Nationalities Papers (2025), 1–20
doi:10.1017/nps.2024.100

SPECIAL ISSUE ARTICLE

Vaterland, Heimat, and the Family of Nation: Education and Identity Formation in Late-Habsburg Austria

Scott O. Moore

Department of History, Eastern Connecticut State University, USA
Email: mooresc@easternct.edu

Abstract

In the last quarter of the 19th century, Austrian schools effectively developed a robust system of civic education that attempted to cultivate the patriotism of all students, regardless of their nationality. While the ultimate goal of Habsburg civic education was loyalty to the imperial state, officials realized that this loyalty would not be able to supplant regional or national identities. Instead, officials designed a curriculum that would enhance these other identities hoping they would contribute to imperial patriotism. Students learned they shared their home with different national groups and that they belonged to a larger family of nations. While this concept was earnestly supported by the school curriculum, the way in which this material was taught may have impacted its effectiveness. For example, when discussing national groups, educators often drew from prevailing ethnographic theories that relied on stereotypical assessments. Moreover, compromises made in the early 20th century complicated these efforts. As nationalists gained increased control over school administration, the emphasis on shared local identity weakened. These factors did not necessarily alter Austrian civic education, but they do point to the ways in which it would have needed to adapt to the Monarchy's changing political circumstances.

Keywords: Habsburg Austria; identity formation; civic education

Introduction

By the end of the 19th century, public education became an essential tool for identity formation in European states. Government officials realized that schools offered an unparalleled opportunity to shape the way future citizens thought about their country, neighbors, and history. As a result, school curricula were designed to influence how children thought about these issues, with the expressed purpose of ensuring they would become loyal and patriotic adults. Nationalist activists realized the potential of civic education as well. Throughout Europe, nationalists fought to ensure these same curricula were not only patriotic but nationalistic as well. Most fervently believed that it was their duty to raise children to love their nation. Because state identity was becoming increasingly intertwined with national identity in most countries, this process of nationalization seemed like a natural part of patriotic education to many reformers. After all, how could schools produce loyal citizens of France if students were not taught that they were French?

Historians examining this process have successfully revealed that it was not as straightforward as many once assumed. They have convincingly demonstrated that even in supposedly homogenous nation-states, the cultivation of national identity required negotiation with regional, religious, political, and cultural differences. They have also examined the importance of national and ethnic

© The Author(s), 2025. Published by Cambridge University Press on behalf of Association for the Study of Nationalities. This is an Open Access article, distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution licence (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0), which permits unrestricted re-use, distribution and reproduction, provided the original article is properly cited.

Check for updates

minorities in these states. In particular, scholars have shown the way governments could fluctuate between policies of accommodation and persecution directed toward these communities (Green 1990; Harp 1998; Lehning 1995; Von Nuys 2002; Weber 1976; Ziegler-McPherson 2009). Traditionally, the Habsburg Monarchy has been left out of these discussions. Early scholarship assumed that its multinational composition made it impossible for officials to utilize public education as a tool for patriotic development. In fact, traditional views commonly assumed that they did not even try. In this absence, schools became a battleground for nationalist groups, which only heightened ethnic tensions and weakened the cohesion of the state (Jászi 1929; Kann 1950). In recent decades, historians have successfully challenged most of these early assumptions. They have demonstrated that the citizens of the Habsburg Monarchy were not entrenched nationalists constantly in conflict and that the structures of the state were not as atrophied and backward as early scholars claimed (Cohen 2006; Deak 2015; Höbelt 2002; Judson 2015; King 2002; Unowsky 2005).

At the same time, it is undeniable that the Habsburg Monarchy's nationalist compromises shaped the way its citizens developed their sense of identity in the late 19th century. Its constitutional framework, adopted in 1867 when it became the Dual Monarchy of Austria-Hungary, guaranteed the right of all national groups to develop their national culture and to have schools and universities in their language. With these rights in hand, nationalists not only began to influence the Monarchy's socio-cultural development, but they also became a potent political force as well. Because of these realities, it was impossible for the Austrian half of the Monarchy to pursue the nationalizing policies of Europe's aspiring nation-states.

