which they were ruled, and their desire to end it. The other was the revival of old memories of the political independence of individual crownlands.¹

The medium through which the noble landowners could express their political views was their provincial assemblies. These bodies, made up almost exclusively of nobles and prelates, in the German-Slav provinces had long since been submerged by the absolutism, and had little more than a shadow existence.² In some of the provinces, as in Upper Austria, Carinthia and Silesia, they continued to languish throughout the *Vormärz*.³ In others there came into being in the 1840's a definite political agitation that came to be known as the *ständische Bewegung*—the Estates movement. Although each of the assemblies that was affected had its own platform all shared one basic demand. They wanted to be given the place in provincial government they believed was rightfully theirs. They were no longer content with their "rubber-stamp" role and demanded the right to debate proposals of the central government and to suggest new legislation. When the central government refused their demands the estates movement took on the character of an opposition.⁴ This aristocratic discontent held no threat to the existence of the state. But it was eloquent witness to the crumbling of the Franciscan system, the forlorn condition of the government, and the irresistible pressure for change.⁵

The provincial assemblies of Styria, Carniola and Moravia during the 1840's showed their dissatisfaction with the central government by various unprecedented acts,⁶ but the outstanding estates opposition was in Lower Austria and Bohemia. In Lower Austria the agitation of the estates took on a liberal coloring, although the active members of the assembly were

¹ J. Redlich, *Das österreichische Staats- und Reichsproblem* (3 vols., Leipzig, 1920-1926), I, 80-81.

² See pp. 23-24, above.

³ Stern, *Geschichte Europas*, VI, 354.

⁴ Bibl, *Stände*, p. 38.

⁵ Springer, *Geschichte*, I, 509-510; Redlich, *Reichsproblem*, I, 76.

⁶ In 1846 the Styrian Estates proposed that exhaustive conferences be held on the gradual redemption of peasant dues and services. In 1843 the Carniolan Estates protested against the tax proposals of the government, instead of the usual practice of approving them automatically. Stern, *Geschichte Europas*, VI, 354-355. For the activities of the Moravian Estates see pp. 122-124, above, and pp. 217-218, below.

entirely noble and clerical. Many of the younger noblemen leaned toward liberalism.⁷ When they rose to demand the abolition of *Robot* and *Zehent* they appealed to the *Zeitgeist* for their justification.⁸ This abolition, they claimed, was in accordance with the common welfare and the advanced spirit of the times.⁹ *Robot* and *Zehent* were relics of a bygone era.¹⁰ In Bohemia the Czech national renaissance provided the driving force for the estates movement in that land. Czech nationalism sought to gain for Bohemia what was considered its proper place in the Monarchy, based upon historic right.¹¹

In Galicia the cause of agrarian reform became associated with Polish nationalist strivings. After the unsuccessful Polish revolution of 1830-1831 many revolutionaries had fled to Galicia where they continued their eternal plotting. A large number of these exiles were adherents of the Democratic Party, the *Towarzystwo demokratyczne*. They took up the cause of peasant reform because they realized that a Polish national movement was not possible if the people upon whom it must depend were held in bondage. The national revolution must go hand-in-hand with a social revolution. To win over the masses "shining promises were made and magical slogans invented," assuring every Galician peasant a piece of land all his own with no dues or services to render for it.¹² The nationalist propaganda had its effects upon the lower nobility, the clergy, burghers, estate officials and soldiers. Soon a revolutionary net covered Galicia and, despite arrests by the government, the movement made progress. But the reaction that greeted the agitators who went out among the peasants was not what the Democrats had expected. The peasants listened carefully but what they heard did not inspire them with patriotic fervor.

Indeed the peasants listened when townsmen, priests, estate officials, on many a smaller estate the lord himself,—men who had hitherto assiduously avoided all contacts with them—sought them out and talked confidentially with them. Their eyes gleamed when they heard these

⁷ Springer, *Geschichte*, I, 542; Redlich, *Reichsproblem*, I, 76.

⁸ Bibl, *Stände*, pp. 193-194.

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 195.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 207.

¹¹ V. Valentin, *Geschichte der deutschen Revolution 1848-1849* (2 vols., Berlin, 1930-1931), I, 6-7; Redlich, *Reichsproblem*, I, 106-109.

¹² Mises, pp. 101-103; Stern, *Geschichte Europas*, VI, 365.

people speak of a better, more beautiful, future in which there would be no more lords and no more thralls but where everyone would be brothers. But what they drew from the words of the agitators added fuel to their hatred of the nobility. The restoration of the Polish state meant nothing to them. What did they care about Poland? Polish or German, it was all the same. They knew just one thing and that was that their sole protection against the oppression of their Polish landlords had come from the Austrian government. Old people still remembered all the injustices the peasant had suffered long ago, and which he no longer had to endure because of the intervention of the Emperor. So peasants everywhere labelled themselves as "imperial" and "Austrian" and shunned all that was Polish, for Polish were their oppressors.¹³

The Democrats realized that their plans had gone awry. Moreover, the peasant reaction to their propaganda had, naturally enough, awakened the mistrust of the landed nobility, and the friendship of this class seemed more important to the Democrats at this time than did the support of the peasantry. It was agreed to end peasant agitation. But some clergymen, and Democrats who did not feel themselves bound by the decision of their party leaders, soon resumed their propaganda among the countrymen. The priests cloaked their activities by forming temperance societies among the heavy-drinking peasants.¹⁴

In Hungarian agrarian reform became a plank of the Liberal party's platform. The Liberal's rallying cry of patriotism tipped the scales increasingly in favor of freeing the peasants and wrested more and more concessions from the opposition.¹⁵ But patriotism was not enough. Count Stephen Széchenyi, the "Great Magyar," recognized this early in his career when he said of his fellow noble landowners: "These people do not worry, or if they do worry it is just about themselves. They forget completely about the peasant. He counts for nothing in their eyes."¹⁶ Széchenyi knew that such men would never favor peasant freedom unless they were convinced of its profitability to them. An appeal to their emotions would be fruitless. So he approached them on the plane of dispassionate reasoning. He told them that emancipation of the peasant was in their best interests, attributing much of Hungary's economic back-

¹³ Mises, pp. 104-105.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 105, 111-112.

¹⁵ Kún, pp. 94-95.

¹⁶ Quoted in *ibid.*, p. 92 n.

wardness to the maintenance of the system of hereditary subjection.¹⁷ He propagated his ideas through his books in which he developed his plans to reform the lord-peasant relationship, the legal and political class inequalities, and the forms of noble land tenure. He had a deep intellectual influence upon his contemporaries and won many adherents who carried his ideas into the governing bodies of Hungary in which they sat.¹⁸

New ideas, new movements, and new sympathies were not the only social and political impetuses to agrarian reform. There was also the ever-present danger of peasant revolt. Ignaz Beidtel suggests that judicious Austrian landlords had come to the realization that the system of hereditary subjection could not withstand a determined attack. The examples of neighboring countries where forced labor had been abolished and the peasant freed had demonstrated to these nobles the economic feasibility of emancipation and had made the peasants look upon their own status as a form of slavery. It was feared that the peasants would seize a favorable opportunity to throw off their yoke and declare themselves free without any indemnification being made to their erstwhile lords.¹⁹

Until the Galician revolt in 1846 (described later in this chapter) there were only trifling peasant uprisings during the *Vormärz*. In 1831 the cholera had raged in Hungary. To the usual horrors of this plague were added peasant disturbances in several northern Hungarian counties. At first, the peasants had been stirred up by the fear of the disease but soon they turned against landlords.²⁰ Bibl cites several instances of petty local revolts in the early 1830's over pasturage rights in Lower Austria, which subsided after arrests and beatings.²¹ In 1834 troops were called out to quell disturbances in Lower Austria arising from new tax regulations.²² In the spring of 1835 reports were received by the Lower Austrian Estates,

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 92. See pp. 198-199, above.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 93.

¹⁹ Beidtel, II, 377-378.

²⁰ Springer, *Geschichte*, I, 466; L. von Wirkner, *Meine Erlebnisse* (Pressburg, 1879), pp. 62-63.

²¹ Bibl, *Stände*, pp. 111-116.

²² *Ibid.*, p. 101.

then in session in Vienna, of peasant disturbances in the *Viertel unter dem Manhartsberg*, the northeast quarter of the province. The outbreaks had taken place after peasant community meetings discussing the ending of servile obligations. These meetings had been held openly in inns and elsewhere, at both day and night, and money and signatures had been collected. The Estates became seriously concerned about all these disorders, fearing that the services of the peasants would be lost to landlords without indemnification. They sent a petition to the throne in April, 1835, asking that the Emperor give the outbreaks his attention because they were loaded with dangerous potentialities. The petition said, in part:

It is well known that the obligations owed to the lord which adhere to peasant land and which are taken on by the occupant of that land, have for a long time been demanded, generally, with the greatest of consideration. They have frequently been overlooked, and have usually been below the limit allowed by law. Despite this [the peasants] frequently refuse to perform their obligations, taking advantage of their lords, so that the latter no longer draw out the income they used to get. Oftentimes, they do not even get the amount equal to the taxes they are required to pay. These generally changed conditions have produced in most lords the desire to come to an agreement with their peasants either to redeem the obligations or to commute them into annual cash payments. This desire is in the best interests of the peasants and also is designed to avoid the future danger of losing still more or even all of the lords' income from the dues and services.²³

The Estates requested that the throne issue a Patent warning the peasants that they must perform their obligations. This would serve as the surest way to fend off further disorders, and at the same time promote the desired adjustment of the lord-peasant relationship. The plaint of the Estates and their suggestions fell on deaf ears. The government refused to take any action.²⁴

THE NOBLE PROGRAM OF AGRARIAN REFORM

The campaigns for agrarian reform that were waged by noble landowners through their provincial assemblies were all basically similar. The individual plans that were advanced differed in detail with the different provinces, but all were erected on

²³ Quoted in *ibid.*, p. 124.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 125.

the same fundamental assumption. This assumption was that the dues and services owed by the peasant were a property right of the lord. If they were ended, an indemnification must be paid to the lord for the loss in property he thereby incurred. This was the essence of the noble landowners' program of agrarian reform.

Hungary was the only province in which the campaign of the noble landlords met with any success before 1848. In the German-Slav provinces their drives for reform foundered because the provincial assemblies there lacked the power to wrest reforms from an unwilling absolutism. In Hungary the nobility had retained its corporate power in government.²⁵

The reaction against the reforms of Joseph II had held the noble landowners of Hungary in its grip for many years. Not until the Diet of 1832-1836 did these men concern themselves seriously with the problem of agrarian reform. At that Diet, for the first time, defenders of the Liberal cause appeared in open debate to lead the fight for change in the lord-peasant relationship.²⁶ Their zeal for reform did not yet extend to fundamentals. No one contradicted the belief that the lord was the owner of the land and the peasant only the usufructuary. These men were ready only to regulate and amend.²⁷

On 19 November 1833, the reform proposals of the Diet were presented to the throne for its approval. Among these proposals were recommendations that the limits on peasant freedom of movement be extended, that the peasant be given credit for improvements he made to his holding, that a number of local abuses be ended, and that the peasant community be allowed to choose its magistrate from a slate of three men nominated by the lord. In addition, the Diet urged that peasant dues and services be made redeemable, that the jurisdiction of the lord be limited, that disputes between lord and peasant over matters concerning tenure be settled by county officials, and that the privilege of the nobility to be sentenced only by a judge's decision be extended to the peasantry.

Nine months later the government announced its decision on these proposals. Most of the measures lightening the

²⁵ See pp. 33-38, above.

²⁶ Kún, p. 93.

²⁷ Springer, *Geschichte*, I, 471.

peasant's burden were endorsed. But approval was withheld from the decisive proposal that peasant services be redeemable. The government pointed out that in a code regulating the system of hereditary subjection there was no place for provisions which would abolish the system. The proposed limitations on the lord's judicial powers were also disapproved.

Undismayed at this rejection, the Diet's liberal members went back to work to produce new and acceptable reform proposals. They encountered stronger opposition now, for the royal disapprobation had strengthened the cause of the opponents of reform in the Diet. When the motion was made that the new bill, like the previous bill, should include recommendations for redemption and for limitation of the lord's judicial powers, it was defeated, although by a narrow margin. The reformers did succeed in gaining the approval of the Diet for the right of the peasant to commute his dues and services into money payments and to institute legal proceedings in his own name rather than through the intercession of the lord, and for ending the power of the lord's court to give the death penalty.²⁸

These modified proposals won royal approval and were promulgated as the *Urbarium* of 1836 to serve as an amendment to the Theresian code.²⁹ Soon after the promulgation of the new code it was found that some of its provisions were unclear and that others failed to conform to the requirements of the interested parties. So the Diet which convened in 1839 busied itself anew with the agrarian problem. It became quickly evident from the discussions that the majority of the members present were in favor of extending the property rights and the personal freedom of the peasant.³⁰ The principle of the redemption of peasant obligations, rejected only a few years before by the throne, now was approved without debate and was given royal consent. The new law, issued in 1840, declared that the individual peasant or community could redeem dues and services perpetually by paying an amount arrived at by free, voluntary agreement with the lord. The agreement, once made, could not be dissolved.³¹

²⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 470-473.

²⁹ For the provisions of this new code see pp. 87-88, above.

³⁰ Springer, *Geschichte*, I, 502.

³¹ Kún, p. 95.

A few years later at the Diet of 1847 a member of the lower house proposed that redemption be made compulsory.³² All parties in the debate that followed agreed that *Robot* should be abolished and that the acts of 1836 and 1840 had not been effective. The argument centered on whether the law should be compulsory for both parties, that is, that the peasant be compelled to redeem perpetually or commute into annual money service his dues and services, and that the lord be compelled to accept; or, whether the only legal compulsion be that the lord accept if the peasant wanted to redeem or commute. The supporters of the latter view, that the compulsion extend only to the lords, won out. It was decided to appoint a committee from both chambers charged with drawing up a bill incorporating the wishes of the majority. These proposals were sent forward to the upper chamber for its approval.³³

It soon became evident there that the majority in the upper chamber, both liberal and conservative, were opposed to compulsion. Baron Nicolas Vay expressed the dominant view of his fellow magnates when he said that if the law was to be coercive it should be so for peasant as well as lord. He advised, however, that the best course to follow would be to afford increased facilities for voluntary redemption or commutation as provided by the 1840 law. He proposed the selection of a committee to devote itself to determining the methods of removing the obstacles in the way of these voluntary operations. Above all, Vay urged, the committee should devise a way of raising the needed capital in such a manner as to insure full compensation for the lords without ruining the peasants. He recommended the committee consider the establishment of mortgage banks for this purpose. Further, he believed that it should plan the creation of impartial commissions to adjust equitably claims and disputes arising in the course of voluntary redemption and commutation.

Vay's motion was supported by both Liberal and Conservative leaders of the chamber and was carried without a division. Among those who spoke in favor of the measure was the

³² Springer, *Geschichte*, II, 131.

³³ Inclosure 2, "Summary of the proceedings of the Hungarian Diet of 1847-1848," Ponsonby to Palmerston, Vienna, 19 January 1848, *Sessional papers*, 1851, LVIII, 10-11.

Bishop of Csanad, a prelate member of the Diet. He told the meeting that it was an error to believe the clergy were opposed to the ending of servile obligations. On the contrary, said the Bishop, the clergy will always be ready to support any measure that tended to ameliorate the condition of the peasantry.³⁴

In Lower Austria the Estates' attack upon the lord-peasant relationship was connected with the nobility's dissatisfaction with tax assessments. This general vexation with taxation was extremely useful to the liberal members of the Estates because it provided them with a lever in their campaign against the *Robot* and the *Zehent*. In the early 1840's, after twenty-five years of work, the land cadastre for Lower Austria had been completed. The lords immediately protested against the assessed valuation for tax purposes placed upon the dues they received from their peasants, especially the *Zehent*.³⁵ They claimed that actually they did not receive a tenth of what the assessors credited them with, since it was a known fact that the lord was bested in these payments. They pointed out further that the collection of the *Zehent* was an expensive procedure, especially when it had to be brought from a distance. It was subject to the depredations of thieves and the possibility of damage from the weather.³⁶ In a discussion of taxation at the Estates meeting in September, 1843, Freiherr von Walterskirchen stated that the lands of the lords were threatened with destruction by the new taxation. He urged the abolition of *Robot* and *Zehent* as the way to avoid this. He argued that the Estates must declare themselves ready to allow redemption of these two obligations with the proviso that the Estates determine the method of redemption.³⁷ Walterskirchen, now 48, had operated his great ancestral estate of Wolfsthal, situated on the Lower Austrian-Hungarian frontier, since he was nineteen. Bibl wrote of him: "His entire life was an actual advertisement for justifying the existence of the seignorial system, for he worked tirelessly for the welfare of his peasants, was responsible for the introduction of many improvements, and in a truly

³⁴ Inclosure 5, "Continuation of the proceedings of the Hungarian Diet," Ponsonby to Palmerston, Vienna, 14 March 1848, *ibid.*, pp. 35-36.

³⁵ Springer, *Geschichte*, I, 543.

³⁶ Bibl, *Stände*, p. 189.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 191-192.

self-denying fashion applied measures of social welfare at a time when the understanding for such things was very rarely encountered."³⁸ His fellow lords listened intently to his proposals and decided that they should be studied carefully and at length. Walterskirchen, Anton Freiherr von Doblhoff-Dier, liberal leader of the Estates, and the Abbot of Melk were delegated to draw up a workable plan based upon Walterskirchen's motion. A special session of the Estates was to be called to hear and debate this report.

The appointment of a special committee and the calling of a special session were evidence of the importance the Estates' members attached to this issue. Both of these procedures were most unusual. The summoning of a special session was virtually an unknown practice, while all proposals made by members had always been referred to the Estates' standing steering committee of eighteen. The purpose behind the tactics that were now adopted was to achieve speedy action. If the Walterskirchen proposals had gone through the usual channels into the hands of the unwieldy steering committee much time would have been lost in the wrangling there.³⁹

The special session, which attracted many more members than the usual meetings, convened in November, 1843. Walterskirchen opened the debate, repeating his proposals. He pointed out that the root of the present difficulties of landowners was the inaccurate and inflated tax evaluation placed upon the dues and services lords received from their peasants. The assessors had made theoretical calculations, he said, so that the lord was taxed upon income he did not receive. He explained that *Zehent* commutation would benefit the lord because he would get a fixed annual sum rather than a quantity of produce which fluctuated from year to year and which he collected with difficulty. The peasant would be encouraged to become a better farmer and would increase his gross product when he knew that all he raised belonged to him. The state would benefit from the improvement in farming and from the cessation of the many quarrels and the deceitfulness engendered and encouraged by the existing system. He attacked the *Robot*

³⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 191.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 192-193.

as uneconomic because of its waste of labor power, and as morally debilitating.⁴⁰

Then Doblhoff-Dier presented the report of the special committee. The committee agreed that the only way out of the difficult tax situation was the redemption of *Robot* and *Zehent*. This redemption should be voluntary for the next five years, then be made compulsory. A mortgage bank should be established to provide the necessary capital for the operation.⁴¹

The debate on the committee's plan was a lively one. Finally, 33 members voted for the committee's report, 28 favored a modified scheme suggested by Freiherr von Aichen, and 19 voted against both plans. Since there was no absolute majority a compromise was effected. It was decided to forward a petition to the throne in which the Estates announced their willingness to have *Robot* and *Zehent* redeemed and asked for enabling legislation to facilitate this.⁴² A nine-member committee was appointed to draw up this memorandum but it was actually written by Doblhoff-Dier, who was one of the nine chosen. The document he produced, pointing out the need for agrarian reform and its inevitability, was a "manifesto of the Liberal party of the Estates."⁴³

The ten prelates at the session were among the nineteen men who had voted against any change in the status quo. These churchmen, according to Springer, had a natural sympathy for medieval institutions. Furthermore, the system of hereditary subjection, although not profitable, was easy to manage and produced enough to meet the needs of clerical landlords.⁴⁴ One of the prelates had attacked the proposal for redemption made by the Walterskirchen committee as being too precipitous. He said he could not see how rights that were more than a thousand years old, that were imbedded in the soil, could be changed all at once into money payments. One could consider such a procedure only if a just basis had been established for it voluntarily. Any compulsion, any deadline, was unacceptable to him.⁴⁵

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 193-194.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 194-195. See pp. 118-120, above, for mortgage bank plans.

⁴² *Ibid.*, pp. 200-202.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, pp. 205-208.

⁴⁴ Springer, *Geschichte*, I, 544.

⁴⁵ Bibl, *Stände*, p. 195.

A Vienna dispatch to the liberal emigré journal *Grenzboten* assailed and explained this clerical opposition to agrarian reform, which continued at subsequent meetings of the Estates, in the following words:

. . . the clerics, who own large estates in Lower Austria, will hear nothing of redemption. It must be kept in mind that the economy of the monastic estates differs from that of secular lords. *Robot* is suitable for the former since most of them . . . usually do not have the necessary work animals and tools to be used in working their lands if the *Robot* would be ended today. The monasteries, then, have no expenses and have an assured income which is considerably larger than it would be if they accepted redemption and had to pay for each day's labor in cash. The venerable fathers do not consider the difference in the quality of the labor. Further, they jesuitically argue that the payment of the *Zehent* in kind is much less oppressive to the peasant than an annual cash payment. In the latter case he always has to pay the same fixed amount, whereas if he is paying in kind he pays less in the event of a bad year. The priests overlook the fact that in a bad year every ear of corn is precious to the peasant. The produce with which he pays his *Zehent* has to be replaced by money purchases because what he has left after paying the *Zehent* is not enough to meet his needs.⁴⁶

When the Estates next met in the spring of 1844 Walterskirchen again complained of the unfair burdens resting upon the landlord. "Unbearable is the pressure which weighs down upon the landlord," he exclaimed. Prince Liechtenstein seconded these sentiments, saying "Unfortunately, it cannot be denied that in recent times demands have been made of the landlord which he cannot meet. The desire all but takes shape in the landlord not to have anything more to do with administrative and judicial functions."⁴⁷

At the Estates meeting of 17 June 1844, Ritter von Schreiber gave the report of a special committee selected earlier that year to draw up a bill of the complaints of the nobles for presentation to the throne, along with a petition for relief. The report protested against the administrative costs of the various, and increasing, unpaid civil and police duties the lords had to perform, such as the supervision of the *Vorspann*, the supervision of troop billeting, the authenticating of passes, aiding in tax levying and collection, and many more. An espe-

⁴⁶ *Grenzboten*, V (1846), iii, 173.

⁴⁷ *Bibl, Stände*, p. 252.

cially strong protest was registered against the system for the care of vagabonds. No province of the Monarchy was so plagued by these wanderers as was Lower Austria, the report declared. Vienna drew the "scum of the Monarchy." Thousands streamed to and from it each year, and to the estates surrounding the city fell the thankless task of caring for the vagabonds who were among the transients.⁴⁸

A year later, at the meeting of 13 June 1845, the Estates voted to forward to the throne two more petitions pleading the case of the nobles. One was a statement of the ancient rights of the Estates.⁴⁹ The other told of the weak position to which the landlord-peasant relationship had fallen and the dangers of its imminent complete collapse. The landlords were now burdened with a host of duties they had never before had. Simultaneously, they no longer enjoyed privileges nor had the same income that had once been theirs. The right to pasture their herds and flocks on the fallow fields and the alcoholic beverages monopoly had once paid the costs of police administration. The obligatory labor of peasant orphan children had reimbursed the lord for his expenses of guardianship of these children. The money dues he had received from his peasants had supplied him with the cash he needed to pay his taxes. Now the right to pasture was in the largest measure valueless because of the general practice of tilling and planting of the fallow. The value of the liquor monopoly was almost extin-

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 252-253.

The costs of the vagabond system were, in fact, apparently not inconsiderable. The vagabond had to be jailed and fed while the estate to which he belonged was informed of his whereabouts. Once the necessary arrangements had been made for his return the vagabond was started upon his homeward trip. But first he had to be examined by a doctor, cleaned, and clothed. After he got home the vagabond could sell his clothes for liquor, and, after an alcoholic debauch, begin his wanderings again, revisiting the estates which had given him the best treatment in his previous tramp journeys. The lords were helpless against this peculiar form of exploitation.

The most unfair aspect of the system was its unequal distribution of costs. The burden fell almost exclusively upon those landowners whose estates were traversed by the chief highways or were situated on the borders between provinces. Walterskirchen, whose holding lay on the Hungarian-Lower Austrian border, told the Estates that in one year he had had to provide 1,700 rations for vagabonds and spend 200 florins for clothes for them. *Ibid.*, pp. 252, 253-254.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 260.

guished by the introduction of new taxation and by the ease with which a publican's license could be obtained. The forced labor of minor children who were not needed at home had been abolished by the government, as had a number of cash dues. These ancient rights and privileges were gone but their equivalent noble obligations remained and had been increased. Now, the lord carried the heaviest burden in the state.⁵⁰

Despite the urgency with which the November, 1843, special session of the Estates had pressed this entire matter, their address to the throne in which they had made known their views and wishes went unanswered.⁵¹ But the actions of the Estates had not gone unmarked by the central government. Hitherto, the Estates had held themselves aloof from political opposition, had presented their petitions in legal form, and had served the conservative interest. Now their activities had made them offensive to the regime. The Chancellory, on 7 June 1844, informed the Estates that the views of the Estates would be asked only on those tax questions which they had the right to discuss. The displeasure of the government was demonstrated more positively when on 19 September 1845, the Estates were forbidden to present their petitions or addresses directly to the throne, even if the document was only a message of thanks to the Emperor.⁵²

In 1847 the Moravian Estates petitioned the throne (unsuccessfully) for permission to establish an Estates mortgage bank to facilitate agricultural improvement, especially to finance the redemption of the *Robot* and *Zehent*.⁵³ Their address, in part, was as follows:

It is unfortunately a recognized fact that during a period of peace lasting more than 30 years landed property, of all the elements of society, has gone through the least prosperous development,—that same landed property which in days gone by was considered the real foundation of our state, and which the state had always protected as such in trying times. Investment, improvement, an upswing of any sizable degree in this field is an exception. By and large, in agricultural pursuits and production, as well as in the welfare of the farm population,

⁵⁰ "Ein Acktenstück der Niederösterreichischen Ständeversammlung," *Grenzbotten*, V (1846), part iii, 472-486.

⁵¹ Bibl, *Stände*, p. 278.

⁵² Springer, *Geschichte*, I, 544-545.

⁵³ See pp. 122-124, above.

there is not to be found that progress which in view . . . of the development in other spheres of activity one could with justice expect to find. Indeed, recent experiences have awakened the fears, not without reason, that in our land that is so richly endowed by nature, production of essentials is not keeping pace with demand. . . .

It would be a mistaken judgement to ascribe these farm conditions to a lack of intelligence, alertness, and activity on the part of the rural population.⁵⁴

The petitioners blamed this parlous state of agriculture on several factors, all of them beyond the farmer's control. Thus, there was the heavy tax burden resting on the land, the absence of credit facilities, the periodic economic crises, the competition that was beginning to be felt from the new lands across the seas. Finally:

To all this [the petitioners continued] is added the fact that right now a question is ripening into maturity upon whose happy or unhappy solution depends the most important results, not only for the material but also for the moral conditions of land ownership. A composition of the most important servitudes encumbering peasant holdings, the *Robot* and the *Zehent*, should be arrived at. This composition will take enormous sums of money.

If this operation . . . is not to remain fruitless, peasant occupants must have not just titular freedom but real freedom. The chains must not be just exchanged, they must be entirely unlocked, they must be broken. . . .⁵⁵

In Galicia the unexpected backfiring against the nobility of the propaganda of the Democratic Party among the peasants had forced the nobles into a deal with the Democrats. Mises (who cites Freiherr von Sala, *Geschichte des polnischen Aufstandes vom Jahre 1846* [Vienna, 1867] as his authority) states that it was agreed that the Democrats should stop their activities among the peasants, in return for which the nobles would introduce the question of agrarian reform into the Estates. The lords were willing to be a party to this compromise, Mises continues, because of the 'low value of the *Robot*, the increasing peasant discontent, and the fear that the *Robot* would ultimately become entirely worthless.'⁵⁶

Whatever their ulterior motivation might have been, the

⁵⁴ Petition of the Moravian Estates, 2 June 1847, in *Grenzboten*, VI (1847), iv, 27.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 28-29.

⁵⁶ Mises, pp. 105-106.

Galician Estates, in their public actions and their addresses to the throne stressed repeatedly the economic ills besetting lord, peasant, and state as a result of the existing system. At the September, 1843, sessions of the Estates it was moved that a commission be appointed which "should concern itself with proposals for improving the condition of the peasant, investing him with property, and modifying the *Robot* obligations." The motion failed to carry. It was then decided by an 86-15 vote that the Emperor should be asked to empower the Estates at their next meeting to choose a commission of members to study the lord-peasant relationship. This commission, on the basis of its investigations, would make recommendations to the Estates on the method of improving this relationship that would best serve the interests of lord, peasant, and commonweal. The Estates would present to the throne their petition for reforms based upon the commission's recommendation.⁸⁷

The government went through its customary tergiversations before it answered this mild proposal. Finally, the regime's fear of the unrest and instability that would inevitably accompany sweeping changes in the social fabric and its hunch that revolution was lurking somewhere off in the wings, won out over the considerations favoring reform.⁸⁸ On 9 July 1844, the Estates were informed that the relation between lord and peasant, and any improvements in it, had always been and would remain a concern of the throne, alone. The Estates' request, therefore, was denied.⁸⁹

This rejection left the Estates undismayed. At their next meeting, in September, 1844, a decisive majority voted to forward another petition to the Emperor on the subject of the lord-peasant relationship and again asked permission to form a commission to study it. This time they told the Emperor that they

. . . were convinced of the necessity incumbent upon them to relieve the poverty of the Galician countryman which stood in the way of the prosperity of the entire province, of the need to introduce such improvements into the mutual relations of lord and peasant which would eliminate the frequent disputes, and to clear away the hindrances to

⁸⁷ Kraiński, p. 48; Mises, pp. 107-108.

⁸⁸ Mises, p. 108.

⁸⁹ Kraiński, pp. 49-50.

the proper cultivation of the soil; [all of which measures] would consolidate internal peace and be calculated to develop the productive capacities of the province. . . .⁶⁰

They, therefore, requested permission to select a commission of their members to study these and related problems and issues. The commission would then submit a carefully thought out plan of reform to the Estates for further action.⁶¹

This request met with more success than did the similar request of the year before. This time the Emperor gave his approval with the proviso that the commission was not to meet until the government gave the word. Meanwhile, its members could be selected and could gather data and perform necessary preliminary work. At the next meeting of the Estates, in September, 1845, eighteen members and eighteen alternates, one member and one alternate for each of the eighteen districts of the province, were chosen to serve on the commission.⁶²

With this imperial concession to their credit the Estates now sought, by a 116 to 10 vote, to induce the throne to allow an extension of the commission's powers. They forwarded a petition in which they requested that

. . . with reference to the mutual disadvantages which arise from the . . . obligations [inherent in the system of hereditary subjection], measures be considered whereby these obligations of the peasants would be made easier by commutation . . . or by redemption through voluntary agreement. Thereby, the hindrances arising from the existing legislation could be ended. Also, a study should be made to determine what methods [of commutation and redemption] are most suitable, and what arrangements are needed for a proper consolidation of the land of both lord and peasant; and for peasant land alone, determination of what is needed for the most expeditious promotion of the division of the commons and the abolition of the harmful servitudes.⁶³

This request for increased powers for the commission was repeated in the final address of the Estates of 1845 to the throne.

To an even greater extent than the railroads, the improvement and regularization of the peasantry's condition, of which your Majesty most graciously has permitted a commission of the Estates to make a study, promises a better future for the province. May it please Your Majesty

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 50-51.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, p. 52.

⁶² Mises, pp. 109-110.

⁶³ Krański, pp. 55-56.

to grant the most submissive request of the Estates to increase the objects of the commission's study. The most loyal Estates do not want to injure property or other well-deserved rights, nor to evoke either apprehension or hopes which could interrupt the course of agriculture, decrease the product of the province, or endanger internal peace. In contrast, the Estates' efforts are directed toward preserving those rights, but also toward pushing aside the barriers which make difficult the advantageous use of these rights, to facilitate voluntary agreements, to promote the development of the productive capacities of the landlords as well as those of the peasants, to remove the cause or pretext for any peace-destroying activities in the future and make them forever impossible. A narrowly limited commission could not achieve any of these desired results. That the conviction of the necessity for giving the commission more latitude is general is shown by the decisive majority by which landlords from all parts of the province, at a very well-attended meeting of the Estates, resolved upon this most submissive petition to Your Majesty.⁶⁴

Events were to prove that the desired extension of the commission's powers was not needed. For the commission was destined never to meet. In the early part of 1846 a bloody revolt broke out in Galicia. The government was compelled to face issues squarely and to undertake to solve the agrarian question. Its efforts were unsuccessful but they led directly to the successful solution of 1848 and 1849.

