

The Historical Journal

<http://journals.cambridge.org/HIS>

Additional services for *The Historical Journal*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)



PACIFISM IN FIN-DE-SIÈCLE AUSTRIA: THE POLITICS AND LIMITS OF PEACE ACTIVISM

DANIEL LAQUA

The Historical Journal / Volume 57 / Issue 01 / March 2014, pp 199 - 224
DOI: 10.1017/S0018246X1300037X, Published online: 29 January 2014

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0018246X1300037X

How to cite this article:

DANIEL LAQUA (2014). PACIFISM IN FIN-DE-SIÈCLE AUSTRIA: THE POLITICS AND LIMITS OF PEACE ACTIVISM . The Historical Journal, 57, pp 199-224
doi:10.1017/S0018246X1300037X

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

PACIFISM IN FIN-DE-SIÈCLE AUSTRIA: THE POLITICS AND LIMITS OF PEACE ACTIVISM*

DANIEL LAQUA
University of Northumbria

ABSTRACT. *The late Habsburg Monarchy produced two of the most renowned peace activists of their day: Bertha von Suttner and Alfred Fried. In comparison to these two Nobel Peace laureates, the main association of Austro-pacifism – the Österreichische Friedensgesellschaft (ÖFG) – is less well known. The article concentrates on this organization, which had been founded in 1891, and it draws attention to the political and intellectual environment in which it operated. The ÖFG originated in the milieu of Austro-German liberalism, but had an ambivalent rapport with liberal politics. The Austro-pacifists' focus on supranational principles and dynastic loyalty sat uneasily with the national dimensions of Cisleithanian politics. The obstacles encountered by the ÖFG illustrate wider aspects of the political culture of fin-de-siècle Austria, ranging from the question of militarism in Austrian society to the challenges created by socialist and nationalist movements. As a whole, the article highlights the inherent limitations of Austro-pacifism, as reflected in its quest for respectability and its acceptance of the social and political order.*

In 1905, the Austrian baroness Bertha von Suttner became the first female recipient of the Nobel Peace Prize, praised for having ‘taken the lead among women of today’ in the struggle against war.¹ She had been an internationally renowned campaigner ever since the publication of her anti-war novel *Die Waffen nieder* in 1889 and was credited with influencing Alfred Nobel’s endowment of the peace award.² Accordingly, many of her supporters deemed the honour long overdue: as a liberal Austrian newspaper put it, she ‘might have been considered worthy of the Prize already earlier on’.³ Only six years later,

Department of Humanities, Faculty of Arts, Design and Social Sciences, Northumbria University, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE1 8ST daniel.laqua@northumbria.ac.uk

* The author wishes to thank Tim Kirk, Axel Körner, and Matthew Potter for their comments on this article, Robert J. W. Evans for his earlier advice on Austrian history, and the article’s anonymous reviewers for their thoughtful observations and invaluable suggestions.

¹ Jørgen Gunnarsson Løvland, ‘Banquet speech’, in Frederick Haberman, ed., *Nobel Lectures including presentation speeches and laureates’ biographies: peace, 1910–1925* (Singapore, 1999), pp. 82–3.

² Brigitte Hamann, *Bertha von Suttner: Ein Leben für den Frieden* (Munich, 1986), pp. 330–44.

³ *Neues Wiener Tagblatt*, 11 Dec. 1905, as cited in Brigitte Hamann, ‘Bertha von Suttner and Alfred Hermann Fried’, in Karl Holl and Anne Kjelling, eds., *The Nobel Peace Prize and the*

one of Suttner's closest associates received the same accolade: the Viennese journalist Alfred Hermann Fried was rewarded for having 'devoted his entire life [since 1891] to work for peace, one of the few men to do so'.⁴

Suttner and Fried represented a wider international movement, as reflected in congresses and peace societies with transnational links. Like their counterparts in other countries, the two Austro-German activists drew attention to the horrors of war, argued for disarmament, and campaigned for new international institutions and the extension of international law. The very term 'pacifism' originated in Suttner and Fried's lifetime: as a neologism coined in 1901, it described a general commitment to the principles of peace and arbitration. However, it did not denote a categorical rejection of violence and could hence involve an acceptance of defensive wars.⁵ 'Patriotic pacifism' is therefore an apt label for the stance of many European activists.⁶ Most of them did not question the social order, and their preference for reform over revolution contrasted with socialist anti-militarism. Fittingly, Roger Chickering has viewed pacifists in Imperial Germany as 'small groups of ardent liberals . . . drawn from the ranks of those who were opposed to the illiberal aspects of the empire and who also rejected social revolution'.⁷

The fact that two major pre-war pacifists stemmed from Austria is at once striking and plausible: international crises impacted significantly on the Habsburg Monarchy, owing to its geopolitical role and the growing national tensions within the monarchy itself. These circumstances produced significant challenges for the Austrian peace movement, and its history has therefore been presented as 'a story of frustration, apathy and defeat'.⁸ In this context, the pacifists' ambivalent relationship with Austro-German liberalism was a significant factor. Austro-pacifism grew from the political and social milieu of liberalism – yet, as Christian Jansen has argued, liberal movements contained forms of militarism early on and maintained an 'elective affinity with modern

laureates: the meaning and acceptance of the Nobel Peace Prize in the prize winners' countries (Frankfurt, 1994), p. 86.

⁴ Løvland, 'Presentation', in Haberman, ed., *Nobel lectures*, p. 238. On Fried, see Petra Schönemann-Behrens, *Alfred Hermann Fried: Friedensaktivist – Nobelpreisträger* (Zurich, 2011) and Walter Göhring, *Verdrängt und Vergessen: Friedensnobelpreisträger Alfred Hermann Fried* (Vienna, 2006).

⁵ Karl Holl, 'Pazifismus', in Otto Brunner, ed., *Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe: historisches Lexikon zur politisch-sozialen Sprache in Deutschland* (8 vols., Stuttgart, 1978), iv, pp. 771–3. The term 'pacific-ism' explicitly makes this distinction: Martin Ceadel, *Thinking about peace and war* (Oxford, 1987), p. 5.

⁶ Sandi Cooper, *Patriotic pacifism: waging war on war in Europe 1815–1914* (New York, NY, 1991).

⁷ Roger Chickering, *Imperial Germany and a world without war: the peace movement and German society, 1892–1914* (Princeton, NJ, 1975), p. 121. Cf. Karl Holl, *Pazifismus in Deutschland* (Frankfurt, 1988), p. 15.

⁸ Richard R. Laurence, 'The problem of peace and Austrian society, 1889–1914: a study in the cultural origins of the First World War' (PhD thesis, Stanford, CA, 1968), p. 259.

antagonistic nationalism'.⁹ Austrian liberalism was a multifarious phenomenon, albeit with unifying characteristics such as constitutionalism, anti-clericalism, and appeals to the *Bürgertum*. Its main party comprised different factions and experienced further fragmentation after 1879. Over the subsequent decades, liberals competed with political Catholicism, socialism, and different nationalist movements.¹⁰ In this period, liberal activists themselves increasingly embraced language-based politics, in particular in border regions.¹¹ The national dimensions of fin-de-siècle liberalism ensured uneasy relations with pacifists, who strove to be acceptable to liberals while championing supranational ideas and loyalty to the monarchy.

An examination of Austro-pacifism thus involves much wider issues: it draws attention to domestic obstacles for the peace movement, but also sheds light on the political culture of the late Habsburg Monarchy. Traditionally, scholarship on Austrian peace activism focuses on the figure of Suttner. In contrast, this article considers a broader cast of characters. It draws particular attention to the *Österreichische Friedensgesellschaft* (ÖFG), whose 'relative neglect by scholars of Austrian pacifism' has been noted by Richard Laurence.¹² Founded by Suttner in 1891 as *Österreichische Gesellschaft der Friedensfreunde*, it was the principal Austro-German peace organization. Although the ÖFG's statutes described it as 'apolitical', Austria-Hungary's internal dynamics invested peace activism with political meanings. By contextualizing the work of the ÖFG, the article reveals the domestic implications of promoting international reconciliation in a multinational empire.

I

Before Suttner's rise to prominence, key stimuli for the Austrian peace movement came from the Viennese democrat Adolf Fischhof and the Styrian liberal Robert von Walterskirchen. Both were well-known politicians: the former had played a major role during the 1848 revolution, and the latter became a deputy in the Austrian *Reichsrat* in 1873. Already, three years before being elected, Walterskirchen called for an international association of deputies; by 1880, he specified his ideas on disarmament and the international co-operation

⁹ Christian Jansen, 'Die Militarisierung der bürgerlichen Gesellschaft im 19. Jahrhundert', in idem, ed., *Der Bürger als Soldat: Die Militarisierung europäischer Gesellschaften im langen 19. Jahrhundert: ein internationaler Vergleich* (Essen, 2004), p. 9.

¹⁰ Pieter Judson, *Exclusive revolutionaries: liberal politics, social experience, and national identity in the Austrian empire, 1848–1914* (Ann Arbor, MI, 1996); John Boyer, *Political radicalism in late Imperial Vienna: origins of the Christian Social movement, 1848–1897* (Chicago, IL, 1981). On the transformations of liberal politics, see Allan Janik, 'Vienna 1900 revisited: paradigms and problems', in Steven Beller, ed., *Rethinking Vienna, 1900* (New York, 2001), pp. 27–56.

¹¹ Pieter Judson, *Guardians of the nation: activists on the language frontiers of Imperial Austria* (Cambridge, MA, 2006).