This reality was especially true with regard to educational policy, where nationalist groups vigilantly fought against any attempt to erode the constitutional provisions that protected language rights in schools. Their efforts do not mean that the Habsburg Monarchy could not or did not try to utilize schools for patriotic development, however. It meant that education officials had to design its system of civic education in a way that accommodated these rights. They accomplished this task by creating a curriculum designed to develop a layered identity in which schools cultivated national and regional senses of self as part of a larger supranational Austrian or imperial identity. Officials believed that, through this process, local identity would serve as a constructive rather than a destructive force, helping to bind the Monarchy's diverse population today. The goal of this layered identity was to create a flexible framework that could adjust to the unique circumstances created by the Monarchy's multinational composition (Moore 2020). It represented a pragmatic attempt to recognize the Monarchy's diversity while pursuing the goal of creating loyal citizens to the state.

While this goal remained consistent throughout the dualist period, the way local, regional, and national identities were conceptualized adapted to meet the political and social demands of the time. In particular, national education became increasingly important as nationalist groups won further concessions from the Habsburg government and obtained more control over educational policy in regions like Bohemia and Moravia. As a result, national and local identities became more directly intertwined. These shifts did not impact the way broader imperial loyalty was conceptualized, however. From the 1860s onward, Austrian civic education consistently taught children that they lived in what can be referred to as a "family of nations," where each national group stood together and benefited from the prosperity and stability made possible by being part of the Habsburg Monarchy. This notion of the family of nations was meant to reinforce the idea that the Monarchy was a multinational state where each group had the same rights and privileges. When teaching this concept, and when teaching about nations in general, educators relied on the official language classifications established by Habsburg authorities. They also reinforced the prevailing assumption that national groups had innate characteristics and behaviors. Even though these reductive beliefs were hardly unique to the Habsburg Monarchy, they nevertheless impacted the way students and teachers thought about themselves and those from different national groups.

Exploring the contours of these developments provides a more robust understanding of how nationalism and national identity developed in 19th-century Europe. Doing so reveals that, contrary to nationalist claims at the time, nationhood was hardly an innate aspect of the human condition.

https://doi.org/10.1017/nps.2024.100 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Moreover, it demonstrates that there were other pathways toward patriotic development that did not rely solely on loyalty to the nation-state. Instead, the example of Habsburg Austria illustrates that there were efforts to cultivate alternative forms of identity in tandem with, not in opposition to, nationalist ideas. As real as this potential was, this example also reveals the growing importance of the concept of the nation.

While this article offers a general analysis of the layered identity developed in Austrian schools and the ways in which this process was influenced by the prevailing pedagogical beliefs of the time, it would be impossible to provide a comprehensive examination of this issue. Recognizing this limitation, this article will focus on the German-speaking schools in the Austrian half of the Monarchy. This focus has several advantages. German-speaking schools were present in every Austrian province, offering a geographically diverse range of examples. Additionally, there were more textbooks and pedagogical journals published in German than in other languages spoken in Austria, providing a rich collection of sources. Equally as important, considering the rancorous conflicts German nationalist groups often had with their co-nationalists, studying the ways in which Austria's German-language schools conceptualized its multinational character helps to better understand how German speakers viewed their place in the Monarchy. Understanding this sense of self also has the benefit of contributing to the excellent body of work that explores similar developments among Austria's non-German-speaking citizens. The other contributions to this special issue, along with the scholarship of Karin Almasy (2018), Ernst Bruckmüller (2007), and others reveal that the sense of identity among these populations was much more complex than nationalist groups at the time and early scholarly assessments assumed. Contextualizing Austria's German-language schools within this broader framework offers compelling insight into the nature of Habsburg identities and the role schools played in crafting those identities.

Teaching National Identity

National education was an essential part of the layered identity cultivated in Austrian schools. Educators and bureaucrats alike believed that children had to love their nation if they were to love the Monarchy. Contrary to the views of earlier historians, these officials did not consider nationalism to be an inherent threat to the state. Instead, they assumed that, if taught properly, national loyalty would be constructive rather than destructive, helping to improve the cohesion of the state. While they understood the potential destructiveness of radical nationalism, they also accepted the prevailing assumption that humans were innately divided into national groups, each with their own culture, character, and nature. Officials, like most nationalist groups, assumed the most important characteristic of the nation was its language. Moreover, Habsburg authorities always dealt with national groups as language groups. As a result, the cultivation of national identity revolved primarily around the teaching of languages.