In every province except Hungary the noble program of agrarian reform was entirely unsuccessful during the *Vormärz*. In Hungary progress had been made toward realizing it because the noble landowners of Hungary as a corporate unit, alone of all the noble landowners of the Monarchy, had a real share in the government of their land. But even there full realization of the program had not been effected before 1848. Its necessary financial implementation had not been worked out. In the German-Slav lands the noble landowners were powerless. All they could do was to express their demands in petitions to the throne, and the petition campaign they waged bore no fruit. Until 1846 their demands went unanswered, or, at most, were put off by the procrastination, the indecision and the fear of change that were the hallmarks of the regime during the *Vormärz*. Even the decision that events forced the government to make in 1846 was, as will be seen, an attempt to stave off a real reform.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 57-58.

THE GOVERNMENT'S PROGRAM OF AGRARIAN REFORM

The government's program for agrarian reform, then, as with all other matters, was the avoidance of making any decisions that would result in change. Instances of this procrastination and "repugnance for every innovation" (as Šrbik put it) in connection with the agrarian situation were recorded by Freiherr von Kübeck in his diary. In 1831 Emperor Francis had received a report from Count Chotek, president of the Bohemian *Gubernium*, in which Chotek called attention to the ever-increasing need for measures providing for redemption of peasant dues and for the abolition of the limitations on the indivisibility of peasant land. The Emperor conferred with Count Kolowrat, his chief counselor on internal affairs, on the report. "Have you read it?" asked Francis. "It seems to me that Count Chotek has become infected with liberal ideas. What has happened to him?" To which Kolowrat, himself a Bohemian landlord and former long-time head of the Bohemian government, replied "It seems to me that Chotek is right. My own observations and experiences, plus the opinions of all landowners in Bohemia, move me to agree entirely with his views." The Emperor's reply was "No! No! We'll leave well enough alone."⁶⁵

In a later conversation between the Emperor and Kolowrat concerning proposals for agrarian reform submitted to the throne, Francis told his minister, "Look here, now, the landlord-peasant relationship is a red-hot poker. You can't touch it without getting blistered. Take care that you don't burn yourself."⁶⁶ Kolowrat must have taken this warning to heart—or else was guilty of the duplicity with which Kübeck charged him. On 9 December 1831 the Emperor spoke to him again about proposals to reform the system of hereditary subjection and said, "I am killing these proposals. Don't you agree that that is the best thing to do?" Kolowrat replied "Certainly. Any change in the organic laws of hereditary subjection is unthinkable at the present time."⁶⁷

⁶⁵ Kübeck, *Tagebücher*, I, pt. ii, 508.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 520.

A few weeks later, in January, 1832, Kolowrat, who seems to have changed his mind once more, urged the Emperor to do something about facilitating the redemption of peasant obligations. Francis replied:

"What? Shall we force people to this? Anyway, isn't everyone free to come to an agreement with his peasants on this matter?"

"I beg your pardon," answered Kolowrat, "redemptions are now prohibited."

"I don't know anything about such a prohibition," retorted the Emperor. "Kübeck will bear me out on that."

Kübeck, who was present and who recorded this conversation in his diary, agreed that the Emperor was correct.

But Kolowrat was acquainted with the actual state of affairs out on the land.

"Well, so many obstacles are laid by officials in the way of such redemptions," he persisted, "that they might as well be prohibited."

"Then the officials are wrong," the Emperor concluded, "and anyway this is an affair about which we have to be very cautious."⁸⁸

Yet the government was not entirely insensible to the need for change. For one thing, the enlightened Josephine tradition had not disappeared completely from the government. A certain sympathy for the peasant, the desire to relieve him of some of his burdens, and to equalize the responsibilities and contributions to the state of lord and peasant, still existed. So long as the peasant was the subject of his landlord he could not be drawn into a greater participation in the state. At the same time the lord was not making his full contribution. For example, in Bohemia the product of the fields of both lord and peasant was taxed at the same rate. In addition, the land the peasant tilled was further encumbered with the dues he had to pay his lord, while the lord enjoyed the entire yield of his own land after taxes, plus the income he received from his peasants. In 1825 the government, following the Josephine tradition, proposed to equalize the tax burden in Bohemia by deducting from the peasant's tax base the amount he paid the

⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 537.

lord, and include in the lord's taxable income the amount he received from the peasant. The Bohemian Estates protested mightily to no avail. Then the Bohemian lords turned to a more subtle and effective method. One of their number, Prince Alfred Windischgrätz, the later Field Marshall and defender of the throne of the Hapsburgs, approached the Emperor and persuaded him to rescind the order and quash the entire matter.⁶⁹

Counteracting this Josephine legacy was the yearning for internal calm and the fear of change. The government was not enamored of the *Robot* and *Zehent*. It realized the advantages that would accrue to the state from free peasant proprietorship. But it also realized that any thoroughgoing reform in the lord-peasant relationship or in the system of land tenure would inevitably be accompanied by the agitations, uncertainties, and unrest which the regime dreaded.⁷⁰

Still, the government inclined toward the peasantry because of the basic political fact that the state depended upon the peasantry to support it against the nobility. The peasant knew that the government was *his* defender against the excesses of the nobility, and the government consciously followed this policy of peasant protection to keep its hold upon the loyalty of the countryman. Thereby the regime could maintain a checkrein upon the political influence of the nobility.⁷¹

A forthright statement of this policy was confided to his diary by Kübeck in 1832. Kübeck, a member of the inner circle of the central government, was commenting upon the nationalist agitation among Hungarian landlords. He wrote:

It would be easy for the government to crush the opposition of the nobility, which approaches intolerable insolence. It [the Hungarian nobility] is in the minority and is hated at least as much by the vast majority of the other classes as it, itself, has disrespect for the government. All the government has to do is really to lighten the burden of the peasantry and put on the front of providing protection and support for this interesting, numerous and oppressed class, and the nobility would tremble and beat a hasty retreat to its proper position.⁷²

⁶⁹ Springer, *Geschichte*, I, 298-299.

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 472, 544.

⁷¹ Cf. Horváth, I, 315.

⁷² Kübeck, *Tagebücher*, I, pt. ii, 548.

The great value of this technique was proven in the Galician revolt of 1846. This uprising was a strange affair. Its plotters—whose naiveté was unbelievable—intended it to be a mass nationalist uprising of Poles. Instead, it turned out to be a *Jacquerie* in which the Polish leaders were slain by the very Polish masses they had planned to lead. Nowhere did these aristocratic leaders receive more brutal treatment than in the Tarnow district in western Galicia,⁷³ in the very heart of that part of the province inhabited almost exclusively by Poles. The intent of the revolt was to separate Galicia from the Austrian Monarchy. Actually it made closer and stronger the bonds between the Hapsburg regime and the peasantry. It was truly an epic of poorly-laid plans miscarrying.⁷⁴

It had been planned originally that on 21 February 1846, a nationalist mass revolt would break out in all of what had once been Poland—in Congress Poland, in Lithuania, in Posen, in Cracow, and in Galicia. In these lands there were men of patriotic ardor who believed they could reconstitute the Poland of their fathers. The only thing the revolutionaries lacked for this mass revolt was the support of the masses, but they seemed not too concerned about this. At the moment of the outbreak the lords were to assemble their peasants, release them from all their dues and obligations, give them the land they tilled, and, in return, demand that they take part in the revolt. The plotters reasoned that if the peasants did not join them immediately they would only hesitate, at the most, before joining the victorious revolutionaries (who, of course, assumed that victory would be theirs from the very outset of the uprising).

The secret of the revolt was poorly kept. Before it could get started in Russia and Prussia the governments of those lands crushed it. The uprising materialized only in Austrian territory, where the Hapsburg regime ignored the many evidences of its coming.

The insurgents in Galicia decided to move up the date of the outbreak and on the night of 18 February they began to make open preparations. The suspicions of the peasants of the Tarnow district became aroused. Rumors of the

⁷³ Mises, pp. 113-114; Stern, *Geschichte Europas*, VI, 368-369.

⁷⁴ The following account of the revolt is from Mises, pp. 111-115.

abolition of the *Robot* began to spread. It was said that the Emperor had long since ended this hated service but that the landlords were holding back the issuance of the Patent. At the same time revolutionary agents told them that their hereditary subjection was over and urged them to join the revolt. Uncertain, not knowing what or who to believe, and having always in their hearts a burning hatred for their lords, the peasants decided to take no chances and be on their guard against any eventuality. Led by leaders of their own villages they armed themselves with scythes, pitchforks, and flails, took up posts at crossroads, and waited to see what was going to happen. Soon, the noble Polish insurgents began to appear on their way to their rendezvous. The peasants would not let them by. The nobles tried to fight their way through and fell before the numerically superior peasants. By daybreak of 19 February the nationalist revolt in the Tarnow district had been put down.

The same fate overtook the revolutionists in the other parts of the province. With the exception of the inhabitants of one mountain village the peasants rallied to the support of the government. In the one village where this did not happen, the peasants from neighboring settlements intervened and stamped out the revolt.

Then came the *Jacquerie*. The victorious peasants were not ready to go back to their homes. This was too good a chance to settle old scores against the aristocracy and its lieutenants.

Organized into bands they went from manor to manor murdering, plundering, burning. They slaughtered without mercy every lord and estate official they could find. The fearful killings lasted for days in western Galicia. Calm did not return until the first days of March. Then troops streamed through the province ordering the peasants to stop their acts of violence. Most of them obeyed and harsh measures were needed only rarely. They returned to their villages . . . with the firm conviction that from now on they had no more obligations to their lords.⁷⁵

Mises ascribes this literally murderous hatred of the Galician peasant for his lord to the lack of definition in the existing lord-peasant relationship.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 114-115.

Mutual privileges and obligations were unclear, offering a continuous cause for disagreements. The peasants claimed the lords took away land and overburdened them with *Robot*, while the lords complained that the peasants performed their obligations badly or not at all, and that because of the peasants' negligence in farming their own holdings they made all-too-frequent demands for help from the lords. Above all else, however, the right of the peasants to use forest and pasture was a source of endless lawsuits and not infrequent bloody clashes between peasants and retainers of the landlord. . . .⁷⁶

If the outraged peasants took their claims to court, they fell into the hands of shysters and their claims ran up on the shoals of bureaucratic inefficiency. Many of the lawsuits lasted twenty to thirty years, sometimes even longer. As a result, a large number of peasant communities were engaged at any one time in disputes with their lords. If the peasants lost their case they resorted to passive opposition to their lords. They took an unconscionably long time to get to the place where they did their *Robot*. Once there they did the work poorly; whereupon the overseers used their whips and clubs all the more freely and frequently. Under such conditions the chasm widened between lord and peasant.⁷⁷

The simple fact that the Galician *Jacquerie* had been the product of the ill-feeling of many years, and that the machinations of the Democrats had only "fanned the embers that had long been under the ashes," were not believed by the rest of Europe. In the French and English parliaments and in the European press, generally, the Austrian government was accused of deliberately inciting the peasantry against their lords. It was charged that the government had paid a reward for the head of every murdered nobleman, that it had spread communistic literature among the peasants, and so on.⁷⁸

These foreign protests were matters of no concern to the rulers of Austria. They were preening themselves on the loyalty of the peasants of Galicia. But they realized that reforms must be made quickly if they were to hold this loyalty. At the same time, these changes had to be made in such a manner as to indicate that the regime had not been browbeaten or frightened into action by the revolt. It was decided that

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 98.

⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 99-100.

⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 115-116; Stern, *Geschichte Europas*, VI, 370-371.

first of all the peasants had to return to the performance of their obligations. Their labor was badly needed, for it was time for spring plowing and planting. Government officials were ordered to assign men from their offices to manage those estates where there was no one left in charge.

The belief had been general among the peasants that the revolt had ended their servile obligations. The insurgents whom they had spurned had promised them freedom. Now were they to be punished because they had fought for the Emperor? Yet most of them complied with the government's order. In the Tarnow district, however, many communities were recalcitrant and their attitude began to spread into neighboring areas. At this point the government decided to resort to force and ordered that the military be used to compel performance.⁷⁹

These first steps taken, the government turned to the problem of reform. There was discussion and debate in official circles and sweeping measures were proposed. But the Patent that was finally promulgated for Galicia on 13 April 1846 failed to touch upon the basic issues. About all it did was to abolish some of the extra services that the peasant had found so onerous, such as the long journey and the compulsory days of wage labor for the lord, and give the peasant the right to present a complaint against his lord directly to the local government office instead of having to go first to the lord.⁸⁰

Neither peasants nor lords were satisfied with this legislation. The former regarded it only as a first installment on the complete emancipation they confidently expected.⁸¹ The lords realized that matters could not continue as they were and that real agrarian reform was an absolute necessity. At the same time they wanted to protect their property rights. In June, 1846, 107 Galician landlords addressed a petition to Count Rudolph Stadion, recently appointed as extraordinary Court Commissioner (*Hofkommissär*) for Galicia, in which they demanded real reform, and complained that government officials out in the land were favoring the peasant in their restoration of order after the revolt. They accused these officials of trying to lighten the peasant's burden at the expense of the lord.

⁷⁹ Mises, pp. 116-118.

⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 118-119.

⁸¹ *Ibid.*, p. 120.

Half of the property of the landlord consists of obligations *in natura* which he gets from the peasant in payment for the land the latter uses. The entire cultivation of the demesne is dependent upon the exact discharge of these obligations. Yet all the efforts and thoughts [of the government officials] are directed toward curtailing these obligations as much as possible. . . . "Relief of the peasant" is the motto under which these things are being done. That motto should be "Relief of the peasant entirely at the expense of the landlord." . . . We do not believe that the increasingly more patent attempts to cut down on our property, our rights, our prestige, can contribute toward consolidating the bond of confidence between the government and the landlords. We deplore it as a serious sign of a very widespread mistrust that we hear so many peaceful landlords say that they fear the coming of a government official as much as the coming of a communist emissary. . . .⁸²

The petitioners explained that they recognized the need for reform and had been demanding it for some time.

The Estates long since realized the untenability of the entire existing situation and repeatedly petitioned for its reform. Yes, we all long ago deemed a reform as necessary to check the tremendous waste of time and labor power which now goes on to the damage of both parties; to fix the rights of the peasants but allow the continued existence of those of the lord; to establish the welfare of the peasant without destroying that of the lord; to put an end to the willfulness of officials which we all are now experiencing to the highest degree. We consider such a reform, in view of the recent events, as imperative and unavoidable, because the previous conditions cannot be maintained for any length of time, and because it is in the interest of the state and of civil peace that a lever suited for the designs of the proponents of social revolt be wrested from their hands, so that once and for all they will be cut off from the hopes which they, in their delusion, still draw out of the present situation.

However, we ask for the share in this reform that is befitting us, in view of the fact that it will affect our private property. We will make sacrifices—important sacrifices—for this reform, but we do not want these sacrifices to be forced from us illegally and unjustly.⁸³

They urged that the commission appointed with imperial approval by the Estates at the 1845 session be called into life with all speed so that it could get on with its work. In the interim, peasants should be compelled to perform their obligations.⁸⁴ If the planned reforms were to take the shape of

⁸² Krainiński, pp. 211-213.

⁸³ *Ibid.*, pp. 214-216.

⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 216.

commutation or redemption the peasant should first be made to understand the unquestioned right of the lord to the commuted or redeemed dues.⁸⁵

Meanwhile, projects and plans for partial and complete emancipation were being sent to the central government from all parts of the realm.⁸⁶ Although these proposals received scant attention the regime knew that it must act. Finally, after months of indecision, it issued the decree of 18 December 1846, for the German-Slav provinces.⁸⁷

This eagerly awaited piece of legislation was the summation of the *Vormärz* government's program for agrarian reform. It proved to be a fraud. In essence it only repeated that which had already been granted almost half a century before by the decree of 1 September 1798. It said that all peasant dues and obligations could be commuted or redeemed by voluntary agreement.⁸⁸ Not a word did it contain about the all-important problem of how the peasant was to get the money he needed for commutation or redemption. Nor was there any mention of cotters and landless peasants, nor of the lesser dues that were hated almost as much as the *Robot*. Like the earlier law of 1798 it was impractical, poorly framed legislation, destined to remain without any real direct result.⁸⁹ The law was not even proclaimed in Galicia.⁹⁰

The law did have positive results, though they were hardly what the government had planned. It made it clear to both lord and peasant that the government was not willing to institute the agrarian reform that they believed was so urgently needed. The government's efforts were hardly more than a sham. This fact was not lost upon the rural masses.

⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 217.

⁸⁶ Mises, p. 120.

One of these plans is reproduced in Kraiński, pp. 229-284. It was presented by two members of the Galician Estates (Moritz Ritter von Kraiński and Agenor Graf Goluchowski). It provided for full ownership of his land by the peasant with indemnification for the lord. The peasants were to be dealt with as communities rather than as individuals. The peasants were to bear the entire costs of indemnification, with the government serving as the collecting agency.

⁸⁷ *Ferdinand des Ersten politische Gesetze und Verordnungen*, LXXIV, 247-253.

⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, sect. 1, 248.

⁸⁹ Mises, pp. 128-129.

⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 129 and n.

From now on the peasant would have an open ear for the promises of those who were plotting the fall of the old regime. No longer would he hold himself aloof from their agitations, as once he had. In this way the decree of 18 December 1846 had a great indirect influence and was of much importance for further political development and for the history of the revolution of 1848.⁹¹

THE AGRARIAN REVOLUTION

Many peasants looked upon the Patent as an invitation to cease performing their obligations. They made no attempt at indemnification, since they lacked the cash and the law failed to provide any method of raising it. This happened in places in Lower Austria. Count Colloredo-Mansfeld told a meeting of the Lower Austrian Estates in 1847 that trouble-makers had circulated among peasants of the province telling them that *Robot* and *Zehent* were to be ended without any indemnification. Count Breuner claimed that the entire Bohemian-Moravian border of Lower Austria was in an unsettled condition. Peasants from the Slav provinces, Breuner reported, were telling the Lower Austrians "If you do your *Robot* we will burn down your houses."⁹² An extreme peasant program of agrarian reform had begun to emerge, aimed at the abolition of all servile obligations without any indemnification to the landlords.

The nobles of Lower Austria expressed their dissatisfaction with the Patent in the *Dankadresse* of their Estates sent to the throne in the spring of 1847. The Patent, according to the address, was stillborn, and would remain without effect because the basic conditions for its effectiveness were lacking, or, at least, were not sufficient to meet the need and desire of the country. Half measures were not enough at a time when the solution of the agrarian problem was recognized as a pressing necessity. Once the state had decided in favor of voluntary redemption or commutation it should have created a credit institution as the necessary foundation for these operations. The one thing which the Estates expressed themselves as being really grateful for was the declaration by the state that

⁹¹ Grünberg, *Bauernbefreiung*, I, 375. See also Springer, *Geschichte*, I, 593.

⁹² Bibl, *Stände*, p. 315.

the rights of the landlord would be supported undiminished. They believed that this was a chief consideration for the success of any agrarian reform.⁹³

The unsettled conditions in the countryside continued until the spring of 1848 when the news of the March Days in Vienna swept through the Monarchy. Then all factions realized that the peasants held the balance of power, and that that party would win out which could attract and hold the peasantry to its side. The peasants, themselves, knew and cared nothing about any issues and policies save agrarian reform.

The rural population, of the greatest importance because of its size, had only one hope—to be freed from its servile burdens, and had only one desire—the abolition of the system of hereditary subjection. The absolutist regime had not satisfied this hope nor filled this desire, and had shown itself to be inflexible so far as the interests of the peasants were concerned. So the peasants deserted it. They figured they would get favorable treatment from the Revolution. They understood nothing of the many programmes and manifestoes. They did not get excited about constitutional rights and democratic fundamentals. They knew just one thing. That was that they could set their own price upon their sympathies, for the fulfilment of the wishes of the peasantry was nearest to the heart of all the parties.⁹⁴

The events of March found the central government unprepared, and in perplexity as to what policy it should follow. Since the demands for abolition of the *Robot* and other dues were general and since it was realized further that they could no longer be collected, the government decided to accommodate the wishes of the rural population. On 20 March 1848, a decree was issued providing that in Bohemia and Moravia-Silesia the *Robot* was to end by 31 March 1849, with the lords receiving indemnification. Similar laws were proclaimed for Styria on 11 April, for Carinthia on 25 April, and for Carniola on 23 May, at the requests of the Estates of these provinces.⁹⁵ These laws evidenced the determination of the government to end the

⁹³ *Ibid.*, pp. 299-300.

The Bohemian Estates in their *Dankadresse* to the throne in May, 1847, also expressed their gratitude for the government's recognition of the *Robot* as a private right or debt which, like any other debt, must be paid. Springer, *Geschichte*, I, 593.

⁹⁴ Springer, *Geschichte*, II, 366.

⁹⁵ Grünberg, "Die Grundentlastung," pp. 39-40 and n.

servile obligations of the peasant. Their effect, however, was only to aggravate peasant grievances, for nothing was said about abolishing the system of hereditary subjection, and the laws provided that the peasant alone was to bear the cost of the indemnification.⁹⁶

Meanwhile, when the news of the March Days reached Galicia the thoughts of the ever-hopeful Polish nationalists turned immediately to the possibility of realizing their aims. They sent their emissaries out into the land bearing the promise of freedom to the peasant in order to win them to the nationalist banner. As in earlier years the agitators could not overcome the peasants' distrust of their aristocratic masters. "To the deep social dissension, to the unbridgeable chasm between the different classes of society," Springer wrote, "to these things alone, does Austria owe the fact that in Galicia during March there was not a repetition of the drama of secession that took place in Lombardy on the eighteenth of March."⁹⁷

Quick reform was needed, however, to avoid the danger of a peasant uprising. Count Stadion, now Galicia's governor, realized this and urged action upon the central government at Vienna.⁹⁸ In response to his demands the government on 17 April empowered him to issue a declaration (dated 22 April 1848) ordering that all obligations of the peasant rising from the system of hereditary subjection were to end on 15 May. The declaration further stated that an indemnification, in an amount to be determined later, was to be paid to the lords by the state.⁹⁹ On 14 May an Imperial Patent, predated to 17 April, was issued confirming these provisions.¹⁰⁰ In Bukowina the terminal date for the performance of obligations was set at 1 July.¹⁰¹

Naturally, the peasants of the other German-Slav lands, when they learned of this Galician Patent sought similar legislation in their own behalf. Meanwhile they stopped rendering their dues and services. This was accomplished without any

⁹⁶ Grünberg, *Bauernbefreiung*, I, 376-378.

⁹⁷ Springer, *Geschichte*, II, 233-234.

⁹⁸ Mises, p. 134.

⁹⁹ *Provinzial-Gesetzsammlung des Königreiches Galizien und Lodomerien*, XXX, 74.

¹⁰⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 86-96.

¹⁰¹ Kaindl, "Unterthanswesen," p. 676.

important disturbances because the lords were unable, in the existing unsettled state of affairs, to force their peasants to meet their obligations.¹⁰² The Moravian-Silesian Estates made the best of this situation by proclaiming on 9 June, with the approval of the central government, that from 1 July 1848, *Robot* and *Zehent* were to be abolished with a fair indemnification.¹⁰³

On 11 July the Constitutional *Reichstag* convened in Vienna. Among its 383 delegates, all of whom had been elected by universal male suffrage, there were 92 peasants and many non-peasant delegates who were warm friends of the peasant cause. With the exception of the Galician delegation there were scarcely any nobles in the assembly.¹⁰⁴ On 26 July, the third session after the *Reichstag* had constituted itself, Hans Kudlich, 25-year-old university graduate, son of a peasant, and delegate from a rural district in Silesia, proposed that the assembly announce the immediate end of hereditary subjection with the question as to whether there should be indemnification to be settled later. His motion was carried unanimously.¹⁰⁵

The indemnification debate was a heated one. Three separate issues had to be settled. First, should the lords receive indemnification; second, if they were indemnified, for what services; and, third, who should pay the indemnification.¹⁰⁶ Defenders of the extreme peasant program opposed all indemnification. Other delegates supported it, some from self-interest, some because they believed this was the only workable solution of the agrarian problem, some out of respect for property rights.¹⁰⁷ On 31 August 1848 the question of indemnification was voted upon, the other provisions of the proposed law having been passed by voice vote, some by unanimous consent.

¹⁰² Grünberg, "Grundentlastung," pp. 42-43.

¹⁰³ Grünberg, *Bauernbefreiung*, I, 383.

¹⁰⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 379.

¹⁰⁵ *Verhandlungen des österreichischen Reichstages*, session of 26 July 1848, I, 159-160.

¹⁰⁶ *Ibid.*, Delegate Ingram, session of 18 August 1848, I, 613; Delegate Helfert, session of 24 August 1848, II, 41. Helfert reprinted his speech in his memoirs of the *Reichstag*. Helfert, *Aufzeichnungen*, pp. 131-142.

¹⁰⁷ Examples of these different views can be found in the speech of Delegate Kapuszcak, session of 17 August 1848, *Verhandlungen des österreichischen Reichstages*, I, 586; speech of Delegate Hawelka, session of 18 August 1848, *ibid.*, p. 608; speech of Delegate Klaudy, session of 19 August 1848, *ibid.*, pp. 649-650; speech of Delegate Helfert, session of 24 August 1848, *ibid.*, II, 41.

A roll call was held and the vote was 174 for indemnification, 134 against, and 36 abstaining.¹⁰⁸

On 7 September 1848 the law was issued, announcing the end of hereditary subjection (sect. 1), removing all encumbrances upon peasant land and erasing all distinction between *dominical* (demesne) land and *rustical* (peasant) land (sect. 2, 3), and recognizing the principle of indemnification (sect. 4). All the dues and services of the peasant rising out of the abolished system were to be ended. For purposes of indemnification they were to be divided into three categories. In the first group, for which there was to be no indemnification, were all the rights and incomes the lord had enjoyed that arose from the personal servile status of the peasant, such as the lord's right of jurisdiction (sect. 5). In the second group, for which a fair indemnification was to be paid, were all the dues in kind, labor, or cash which were encumbrances upon the land and which were paid by the user of the land to the landlord (sect. 6). Finally, the rights in wood, pasture and fallow were to be ended without any compensation (sect. 7). Legislation to implement the carrying through of this decree was to be passed later (sect. 8).¹⁰⁹

Soon after the promulgation of this law the counter-revolutionary forces gained control of the government. This was made possible because the peasants had withdrawn their support from the Revolution. The peasants believed they had gained their goal by the law of 7 September. Actually, that law, by its recognition of the right of indemnification, was a victory for the noble program of agrarian reform. But the peasants apparently were satisfied to jettison the extreme program of no indemnification. From now on they showed no further interest in the Revolution, and with their withdrawal it collapsed.¹¹⁰

The Revolution held sway [Springer wrote] only as long as the peasants harbored the belief that it could and would better their condition by

¹⁰⁸ *Ibid.*, II, 164.

¹⁰⁹ *Ferdinand des Ersten politische Gesetze und Verordnungen*, LXXXVI, 284-288.

¹¹⁰ L. Eisenmann, *Le compromis austro-hongrois de 1867* (Paris, 1904), p. 144; H. Friedjung, "Gegner der Bauernbefreiung in Österreich," *Vierteljahrsschrift für Social- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte*, I (1903), 114; Grünberg, *Bauernbefreiung*, I, 388-389.

giving them their freedom. After the peasant emancipation was carried through the reaction had only to emerge into the open. The peasants had cut loose from the political movement. Their unalloyed selfishness guaranteed that this happened only after their own interests had been satisfied. So the peasantry was the essential prop of the Revolution and the *Robot* question was the pivot upon which turned the Revolution's political strivings.¹¹¹

Another factor that contributed to the landed peasants' loss of interest in the Revolution was that they now had a vested interest in the preservation of the new order. They quickly returned to their innate conservatism, eager to protect their newly won gains against the demands of the cotters and landless peasants—the rural proletariat—who were demanding that the common property of the community be divided. It was now to the benefit of the landed peasants that there be no further discussion of agrarian reform beyond that already accomplished, and no further state intervention.¹¹² Selfishness, conservatism, perhaps the traditional obedience of the peasants to the Emperor's will, all played their part in bringing about this abrupt *volte face*.

The Patent of 7 September 1848 was the one lasting result of the Revolution. The victorious absolutism carried it through with energy and dispatch, albeit with some important changes. A law issued on 4 March 1849—the same day on which the Reichstag ended its shadow-life at Kremsier and the restored absolutism imposed its own constitution—provided the method by which the emancipation was to operate.¹¹³ The obligations which had been paid in products of the field were to be evaluated according to their cadastral evaluation, that is, the evaluation on which taxes were based (sect. 9). The value of the *Robot* was to be determined "according to the relation in which the value of forced labor stands to that of free labor. Here, nevertheless, the principle is to be followed, that in no case will it be allowed to calculate the value of forced labor higher than one third the value of free labor" (sect. 11). Thus, the

¹¹¹ Springer, *Geschichte*, II, 366.

¹¹² J. A. von Helfert, *Geschichte Oesterreichs vom Ausgange des Wiener Oktober-Aufstandes 1848* (4 pts. in 6 vols., Prague and Leipzig, 1869-1886), II, 319; O. Bauer, *Der Kampf um Wald und Weide* (Vienna, 1925), pp. 114-116.

¹¹³ *Allgemeines Reichs-Gesetz- und Regierungsblatt für das Kaiserthum Oesterreich*, 1849, pp. 169-173.

law recognized the uneconomic nature of *Robot* work. A deduction of one third was to be made from the evaluation of all peasants obligations, as representing the expenses the lord had incurred in his administration of the system of hereditary subjection (sect. 16). The remaining two thirds was to be the lord's indemnification (sect. 17). Half of this amount was to be paid by the peasant and half by the province in which he lived (sect. 18). Cotters and landless peasants were to pay no indemnity for the *Robot* they had performed (sect. 1). The March law differed most importantly from the decree of the previous September in that the former ordered that forest and pasture rights, and other servitudes, were to remain in force until further arrangements for their commutation had been made (sect. 4).¹¹⁴

In Hungary a somewhat different course had been followed. On 11 April 1848, the Diet issued a decree abolishing the system of hereditary subjection, and with it the dues and services the peasant had paid the lord. Indemnification was to be made by the state. Subsequently, enabling legislation had been passed. After the defeat of the [Hungarian] revolution Hungary was reduced to the status of a province of the Monarchy and the laws of the Monarchy, including those on emancipation, were extended to that land.¹¹⁵

* * * *

The noble platform of agrarian reform had triumphed. The structure of hereditary subjection had been swept away, but the dues and services the peasant had paid were recognized as property rights of the landlord. The law ordered that he was to receive monetary indemnification for their loss. The government's platform of the avoidance of the basic issues and of indecision that had been dominant during the years of the *Vormärz* had collapsed after the March Days in Vienna. The peasant program which had demanded that the lords receive no indemnification had gone down in defeat in the voting on

¹¹⁴ This was done partially by the Patent of 5 July 1853, which actually provided more for the maintenance and regularization of the various servitudes than for their abolition. W. Schiff, "Die Regulierung und Ablösung der Wald- und Weide-Servituten," *G. L. F.*, I, 112.

¹¹⁵ Kún, pp. 100-102.

the emancipation bill in August 1848 in an assembly in which nobles formed a small minority. The withdrawal of the peasantry from the Revolution after the promulgation of the emancipation law and the consequent victory of the reaction had ended any chance of this program being revived.

Not only had the noble landowners succeeded in getting rid of the system they had found to be an economic liability. They were paid for giving it up.

CHAPTER VII

CONCLUSIONS

The evidence presented in the preceding chapters allows the formulation of the following major conclusions:

1. A new interest in capitalistic agricultural production appeared among noble landowners during the years 1815-1848.
2. Noble landowners were the leading advocates of agrarian reform during this period.
3. The principal reason for their advocacy of agrarian reform was an economic one.
4. The emancipation law of 1848 enacted the program of agrarian reform that had been advocated by the noble landowners.

1. *A new interest in capitalistic agricultural production appeared among noble landowners during the years 1815-1848.*

To an ever increasing extent during the *Vormärz* noble landowners in all parts of the Monarchy showed that they were motivated by the rationalistic spirit of capitalistic enterprise in the conduct of their holdings. They wanted to make as much profit as they could from their agricultural operations. So they sought to maximize profits and minimize costs through the application of what seemed to them the most rational and best suited methods.

The explanation of this development is found in the changes that took place in the Austrian economy during this period. There was a large increase in population, especially in urban centers. Large-scale factory industry became firmly established, located usually in the growing cities. The existing means of transportation were greatly extended and new means, the railroad and the steamship, were introduced. The result of these changes was the creation of enlarged or entirely new markets for the products of agriculture and the ability to reach these markets with a greater facility than had hitherto been the case.

Noble landowners recognized the opportunity that was presenting itself for the profitable sale of the products of their holdings and set out to take advantage of it.