¹² Richard R. Laurence, 'Bertha von Suttner and the peace movement in Austria to World War I', *Austrian History Yearbook*, 23 (1992), pp. 181–201, at p. 200.

of parliamentarians.¹³ In this context, he drew on the writings of Fischhof, who had discussed this issue in 1875. Fischhof criticized the economic burden of war policies and favoured the creation of a ‘general Representative Diet of Nations’ that would initiate international disarmament.¹⁴ The ÖFG later acknowledged Fischhof’s influence and sponsored a wreath at his funeral.¹⁵

Richard Laurence has concluded that ‘Fischhof’s proposals were not those of a pacifist’ because of his acceptance of defensive wars.¹⁶ Yet, such an assessment risks obscuring the nature of the international peace movement in this period: like Fischhof, many peace activists championed arbitration and transnational co-operation without ruling out wars entirely. Fittingly, an English version of Fischhof’s writings followed shortly after their original publication. The translator, a radical MP, stated in his introduction that no one ‘would have read [this pamphlet] with greater interest than Richard Cobden’.¹⁷ Reflecting such transnational links, the Spanish campaigner Arturo de Marcoartu addressed a meeting of forty-three Austrian parliamentarians in 1876. The event – fondly recalled by the visitor over fifteen years later – resulted in a short-lived committee for a ‘congress of parliaments’, with Walterskirchen among its members.¹⁸ Furthermore, by 1882, the International Peace and Arbitration Society listed eight Austrian adherents, including the liberal deputy Peter Freiherr von Pirquet. Although no Austrian was present at the organization’s international congress in Brussels that year, both Fischhof and Pirquet sent messages of support.¹⁹

The efforts of Fischhof, Walterskirchen, and Pirquet suggest that early Austrian peace activism involved both democrats and liberals. The divide between these two political currents had already become apparent in 1848, as democrats advocated further-reaching social and political change. Admittedly, in the late 1860s, the Democratic Clubs and the liberals could be viewed as ‘branches of a still common movement, like the radicals in the British liberal movement’.²⁰ Nonetheless, the liberal movement was ‘institutionally splintered’ – and this was the case even before it lost its dominant role in

¹³ Robert Freiherr von Walterskirchen, *Zur Abrüstungs-Frage* (Vienna, 1880). Cf. Richard Charmatz, *Adolf Fischhof* (Stuttgart, 1910), p. 400.

¹⁴ Adolf Fischhof, *On the reduction of continental armies*, trans. H.W. Freeland (London, 1875), p. 16. ¹⁵ ‘Adolf Fischhof †’, *Die Waffen nieder!*, 2 (1893), pp. 161–2.

¹⁶ Laurence, ‘The problem of peace’, p. 135. On Fischhof and Walterskirchen, see *ibid.*, pp. 101–2.

¹⁷ Humphrey William Freeland in Fischhof, *Reduction of continental armies*, p. 4.

¹⁸ Preface by Arturo de Marcoartu in *Jahresbericht der Oesterreichischen Gesellschaft der Friedensfreunde für 1892* (Vienna, 1893), p. 14; Charmatz, *Fischhof*, pp. 417–8; Cooper, *Patriotic pacifism*, p. 49.

¹⁹ L’Association Internationale de l’arbitrage et de la Paix de la Grande Bretagne et de l’Irlande, *Procès verbal de la conférence internationale tenue à Bruxelles, le 17, 18, 19, et 20 Octobre, 1882* (London, 1883), pp. viii and 216.

²⁰ Robin Okey, *The Habsburg Monarchy, c. 1765–1918* (Basingstoke, 2001), p. 209.

Cisleithanian politics at the end of the 1870s.²¹ In 1882, both Fischhof and Walterskirchen contributed to the abortive effort to found a German People's Party, seeking to unite different left-liberal and democratic groups. When the ÖFG was launched in 1891, it involved figures who had supported the plans for this party: Theodor Hertzka, editor of the *Wiener Allgemeine Zeitung*, co-founded the peace society; Walterskirchen joined it; and Fischhof gave his blessing.²² Two years later, the leader of the Viennese democrats, Ferdinand Kronawetter, presented the 'peace and arbitration idea' to the Delegations, the joint session of representatives from the Hungarian and Cisleithanian parliaments.²³ However, given the small numbers of democrats in parliament, the ÖFG's path to political influence seemed to lead through the moderate liberals. This strategy was particularly important since the outlooks of the two growing Austro-German mass parties of the 1890s – the Social Democrats and the Christian Socials – differed significantly from the Austro-pacifists, as later parts of this article will show.

The Inter-Parliamentary Union (IPU) was a key vehicle for engaging liberal deputies. This international organization had been founded in 1889 to unite parliamentarians from different countries and to support campaigns for peace and arbitration.²⁴ In 1903, Vienna hosted an Inter-Parliamentary Conference, opened by the liberal prime minister Ernst von Körber. By 1913, over 100 Austrian deputies – most of them liberals – had joined the IPU, amounting to one out of five members of the lower chamber.²⁵ The Inter-Parliamentary Conferences often shared delegates and the host city with the Universal Peace Congresses, which were the main events of international pacifism. For instance, in 1896, Budapest hosted both an Inter-Parliamentary Conference and a Universal Peace Congress, with considerable public resonance.²⁶ Suttner viewed the conferences and congresses as two chambers of one 'peace parliament'.²⁷ Accordingly, the masthead of the periodical *Die Waffen nieder!* – named after Suttner's famous pacifist novel – described it as the 'organ of the Inter-Parliamentary Conference, the International Peace Bureau

²¹ *Ibid.*, p. 210.

²² Hamann, *Bertha von Suttner*, pp. 158–9.

²³ 'Von den Delegationen', *Die Waffen nieder!*, 4 (1895), p. 260.

²⁴ Ralph Uhlig, *Die Interparlamentarische Union, 1889–1914* (Stuttgart, 1988). On visions of the IPU as the nucleus of a world parliament, see William Albers, 'Between the crisis of democracy and world parliament: the Inter-Parliamentary Union in the 1920s', *Journal of Global History*, 7 (2012), pp. 189–209.

²⁵ The numbers for Hungary were 197 out of 453 members of the Chamber of Representatives; for Imperial Germany, 67 out of 397 *Reichstag* deputies; for France, 343 out of 584 *deputés*; for Britain, 197 out of 670 MPs: Alfred Fried, *Handbuch der Friedensbewegung* (2nd edn, 2 vols., Vienna, 1913), II, p. 263.

²⁶ Peter van den Dungen, 'The political engagement of Bertha von Suttner', in Internationaler Bertha-von-Suttner-Verein, ed., *Friede – Fortschritt – Frauen: Friedensnobelpreisträgerin Bertha von Suttner auf Schloss Harmannsdorf* (Vienna, 2007), pp. 100–1; Endro Ustor, 'A Budapest peace congress in 1896', *New Hungarian Quarterly*, 22 (1981), pp. 154–9.

²⁷ 'Nachklänge vom Friedens-Congress', *Die Waffen nieder!*, 2 (1892), p. 5.

in Bern and the Peace Society in Vienna'. In Austria, the connection between pacifism and inter-parliamentarianism was personified by Pirquet, who headed the Austrian IPU delegation and remained involved in the ÖFG.

The IPU managed to attract some political support as it focused on the least controversial parts of the peace agenda, especially arbitration, which was 'probably the single most influential strand of internationalism' before 1914.²⁸ In contrast, liberals were reluctant to get involved in the ÖFG, whose criticism extended to armaments policies and the military. Pirquet therefore remained the sole deputy to be consistently active in the association. The views of Ernst von Plener, the liberals' parliamentary leader in the 1890s, illustrate this ambivalence. He succeeded Pirquet as head of the Austrian IPU delegation and presided over the Inter-Parliamentary Conference of 1903. His role in drafting proposals for compulsory arbitration seemed to underscore his internationalist credentials, and he has even been described as a 'leading spokesman' of the 'Liberal peace advocates'.²⁹ Yet Plener declined the invitation to chair pacifist events and denounced the Universal Peace Congresses as 'foolish'.³⁰ In his correspondence with Alfred Fried, he stressed his unwillingness to be associated with pacifism.³¹ He thus 'shared the ambivalent involvement with the peace movement characteristic of Austrian liberalism'.³²

Plener's stance needs to be understood in the context of his party's fall from power after their opposition to the occupation of Bosnia in 1878. Andrew Whiteside has described anti-militarism as 'the principal immediate cause of the Germans' loss of the "commanding heights" of government'.³³ Ten years later, Plener explained how these events had triggered a revision of his party's critique of armaments.³⁴ His memoirs also expressed regret about earlier liberal opposition to military expenditure.³⁵ Plener's response to his party's declining influence was to work within the Austrian institutions: in 1895, he accepted the presidency of the Supreme Court of Accounts. His attitude contrasted with Walterskirchen who in 1880 stated his disinterest in

²⁸ Mark Mazower, *Governing the world: the history of an idea* (London, 2012), p. 83.

²⁹ Solomon Wank, 'The Austrian peace movement and the Habsburg ruling elite, 1906–1914', in Charles Chatfield and Peter van den Dungen, eds., *Peace movements and political cultures* (Knoxville, TX, 1988), p. 43.

³⁰ Ernst von Plener, *Erinnerungen* (3 vols., Stuttgart, 1921), III, p. 334.

³¹ Plener to Fried, 14 Apr. 1911, Fried correspondence, box 74, in Fried-Suttner papers, League of Nations Archives, United Nations Library Geneva (henceforth FSP).

³² Richard R. Lawrence, 'Ernst von Plener', in Harold Josephson, ed., *Biographical dictionary of modern peace leaders* (London, 1985), p. 758. Laurence ('The problem of peace', p. 239) speaks of the 'chauvinistic, self-righteous tone' of Plener and other members of his party.

³³ Andrew Whiteside, *The socialism of fools: Georg Ritter von Schönerer and Austrian Pan-Germanism* (London, 1975), p. 20. See also Lothar Höbelt, 'The Bosnian Crisis revisited: why did the Austrian liberals oppose Andrassy?', in idem and T. G. Otte, eds., *A living anachronism? European diplomacy and the Habsburg Monarchy* (Vienna, 2010), pp. 179–98.

³⁴ Speech on 7 Dec. 1888: Ernst von Plener, *Reden 1873–1911* (Stuttgart, 1913), pp. 459–67.

³⁵ Plener, *Erinnerungen*, III, p. 534.

government participation.³⁶ Evidently, the latter stance made an alignment with the peace movement much easier.

The attitudes to pacifism thus connected with power-political considerations. In this respect, the orientation of the Austrian Foreign Office was a complicating factor. Under the foreign minister Alois von Aehrenthal, it had the reputation of being populated by 'narrow-minded, frivolous, and arrogant aristocrats'.³⁷ Aehrenthal himself spoke out against both the IPU and the peace movement, perceiving both of them as challenges to the existing order.³⁸ Solomon Wank has confirmed the ministry's conservative nature, although he has pointed out that Habsburg foreign policy 'became more aggressive and more expansionist' after Aehrenthal's death in 1912.³⁹ Even before his ministerial tenure, Austro-Hungarian diplomats rejected a permanent arbitration tribunal during the negotiations at the Hague Peace Conference of 1899. At the successor conference in 1907, they opposed armaments limitations and compulsory arbitration in international disputes.⁴⁰ Seen from this angle, any push towards the peace movement's goals implied a challenge to key features of Habsburg policy.