The Ministry of Religion and Education, which supervised Austrian schools, not only abided by the constitutional provisions that protected language rights with regard to education, but it also actively supported broader efforts at national education. One of the most common ways it provided this support was by granting funding awards and reduced teaching commitments to educators who were researching languages and national history and culture. When providing this assistance, the Ministry assiduously avoided preferencing one national group over the other. A teacher requesting time off from teaching to study German literature was just as likely to receive support as one eager to write about Czech monuments in Bohemia (Request from January 2, 1913, ÖStA, AVA, MKU, Fasz. 2337 C-Lst, 1150). This same commitment was evident in the curriculum adopted by school boards throughout Austria. Each province mandated that every school devote several hours a day to language instruction and to studying national literature (*Verordnung* 1898, 3–9). National education continued in history and geography classes where information about the school's national group was embedded within lessons about the Monarchy. In the first years of education, students also learned local folktales, legends, and folk songs (*Lehrpläne* 1885, 16; Lehrpläne 1876, 5;

https://doi.org/10.1017/nps.2024.100 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Lehrpläne 1875, 4–8). Considering the multinational character of most provinces and the Monarchy as a whole, these lessons were not exclusively about a student's national group. Nevertheless, they provided ample opportunities to teach children about their national culture. During these discussions, textbooks and curricular guidelines almost always used the term *Volk* to refer to national groups, as opposed to the more modern term *Nation.*

Most teachers' associations and pedagogical associations used this term as well and eagerly embraced the chance to cultivate a national culture within schools. Historians have long noted that teachers were among the most strident participants in nationalist organizations, and this finding is reinforced by the views offered in pedagogical writings (Judson 2007, 19–65; Zahra 2008, 13–78). In the minds of most educational leaders, teachers occupied a paternalistic role in the lives of their students, "raising" them with "a father's heart" (*Blätter für Erziehung und Unterricht* July 2, 1873). This responsibility made them the natural protectors of the nation. According to the pedagogical theorist Joseph Niemetz, teachers were both the "bearers and transmitters" of culture, especially in rural communities (1884, 4, 26–27). It was their responsibility to protect national culture and ensure that children grew up as proud members of their nation. Niemetz was not alone in this conviction, the notion that teachers were vital to the preservation of national culture permeated German-language pedagogical journals and the speeches given at teachers' associations ("Lehrer – Erzieher unseres Volkes!" 1887; Ressel 1897). Often, these discussions were as acrimonious as earlier scholarship assumed. As we will see, many German nationalists had difficulty embracing the notion that Austria was a multinational — as opposed to a German — state and clung to chauvinistic attitudes.

Even for those who did not harbor such radical views, schools nevertheless represented the frontline in the struggle with other nationalist groups. Particularly among German nationalist teachers' associations, there was a fear that if educators failed to cultivate the "national spirit" of their students, German culture and identity in Austria would be subsumed by that of the country's Slavic groups (Egermann 1872, 174–175; Netopil 1898; Katschinka 1902). In 1901, an editorial published in the *Deutsch-österreichische Lehrer-Zeitung* reflected on this anxiety. It noted that more and more German speakers found themselves in language islands, which meant they only had "loose contact" with their German language and culture. While this was a concern in Austria, the journal was particularly concerned about the large number of German immigrants living in the USA and Canada. It concluded that robust national education was essential if German speakers living in these language islands were to develop their attachment to German culture ("Die Sprachgrenze des deutschen Volkes" 1901).

Anton Katschinka, a German-speaking teacher in Bohemia offered a similar assessment. He considered vigorous national education to be an essential task in German-speaking schools, especially, since in his view Czech educators were effectively organizing to represent their own national interests (1902, 453–454). These anxieties not only reinforce Gary Cohen's realization that nationalist animosity in Austria was often reactive rather than proactive, it also confirms that for many teachers, schoolhouses were indeed the nationalist fortresses identified by Pieter Judson (2006, 18–28; 2007, 19–65). At the same time, such fears do not necessarily confirm the views of earlier historians who considered Austria to be hopelessly consumed by nationalist strife.