This was shown by the direction of their activities. They concentrated on the production of goods for which there was a ready and profitable sale, notably wool, beet sugar, and potato whiskey. There was a large market for Austrian wool both at home and abroad. Wool raising first became important in the Monarchy during the years of the Continental Blockade and remained a prominent part of the agricultural economy of Austria until the last years of the *Vormärz*. Noble landlords built up great flocks with many animals of blooded stock. Bohemian and Moravian wool was among the finest produced in Europe. Beet sugar manufacture had been introduced during the Continental Blockade. Production costs were high and the industry disappeared when colonial sugar came back into the European market. At the end of the 1820's the industry was revived when technical improvements which lowered production costs were introduced. Noble landlords, especially those in the Northwest zone, were the leaders in this revival. They built factories on their estates to process the beets they now had planted in their fields. The new industry grew remarkably and by the end of the *Vormärz* had become a permanent and important part of the agricultural scene. Potatoes had been introduced into various parts of the Monarchy during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. They did not become an important crop until after 1800, however. The primary use that was made of this vegetable was as a staple of peasant diet, principally in the North Slav provinces of Bohemia, Moravia-Silesia and Galicia. The second most important use to which it was put was for distilling whiskey. It was in this use that the lords were most interested. They built distilleries on their estates and produced huge quantities of the beverage which had become the favorite drink of the North Slav peasant.

Other evidences of the interest of noble landowners in capitalistic agricultural production were their activities in land reclamation, in attempting to establish sources of agricultural credit, founding agricultural schools, organizing societies for the promotion of agriculture, and using improved techniques in the conduct of their holdings. Each of these activities indi-

cated the interests of the involved landlords in increasing their return from their holdings.

Land reclamation was carried out mainly in Hungary and in the provinces of the Northwest zone. Here landlords either as individuals or in groups engaged in the drainage of large areas which they then put into productive use, or regulated the course of streams that flowed through their lands to prevent floods. These projects usually involved the outlay of large sums of money.

Noble landlords realized their need for new sources of agricultural credit in order to expand and improve their operations, since the existing sources were inadequate to meet the demand that had now developed. Noble landlords of several provinces requested permission from the throne to establish new facilities for the granting of the needed credit. In every case except that of the request made by the nobles of Galicia the petitions were denied.

Noble landowners, especially those in Hungary and in the Northwest zone who were the owners of huge holdings, realized they needed trained managers to run their estates. They established agricultural schools at their own expense on their estates, providing the land, buildings and equipment, hiring the faculty, and supporting many of the pupils. Students were trained in all phases of agriculture, with the course of study lasting from two to three years. Several of the schools also offered shorter courses in a variety of agricultural subjects. The original purpose of these schools was to train managers for the estates of their founders but other students were also allowed to enter.

The formation of agricultural societies was especially striking evidence of the new interest of noble landlords in profitable agricultural production. Agricultural societies had been established by the central government in most of the provinces around the middle of the eighteenth century. These organizations had never had many members nor had they accomplished very much. In the matter of a few years after their founding most of them had disappeared. The rest existed only in name for decades. After 1800, and especially after 1815, new agricultural societies were established in almost every province of the Monarchy by the landlords themselves. By 1848 there were fourteen of these provincial organizations and many

affiliated and subordinate societies. The primary purpose of these organizations was to promote the advancement of agriculture in their respective provinces. This was accomplished through a wide variety of activities, which included the publication of journals, farm calendars, and books in which new and improved methods or products were described and ideas on agricultural policy were discussed, the holding of periodic meetings where members could exchange information and opinions, staging cattle shows, sponsoring essay contests on agricultural subjects, maintaining museums and exhibits, promoting agricultural education and research, and conducting experiments on techniques of tillage and on new or better products on the experimental farms which most of the societies had.

Notable advances designed to improve and increase production were made in the techniques of cultivation that were employed on the holdings of noble landlords. Consideration of this development has been limited in this study to the Northwest zone (Bohemia and Moravia-Silesia). This zone, in proportion to its size, was the most important agricultural area of the Monarchy. The three field system was the regnant method of cultivation there. During the *Vormärz* the practice of planting a restorative crop on the hitherto barren third field spread widely on demesne land. Some landlords abandoned the three field system in favor of convertible husbandry, that is, rotation of crops. Agricultural machinery and improved implements were used increasingly on demesne land. Some nobles built up blooded herds of cattle, importing pedigreed stock from other lands for breeding purposes.

2. Noble landlords were the leading advocates of agrarian reform during the Vormärz.

The noble landlords were the beneficiaries of the system of hereditary subjection. They had a complete or a near monopoly of land ownership almost everywhere in the Monarchy. The peasant paid a host of dues and services in kind, cash, and labor to the lord. He was the hereditary subject of the lord who had political and social powers over him. He was a member of a voiceless class, without organization or leaders, and without power in the state. Yet, noble landlords were the leaders during the *Vormärz* in the movement for agrarian

reform that aimed at seriously modifying or abolishing entirely the system of hereditary subjection.

In books and in journals noble landlords or men closely connected with the agricultural interest, such as estate managers and professors of agriculture, urged reform. In the provinces of Bohemia, Moravia, Hungary, Lower Austria, and Galicia noble landlords took action through their provincial assemblies to demand reform. These bodies addressed petitions to the throne asking for legislation facilitating redemption or commutation of peasant dues and services into money payments.

In every case except that of Hungary this noble demand was entirely unsuccessful. The technique of rule of the central government was to leave things as they were and to resist all change, so that the petitions of the German-Slav provincial assemblies were denied. In Hungary a partial reform was allowed although it fell far short of the desired goal. The reason for this difference between Hungary and the other provinces was that in Hungary the nobility had retained some power in the governing of the province. In the other provinces the power of the nobility in local government had been destroyed by the central government in the eighteenth century. The provincial assemblies, which were dominated by the noble estate, were impotent relics of a bygone time. In the latter years of the *Vormärz* these assemblies served as centers for the expression of noble discontent with the central regime that came to be known as the Estates movement.

3 *The principal reason for noble advocacy of agrarian reform was an economic one.*

The chief reason why noble landlords wanted to reform the existing system was because they found it to be uneconomic. They considered it to be the major barrier to the most profitable exploitation of their holdings. Their chief target was the *Robot*—the unpaid labor service their peasants were required to perform for them—although they also attacked other aspects of the system, especially the *Zehent*, the chief payment in kind made by the peasants. In books and articles, in debates in the provincial assemblies, in petitions to the throne, and in discussions at meetings of the agricultural societies, they assailed

the *Robot* as wasteful of labor.) They claimed that the *Robot* worker scamped his job and that the draught animals and equipment he supplied for this work were inferior. They pointed out that the *Robot* laborer performed only a part of the work that was done in the same amount of time by a laborer working for hire. Some attempted to reduce the comparative efficiency of *Robot* labor and hired labor to an exact figure. The proportion at which they arrived varied from one fourth to three fourths (that is, the *Robot* worker did from one fourth to three fourths as much work in the same amount of time as a hired worker) with more of the estimates nearer the lower than the higher limit. The lords' poor opinion of the value of *Robot* labor was shown by the extremely low price, compared with the lowest wage of hired labor, at which they were willing to allow their peasants to commute their *Robot*.

The main reason for the high degree of inefficiency of *Robot* labor was the natural inclination of workers to loaf when doing forced, unpaid labor. Free men working for hire are better workers than unfree men. Another cause for this inefficiency arose from the codes regulating the system of hereditary subjection. These codes had been imposed by the government during the eighteenth century when Austria was ruled by enlightened despots. Their purpose was to protect the peasantry from landlord oppression. The labor provisions of the codes, however, were such that they interfered seriously with the most efficient use of *Robot* labor. Thus, time spent going to and coming from the work site was counted as part of the *Robot* day.

The desire of noble landlords for agrarian reform was molded by motives other than the economic. The leaders of the various political movements which developed during the *Vormärz* sought to win peasant support for their programs by including the demand for agrarian reform in their platforms.

A final motive for the advocacy by the nobles of agrarian reform was the fear of peasant revolt. Minor peasant outbreaks and strikes in Lower Austria in the early 1830's inspired the Estates of that province to address a petition to the throne complaining of peasant recalcitrance in the meeting of obligations and warning of the dangers of a possible revolt. The one serious peasant disturbance of the *Vormärz* was the Galician

revolt of 1846. The impetus for this outbreak had come from Polish nationalists in Galicia, including noble landlords, who tried to inflame the peasants against the central government. Instead, the peasants, who had reason to care more for the Hapsburgs than for Polish nationalism, turned on their lords. The revolt forced the government to issue the totally inadequate Patent of 18 December 1846.

4. *The emancipation law of 1848 enacted the program of agrarian reform that had been advocated by the noble landowners.*

There were three programs advanced during the *Vormärz* for handling the question of agrarian reform: that of the noble landowners, the government, and the peasants. The basic premise of the noble program was that the lord should receive a cash payment in lieu of the goods and services he had received from the peasant under the system of hereditary subjection. Existing legislation theoretically allowed commutation or redemption of peasant obligations but the provision of the laws were such that they had no practical value. Noble landowners advanced schemes they believed would be workable. The landlords planned that with the money they received from their peasants they could hire wage workers. These hired hands were so much more efficient than *Robot* workers that the rate at which the *Robot* could be commuted could be low and still provide money enough to hire the labor the lords needed. The nobles did not neglect to point out that the peasant would benefit from this procedure, both economically and morally. He would receive a cash income as a hired worker and his work habits would no longer be infected by the slothfulness of *Robot* labor. Finally, the Monarchy would benefit because of the increased productivity that would result from a more efficient agriculture.

The government policy on the agrarian question was to avoid making a change. This was in line with the general policy of the *Vormärz* government. Change was feared and necessary decisions were put off by a definite policy of procrastination. The continued avoidance of agrarian reform could not be continued, however. Events compelled the government to

issue the Patent of 18 December 1846. This law, designed ostensibly to facilitate agrarian reform, was quickly recognized by noble and peasant alike as a fraud. It only repeated that which had already been on the statute books for half a century and had proven to be of no value. The complete bankruptcy of the agrarian policy of the government was plain for all to see.

An extreme peasant program of agrarian reform now emerged. The basis of this program was that the lord should receive no indemnification for the dues and services he had received from his peasants. In 1847 and 1848 reports from several provinces told of peasants refusing to perform their obligations and showing no intention of paying an indemnification. In the Constitutional Reichstag the supporters of the peasant program, most of whom were peasants or of peasant birth, staged a determined fight to gain their goal.

The victory went to the noble program, however. The emancipation decree of 7 September 1848, ordered that the lords were to receive indemnification. The peasants, having gained their freedom, and motivated by selfishness, innate conservatism, and traditional obedience, forsook the peasant program of no indemnification and the cause of revolution.

APPENDIX 1

CONVERSION TABLES

MONEY, MEASURES, AND WEIGHTS

Sources:

J. E. Kruse, *Allgemeiner und besonders Hamburgischer Contorist* (Hamburg, 1808), I, 553-565.

J. C. Nelkenbrecher, *Allgemeines Taschenbuch der Münz-, Maass- und Gewichtskunde für Banquiers und Kaufleute* (13th ed., Berlin, 1820), pp. 356-362.

C. V. J. Scherer, *Allgemeiner Contorist* (Hamburg, 1834), pp. 597-617.

C. J. C. and F. E. Noback, *Münz-, Maass- und Gewichtsbuch* (Leipzig, 1858), pp. 747-781, 936-948.

Money

1 (silver) *Florin* (containing 60 *Kreuzer* of 4 *Pfennig* each) = \$0.48. (Schwarz to McClane, Vienna, 25 January 1832 and 15 August 1833, *Consular letters*, and Scherer, pp. 419 and 599, gave the exchange value of the silver florin at \$0.48. Jenifer to Calhoun, Vienna, 5 March 1843, *Diplomatic dispatches*, gave the exchange value as \$0.485.).

Two kinds of florins were accepted currency in the Monarchy. One was the silver florin, which was identified by the initials C. M. (*Conventions-Münze*). The other was the paper florin, identified by the initials W. W. (*Wiener Währung*). The silver florin was valued at $2\frac{1}{2}$ paper florins.

The silver florin is used exclusively in this study. Where the value given in the source was in *Weiner Währung* florins I converted it into silver florins at the rate of $2\frac{1}{2}$ to 1.

Linear Measure

1 *Klafter* = 2.07 feet.

1 austrian post mile = 4.9782 english statute miles.

1 german (geographical) mile = 4.61 english statute miles.

Square Measure

1 *Joch* (yoke) (containing 1600 square *Klafter*) = 1.42 acres

1 austrian square mile (containing 10,000 yokes) = 1.049 geographical square miles = 22.239 english square miles.

Cubic Measure

1 cubic *Klafter* = 8.92 cubic yards.

Liquid Measure

1 *Eimer* (containing 40 Maass) = 14.95 gallons.

*Dry Measure*1 *Metzen* = 1.74 bushels.*Weights*1 *Centner* (containing 100 *Pfund*) = 123.48 english pounds avoirdupois.

APPENDIX 2

Pfandbrief OF GALICIAN ESTATES CREDIT-ANSTALT
(from Deym, p. 134)

Serie 00000

Nro. 000000

Gulden Konventions-Münze 100

PFANDBRIEF

Uiber Ein Hundert Gulden Konventions-Münze, Zwanzig Gulden auf eine Kölnische Mark fein Silber und drei k. k. Oesterreichische Zwanzigkreuzerstücke auf Einen Gulden gerechnet, welche mit Vier vom Hundert jährlich verzinst werden.

Das Kapital wird nach der statutenmässigen Verlosung oder der Anstalt vorbehaltenen Aufkündigung (dem Uiberbringer) (dem N. N.), gegen Rückstellung dieses Pfandbriefes, die Zinsen aber werden halbjährig am letzten Juni und letzten December eines jeden Jahres dem Uiberbringer des gehörigen Zinskoupons und gegen Abgabe desselben von der Kasse der Kredit-Anstalt in Lemberg bezahlt werden.

Dieser Pfandbrief ist unter der Kontrolle und Garantie der galizischen Stände in Folge Direktions-Beschlusses zur Zahl 00000 1841 ausgestellt worden.

Lemberg, den 1. Januar 1841

Für die Galizisch-ständische Kredit-Anstalt.

Präsident der Direktion

N. N.

Direktor.

N. N.

Dieser Pfandbrief ist im Grunde eines landtäglich verbuchten Darlehens der Vereins-Direktion ausgefertigt worden.

Lemberg, den 1. Januar 1841.

Präsident der Aussichts-Kommission
N. N.

Beisitzer

N. N.

Sekretar

N. N.

Buchhalter
N. N.

Bankbrief OF PROPOSED BOHEMIAN ESTATES REAL
MORTGAGE BANK

(from Deym, p. 105)

Serie 0000

Nro. 000000

Kapital fl. 1000 K. M.

Jahrzins fl. 40 K. M.

BANKBRIEF

fl. 1000 Kapital

4% Verzinsungsfuss

Gulden K. M. *Eintausend*

Vier von Hundert jährlich

Welcher Betrag von *Eintausend* Gulden Konv. Münze, 20 Gulden auf eine kölnische Mark fein Silber und 3 k. k. österreichische Zwanzig-Kreuzer-Stücke auf einen Gulden gerechnet, von heute halbjährig nachhinein mit *Vier* von Hundert in gleicher Münze pro anno verzinst, und für den Fall der statutengemässen Verlosung bei den Kassen dieser Bank rückgezahlt werden wird dem *Uiberbringer*.

Dieser Bankbrief sammt den zur Zinsenbehebung erforderlichen Koupons und Talon ist unter der Kontrolle und Garantie der hochlöbl. böhm. Stände in Folge Direktions-Beschlusses zur Z.000 de anno 1843 ausgestellt worden.

Koupon mit
fl. 20 fällig
jeden 1. Juli.

Von der böhmisch-ständischen
Real-Hypotheken-Bank.
Prag, am 30 Juni 1843

Koupon mit fl. 20 fällig jeden 1. Juli.

Johann Mayer,
Buchhalter

Obstehende Ausfertigung wurde in Uibereinstimmung mit den Akten befunden.

Prag, am 1 Juli 1843

v. Hochmark,
des verst. ständ. Ausschusses
Referent in Banksachen

Bank-
Siegel

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL NOTE

In accordance with the practice of the Johns Hopkins *Studies* full citations of all works referred to in the foregoing text will be found on the page where the work is first cited. This page number can be located by referring to the index where the work is entered under the name of its author.

In this bibliographical note I discuss only those sources which are of particular importance to this present work, and which would be of value in the study of any aspect of Austrian agriculture during the *Vormärz*. I have divided these sources into six categories, as follows:

- I. Official sources (a. laws, b. government statistics, c. diplomatic correspondence)
- II. Documents and reports of proceedings (printed collections of documents, stenographic reports of conferences)
- III. Diaries, letters and memoirs
- IV. Serial publications published before 1850
- V. Contemporary authorities (books written between 1800 and 1850)
- VI. Secondary works

This study was written entirely from printed sources available in American libraries, except for manuscript United States diplomatic materials in the National Archives.

I

OFFICIAL SOURCES

a. Laws

Laws of Joseph II, Leopold II, Francis I, Ferdinand I, and Francis Joseph, that is, from 1780 on, were published in chronological order in several series which were available to me. In addition, the legislation issued for the individual German-Slav provinces during all but the very first years of the *Vormärz* are also available in published series.

b. Government Statistics

Budapest Handels- und Gewerbekammer, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Preise ungarischen Landesprodukte im neunzehnten Jahrhundert*, Budapest, 1873.

Contains a lengthy essay on Hungarian economic development from 1800 which presents much statistical and textual material. This is followed by a listing of the weekly, annual, quinquennial, and decennial average prices of farm products at the Pest market from 1800 on, calculated from the original market quotations, and statistical data on transportation and credit.

Bukowina Handels- und Gewerbekammer, *Hauptbericht und Statistik über das Herzogthum Bukowina für die Periode vom Jahre 1862-1871*, Lemberg, 1872.

Historical essays on the development of various branches of agriculture in Bukowina and useful information on the operations of the emancipation laws in that region.

K. k. Direction der administrativen Statistik, *Mittheilungen aus dem Gebiete der Statistik*, Vienna, 1852-1873.

In 1850 the *Direction der administrativen Statistik*, the government statistical agency, at the request of the Ministry of Commerce began issuing periodically the *Mittheilungen über Handel, Gewerbe und Verkehrsmittel sowie aus dem Gebiete der Statistik überhaupt*. This publication contained consular reports, reports of chambers of commerce and industry (*Handels- und Gewerbekammer*), foreign trade data, monographs on commercial subjects, and similar material of interest to the commercial community. In 1852 the scope of this publication was widened and statistical data from a variety of fields besides commerce were presented. Most of this material was published ultimately in the *Tafeln zur Statistik* but the appearance of the *Tafeln* for a given year was always delayed for several years. In order to publish statistical data of interest as quickly as possible it was placed in this new official publication. It also contained statistical monographs on economic subjects. To conform to the wider field it now covered the title of the publication was changed to *Mittheilungen aus dem Gebiete der Statistik*. Its publication was continued through 1874. The statistical information and monographs that appeared in the first few volumes of the *Mittheilungen* are especially valuable sources since they presented much detailed material not otherwise available for the years immediately before and after 1848.

Lower Austrian Handels- und Gewerbekammer, *Statistische Uebersicht der wichtigsten Produktionszweige in Oesterreich unter der Ens*, Vienna, 1855.

Contains much useful information on Lower Austrian agriculture for the last years of the *Normierz* and the immediately succeeding years.

K. k. Direction der administrativen Statistik, *Tafeln zur Statistik der österreichischen Monarchie*, 1829-1859.

This is the most important statistical source for the study of the Austrian Monarchy during the years 1815-1848.

Statistical data had been collected sporadically before 1800 by the Austrian government but it was not until 1804 that a permanent statistical organization was established within the administration.¹ The primary func-

¹ The following account of the development of government statistics in the Monarchy is drawn from A. Ficker, "Skizze einer Geschichte des k. k. statistischen Bureau's in den Jahren 1829-1835," *Mittheilungen aus dem Gebiete der Statistik*, IV (1855), pt. i; *id.*, "Skizze einer Geschichte des k. k. statistischen Bureau's in den Jahren 1829 bis 1866," *Statistisch-administrative Vorträge auf Veranstaltung der k. k. statistischen Central-Commission abgehalten im Winter-Semester 1866-1867* (Vienna, 1867), pp. 19-34; *Denkschrift der k. k. statistischen Centralcommission zur Feier ihres fünfzigjährigen Bestandes* (Vienna, 1913), pp. 1-47.

tion of this new agency was to conduct censuses for purposes of military conscription in certain of the provinces (the so-called *altkonskribierten Länder*). In 1810 the Emperor ordered the creation of a department of administrative statistics in the *Hofkammer* (Exchequer), whose function would be to provide him with a true picture of the condition of his subjects to serve as a guide for measures necessary to increase the national welfare. Stress was to be laid on economic statistics. These plans were dropped with the renewal of the French wars. In 1819 the creation of a topographical-statistical office as part of the Council of State was ordered but no action was taken in this matter for another ten years.

Meanwhile, private individuals were publishing statistical surveys of the Monarchy, or of parts of it, and the study of statistics was occupying an increasing number of people. By 1826 courses in statistics were offered at seven universities (Prague, Vienna, Padua, Pavia, Pest, Innsbruck and Lemberg), eight academies and three lycées. More and more men in government and in academic life were beginning to realize the usefulness of statistical information for governmental purposes. One of these was Anton Freiherr von Baldacci, who was president of the Directorate-General of Accounts of the central government. In 1829 Baldacci persuaded the Emperor to create a statistical bureau, with Baldacci as chief.

Baldacci assigned Baron von Metzburg, vice-president of the Directorate-General of Accounts, to draw up the necessary plans and to direct the work of the new office. Metzburg proposed a presentation of the statistics of the Monarchy in tabular form. These tables were to cover all facets of the state's administration and so serve as a reference work for state officials. His plans received imperial approval and in December, 1829, the first volume of the *Tafeln zur Statistik* appeared.

This first volume of tables was regarded in the nature of an experiment, as its title indicates—*Versuch einer Darstellung der österreichischen Monarchie in statistischen Tafeln*. These tables and the volumes for the subsequent years until and including 1840 were struck off from hand-engraved plates. One hundred copies were made but only six were complete. These six, which were reserved for the exclusive use of the Emperor and his highest counselors, contained thirteen tables dealing with state finances and military matters that were not included in the other 94 copies. All the tables were classified as confidential material, however. An Imperial decree of 6 April 1829 ordered that all volumes be exclusively for administrative use and the Emperor adjured Baldacci to keep close watch over the tables and make sure that they did not come into unauthorized hands.

By the time the 1831 *Tafeln* was issued the form of presentation of the material had become fixed and remained virtually unchanged for the succeeding nine volumes through 1840. There were approximately 70 tables in each volume in these years, divided into five sections: A. *Der Bewohner* (demographic statistics); B. *Staatsverfassung und Verwaltung* (administrative, financial and police statistics); C. *Cultur* (economic and social statistics); D. *Provinzial-Übersichten* (summary tables for each province); E. *Anhang* (miscellaneous tables). In all the sections except D the tables were broken down by provinces. In section D the information was further broken down into the chief administrative district of each province.

In 1839 Freiherr von Metzburg died. Soon thereafter Freiherr von Kübeck was appointed to the presidency of the Directorate-General of

Accounts to succeed Baldacci who had retired. Kübeck wanted to increase the scope of the statistical information collected by the government and realized that the existing statistical bureau was not capable of performing the functions he believed it should perform. He persuaded the Emperor in 1840 to create the Board of Administrative Statistics (*Direction der administrativen Statistik*) as a separate agency with its own staff, under the general control of the Directorate-General of Accounts. In 1841 Carl Czoernig was appointed to head the new bureau.

Czoernig (1804-1889), after education at the Universities of Prague and Vienna, where he showed special aptitude in statistics and government, entered the state's service in 1828. His unusual ability soon attracted attention and he rose quickly. He had already gained a professional reputation as a statistician before he was appointed to head the Board of Administrative Statistics. His work in this capacity, plus the many independent studies that he published in subsequent years on administrative and ethnographic statistics, won him international recognition.

The first volume of the *Tafeln* put out under Czoernig's direction was for the year 1841. It appeared in 1844. The contrast between it and the previous tables was great. The most obvious difference was that the 1841 *Tafeln* was printed from type and the volume was much thicker than it had ever been before. The total number of tables was only 76, but the data were presented in much greater detail. This was especially true of the economic data. Under Czoernig's predecessors this branch of the tables had been slighted. Czoernig took special and determined efforts to correct this condition. The 1841 *Tafeln* was unique in the lengthy textual material it contained in the tables dealing with communications and industry. This text included much valuable information not otherwise accessible covering the early development of new industries and transportation in the Monarchy. This practice of combining figures and text was continued in the succeeding years.

Another very important innovation was the gradual removal of the secrecy restrictions from the *Tafeln*. Starting with the 1842 volume (printed in 1846) permission was given for some of the individual tables to be made public. In succeeding years this permission was extended to more tables until the entire 1845-1846 volume, which appeared in 1850-1851, was made public.

In order to get the data needed for the *Tafeln* Czoernig had an extensive reporting system, some of which he had inherited from the Metzburg regime, but most of which he had built up himself. Population figures for most of the German-Slav lands were obtained from the triennial census in those lands made for purposes of conscription. In the Italian provinces, Tyrol, Trieste, Dalmatia, and the Military Frontier, government officials made an annual population report. Vital statistics were reported by the clergy. Data on the clergy were provided by the bishops and cloisters. Educational institutions, hospitals and some welfare institutions were under state control so that information on them was readily available within the government. Almshouses, banks, insurance companies, railroads and steamship companies were privately owned, but they made public reports to their supporters and stockholders. These were used by the *Tafeln* staff, plus additional information the government procured on its own initiative. Price and wage statistics were reported by government officials who visited the weekly markets of the more important trading centers and noted prices. Data on shipping, foreign trade, roads and water-

ways and the state-owned railroads were readily available from the different government offices which concerned themselves with these activities. Statistics on the administration of justice were forwarded by the lower courts to the central judicial agencies who turned them over to the statistical bureau.

The gathering of information on industrial and agricultural activity offered a more difficult problem. For statistics on industry it was necessary to depend upon the industries themselves. The Board of Administrative Statistics realized that many of the individual industries would not submit adequate information, and that many, especially the small producers, would submit no report. So an elaborate administrative-technical control system was worked out by means of which the Board hoped to fill the gaps in its data and make proper corrections. This system included sending out questionnaires, making field trips, analyzing business reports, and sifting government reports such as those on import and export returns, mineral production, and the production of agricultural raw materials.

Agricultural data was collected from several sources. Information on the number of live stock was collected at the same time that the officials made their population census. Data on the size of the product of agriculture were collected by communities. The local district government official served as the collecting agency and was responsible for the accuracy of the data. Cadastral figures for grain and lumber production were used wherever available. The cadastre was also employed for the statistical tables on the uses of the land.

The first land cadastre in the Monarchy dated back to the reign of Charles VI, who, in 1718 ordered that a land survey be made of his newly-gained lands in northern Italy. This survey was known as the Milanese cadastre. Over 60 years later Joseph II ordered that a cadastral survey be made of all the German-Slav provinces in order to gain a more equitable distribution and a higher yield from the land tax. All land yielding an income was to be measured and its yield estimated on the basis of its product for the previous ten years. The Josephine cadastre was made hurriedly, the surveyors were inexperienced, and the task itself was an extremely difficult one. Further, it appears that landlords were able to influence the officials carrying out the work, or put obstacles in their way, so that the measurements erred in favor of the landlords.^a

Because of the unsatisfactory nature of this survey Emperor Francis in 1806 ordered that plans be started for the making of a new and exact cadastre, modeled after the Milanese cadastre. The job was turned over to a Land-tax Commission (*Grundsteuer-Hofkommission*), created in 1810. Actual surveying for the *stabilen Kataster*, as it was called, began in 1817. A network of known points was established trigonometrically in the various provinces and the survey was carried from them. Mapping was on a scale of 1: 2880, with one square inch (austrian) on the map equal to one yoke on the ground. A separate map was made for each tax district. The net yield of each parcel of land was determined when it was surveyed.

The preparation of this cadastre was a gigantic task and could proceed only slowly. As an interim measure the government ordered that a provisional cadastre was to be used until the permanent one was completed.

^a Townson, p. 142; E. N. von Ragenfeld, *Über den österr. Grundkataster und seine Erneuerung* (Graz, 1913), p. 20; Medinger, *Lobositz*, pp. 55-56.

This provisional cadastre was based upon the Josephine survey, with corrections. In order to get the data for these corrections the government required landlords to render full accounts of their incomes to the local government office, which also conducted its own surveys and checks.

As the results of the *stabilen Kataster* became available they were included in the *Tafeln*, supplementing the provisional cadastre figures, until, when the cadastre for the individual province was completed, the provisional figures were completely supplanted. The 1845 *Tafeln* (printed in 1850) is used in this study for statistics on productive area and agricultural production. The note of the *Tafeln* editors on the sources for their productive area table stated that the data on Lower Austria, Upper Austria, Styria, Carinthia, Carniola, Littoral, Bohemia, Moravia-Silesia and Dalmatia were taken from the permanent cadastral survey, which had been completed for these provinces. For Galicia, the Josephine cadastre was used, with corrections. For Tyrol and Vorarlberg the reports of officials were relied upon. For the older parts of Lombardy a cadastre made in 1760 was still in use. For other sections of Lombardy and for Venetia a new cadastre was being carried through. For the Military Frontier a survey made some years before was used. For Hungary and Transylvania only estimates were available, although some exact data were obtained and incorporated.³

For the tables of agricultural production the editors noted that with the exception of Hungary and Transylvania the data presented were based upon official reports which, they stated, were incomplete in many ways. Cadastral figures on productivity when available were used. For the 1845 *Tafeln* these figures were available for all of Lower Austria, Upper Austria, Styria, Carinthia and Carniola, Littoral, Dalmatia, and for parts of Bohemia, Moravia-Silesia, and Galicia. The data on the field crops of Hungary were based on the average of reports for a long series of years for most of the counties. For other products of Hungarian agriculture the estimates were based on what the editors termed "the most trustworthy sources." For Transylvania official sources were available only for peasant land and estimates had to be made for church and noble land. For these reasons no figures were given for several of the products of Hungary and Transylvania. In computing the value of the agricultural production of each province consumption by the producer was taken into account. For this reason average market prices were not used in the computations but an adjusted price was employed.⁴

In view of the methods used in gathering data for the *Tafeln* and the sources that were available, the quality of the statistics vary. The data presented on such matters as government finances, tax returns, government owned and operated factories and estates, schools, and the numerous other direct governmental functions came entirely from within the government itself and can be considered as accurate.

The population statistics were based upon three different sources: first, the triennial census taken with army cooperation for the purpose of military conscription in the provinces of Lower Austria, Upper Austria, Styria, Carinthia and Carniola, Littoral without the Trieste district, Bohemia, Moravia-Silesia, and Galicia; second, an annual population survey and report made by central government officials in Tyrol, Dalmatia,

³ T. S., 1845, pt. ii, table 1, p. 1.

⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 2-3.

Lombardy-Venetia, and the Trieste district; third, estimates for Hungary and Transylvania. The total for the Monarchy, however, represented a composite of the census returns and the estimates. A check on the general accuracy of the totals is that the rate of increase in the Monarchy's population during the *Vormärz* shown by these statistics is comparable to that of its continental neighbors.⁵

Varying measures of control were achieved in the collection of economic statistics, with resulting variation in their reliability. Statistics on the foreign trade of the Monarchy and of the trade between Hungary and the German-Slav-Italian provinces were from the government tariff returns, the best possible source, although an inadequate one since there was apparently considerable smuggling. The tables on railroads and steamship companies were, as pointed out above, derived from the reports of the companies themselves and from investigations of the statistical bureau. The enterprises reported upon individually in the *Tafeln* were the most important in the Monarchy and the statistical information presented is in much detail. It is unlikely that this information was distorted purposely. In any event, the steady increase in the size and activity of such an enterprise as the Danube Steamship Company is borne out by other statistical tables of the *Tafeln*, for example, the increase in the trade between Hungary and the *Zollverband* (the German-Slav-Italian provinces), the growth in the size of Pest, and the tables on the number of steam engines in the Monarchy with the uses to which they were put.

The data presented on the amount of productive area, the divisions of this productive area between arable, meadow, etc., and the size of the various crops raised, are subject to many qualifications. The information on productive area, as pointed out above, was gotten from the cadastre which was not completed for the Monarchy. In those provinces where it had not been carried through provisional data or estimates were employed. The reports on the size of the crop raised were based on data which the compilers of the *Tafeln* stated were incomplete.

It has been found possible, however, to use these statistics to determine the relative position of individual provinces or zones of production in such things as the total productive area, and to show short-term movements in agriculture. Their validity for these purposes has been checked both by internal and external evidence.

Internal checks are provided by comparing individual tables with one another. Thus, between 1831 and 1846 the statistics on productive area show an increase in the extent of the land in which field crops were raised. During the same years the tables of productivity show a sizable increase in the amount of field crops produced. The statistics for 1847 show a large drop in total agricultural production. Inspection of the tables of average market prices shows that prices of farm products rose sharply in 1847 over the preceding years.