The limited support for the ÖFG mirrored the situation in Imperial Germany where the main party on the liberal left was reluctant to support pacifism.⁴¹ Alfred Fried conceived academia as the arena in which pacifism's isolation could be overcome, as exemplified by the foundation of the *Verband für internationale Verständigung* under the law professor Ottfried Nippold in 1911. In Austria, the ÖFG member Arthur Müller adopted a similar strategy when launching the *Österreichischer Völkerverständigungs- und Freundschaftsverband 'Para Pacem'* in 1914. Out of its 101 founding signatories, 50 were university professors. Fried's plan of a banquet in honour of Heinrich Lammasch, the legal scholar and Austrian delegate to the Hague Peace Conferences, can also be seen in this context.⁴² Fried even received Plener's backing for this event, which was attended by the former prime minister Paul Gautsch.⁴³ In 1914, Fried invited Lammasch to preside over the Universal Peace Congress that was

³⁶ Lothar Höbelt, *Kornblume und Kaiseradler: Die deutschfreiheitlichen Parteien Altösterreichs, 1882–1918* (Munich, 1993), p. 21.

³⁷ William Godsey Jr, *Aristocratic redoubt: the Austro-Hungarian Foreign Office on the eve of the First World War* (West Lafayette, IN, 1999), p. 103.

³⁸ Cooper, *Patriotic pacifism*, pp. 107 and 132.

³⁹ Wank, 'The Austrian peace movement and the Habsburg ruling elite', p. 41. See Wank, *In the twilight of empire: Count Alois Lexa von Aehrenthal (1854–1912), Imperial Habsburg patriot and diplomat* (Vienna, 2009).

⁴⁰ F. S. L. Lyons, *Internationalism in Europe, 1815–1914* (Leiden, 1963), p. 353; Fritz Huber, 'Heinrich Lammasch als Völkerrechtsgelehrter und Friedenspolitiker' (D.Phil. thesis, Graz, 1968), pp. 101–5; Solomon Wank, 'Diplomacy against the peace movement: the Austro-Hungarian Foreign Office and the Second Hague Peace Conference of 1907', in idem, ed., *Doves and diplomats: foreign offices and peace movements in Europe and America in the twentieth century* (Westport, CT, 1978), pp. 55–83.

⁴¹ Chickering, *Imperial Germany*, p. 252.

⁴² Lammasch to Fried, 28 Oct., 7 and 15 Nov. 1910, in Fried correspondence, box 73, FSP.

⁴³ 'Die Lammasch-Feier in Wien', *Die Friedens-Warte*, 12 (1910), pp. 223–7.

scheduled to take place in Vienna.⁴⁴ However, Lammasch appears as somewhat exceptional in bridging the gap between ‘leading peace activists... and the highest circles of government’.⁴⁵

II

Given the limited involvement of leading liberals, what was the actual profile of the ÖFG and its members? Bertha von Suttner tends to overshadow the association that she had founded. To the movement’s detractors, pacifism was ‘Suttneri’ and her supporters reinforced this focus. Even during her lifetime, two fellow campaigners – Leopold Katscher and Alfred Fried – published books about her.⁴⁶ Both were significant figures in their own right: Katscher was well known in literary circles and contributed to both Austrian and Hungarian pacifism. Alongside Suttner, he helped establish the Hungarian Peace Society in 1895.⁴⁷ Meanwhile, Fried’s field of action extended to Imperial Germany: he lived and worked in Berlin from 1887 until returning to his hometown Vienna in 1903. In 1892, he co-founded the German Peace Society, which he modelled after the ÖFG. He subsequently fell out with the leadership of the German association, but nonetheless emerged as the leading theorist and publicist of the German-language peace movement. The connection to Suttner was of central importance, as Fried had collaborated with her on the pacifist periodical *Die Waffen nieder!*. This experience enabled him to launch the journal *Die Friedens-Warte* in 1899 – ‘undoubtedly the most efficient periodical of the Pacifist movement in the world’, as the famous British journalist and peace campaigner Norman Angell put it.⁴⁸

In 1891, Suttner optimistically predicted a fast-growing membership for the ÖFG.⁴⁹ Yet, over two years later, its secretary referred to a relatively modest 3,000 members.⁵⁰ In 1905, Fried gave an even lower estimate of 2,000.⁵¹

⁴⁴ Fried to Lammasch, 21 Feb. 1914, in Fried correspondence, box 67, FSP.

⁴⁵ Richard Laurence, ‘The peace movement in Austria, 1867–1914’, in Wank, ed., *Doves and diplomats*, p. 31.

⁴⁶ Leopold Katscher, *Bertha von Suttner, die ‘Schwärmerin’ für Güte* (Dresden, 1903); Alfred Fried, *Bertha von Suttner* (Gautzsch, 1908). The main posthumous studies are Hamann, *Bertha von Suttner*, and Beatrix Kempf, *Bertha von Suttner: das Lebensbild einer großen Frau: Schriftstellerin, Politikerin, Journalistin* (Vienna, 1964).

⁴⁷ Henriett Kovács, *Die Friedensbewegung in Österreich-Ungarn an der Wende zum 20. Jahrhundert* (Herne, 2009), pp. 104–5.

⁴⁸ Norman Angell, ‘Preface’, in Alfred Fried, *The German emperor and the peace of the world* (London, 1912), p. x. On Angell, see Martin Ceadel, *Living the great illusion: Sir Norman Angell, 1857–1967* (Oxford, 2009).

⁴⁹ Bertha von Suttner, *Lebenserinnerungen* (Berlin 1968), p. 255 (orig. 1909).

⁵⁰ Alfred Fürst Wrede, ‘Jahresbericht’, in *Jahresbericht*, p. 15. In contrast, Kovács speaks of 577 members by late 1893: Kovács, *Die Friedensbewegung in Österreich-Ungarn*, p. 77. On membership numbers, see also Hamann, *Bertha von Suttner*, p. 185.

⁵¹ Alfred Fried, *Handbuch der Friedensbewegung* (Leipzig, 1905), unpaginated section ‘Die Friedensbewegung und ihre Organe’.

Although the ÖFG maintained seven branches outside Vienna by that stage,⁵² its main focus was on the Imperial capital. As a whole, the society's membership remained stagnant at best. However, such limited active involvement was not a peculiarity of Austro-pacifism seeing that the ÖFG's British and German counterparts had a comparable profile.⁵³ Importantly, the ÖFG attracted highly educated and often well-connected individuals: for instance, a quarter of the 372 subscribers to an ÖFG booklet in 1892 held a doctorate.⁵⁴ Writers and journalists were well represented, including figures such as Hermann Fürst, who wrote for the liberal high-circulation newspaper *Neues Wiener Tagblatt*.

These observations suggest that the ÖFG bore the characteristics of *Honoratiorenvereinigungen* – 'societies of luminaries' that were the predominant form of association-building among Austro-German liberals.⁵⁵ A Marxist account of the Austrian peace movement later claimed members joined the ÖFG as a token of their 'peace-mindedness' rather than reflecting genuine commitment.⁵⁶ Suttner, however, viewed the passive membership of well-regarded individuals as a vital service, as it helped demonstrate the movement's respectability.⁵⁷ To similar ends, the ÖFG forged links with the associations of teachers and civil servants. Meanwhile, individual members were also involved in Masonic networks: Fried was active in the Viennese lodge *Sokrates* and corresponded with freemasons in other parts of Austria-Hungary.⁵⁸

As a whole, then, the ÖFG was a vehicle for middle-class sociability, although it also involved liberal aristocrats. Only on rare occasions did the association venture towards mass action: in 1910, it claimed 120,000 signatures for an international petition on compulsory arbitration.⁵⁹ By and large, Austro-pacifists focused on the cultural realm, as reflected in their creation of academic and literary organizations with close ties to the ÖFG.⁶⁰ Such endeavours extended to the field of education: in 1894, Leopold Katscher compiled a literary anthology to counter militaristic content in school textbooks.⁶¹ In a similar vein, the ÖFG activist Arthur Müller wrote a *Pacifistisches Jugendbuch* for which the organization acted as co-publisher.⁶²

⁵² *Ibid.*, p. 276.

⁵³ Paul Laity, *The British peace movement, 1870–1914* (Oxford, 2001), p. 114; Chickering, *Imperial Germany*, p. 53.

⁵⁴ 'Zahlungsausweis', in ÖFG, *Jahresbericht*, pp. 31–7.

⁵⁵ Ernst Bruckmüller, *Sozialgeschichte Österreichs* (Vienna, 1985), p. 427; Okey, *Habsburg Monarchy*, p. 134–5. Okey has described 'bourgeois liberals' as a 'largely bookish community' (*ibid.*, p. 207).

⁵⁶ Josef Bauer, 'Die Österreichische Friedensbewegung' (D.Phil. thesis, Vienna, 1949), p. 99.

⁵⁷ Bertha von Suttner, 'Der nächste Friedenskongreß in Rom', *Neue Freie Presse*, 3 Sept. 1891.

⁵⁸ Freimaurer-Loge Eötvös to Fried, 20 May 1912, in Fried correspondence, box 49, FSP. On Fried and freemasonry, see Schönemann-Behrens, *Alfred H. Fried*, p. 190.

⁵⁹ 'Oesterreichische Friedensgesellschaft', *Die Friedens-Warte*, 12 (1910), p. 60.

⁶⁰ 'Zur Gründung des Wiener Akademischen Friedensvereins', *Die Waffen nieder!*, 1 (1892), p. 15.

⁶¹ Leopold Katscher, *Friedensstimmen: Eine Anthologie* (Leipzig, 1894), p. 8.

⁶² Arthur Müller, *Pacifistisches Jugendbuch: ein Ratgeber für Eltern und Erzieher* (Vienna, 1911).

Yet not all pacifists supported this cultural approach. Fried favoured a 'scientific pacifism' that would demonstrate global interdependence by listing the sheer extent of international contacts and organizations. When the Belgian peace leader Henri La Fontaine requested a list of literary works on peace, Fried reprimanded him for pursuing the 'questionable path of compromising our peace technology through music and poems', declaring himself an 'absolute opponent of such sentimental propaganda'.⁶³ In a letter to Arthur Müller, Fried argued that appeals to reason would ultimately convince the masses: those who defended militarism with 'hooray-enthusiasm' would soon shout 'hooray for pacifism'.⁶⁴

Fried's approach reflected a major strand in European pacifism, namely the effort to gather economic and social evidence on the futility of war.⁶⁵ The academic Rudolf Kobatsch, one of the ÖFG's vice-presidents, was another exponent of this approach: in 1911, he analysed armament expenses to show their detrimental effects for the Austrian economy.⁶⁶ Another ÖFG member, Rudolf Goldscheid, considered the wider military impact on the 'human economy'. He suggested that the 'entanglement of different peoples' meant that war would become rarer 'because every national conflict threatens to incite a world war'.⁶⁷ Goldscheid remained a prominent figure in pacifist and academic circles: in the interwar period, he led the ÖFG and also edited the *Friedens-Warte* for three years.