While many German-speaking teachers unquestionably feared that German culture in Austria was under threat, many were equally as concerned about the challenge posed by other political opponents as well. Depending on the political leanings of the pedagogical journal, it was not unusual to see as much, if not more, anxiety about the influence of liberal, socialist, or clerical parties over schools. In fact, throughout the 1890s and early 1900s, when nationalist rancor was at its peak, many liberal nationalist teachers' associations even advocated working with their nationalist rivals to resist conservative efforts to rollback liberal education reforms or to oppose ministry efforts to restrict the political freedoms of teachers ("Der Lehrer als Staatsbürger" 1895; "Die Außerordentliche Versammlung des Deutsch-Österreichischen Lehrerbundes" 1899; "Der slavische Lehrerkongress in Prag" 1908). These other political struggles were often, if not more,

https://doi.org/10.1017/nps.2024.100 Published online by Cambridge University Press

acrimonious and bitter as those between nationalist groups. Their size, scope, and intensity speak to the fact that Austria was developing a more robust and democratic political culture more than signifying its descent into irreconcilable national discord (see Judson 2015, 1–10, 270–280). Additionally, many of the same teachers who believed that they had a solemn duty to educate the *Volk* nevertheless realized that nationalist strife could be destructive to the cohesion of the state. Not only did they argue that teachers needed to avoid stoking nationalist animosity, but some even believed teachers needed to ensure that their political views did not "tarnish" their lessons ("Über den Geschichtsunterricht in der Volksschule" 1895).

The Ministry of Religion and Education, along with local and provincial school boards, worked diligently to prevent such tarnishing from occurring. While officials clearly supported national education and believed that nations were innate to human existence, they realized that radical and separatist nationalism posed an inherent threat to the state. As a result, they used regulations alongside regular inspections to identify and sanction teachers who advocated such views. Ministry regulations specifically warned teachers to "mind their political, national, or religious activities" and established a range of punishments for those who did not do so (*Die Schul- und Unterrichtsordnung* 1887, 19–20). Administrators screened the political and moral character of each applicant for teaching positions, and inspectors evaluated these qualities in end-of-year reports. While these assessments were generally rudimentary, often consisting of nothing more than brief comments, those teachers found to be suspect could face fines, be denied promotions or transfers, or be dismissed (ÖStA Box 2290 and 2291; ÖStA Fasz 2332; OÖLA Sach 26). School leaders similarly monitored the behavior of students, particularly those in *Gymnasien.* In the Upper Austrian town of Kremsmünster, for example, administrators feared that students were being radicalized during visits to local pubs during the 1898–1899 school year. Bans were put in place as a result (OÖLA Sach 27).

Teaching the Family of Nations

The consensus that teachers had a solemn duty to raise members of their nation, coupled with the notion that, when taught properly, national identity would lead to broader Habsburg patriotism meant that national education was an essential part of Austrian schools. At the same time, the official curriculum also made clear that the Monarchy was a multinational state and that each of its constituent nations shared a common history and future. Instead of a nation-state, Austria was what could be considered a family of nations. Schools at all levels and in all languages reinforced this notion throughout the dualist period. When liberal officials from the Ministry of Religion and Education began reforming the curriculum in the 1870s, one of their priorities was to add more Austrian geography and history lessons to the school day. These efforts received broad support from pedagogical groups, with few questioning the importance of these additions (Decree from April 6, 1876, ÖStA Fasz 4188; Letter from the Geography and History Association 1871, ÖStA Box 1833). Over the next several decades, there was continual support from teachers' associations, local and provincial school boards, and ministry officials to place even greater emphasis on this material. These demands were especially strong during the curricular revisions made at the start of the 20th century (Proposal from May 21, 1904, ÖStA Fasz 4191; Memo from May 7, 1914, ÖStA Fasz 4198; Evaluation from Anton Becker, ÖStA Fasz 4198).

While there were always calls for adding more Austrian history and geography to the curriculum, the content of these lessons was consistent from the 1870s until the end of the Monarchy. The major debates surrounding curricular revisions generally focused on the depth and breadth of the material that should be taught in schools rather than how that material should be interpreted (Records related to curriculum revision, ÖStA Fasz 4191–4198). Until the collapse of the Monarchy in 1918, the stated goal of history and geography classes was to teach about Austria and its peoples in a way that would enhance a student's "love of [their] *Heimat* and fatherland" while cultivating their "attachment to the emperor and the dynasty" (Schul- und Unterrichtsordnung July 18, 1870, ÖStA

https://doi.org/10.1017/nps.2024.100 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Box 4188). History and geography lessons began in the first year of education with an emphasis on the student's hometown and province. By the second year, lessons broadened to include the Monarchy as a whole. Starting at the midpoint of their education, students began to learn about Europe and the world, though the curriculum made sure to explain that Austria's role in global affairs should remain at the forefront of this material. For the most part, the lessons and textbooks used for these classes prioritized dramatic, biographic episodes. If students went on to *Realschulen* and *Gymnasien*, these classes became more complex, containing more detail and prioritizing command of historical facts rather than the recitation of historical vignettes (Schul- und Unterrichtsordnung July 18, 1870, ÖStA Box 4188; *Instructionen* 1884, 158).