External checks on the accuracy of the picture of Austrian agriculture afforded by these statistics are provided by contemporary non-statistical works. Thus, with reference to the drop in agricultural production in 1847 referred to above, such non-statistical sources as agricultural journals reported that 1847 was a year of crop failure. These journals mentioned frequently the serious effect of disease upon the Monarchy's potato crop in the last years of the *Vormärz*. The *Tafeln* returns show a 27 per cent

⁵ W. Bowden, M. Karpovich, A. P. Usher, *An economic history of Europe since 1750* (New York, 1937), p. 15.

decrease in total potato production between 1841 and 1847. Such non-statistical sources as travellers' accounts reported that in comparison with the rest of the Monarchy the Northwest zone was tilled more intensively, that its farmers preferred rye and oats to other cereals, that it was a chief center for potato and hop culture, sheep herding, beet sugar production, and potato whiskey distilling. Examination of the statistics in the *Tafeln* bears out these comparative statements. Thus, the *Tafeln* aided in establishing the relative position of the Northwest zone with reference to the rest of the Monarchy with regard to these important agricultural activities. Or, again, non-statistical sources make it clear that there was an important development in the cultivation of sugar beets and the manufacture of beet sugar in certain areas of the Monarchy from 1830 on. The data presented in the *Tafeln* show this development in these areas and its absence in others.

Geographical information also serves as a check on the *Tafeln*. The barren, rocky nature of most of Dalmatia is reflected in the statistics of productive area and agricultural production for that province. These show that the ratio of arable land to total productive land in Dalmatia was far below the average for the Monarchy. The mountainous terrain of Tyrol militated against tillage but favored pasturage. The *Tafeln* show that the ratio of pasture to total productive area there was twice as high as it was for the Monarchy as a whole. In Lower Austria a large part of the *Viertel unter dem Manharisberg* (VUMB) was lowland while the other districts of the province were mainly mountainous or hilly. An analysis of the statistics of agricultural production showed that the VUMB was the most productive district of the province in field crops, but lagged behind in horned cattle and forage production.

The checking of the statistical data with non-statistical sources was at the same time a check of the latter material.

HUNGARY AND TRANSYLVANIA⁶

The most important failing of the *Tafeln* is the poor quality of the statistics presented for Hungary and Transylvania. The reporting system by which the data for the *Tafeln* were gathered did not extend into the lands of the Hungarian crown, except in a few isolated instances, as steamships and railroads. Statistics for Hungary and Transylvania were included in most of the tables but with the editorial explanation that they were either based on partial data or were estimates. There was no official statistical organization in Hungary until 1848 when the revolutionary government established such a bureau. This office accomplished nothing in the troubled days of its brief existence. With the restoration of Hapsburg rule in 1849 and the incorporation of the Hungarian lands into the Monarchy on the same level as the other crownlands, the central statistical bureau in Vienna extended its activities into Hungary. The bureau apparently got little cooperation from the Hungarians, who, according to Bokor "hated the collection of statistical data just as much as they hated the entire political system which this gathering of data promoted."⁷ Finally,

⁶ This brief account of official statistics in Hungary is from G. Bokor, *Geschichte und Organisation der amtlichen Statistik in Ungarn*, transl. from the Hungarian (Budapest, 1896), pp. 1-21, and *Magyar Statisztikai Közlemények, Landwirtschaftliche Statistik*, new series, XV (1897), 3-8.

⁷ Bokor, p. 9.

in 1867, when Hungary became a separate kingdom once more, an official Hungarian statistical bureau was formed.

c. Diplomatic correspondence

Great Britain, House of Commons, *Sessional papers*, 1851, vol. LVIII, "Correspondence relative to the affairs of Hungary, 1847-1849."

Report of the proceedings of the Hungarian Diet in which the question of agrarian reform among other problems, was the subject of debate. The reports were written by a representative of the British embassy at Vienna who attended the sessions of the Diet.

United States, State Department, *Diplomatic dispatches, Letters of ministers and chargés d'affaires*, 1830-1848.

———, ———, *Consular letters*, 1815-1848.

These dispatches and reports from the American consuls at Trieste (1815-1848), Vienna (1830-1848), and Venice (1830-1848), and of the American ministers at Vienna (1830-1848) are in the National Archives, Washington, D. C. They contain only incidental information about agriculture. The entire consular correspondence of J. G. Schwarz, American consul at Vienna from 1830 to 1850 is printed as a House document in 31st Congress, 1st session, House Executive Document, no. 571.

II

DOCUMENTS AND REPORTS OF PROCEEDINGS

Amtlicher Bericht über die im Mai 1857 abgehaltene fünfzigjährige Jubelfeier der k. k. Landwirtschafts-Gesellschaft in Wien, A. Fuchs, ed., Vienna, 1858.

Report of the anniversary celebration of the Lower Austrian Agricultural Society, including papers read at sessions and stenographic transcriptions of the discussions.

Amtlicher Bericht über die X. Versammlung deutscher Land- und Forstwirthe zu Grätz im September 1846, Graz, 1847.

In 1837 several outstanding agriculturists of Central Europe established an association of agriculturists and foresters and held annual meetings in various cities of Germany and Austria until 1872. These meetings were the occasions for discussions and papers on important agricultural questions and for farm expositions. The report of the meeting held at Graz, capital of Styria, is of special interest because of the large number of Austrians who took part, giving their opinions on the various agricultural problems discussed or telling of their experiences in the conduct of their farming operations. At least one other meeting of this association was held in the Monarchy before 1848. This was at Brünn, Moravia. No records of this meeting, however, were available to me.

Baldacci, A. von, "Über die inneren Zustände Österreichs. Eine Denkschrift aus dem Jahre 1816," ed. by F. von Krones, *Archiv für österreichische Geschichte*, 1889, LXXIV, 1-160.

A long, official memorandum written by Freiherr von Baldacci, President of the Directorate-General of Accounts, on the domestic situation in the

Monarchy at the end of the war period. Economic matters, especially transportation, were dealt with at length in this report.

Dunder, W. G., *Denkschrift über die Wiener Oktober-Revolution*, Vienna, 1849.

Includes documents and data dealing with this revolution and with the Constitutional Reichstag, with a list of delegates to the Reichstag, giving their district and occupation.

Falk, V. ed., *Der böhmische Landtag im Jahre 1847*, Hamburg, 1848.

Memoranda and other documents of the Bohemian estates in connection with the estates movement in that province.

Friedjung, H., "Gegner der Bauernbefreiung in Österreich," *Vierteljahrsschrift für Social- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte*, 1903, I, 115-119.

Includes memorandum to the throne written in 1850 by Prince Windisch-Grätz dealing with the emancipation operation. Windisch-Grätz, as spokesman for a small group of the nobility, took exceptions to certain provisions of the emancipation law which he claimed worked hardship on these nobles.

Historische Aktenstücke über das Ständewesen in Österreich, 6 pts., Leipzig, 1847-1848.

Collection of documents of earlier centuries which granted and guaranteed rights and privileges of the estates of various provinces.

Krański, M. von, ed., *Memoiren und Aktenstücke aus Galizien im Jahre 1846*, Leipzig, 1847.

Documents dealing with noble discontent in Galicia. This collection is of special interest because of the inclusion of documents concerning the lord-peasant relationship, and for the light it throws on the landlord attitude to this relationship before and after the Galician Revolt of 1846.

Verhandlungen des österreichischen Reichstages nach der stenographischen Aufnahme, 5 vols., Vienna, 1848-1849.

Stenographic transcription of the debates of the Constitutional Reichstag from its first meeting at Vienna on 10 July 1848 to its last session on 6 March 1849, at Kremsier. Volumes I and II contain the report of the debate on the motion for peasant emancipation made by Hans Kudlich. J. A. von Helfert, who was a delegate to this Reichstag, suggests that stenographers at the earlier sessions were unskilled and missed some of what was said in debate.*

Verhandlungen des landwirtschaftlichen Congresses gehalten zu Wien im Monate März 1849, Vienna, 1849.

Stenographic report of an agricultural conference held in Vienna under the auspices of the newly-formed Ministry of Agriculture. Delegates were present from the loyal or pacified provinces. There were five subjects on the agenda: the organization and function of agricultural societies and governmental agricultural agencies, agricultural education, water rights, forest legislation, and the parcelling and consolidation of farm land. Among the discussants were some of the Monarchy's greatest landlords and most important agriculturists.

* Helfert, *Aufzeichnungen*, p. 131.

III

DIARIES, LETTERS AND MEMOIRS

Helfert, J. A. von, *Aufzeichnungen und Erinnerungen aus jungen Jahren. Im Wiener konstituierenden Reichstag Juli bis Oktober 1848*, Vienna, 1904.

Helfert (1820-1910) was a youthful delegate to the Constitutional Reichstag and an active participant in its deliberations, especially in the emancipation debate.

Horsky von Horskyfeld, F. von, *Meine Streben, Wirken, Meine Resultate*, Kolin, 1873.

The autobiography of one of Austria's most important practical agriculturists. Horsky (1801-1877) gives interesting data on the new techniques, especially crop rotation, and new implements he introduced, and also reports of comparative yields with old and new methods on estates he managed.

Kübeck, M., von, ed., *Tagebücher des Carl Friedrich Freiherrn Kübeck von Kùbau*, 2 vols. in 3, Vienna, 1909.

An inside and unvarnished view of the formation of policy at the top levels of the government during the *Vormärz*. Kübeck (1780-1855), born in Moravia of humble parents, at an early age entered state service where he soon distinguished himself by his outstanding ability. He rose steadily, was ennobled, and in 1840 was made president of the *Hofkammer*. As one of the chief figures in the government he exerted much influence, principally in financial and economic matters.

Kudlich, H., *Rückblicke und Erinnerungen*, 3 vols., Vienna, Pest, Leipzig, 1873.

Hans Kudlich (1823-1917), the university trained son of a peasant, was the youngest delegate to the Constitutional Reichstag where he was an ardent Leftist. He introduced the emancipation bill. His memories of his peasant childhood and of the Constitutional Reichstag are valuable.

Lónyay, M., ed., *Graf Stefan Széchenyi und seine hinterlassenen Schriften*, transl. from the Hungarian by A. Dux, Budapest, 1875.

Excerpts from the diaries and correspondence of Széchenyi.

IV

SERIAL PUBLICATIONS PUBLISHED BEFORE 1850

One of the chief functions of the agricultural societies of the Monarchy was the issuance of serial publications dealing with the agriculture of the individual province and its advancement. These journals carried agricultural news and reports, descriptions of new techniques, new implements, new crops, reports of the activities of the society, and sometimes, stenographic transcriptions or summaries of meetings of

the society. Their main interest was in their home province but they not infrequently carried information on other parts of the Monarchy. They are indispensable sources for the study of agriculture in Austria. The single most important agricultural journal, however, was not an agricultural society venture but was privately owned. This was the *Oekonomische Neuigkeiten und Verhandlungen*.

A number of Austrian, German, French, and English periodicals published during the period 1800-1850 were examined. Only a few were found to contain material of value for this study. The most useful was the *Grenzboten*, a liberal Austrian emigré journal, published in Leipzig, which began publication in the last years of the *Vormärz*.

The dates given in the following titles are the years for which these journals were available to me.

Allgemeine Zeitung, Augsburg, 1797 ff.

This daily newspaper was a semi-official organ of the Austrian government throughout the period. Data on markets, prices, credit, and communications can be found in its columns.

Grenzboten, Leipzig, 1845 ff.

Liberal emigré weekly established and edited by Ignaz Kuranda, a Bohemian. Its publication was started in Brussels in 1841 but it was soon moved to Leipzig. Although banned by the Austrian office of censorship the *Grenzboten* had a wide circulation within the Monarchy.* It published outspoken dispatches from correspondents in all parts of the Monarchy, in which economic matters were often reported and discussed. It also printed contemporary documents, such as the petitions of provincial estates to the throne.

Mittheilungen der k. k. mährisch-schlesischen Gesellschaft zum Beförderung des Ackerbaues, der Natur- und Landeskunde, Brünn, 1847 ff.

Mittheilungen über Gegenstände der Landwirtschaft und Industrie Kärntens, published by the k. k. Kärntnerischen Gesellschaft zur Beförderung der Landwirtschaft und Industrie, Klagenfurt, 1844 ff.

Neue Schriften der k. k. patriotischen-ökonomischen Gesellschaft im Königreiche Böhmen, 1828-1847.

Oekonomische Neuigkeiten und Verhandlungen. Zeitschrift für alle Zweige der Land- und Forstwirtschaft, des Forst- und Jagdwesens im österreichischen Kaiserthum und dem ganzen Deutschland, 1820-1825, 1847-1850.

Appeared weekly from 1811 to 1850. As indicated by its long title the coverage of the journal extended over Central Europe, with emphasis on the Austrian Monarchy. It carried news and articles on everything its editors believed would be of interest to the agriculturists of the great area it served. It attracted some of the best-known agricultural publicists and scholars of the day as contributors to its pages. Until 1821 it was issued

* Stern, *Geschichte Europas*, VI, 353.

with the cooperation of the Moravian-Silesian Agricultural Society. Its founder and first editor was Christian Carl André (1763-1831). André, a native of Germany, settled in Brünn, Moravia, in 1798, working there as a school director and as secretary of the Moravian-Silesian Agricultural Society. He was a prolific writer on economic, geographical, and scientific subjects, and his writings won him wide recognition. His successors in the editorial chair of the *Oekonomische Neuigkeiten* were J. G. Elsner, Emil André (a son of the founder), and, finally, F. X. Hlubek. Elsner, a German, and Hlubek, an Austrian, were among the outstanding agriculturists and agricultural publicists of the time. Under the direction of Hlubek, who was a university professor of agriculture, the journal became much more scholarly in tone, with lengthy scientific articles on agricultural subjects and with much less news coverage than is found in the earlier years of the publication.

Verhandlungen und Aufsätze, published by the *k. k. Landwirtschaftsgesellschaft in Steiermark*, Graz, 1834-1841.

F. X. Hlubek, ed., *Resultate der Wirksamkeit der k. k. Landwirtschaftsgesellschaft in Steiermark, vom Jahre 1829-1839*, Graz, 1840, is a summary of this journal for the years indicated in its title.

V

CONTEMPORARY AUTHORITIES

By contemporary authorities is meant those works written between 1800 and 1850 (a few of the books included here were written a few years before or after these terminal years) which were found to contain material of value for the study of the Austrian economy of the time, especially its agriculture. The works that were used fell into seven categories; a. legal commentaries, b. statistical writers, c. statistical-topographical surveys, d. agricultural surveys, e. treatises on agriculture, f. travellers' accounts, g. economic and political treatises.

a. Legal manuals

Contemporary manuals on the legal codes regulating the system of hereditary subjection in the various provinces of the Monarchy are indispensable for the study and understanding of this institution. The merits of the different manuals used varied, with some being clearer and more precise in their explanations, as the books by Barth-Barthenheim or Mailath, but all of them are extremely useful.

b. Statistical writers

Between 1800 and 1850 a number of statistical surveys of all or parts of the Monarchy were compiled by private individuals. The lack of official statistics in the earlier part of this period and the secret classification of the data collected by the government in the latter part,

combined with the deep interest in statistics that had developed, stimulated the writing and publishing of these books. Some of the writers in the later years were given access to official government data but were not allowed to cite their source. One of the arguments advanced by Freiherr von Kübeck in 1841 for making public the *Tafeln zur Statistik* was that it would provide data for the statistical writers and so improve the difficult situation in which they found themselves with regard to source materials.¹⁰

The custom of not citing sources was followed by the statistical writers also in the data they presented from non-official sources. Thus, insofar as the statistical material they present is concerned, their books are of little use for a double reason: first, the availability of the *Tafeln zur Statistik* to the modern student negates the value of the data from official sources which the statistical writers present, and, second, their non-official statistical material is open to question because of their failure to indicate their sources. Another weakness of their work is their tendency to make generalizations on the basis of inadequate statistical data. Their general descriptions of economic life and its development must be used with caution. Some of these writers, however, present non-statistical information which is of value, especially in their descriptions of the organization of the government. Johann Springer's work is especially valuable for this. The works by Demian, Schwartner and Fényes on Hungary are of greater value than their counterparts for the other parts of the Monarchy because of the lack of contemporary official statistical data on Hungary.

c. Statistical-topographical surveys

Two works of this type were used, Sommer on Bohemia and Wolny on Moravia. These works are complete surveys of these two provinces—Sommer being in 16 volumes and Wolny in 6. Each estate, village, and town is described in historical, geographical, statistical, and economic detail. The descriptions they give trace estate ownership from the formation of the estate, provide data on roads and streams, drainage, river control, etc., and often provide information on methods of tillage, agricultural improvements that had been introduced, animal husbandry, agricultural industries, etc.

d. Agricultural surveys

These works contain descriptions of the agricultural economy of a single province or of a region of the Monarchy. When written by competent authorities they are extremely valuable sources, as, for example, Schnabel's book on Bohemia.

¹⁰ *Denkschrift der k. k. statistischen Zentralkommission*, p. 27.

e. Treatises on Agriculture

Contemporary treatises on agriculture, when written by experts in the field, are valuable sources for determining the agricultural techniques of the time. These writers were interested in promoting improvements in the existing methods of agriculture, and they devoted much attention to the existing system to show its shortcomings and how it could be improved. Their definitions and explanations of current methods and of new ones are of basic importance to the study of the agriculture of the period. The most important agricultural treatise for Central Europe is Thae'r's influential work, *Grundsätze der rationellen Landwirtschaft*. Of the works written by Austrians the most useful for this study were the books by Rudolph André and Burger.

f. Travellers' accounts

A host of English travellers descended upon Central Europe in the first half of the nineteenth century. Their visits and their books aroused the ire of Friedrich List, who wrote of them in 1842, as follows:

Wherever there is a full wool sack to be traded for a case of manufactured goods, there John Bull sends his apostles, who then write books (such as those of Gleig, Turnbull, Paget, Miss Pardoe, et al.) in which they place the native government in the shade, make laughable and despicable objects of the Germans, and praise the happiness of a trade connection with England. The Germans—those honest but stupid Teutons—then find nothing better to do than to translate these books word for word into German and offer them for sale at the Leipzig fair to their most enlightened and most philosophical fellow countrymen, who devour them greedily and without suspicion.²¹

Whatever the justification for List's outburst, several of these travellers were excellent reporters and their books are excellent sources, especially the works of Townson, Bright, and Paget. Most of the other travel books examined were little more than superficial travel diaries.

The majority of the books written by French and German travellers in the Monarchy are also travel diaries and little more. As with the English travellers, however, there are notable exceptions, such as the books of Elsner and Kohl.

g. Economic and political treatises

These are works by contemporaries dealing critically and analytically with various aspects of the Monarchy's government and economy. They were usually written for the purpose of promoting administrative or economic innovation and reform. These writings have a two-fold

²¹ List, "Ackerverfassung," p. 511.

use for the student: first, they contain factual data of value, and second, they help to establish an understanding of the *Zeitgeist*.

The implications of the economic writings of the period insofar as they concern the development of economic thought are not a matter of concern here. It should be noted, however, that Hungarian economic thought, starting with the works of Széchenyi and stimulated by the writings of Friedrich List, entered at this time upon a highly active and important period. An old but interesting and valuable analysis of this movement, written *con amore*, is J. Kautz, *Entwicklungsgeschichte der volkswirtschaftlichen Ideen in Ungarn und deren Einfluss auf das Gemeinwesen*, translated from the Hungarian by S. Schiller, Budapest, 1876.

André, R., *Darstellung der vorzüglichsten landwirtschaftlichen Verhältnisse*, 5th ed., with notes and additions by A. Rieger and C. J. N. Balling, Prague, 1846.

This treatise on agriculture was first published in 1817. André (1792-1825) was the son of C. C. André, founder and first editor of the *Oekonomische Neuigkeiten und Verhältnisse*. The younger André distinguished himself at an early age as a practical agriculturist, and at 23 was hired to help manage the great Salm estate of Raitz in Moravia. His father aided him in the writings of this text which is illustrated with many examples from actual farming experience. It was strongly influenced by Thae's writings. The book was well received and went through several editions. In addition to this book André, in his short lifetime, wrote two other books on agricultural subjects and was an assistant editor of the *Oekonomische Neuigkeiten*.

Brauner, F. A., *Böhmische Bauernzustände im Interesse der Landescultur und des Nationalwohlstandes*, Vienna, 1847.

Advances a program for the amelioration of the condition of the Czech peasantry. Brauner, himself a Czech, had gained an intimate knowledge of peasant life from long service as a chief official of a large Bohemian estate. The peasants of his district sent him to the Constitutional Reichstag in 1848 as their delegate. In this book he recommended the following reforms: agricultural education for peasant children, consolidation of holdings, and a shift from the three field system with barren fallow to a more diversified agriculture. In the development of these theses he presents important material on Bohemian peasant agricultural practices.

Bright, R., *Travels from Vienna through lower Hungary; with some remarks on the state of Vienna during the congress in the year 1814*, Edinburgh, 1818.

Bright (1789-1858) received his medical degree from Edinburgh in 1812. He travelled extensively in Iceland and on the Continent before settling down in 1820 to the practice and teaching of medicine in London. He became renowned for his medical research and discoveries. His ability for keen observation was not limited to medicine as is evident in his book

on Hungary. He paid much attention to agriculture and land tenure and gives valuable data on both these subjects, with lengthy and useful descriptions of what he saw on the estates he visited.

Burger, J., *Agriculture du royaume Lombardo-Vénitien*, transl. from the German by V. Rendu, Paris, 1842.

Invaluable for the study of North Italian agriculture. Burger (1773-1842), Austria's outstanding agriculturist of his time, spent several years in Lombardy working on the cadastral survey of that province.

———, *Lehrbuch der Landwirtschaft*, 2 vols., Vienna, 1838.

Contains much information on the types and techniques of tillage employed in the Monarchy. A greatly abridged version appeared in English, entitled *The economy of farming*, translated by E. Goodrich Smith, New York, 1843.

Demian, J. A., *Tableau géographique et politique des royaumes de Hongrie, d'Esclavonie, de Croatie, et de la grande principauté de Transilvanie*, transl. from the German, 2 vols., Paris, 1809.

Demian (1770-1845), a native of Hungary, served as an officer in the Austrian army until 1803. In 1804 he was employed by the government in the collection of statistics in the Military Frontier. He continued at this work for some time and then re-entered the army. After a few months he resigned his commission and moved to Germany where he spent the rest of his life. In 1796 he published his first important work, a study of Austrian statistics. In 1804-1807 he published *Darstellung der österreichischen Monarchie nach den neuesten statistischen Beziehungen*, 4 vols. in 6 parts. The two-volume work cited above is a French translation of the part of this study dealing with the Hungarian lands. The original German work was not available.

Deym von Stritzetz, F. von, *Ueber Kredit Institute im Allgemeinen und das Hypotheken-Institute insbesondere. Nebst Vorschlägen zur Errichtung einer Real-Hypotheken-Bank im Königreiche Böhmen*, Prague, 1844.

Published by the Bohemian Estates as part of its program for the establishment of an estates Credit-Anstalt. Deym (1801-1853) was one of the estates' leaders and an active proponent of agricultural reform. In this book he presented a detailed plan for a mortgage bank for Bohemia modelled after the Galician Estates Credit-Anstalt.

Elsner, J. G., *Ungarn, durchreiset, beurtheilet und beschrieben*, 2 vols., Leipzig, 1840.

Elsner (1784-1869) was one of central Europe's outstanding agriculturists and agricultural publicists. He wrote extensively on agricultural subjects, especially sheep herding, and edited several agricultural journals at various times. Elsner's interest in his extended journeys in Hungary was agriculture. His trained eye saw a great deal so that his book is a valuable source of information on Hungarian agriculture of the *Vormärz*.

Fényes, A., *Ungarn in Vormärz*, transl. from the Hungarian, Leipzig, 1851.

Fényes (1807-1876) after studying law spent several years traveling through his native Hungary gathering data on statistics and geography. In 1835 he settled in Pest and spent the rest of his active career in research and writing on statistical and geographical subjects. In 1839 he put out a six volume work on Hungarian statistics and geography and in 1842-1843 he published a three volume study on the same subject. In 1847 he put out a two volume epitome of his earlier books, with additional information to bring them up to date. All these books were written in Hungarian. The work cited above is a German translation of the 1847 book.

Gleig, G. R., *Germany, Bohemia and Hungary visited in 1837*, 3 vols., London, 1839.

In the main a superficial work. Gleig (1796-1888), after youthful years as a soldier was ordained a priest of the Anglican church. He turned to writing with great energy to supplement his income and produced many multi-volumed histories and biographies. Gleig travelled through Austria and Hungary quickly and judged what he saw by English standards—all to Austria's disadvantage. Occasionally, however, he gives an accurate and interesting description.

Heintl, F. von, *Die Landwirtschaft des österreichischen Kaiserthumes*, Vienna, 1808.

The work of an enthusiastic amateur. Heintl (1769-1838) was a successful Vienna lawyer who had been ennobled and became a landowner. He developed an intensive interest in the promotion of Austrian industry, commerce, and agriculture, wrote extensively on these subjects, and was active in the promotion of plans and proposals to further these objects of his interest. His book on agriculture is not the equal of such agricultural treatises as the books by André or Burger and contributes little to an understanding of agricultural operations. Its interest lies in the many expressions of Heintl's own opinions on matters of agricultural importance which contributes to the understanding of the new interest of landlords in profitable agricultural production.

———, *Das Weinbau des österreichischen Kaiserthumes*, Vienna, 1821.

Part two of the book on Austrian agriculture described above.

Hlubek, F. X., *Einfluss der Eisenbahnen auf die Landwirtschaft des Herzogthumes Steiermark*, Graz, 1844.

A warning to the farmers of Styria that the new railroads would bring Hungarian grain into Styria at a price at which the Styrian producers could not compete, and recommending that they shift away from the growing of cereals. Hlubek (1802-1880) was an outstanding teacher of agriculture. He was Professor of Agriculture successively at Vienna, Lemberg, Laibach and Graz.

—, *Die Landwirtschaftslehre in ihrem ganzen Umfange*, 2 vols., Vienna, 1846.

A lengthy and scholarly treatise on scientific agriculture.

Jacob, W., *Report on the trade in corn and on the agriculture of the north of Europe*, 3rd ed., London, 1826.

———, "A report presented to the lords of the committee of his majesty's privy council for trade, respecting the agriculture and the trade in corn in some of the continental states of northern Europe," *Pamphleteer*, XXIX (1828), 361-456.

Jacob in 1822 had been appointed comptroller of corn returns in the British Board of Trade. These two works were official reports of trips he made to the continent to study the corn trade. Both works contain general information on agricultural practices in Central Europe, and in the earlier report some information on grain prices and marketing in Galicia.

Kohl, J. G., *Reisen im Inneren von Russland und Polen*, 3 vols., Dresden and Leipzig, 1841.

The third volume contains the report of Kohl's journey through Galicia and Moravia. Kohl (1808-1878) won renown for the excellent quality of his travel books and also as a cartographer. He was a keen observer, was interested in economic activity, and gives valuable descriptions of the appearance and fertility of the countryside through which he passed.

List, F., "Die Ackerverfassung, die Zwergwirtschaft und die Auswanderung," *Friedrich List. Schriften, Reden, Briefe*, ed. by E. von Beckerath *et al.*, V.

———, "Über die nationalökonomische Reform des Königreichs Ungarn," *ibid.*, III, pt. i.

———, "Über die Transportverbesserung in Ungarn," *ibid.*, III, pt. i.

———, "Über die Zollvereinigung der österreichischen Provinzen mit Ungarn," *ibid.*, VII.

List, who visited Hungary in the 1840's, defended an independent national existence for Hungary in these essays and urged the economic development of that land. His views on the advantages of a protective tariff system, the development of domestic industry and of a good transportation system, and a de-emphasis of agriculture, won many adherents among the Hungarian nationalists, the most important convert being Louis Kossuth.

Paget, J., *Hungary and Transylvania; with remarks on their condition, social, political and economical*, 2 vols., Philadelphia, 1850. First published in London in 1837.

Paget (1808-1892) received a medical degree from Edinburgh but never practiced. He wrote his book on the basis of a year and a half of travel in Hungary between 1835 and 1837, in the course of which he covered the entire width and length of the land. In 1837 in Rome he married an Hungarian widow, Baroness Wesselenyi, and a few years later he settled down to the life of an Hungarian landlord, spending the rest of his life in his adopted land. In his book he is sympathetic with the Magyars, especially with the liberal element of the aristocracy typified by Széchenyi, and was enthusiastic over the spirit of reform he found stirring in the

land. These prejudices did not keep him from being an accurate reporter and he did not hesitate to write of conditions which he regarded as reprehensible. His accounts of Hungarian social life are of special value to the historian. A modern Hungarian scholar, in discussing this phase of Paget's work, wrote:

" . . . we lack records of those very features of Hungarian life which would appear most quaint and curious to the foreign observer while they seem most natural to the Hungarians themselves. John Paget brought a cheerful curiosity and a sure eye to his investigation of the life of the Hungarian *ancien régime*, and he had every quality for resuscitating it before our eyes with all the animated magic of a good film. . . .

" We have absolutely no literature of our own worthy of being placed side by side with Paget's work in this respect." ¹²

Schnabel, G. N., *Statistik der landwirtschaftlichen Industrie Böhmens*, Prague, 1846.

An extremely useful survey of Bohemian agriculture in the 1840's. Schnabel (1791-1857), after studying at the Universities of Prague and Vienna, was appointed professor of statistics and constitutional law at the University of Prague when he was 26. He soon won recognition as an outstanding scholar in both these fields. The book cited above is the elaboration of a report he had prepared as a member of the Bohemian Provincial Trade Commission, in which he had had the cooperation of other Bohemian scholars and had been given access to official sources. His chief source for this study was the newly-completed cadastral survey whose data he presents in detailed breakdowns. The book is divided into eleven sections, each dealing with a different branch of agriculture and each containing much important source material.

Schwartner, M. von, *Statistik des Königreichs Ungern*, 3 vols., Ofen, 1809-1811.

Schwartner (1759-1823), a native of Hungary, studied in Germany and returned to his homeland as a teacher. He was employed first at the Oedenburg *Gymnasium* and then was appointed to a chair at the University of Pest where he taught diplomatics and statistics, and was University librarian.

Serre, M. de, *L'Autriche*, 6 vols., Paris, 1821.

———, *Voyage dans l'empire Autriche pendant les années 1809 et 1810, ou, essai statistique et géographique sur cet empire*, 4 vols., Paris, 1814.

Serre wrote this book to aid the French governors of those parts of the Austrian Monarchy that were occupied by the Napoleonic armies. Serre (1783-1862) was born in Montpellier and attended the university there. When Illyria and Dalmatia were taken by the French he was charged with the judicial and administrative organization of these provinces. His book on Austria was the result of the investigations, trips, and studies he made in this work. He did much research and prefaced his study with a

¹² J. Balogh, "Paget's Hungary and Transylvania," *Hungarian Quarterly*, VI (1940), pt. i, 473.

critical essay on the printed source materials in the fields he covered in his book.

Sommer, J. G., *Das Königreich Böhmen, statistisch-topographisch dargestellt*, 16 vols., Prague, 1833-1848.

A complete survey of Bohemia. Sommer (1782-1848) was born in Germany with the name of Volte. He settled in Prague around 1810 and changed his name to Sommer at that time. He was the author of several voluminous works on geography. In 1831 the Bohemian Museum in Prague commissioned him to prepare a new topographical-statistical survey of Bohemia to replace the one compiled by Schaller between 1785 and 1790, which was now outmoded. This new work had already been started by Joseph Eichler, a Prague *Gymnasium* professor, but illness had kept him from continuing it. Sommer's source for agricultural area was the Josephine cadastre until results of the new cadastre became available; for his other information he relied upon information collected by the Bohemian Patriotic-Economic Society, government reports, provincial records, etc. In all phases of his work he had the cooperation of many Bohemian scholars. Sommer died a year before his work was completed and the sixteenth and last volume was brought out by F. X. Zippe who had assisted Sommer since the inception of the project. Zippe was a well known Bohemian scientist who, in 1850, was appointed professor of mineralogy at the University of Vienna.

Springer, J., *Statistik der österreichischen Kaiserstaates*, 2 vols., Vienna, 1840.

The best of the statistical writers. Springer was allowed to use certain information from the *Tafeln zur Statistik* but was not allowed to cite his source. His work is especially valuable for its detailed descriptions of the governmental organization. Springer (1789-1869), a native of Bohemia, spent his adult life as a student and teacher of statistics, jurisprudence and government. After teaching at Graz for some years he was appointed professor of statistics at the Vienna *Hochschule* and spent the rest of his career there. He served the government in various advisory and administrative capacities.

Stamm, F., *Verhältnisse der Volks-, Land- und Forstwirtschaft des Königreiches Böhmen*, Prague, 1856.

A survey of Bohemian agriculture which is much inferior to the work of Schnabel. Stamm (1813-1880) was a writer on many subjects, as well as a successful businessman. His book on Bohemian agriculture is uncritical, and, at times, confused and inaccurate in its presentation.