Alongside its cultural and 'scientific' dimensions, the ÖFG's endeavours also related to women's activism. Rosa Mayreder, a prominent Austrian feminist, was an ÖFG member,⁶⁸ and Austrian pacifists received invitations from women's clubs.⁶⁹ At the time, many Austrian feminists evoked women's 'political qualities' rather than 'arguments based on the natural rights of women'.⁷⁰

⁶³ Fried to Henri La Fontaine, 23 Apr. 1913, Correspondence Henri La Fontaine, *HLF 64*, Mundaneum, Mons. On Fried and his co-operation with La Fontaine, see Daniel Laqua, 'Alfred H. Fried and the challenges for "scientific pacifism" in the belle époque', in Boyd Rayward, ed., *Information beyond borders: international cultural and intellectual exchange in the belle époque* (New York, NY, 2014), pp. 181–99.

⁶⁴ Fried to Arthur Müller, 12 Nov. 1902, Fried correspondence, box 39, FSP.

⁶⁵ Jan Bloch, *Is war now impossible? Being an abridgment of 'The war of the future in its technical, economic and political relations'* (London, 1899); Norman Angell, *The great illusion: a study of the relation of military power in nations to their economic and social advantage* (London, 1911); Yakov Novikov, *War and its alleged benefits: with an introduction by Norman Angell* (London, 1912).

⁶⁶ Rudolf Kobatsch, *Die volks- und staatswirtschaftliche Bilanz der Rüstungen: nach einem Vortrag gehalten am 10. Februar 1911* (Vienna, 1911).

⁶⁷ Rudolf Goldscheid, *Friedensbewegung und Menschenökonomie* (Berlin, 1912), p. 43.

⁶⁸ Edith Leitsch-Prost, 'Rosa Mayreder', in Francisca de Haan, Krassimira Daskalova, and Anna Loutfi, eds., *Biographical dictionary of women's movements and feminisms in central, eastern and southern Europe: nineteenth and twentieth centuries* (Budapest, 2006), pp. 319–21.

⁶⁹ Olga Misař to Alfred Fried, 14 Oct. 1912, Fried correspondence, box 69, FSP.

⁷⁰ Brigitte Bader-Zaar, 'Women in Austrian politics, 1890–1934: goals and visions', in David Good, Margarete Grandner, and Mary Jo Maynes, eds., *Austrian women in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries: cross-disciplinary perspectives* (Providence, RI, 1996), p. 60.

This approach extended to portraying women's politics as inherently peaceful. The feminist Auguste Fickert—founder of the General Austrian Women's Association (1893)—claimed that once women had received the vote, they would ensure better funding for education and welfare, and a reduction in military spending.⁷¹ Fickert's organization and the ÖFG shared some underlying features: both presented themselves as apolitical and co-operated with female educators' associations. Links between pacifists and feminists extended to the Hungarian part of the Dual Monarchy: Anna Zipernowsky—'the Hungarian Bertha von Suttner'—was a member of the Hungarian Peace Society and helped launch the peace section of the Hungarian Women's Association.⁷² Furthermore, Leopold Katscher's niece Rosika Schwimmer was a renowned Hungarian feminist who became a major peace campaigner during the Great War. Reflecting the links between the women's and peace movements, the abortive Universal Peace Congress of 1914—scheduled to take place in Vienna—included plans for a women's assembly and a debate on the relationship between pacifism and feminism. Nonetheless, Austro-pacifism never entered a full partnership with the women's movement. In 1911, Suttner praised the feminist Adelheid Popp for her criticism of the costs of armaments, yet stressed that pacifists strove for humane rather than feminine politics.⁷³

III

The ÖFG's *raison d'être* was to transform the conduct of international politics. However, its critique of militarism had evident domestic implications, if 'militarism' is understood as the subordination of civilian values or powers to military ones.⁷⁴ While militarism is frequently associated with pre-1914 Germany, its application to the Habsburg context is more complex. Gunther Rothenberg has argued that the Austro-Hungarian army 'never achieved separate or superior standing from political authorities'.⁷⁵ This assessment contrasts with Richard Laurence's comment that 'the armed forces functioned as an extra-constitutional organization, privileged and protected from outside

⁷¹ Bader-Zaar, 'Women in Austrian politics', p. 64, referring to an article in the *Neues Wiener Tagblatt*, 23 Mar. 1889. On Fickert's association, see Richard Evans, *The feminists: women's emancipation movements in Europe, America and Australasia, 1840–1920* (London, 1977), p. 95.

⁷² After the Great War, Zipernowsky combined feminism and pacifism by leading the Austrian section of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom: Gabor Vermes, 'Anna Zipernowsky', in Josephson, ed., *Biographical dictionary of modern peace leaders*, p. 1051.

⁷³ Bertha von Suttner, *Die Waffen nieder! Ausgewählte Texte*, ed. Klaus Mannhardt and Winfried Schwaborn (2nd edn, Cologne, 1982), p. 123 (orig. 1911).

⁷⁴ Volker Berghahn, *Militarism: the history of an international debate, 1861–1979* (Leamington Spa, 1981); Wolfram Wette, ed., *Militarismus in Deutschland 1871 bis 1945: zeitgenössische Analysen und Kritik* (Münster, 1999).

⁷⁵ Gunther Rothenberg, *The army of Francis Joseph* (West Lafayette, IN, 1976), p. 221.

interference in all matters essential to their operation'.⁷⁶ These contrasting interpretations reflect the peculiarities of the political situation in Austria-Hungary: after 1867, the *Landwehr* in Cisleithania and the *Honvédség* in Hungary co-existed with the Imperial Army. The latter came under increasing pressure from Hungarian politicians who aimed to establish the *Honvédség* as a national army. The reluctance of both the Hungarian parliament and the Cisleithanian *Reichsrat* to increase military spending suggested limitations to the army's bargaining power. In 1911, the overall defence budget amounted to 420 million Crowns – less than in Italy, and a mere quarter of the German equivalent.⁷⁷ Yet, in another respect, the army's role as a supranational institution increased its importance: along with the crown and the court, the Imperial Army served as *Klammer des Reiches* – a device that kept the monarchy's parts together.⁷⁸

Stig Förster has distinguished between 'bourgeois' and 'conservative' militarism, with the former being expansionist and nationalist, and the latter aiming at stability.⁷⁹ Within the Habsburg context, the inspector-general Archduke Albrecht personified conservative militarism: he regarded the army as 'the instrument of governmental conservatism to sustain the existing order both externally and internally'.⁸⁰ In 1874, his influence triggered the resignation of the minister of war, Franz Freiherr Kuhn von Kuhnenfeld. The controversy marked a defeat for attempts to lead the army towards constitutionality, a path that Kuhn's anonymous treatise *Über die Reorganisation der Militär-Bildungsstätten* had outlined in 1869. Indeed, parliamentary control over military matters remained limited. More than two decades before joining the ÖFG, the journalist Moritz Adler expressed his concern about 'cosmetic constitutionalism' and specifically mentioned the military in this context.⁸¹ One aspect was the absence of regulations allowing the Delegations to censure the Imperial war minister. The problematic nature of these constitutional arrangements became evident in 1878 as the loan for the occupation of Bosnia passed despite the opposition of Cisleithania's lower house. Similarly, in 1911,

⁷⁶ Laurence, 'The problem of peace', p. 80. The adjective 'militaristic' features in Laurence's study, yet he avoids 'militarism' as a conceptual framework.

⁷⁷ Rothenberg, *The army of Francis Joseph*, p. 160.

⁷⁸ This frequently used term features, inter alia, in Johann Christoph Allmayer-Beck, 'Die bewaffnete Macht in Staat und Gesellschaft', in Adam Wandruszka and Peter Urbanitsch, eds., *Die Habsburgermonarchie 1848–1918*, v (Vienna, 1987), p. 95. On the army's supranational character, see István Deák's *Beyond nationalism: a social and political history of the Habsburg officer corps, 1848–1918* (Oxford, 1990). Its role in sustaining Habsburg patriotism is also noted in Jörg Kirchhoff, *Die Deutschen in der Österreichisch-Ungarischen Monarchie: ihr Verhältnis zum Staat, zur deutschen Nation und ihr kollektives Selbstverständnis (1866/67–1918)* (Berlin, 2001), p. 149.

⁷⁹ Stig Förster, *Der doppelte Militarismus: Die deutsche Heeresrüstungspolitik zwischen Status-Quo-Sicherung und Aggression 1890–1913* (Stuttgart, 1985), pp. 7–8.

⁸⁰ Allmayer-Beck, 'Die bewaffnete Macht', p. 66.

⁸¹ Moritz Adler, *Der Krieg, die Congressidee und die allgemeine Wehrpflicht – im Lichte der Aufklärung und Humanität unserer Zeit* (Prague, 1868), p. 91.

War Minister Moritz von Auffenberg placed new armaments orders despite the Hungarian government's opposition. Such incidents seemed to confirm the pacifist quip that in disputes between the Imperial war minister and the Austrian and Hungarian finance ministers, 'the war minister always wins'.⁸² Unsurprisingly, Suttner criticized parliamentarians for their subservient attitude towards the army.⁸³

At the turn of the century, two military figures sought to shape Habsburg politics: as head of the general staff (1889–1906), Friedrich Beck endorsed expansion in south-east Europe and, from 1904, also drew up plans for a possible military intervention in Hungary. Significantly, Beck managed to establish 'a powerful general staff over the resistance of the imperial war ministry' – something which Scott Lackey has described as 'Prussian-style'.⁸⁴ While avoiding the use of the label 'militarist' for Beck, Lackey confidently applies it to Beck's successor, Conrad von Hötzendorf, a 'captive of the cult of the offensive'.⁸⁵ When discussing the military in Austria-Hungary, it is possible to extend the argument to the monarch himself: Francis Joseph rejected parliamentary interference in foreign affairs and frequently wore a military uniform. István Deák has therefore labelled the Habsburg Monarchy a 'militaristic state', comparing it to Imperial Germany and the Russian empire: 'the rulers of these countries viewed themselves first and foremost as soldiers'.⁸⁶

In their anti-militarist critique, peace activists did not only comment on the military's political role: they also attacked military modes of thinking. This aspect resonates with Michael Howard's definition of militarism as the 'acceptance of the values of the military subculture as the dominant values of society'.⁸⁷ The prevalence of such attitudes is frequently noted in discussions of Wilhelmine society and provides a potential explanation for pacifists' limited success in Imperial Germany.⁸⁸ Yet fin-de-siècle Austria too was marked by the 'militarization of society's conditions'.⁸⁹ The monarchy provided numerous examples of folkloristic militarism as reflected in 'the notably martial tone to representations of imperial power'.⁹⁰ Francis Joseph's jubilee in 1898 was a case

⁸² Moritz Stekel, 'Am Abgrund und schlafend: Ein Situationsbild aus der Bukowina', *Die Waffen Nieder!*, 1 (1892), p. 12.