The way the curriculum at every level defined Austrian history was essential to the efforts to portray the Monarchy as a family of nations. Teachers were required to offer lessons about the history of Austrian hereditary lands, the Kingdom of Bohemia, the Kingdom of Hungary, and the Kingdom of Poland, with a special focus on how these territories became part of the Habsburg patrimony. (While discussions of the Austrian lands, Bohemia, and Hungary emphasized the unquestioned legitimacy of the dynasty's inheritance of these crowns, mentions of the acquisitions of Galicia were notoriously vague.) Even though the curriculum permitted teachers to spend more time on lessons about local and national history, every school, regardless of its language of instruction, was required to teach the individual histories of these key regions of the Monarchy. This fact was especially true for *Realschulen* and *Gymnasien*, which provided an exhaustive discussion of these developments.

Since detailed lesson plans from individual teachers have not been preserved, and considering the vast number of teachers who taught in Austria during this period, it is impossible to say with certainty how each student learned this material. That said, the printed curriculum released by provincial school boards and the textbooks used in classrooms offer compelling insight into how teachers presented this content. Even though each province had control over its elementary and secondary school curricula, they were based on guidelines prepared by the ministry and were consistent across Austria. The ministry had a similar influence over the content of textbooks. In order for textbooks to obtain ministry approval and appear in its catalogs, they were reviewed by trusted outside experts, like historians, teachers, and school administrators, to make sure that their content matched curricular guidelines. While all textbooks, regardless of their language, were subjected to these evaluations, those in German generally received more rigorous reviews. Evaluators spent time scrutinizing even the most pedantic of details and meticulously compared a book's content to the printed curriculum (Textbook reviews from January 5, 1901, February 20, 1901, June 12, 1911, ÖStA Fasz 4852).

These textbooks were the most widely distributed in Austria and were often translated into other languages for use in non-German-speaking schools, offering further standardization. These translations were almost always modified to add more information about the history of that language group and were used as frequently as textbooks written exclusively for non-German-speaking schools (Almasy 2018, 282–305). When translators incorporated national history into textbooks, they made sure to include historical figures and episodes that contributed to patriotic as well as national development. These additions also supported the general principle of the family of nations (Almasy 2018, 266–306; Bruckmüller 2007, 12–23). The number of books available in languages other than German directly corresponded to the number of schools that offered instruction in that language. For example, there was more variety for Czech-speaking schools than Slovene-speaking ones. While these textbooks often received a less rigorous assessment, reviewers thoroughly evaluated them to make sure they were not aggressively nationalistic (Reviews from February 23, 1898, January 31, 1899, November 12, 1912, ÖStA Fasz 4852; Almasy 2018, 282–283).

The content of textbooks understandably varied depending on the grade level for which they were written. Reflecting the design of the curriculum, during students' first years in school, they were assigned readers that offered brief historical vignettes told in the form of stories, folktales, or legends. As children progressed, the text became more formalized and complex, offering a

https://doi.org/10.1017/nps.2024.100 Published online by Cambridge University Press

chronological narrative of the past. The textbooks used in *Realschulen* and *Gymnasien* utilized dense prose packed with details. German-speaking schools could select from dozens of Ministry-approved textbooks to use for history lessons, though there was enormous consistency among these different possibilities. As Oliver Pejić points out in this special issue, different authors found ways to embed various political and social opinions within their work. Even among this variety, however, almost all of them adhered to an accepted consensus regarding the general interpretation of the Habsburg past. This tendency is especially true regarding the way authors portrayed the family of nations.

While there is no way of knowing for sure that teachers faithfully based their lessons on these textbooks, there is evidence to suggest that they generally did. School inspection reports regularly evaluated how well lessons aligned with curricular guidelines. They also reveal that inspectors were deeply frustrated by the fact that teachers often lacked the expertise and training to do more than simply recite information from the textbook. In many cases, teachers simply read the book verbatim (Inspector reports, ÖStA Fasz 2221; Year-end report from Kirchdorf 1879, Year-end report from Schärding 1880, OÖLA Sach 67; Year-end reports from Lower Austria 1893, OÖLA Sach 72). While this lack of content knowledge aggravated inspectors hoping to find schools staffed with well-trained teachers, it also perversely meant that many did not have enough outside information to go too far afield from approved materials.