Széchenyi, S., *Licht*, transl. from the Hungarian by M. von Paziazi, Pest, 1832.

———, *Ueber den Credit*, transl. from the Hungarian by J. Vojdissek, 2d ed., Leipzig and Pest, 1830.

Like so much else in Hungary, Hungarian economic writing owed its beginnings to the activities of Count Stephen Széchenyi. Széchenyi (1792-1860) wrote well over twenty books to publicize or to defend his program of economic reform for his beloved homeland. The basic elements of this program are to be found in three of his earliest books, of which two are cited above; the third, *Stadium*, published in 1833, was not available to me.

In *Ueber den Credit* Széchenyi argued that individual freedom, equality before the law, and protection of property are the basic foundations of a healthy state and he urged the institution of reforms to achieve these goals. He wanted Hungarians to become more industrious, to adopt a rationalistic approach to economic activity, and to accept modern political and economic principles and institutions. He attacked the privileges of the nobility and struck out with special force against the system of hereditary subjection. But he argued that until a practicable credit system was adopted these changes and reforms were not possible. Széchenyi had travelled in England and been greatly and favorably impressed by what he saw there. This was the model he had for Hungary. His book on credit attracted much attention and was assailed by critics. In *Licht* he defended his theses and elaborated upon the arguments he had advanced in the earlier book.

Tebeldi, A., *Das Eigenthum*, Stuttgart, 1848.

———, *Die Geldangelegenheiten Oesterreichs*, Leipzig, 1847.

A critique and attack upon the economic policies of the Austrian government. Tebeldi was the pseudonym of Carl Beidtel (son of Ignaz Beidtel). The book was suppressed in the Monarchy but apparently had a wide circulation, seemingly gaining in authority as the result of its being banned. According to a Prague dispatch to the *Grenzboten* the book had started a run on the banks of that city and in ten days a half million florins had been withdrawn and converted into metal coin by worried depositors.¹⁸ Tebeldi included much interesting and useful information in his analyses.

Tegoborski, L. de, *Des finances et du crédit public de l'Autriche, de sa dette, de ses ressources financières et de son système d'imposition*, 2 vols., Paris, 1843.

Tegoborski (1793-1857), a native of Russian Poland, entered the service of the Russian government at an early age and soon rose to prominence. In 1834 he was sent to France with the rank of plenipotentiary to negotiate certain Russian-French financial arrangements, and then was sent to Vienna for the same type of work with the Austrian government. His mission kept him in Austria from 1835 until 1847. In this book on Austrian finances he included much statistical material he obtained from contemporary statistical writers, notably J. Springer. Tegoborski's work suffers from over-generalization in its discussions of economic activities and development. His description of the governmental financial system is well done. His concise definitions of tax terminology in use at that time and the comparisons he makes between Austrian taxes and French and Prussian counterparts are valuable for an understanding of the Austrian financial system.

Thaer, A. D., *Grundsätze der rationellen Landwirtschaft*, 4 vols., Berlin, 1809-1810.

Thaer (1752-1828), the premier agriculturist of his time, provides fundamental material in this, his most famous, book, necessary for an understanding of the agriculture of the period. The work has been translated into English by W. Shaw and C. W. Johnson as *The principles of agriculture*, 2 vols., London, 1844.

¹⁸ *Grenzboten*, VII (1848), pt. i, 473.

Townson, R., *Travels in Hungary, with a short account of Vienna in the year 1793*, London, 1797.

Townson, an Englishman, studied medicine and received his medical degree from the University of Göttingen. His book was written after five months of travel in Hungary. The large amount of space he devoted to natural history reveals the focus of Townson's interests. But he was also a good reporter of social and political life, and gives a good account of the Josephine reforms and the reaction against them, with translations of some of the acts of the Hungarian Diet of 1790. He also included in his book a translation of part of the Theresan *Urbarium*.

Turnbull, P. E., *Austria*, 2 vols., London, 1840.

Turnbull (1786-1852), who was a Fellow of the Royal Society, devoted the first volume of his work to a narrative of his travels through Bohemia and the Alpine provinces. The second volume is a treatise on Austrian institutions. Turnbull does not indicate his sources for this study but it is clear that he made extensive use of the statistical writers of the time. Although his work is useful it must be used with caution, since it is often inaccurate and incomplete. The work is marred by a very strong bias in favor of the absolutist government and the necessity he apparently felt to rise to its defense.

Wessely, J., *Die österreichischen Alpenländer*, 2 vols. in 1, Vienna, 1853.

Contains much information on the agriculture of the Alpine provinces of the Monarchy. Wessely (1814-1898), after training in a government forestry school, worked for years in the forests of the Alpine lands. In 1849 he was appointed to a post in the new Ministry of Agriculture and Mining, and played an important role in the framing of forest legislation. His new job gave him the opportunity to write and he produced a long series of meritorious works on forestry and agriculture.

Wolny, G., *Die Markgrafschaft Mähren*, 6 vols. in 7, Brünn, 1835-1842.

A statistical-topographical survey of Moravia, on the same order as Sommer's survey of Bohemia. Wolny (1793-1871), a native of Moravia, was a member of the Benedictine order. For over twenty years he was professor of history and philology at the Brünn *Gymnasium*. In the early 1840's he retired from teaching to devote himself entirely to topographical and statistical research. His sources for the survey of Moravia were the Josephine cadastre with corrections, the new cadastral returns as they became available, and the reports and records of government and estate officials and magistrates. He had the cooperation of Moravian scholars in carrying through his survey.

VI

SECONDARY WORKS

Beidtel, I., *Geschichte der österreichischen Staatsverwaltung 1740-1848*, ed. by A. Huber, 2 vols., Innsbruck, 1896-1898.

Beidtel (1783-1865) received the degree of doctor of laws from the

University of Vienna and then entered government service. He spent many years in this employment rising to high rank and gained an intimate, first hand knowledge of its workings which he augmented with private research and study. Most of the second volume deals with the period in which he was in the government and contains much primary source material. This book was part of the large amount of manuscript material Beidtel left behind. It was not published until over 30 years after his death.

Bibl, V., *Die niederösterreichischen Stände im Vormärz*, Vienna, 1911.

Written almost exclusively from the manuscript records of proceedings of the Lower Austrian estates. Bibl's lengthy paraphrases and direct quotations from this source make his own book take on the character of a source.

Comité des k. k. Ackerbauministeriums, *Geschichte der österreichischen Land- und Forstwirtschaft und ihrer Industrien 1848-1898*, 4 vols. in 5 and supplemental volume, Vienna, 1899.

This massive work, running into thousands of pages, was issued to celebrate the golden jubilee of Emperor Francis Joseph's accession to the throne. It was one of several such series put out at this time dealing with the development of the various branches of the Austrian economy during the reign of Francis Joseph. The contributors to the series on agriculture included the most important figures in that field in the Monarchy. These men in their articles were most concerned with the period 1848-1898 but they included much material on the years prior to 1848.

Ditz, H., *Die ungarische Landwirtschaft*, Leipzig, 1867.

An official report written for the Bavarian government. The low grain prices which had prevailed in Bavaria for some years were ascribed to the increased production of Hungarian growers. Ditz, a Bavarian, was sent to Hungary to study and report on the agricultural situation there. His thoroughgoing descriptions and analyses of all aspects of the agriculture of the Hungarian Plain (to which he limited his work) is basic for a study of Hungarian agriculture in the nineteenth century.

Elvert, C. d', *Geschichte der k. k. mähr.-schles. Gesellschaft zur Beförderung des Ackerbaues, der Natur- und Landeskunde mit Rücksicht auf die bezüglichen Cultur-Verhältnisse Mährens und Schlesiens*, 2 vols., Brünn, 1870.

A rich mine of information on the agriculture of Moravia and Silesia in the first half of the nineteenth century. Elvert (1803-1896), a native of Moravia, wrote prolifically on the modern history of that land. He employed the agglutinative method so that his book is in the main undigested source materials. He included verbatim in the text much documentary matter and gives lengthy quotations and paraphrases from contemporary materials that are not otherwise available. He gave complete citations for his sources. The second volume of the book contains documents dealing with the history of the Moravian-Silesian Society for the Promotion of Agriculture, etc., and the biographies of 91 of its outstanding members in which emphasis is laid upon their work in agriculture.

Grünberg, K., *Die Bauernbefreiung und die Auflösung des gutherrlich-bäuerlichen Verhältnisses in Böhmen, Mähren und Schlesien*, 2 vols., Leipzig, 1893-1894.

The standard work on this subject. The first volume contains the narrative while the second has a valuable collection of the documents which were the chief sources for the study. The book is actually a legal history of the institution of hereditary subjection in the eighteenth century and of its abolition in the nineteenth century. Despite the book's title only 104 of its 918 pages are devoted to the period after Joseph II, that is, 1790-1848. According to Grünberg these years were a resting period of the social organism. This view is understandable when it is realized that Grünberg's concern is with the policy of the government on the peasant and land tenure questions. The legal-administrative focus of the book results in Grünberg always looking down from the elevated position of government upon the institutions he is describing. In the years between 1790 and 1848 the government's policy was to make no changes in anything, as Grünberg so ably points out in his discussion of the administration of this period. But he neglects the fact that in economic life there was much change, with deep and lasting effects on the peasant and land tenure questions.

Mises, L. von, *Die Entwicklung des gutherrlich-bäuerlichen Verhältnisses in Galizien bis zu seiner Auflösung (1772-1848)*, Vienna, 1902 (Wiener Staatswissenschaftlich Studien, IV).

Mises wrote this study under the direction of Karl Grünberg and it reflects the interests and influence of the latter man. Thus, the focus of the monograph is on legal and administrative institutions with virtually no attention paid to economic or social history. An exception to this is Mises' account of the Galician Revolt of 1846 in which he probes into economic and social issues. The study contains much valuable information, conveniently assembled and well-written.

Springer, A., *Geschichte Oesterreichs seit dem Wiener Frieden 1809*, 2 vols., Leipzig, 1863-1865.

A genuine masterpiece of historical literature that has not been surpassed as yet in its field. Anton Springer (1825-1891), born a Catholic Austrian became a Protestant *Reichsdeutscher*. He was a native of Bohemia, and after studying at German universities, he returned to Prague to teach modern Austrian history at the university there. Although he was a German he became closely connected with the Slav movement among the Czechs during the revolutionary era of 1848 and was an ardent advocate of federalism for the Monarchy. In 1849 he settled in Germany where he taught the history of art in several German universities. But he still maintained a close interest in modern Austrian history. Dahlmann urged him to put this knowledge in book form and Springer agreed to write the history of Austria from 1809 to 1850 for the series *Staatengeschichte der neuesten Zeit*. The first volume carries the story down to the outbreak of the March Revolution in 1848 and the second deals with the revolutionary period. Springer was master of the languages spoken by the different major linguistic groups of the Monarchy and had an interest in and

sympathy for their nationalistic desires so that the focus of his history is Monarchy-wide. Further, his interests were broad so that he dealt equally with economic and social, as well as political history. Like other great historians Springer was not unprejudiced or impassive. His treatment is often subjective and he does not conceal his censure or scorn when he feels it is merited, nor his praise. This does not detract from the value of the book as an indispensable source for the study of any aspect of *Vormärz* Austria.

INDEX

- Abfabrtsgeld*, 80.
Academia Operosum, 136.
 Achard, F. C., 141.
 Adamec, J., 150;
 "Die Landwirtschaft in Mähren,"
 147 n.
 Adige River, 13.
 Adriatic Sea, 13, 19, 21.
 Agrarian revolution, 41, 44.
 Agricultural credit:
 demands for extension of, in Bo-
 hemia, 121-122, in Galicia, 116-
 117, in Hungary, 124-126, in
 Lower Austria, 117-120, in Mor-
 avia, 122-124, 217, in Styria, 120-
 121;
 lottery loans, 115-116;
 private sources, 115, 119;
 relation to redemption of peasant
 obligations, 119, 121-122;
 sources of in early *Vormärz*, 113-
 114.
 Agricultural education:
 agricultural societies and, 142-143;
 in Bohemia, 130-131;
 in Galicia, 131-132;
 in Hungary, 127-130.
 Agricultural implements, 134 n., 143,
 163-164, 190-192, 242.
 Agricultural industry, 42;
 beet sugar, 102-107, 165-166;
 potato processing, 109-110, 166.
 Agricultural journals, 139-140, 141-
 142, 260-261.
 Agricultural labor, *see* Hired farm
 labor, Migratory farm labor, Ro-
 bot, Wages.
 Agricultural production, intensity of,
 148-149.
 Agricultural revolution, 41, 44, 44 n.,
 145.
 Agricultural societies, activities of, 139-
 144.
 Agricultural Society of Cracow, 138,
 142.
 Agricultural Society of Salzburg, 138.
 Agricultural Society of Tyrol and
 Vorarlberg, 138, 139.
 Agricultural Society of Vienna, 136,
 139, 140, 141, 142, 177-179, 190,
 193.
 Agricultural techniques, 44, 96, 102,
 242;
 agricultural societies and, 143-144;
 in Northwest zone, 164-165.
 Agricultural textbooks, 142.
 Aichen, Freiherr von, 214.
 Albrecht Casimir, Duke of Saxe-
 Teschen, 111, 129-130, 166.
 Alföld, Great (Budapest Basin), 15,
 19, 20, 41, 93-94, 112, 127, 129,
 183.
 Alföld, Little (Pressburg Basin), 15,
 19, 20.
 Alibunaer marshes, 111.
Allgemeine Zeitung (Augsburg), 93 n.,
 104, 261.
*Allgemeines bürgerliches Gesetzbuch
 für die gesammten deutschen Er-
 bländer der Oesterreichischen
 Monarchie*, 63 n.
*Allgemeines Reichs- Gesetz- und Re-
 gierungsblatt für das Kaiserthum
 Oesterreich*, 236 n.
 Alpine zone, 16-17, 157, 187, 188, 189.
 Alps, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17.
 Altenburg, 129-150.
Altionskribierten Länder, 252.
*Amlicher Bericht über die im Mai,
 1857 abgehaltene fünfzigjährige
 Jubelfeier der k. k. Landwirth-
 schaft-Gesellschaft in Wien*, 102
 n., 258.
*Amlicher Bericht über die X. Ver-
 sammlung deutscher Land- und
 Forstwirthe zu Gratz in September
 1846*, 142 n., 258.
 André, Christian Carl, 196, 262, 265.
 André, Emil, 262.
 André, Rudolph, 158, 196-197;
 *Darstellung der vorzüglichsten land-
 wirtschaftlichen Verhältnisse*, 154
 n., 264, 265.
 Andreas II, King of Hungary (1205-
 1235), 34.

- Andrian-Werburg, Viktor, Baron, 32-33;
Oesterreich und dessen Zukunft, 32 n.
- Animal husbandry, 16, 18, 140, 145, 161-163, 169.
- Archduchy of Austria, *see* Lower Austria, Upper Austria, Salzburg.
- Archiv für vaterländische Geschichte und Topographie*, 57 n.
- Arneth, A. von, *Anton Ritter von Schmerling*, 27 n.
- Artz, F. B., *Reaction and revolution 1814-1832*, 38 n.
- Auersperg, Karl, Prince, 158.
- "Aus dem Berichte des Hradischer Kreisamtes vom 12 April 1831," 94-95 n.
- Australia, 102.
- Austria*, 193 n., 197.
- Austrian Agricultural Ministry (*k. k. Ackerbauministerium*), 15, 173.
- Austrian Lloyd, 42.
- Austrian Monarchy:
 area, 11;
 economic development, 41-44, 91-95;
 government, 21-22, 23-24, 28;
 intervention in lord-peasant relationship, 45-60, 223-224;
 nationalities (linguistic groups), 12-13;
 population, 12, 43, 146;
 power of nobles, 22-23, 28-40;
 terrain and climate, 13-21.
- Austrian National Bank, 114, 114-115 n., 117-118, 122.
- Austrian Netherlands, 56.
- Austro-Hungarian trade, 42, 91-92, 91 n., 92 n., 100-101.
- Aviticität*, 64-66, 89, 124, 126.
- Baier, E., "Schafzucht," 102 n.
- Balás, A. von "Landwirtschaftliches Unterrichtswesen," 127 n.
- Baldacci, Anton, Freiherr von, 252, 253, 258;
 "Über die inneren Zustände Österreichs. Eine Denkschrift aus dem Jahre 1816," 20 n., 258.
- Balogh, J., "Paget's Hungary and Transylvania," 269 n.
- Ban of Croatia, 37.
- Banat, 20, 73, 111.
- Barley, 168.
- Bartenstein, Emmanuel, Freiherr von, 151, 158, 159, 161.
- Barth-Barthenheim, J. B. L. E., *Das politische Verhältniss der verschiedenen Gattungen von Obrigkeiten zum Bauernstande im Erzherzogthume Oesterreich unter der Ens*, 72 n., 262.
- Batthányi, Casimir, Count, 130, 199.
- Batthányi, Gustav, Count, 130.
- Batthányi, Prince, 36.
- Bauer, M. R. von, *Die Landwirtschaft in Mähren vor Aufhebung der Untertänigkeit, 1781-1848*, 80 n.
- Bauer, O., *Der Kampf um Wald und Weide*, 236 n.
- Bauernlegen, 46, 151.
- Bauernschutz, 47, 47 n., 49.
- Bauernstand, 27.
- Beer, A., *Die Finanzen Österreichs im XIX. Jahrhundert*, 116 n.
- Beet sugar, *see* Sugar beets.
- Beidtel, Carl, 271. *See also*, Tebeldi, A.
- Beidtel, Ignaz, 30, 32, 33, 95, 207;
Geschichte der österreichischen Staatsverwaltung, 1740-1848, 29 n., 272-273.
- Berchtold, F. von, *Die Kartoffeln*, 107 n.
- Bergrecht*, 69, 77.
- Bernardt, J., *Handbuch der provinziellen Gesetzkunde von Mähren und Schlesien*, 74 n.
- Beroldingen, Count von, 177.
- Bestiftungszwang*, 81-82, 174.
- Bezdiekau, 104.
- Bibl, V., 56, 179, 207, 212-213;
 "Das Robot-Provisorium für Niederösterreich vom 20 Juni 1796," 58 n.;
Die Restauration der Niederösterreich. Landesverfassung unter K. Leopold II., 56 n.;
Die niederösterreichischen Stände im Vormärz, 32 n., 273;
Der Zerfall Österreichs, 32 n.
- Bidermann, H. I., *see* Hock, K. A.
- Bielitz, 26.
- Bisinger, J. C., *General Statistik des*

- österreichischen Kaiserthumes*, 23 n.
- Blattna, 158.
- Blum, J., "Transportation and industry in Austria, 1815-1848," 21 n.
- Bodnar, Michael, 186.
- Bohemia*, 104.
- Bohemia, 7, 12, 42, 223-224, 242;
 agricultural credit, 121-122;
 agricultural education, 130-131;
 agricultural societies, 132, 133, 135-136, 139, 141, 143;
 beet sugar, 102, 104-105, 106, 240;
 commutation, 56-57, 56 n., 57 n., 196, 243;
 emancipation, 232;
 estates movement, 28, 204;
 farm labor, 178, 181, 187, 188, 189, 190, 191, 201;
 geography, 11, 12, 13, 14, 17;
 land ownership, 23, 61-62;
 peasant obligations, 72-73, 75, 75 n., 76-77, 78;
 potatoes, 107, 109, 110;
 provincial estates, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 49, 60 n., 204, 224, 243;
 Raab system, 51;
 reclamation, 111, 112;
Robot, 72-73, 184, 186, 192, 192 n., 193, 196, 197-198;
 tenurial system, 45, 49, 51, 68, 81, 84;
 wool, 99, 100, 240.
See also Northwest zone.
- Bohemian Massif, 146.
- Bohemian-Moravian mountains, 13, 14.
- Bokor, G., *Geschichte und Organisation der amtlichen Statistik in Ungarn*, 257 n.
- Bora, 19.
- Bouquoi, Count von, 131.
- Bourse, 115.
- Bowden W., Karpovich, M., Usher, A. P., *An economic history of Europe since 1750*, 256.
- Bráf, A., "Der landwirtschaftliche Hypothekarcredit in Österreich während der letzten fünfzig Jahre," 113 n.
- Brambor*, 107 n.
- Brauner, F. A., *Böhmische Bauernzustände im Interesse der Landescultur und des Nationalwohlstandes*, 153 n., 265.
- Breuner, Count, 231.
- Brewing, 166.
- Bright, J. F., *Maria Theresa*, 48 n.
- Bright, Richard, 70, 185;
Travels from Vienna through lower Hungary, 20 n., 264, 265-266.
- Brougham, H. P., *Political philosophy*, 38 n.
- Brünner Zeitung*, 161 n.
- Budapest Basin, *see* Alföld, Great.
- Budapester Handels- und Gewerbekammer, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Preise ungarischer Landesprodukte im neunzehnten Jahrhundert*, 112 n.
- Budischau, 149.
- Bug river, 18.
- Bukowina*, 12, 53 n., 70, 73, 81, 108, 181-182, 186, 233.
- Bukowina Handels- und Gewerbekammer, *Hauptbericht und Statistik über das Herzogthum Bukowina für die Periode vom Jahre 1862-1871*, 108 n.
- Bulla Aurea* (1222), 34, 35.
- Bund*, 24-25.
- Burger, J., *Album zur Erinnerung an den 100 jährigen Bestand der k. k. Landwirtschaft-Gesellschaft in Kärnten*, 108 n.
- Burger, Johann, 134, 134 n., 142, 191;
Agriculture du royaume Lombardo-Vénitien, 266;
Lehrbuch der Landwirtschaft, 154 n.
- Burgerstand, 25, 26-27.
- Burghers:
 German-Slav provinces, 26-27;
 Hungary, 37-38, 39;
 land-ownership, 62-63, 89.
- Cadastre:
 Josephine, 54-55, 55 n., 108 n., 151-152, 254;
 Milanese, 254;
stabilen, 212, 254-255.
- Carinthia, 67, 86, 106, 232;
 agricultural society, 108, 132, 133-134, 139;
 commutation, 56 n., 202;
 farm labor, 180, 187, 188, 189, 191;

- geography, 11, 12, 13, 16;
 land ownership, 23, 62;
 peasant obligations, 72, 75, 78;
 provincial estates, 24, 25, 27, 28,
 204;
Robot, 50, 72;
 tenurial system, 45, 81.
 Carinthian Agricultural Society, 108,
 133-134, 139, 180.
Carniola, 23, 67, 188, 189, 202, 232;
 agricultural societies, 132, 136-137,
 139;
 geography, 11, 12, 14, 16, 18;
 provincial estates, 25, 27, 204,
 204 n.;
Robot, 50.
 Carniolan Agricultural Society, 137,
 139.
 Carniolan Estates Agricultural Society,
 137.
 Carpathians, 13, 14, 15, 18, 21, 146.
Centralblatt der Land- und Forstwirtschaft in Böhmen, 21 n.
 Cerhenitz, 158.
 Charles VI, Emperor (1711-1740),
 254.
 Chotek, Count, 222.
 Chotieschau, 153.
 Chudenitz, 104, 159.
 Clapham, J. H., 155;
*An economic history of modern
 Britain*, 95 n.
 Clover, 97, 155, 156 n., 168.
 C. M. (*Conventions-Münze*), 247.
 Coke of Norfolk, Thomas William
 (Earl of Leicester of Holkham),
 101.
 Colloredo-Mansfeld, Count, 105, 141,
 177, 178-179, 231.
 Comité des k. k. Ackerbauministeriums,
*Geschichte der österreichischen
 Land- und Forstwirtschaft und
 ihrer Industrien 1848-1898*, 46 n.
 Common pastures, division of, 86,
 236.
 Commutation, 56-57, 73-74, 76, 82,
 122, 172-173, 179, 181, 194, 199,
 200, 210-211, 214, 222-223, 231.
 Congress Poland, 225.
 Connor, L. G., "A brief history of the
 sheep industry in the United
 States," 99 n.
 Consolidation, 150-151.
 Constitutional Reichstag, 74, 76, 186,
 234-235, 236, 259.
Consular letters, 258.
 Continental Blockade, 96, 98, 99, 102,
 110, 240.
Conventions-Münze, 247.
 Correspondence relative to the affairs
 of Hungary, 1847-1849, 36 n.,
 258.
 Corvaja, 125.
 Cotters, 72, 73, 172, 173, 183, 236,
 237.
 Count Palatine, 37.
 Cracow, Grand Duchy of, 11 n., 67,
 138, 225.
 Credit, *see* Agricultural credit.
 Croatia, 97.
 Croats, 12, 13, 184, 187.
 Crown estates, 50-51, 152, 153.
 Crown of St. Stephen, guardians of
 the, 37.
 Csanad, Bishop of, 212.
 Csaplovics, J. von, *Gemälde von Un-
 gern*, 184 n.
 Czechs, 12, 203, 205.
 Czernichor, agricultural school, 142.
 Čžernin, Count, 103-104.
 Czoernig, Carl, 253;
*Ethnographie der oesterreichischen
 Monarchie*, 108 n.
 Dahlberg, Freiherr von, 103.
 Dalmatia, 11, 12, 14, 18, 70, 187, 188,
 189, 253.
 Danube river, 12, 13, 14, 15, 21, 146.
 Danube Steamship Company (*k. k.
 privilegierte erste Donau-Dampf-
 schiffharts-Gesellschaft*), 41-42,
 94, 256.
 "Darstellung der Rübenzucker-Fabri-
 kation der österreichischen Mon-
 archie in den Jahren 1851-1853,"
 103 n.
 Datschitz, 103.
 Daubrawa river, 112.
 Demesne land, 46, 55, 58, 150-152.
 Demian, J. A.:
*Darstellung der österreichischen
 Monarchie nach den neuesten
 statistischen Beziehungen*, 266;

- Tableau géographique et politique des royaumes de Hongrie, d'Esclavonie, de Croatie, et de la grande principauté de Transilvanie*, 36 n., 263, 266.
- Democratic Party, Galicia (*Towarzystwo demokratyczne*), 205, 218.
- Denis, E., *La Bohème depuis la Montagne-Blanche*, 71-72 n.
- "Denkschrift des Fürsten Windisch-Grätz über die Grundentlastung," 51 n.
- Denkschrift der k. k. statistischen Zentralkommission zur Feier ihres fünfzigjährigen Bestandes*, 251.
- "Der mährische Landtag," 122 n.
- Dessewffy, Emil, Count, *Alföldi levelek* (*Letters from the Alföld*), 125.
- Deutschbiela, 159.
- Deutsch-Knönitz, 151, 158.
- Deym von Stritz, Friedrich, Count von, 121, 199;
- Ueber Kredit-Institute im Allgemeinen und das Hypotheken-Institut insbesondere*, 68 n., 266.
- "Die Dampfmaschinen der österreichischen Monarchie zu Ende des Verwaltungsjahres 1851," 166 n.
- Diebl, Franz, 156, 175 n.
- Dienstbuch*, 67-68.
- Diet, Hungary, 35, 37-39, 209-212.
- Dietrichstein, Prince, 158.
- Direction der administrativen Statistik*, 253, 254.
- Directorate-General of Accounts, 252, 253.
- Ditz, Heinrich, 20, 93-94;
- Die ungarische Landwirtschaft*, 19 n., 273.
- Dniester river, 13, 18.
- Dobloff-Dier, Anton, Freiherr, 118-119, 200, 213, 214.
- Dobrowitz, 104, 105, 165.
- Dominical*, 55, 235.
- Dopsch, A., *see* Huber, A.
- Dorfeschen, 186.
- Drainage, 110-113.
- Drieschfelder*, 157.
- Dunder, W. G., *Denkschrift über die Wiener Oktober-Revolution*, 259.
- Easments, 85-86.
- Eastern European lowland, 15.
- Egartenwirtschaft*, 157.
- Eger river, 167.
- Eichler, J., 270.
- "Ein Actkenstück der Niederösterreichischen Ständerversammlung," 217.
- Eingekauft*, 54, 82.
- Eisenberg, 112.
- Eisenmann, L., *Le compromis austro-hongrois de 1867*, 235 n.
- Elbe river, 13, 15, 146.
- Electoral law of 1831 (France), 38 n.
- Elsner, J. G., *Ungarn, durchreiset, beurtheilt und beschrieben*, 128 n., 262, 264, 266.
- Elvert, C. d':
- Geschichte der k. k. mähr.-schles. Gesellschaft zur Beförderung des Ackerbaues, der Natur- und Landeskunde*, 100 n.;
- Geschichte der Verkehrs-Anstalten in Mähren und Oesterreich-Schlesien*, 79 n.
- Emancipation, 232-237.
- Engel-Janosi, Friedrich, 62;
- Über die Entwicklung der sozialen und staatswissenschaftlichen Verhältnisse im deutschen Österreich 1815-1848," 62.
- Engelmayr, A.;
- Die Unterthans-Verfassung der Königreiches Böhmen*, 73 n.;
- Versuch zu einer systematischen Darstellung der im Lande ob der Enns im Unterthansfache bestehenden Vorschriften*, 72 n.
- England, 38 n., 95, 98, 99, 100, 196, 227.
- Entail, 63-64, 66, 89.
- Erbunterian*, 45. *See also*, Peasants.
- Erbuntertänigkeit*, 53 n.
- "Erweiterung und Vervollkommenung des landwirtschaftlichen Unterrichts in Böhmen," 131 n.
- Erwerbssteuer*, 103.
- Essay contests, 140, 199.
- Estates movement (*ständische Bewegung*), 28, 203, 204-205.

- Estates Table, 38, 39.
 Esterházy, 36, 101, 101 n., 111, 115.
 Exchequer, 115-116.
 Exner, A., *Das oesterreichische Hypothekenrecht*, 67 n.
 Exner, W. F., ed., *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Gewerbe und Erfindungen Österreichs von der Mitte des XVIII Jahrhunderts bis zur Gegenwart*, 107 n.
 Factory industry, 42.
 Falk, V., ed., *Der böhmische Landtag im Jahre 1847*, 259.
 Farkas, Franz, 125.
 Farm calendars, 142, 142 n.
 Farmsteads, 173, 179 n.
 Female workers, 178, 178 n.
 Fényes, A., 36, 109;
 Ungarn in Vormärz, 20 n., 267.
 Ferdinand I, Emperor (1835-1848), 226, 228.
Ferdinand des Ersten politische Gesetze und Verordnungen, 114 n.
 Festetics, George, Count, 111, 127-128.
 Ficker, A.:
 "Gebietsveränderungen der österreichisch-ungarischen Monarchie 1790-1877," 11 n.;
 "Skizze einer Geschichte des k. k. statistischen Bureau's in den Jahren 1829 bis 1866," 251 n.
 Field grass husbandry, 157.
 Firmian, Count, Archbishop of Vienna, 29.
 First Austrian Savings Bank, 113.
 Fiscal reform, 48, 54-56.
 Fischer, L., "Entwurf der Bestimmungen zur Reluirung der Robot auf der Herrschaft N," 193 n.
 Fischer, Ludwig, 158.
 Florin, 247.
Flurzwang, 151.
 Fochtél, Baron von, 158.
 Födisch, J. E., *Heimatskunde*, 147 n.
 Fogarassy, Johann, 125.
 Földes, B., "Das Familienfideikommis in Ungarn," 66.
 Forest rights, 85.
 Forestry, 16.
 Fraas, C., 140.
 France, 38 n., 98, 103, 104, 105, 141, 196, 227.
 Francis I, Emperor (1792-1835), 21-22, 21 n., 29, 30, 60, 89, 116, 222, 223, 224, 250, 252.
 Franciscans, 107.
Franz des Ersten politische Gesetze und Verordnungen, 103 n.
 Free peasants, 27, 45, 89, 171, 183.
 French Revolution, 11, 60, 89.
 Fresnel, Count, 105.
 Friedjung, Heinrich, 179;
 "Freunde und Gegner der Bauernbefreiung in Österreich," 51 n.;
 "Gegner der Bauernbefreiung in Österreich," 235 n.;
 Historische Aufsätze, 51 n.;
 Österreich von 1848 bis 1860, 179 n.
Frondienst, 72.
Frone, 72.
 Fruit culture, 163, 168.
 Fruwirth, C., "Hackfruchte," 109 n.
 Fuerstenberg, Prince, 131.
 Galicia, 53, 106, 138;
 agricultural credit, 116-117;
 agricultural education, 131-132;
 agricultural labor, 181-182, 185, 187, 188, 189, 190, 201-202;
 commutation, 56, 56 n., 200, 201, 218-221;
 emancipation, 186-187, 233;
 geography, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 17-18;
 land ownership, 23, 61-62;
 nobility, 23 n.;
 peasant obligations, 73, 75, 75 n., 186-187;
 Polish nationalism, 205-206, 218;
 potatoes, 107-108, 108 n., 109-110; 240;
 provincial estates, 24, 26, 27, 200, 219-221, 243;
 Revolt of 1846, 207, 221, 222-229, 230;
 Robot, 50, 73, 181, 192;
 tenurial system, 45, 81.
 Galician Agricultural Society, 138.
 Galician Estates Credit-Anstalt, 116-117, 119, 121, 126.
 Galician Revolt of 1846, 207, 221, 225-229, 244-245.