⁸³ Bertha von Suttner, 'Randglossen zur Zeitgeschichte', *Die Friedens-Warte*, 12 (1910), p. 208. ⁸⁴ Scott Lackey, *The rebirth of the Habsburg army* (Westport, CT, 1995), p. 156.

⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 161.

⁸⁶ Deák, *Beyond nationalism*, p. 6.

⁸⁷ Michael Howard, *War in European history* (Oxford, 1976), p. 109. See the definition of militarism as 'a political and social order which is predominantly characterized by military interest and martial pattern of thinking': Wolfram Wette, 'Für eine Belebung der Militarismusforschung', in *Militarismus in Deutschland*, p. 13.

⁸⁸ Jost Dülffer and Karl Holl, eds., *Bereit zum Krieg: Kriegsmilitarität im Wilhelminischen Deutschland, 1890–1914: Beiträge zur historischen Friedensforschung* (Göttingen, 1986). Cf. Chickering, *Imperial Germany*, p. 37. ⁸⁹ Bruckmüller, *Sozialgeschichte Österreichs*, p. 448.

⁹⁰ Laurence Cole, 'Military veterans and popular patriotism in Imperial Austria, 1870–1914', in idem and Daniel Unowsky, eds., *The limits of loyalty: imperial symbolism, popular allegiances and state patriotism in the late Habsburg Monarchy* (New York, NY, 2007), p. 37. See also Peter Urbanitsch, 'Pluralist myth and nationalist realities: the dynastic myth of the

in point, with the army playing a prominent role in the celebrations.⁹¹ Pacifists evidently disapproved of the staging of military values. For instance, Suttner's famous novel sarcastically cited press coverage of soldiers' departure for the Austro-Prussian War 'with music playing and banners waving'.⁹²

Conscription was another key issue as it provided 'an opportunity for indoctrination'.⁹³ In Austria-Hungary, this tendency became evident with the introduction of universal military service in 1868. While most Liberals supported the new legislation, the pacifist Moritz Adler described it as 'the first delirium of [war] fever'.⁹⁴ The changes also involved the creation of a 'reserve officer corps' which, as Déak has suggested, meant that military 'ideology and lifestyle penetrated an ever-widening circle of middle-class civilians'.⁹⁵ The introduction of conscription had different implications: it could spread military values and promote dynastic loyalty.⁹⁶ It also meant that military jurisdiction potentially concerned every male citizen. This change allowed critics to evoke the rule of law in regard to military matters: in 1888–9, Pirquet and Kronawetter spoke up in parliament to criticize the workings of military tribunals.⁹⁷ Over the subsequent decades, peace activists also addressed other measures related to the dissemination of military values: in 1894, they noted the positive press coverage for the foundation of a *Reichskriegercorps*.⁹⁸ In 1912, Suttner commented critically on the introduction of shooting lessons in middle schools.⁹⁹

Most activists were aware of the unpopularity of their cause. Answering Fried's claims that the peace movement spoke for half the population, ÖFG member Arthur Müller deplored the public's lack of interest and stated that 'millions' of

Habsburg Monarchy – a futile exercise in the creation of identity?', *Austrian History Yearbook*, 35 (2004), pp. 101–42. I have borrowed the term 'folkloristic militarism' from Jakob Vogel, *Nationen im Gleichschritt: Die Kultur der 'Nation in Waffen' in Deutschland und Frankreich, 1871–1914* (Göttingen, 1997), pp. 18–20 and 275–8.

⁹¹ Daniel Unowsky, 'Staging Habsburg patriotism: dynastic loyalty and the 1898 Imperial Jubilee', in Pieter Judson and Marsha Rozenblit, eds., *Constructing nationalities in east central Europe* (New York, NY, 2005), p. 147; Daniel Unowsky, *The pomp and politics of patriotism: imperial celebrations in Habsburg Austria, 1848–1916* (West Lafayette, IN, 2005), pp. 97–8.

⁹² Bertha von Suttner, *Lay down your arms: the autobiography of Martha von Tilling*, trans. T. Holmes (rev. edn, New York, NY, 1908), p. 149.

⁹³ Geoffrey Best, 'The militarisation of European society, 1873–1914', in John Gillis, ed., *The militarisation of the western world* (London, 1989), p. 15.

⁹⁴ Adler, *Der Krieg, die Congressidee*, p. 56. On Adler's critique, see also Christa Hämmerle, 'Die k. (u.) k. Armee "Schule des Volkes"? Zur Geschichte der Allgemeinen Wehrpflicht in der multinationalen Habsburgermonarchie (1866–1914/18)', in Jansen, ed., *Der Bürger als Soldat*, esp. pp. 186–98.

⁹⁵ Déak, *Beyond nationalism*, p. 7.

⁹⁶ Cole, 'Military veterans', p. 40; Laurence Cole, Christa Hämmerle and Martin Scheutz, 'Glanz – Gewalt – Gehorsam: Tradition und Perspektiven der Militärgeschichtsschreibung zur Habsburgermonarchie', in idem, eds., *Glanz – Gewalt – Gehorsam: Militär und Gesellschaft in der Habsburgermonarchie (1800 bis 1918)* (Essen, 2011), pp. 13–28.

⁹⁷ Anton Kreuzig, Ferdinand Kronawetter, and Peter von Pirquet, *Zur Reform der Militär-Justiz* (Vienna, 1889).

⁹⁸ Note in *Die Waffen nieder!*, 3 (1894), p. 58.

⁹⁹ Suttner, *Die Waffen nieder! Ausgewählte Texte*, p. 120 (orig. 1912).

Austrians were convinced of the 'necessity of militarism'.¹⁰⁰ As early as 1892, peace activists also reported difficulties in attracting support among university students.¹⁰¹ In 1906, Oswald Richter, another ÖFG member, later described an example that he deemed typical of the 'military spirit': in a public lecture, the rector of the German University of Prague had labelled the peace movement 'damaging' because of its alleged 'propagation of utopias'.¹⁰² Pacifists were particularly concerned about the role of the press. In the wake of the Bosnian Crisis of 1908, the *Friedens-Warte* denounced the large Austrian newspapers as 'Aehrenthal trombones and Hötzendorf trumpets' because of their 'bellicose' stance.¹⁰³ One year later, the periodical featured an appeal against anti-Italian 'war-mongering', signed by ÖFG members such as Suttner and Kobatsch. The document singled out the right-wing press for worsening the tension between the two states.¹⁰⁴ The military features of Austrian society made it a difficult environment for pacifists, as testified by anti-pacifist caricatures and articles: the periodical *Die Waffen nieder!* included a monthly column which reprinted the most vitriolic attacks. The ongoing problems surrounding coverage contrasted with more positive assessments in the early years of the ÖFG, when its secretary, Alfred Count Wrede, optimistically estimated that forty 'large newspapers' supported the peace movement.¹⁰⁵

In light of these domestic obstacles, the ÖFG stressed its respect for state and army. The first paragraph of its statutes affirmed the 'patriotic duty' to 'make the sacrifice and put on the military boots in the fatherland's service'.¹⁰⁶ In a similar vein, Fried dismissed anti-militarism – defined as a categorical rejection of the military and military service – as 'the pacifism of the uneducated'.¹⁰⁷ The fear of repercussions may have been one factor, with the arrest of a conscientious objector in 1895 constituting a clear warning.¹⁰⁸ The ÖFG's stance was in line with the mainstream of European pacifism: before the Great War, none of the large European peace associations promoted conscientious objection.

The ambivalent nature of this approach became apparent in the pacifists' reaction to the Bosnian Crisis. On the one hand, they denounced the measure

¹⁰⁰ Arthur Müller to Fried, 4 Nov. 1902, Fried correspondence, box 39, FSP.

¹⁰¹ 'Wiener akademischer Friedensverein', *Die Waffen nieder!*, 2 (1893), p. 73.

¹⁰² Oswald Richter to Suttner, 26 Oct. 1906, Suttner correspondence, box 26, FSP.

¹⁰³ Note in *Die Friedens-Warte*, 11 (1909), p. 63.

¹⁰⁴ 'Protest gegen die austro-italienische Kriegshetze', *Die Friedens-Warte*, 11 (1909) pp. 132–3.

¹⁰⁵ Wrede, 'Jahresbericht', p. 15. Fried suggested that fifty-two out of ninety-eight major Austrian newspapers were 'sympathetic to the peace movement': Laurence, 'The problem of peace', p. 349.

¹⁰⁶ *Statuten des Vereines Oesterreichische Gesellschaft der Friedensfreunde* (Vienna, 1893). The de facto student branch of the association represented similar views: Laurence, 'The problem of peace', p. 341.

¹⁰⁷ Fried, *Handbuch* (1913 edn), 1, p. 89.

¹⁰⁸ 'Tolstojaner in der österreichischen Armee', *Die Waffen nieder!*, 4 (1895), pp. 337–8.

as an 'adventure' that would trigger increases in military expenditure.¹⁰⁹ With military conflict seemingly imminent, the ÖFG distributed 10,000 copies of an anti-war leaflet in Vienna.¹¹⁰ On the other hand, the association subsequently congratulated Aehrenthal on his handling of the crisis.¹¹¹ Fried later suggested that the Berlin treaty of 1878 might have provided a legal basis for the Austrian move.¹¹² Peace activists often cast themselves as respectful of authority and mindful of their patriotic duties. Such attitudes also became manifested in their praise for autocratic rulers: in 1910, Fried suggested that Wilhelm II might become a 'peace emperor'.¹¹³ In similar terms, the head of the ÖFG's Linz section paid homage to Francis Joseph as 'the greatest friend of peace' in 1913.¹¹⁴

IV

Several diary entries suggest that by the end of her life, Suttner viewed socialists as the sole hope in the quest for a peaceful future.¹¹⁵ This assessment is hardly surprising, as anti-militarist critiques featured prominently in international socialism. As early as 1892, Wilhelm Liebknecht assured Suttner that socialists would 'implement your aims, namely peace on earth'.¹¹⁶ One year later, Suttner described the International Socialist Congress in Zurich as a 'highly significant demonstration against chauvinism'. She expressed particular gratitude for a resolution that had ended the 'misunderstanding that kept the socialists at a distance from our supposedly bourgeois movement'.¹¹⁷ Furthermore, in a letter to August Bebel, Fried stressed the similarities between pacifist objectives and aspects of the socialists' Erfurt programme.¹¹⁸

After the turn of the century, socialists in Austria-Hungary and Imperial Germany extended their involvement in peace campaigns. This development was exemplified by mass demonstrations during the Bosnian Crisis, agitation for naval disarmament, and the debates of the International Socialist Congress at Stuttgart in 1907. Suttner praised one of the Stuttgart resolutions for its reference to the anti-war obligations of socialist parliamentarians, noting that 'groups within the Inter-Parliamentary Union rarely remember this duty'.¹¹⁹

¹⁰⁹ 'Von den Delegationen', *Die Friedens-Warte*, 12 (1910), p. 202.