Vaterlandskunde textbooks, used for history and geography classes during a student's final years in school, offer the best glimpse at how schools developed the idea that the Habsburg Monarchy was a state shared by different national groups. These books provided succinct summaries of Austrian history alongside a comprehensive overview of the Monarchy's physical and human geography. Each section reminded students that the state was a family of nations, and many authors found this concept to be the best way to start their introduction to the material. Franz Frisch's book of "geographic vignettes," meant to accompany *Vaterlandskunde* lessons, offers the best example of this tendency. He begins with a poem by Maximilian I written about "the peoples of Austria-Hungary," and describes the Monarchy as Europe's most diverse state. This diversity could be found within every aspect of Austrian society, from its "multilingual population [that] follows different religions," to the differing levels of education and prosperity of its people. In Frisch's assessment, its diverse nations were ancient and rooted, and Austria could be proud that it had populations descendent from the *Hauptvölker* of Europe — the Germans, Slavs, Romans, and Hungarians (Frisch 1895, 1).

The geography section of *Vaterlandskunde* textbooks left little doubt that this national diversity was a defining characteristic of the Monarchy. Geography lessons not only described each province's geographical features but also taught about the human geography of the Monarchy. This material included descriptions of each region's infrastructure, government buildings, schools, and churches, as well as its population (Gindely 1886, 121–132; Hannak 1896, 45–69). Using the official classifications established by the government, textbooks would provide population statistics and offer detailed information about which language groups lived there. When discussing these language groups, textbooks would also often describe the dialects spoken by the inhabitants of each region (Hannak 1875, 88–95; Gindely 1886, 100–106). The simple and matter-of-fact way these statistical breakdowns presented the national diversity of the Monarchy made its multinational character appear equally as a matter of fact. Since these population statistics also made clear which regions had ethnically blended communities and language islands, they also reinforced the fact that national groups often shared the same spaces (Hannak 1896, 42–44; Gindely 1886, 109).

For the most part, the authors presented these statistics in a straightforward manner with little commentary. As they reflected on the diversity of the Monarchy, however, many authors reinforced the notion that it was a family of nations and felt compelled to remind students that countries did not need to be homogenous nation-states. As Emanuel Hannak explained, a state did not have to contain "only one *Volk*…as [demonstrated] in the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy [where] many peoples are united in statehood under the House of Habsburg" (Hannak 1896). Hannak's

https://doi.org/10.1017/nps.2024.100 Published online by Cambridge University Press

assessment reveals an implicit notion that the Monarchy's national groups shared a bond akin to a family, an idea explicitly articulated by other writers and educators. The use of this family metaphor often relied on paternalistic notions of Emperor Franz Joseph as the "father" of his people. By this logic, the constituent nations of the Monarchy were bound to one another as a student was to his/her siblings ("Patriotismus und Kosmopolitismus" 1901, 268). While these groups may not have a common language, they were connected by a common dynasty and a common history of shared success and sacrifice.

Vaterlandskunde's textbooks consistently reinforced this idea in their sections on Austrian history. They inevitably offered a comprehensive, sometimes tedious, review of the migrations that occurred in the late Roman period, which saw the Germans, Slavs, and Hungarians settle into the region. These discussions were followed by the development of medieval societies and an overview of the history of the kingdoms and territories that would one day be united by the Habsburgs (Petritsch 1875, 3–4; Hannak 1875, 5–26; Zeehe 1907, 5–27; Zeehe and Heiderich 1907, 9–10; Gindely 1886, 4–27). Since these textbooks reviewed material from earlier years and were often written by authors who also published history textbooks, *Vaterlandskunde* material was sometimes nothing more than an abridged version of these other works (Rebhann 1915). While the authors made clear that Austria's national diversity could be traced back to the Middle Ages, the early history of the Monarchy's territories also drew attention to the fact that these periods were marked by constant struggle and bloodshed. Once these lands were bound together by the Habsburg dynasty, these struggles ended, and the Monarchy's peoples were able to find stability. While this point was often implied, it was a powerful argument explaining the benefits of belonging to the Habsburg family of nations. The Monarchy provided greater prosperity and security than its constituent parts could hope to achieve on their own.