- Ganzbauer, 68, 72, 73.
Gegenwart, Die (Leipzig), 108 n.
Georgikon, 127-128.
 German provinces, 13 n., 76, 109.
 See also, Carinthia, Lower Austria, Styria, Tyrol, Upper Austria.
 German-Slav provinces, 13 n., 15, 42, 43, 54, 59, 85, 87, 230;
 agricultural labor, 180-182, 185;
 agricultural societies, 138-139;
 nobility, 22-23, 28-33, 40, 48, 63, 221;
 peasant obligations, 74, 78, 80;
 provincial estates, 23-28, 204, 209;
 Robot, 70, 192;
 tenurial system, 61-64, 68, 82, 89.
 See also, Bohemia, Carinthia, Carniola, Dalmatia, Galicia, Littoral, Lower Austria, Moravia-Silesia, Silesia, Styria, Tyrol, Upper Austria.
 Germans, 12, 13, 108.
 Germany, 95-96, 99, 123, 141, 196.
Gewährbuch, 68.
 Gleig, G. R., 162, 163;
 Germany, Bohemia and Hungary visited in 1837, 154 n., 264, 267.
 G. L. F., *see* Comité des k. k. Ackerbauministeriums.
 Göding, 153.
 Golden Fleece, Order of the, 23.
 Goltz, T. von der, *Geschichte der deutschen Landwirtschaft*, 134 n.
 Goluchowski, Agenor, Count, 230 n.
 Görz, agricultural society, 132, 133, 134, 139.
 Great Britain, House of Commons, *Sessional papers*, 36 n., 258.
Grenzboten, 113 n., 215, 261, 271.
 Grünberg, Karl, 47, 48, 95-96;
 Die Bauernbefreiung und die Auflösung des gutherrlich-bäuerlichen Verhältnisses in Böhmen, Mähren und Schlesien, 47 n., 274;
 "Die Bauernbefreiung in Oesterreich-Ungarn," 45 n.;
 "Die Grundentlastung," 46 n.;
 Studien zur österreichischen Agrargeschichte, 53 n.
Grundbücher, 67-68.
Grundverfassung, Bestätigungsurkunde, und erste Verhandlungen der k. k. Landwirtschafts-Gesellschaft in Steiermark, 136 n.
 Gülich, G. von, *Geschichtliche Darstellung des Handels, der Gewerbe, und des Ackerbaus der bedeutendsten handeltreibenden Staaten unserer Zeit*, 99 n.
Gutsherrschaft, 95.
 Gypsies, 52-53 n.
Halbbauer, 68, 72.
 Hals, 76.
Handbuch aller unter der Regierung des Kaisers Joseph des II. für die K. K. Erbländer ergangenen Verordnungen und Gesetze in einer systematischen Verbindung, 79 n.
Handrobot, 69, 70.
Handwörterbuch der Staatswissenschaften, 45 n.
 Hanság swamp, 111.
 Harrows, 163, 164.
 Hauer, F. von, *Praktische Darstellung der in Oesterreich unter der Enns für das Untertansfach bestehenden Gesetze*, 75 n.
Hauptschuldverschreibung, 115.
 Hecke, W., "Allgemeiner Theil," 107 n.
 Heintl, Franz, Ritter von, 117, 136, 193-194;
 Das Weinbau des österreichischen Kaisertumes, 267;
 Die Landwirtschaft des österreichischen Kaisertumes, 69 n., 267.
 Helfert, J. A. von, 76, 259;
 Aufzeichnungen und Erinnerungen aus jungen Jahren, 77 n., 260;
 Geschichte Oesterreichs vom Ausgange des Wiener Oktober-Aufstandes 1848, 236 n.
 Hereditary subjection, 4, 23, 39, 40, 43-44, 45, 47-57, 59, 61.
 Hermannstadt, 13.
 Herrenstand, 22, 25, 26.
 High Tatra, 18.
 Hillebrandt, Freiherr, 158.
 Hired farm labor, 107, 170, 171, 172;
 efficiency, 190-191, 194, 195, 197-198;
 in Hungary, 183;
 in Lower Austria, 176-180;
 in Northwest zone, 173-176;
 in Upper Austria, 180-181;
 wages, 58, 187-190, 201-202.

- Hirsch, A., *Ungarns Grundbesitzverhältnisse*, 36 n.
- Historische Aktenstücke über das Ständewesen in Österreich*, 259.
- Hlubek, F. X., 141, 143, 181, 191, 200-201, 262;
- Die Landwirtschaftslehre in ihrem ganzen Umfange*, 191 n., 267;
- Ein treues Bild des Herzogthumes Steiermark*, 72 n.;
- Einfluss der Eisenbahnen auf die Landwirtschaft des Herzogthumes Steiermark*, 267;
- Resultate der Wirksamkeit der k. k. Landwirtschafts-Gesellschaft in Steiermark, vom Jahre 1829-1839*, 120 n.
- Hochwald, 153.
- Hock, K. A. and Bidermann, H. I., *Der österreichische Staatsrath 1760-1848*, 29 n.
- Holics, 97, 98-99.
- Holycross, Abbot of, 178.
- Hönigsberg, G. A. von, 94, 195-196;
- "Kurze Darstellung der Hindernisse, welche dem Ackerbau im Allgemeinen, und zu Unter-Oesterreich insbesondere im Wege sind," 94 n.
- Honrichs, Baron, 153.
- Hopfen, Joseph von, 99.
- Hops, 166.
- Horak, B., ed., *Die Tschechoslovakische Republik. Jahrbuch 1928*, 147 n.
- Horowicz, 102.
- Horsky, Franz, Ritter von, 130, 130 n., 159-160, 162, 164;
- Mein Streben, Wirken, meine Resultate*, 130 n., 260.
- Horváth, M., 65;
- Fünfundzwanzig Jahre aus der Geschichte Ungarns von 1823-1848*, 65 n.
- Hradisch, district of, 94, 150.
- Huber, A. and Dopsch, A., *Österreichische Reichsgeschichte. Geschichte der Staatsbildung und des öffentlichen Rechts*, 47 n.
- Hudeczek, K., *Österreichische Handelspolitik im Vormärz 1815-1848*, 98 n.
- Hueber, J. V., "Uebersichtliche Darstellung der bis zum Jahre 1848 in Kärnten bestandenen Unterthans-Verhältnisse," 57 n.
- Hugelmann, K., *Die österreichischen Landtage im Jahre 1848*, 25 n.
- Hundsbafer*, 77.
- Hungarian Agricultural Society, 137, 142, 182, 192, 199.
- Hungarian-Altenburg, 129-130.
- Hungarian Animal Husbandry Society, 137.
- Hungarian lands, 13 n.
- Hungarian Plains, *see* Alföld, Great, and Alföld, Little.
- Hungary, 53, 56, 59, 80, 86, 106, 192; agrarian reform, 209-212, 221-237; agricultural credit, 124-126; agricultural education, 127-130, 241; agricultural labor, 182-184, 184-185, 187, 188, 189, 190, 198-199; agricultural societies, 137, 142; geography, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 18, 19-21, 22; land ownership, 35, 61; land reclamation, 111-112; Liberals, 206-207; nobility, 22, 33-39, 40, 67, 87, 224, 243; peasant obligations, 73-74, 75-76, 78, 79, 81; population, 38 n., 43, 182-183, 183-184; potatoes, 108-109; *Robot*, 73-74, 183, 192-193; statistics, 257-258; tenurial system, 45, 64-66, 82, 83, 84-85, 89; trade, 91-92, 93-94, 100-101; transportation, 41, 42, 93-94; *Urbarium*, 50, 69-70, 83, 85, 86, 87-88, 210; wool, 98-99, 100.
- Hupka, S. von, *Über die Entwicklung der westgalizischen Dorfstände in der 2. Hälfte des 19. Jahrhunderts*, 108 n.
- Hussars, 37.
- Iglau Kreis, 149.
- Inama-Sternegg, K. T. von. "Die Familien-Fidelikommis in Österreich," 63 n.

- Indemnification, 208-209, 232, 233,
234-235, 236-237, 245.
Innviertel, 67.
Iron Gates, 14.
Italian provinces, 13 n., 253.
Italians in Monarchy, 12.
- Jacob, W.: *Report on the trade in
corn and on the agriculture of the
north of Europe*, 148 n., 268;
"A report presented to the lords of
the committee of his majesty's
privy council for trade," 268.
*Jahrbuch für Landeskunde von Nieder-
österreich*, 58 n.
*Jahrbücher für Nationalökonomie und
Statistik*, 66 n.
Jockey Club (Hungary), 137.
John, Archduke, 136, 138.
*Joseph der Zweyten Römischer Kaisers
Gesetze und Verfassungen im
Justiz-Fache*, 52 n.
Joseph II, Emperor (1780-1790), 24,
29, 40, 51-56, 57, 59, 61, 66, 83,
86, 87, 89, 96, 111, 209, 250.
Jung, J. von, *Darstellung des ungar-
ischen Privat-Rechtes*, 66 n.
- Kaindl, R. F., "Das Unterthanswesen
in der Bukowina," 79 n.
Kaiser-Ferdinands-Nordbahn, 92-93.
K. k. Ackerbau-Ministeriums:
*Bericht über die Thätigkeit des k. k.
Ackerbau-Ministeriums in der Zeit
vom 1. Jänner 1877 bis 31. De-
cember 1880*, 150 n.;
*Statistisches Jahrbuch des k. k. Ack-
erbau-Ministeriums für 1874*, 15 n.
K. k. Direction der administrativen
Statistik:
*Mittheilungen aus dem Gebiete der
Statistik*, 103 n., 251;
*Statistisches Handbüchlein für die
österreichische Monarchie*, 12;
*Tafeln zur Statistik der österreich-
ischen Monarchie*, 36 n., 251-257,
263, 270.
K. k. Statistischen Central Bureau,
*Statistisches Handbüchlein für das
Jahr 1871*, 43 n.
Kallus, F., *Die Landwirtschaft in
unteren Egerland (Nord-Böhmen)*,
155 n.
- Kapuszczak, Ivan, 186-187.
Karl, Archduke, 105-106, 111, 112,
153.
Károlyi, 36, 130.
Karst, 13, 14.
Karst zone, 16, 18-19, 187, 188, 189.
Kautz, J., *Entwicklungs-Geschichte der
volkswirtschaftlichen Ideen in Un-
garn und deren Einfluss auf das
Gemeinwesen*, 125 n., 265.
Kerner, R. J., *Bohemia in the eight-
eenth century*, 60 n.
Keszthely, 111.
Khackl, *Wirtschaftsverwalter*, 180 n.
Kleyle, Ritter von, 177;
lecture on agricultural conditions in
Austria, 102 n.
Klibanski, H. O., *Handbuch des ge-
samten russischen Zivilrechts*, 65 n.
Knapp, G. F., 58;
*Die Bauernbefreiung und der Ur-
sprung der Landarbeiter in den
älteren Teilen Preussens*, 47 n.;
"Die Bauernbefreiung in Öster-
reich und Preussen," 53 n.;
Grundherrschaft und Rittergut, 53 n.
Kohl, J. G., 175, 264;
Reise in Böhmen, 175 n.;
*Reisen im Inneren von Russland
und Polen*, 23 n.
Kolowrat, Count, 30, 222-223.
Komers, A. E. von, *Skizzen über die
Verwaltungs-Organisation von
Grossgrundbesitz-Complexen in
Böhmen*, 151 n.
Kommotau, 170.
Kön. ung. Minister für Ackerbau,
Ungarns Landwirtschaft 1896,
127 n.
Königsaal, 105.
Koppe, J. G., 134 n.
Kossuth, Louis, 268.
Kovach, Ladislaus, 125.
Krański, Moritz, Ritter von, 230 n.;
*Memoiren und Aktenstücke aus
Galizien im Jahre 1846*, 69 n.,
259.
Krasso, 74.
Krause, Julius, Dr., 105, 141.
Krems Basin, 14.
Kremsier, 236, 259.
Kronstadt, 13.
Krumau, 130-131, 152, 159.

- Kruse, J. E. *Allgemeiner und besonders Hamburgischer Contorist*, 247 n.
- Krzisch, Thädäus, 190.
- Kübeck von Kübau, Carl Friedrich, Freiherr von, 31-32, 33, 60-61, 121-122, 125-126, 222, 223, 224, 252-253, 263.
- Kübeck, M. von, ed., *Tagebücher des Carl Friedrich Freiherrn von Kübeck von Kübau*, 31 n., 260.
- Kudlich, Hans, 186, 234, 259; *Rückblicke und Erinnerungen*, 186 n., 260.
- Kuhländchen, 156 n.
- Kun, E., *Sozialhistorische Beiträge zur Landerbeiterfrage in Ungarn*, 183 n.
- Kunstatt, 153.
- Kuranda, Ignaz, 261.
- Laeuen, H., *Tschechische Bodenpolitik*, 24 n.
- Lamberg, Count, 158.
- Land ownership, 23, 35, 61-68, 89.
- Land reclamation, 110-113, 240, 241.
- Landless laborers, 72, 73, 172, 173, 183, 236, 237.
- Landstandschaft, 25, 26, 27.
- Landtafel, 63, 64.
- Landwirtschaftlichen Central Comité der allgemeinen Landesausstellung in Prag 1891, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Landescultur des Königreiches Böhmen im Jahrhundert 1791-1891*, 147 n.
- Larisch-Mönnich, Count, 166.
- Laudemium, 78.
- Legumes, 44, 96, 97, 154-155.
See also, Clover.
- Lehentafel, 63.
- Lebenswaare, see *Laudemium*.
- "Lehranstalt für Landwirthe zu Ungarisch-Altenburg," 129.
- Leibeigenschaft, 52, 52-53 n.
- Leitmeritz, 170.
- Leitomischel, 152-153.
- Leopold I, Emperor (1658-1705), 46, 63.
- Leopold II, Emperor (1790-1792), 56, 59, 60, 83, 89, 250.
- Leopold des Zweyten Römischen Kaisers *Gesetze und Verfassungen im Justiz-Fache*, 84 n.
- Leser, P., *Entstehung und Verbreitung des Pfluges*, 163 n.
- Libejic, 159-160, 162, 163.
- Liberalism, 203, 205, 214.
- Liberals (Hungary), 206, 209, 210, 211, 268-269.
- Lichnowsky, Prince, 158.
- Liechtenstein, Prince von, 131, 215.
- Lindenbichel, J. N. Rainer von, *Handbuch zur Geschäftsführung der Wirtschafts-Aemter überhaupt*, 67 n.
- Linz-Budweis railroad, 42.
- List, Friedrich, 11, 264, 265, 268;
"Die Ackerverfassung, der Zwergwirtschaft und die Auswanderung," 111 n.;
Über die nationalökonomische Reform des Königreiches Ungarn," 93 n.;
"Über die Transportverbesserung in Ungarn," 268;
"Über die Zollvereinigung der österreichischen Provinzen mit Ungarn," 268.
- Lithuania, 225.
- Little Russians, 12, 187.
- Littoral, 11, 12, 14, 18, 25, 67, 134, 139, 188, 189.
- Littoral zone, see *Karst zone*.
- Lobkowitz, Ferdinand, Prince, 112, 130, 159.
- Lobositz, 151, 155, 176.
- Lombardy, 7, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 146, 233.
- Long journey, 69, 88, 228.
- Lonyay, M., ed., *Graf Stefan Széchenyi und seine hinterlassenen Schriften*, 124 n.
- Lottery loans, 115-116.
- Louis I (the Great), King of Hungary (1362-1382), 64, 76.
- Lower Austria, 23, 42, 45, 81, 106, 111, 145 n., 193, 195;
agricultural credit, 117-120;
agricultural societies, 132, 136, 139, 140, 141, 142;
commutation, 56, 56-57, n., 231;
estates movement, 204-205, 212-217, 243;

- farm labor, 176-180, 188, 189, 191, 195-196, 200;
 geography, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, 17, 146, 147;
 land ownership, 23, 62, 231;
 peasant disturbances, 207-208, 231;
 peasant obligations, 49-50, 75, 75 n., 78, 200;
 provincial estates, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 200, 204-205, 212-217, 243;
Robot, 49-50, 72, 179.
See also. German-Slav provinces.
- Lower Austrian Handels- und Gewerkekammer, *Statistische Uebersicht der wichtigsten Produktionszweige in Oesterreich unter der Ens*, 251.
- Lucerne, 168.
- McCormick reaper, 164.
- Magnates (Hungary), 36-37.
- Magnates Table, 38, 39.
- Mágócs, 94.
- Magyar Statisztikai Közlemények*, 257 n.
- Magyars, 12, 13, 34.
- Mailath, J., *Studien über die Landarbeiterfrage in Ungarn*, 183 n.
- Mailath, J., *Das ungrische Urbarialsystem*, 67 n., 262.
- Majorat*, 63-64.
- Mandel, Baron von, 121.
- Mannersdorf, 97.
- March Days (1848), 232, 233, 237.
- March-Order corridor, 146.
- March River, 15, 94, 146, 147.
- Marchet, G., "Grundentlastung," 71 n.
- Marchfeld*, 15, 187.
- Marczali, H., *Hungary in the eighteenth century*, 34 n.
- Margelik, Baron, 57.
- Maria Theresa, Empress (1740-1780), 23, 28, 29, 37, 40, 46-51, 52, 54, 57, 59, 61, 69, 86, 89, 97, 111, 132, 134, 136.
- Marmont, A. F. L. V. d', *Duc de Raguse, Voyage en Hongrie en Transylvanie, dans le Russe meridionale etc.*, 65 n.
- Maros River, 13, 20.
- Mastiaux, M. F. von, *Versuch einer Darstellung der hungarischen Konstitution*, 35 n.
- Mauthdorf, 201.
- Mecklenburg, 99-100.
- Medinger, W. von:
Grossgrundbesitz, Fideikommiss und Agrarreform, 63 n.;
Wirtschaftsgeschichte der Domäne Lobositz, 151 n.
- Melk, Abbot of, 213.
- Mell, A., "Die Anfänge der Bauernbefreiung in Steiermark unter Maria Theresa und Josef II.," 51 n.
- Mercopail, 97.
- Merino sheep, 97-98, 98-99.
- Metallurgical industry, 42-43.
- Metternich, Prince, 24, 31, 95 n., 124, 131.
- Metzburg, Baron von, 252, 253.
- Michna, Professor, 131.
- Migratory farm labor, 173, 174-175, 176-178, 184, 187, 190.
- Military Frontier, 11, 13, 14, 21, 108, 253.
- Ministry of Justice, 115.
- Mises, L. von, 181, 218, 226-227;
Die Entwicklung des gutherrlichen bäuerlichen Verhältnisses in Galizien (1772-1848), 51 n., 274.
- Mittheilungen der k. k. mähr.-schles. Gesellschaft zur Beförderung des Ackerbaues*, 140 n.
- Mittheilungen über Gegenstände der Landwirtschaft und Industrie Kärntens*, 180 n., 261.
- Mittrowsky, Count von, 151.
- Möglinsche Annalen der Landwirtschaft*, 148 n., 158.
- Mohács, 111.
- Moldau river, 15, 146.
- Money lenders, 113.
- Moravia-Silesia, 56 n., 68, 81, 92, 94, 193, 232, 242;
 agricultural credit, 122-124;
 agricultural societies, 132, 133, 134-135, 139, 140, 142;
 estates movement, 204, 217-218;
 farm labor, 177, 178, 181, 186, 187, 188, 189, 191;
 geography, 11, 12, 14, 17;
 land ownership, 45, 61-62;
 peasant obligations, 49, 69, 75, 75 n., 78, 192, 192 n.;
 provincial estates, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 243;

- Robot*, 49, 72-73, 181, 184;
sugar beets, 103, 105-106;
wool, 99, 100, 240.
See also, Northwest zone, Silesia.
- Moravian Agricultural Society, 134, 135.
- Moravian plateau, 147.
- Moravian-Silesian Society for the Promotion of Agriculture, Natural Science, and Geography, 134-135, 139, 140, 142, 150, 158, 262.
- Mortgages, *see* Agricultural credit.
- Mortuarium*, 78.
- Mrozowicki, Franz von, 105.
- Muhlenberg, H. A. P., 101.
- Mühlkreis*, 146.
- Nagy-Szent-Miklós, Christopher Nákó, Edler von, 128-129.
- Nationalism, 203, 205-206, 224, 233.
See also, Galician Revolt.
- Napoleon, 11, 22, 24, 29.
- Neisse, 26.
- Nelkenbrecher, J. C., *Allgemeines Taschenbuch der Münz-, Maass- und Gewichtskunde*, 247.
- Netherlands, 196.
- Neue Schriften der k. k. patriotischen-ökonomischen Gesellschaft im Königreiche Böhmen*, 105, 261.
- Neumann, L. von, ed., *Recueil des traités et conventions conclus par l'Autriche avec les puissances étrangères*, 24 n.
- Neunte*, 74, 75-76, 80.
- Neusiedlersee, 111.
- Neustadt, 149.
- Noback, C. J. C. and F. E., *Münz-, Maass- und Gewichtsbuch*, 247.
- Nobility, 44, 87; and
agrarian reform, 203, 205-207, 208-231;
agricultural credit, 113-126, 240, 241;
agricultural education, 127-132, 240, 241;
agricultural societies, 132-144, 240, 241-242;
agriculture of Northwest zone, 160-166;
Galician Revolt, 205-206, 218, 225-230;
German-Slav provinces, 22-23, 40;
growth of markets, 91, 95-96, 240;
Hungary, 34-39, 40;
indemnification, 208-209, 237-238;
judicial powers, 49, 66-67;
labor productivity, 191-192, 193-202;
land ownership, 61-67, 89;
land reclamation, 110-113, 240, 241;
opposition to agrarian reforms, 56, 58-59;
political power, 28-33;
potato processing, 109-110, 166, 240;
sugar beets, 103-107, 165-166, 240;
wool, 98-101, 240.
- Nona*, *see* *Neunte*.
- North Slav provinces, 13 n., 43, 76, 109, 240.
See also, Bohemia, Galicia, Moravia-Silesia, Silesia.
- Northeast zone, 16, 17-18, 187, 188, 189.
See also, Galicia, Bukowina.
- Northwest zone, 95-96, 100, 106, 107, 112, 181, 240;
agricultural education, 127, 130-132;
agricultural techniques, 149-167, 242;
farm labor, 172-176, 177, 187, 188, 189;
geography, 16, 17, 145-149;
Robot, 172-173, 175;
urban and rural population, 173-174, 180.
See also, Bohemia, Moravia-Silesia, Silesia.
- Notizen-Blatt der hist.-stat. Section der k. k. mähr.-schles. Gesellschaft zur Beförderung des Ackerbaues, der Natur- und Landeskunde*, 95 n.
- Nucleated village, 173, 179.
- Oekonomische Neuigkeiten und Verhandlungen*, 81 n., 94, 109, 110, 114, 161, 175, 193, 194, 195, 196, 197, 200, 261, 262, 265;
- Oettingen-Wallerstein, Friedrich, Prince von, 105.
- Olmütz, Archbishop of, 153.
- Oppelt, A. J., "Relation über die . . .

- zu Swinarz im berauner Kreise, im Jahre 1832 neu errichtete Rübenzucker-Fabrik," 105 n.
- Orsowa, 13, 14.
- Österreichische Land- und Forstwirtschaftsgesellschaft in Wien, 1807-1932. *Festschrift*, 136 n.
- Österreichisches Staatswörterbuch, 49 n.
- Pabst, H. W. von, *Der landwirtschaftliche Pflanzenbau*, 166 n.
- Paget, John, 34, 65, 101 n.; *Hungary and Transylvania; with remarks on their condition, social, political and economical*, 34 n., 264, 268-269.
- Palacsá swamp, 111.
- Parcelling, 44, 149-151.
- Pardoe, Julia, 264.
- Pardubitz, 152.
- Paskau, 159.
- Patent:
- 1 September 1781, 52, 66-67;
 - 1 November 1781, 52-53, 78, 80, 82;
 - 11 May 1786, 83-84;
 - 10 February 1789 (1 November 1789), 55-56, 57-60, 89;
 - 29 October 1790, 83, 84;
 - 26 May 1791, 84;
 - 1 September 1798, 57, 230;
 - 13 April 1846, 228;
 - 18 December 1846, 82, 230, 231, 231-232, 232 n., 245, 246;
 - 7 September 1848, 235, 236, 246;
 - 4 March 1849, 236-237.
- Paton, A. A., 190;
The goth and the hun, 20 n.
- Patriotic-Economic Society of the Kingdom of Bohemia, 104, 105, 135-136, 139, 141, 143, 158, 167.
- Peasant disturbances, 46, 49, 59, 203, 207-208, 225-228, 231, 244-245.
See also, Galician Revolt.
- Peasants, 27, 39, 40, 43-44, 87-88, 90-91;
agrarian reform in Hungary, 209-212;
easements, 85-86;
emancipation, 233-237;
freedom of movement, 80-81;
Galician Revolt, 205-206, 218, 225-228;
holdings, 68-69, 82-83, 171-172;
Joseph II and, 52-56;
Maria Theresa and, 47;
Northwest zone, 153, 160, 162-163, 170;
obligations, 23, 45, 49-50, 61, 69-71, 71-80;
potatoes and, 107-109;
Revolution of 1848 and, 235-236;
testamentary rights, 83-85.
- Pest, 42, 92, 94, 141.
- Pesti Hírlap*, 125.
- Petition of the Moravian Estates to the throne, 2 June 1847, 114 n.
- Peyrer, C., *Die Regelung der Grundeigentums-Verhältnisse*, 86 n.
- Pfandbriefe*, 117, 248, 249.
- Physiocrats, 52.
- "Plan zu einer Hypothekenbank, zur Unterstützung grösserer und kleinerer Grundbesitzer," 114 n.
- Plata river, 102.
- Plattensee, 111.
- Plowing, 190.
- Plows, 163, 164.
- Po river, 13.
- Podolian plateau, 18.
- Podstatsky-Liechtenstein, Leopold von, Count, 159.
- Poles in Monarchy, 12, 225.
- Pomerania, 99-100.
- Population:
- agricultural, 43;
 - Lower Austria, 179-180;
 - Monarchy, 12;
 - non-agricultural, 43;
 - Northwest zone, 146, 174.
- Posega, 73.
- Posen, 225.
- Postelberg, 112, 159, 167-170.
- Potato meal, 110.
- Potato starch, 110.
- Potato whiskey, 42, 109-110.
See also, Potatoes.
- Potatoes, 97, 134, 169;
disease, 110, 256-257;
introduction into Monarchy, 107-109;
uses, 109-110, 166.
- Potocki, Adam, Count, 131-132.

- Potocki, Franz, Count, 103, 105.
 Prague, 102, 107.
 Prague, University of, 131.
 Prague Polytechnic Institute, 131.
Prälatenstand, 25.
 Pressburg, 14.
 Pressburg Basin, *see* Alföld, Little.
 Preyer, J. N., *Des ungrischen Bauer's früherer und gegenwärtiger Zustand*, 74 n.
 Primogeniture, 63.
 Private bankers, 115.
 Prohibitive-protective tariff, 96.
 Proskowetz, E. von, "Die Rübenzuckerfabrication und die Zuckerrübenkultur," 102.
 Provincial estates, 33, 200;
 composition and powers, 23-28;
 opposition to Josephine reforms, 58-59.
 See also, Bohemia, Galicia, Lower Austria, Moravia-Silesia, Silesia, Styria, Upper Austria, Estates movement, Nobility.
 Prussia, 225.
 Pulszky, F., *Meine Zeit, mein Leben*, 125 n.

Quarterly review, 101 n.
 Quesnay, François, 52.

 Raab system, 50-51.
 Ragenfeld, E. N. von, *Über den österr. Grundkataster und seine Erneuerung*, 254 n.
 Railroads, 42, 92-93, 175, 178.
 Rainfall in Monarchy, 16, 17, 18-19, 147, 148.
 Raitz, 197, 265.
 Rape, 97, 155-156.
 Rauchberg, H., *Die Bevölkerung Österreichs auf Grund der Ergebnisse der Volkszählung vom 31. December 1890*, 43 n.
 Reaping, 190-191.
 Rechtenbach, 104.
 Reden, Friedrich von, 43;
 Allgemeine vergleichende Finanz-Statistik, 43 n.
 Redlich, J., *Das österreichische Staats- und Reichsproblem*, 204 n.
 Reform Bill of 1832 (England), 38 n.

Reichs-Gesetz-Blatt für das Kaiserthum Oesterreich, 115 n.
 Renard, Count, 186.
Resultate der Wirksamkeit der k. k. Landwirtschafts-Gesellschaft in Steiermark, vom Jahre 1829-1839, 120 n., 143.
 Revolution of 1848, 203, 232-237.
 Rezek, J., "Die Entwicklung des landwirtschaftlichen Maschinenwesens," 164 n.
 Richter, S., "Das landwirtschaftliche Vereins- und Genossenschaftswesen," 134 n.
 Rieger, B., "Untertans- und Urbarialverhältnisse," 49 n.
 Rittersfeld, Franz Gezek von, 156.
Ritterstand, 22, 25, 26.
 River control, 111-112.
 Roads, 41, 93, 94.
 Robert, Florenz, 105-106.
Robot, 49, 60, 60 n., 61, 69;
 amount rendered, 70, 71-74;
 in Bukowina, 181-182;
 increasing *Robot*, 70, 184-187;
 inefficiency, 190, 192-202, 213-214, 243-244;
 length of work day, 192-193;
 redemption, 201-202, 236-237.
 See also, Bohemia, Galicia, Hungary, Lower Austria, Moravia-Silesia, Northwest zone, Styria, Upper Austria.
Robotpatent, 48-50.
 Rogin, L., *The introduction of farm machinery in its relation to the productivity of labor in the United States during the nineteenth century*, 190 n.
 Rohoniz, 130.
 Roschmann-Horburg, J. von, "Bericht über die Tätigkeit des statistischen Seminars an der k. k. Universität Wiens im Wintersemester 1883/1884," 151 n.
 Rotation of crops, 44, 145, 154-155, 157-160, 242.
 Rothschild, 42.
 Roumanians in Monarchy, 12, 13.
Ruchadlo, 164, 170.
 "Rückblick auf die fortschreitende Entwicklung des Handelsverkehrs

- in den Donauländern seit 1815," 111 n.
- Rudolph I, Emperor (1273-1291), 11.
- Rural population, 43, 173-174, 179-180.
- Russia, 65 n., 225.
- Rustical*, 55, 235.
- Ruthenians, 12, 187.
- Rye, 168.
- Safran, M. B., *Die inneren und kulturellen Verhältnisse in der Bukowina 1825-1861*, 73 n.
- St. Genois-d'Aneaucourt, Count, 159.
- Sala, M., Freiherr von, *Geschichte des polnischen Aufstandes vom Jahre 1846*, 218.
- Salm, Prince, 158, 197.
- Salzburg, 11, 67, 138, 196.
- Sammlung der Gesetze welche unter der glorreichsten Regierung des König Leopold des II. in den sämtlichen K. Erbländen erschienen sind*, 56 n.
- Sammlung der politischen Gesetze und Verordnungen für das Erzherzogthum Oesterreich ob der Ens und das Herzogthum Salzburg*, 74 n.
- San river, 18.
- Satzbuch, 68.
- Save river, 20, 21.
- Savings banks, 113-114, 116.
- Schaller, J., 270.
- Scherer, C. V. J., *Allgemeiner Con-
torist*, 247.
- Schiff, W., 150;
"Die Regulierung und Ablösung
der Wald- und Weide-Servituten,"
237 n.;
*Österreichs Agrarpolitik seit der
Grundentlastung*, 69 n.;
*Zur Frage der Organisation des land-
wirtschaftlichen Kredites in Deut-
schland und Österreich*, 113 n.
- "Schilderung der Kartoffelbaues an
der östlichen Seite Galiziens,"
108 n.
- Schimaushek, J., "Topographisches
Beschreibung der Herrschaft Pos-
telberg," 112 n.
- Schimmer, G. A., see Schmitt, F.
- Schlegelberger F., ed., *Rechtsvergleich-
endes Handwörterbuch für das
Zivil- und Handelsrecht des In-
und Auslandes*, 64 n.
- Schlitter, H., *Aus Österreichs Vormärz*,
122 n.
- Schmerling, Ritter von, 118.
- Schmidt, Franz, Professor, 141.
- Schmitt, F. and Schimmer, G. A.,
*Statistik des österreichisch-ungar-
ischen Kaiserstaates*, 43 n.
- Schnabel, G. N., 109, 151, 156, 158,
162, 163, 166, 192;
*Statistik der landwirtschaftlichen
Industrie Böhmens*, 109 n., 263,
269.
- Schollenpflichtigkeit*, 53 n.
- Schreiber, Ritter von, 215.
- Schubernigg, Franz, 101.
- Schulte, F., *Die Bodenkreditinstitute
der Österreichisch-Ungarischen
Monarchie 1841 bis 1910*, 68 n.
- Schwartner, M. von, *Statistik des
Königreichs Ungarn 1809-1811*,
20 n., 263, 269.
- Schwarz, J. G., 258.
- Schwarzenberg, 112, 130-131, 151, 152,
155, 159, 160, 163, 167, 176, 190.
- Schwerz, J. N., 134 n.
- Schwicker, J. H., *Statistik des König-
reiches Ungarn*, 113 n.
- Scythe, 164, 179, 190-191.
- Seehuschitz, 112, 163.
- Seelowitz, 106, 112-113, 153, 159.
- Seidl, M., "Bericht an die k. k. patr-
okön. Gesellschaft in Böhmen,
über die Herrschaft Altenburg in
Ungarn, und die Herrschaft Seelo-
witz in Mähren," 113 n.
- Seniorat*, 63-64.
- Serbs, 13.
- Serf, 90.
- Serre, M. de *L'Auriche*, 269;
*Voyage dans l'empire Autriche pen-
dant les années 1809 et 1810*, 269.
- Session*, 69.
- Sessional papers*, Great Britain, House
of Commons, 36 n., 258.
- Shaw, W. and Johnson, C. W., transl.,
The principles of agriculture, 271.
- Sheep, see Wool.
- Sickle, 163-164, 179, 190-191.