¹¹⁰ 'Mitteilungen der Oesterreichischen Friedensgesellschaft', *Die Friedens-Warte*, 12 (1910), p. 59.

¹¹¹ 'Mitteilungen der Oesterreichischen Friedensgesellschaft', *Die Friedens-Warte*, 11 (1909), p. 39.

¹¹² Fried, *Handbuch* (1913 edn), II, pp. 192 and 195. See also Cooper, *Patriotic pacifism*, pp. 170–1.

¹¹³ Fried, *Der Kaiser und der Weltfrieden* (Berlin, 1910).

¹¹⁴ 'Oesterreichische Friedensgesellschaft', *Tages-Post*, 2 Apr. 1913.

¹¹⁵ Suttner, *Lebenserinnerungen*, pp. 542, 545, and 553.

¹¹⁶ Wilhelm Liebknecht, letter of 2 May 1892 as quoted in *ibid.*, p. 19.

¹¹⁷ Suttner, *Die Waffen nieder! Ausgewählte Texte*, pp. 95–9 (orig. 1893).

¹¹⁸ Fried to August Bebel, 28 Apr. 1897, in Fried correspondence, box 33, FSP.

¹¹⁹ Suttner, *Die Waffen nieder! Ausgewählte Texte*, p. 99 (orig. 1907).

The year 1907 was of particular significance for the Austrian socialists, as their parliamentary representation increased substantially as a result of the introduction of universal male suffrage. They remained strong critics of Aehrenthal's foreign policy, as reflected in their party conference of 1909.¹²⁰ The intellectual basis for their stance was outlined by the German socialist Karl Liebknecht when he visited Budapest in 1912: he denounced the army as a 'machine to earn money for the ruling classes', exemplifying the Marxist position on the relationship between militarism and class.¹²¹

Common aims and a shared hostility to militarism did not, however, produce an alliance between socialists and pacifists. According to Marxist principles, an end to class-based society was the sole way of securing permanent peace. Furthermore, German and Austrian socialists favoured the model of a militia early on in their history.¹²² The Austro-Marxist Karl Renner even viewed military service as 'a step up in the life of the common man'.¹²³ Czech socialists adopted a similar line: when the arms question was debated at their 1911 congress, their leader Bohumil Šmeral suggested arming the people. He contrasted this approach with Tolstoyan non-resistance and Suttner's emphasis on disarmament.¹²⁴ As a whole, Austrian socialists were reluctant to adopt strikes as a means of war prevention; their stance played a role in the failure of the Second International to adopt a binding policy on war resistance.¹²⁵

In contrast to the socialists, the Austro-pacifists believed that the political and social system would improve once the economic burden of armaments had been lifted. Walterskirchen, for instance, outlined a pacifist version of historical change that contradicted historical materialism. According to his narrative, one system of organized warfare succeeded another until the arrival of a new, conflict-free order.¹²⁶ Suttner expressed the view that 'war bears its conditions within itself', rather than deriving from class antagonism.¹²⁷ At the same time, peace activists opposed revolutionary change. An article on 'Social democracy and peace societies' in *Die Waffen nieder!* favoured individualism over collective

¹²⁰ 'Die österreichische Sozialdemokratie gegen die Politik Aehrenthals', *Die Friedens-Warte*, 11 (1909), p. 197.

¹²¹ Karl Liebknecht, 'Rede in Budapest, 17. Nov. 1912', *Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaft*, 9 (1961), p. 437. Cf. idem, *Militarism and anti-militarism* (New York, NY, 1972), p. 1 (orig. 1912).

¹²² Allmayer-Beck, 'Die bewaffnete Macht', p. 119; Nicholas Stargardt, *The German idea of militarism: radical and socialist critics, 1866-1914* (Cambridge, 1994).

¹²³ Okey, *Habsburg Monarchy*, p. 343.

¹²⁴ Jan Havránek, 'Der tschechische Pazifismus und Antimilitarismus am Vorabend des Ersten Weltkrieges', in Gernot Heiss and Heinrich Lutz, eds., *Friedensbewegungen: Bedingungen und Wirkungen* (Munich, 1984), pp. 132-4.

¹²⁵ Laurence, 'The problem of peace', pp. 290-3.

¹²⁶ Walterskirchen, *Abrüstungs-Frage*, pp. 6-7.

¹²⁷ Suttner, 'Unsere Plattform', *Die Waffen nieder!*, 1 (1892), p. 48.

values.¹²⁸ Similarly, in a 1906 leaflet, German peace activists reassured the public that they did not seek to transform the system of government.¹²⁹ Two years later, Leopold Katscher co-authored a brochure on industrial strikes in which he acknowledged the validity of social demands, but affirmed the need to maintain public order.¹³⁰

Unsurprisingly, the socialist–pacifist relationship remained tense. In 1899, many socialists rejected Nicholas II’s initiative for the Hague Peace Conference, considering it impossible that a reactionary ruler might promote a progressive cause – an attitude which the pacifists deemed ‘deplorable’.¹³¹ Left-wing hostility did not only target autocratic rulers but extended to pacifists as well. Austrian and German socialists remained absent from Inter-Parliamentary Conferences and Universal Peace Congresses. Furthermore, Roger Chickering has noted that in Imperial Germany ‘Social Democrats were as abusive of the pacifists as were nationalists themselves’.¹³² In 1903, the Austro-Marxist Victor Adler stressed that socialists did not advocate ‘disarmament in this “peace-mongering” way’.¹³³ In 1912, Fried was so concerned about socialist scorn for the ‘bourgeois’ pacifists that he contacted Eduard Bernstein, the leading theorist of socialist revisionism.¹³⁴ Yet, such broader tensions did not preclude occasional collaboration. Earlier that year, Bernstein had written an article for the *Friedens-Warte*, with Fried praising his contribution.¹³⁵ Indeed, Fried even intended to nominate the International Socialist Bureau for the Nobel Prize. He asked Rudolf Goldscheid to contact Austrian socialists on his behalf, since the latter was both a socialist and an ÖFG committee member.¹³⁶ Goldscheid himself expressed the pacifist message in socialist terms, arguing that war and armaments perpetuated the class system.¹³⁷ He hoped to outline this position at the Universal Peace Congress of 1914. After the event’s cancellation, he published the manuscript of his speech which argued that, unlike Karl Marx, pacifists had grasped the extent to which the social and national questions were interrelated.¹³⁸

¹²⁸ M. J. Bonn, ‘Die Sozialdemokratie und die Friedensvereine’, *Die Waffen nieder!*, 2 (1893), pp. 169–72.

¹²⁹ Leaflet ‘Was wollen die Friedensgesellschaften?’, in ‘Miss-AHF: Materials, Newspaper Cuttings, 1897–1914’, Fried correspondence, box 14, FSP.

¹³⁰ Nicholas Gilman and Leopold Katscher, *Der Arbeitsfriede* (Gautzsch, 1908), p. 11.

¹³¹ ‘Die Friedensaction des Czaren’, *Die Waffen nieder!*, 7 (1898), p. 379. See also Suttner, *Lebenserinnerungen*, pp. 412–14.

¹³² Chickering, *Imperial Germany*, p. 398.

¹³³ Allmayer-Beck, ‘Die bewaffnete Macht’, p. 121.

¹³⁴ Fried to Eduard Bernstein, 31 Dec. 1912, in Fried correspondence, box 49, FSP.

¹³⁵ Fried to Bernstein, 23 Jan. 1912, *ibid.* See Eduard Bernstein, ‘Wie man Kriegsstimmung erzeugt’, *Friedens-Warte*, 14 (1912), pp. 2–7.

¹³⁶ Fried to Goldscheid, Jan. 1913, in Fried correspondence, box 60, FSP. See also Schönemann-Behrens, *Alfred H. Fried*, pp. 192–3.

¹³⁷ Goldscheid, *Friedensbewegung und Menschenökonomie*, p. 9.

¹³⁸ Rudolf Goldscheid, *Das Verhältnis der äußeren Politik zur inneren: Ein Beitrag zur Soziologie des Weltkrieges und Weltfriedens* (Vienna, 1914), pp. 16–17.

V

In 1914, Goldscheid suggested that the ‘national ideal’ had been a ‘revolutionary device’ which, deplorably, had become associated with reactionary principles.¹³⁹ He believed that nationhood could still be a productive force and provide ‘the essential meaning of internationalism’ when approached in a spirit of openness.¹⁴⁰ Goldscheid’s somewhat laboured attempt to define the relationship between nationalism and internationalism illustrates how Austro-pacifists struggled with the phenomenon of modern nationalism. Despite their championing of dialogue and reconciliation, the pacifists’ response to national tensions within Austria-Hungary was vague and contradictory. The ÖFG itself did not make a pronouncement on the national question and never drew up a programme for national reconciliation. As a result, the historiography of the Austrian peace movement rarely discusses its engagement with nationalism. However, as publicly engaged figures, peace activists could hardly ignore nationalism. After all, as Lothar Höbelt has noted, ‘[i]t is a truism that politics in the Habsburg Monarchy was almost always tied up with the nationality question in one way or another’.¹⁴¹ Peace activists had several options when confronting the national challenge: they could deny the relevance of domestic matters for their cause or claim that pacifist endeavours were compatible with an attachment to the nation. A third possibility was to apply pacifist principles to the Dual Monarchy’s internal situation. Austro-pacifists veered between all three positions, as an analysis of their pronouncements and efforts demonstrates.

The first of these approaches—to treat national issues as irrelevant for pacifists—was reflected in the ÖFG’s foundation: it stated that the association did not consider the empire’s internal, but only its external affairs.¹⁴² In consequence, peace periodicals mostly refrained from discussing domestic matters, and divergences from this path were soon rectified. For instance, in 1909, Suttner’s column in the *Friedens-Warte* briefly mentioned the conflicts between Czechs and Germans in Bohemia. Her comments provoked letters from both sides; Suttner subsequently apologized for raising an issue that was inappropriate for a ‘journal of supranational ideas’. She nonetheless expressed the hope that the two communities could co-operate ‘on a higher level than the national one’.¹⁴³ Such views resonated with the beliefs of the *Friedens-Warte*’s editor: according to Fried, the nation-state was not the ‘highest level of social

¹³⁹ Ibid., p. 24.