Considering Austria's tumultuous history, it was impossible for authors to ignore periods of warfare and crisis. They made clear, however, that during these times, the Monarchy survived because of the solidarity of its people and their shared sacrifices. This sense of shared history and destiny helped to provide the unity not offered by a common nationality. Events like the Ottoman siege of Vienna in 1683 and the Tyrolean uprising during the Napoleonic Wars served as examples of what the peoples of the Monarchy could accomplish by remaining united in the face of adversity. The siege of Vienna and the victories that followed were particularly illustrative of this point since the prevailing interpretation of that event asserted that during this struggle not only were the Monarchy's diverse peoples united, but its different social classes were as well. Few authors missed the opportunity to describe the citizens of Vienna, noble and common, rich and poor, standing side by side to resist the Ottoman onslaught (Rebhann 1915, 174; Tupetz 1908, 119; Gindely 1886, 54–59; Gindely 1893, 93–99; Kraft and Rothaus 1892, 110–111, 114–117).

Schools also taught that during these periods of crisis, Austrians from all backgrounds were not only defending their home, but they were also helping the Monarchy to fulfill its historic mission to defend European stability and protect Christian civilization. The concept of the Habsburg historic mission had been used for generations to justify the Monarchy's status as a great power and to legitimize its authority. The notion that the dynasty had been the "bulwark of civilization" was particularly effective as a source of unity. It could draw from the nationalist histories advanced by groups like the Poles, Hungarians, and South Slavs, which argued that they had served a similar role in earlier times (Almasy 2018, 311–316; Wolff 2010, 224, 265–266). As part of the Monarchy, they continued to do so. In the 19th century, this historic mission became an essential part of history lessons. For example, Andreas Zeehe's and Franz Heiderich's textbook for *Vaterlandskunde* explained that "Austria-Hungary had a great historical and cultural mission" serving as both "the bulwark of Europe against the Turks" and protecting Central Europe from France. Even though the nature of these threats may have shifted, the Monarchy was still "an indispensable member" of the European community of states and it continued to fulfill its traditional mission in the Balkans (Zeehe and Heiderich 1907, 147).

https://doi.org/10.1017/nps.2024.100 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Zeehe and Heiderich further explained that this mission was shared by all of the Monarchy's citizens. Unlike other multinational states, "like Russia," Austria did not have a dominant national group; instead, each of its constitute nations had the freedom to develop side by side. As a result, it stood "uniquely" in Europe, showing that different national groups could be "bound together through common economic interests" and common sacrifice "on domestic and foreign battlefields" (Zeehe and Heiderich 1907, 148). This assessment was not unique to Zeehe and Heiderich, in one way or another, most history and *Vaterlandskunde* textbooks reinforced the idea that regardless of nationality, religion, or class, all Austrians were connected by a shared history of common sacrifices. In return, they enjoyed a shared prosperity (Pennerstorfer 1897, 137–138).

This interpretation of Austrian history had broad support from German-speaking teachers' associations, regardless of their political orientation. Their pedagogical journals were not only filled with articles discussing the importance of teaching the history of each part of the Monarchy, but many included sample lessons also suggesting how to teach children that they belonged to a family of nations. Both the *Pädagogische Zeitschrift*, which was published by the German-nationalist Styrian Teachers' Association, as well as the *Pädagogische Rundschau*, a politically neutral pedagogical journal that published articles related to teaching praxis, included editorials explaining that history classes had to include lessons about each of the Monarchy's nationalities (Reiterer 1891; "Schule und Nationalität" 1892). Despite its German-nationalist leanings, the *Pädagogische Zeitschrift* also often ran editorials about the role teachers played in developing their students' support for their multinational state. Time after time, the journal made clear that cultivating national sentiment was not enough to accomplish this task. In 1879, it wrote that raising students as true Austrian patriots meant teaching them that the Monarchy could only succeed if each of its nations stood "with one another" as one "large family of states (*Staatenfamilie*)" ("Die Pflege des Patriotismus in der Schule" 1879). A year later, it decried what it considered to be a "shallow patriotism" that did not acknowledge that citizens had to support one another and work to elevate the welfare of the entire community. It then pointed to the sacrifices of "previous generations" that made the contemporary prosperity of the Monarchy possible ("Erziehung zum Patriotismus" 1880; "Werken und Pflegen des Patriotismus in der Volksschule" 1888). Such actions demonstrated authentic patriotism.