- Sieghart, R., *Zolltrennung und Zolleinheit*, 125 n.
- Silesia (Austrian), 12, 13, 24, 25, 26, 28, 49, 56 n., 108, 132, 133, 204.
See also, Moravia-Silesia, Northwest zone.
- Silesian (Prussian) Credit Union, 116, 125.
- Silk, 97.
- Simkhovitch, V. G., "Hay and history," 44 n.
- Sina, Baron von, 36.
- Sirmien, 73.
- Sirocco, 19.
- Sitensky, F., "Die Landwirtschaft im Königreiche Böhmen während der fünfzigjährigen Jubiläumssperiode der Regierung Seiner Majestät des Kaisers Franz Joseph I," 163-164 n.
- Slavery, 52-53 n.
- Slavonia, 23, 111.
- Slokar, J., *Geschichte der österreichischen Industrie und ihrer Förderung unter Kaiser Franz I*, 97 n.
- Slovaks, 12.
- Slovenes, 12.
- Smith, E. G., *The economy of farming*, 266.
- Society for Agriculture and Useful Arts (Carinthia), 133-134.
- Society for Agriculture and the Useful Arts (Carniola), 136-137.
- Sommer, J. G., *Das Königreich Böhmen, statistisch-topographisch dargestellt*, 112 n., 263, 270.
- Sonnenfels, Joseph von, 52.
- South Africa, 102.
- South slav provinces, 13 n.
See also, Carniola, Dalmatia, Littoral.
- Sowing, 163, 190.
- Spain, 97, 98, 99.
- Springer, Anton, 199, 214, 233;
Geschichte Oesterreichs seit dem Wiener Frieden 1809, 27 n., 274-275.
- Springer, J., *Statistik des österreichischen Kaiserstaates*, 23 n., 263, 270, 271.
- Staatsgrundgesetze der österreichischen Monarchie*, 35 n.
- Staat, 105, 141.
- Stadion, Rudolph, Count, 228, 233.
- Stadtbuch*, 63.
- Stamm, F., *Verhältnisse der Volks-, Land- und Forstwirtschaft des Königreiches Böhmen*, 103 n.
- Statistics, 252.
- Statistisch-administrative Vorträge auf Veranstaltung der k. k. statistischen Central-Commission*, 251 n.
- Statistische Monatschrift*, 11 n.
- Statuten der kaiserlich-königlichen mährisch-schlesischen Gesellschaft zur Beförderung des Ackerbaues, der Natur- und Landeskunde*, 142 n.
- Steam engines, 42, 106, 110, 165-166.
- Steiner, F. G., *Die Entwicklung des Mobilbankwesens in Oesterreich*, 115 n.
- Sterbelehen*, see *Mortuarium*.
- Stern, A., *Geschichte Europas von der Verträge von 1815 bis zum Frankfurter Frieden von 1871*, 22 n.
- Stettner, Ritter von, 178.
- Stift, Baron, 117-118.
- Stolberg, L., Count, 199.
- Strafpatent*, see *Patent*: 1 September 1781.
- Strakosch, Siegfried von, 15;
Die Grundlagen der Agrarwirtschaft in Österreich, 16 n.
- Street village, 173, 179 n.
- Strohlendorf, Ritter von, 103-104.
- Stuhlweissenberg, 98.
- Styria, 45, 56 n., 78, 81, 162, 191-92, 232;
agricultural credit, 120-121;
agricultural societies, 120, 121, 132, 136, 139, 141, 142, 143;
commutation, 181, 201;
farm labor, 177, 178, 187, 188, 189, 190-191;
geography, 11, 12, 13, 16.
land ownership, 23, 62;
provincial estates, 24, 25, 27, 204, 204 n.;
Robot, 50, 72, 181.
- Styrian Agricultural Society, 120, 121, 132, 136, 139, 141, 142, 143.
- Styrian Savings Bank, 120-121.

- Suffrage in Hungary, 38, 38 n.
 Sugar beets, 97, 102-107, 140-141, 165-166, 169-170 n.
 Sugar cane, 91 n., 102.
 Sugenheim, S., *Geschichte der Aufhebung der Leibeigenschaft und Hörigkeit in Europa bis zum die Mitte des 19en. Jahrhunderts*, 199 n.
 Svátek, J., *Culturbistorische Bilder aus Böhmen*, 186 n.
 Switzerland, 162, 163, 177.
 Szamos river, 13.
 Szarvar, 127.
 Széchenyi, Stephen, Count, 36, 112, 124-125, 137, 198-199, 206-207, 265, 268;
 Ueber den Credit, 125 n., 270-271;
 Licht, 270-271;
 Stadium, 270-271.
 Szeklars, 13.
 Szentes, 94.
 Szilassy, Z. von, "Landwirtschaftliche Vereine," 137 n.

 Tachau, 76, 201.
Tafeln zur Statistik, see k. k. Direction der administrativen Statistik.
 Tarnow district, 225, 226, 228.
 Taxation, 48, 103, 223-224.
 Taylor, A. J. P., 21;
 The Hapsburg monarchy, 22 n.
 Tebeldi, A. (pseudonym of Carl Beidtel), 71, 153;
 Das Eigenbum, 271;
 Die Geldangelegenheiten Oesterreichs, 71 n., 271.
 Tegoborski, L. de, 71 n.;
 Des finances et du crédit public de l'Autriche 25 n.
 Teleki, Dominik, Count, 137.
 Teltsch, 159.
 Temes, 73.
 Teschen, 26, 151.
 Thaer, Albrecht Daniel, 134 n., 158, 265;
 Grundsätze der rationellen Landwirtschaft, 264, 271;
 The principles of agriculture, 154 n.
 Thaer, Albrecht Phillip, 158, 158 n.
Theilschuldverschreibung, 115.
 Theiss river, 12, 20, 94, 111-112, 190.

Theresianum Ritterakademie, 23.
 Thessedik, Samuel, 127.
 Three-field system, 44, 145, 153-154, 168-169, 242.
 Threshers, 179, 187, 191.
 Thun-Hohenstein, Joseph Mathias, Count von, 112, 151, 163, 199.
 Thurn-Taxis, Anselm, Prince, 104, 165.
 Ticknor, George, *Life, letters and journals of George Ticknor*, 95 n.
 Timon, A., *Ungarische Verfassungs- und Rechtsgeschichte*, 35 n.
 Tolna County, 137 n.
 Török, J. N., 142 n., 182, 192.
 Torontál, 73.
 Townson, R., *Travels in Hungary, with a short account of Vienna in the year 1793*, 69 n., 264, 272.
 Transportation, 41-42, 91-95, 97, 239.
 Transylvania, 11, 13, 14, 18, 45, 53, 61, 106.
 Transylvanian Agricultural Society, 137.
 Tréfort, August, 125.
 Trieste, 42, 253.
 Trischfelder, 157.
 Troppau and Jägerndorf, 26.
 T. S., see k. k. Direction der administrativen Statistik, *Tafeln zur Statistik der österreichischen Monarchie*, 36 n.
 Turkey, 56.
 Turnbull, P. E., *Austria*, 22 n., 264, 272.
 Tyrol, 11, 12, 13, 16, 25, 27, 28, 108, 138, 139, 162, 163, 188, 189, 253.

 Umlauf, F., *Die österreichisch-ungarische Monarchie*, 14 n.
 Uneingekauft, 54, 82.
Ungarns Landwirtschaft, see Kön. ung. Minister für Ackerbau.
 United Friends for the Promotion of Natural Science and Geography, 135.
 United States, 190-191, 196;
 State Department, *Consular letters*, 258;
 State Department, *Diplomatic dispatches*, 20 n., 258.
 Upper Austria, 23, 45, 56 n., 62, 67, 81, 145 n., 146, 196;

- agricultural labor, 180-181, 188, 189, 191;
 agricultural societies, 132, 138;
 geography, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16;
 peasant obligations, 74, 75, 78;
 provincial estates, 24, 25, 26, 27, 204;
Robot, 72.
 Urban population, 173-174, 179-180.
Urbarium (Theresan), 50, 69-70, 83.
Urbarium of 1836, 83, 85, 86, 87-88, 210.
Urkundenbuch, 68.
Vagabonds, 437-438, 438 n.
 Valentin, V., *Geschichte der deutschen Revolution 1848-1849*, 205 n.
 Vásárhely, 94.
 Vay, Nicholas, Baron, 211.
 Venetia, 7, 11, 12, 13, 14, 106, 146.
Verhandlungen der k. k. Landwirthschaftsgesellschaft in Wien, 107 n.
Verhandlungen des landwirthschaftlichen Congresses gehalten zu Wien in Monate März 1849, 138 n., 259.
Verhandlungen des österreichischen Reichstages nach der stenographischen Aufnahme, 74 n., 259.
Verhandlungen und Aufsätze (Styrian Agricultural Society), 120 n., 262.
 Verocz, 73.
Versuch einer Darstellung der österreichischen Monarchie in statistischen Tafeln, 252.
 Veverka, Franz, 164.
 Vienna, 42, 59, 92, 102, 161, 178, 179-180, 188, 189, 216, 232.
 Vienna Basin, 14, 15.
 Vienna Savings Bank, 116.
Viertel ober dem Manbartsberg, 146.
Viertel unter dem Manbartsberg, 208, 257.
Vierteljahrsschrift für Social- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte, 235 n.
 Violand, E., *Die sociale Geschichte der Revolution in Oesterreich*, 174 n.
 Vistula river, 13, 18.
 Vockel, Freiherr von, 159, 162.
Vollständige Sammlung aller seit dem glorreichsten Regierungsantritt Joseph des Zweyten für die k. k. Erbländer ergangenen höchsten Verordnungen und Gesetze, 50 n.
 Vorarlberg, 25, 28, 138, 139.
Vormärz, defined, 11.
Vorspann, 61, 79-80, 215.
 Wages, 187-190, 201-202.
Waisendienste, 78-79, 186.
 Waldstein-Wartenburg, 153.
Waldviertel, 177.
 Walleschau, 103.
 Wallis, B. C., "The peoples of Hungary: their work on the land," 20 n.
 Walterskirchen, Wilhelm, Freiherr von, 200, 212-214, 215, 216 n.
 Warriner, D., *Economics of peasant farming*, 44 n.
 Weinrich, Karl, 104-105, 165;
 "Die neuesten in den böhmischen Rübenzuckerfabrication eingeführten Verbesserungen," 103 n.
 Wessely, J., *Die österreichischen Alpenländer und ihre Forste*, 157 n.
 Wheat, 168.
 Windisch-Grätz, Alfred, Field Marshal, 51, 51 n., 224, 259.
 Winkler, A., *Ungarns landwirtschaftsgeographische Gestaltung*, 19 n.
 Winnowing, 164.
 Wirkner, L. von, *Meine Erlebnisse*, 207 n.
 Wittingau, 152.
 Wolfsthal, 212.
 Wolny, G., *Die Markgrafschaft Mähren, topographisch, statistisch und historisch geschildert*, 149 n., 263, 272.
 Wool, 97-102, 160-161, 240.
 Woolens, 42, 97.
 Wrana, Count, 102.
 Württemberg Credit-Union, 120.
 W. W. (*Wiener Währung*), 247.
 Yoke, hungarian, 86.
 Zailer, V., *Die Land- und Alpenwirthschaft in den österreichischen Alpenländer*, 157 n.
 Zdislawitz, 159.
Zehent, 70-71, 74-76, 75 n., 199, 212, 213, 214, 215.

- Zenker, E. V., 71, 72 n. ;
 Die Wiener Revolution 1848 in ihren
 socialen Voraussetzungen und Be-
 ziehungen, 71 n.
Zichy, Franz, Count, 111.
Zimmerauer, F. von, " Der Land- und
 Forstwirtschaftliche Unterricht,"
 132 n.
Zippe, F. X., 270.
Zollverband, 91, 92, 100.
Zugrobot, 69.
 See also, Robot.
Zwangsgesindedienste, 78.

THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY
STUDIES IN
HISTORICAL AND POLITICAL SCIENCE

' ' '

SIXTY-FIFTH SERIES (1947)
(Complete in two numbers.)

- I. British Block Grants and Central-Local Finance.
By REYNOLD E. CARLSON.
- II. Noble Landowners and Agriculture in Austria, 1815-1848.
By JEROME BLUM.

' ' '

A subscription for the regular annual series (about 600 pages) is \$5.00. Single numbers may be purchased at special prices. A complete list of the series is given on pages vi-xii.

THE WALTER HINES PAGE SCHOOL OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

THE PROTECTION OF NATIONALS: A Study in the Application of International Law. By FREDERICK SHERWOOD DUNN. 238 pages, \$2.25

"I can comment only in superlatives. It is splendid, perfectly splendid!"

—EDWIN D. DICKINSON, *University of Michigan Law School*

THE RUSSO-JAPANESE TREATIES OF 1907-1916 CONCERNING MANCHURIA AND MONGOLIA. By ERNEST B. PRICE. 176 pages, \$1.75

"Invaluable to scholars seeking a clearer understanding of the present conflict of interests between the Soviet Union and Japan."

—*The Nation*

A STUDY OF CHINESE BOYCOTTS with Special Reference to Their Economic Effectiveness. By C. F. REMER with the assistance of WILLIAM B. PALMER. 318 pages, \$2.75

This volume "will be of interest not merely to the student of the commerce and politics of the Far East, but also to political scientists generally."

—TYLER DENNETT, *American Political Science Review*

A VIEW OF EUROPE, 1932: An Interpretative Essay on Some Workings of Economic Nationalism. By PAUL VAN ZEELAND. 162 pages, \$1.75

"The book will commend itself to many general readers and not a few specialists."—JOHN DONALDSON.

Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science

MANIFEST DESTINY: A Study of Nationalist Expansionism in American History. By ALBERT K. WEINBERG. 372 pages, \$4.50

"If it is true that the world is on the verge of a new epoch in imperialism, initiated by the Japanese invasion of China and the Italian crusade against Ethiopia, then the publication of this book is both timely and embarrassing . . . because it reveals that the United States, now definitely hostile to expansionism on the part of other nations, has justified the taking of territory in the past by arguments even more shoddy than those today advanced by Italy or Japan." . . .

—RAYMOND LESLIE BUELL, *New York Herald Tribune Books*

INTERVENTION, CIVIL WAR, AND COMMUNISM IN RUSSIA. APRIL-DECEMBER 1918: DOCUMENTS AND MATERIALS. By JAMES BUNYAN. 610 pages, \$4.50

"The volume covers the critical months of 1918, when everything seemed to indicate that the Soviet government, established in Moscow, had no chance to survive."

—LEONID I. STRAKHOVSKY, *The Journal of Modern History*

THE ORIGINS OF THE FOREIGN POLICY OF WOODROW WILSON. By HARLEY NOTTER. 702 pages, \$4.50

To examine the foreign policy of President Wilson is to examine one of the most decisive factors in the contemporary history of the United States and of the world.

THE UNITED STATES AND SANTO DOMINGO 1798-1873. A Chapter in Caribbean Diplomacy. By CHARLES CALLAN TANSILL. 497 pages, \$3.50

Dr. Tansill has made effective use of the records in the Foreign Offices of France, Germany, and Great Britain, together with materials taken from the manuscripts in the Department of State and other American sources.

THE ORIGIN OF MANCHU RULE IN CHINA: Frontier and Bureaucracy as interacting Forces in the Chinese Empire. By FRANZ MICHAEL. 135 pages, map, \$2.00

Mr. Michael shows just what really happened during the last "barbarian" conquest of China, when the Manchus set up a dynasty that lasted from 1644 to the founding of the Chinese Republic in 1911. And by so doing he shows the vital difference between past invasions and conquests of China and the much more sinister "New Order" of institutionalized helotry which Japan is trying to create in the name of a "Greater East Asia."

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS • BALTIMORE 18

ALBERT SHAW LECTURES ON DIPLOMATIC HISTORY

UNDER THE AUSPICES OF THE WALTER HINES PAGE
SCHOOL OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

Duodecimo, cloth

1899. JOHN H. LATANÉ. The Diplomatic Relations of the United States and Spanish America. 1900. (Out of print.)
1900. JAMES MORTON CALLAHAN. The Diplomatic History of the Southern Confederacy. 1901. (Out of print.)
1906. JESSE SIDDALL REEVES. American Diplomacy under Tyler and Polk. 1907. (Out of print.)
1907. ELBERT JAY BENTON. International Law and Diplomacy of the Spanish-American War. 1908. \$1.75.
1909. EPHRAIM DOUGLASS ADAMS. British Interests and Activities in Texas, 1838-1846. 1910. (Out of print.)
1911. CHARLES OSCAR PAULLIN. Diplomatic Negotiations of American Naval Officers, 1778-1883. 1912. \$2.25.
1912. ISAAC J. COX. The West Florida Controversy, 1798-1813. 1918. (Out of print.)
1913. WILLIAM R. MANNING. Early Diplomatic Relations between the United States and Mexico. 1916. (Out of print.)
1914. FRANK A. UPDYKE. The Diplomacy of the War of 1812. 1915. (Out of print.)
1917. PAYSON JACKSON TREAT. The Early Diplomatic Relations between the United States and Japan, 1853-1865. 1917. \$2.75.
1921. PERCY ALVIN MARTIN. Latin America and the War. 1925. \$3.50.
1923. HENRY MERBRITT WRISTON. Executive Agents in American Foreign Relations. 1929. \$5.00.
1926. SAMUEL FLAGG BEMIS. Pinckney's Treaty: A Study of America's Advantage from Europe's Distress, 1783-1800. 1926. Second printing 1941. \$3.00.
1927. BRUCE WILLIAMS. State Security and the League of Nations. 1927. \$2.75.
1928. J. FRED RIPPY. Rivalry of the United States and Great Britain over Latin America, 1808-1830. 1929. \$2.75.
1930. VÍCTOR ANDRÉS BELAUNDE. Bolívar and the Political Thought of the Spanish American Revolution. 1938. \$3.50.
1931. CHARLES CALLAN TANSILL. The Purchase of the Danish West Indies. 1932. \$3.50.
1932. DEXTER PERKINS. The Monroe Doctrine, 1826-1867. 1933. (Out of print.)
1933. CHARLES SEYMOUR. American Diplomacy during the World War. 1934. Second printing 1942. \$3.00.
1935. FRANK H. SIMONDS. American Foreign Policy in the Post-war Years. 1935. \$2.00.
1936. JULIUS W. PRATT. Expansionists of 1898. The Acquisition of Hawaii and the Spanish Islands. 1936. \$3.00.
1937. DEXTER PERKINS. The Monroe Doctrine, 1867-1907. 1937. \$3.50.
1938. ARTHUR PRESTON WHITAKER. The United States and the Independence of Latin America, 1800-1830. 1941. \$3.75.
1939. WILLIAM SPENCE ROBERTSON. France and Latin-American Independence. 1939. \$3.75.
1941. THOMAS A. BAILEY. The Policy of the United States toward the Neutrals, 1917-1918. 1942. \$3.50.
1942. WILFRID HARRY CALLCOTT. The Caribbean Policy of the United States, 1890-1920. 1942. \$3.50.
1946. MALBONE W. GRAHAM. American Diplomacy in the International Community. 1948. \$3.25.

A REPRINT OF ECONOMIC TRACTS

FOUNDED BY JACOB H. HOLLANDER

Octavo, Paper

The first series and numbers one, three and four of the second were out of print for many years but due to a continued demand for them they have been reprinted by planograph.

First Series

1. Three Letters on "The Price of Gold." By DAVID RICARDO. London, 1809. \$1.00.
2. An Inquiry into the Nature and Progress of Rent. By T. R. MALTHUS. London, 1815. \$1.00.
3. Essay on the Application of Capital to Land. By EDWARD WEST. London, 1866. \$1.00.
4. A Refutation of the Wage-Fund Theory. By FRANCIS D. LONGE. London, 1866. \$1.00.

Second Series

1. Discourse of Trade. By NICHOLAS BARBON. London, 1690. \$1.00.
2. Several Assertions Proved. By JOHN ASGILL. London, 1696. (out of print).
3. Discourses upon Trade. By DUDLEY NORTH. London, 1691. \$1.00.
4. Englands Interest and Improvement. By SAMUEL FORTREY. Cambridge, 1663. (out of print).

Third Series

1. The Querist, containing several queries proposed to the consideration of the public. Parts I, II, III. By GEORGE BERKLEY. Dublin, 1735-37. \$1.00.
2. An Essay on the Governing Causes of the Natural Rate of Interest; wherein the sentiments of Sir William Petty and Mr. Locke, on that head, are considered. By JOSEPH MASSIE. London, 1750. 50 cents.
3. Money answers all Things: or an essay to make money sufficiently plentiful amongst all ranks of people, and increase our foreign and domestick trade. By JACOB VANDERLINT. London, 1734. \$1.00.
4. An Essay on Ways and Means for Raising Money for the support of the present war, without increasing the public debts. By FRANCIS FAUQUIER. London, 1756. 50 cents.

Fourth Series

1. Letters of John Ramsay McCulloch to David Ricardo, 1818-1823. \$1.00.
2. Observations on the Effects of the Corn Laws and of a Rise or Fall in the Price of Corn on the Agriculture and General Wealth of the Country. By T. R. MALTHUS. London, 1814. \$1.00.
3. Observations on the circumstances which Influence the Condition of the Labouring Classes of Society. By JOHN BARTON. London, 1817. \$1.00.
4. Two Letters on the Measures of Value Contributed to the Traveller (London) in December 1822. By JOHN STUART MILL. \$1.00.

Fifth Series

1. Two Tracts by Gregory King:
 - (a). Natural and Political Observations and Conclusions upon the State and Condition of England. 1696.
 - (b). Of the Naval Trade of England A° 1688 and the National Profit then arising thereby. 1697. MS.
Edited with an Introduction by GEORGE E. BARNETT. \$1.50
2. Natural and Political Observations Mentioned in a following Index and made upon the Bills of Mortality. By JOHN GRAUNT. London, 1676.
With an introduction by WALTER F. WILLCOX. \$1.25.
3. Two papers on the Degrees of Mortality of Mankind. 1693. By EDMUND HALLEY.
Introduction and notes by LOWELL J. REED. \$1.25.
4. (a). A Memorial Concerning the Coyn of England. 1695. MS. (b). A Memorial Concerning Credit. 1696. MS. Two Manuscripts. By CHARLES DAVENANT, with an Introduction by ABBOTT PAYSON USHER. \$1.75.

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS

BALTIMORE 18

THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY STUDIES IN HISTORICAL AND POLITICAL SCIENCE

* Not sold separately.

FIRST SERIES.—1888.

(Complete volume out of print.)

- I. An Introduction to American Institutional History. By E. A. FREEMAN. 25 cents
- *II. The Germanic Origin of New England Towns. By H. B. ADAMS.
- III. Local Government in Illinois. By ALBERT SHAW.—Local Government in Pennsylvania. By E. R. L. GOULD. 80 cents.
- IV. Saxon Tithingmen in America. By H. B. ADAMS. 50 cents.
- V. Local Government in Michigan and the Northwest. By E. W. BEMIS. 25 cents.
- VI. Parish Institutions of Maryland. By EDWARD INGLE. 40 cents.
- *VII. Old Maryland Manors. By JOHN HEMSLEY JOHNSON
- VIII. Norman Constables in America. By H. B. ADAMS. 50 cents.
- IX-X. Village Communities of Cape Ann and Salem. By H. B. ADAMS. 50 cents.
- XI. The Genesis of a New England State. By A. JOHNSTON. 80 cents.
- *XII. Local Government and Schools in South Carolina. By B. J. RAMAGE.

SECOND SERIES.—1884.

(Complete volume out of print.)

- *I-II. Methods of Historical Study. By H. B. ADAMS.
- III. The Past and Present of Political Economy. By R. T. ELY. 35 cents.
- IV. Samuel Adams, the Man of the Town Meeting. By JAMES K. HOSMER. 35 cents.
- V-VI. Taxation in the United States. By HENRY CARTER ADAMS. 50 cents.
- VII. Institutional Beginnings in a Western State. By JESSE MACY. 25 cents.
- VIII-IX. Indian Money in New England, etc. By WILLIAM B. WEEDEN. 50 cents.
- *X. Town and County Government in the Colonies. By E. CHANNING.
- *XI. Rudimentary Society among Boys. By J. HEMSLEY JOHNSON.
- XII. Land Laws of Mining Districts. By C. H. SHINN. 50 cents.

THIRD SERIES.—1885.—\$4.00.

- I. Maryland's Influence upon Land Cessions to the U. S. By H. B. ADAMS. 75 cents.
- *II-III. Virginia Local Institutions. By E. INGLE.
- IV. Recent American Socialism. By RICHARD T. ELY. 50 cents.
- V-VI-VII. Maryland Local Institutions. By LEWIS W. WILHELM. \$1.00.
- VIII. Influence of the Proprietors in Founding New Jersey. By A. SCOTT. 25 cents.
- *IX-X. American Constitutions. By HORACE DAVIS.
- *XI-XII. The City of Washington. By J. A. PORTER.

FOURTH SERIES.—1886.—\$4.00.

- *I. Dutch Village Communities on the Hudson River. By I. ELTING.
- *II-III. Town Government in Rhode Island. By W. E. FOSTER.—The Narragansett Planters. By EDWARD CHANNING.
- IV. Pennsylvania Boroughs. By WILLIAM P. HOLCOMB. 50 cents.
- *V. Introduction to Constitutional History of the States. By J. F. JAMESON.
- VI. The Puritan Colony at Annapolis, Maryland. By D. R. RANDALL. 50 cents.
- *VII-VIII-IX. The Land Question in the United States. By S. SATO.
- X. Town and City Government of New Haven. By C. H. LEVERMORE. 50 cents.
- *XI-XII. Land System of the New England Colonies. By M. EGLESTON.

FIFTH SERIES.—1887.—\$4.00.

- I-II. City Government of Philadelphia. By E. P. ALLINSON and B. PENROSE. 50 cents
- III. City Government of Boston. By JAMES M. BURNES. 25 cents.
- *IV. City Government of St. Louis. By MARSHALL S. SNOW.
- V-VI. Local Government in Canada. By JOHN GEORGE BOURINOT. 50 cents.

- *VII. Effect of the War of 1812 upon American Union. By N. M. BUTLER.
- VIII. Notes on the Literature of Charities. By HERBERT B. ADAMS. 25 cents.
- *IX. Predictions of Hamilton and De Tocqueville. By JAMES BRYCE.
- X. The Study of History in England and Scotland. By P. FREDERICK. 25 cents.
- XI. Seminary Libraries and University Extension. By H. B. ADAMS. 25 cents.
- *XII. European Schools of History and Politics. By A. D. WHITE.

SIXTH SERIES.—1888.

(Volume sold only with complete set.)

- * The History of co-operation in the United States.

SEVENTH SERIES.—1889.

(Complete volume out of print.)

- I. Arnold Toynbee. By F. C. MONTAGUE. 50 cents.
- II-III. Municipal Government in San Francisco. By BERNARD MOSES. 50 cents.
- IV. Municipal History of New Orleans. By WM. W. HOWE. 25 cents.
- *V-VI. English Culture in Virginia. By WILLIAM P. TRENT.
- VII-VIII-IX. The River Towns of Connecticut. By CHARLES M. ANDREWS. \$1.00.
- *X-XI-XII. Federal Government in Canada. By JOHN G. BOURINOT.

EIGHTH SERIES.—1889.

(Complete volume out of print.)

- I-II. The Beginnings of American Nationality. By A. W. SMALL. \$1.00.
- III. Local Government in Wisconsin. By D. E. SPENCER. 25 cents.
- *IV. Spanish Colonization in the Southwest. By F. W. BLACKMAR.
- V-VI. The Study of History in Germany and France. By P. FREDERICK. \$1.00.
- VII-IX. Progress of the Colored People of Maryland. By J. R. BRACKETT. \$1.00.
- *X. The Study of History in Belgium and Holland. By P. FREDERICK.
- XI-XII. Seminary Notes on Historical Literature. By H. B. ADAMS and others. 50 cents.

NINTH SERIES.—1891.

(Volume sold only with complete set.)

- *I-II. Government of the United States. By W. W. WILLOUGHBY and W. F. WILLOUGHBY.
- III. University Education in Maryland. By B. C. STEINER.—The Johns Hopkins University (1878-1891). By D. C. GILMAN. 50 cents.
- *V-VI. Municipal Unity in the Lombard Communes. By W. K. WILLIAMS.
- VII-VIII. Public Lands of the Roman Republic. By A. STEPHENSON. 75 cents.
- *IX. Constitutional Development of Japan. By T. IYENAGA.
- *X. A History of Liberia. By J. H. T. MCPHERSON.
- XI-XII. The Indian Trade in Wisconsin. By F. J. TURNER. 50 cents.

TENTH SERIES.—1892.—\$4.00.

- *I. The Bishop Hill Colony. By MICHAEL A. MIKKELSEN.
- II-III. Church and State in New England. By PAUL E. LAUER. 50 cents.
- IV. Church and State in Maryland. By GEORGE PETRIE. 50 cents.
- V-VI. Religious Development of North Carolina. By S. B. WEEKS. 50 cents.
- *VII. Maryland's Attitude in the Struggle for Canada. By J. W. BLACK.
- VIII-IX. The Quakers in Pennsylvania. By A. C. APPLERARTH. 75 cents.
- X-XI. Columbus and His Discovery of America. By H. B. ADAMS and H. WOOD. 50 cents.
- XII. Causes of the American Revolution. By J. A. WOODBURN. 50 cents.

ELEVENTH SERIES.—1893.—\$4.00.

- I. The Social Condition of Labor. By E. R. L. GOULD. 50 cents.
- II. The World's Representative Assemblies of To-day. By E. K. ALDEN. 50 cents.
- III-IV. The Negro in the District of Columbia. By EDWARD INGLE. \$1.00.
- *V-VI. Church and State in North Carolina. By STEPHEN B. WEEKS.
- VII-VIII. The Condition of the Western Farmer, etc. By A. F. BENTLEY. \$1.00.
- IX-X. History of Slavery in Connecticut. By BERNARD C. STEINER. 75 cents.
- XI-XII. Local Government in the South. By E. W. BEMIS and others. \$1.00.

TWELFTH SERIES.—1894.—\$4.00.

- I-II. The Cincinnati Southern Railway. By J. H. HOLLANDER. \$1.00.
- III. Constitutional Beginnings of North Carolina. By J. S. BASSETT. 50 cents.
- IV. Struggle of Dissenters for Toleration in Virginia. By H. R. McILWAINE. 50 cents.
- *V-VI-VII. The Carolina Pirates and Colonial Commerce. By S. C. HUGHSON.
- VIII-IX. Representation and Suffrage in Massachusetts. By G. H. HAYNES. 50 cents.
- X. English Institutions and the American Indian. By J. A. JAMES. 25 cents.
- XI-XII. International Beginnings of the Congo Free State. By J. S. REEVES. 50 cents.

THIRTEENTH SERIES.—1895.—\$4.00.

- I-II. Government of the Colony of South Carolina. By E. L. WHITNEY. 75 cents.
- III-IV. Early Relations of Maryland and Virginia. By J. H. LATANE. 50 cents.
- V. The Rise of the Bicameral System in America. By T. F. MORAN. 50 cents.
- *VI-VII. White Servitude in the Colony of Virginia. By J. C. BALLAGH.
- VIII. The Genesis of California's First Constitution. By R. D. HUNT. 50 cents.
- IX. Benjamin Franklin as an Economist. By W. A. WETZEL. 50 cents.
- X. The Provisional Government of Maryland. By J. A. SILVER. 50 cents.
- XI-XII. Government and Religion of the Virginia Indians. By S. R. HENDREN. 50 cents.

FOURTEENTH SERIES.—1896.—\$4.00.