¹⁴⁰ Ibid., p. 55.

¹⁴¹ Lothar Höbelt, ‘Well-tempered discontent: Austrian domestic politics’, in Mark Cornwall, ed., *The last years of Austria-Hungary: a multi-national experiment in early twentieth-century Europe* (rev. edn, Exeter, 2010), p. 49.

¹⁴² §2, ‘Grundidee’, in *Statuten der Österreichischen Friedensgesellschaft (früher ‘Österreichische Gesellschaft der Friedensfreunde’)*, c. 1912, in folder ‘ÖFG’, Fried correspondence, box 73, FSP.

¹⁴³ Bertha von Suttner, ‘Randglossen zur Zeitgeschichte’, *Die Friedens-Warte*, 11 (1909), p. 30.

development'.¹⁴⁴ However, as he later explained, pacifists did not concern themselves with national questions as the 'pacifist idea is not based on relations between nationalities, but between states'.¹⁴⁵

Yet, even when considering inter-state relations, pacifism was conceived within the existing order. When a Polish delegate to the Universal Peace Congress of 1892 demanded the re-establishment of the kingdom of Poland, the congress president, Frédéric Passy, rejected a debate on this issue as it was not the pacifists' task to revise Europe's political map.¹⁴⁶ Recalling this incident, Suttner suggested that 'burning political issues' should not feature at peace congresses: to raise national issues at such events would be like arguing for papal infallibility at the congresses of freethinkers.¹⁴⁷ In discussing Austro-German culture at the fin de siècle, Carl Schorske and Péter Hanák have used the image of 'the garden' to describe a bourgeois retreat into aesthetic realms and a detachment from politics.¹⁴⁸ Suttner's warning against the discussion of 'burning political issues' suggests a preference for the garden – at least as far as domestic matters were concerned. Such attitudes were not confined to activists in the Dual Monarchy's Cisleithanian part: for instance, at the Inter-Parliamentary Conference in Budapest in 1895, the Hungarian internationalist Albert Apponyi portrayed Hungary's national disputes as 'a domestic matter'.¹⁴⁹

While affirming their apolitical nature, peace activists stressed that they were not 'anti-national' – an argument which constituted their second possible answer to the national question. For instance, in 1893, the author Robert Plöhn argued that internationalism could benefit the nation. He claimed that exclusivist nationalism was, in fact, 'anti-national', since it shut off nations from positive influences and prevented them from responding to contemporary challenges, which were international in nature.¹⁵⁰ Goldscheid expressed similar views in 1912, stating that internationalism could be a 'cultural form of patriotism', whereas aggressive nationalism amounted to 'heartless particularism'.¹⁵¹ Two years later, Fried claimed that the term 'international' did not mean to be 'anti-national, but hyper-national' as it extended principles of collaboration that formed the very basis of nationhood.¹⁵² Such professions were significant if pacifists wanted to appeal to Austro-German liberals. After all, national questions played an increasingly central role for the latter. This stance

¹⁴⁴ Fried, *Handbuch* (1905 edn), p. 35.

¹⁴⁵ Alfred Fried, *Kurze Aufklärungen über Wesen und Ziel des Pazifismus* (Berlin, 1914), p. 20.

¹⁴⁶ Passy's rebuttal is quoted in Wrede, 'Jahresbericht', p. 18. See also Suttner, *Lebenserinnerungen*, p. 298.

¹⁴⁷ Suttner, 'Unsere Plattform', *Die Waffen nieder!*, 1 (1892), p. 5.

¹⁴⁸ Carl Schorske, *Fin-de-siècle Vienna: politics and culture* (New York, NY, 1980); Péter Hanák, *The garden and the workshop: essays in culture and the history of Vienna and Budapest* (London, 1998).

¹⁴⁹ '5. Interparlamentarische Konferenz', *Die Waffen nieder!*, 4 (1895), p. 287.

¹⁵⁰ Robert Plöhn, 'International und Antinational', *Die Waffen nieder!*, 2 (1893), pp. 465–8.

¹⁵¹ Goldscheid, *Friedensbewegung und Menschenökonomie*, p. 57.

¹⁵² Fried, *Kurze Aufklärungen*, p. 21.

became evident in 1895 as the main liberal party – the United German Left – ended its government participation over the question of a Slovene school in the Styrian town of Cilli.¹⁵³ Yet, it was not only in Cisleithania that pacifists sought to avoid suspicions of being at odds with national thinking: a similar line of argument was adopted by Hungarian activists. At the foundation of the Hungarian Peace Society, its president, the poet Mór Jókai, argued that the ‘fighting bond of the nation must not be weakened by the promotion of the peace alliance’.¹⁵⁴ The retired Hungarian general István Tűr seemed to embody this convergence: his renown stemmed from his membership of Kossuth’s army in 1849 and later of Garibaldi’s forces, yet he also served as president of the Universal Peace Congress in Budapest in 1896.

The pacifists’ affirmation of their national credentials should not obscure a third strand within their response to nationalism. The intensity of conflicts within the Habsburg Monarchy meant that activists – some of them sporadically, others more consistently – spoke up and offered solutions. For instance, in the 1860s, Adolf Fischhof presented a reform programme that has been described as ‘the most significant German liberal contribution to the Austrian national problem’ since 1849.¹⁵⁵ Nearly a decade before his writings on peace and arbitration, Fischhof envisaged federalism as a solution to national conflicts within the Habsburg Monarchy. Another protagonist of the Austrian peace movement – the liberal deputy Pirquet – applied the pacifist idea of arbitration to the domestic realm: in 1894, he proposed an arbitration court for disputes between Cisleithania and Hungary. Combined with such suggestions, pacifist periodicals occasionally published general appeals for mutual understanding. In 1898, for example, *Die Waffen nieder!* published a letter by Tűr, in which he considered the pacification of relations between different nationalities.¹⁵⁶ One year later, the journal deplored ‘paroxysms of nationalism everywhere’, presenting ‘federation, tolerance and internationalization as the solution’.¹⁵⁷ By this point, language rights had become a divisive issue across the Habsburg Monarchy. In this context, Moritz Adler rejected the drive for linguistic purity, mentioning Magyarization policies in this context.¹⁵⁸ Tellingly, key figures of Austro-pacifism, including Fried, were active Esperantists, viewing the auxiliary language as a means for international understanding.

In the monarchy’s Cisleithanian half, the language-related struggles between Czechs and Germans intensified during the 1890s. The conflict escalated in

¹⁵³ Judson, *Exclusive revolutionaries*, pp. 249–51.

¹⁵⁴ Kovács, *Die Friedensbewegung in Österreich-Ungarn*, p. 109.

¹⁵⁵ Robert Kann, *The multinational empire* (2 vols., New York, NY, 1950), II, pp. 143–8. See also Stefan Walz, *Staat, Nationalität und jüdische Identität vom 18. Jahrhundert bis 1914* (Frankfurt, 1996), pp. 186–96.

¹⁵⁶ General Tűr, ‘Gehörter Herr Redacteur!’, *Die Waffen nieder!*, 7 (1898), p. 402.

¹⁵⁷ ‘Zeitschau’, *Die Waffen nieder!*, 8 (1899), p. 3.

¹⁵⁸ Moritz Adler, ‘Die allgemeine Wehrpflicht und die Nationalität’, *Die Waffen nieder!*, 1 (1894), p. 237.

1897, when German nationalists protested violently against the Badeni Language Ordinances. With this measure, the prime minister sought to strengthen the Czechs' cultural rights in Bohemia, intending to accord their language equal status with German. Two years before the Badeni crisis, Rudolf Jenny, Suttner's later secretary, had claimed that Czechs were 'less chauvinistic than their German counterparts and that an understanding between both nations would be possible, if only people wanted it'.¹⁵⁹ Suttner herself had travelled to Prague and praised the 'readiness, understanding, enthusiasm' she had encountered among the city's Czech and German inhabitants.¹⁶⁰ In her memoirs, she suggested that, being Prague-born, she might have learnt Czech if their national movement had been stronger in her youth.¹⁶¹

Fried's comments on the Pan-Slav Congress of 1898 provide an interesting perspective on the Czech–German conflict. The congress marked a double anniversary: the founding figure of the Czech national movement, František Palacký, had been born in 1798, and in 1848 he had organized the first Pan-Slav Congress. Both congresses countered German nationalism: the first in the context of the 1848 revolution, the second in regard to German resistance to the Badeni decrees. At first sight, Fried's comments on the 1898 meeting suggest sympathies with German nationalism. The journalist – who still resided in Berlin at the time – noted that representatives of the 'Slavic world... had thrown the gauntlet down to *Deutschum* in general'. He criticized 'foreigners' who 'on the hospitable soil of a European empire' sought to 'besmirch the image of a nation that has provided the cultural foundations of this empire'.¹⁶² Fried expressed particular resentment about the Russian general Vissarion Komarow, editor of the pan-Slavist periodical *Ruskii Mir*, whose Prague speech had encouraged Czechs in their conflict with the Austro-Germans.¹⁶³ Yet, to Fried, such incidents were mere reflections of a wider problem, namely 'this woeful chauvinism, this exaggerated cult of the nation and this pigheaded addiction to self-adulation, from which all of Europe suffers'. Fried interpreted the Prague congress as the mirror image of 'our own chauvinism'. As evidence of this diagnosis, he cited the infamous remarks of the German classicist Theodor Mommsen who, during the Badeni crisis, had described 'Czech skulls' as 'impervious to reason, but susceptible to blows'.¹⁶⁴ Thus, Fried's discussion served as a plea to Germans and Slavs to abandon aggressive nationalism and engage in dialogue.

Austro-pacifists fostered Czech–German contacts after the turn of the century. Fried himself exchanged letters with Alexandr Batěk, a journalist

¹⁵⁹ Rudolf Jenny to Suttner, 24 Nov. 1895, Suttner correspondence, box 21, FSP.

¹⁶⁰ Suttner, 'Mein Aufenthalt in Prag', *Die Waffen nieder!*, 4 (1895), p. 427.

¹⁶¹ Suttner, *Lebenserinnerungen*, p. 531.

¹⁶² Fried, 'Der Slaventag zu Prag' (1898), in Fried, *Unter der weißen Fahne: aus der Mappe eines Friedensjournalisten* (Berlin, 1901), p. 130.

¹⁶³ *Ibid.*, p. 131.

¹⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 134. This was a reference to Theodor Mommsen's letter 'An die Deutschen in Österreich', published by the *Neue Freie Presse*, 31 Oct. 1897.

writing for the Czech newspapers *Přednášky pro lid* and *Přednášky z oboru vzdělanosti*. Batěk sought advice concerning the publication of a Czech-language pamphlet on peace, and the establishment of the review *Zájmy všelidské* with a permanent pacifist section.¹⁶⁵ Meanwhile, Suttner agreed to lend her name to a 'committee for cultural reconciliation between Czechs and Germans', which the author Hermann Bahr – initially close to Pan-Germanism and by no means a pacifist – intended to set up in 1909.¹⁶⁶ The same year, Austrian pacifists co-operated with Czech associations in a joint appeal for an international 'peace day'.¹⁶⁷ The Czech leader Thomas Masaryk acknowledged the ÖFG's efforts when advocating a freeze on armaments expenditure at a session of the Delegations in October 1910.¹⁶⁸ Nonetheless, attempts to create a supranational Bohemian Peace Society failed on several occasions.

In 1913, a new organization, entitled *Austria Nova, Gesellschaft zur Förderung des nationalen Friedens in Österreich*, sought to pacify Czech-German relations. Its programme echoed pacifist arguments, for instance by portraying the struggle between different national groups as detrimental to economic development. 'Organizational work towards peace' was one of the association's declared aims.¹⁶⁹ At its founding meeting, Josef Václav Drozda, a leader of the Viennese Czechs, argued that Austria's 'true vocation' was the 'concert of European peoples' and that its 'higher vocation' was to offer equal treatment to its different nationalities.¹⁷⁰ The ÖFG committee member Kobatsch was among the society's founding members, and Fried was the first person to sign its public appeal.¹⁷¹ These examples highlight the ambiguities of pacifist engagement with the national question: instinctively, many activists favoured reconciliation not only between states but also domestically. However, the ÖFG declined to present a comprehensive reform programme, offering its 'apolitical' nature as an excuse.

Austro-pacifists were more outspoken when it came to another divisive force in fin-de-siècle Austria: anti-Semitism. In the 1880s, the nationalist Georg von Schönerer rose to prominence, blending anti-Semitism with Pan-Germanism and anti-Slavism. In the subsequent decade, a new party – Karl Lueger's Christian Socials – turned political Catholicism, middle-class politics, and anti-Semitism into a winning electoral formula. As a result, Vienna became 'the only European capital...to have an elected anti-Semitic municipal

¹⁶⁵ Alexandr Batěk to Fried, 23 May 1907 and 29 Nov. 1908, Fried correspondence, box 48, FSP.

¹⁶⁶ Hermann Bahr to Suttner, 7 Feb. and 11 Feb. 1909, Suttner correspondence, box 13, FSP. See also Hamann, *Bertha von Suttner*, pp. 473–4.

¹⁶⁷ 'Oesterreichische Friedensgesellschaft', *Die Friedens-Warte*, 11 (1909), p. 95.

¹⁶⁸ 'Von den Delegationen', *Die Friedens-Warte*, 12 (1910), p. 204 – Fried mentions this in his *Handbuch* (1913 edn), II, p. 217. ¹⁶⁹ Leaflet in box 47, Fried correspondence, FSP.

¹⁷⁰ Monika Glettler, *Die Wiener Tschechen um 1900* (Munich, 1972), pp. 265–6.

¹⁷¹ Alfred Rossmann to Fried, 12 May 1913, Fried correspondence, box 79, FSP.

government'.¹⁷² Steven Beller has distinguished between Schönener's racial anti-Semitism and the Christian Socials' more diffuse variant: the latter alternated between religious, economic, and ethnic arguments, with Lueger 'milking the ambiguities of Viennese antisemitism for all they were worth'.¹⁷³ Strikingly, the leader of the Christian Socials and mayor of Vienna had started his political career as a liberal. Moreover, in 1882, he supported the abandoned project of a German People's Party – despite the involvement of Fischhof, who has been described as 'the most significant political theorist of Jewish origin in the Austro-German *Bürgertum*'.¹⁷⁴ Lueger's trajectory is, however, less surprising if one considers John Boyer's argument that 'the history of the Christian Socials owed much to the Liberal and Democratic traditions'.¹⁷⁵ The Christian Socials managed to form a party that attracted broad middle-class support and thus performed a role that had previously been taken by the liberals.

Even before the Christian Socials' breakthrough in 1895, Austro-pacifists campaigned against anti-Semitism. In 1891, Suttner's husband set up a *Verein zur Abwehr des Antisemitismus*, supported by peace activists such as Rudolf Count Hoyos. In launching this initiative, Arthur Gundaccar von Suttner evoked Austrian patriotism, describing it as a 'society to save the good old Austrian spirit'.¹⁷⁶ Two years later, an article in *Die Waffen nieder!* stressed the incompatibility of pacifism and anti-Semitism.¹⁷⁷ Pacifists such as Bertha von Suttner viewed militarism and anti-Semitism as being animated by a similar spirit of destruction, and noted that anti-Semitism could serve as a tool for militarist forces.¹⁷⁸ Their resistance to anti-Semitism did not, however, trigger pacifist support for Zionism. For instance, Fried – who came from a secular Jewish family – kept his distance, although newspaper cuttings in his personal papers suggest that he followed the debates on the Zionist project.¹⁷⁹ Meanwhile, Suttner maintained direct links with Theodor Herzl, the Viennese journalist and founding father of Zionism. Herzl disagreed with the ÖFG's pacifism, but nonetheless sponsored Suttner's journey to the Hague Peace Conference, on which she reported for Herzl's newspaper *Die Welt*.¹⁸⁰ One person who knew and respected both Herzl and Suttner was the celebrated

¹⁷² Steven Beller, *Vienna and the Jews, 1867–1938: a cultural history* (Cambridge, 1989), p. 188.

¹⁷³ *Ibid.*, p. 195.

¹⁷⁴ Walz, *Staat, Nationalität und jüdische Identität*, p. 186. Cf. Boyer, *Political radicalism*, pp. 209–10.

¹⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 361.

¹⁷⁶ Arthur Gundaccar v. Suttner, 'Zur Situation der Gegenwart', reprinted in Suttner, *Lebenserinnerungen*, p. 340.

¹⁷⁷ Emerich Kowalek, 'Kritik des "gebildeten" Antisemitismus in seinem Verhältnisse zur Friedensidee', *Die Waffen nieder!*, 3 (1893), pp. 60–5 and 103–8.

¹⁷⁸ Suttner, *Lebenserinnerungen*, p. 431; also *Die Waffen nieder!*, 5 (1896), p. 291 and Hamann, *Bertha von Suttner*, pp. 212–13.

¹⁷⁹ 'F/S Materials 1892–1914, Misc. AHF: Materials, Newspaper Cuttings, 1897–1914', box 14, FSP.

¹⁸⁰ Alan Levenson, 'Theodor Herzl and Bertha von Suttner: criticism, collaboration and utopianism', *Journal of Israeli History*, 15 (1994), pp. 213–22.

writer Stefan Zweig: he described the former as ‘one of the creators of ideas who disclose themselves triumphantly in a single country, to a single people at vast intervals’ and praised the latter as the ‘majestic and grandiose Cassandra of our time’.¹⁸¹ Zweig portrayed himself as ‘an Austrian, a Jew, an author, a humanist, and a pacifist’ – yet he was neither a Zionist nor an ÖFG member.¹⁸² Instead, his pacifism was based on wider notions of European culture and on the experience of an empire whose ‘supranational character and cosmopolitan tradition’ appeared to intellectuals such as Zweig as a ‘model of European co-operation’.¹⁸³

VI

Zweig’s view of the Habsburg Monarchy seems to contrast with the experience of the Austro-pacifists, whose problems illustrate the turbulent nature of Austrian politics at the fin de siècle. The late Habsburg Monarchy was a state whose army performed a unifying role and whose monarch emphasized his military credentials. In such an environment, campaigns for international federations, compulsory arbitration, and disarmament had limited appeal. Furthermore, Austro-pacifism was a form of middle-class politics and, as such, sought alliances with political liberalism – yet the latter was subject to both internal rifts and external challenges. In Vienna, the Christian Socials succeeded the liberals as the party of the *Bürgertum*, and in different parts of Cisleithania, liberal activism occurred within voluntary associations dedicated to German language and culture.¹⁸⁴ The ÖFG’s focus on supranational ideas and tolerance therefore seemed at odds with the broader direction of Austrian politics. As a result, pacifists largely avoided discussions of controversial domestic matters. They thus missed the opportunity to define what the multinational nature of the Habsburg Monarchy might mean for peace activism – or what pacifism might mean for Austria-Hungary’s domestic conflicts.

The pacifists’ disillusionment became evident in 1914: ‘Oh well, Austria as the location for a Universal Peace Congress: what nonsense!’, Suttner wrote in April that year, expressing her frustrations at the attempt to organize this event.¹⁸⁵ After her death in June 1914, Fried continued to prepare the gathering. Having anticipated ‘the most brilliant congress’, Austria-Hungary’s declaration of war on Serbia put paid to his efforts ‘in the most brutal manner’. He viewed the cancellation as an ‘immense disappointment and a great loss for our propaganda’.¹⁸⁶ Following the outbreak of military conflict, Fried and the

¹⁸¹ Ibid., pp. 91 and 163. ¹⁸² Stefan Zweig, *The world of yesterday* (London, 1943), p. 5.

¹⁸³ Beller, *Vienna and the Jews*, p. 180.

¹⁸⁴ Pieter Judson, ‘Rethinking the liberal legacy’, in Beller, *Rethinking Vienna, 1900*, p. 74.

¹⁸⁵ Suttner, *Lebenserinnerungen*, p. 550.

¹⁸⁶ Alfred Fried to Henri La Fontaine, 29 July 1914, in box 66, records of the International Peace Bureau, League of Nations Archives, United Nations Library.

ÖFG planned a peace demonstration.¹⁸⁷ However, after the government's prohibition of the event, most activists rallied behind emperor and army.¹⁸⁸ As this article has shown, their stance in 1914 did not represent a simple volte-face: from the outset, Austro-pacifism was characterized by a quest for respectability and a willingness to operate within the limitations of Austrian fin-de-siècle politics.

¹⁸⁷ ÖFG board meeting, 7 Aug. 1914, Fried correspondence, box 73, FSP.

¹⁸⁸ That said, Fried subsequently moved to Switzerland to continue his journalistic activities.