- I. Constitutional History of Hawaii. By HENRY E. CHAMBERS. 25 cents.
- II. City Government of Baltimore. By THADDEUS P. THOMAS. 25 cents.
- III. Colonial Origins of New England Senates. By F. L. RILEY. 50 cents.
- IV-V. Servitude in the Colony of North Carolina. By J. S. BASSETT. 50 cents.
- VI-VII. Representation in Virginia. By J. A. C. CHANDLER. 50 cents.
- VIII. History of Taxation in Connecticut (1636-1776). By F. R. JONES. 50 cents.
- IX-X. A Study of Slavery in New Jersey. By HENRY S. COOLEY. 50 cents.
- XI-XII. Causes of the Maryland Revolution of 1869. By F. E. SPARKS. 50 cents.

FIFTEENTH SERIES.—1897.—\$4.00.

- I-II. The Tobacco Industry in Virginia since 1860. By B. W. ARNOLD. 50 cents.
- III-V. Street Railway System of Philadelphia. By F. W. SPEIRS. 75 cents.
- VI. Daniel Raymond. By C. P. NEILL. 50 cents.
- VII-VIII. Economic History of B. & O. R. R. By M. REIZENSTEIN. 50 cents.
- IX. The South American Trade of Baltimore. By F. R. RUTTER. 50 cents.
- X-XI. State Tax Commissions in the United States. By J. W. CHAPMAN. 50 cents.
- XII. Tendencies in American Economic Thought. By S. SHERWOOD. 25 cents.

SIXTEENTH SERIES.—1898.—\$4.00.

- I-IV. The Neutrality of the American Lakes, etc. By J. M. CALLAHAN. \$1.25.
- V. West Florida. By H. E. CHAMBERS. 25 cents.
- VI. Anti-Slavery Leaders of North Carolina. By J. S. BASSETT. 50 cents.
- VII-IX. Life and Administration of Sir Robert Eden. By B. C. STEINER. \$1.00.
- X-XI. The Transition of North Carolina from a Colony. By E. W. SIKES. 50 cents.
- XII. Jared Sparks and Alexis De Tocqueville. By H. B. ADAMS. 25 cents.

SEVENTEENTH SERIES.—1899.—\$4.00.

- I-II-III. History of State Banking in Maryland. By A. C. BRYAN. \$1.00.
- *IV-V. The Know-Nothing Party in Maryland. By L. F. SCHNECKENBER.
- VI. The Labadist Colony in Maryland. By B. B. JAMES. 50 cents.
- VII-VIII. History of Slavery in North Carolina. By J. S. BASSETT. 75 cents.
- IX-X-XI. Development of the Chesapeake & Ohio Canal. By G. W. WARD. 75 cents.
- XII. Public Educational Work in Baltimore. By HERBERT B. ADAMS. 25 cents.

EIGHTEENTH SERIES.—1900.—\$4.00.

- I-IV. Studies in State Taxation. Edited by J. H. HOLLANDER. \$1.00; cloth, \$1.25.
- V-VI. The Colonial Executive Prior to the Restoration. By P. L. KAYE. 50 cents.
- VII. Constitution and Admission of Iowa into the Union. By J. A. JAMES. 30 cents.
- VIII-IX. The Church and Popular Education. By H. B. ADAMS. 50 cents.
- X-XII. Religious Freedom in Virginia: The Baptists. By W. T. THOM. 75 cents.

NINETEENTH SERIES.—1901.—\$4.00.

- *I-III. America in the Pacific and the Far East. By J. M. CALLAHAN.
- IV-V. State Activities in Relation to Labor. By W. F. WILLOUGHBY. 50 cents.
- VI-VII. History of Suffrage in Virginia. By J. A. C. CHANDLER. 50 cents.
- VIII-IX. The Maryland Constitution of 1864. By W. S. MYERS. 50 cents.
- X. Life of Commissary James Blair. By D. E. MOTLEY. 25 cents.
- XI-XII. Gov. Hicks of Maryland and the Civil War. By G. L. RADOLFF. 50 cents.

TWENTIETH SERIES.—1902.

(Complete volume out of print.)

- I. Western Maryland in the Revolution. By B. C. STEINER. 30 cents.
- II-III. State Banks since the National Bank Act. By G. E. BARNETT. 50 cents.
- IV. Early History of Internal Improvement in Alabama. By W. E. MARTIN. 80 cents.
- *V-VI. Trust Companies in the United States. By GEORGE CATON.
- VII-VIII. The Maryland Constitution of 1851. By J. W. HARRY. 50 cents.
- IX-X. Political Activities of Philip Freneau. By S. E. FORMAN. 50 cents.
- XI-XII. Continental Opinion on a Proposed Middle European Tariff Union. By G. M. FISK. 30 cents.

TWENTY-FIRST SERIES.—1903.

(Volume sold only with complete set.)

- *I-II. The Wabash Trade Route. By E. J. BENTON.
- III-IV. Internal Improvements in North Carolina. By C. C. WEAVER. 50 cents.
- *V. History of Japanese Paper Currency. By M. TAKAKI.
- VI-VII. Economics and Politics in Maryland, 1720-1750, and the Public Services of Daniel Dulany the Elder. By ST. G. L. SIOUSSAT. 50 cents.
- *VIII-IX-X. Beginnings of Maryland, 1631-1639. By B. C. STEINER.
- *XI-XII. The English Statutes in Maryland. By ST. G. L. SIOUSSAT.

TWENTY-SECOND SERIES.—1904.—\$4.00.

- I-II. A Trial Bibliography of American Trade-Union Publications. 1st edition. 50 cents.
- *III-IV. White Servitude in Maryland, 1634-1820. By E. I. McCORMAC.
- V. Switzerland at the Beginning of the Sixteenth Century. By J. M. VINCENT. 30 cents.
- *VI-VII-VIII. The History of Reconstruction in Virginia. By H. J. ECKENRODE.
- IX-X. The Foreign Commerce of Japan since the Restoration. By Y. HATTORI. 50 cents.
- XI-XII. Descriptions of Maryland. By B. C. STEINER. 50 cents.

TWENTY-THIRD SERIES.—1905.—\$4.00.

- I-II. Reconstruction in South Carolina. By J. P. HOLLIS. 50 cents.
- III-IV. State Government in Maryland, 1777-1781. By B. W. BOND, JR. 50 cents.
- V-VI. Colonial Administration under Lord Clarendon, 1680-1687. By P. L. KAYE. 50 cents.
- VII-VIII. Justice in Colonial Virginia. By O. P. CHITWOOD. 50 cents.
- *IX-X. The Napoleonic Exiles in America, 1815-1819. By J. S. REEVES.
- XI-XII. Municipal Problems in Mediaeval Switzerland. By J. M. VINCENT. 50 cents.

TWENTY-FOURTH SERIES.—1906.—\$4.00.

- I-II. Spanish-American Diplomatic Relations before 1898. By H. E. FLACK. 50 cents.
- III-IV. The Finances of American Trade Unions. By A. M. SAKOLSKI. 75 cents.
- V-VI. Diplomatic Negotiations of the United States with Russia. By J. C. HILDT. 50 cents.
- VII-VIII. State Rights and Parties in N. C., 1776-1831. By H. M. WAGSTAFF. 50 cents.
- IX-X. National Labor Federations in the United States. By WILLIAM KIRK. 75 cents.
- XI-XII. Maryland During the English Civil Wars, I. By B. C. STEINER. 50 cents.

TWENTY-FIFTH SERIES.—1907.—\$4.00.

- I. Internal Taxation in the Philippines. By JOHN S. HORD. 80 cents.
- II-III. The Monroe Mission to France, 1794-1796. By B. W. BOND, JR. 50 cents.
- IV-V. Maryland During the English Civil Wars, II. By BERNARD C. STEINER. 50 cents.
- *VI-VII. The State in Constitutional and International Law. By R. T. CRANE.
- VIII-IX-X. Financial History of Maryland, 1789-1848. By HUGH S. HANNA. 75 cents.
- XI-XII. Apprenticeship in American Trade Unions. By J. M. MOTLEY. 50 cents.

TWENTY-SIXTH SERIES.—1908.—\$4.00.

- I-III. British Committees, Commissions, and Councils of Trade and Plantations, 1622-1675. By C. M. ANDREWS. 75 cents.
- IV-VI. Neutral Rights and Obligations in the Anglo-Boer War. By R. G. CAMPBELL. 75 cents.
- VII-VIII. The Elisabethan Parish in its Ecclesiastical and Financial Aspects. By S. L. WARE. 50 cents.
- IX-X. A Study of the Topography and Municipal History of Praeneste. By R. V. D. MAGOFFIN. 50 cents.
- *XI-XII. Beneficiary Features of American Trade Unions. By J. B. KENNEDY.

TWENTY-SEVENTH SERIES.—1908.—\$4.00.

- I-II. The Self-Reconstruction of Maryland, 1664-1667. By W. S. MYERS. 50 cents.
- III-IV-V. The Development of the English Law of Conspiracy. By J. W. BRYAN. 75 cents.
- VI-VII. Legislative and Judicial History of the Fifteenth Amendment. By J. M. MATHEWS. 75 cents.
- VIII-XII. England and the French Revolution, 1789-1797. By W. T. LAPRADE. \$1.00.

TWENTY-EIGHTH SERIES.—1910.—\$4.00.

- I. History of Reconstruction in Louisiana (through 1868). By J. R. FICKLEN. \$1.00.
- II. The Trade Union Label. By E. R. SPENDEN. 50 cents.
- III. The Doctrine of Non-Suability of the State in the United States. By K. SINGEWALD. 50 cents; cloth, 75 cents.
- *IV. David Ricardo: A Centenary Estimate. By J. H. HOLLANDER.

TWENTY-NINTH SERIES.—1911.—\$4.00.

- I. Maryland Under the Commonwealth: A Chronicle of the Years 1649-1658. By B. C. STEINER. \$1.00; cloth, \$1.25.
- II. The Dutch Republic and the American Revolution. By FRIEDRICH EDLER. \$1.50.
- *III. The Closed Shop in American Trade Unions. By F. T. STOCKTON.

THIRTIETH SERIES.—1912.—\$4.00.

- I. Recent Administration in Virginia. By F. A. MAGRUDER. \$1.25.
- II. The Standard Rate in American Trade Unions. By D. A. McCABE. \$1.25; cloth, \$1.50.
- III. Admission to American Trade Unions. By F. E. WOLFE. \$1.00.

THIRTY-FIRST SERIES.—1913.—\$4.00.

- I. The Land System in Maryland, 1720-1765. By CLARENCE P. GOULD. 75 cents; cloth, \$1.00.
- II. The Government of American Trade Unions. By T. W. GLOCKER. \$1.00; cloth, \$1.25.
- III. The Free Negro in Virginia, 1619-1865. By J. H. RUSSELL. \$1.00.
- IV. The Quinquennales: An Historical Study. By R. V. D. MAGOFFIN. 50 cents; cloth, 75 cents.

THIRTY-SECOND SERIES.—1914.—\$4.00.

- I. Jurisdiction in American Building-Trades Unions. By N. R. WHITNEY. \$1.00.
- II. Slavery in Missouri, 1804-1865. By H. A. TREXLER. \$1.25.
- III. Colonial Trade of Maryland. By M. S. MORRIS. \$1.00; cloth, \$1.25.

THIRTY-THIRD SERIES.—1915.—\$4.00.

- I. Money and Transportation in Maryland, 1720-1765. By CLARENCE P. GOULD. 75 cents; cloth, \$1.00.
- II. The Financial Administration of the Colony of Virginia. By PERCY FLIPPEN. 50 cents; cloth, 75 cents.
- III. The Helper and American Trade Unions. By JOHN H. ASHWORTH. 75 cents.
- IV. The Constitutional Doctrines of Justice Harlan. By FLOYD BARZILIA CLARK. \$1.00; cloth, \$1.25.

THIRTY-FOURTH SERIES.—1916.—\$4.00.

- I. The Boycott in American Trade Unions. By LEO WOLMAN. \$1.00.
- II. The Postal Power of Congress. By LINDSAY ROGERS. \$1.00.
- *III. Control of Strikes in American Trade Unions. By G. M. JAMES.
- IV. State Administration in Maryland. By JOHN L. DONALDSON. \$1.00; cloth, \$1.25.

THIRTY-FIFTH SERIES.—1917.—\$4.00.

- I. Virginia Committee System and American Revolution. By J. M. LEAKE. \$1.00; cloth, \$1.25.
- *II. The Organizability of Labor. By W. O. WEYFORTH.
- III. Party Organization and Machinery in Michigan since 1890. By A. C. MILLSPAUGH. \$1.00; cloth, \$1.25.

THIRTY-SIXTH SERIES.—1918.—\$4.00.

- *I. The Standard of Living in Japan. By K. MORIMOTO.
- II. Sumptuary Law in Nürnberg. By K. R. GREENFIELD. \$1.25; cloth, \$1.50.
- III. The Privileges and Immunities of State Citizenship. By R. HOWELL. \$1.00; cloth, \$1.25.
- IV. French Protestantism, 1559-1862. By C. G. KELLY. \$1.25; cloth, \$1.50.

THIRTY-SEVENTH SERIES.—1919.—\$4.25.

- I. Unemployment and American Trade Unions. By D. P. SMELSER, JR. \$1.25.
- II. The Labor Law of Maryland. By M. H. LAUCHHEIMER. \$1.25; cloth, \$1.50.
- III. The American Colonization Society, 1817-1840. By E. L. FOX. \$2.00; cloth, \$2.25.
- IV. The Obligation of Contracts Clause of the United States Constitution. By W. B. HUNTING. \$1.00; cloth, \$1.25.

THIRTY-EIGHTH SERIES.—1920.—\$4.25.

- I. The United States Department of Agriculture. By W. L. WANLASS. \$1.25; cloth, \$1.75.
- II. The Amalgamated Association of Iron, Steel and Tin Workers. By J. S. ROBINSON. \$1.50.
- III. Employment of Plebiscite in the Determination of Sovereignty. By J. MATTHEW. \$1.50.

THIRTY-NINTH SERIES.—1921.—\$5.75.

- I. The Capitalization of Goodwill. By KEMPER SIMPSON. \$1.00.
- *II. The Rise of the Cotton Mills in the South. By BROADUS MITCHELL.
- III. The International Molders' Union of North America. By FRANK T. STOCKTON. \$1.50.

FORTIETH SERIES.—1922.—\$5.75.

- I. The Presidential Campaign of 1832. By SAMUEL R. GAMMON, JR. \$1.50.
- II. The Canadian Reciprocity Treaty of 1854. By C. C. TANSILL. \$1.00.
- III. Recent Problems in Admiralty Jurisdiction. By EDGAR T. FELL. \$1.25.
- IV. The Creation of the Presidency, 1775-1789. By C. C. THACH, JR. \$1.50.

FORTY-FIRST SERIES.—1923.—\$5.75.

- I. Paper Money in Maryland, 1727-1789. By KATHRYN L. BEHRNS. \$1.00.
- II. The Shop Committee in the United States. By CARROLL E. FRENCH. \$1.25.
- III. Bavaria and the Reich. By J. MATTERN. \$1.25.
- IV. James Henry Hammond, 1807-1864. By ELIZABETH MERRITT. \$1.50.

FORTY-SECOND SERIES.—1924.—\$5.75.

- I. Contemporary French Opinion on the American Civil War. By W. REED WEST. \$1.50.
- II. Frederick Law Olmsted: A Critic of the Old South. By BROADUS MITCHELL. \$1.50.
- III. Constitutional Doctrines of Oliver Wendell Holmes. By DORSEY RICHARDSON. \$1.00.
- IV. Reformation in Poland: Some Social and Economic Aspects. By PAUL FOX. \$1.50.

FORTY-THIRD SERIES.—1925.—\$5.75.

- I. The Agrarian Movement in North Dakota. By PAUL R. FOSSUM. \$1.75.
- II. The Virginia Frontier, 1764-1768. By LOUIS K. KOONTZ. \$1.50.
- III. The Ordinance Making Powers of the President of the U. S. By JAMES HART. \$2.50; cloth, \$3.00.

FORTY-FOURTH SERIES.—1926.—\$5.75.

- I. Sumptuary Legislation and Personal Regulation in England. By F. ELIZABETH BALDWIN. \$2.50; cloth, \$3.00.
- II. The Doctrine of Continuous Voyage. By H. W. BRIGGS. \$2.00; cloth, \$2.50.
- III. The Wage Policies of Labor Organizations in a Period of Industrial Depression. By V. J. WYCKOFF. \$1.00.

FORTY-FIFTH SERIES.—1927.—\$5.75.

- I. The State as a Party Litigant. By R. D. WATKINS. \$2.00.
- II. The Relation of Thomas Jefferson to American Foreign Policy. By W. K. WOOLERY. \$1.00.
- III. Ecclesiastical Censure at the End of the 15th Century. By W. K. GOTWALD. \$1.00.
- IV. The Constitutional Status and Government of Alaska. By G. W. SPICER. \$1.25; cloth, \$1.75.

FORTY-SIXTH SERIES.—1928.—\$5.75.

- I. Mission of William Carmichael to Spain. By S. G. COE. \$1.00.
- II. The Workers (Communist) Party and American Trade Unions. By D. M. SCHNEIDER. \$1.25.
- III. The Virginia Constitutional Convention of 1901-1902. By R. C. McDANIEL. \$1.50.
- IV. The Protection of Citizens Abroad by the Armed Forces. By M. OFFUTT. \$1.50.

FORTY-SEVENTH SERIES.—1929.—\$5.75.

- I. Congressional Investigating Committees. By M. E. DIMOCK. \$1.75.
- II. A Study of Judicial Administration in Maryland. By G. K. REIBLICH. \$1.50.
- III. Financial History of Baltimore, 1900-26. By L. O. REA. \$1.25.
- IV. Franco-German Relations, 1878-1885. By R. H. WIENEFFELD. \$1.50.

FORTY-EIGHTH SERIES.—1930.—\$5.75.

- I. Economic and Social Aspects of Federal Reclamation. By DOROTHY LAMPEN. \$1.25.
- II. Russo-American Relations, 1815-1867. By B. P. THOMAS. \$1.75.
- III. The Maryland Legislature. By HARRY JOSEPH GREEN. \$1.00; cloth, \$1.50.
- IV. Southern Commercial Conventions, 1837-1860. By HERBERT WENDER. \$2.00.

FORTY-NINTH SERIES.—1931.—\$5.75.

- I. The Departments of the American Federation of Labor. By ALBERT HELBIG. \$1.25.
- II. State Legislative Committees. By C. I. WINSLOW. \$1.50.
- III. French Opposition to the Mexican Policy of the Second Empire. By F. E. LALLY. \$1.50.
- IV. Henry Charles Carey: A Study in American Economic Thought. By A. D. H. KAPLAN. \$1.00.

FIFTIETH SERIES.—1932.—\$5.75.

- I. Hours of Labor. By LAZARE TEPER. \$1.00.
- II. Some Presidential Interpretations of the Presidency. By NORMAN J. SMALL. \$1.75.
- III. The Governor of Maryland. By CHARLES JAMES ROHR. \$1.50; cloth, \$2.00.
- IV. The Yellow Dog Contract. By JOEL I. SEIDMAN. \$1.00.

FIFTY-FIRST SERIES.—1933.—\$5.75.

- I. Studies on Scipio Africanus. By RICHARD M. HAYWOOD. \$1.00.
- II. The Right of Search and the Slave Trade in Anglo-American Relations, 1814-1862. By HUGH G. SOULASY. \$1.75.
- III. American Policy of Recognition Towards Mexico. By STUART A. MACCORKELE. \$1.00.
- IV. Mathew Carey: A Study in American Economic Development. By KENNETH W. ROWE. \$1.25.
- V. Hezekiah Niles as an Economist. By RICHARD GABRIEL STONE. \$1.25; cloth, \$1.75.

FIFTY-SECOND SERIES.—1934.—\$5.75.

- I. Italy's Relations with England, 1896-1905. By JAMES LINUS GLANVILLE. \$1.50.
- II. The Capital Issues Committee and War Finance Corporation. By WOODBURY WILLOUGHBY. \$1.25.
- III. Maryland Business Corporations, 1783-1852. By JOSEPH G. BLANDI. \$1.25.
- IV. The American Doctrine of State Succession. By HERBERT A. WILKINSON. \$1.25.

FIFTY-THIRD SERIES.—1935.—\$5.75.

- I. The Juristic Status of Egypt and the Sudan. By VERNON A. O'ROURKE. \$1.50.
- II. Workmen's Compensation in Maryland. By EVELYN ELLEN SINGLETON. \$1.25.
- III. Mutual Savings Banks in Baltimore. By ROBERT W. THON, JR. \$1.25.
- IV. Contribution of the Ideologues to French Revolutionary Thought. By C. H. VAN DUZEN. \$1.50.

FIFTY-FOURTH SERIES.—1936.—\$5.75.

- I. The Movement for the Acquisition of All Mexico, 1846-1848. By J. D. P. FULLER. \$1.50.
- II. The Gas Light Company of Baltimore: A Study of Natural Monopoly. By G. T. BROWN. \$1.00.
- III. The Journeymen Barbers' International Union of America. By W. S. HALL. \$1.25.
- IV. The Supreme Court and Political Questions. By C. G. POST. \$1.25; cloth, \$1.75.

FIFTY-FIFTH SERIES.—1937.—\$5.75.

- I. Germany and Morocco Before 1905. By FRANCIS T. WILLIAMSON. \$2.00.
- II. History and Development of the Fourth Amendment of the United States Constitution. By NELSON B. LASSON. \$1.50.
- III. The Influence of Border Troubles on Relations Between the United States and Mexico, 1876-1910. By ROBERT GREGG. \$2.00.
- IV. The Floating Debt of the Federal Government, 1919-1936. By E. R. VAN SANT. \$1.00.

FIFTY-SIXTH SERIES.—1938.—\$5.75.

- I. Commercial Banking and the Stock Market before 1863. By J. E. HEDGES. \$1.60.
- II. Industry and Commerce of the City of Rome. 50 B. C.-200 A. D. By HELEN J. LOANE. \$1.50.
- III. The Investment Value of Goodwill. By L. N. BLOOMBERG. 75 cents.
- IV. Historical Scholarship in the United States, 1876-1901: As Revealed in the Correspondence of Herbert B. Adams. Edited by W. S. HOLT. \$2.50; cloth, \$3.00.

FIFTY-SEVENTH SERIES.—1939.—\$5.75.

- I. A History of Criminal Syndicalism Legislation in the United States. By E. F. DOWELL. \$1.50.
- II. The Wholesale Marketing of Fruits and Vegetables in Baltimore. By R. G. DEUPREE. \$1.25.
- III. The History of the Woman's Peace Party. By M. L. DEGEN. \$2.50; cloth, \$2.75.

FIFTY-EIGHTH SERIES.—1940.—\$5.75

- I. Malaria and Colonization in the Carolina Low Country, 1826-1696. By ST. JULIEN RAVENEL CHILDS. \$2.60.
- II. Municipal Indebtedness: A Study of the Debt-to-Property Ratio. By LEROY A. SHATTUCK, JR. \$1.25.
- III. The Security Affiliates of National Banks. By WILLIAM NELSON PEACH. \$1.50.

FIFTY-NINTH SERIES.—1941.—\$5.75.

- I. Investment Management: An Analysis of the Experience in American Management Investment Trusts. By JOHN A. LOFTUS. \$1.50.
- II. Baltimore 1870-1900: Studies in Social History. By CHARLES B. HIRSCHFELD. \$1.50.
- III. The National Bituminous Coal Commission: Administration of the Bituminous Coal Act, 1937-1941. By RALPH H. BAKER. \$3.00; cloth, \$3.50.

SIXTIETH SERIES.—1942.—\$6.00.

- I. From Barter to Slavery: The Economic Relations of Portuguese and Indians in the Settlement of Brazil, 1500-1580. By ALEXANDER MARCHANT. \$1.50.
- II. Geopolitik: Doctrine of National Self-Sufficiency and Empire. By JOHANNES MATTERN. \$1.50.
- III. The Question of Expatriation in America Prior to 1907. By I-MIEN TSIANG. \$1.50; cloth, \$2.25.
- IV. Public Trusteeship. By NORMAN HEANEY. \$1.50.

SIXTY-FIRST SERIES.—1943.—\$6.25.

- I. Maryland During and After the Revolution: A Political and Economic Study. By PHILIP A. CROWL. \$1.75.
- II. Charles J. Bonaparte, Patrician Reformer: His Earlier Career. By ERIC F. GOLDMAN. \$1.50.
- III. Studies in the History of the English Feudal Barony. By SIDNEY PAINTER. \$2.00.
- IV. The Economic Thought of Woodrow Wilson. By WILLIAM DIAMOND. \$2.00; cloth, \$2.50.

SIXTY-SECOND SERIES.—1944.—\$6.25.

- I. Andrea Barbarigo, Merchant of Venice, 1418-1449. By FREDERIC C. LANE. \$2.25.
- II. The Growth of German Historicism. By FRIEDRICH ENGEL-JANOSI. \$1.25.
- III. The Wheats of Classical Antiquity. By N. JASNY. \$1.75.

SIXTY-THIRD SERIES.—1945.—\$6.25.

(Complete in three numbers.)

- I. Henry Barnard's "American Journal of Education." By RICHARD E. THURSFIELD. \$3.00; cloth, \$3.75.
- II. The Roman Rhetorical Schools as a Preparation for the Courts Under the Early Empire. By E. PATRICK PARKS. \$1.25.
- III. The Slave States in the Presidential Election of 1860. By OLLINGER CRENSHAW. \$3.00; cloth, \$3.75.

SIXTY-FOURTH SERIES.—1946.—\$6.50.

(Complete in three numbers.)

- I. The Great National Project: A History of the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal. By WALTER S. SANDERLIN. \$3.00; cloth \$3.75.
- II. Richard Hildreth. By DONALD E. EMERSON. \$2.00.
- III. William Rufus Day: Supreme Court Justice from Ohio. By JOSEPH E. McLEAN. \$2.00.

The set of sixty-four series of Studies is offered (except volumes one, two, four, seven, eight, and twenty), uniformly bound in cloth (where possible), for library use, for \$287.00 net. The separate volumes may be had bound in cloth, where possible, at the prices stated.

EXTRA VOLUMES OF STUDIES IN HISTORICAL AND POLITICAL SCIENCE

* Out of print

- *I. The Republic of New Haven. By CHARLES H. LEVERMORE.
- II. Philadelphia, 1681-1887. By EDWARD P. ALLINSON and BOIES
PENROSE. 444 pages. 8vo. Cloth. \$3.00.
- *III. Baltimore and the Nineteenth of April, 1861. By GEORGE WILLIAM
BROWN.
- IV. Local Constitutional History of the United States. By GEORGE
E. HOWARD.—Volume I—Development of the Township, Hundred
and Shire. 542 pages. 8vo. Cloth. \$3.00.
- VI. The Negro in Maryland. By JEFFREY R. BRACKETT. 270 pages.
8vo. Cloth. \$2.00.
- *VII. The Supreme Court of the United States. By W. W. WILLOUGHBY.
- VIII. The Intercourse between the U. S. and Japan. By INAZO (OTA)
NITORE. 198 pages. 8vo. Cloth. \$1.25.
- *IX. State and Federal Government in Switzerland. By JOHN MARTIN
VINCENT.
- X. Spanish Institutions of the Southwest. By FRANK W. BLACKMAR.
380 pages. 8vo. Cloth. \$2.00.
- XI. An Introduction to the Study of the Constitution. By MORRIS M.
COHN. 250 pages. 8vo. Cloth. \$1.50.
- XII. The Old English Manor. By C. M. ANDREWS. 280 pages. 8vo.
Cloth. \$1.50.
- *XIII. America: Its Geographical History, 1492-1892. By WALTER B.
SCAIFE.
- *XIV. Florentine Life During the Renaissance. By WALTER B. SCAIFE.
- *XV. The Southern Quakers and Slavery. By STEPHEN B. WEEKS.
- *XVI. Contemporary American Opinion of the French Revolution. By C.
D. HAZEN.
- *XVII. Industrial Experiments in the British Colonies of North America.
By ELEANOR L. LORD.
- XVIII. State Aid to Higher Education: A Series of Addresses at The
Johns Hopkins University. 100 pages. 8vo. Cloth. \$1.00.
- *XIX. Irrigation in Utah. By C. H. BROUGH.
- XX. Financial History of Baltimore. By J. H. HOLLANDER. 400 pages.
8vo. Cloth. \$2.00.
- XXI. Cuba and International Relations. By J. M. CALLAHAN. 503 pages.
8vo. Cloth. \$3.00.
- XXII. The American Workman. By E. LEVASSEUR (translation). 540
pages. 8vo. Cloth. \$3.00.
- XXIII. Herbert B. Adams. A Memorial Volume. 232 pages. 8vo. Cloth.
\$1.00.
- *XXIV. A History of Slavery in Virginia. By J. C. BALLAGH.
- XXV. The Finances and Administration of Providence, 1636-1901. By
HOWARD K. STOKES. 474 pages. 8vo. Cloth. \$3.50.
- XXVI. The Adoption of the Fourteenth Amendment. By HORACE E.
FLACK. 280 pages. 8vo. Cloth. \$2.00.

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS • BALTIMORE 18

EXTRA VOLUMES OF STUDIES IN HISTORICAL AND POLITICAL SCIENCE

NEW SERIES

* Out of print

- *I. The Revision and Amendment of State Constitutions. By W. F. DODD.
- II. The Ordinance Power of the Japanese Emperor. By TOMIO NAKANO. 288 pages. 8vo. \$2.50.
- III. The Government of China (1644-1911). By P. C. HSIEH. 414 pages. 8vo. \$3.00.
- IV. The International Aspects of Electrical Communications in the Pacific Area. By L. B. TRIBOLET. 290 pages. 8vo. \$2.50.
- V. The Romanization of Africa Proconsularis. By T. R. S. BROUGHTON. 242 pages. 8vo. \$2.25.
- VI. The Practice and Procedure of International Conferences. By F. S. DUNN. 244 pages. 8vo. \$2.50.
- VII. India's Political Crisis. By WILLIAM I. HULL. 208 pages. 8vo. \$2.00.
- VIII. The International Mandates. By AARON M. MARGALITH. 251 pages. 8vo. \$2.50.
- IX. Tenure of Office Under the Constitution: A Study in Law and Public Policy. By JAMES HART. 393 pages. 8vo. \$3.50.
- X. Slavery Agitation in Virginia, 1829-1832. By THEODORE M. WHITFIELD. 172 pages. 8vo. \$1.75.
- XI. The International Aspect of the Missionary Movement in China. By CHAO-KWANG WU. 294 pages. 8vo. \$2.50.
- XII. The Anglo-Japanese Alliance. By CHUNG-FU CHANG. 328 pages. 8vo. \$2.75.
- XIII. Municipal Expenditures. By MABEL L. WALKER. 207 pages. 8vo. \$2.25.
- XIV. The Foreign Relations of the Federal State. By HAROLD W. STOKES. 240 pages. 8vo. \$2.25.
- XV. The Federal Trust Policy. By JOHN D. CLARK. 310 pages. 8vo. \$2.75.
- XVI. National Collective Bargaining in the Pottery Industry. By DAVID A. McCABE. 459 pages. 8vo. \$3.50.
- XVII. The New Balance of Power in Europe. By VALENTINE DE BALLA. 212 pages. 8vo. \$2.00.
- XVIII. The Capitulatory Régime of Turkey: Its History, Origin, and Nature. By NASIM SOUSA. 401 pages. 8vo. \$3.50.
- XIX. The Federal Reserve Board: A Study of Federal Reserve Structure and Credit Control. By WILLIAM O. WEYFORTH. 224 pages. 8vo. \$2.25.
- XX. The Unanimity Rule and the League of Nations. By CROMWELL A. RICHES. 236 pages. 8vo. \$2.25.
- XXI. The Foreign Debt of the Argentine Republic. By H. E. PETERS. 196 pages. 8vo. \$2.00.
- XXII. Tobacco Regulation in Colonial Maryland. By V. J. WYCKOFF. 238 pages. 8vo. \$2.25.
- XXIII. British Corporation Finance 1775-1850, A Study of Preference Shares. By GEORGE H. EVANS, JR. 216 pages. 8vo. \$2.25.
- XXIV. The Political Doctrines of Sun Yat-Sen. An Exposition of the *Sun Min Chu I*. By PAUL M. A. LINEBARGER. 292 pages. 8vo. \$2.75.
- XXV. The Delaware Corporation. By RUSSELL C. LARCOM. 210 pages. 8vo. \$2.25.
- XXVI. Tench Coxe: A Study in American Economic Development. By HAROLD HUTCHESON. 236 pages. 8vo. \$2.25.
- XXVII. The Baltimore Clearing House. By CHARLES A. HALES. 360 pages. 8vo. \$3.00.
- *XXVIII. Majority Rule in International Organization. By CROMWELL A. RICHES.
- XXIX. Constitution-Making in a Democracy, Theory and Practice in New York State. By VERNON A. O'ROURKE and DOUGLAS W. CAMPBELL. 299 pages. 8vo. \$2.75.