Even though the *Pädagogische Rundschau* generally avoided such direct political commentary, its sample lessons reinforced these views. In 1907, it printed a lesson called "*Mein Vaterland*," which began with a patriotic poem describing the nobility and strength of Austria and its people. Even though they belonged to different nationalities, they were nevertheless "still one in love and loyalty…still one in deeds and words." The emperor's motto *Viribus Unitis* (with united forces) was the Monarchy's "refuge." The lesson itself reinforced the poem's message. It instructs teachers to remind students that the Monarchy's strength not only came from its emperor but from the unified actions of its citizens. Students must always remember that Austria's diverse provinces were "bound together in an inseparable whole," and even though "many peoples live[d] in Austria, [who] differ[ed] in language, upbringing, and customs," they were "one in love and loyalty, in words and deeds." This unity was "their refuge, their shield, and their protection" ("Mein Vaterland" 1907). As members of the Habsburg family of nations, each group was stronger, more prosperous, and safer than they would be on their own.

Teaching Local Identity

As previously explained, when developing the family of nations metaphor, school lessons often compared it to a child's own family. Each group in the Monarchy was connected to one another the same way students were connected to their siblings, and just as in their own family, the Monarchy was led by a father who only wanted the best for them — Emperor Franz Joseph. Such comparisons relied heavily on the paternalistic interpretation of Habsburg rule that had been part of the dynasty's image for generations. They also built upon prevailing interpretations about the nature of human

https://doi.org/10.1017/nps.2024.100 Published online by Cambridge University Press

society and the way modern states developed. Emanuel Hannak reflected this consensus in his textbook for *Vaterlandskunde*. While discussing early communities in Central Europe, he explains that "by nature, people are social creatures," which necessitates closely linked communities. "The smallest [of these communities] is the family, in which the father holds sway." In the earliest times, tribal groups emerged from these families, "led by elders with ages and experience." Monarchies in turn developed from these tribal groups, ruled by kings who formulated laws meant to encourage the prosperity and stability of the state (Hannak 1896, 69).

While family metaphors would allow students to better understand more complex communities, a child's actual family could do the same for historical events as well. Pedagogical theorists regularly suggested that teachers use family history to make what students learned in history class more relatable. In 1908, for example, the *Pädagogische Rundschau* recommended that students talk to their fathers and grandfathers about what they remembered about Austria's recent history. In particular, they should share stories about their military service and explain how their time in the armed forces contributed to the stability and prosperity of the Monarchy. According to the journal, these conversations would make students more interested in history lessons since they would see how their own families experienced these fateful events. Equally as important, it would help children understand the importance of Franz Joseph to the Monarchy. They would see that just like their fathers, the emperor shared in "the joys and the sorrows" of his peoples ("Über den ersten Geschichtesunterricht in der Volksschule" 1908).

A year later, pedagogical theorist Heinrich Ferdinand Güttenberger, who wrote for the Catholic conservative *Österreichische Pädagogische Warte*, echoed these sentiments. He lamented the fact that all too often history lessons ignored the importance of "personal history," and advocated that teachers try to help students learn about their family's past. While this would obviously help to deepen the bonds between children, parents, and grandparents, it would also help them understand that they lived in a world that was built by the work of older generations. As a result, by embedding family stories within history lessons, schools would help students cultivate a deeper love and appreciation for their homes (Güttenberger 1909, 70). In developing these ideas, Güttenberger drew from long-standing educational theories, which argued that children learned best when school lessons began with what they already knew. So, for example, when teaching about communities, teachers should begin with a student's family, then gradually expand this sense of kinship to include their town, then their province, or *Heimat*, and finally the larger Monarchy. As a result, by teaching children to love their families and their immediate communities, they would soon develop the same level of attachment to their country and the people who lived in it ("Zur Pflege des Patriotismus in der Volksschule" 1894).

Because of the popularity of this theory, history, and geography lessons during the first years of school focused almost entirely on a student's town and province. In German-language schools, this material was included as part of a subject called *Heimatkunde*, which, like *Vaterlandskunde*, blended history, geography, geology, and natural history. The similarity between the two classes was not coincidental. While *Vaterlandskunde* was designed to review what students had learned about the Monarchy in their earlier years in school, *Heimatkunde* was intended to provide a strong foundation for these future lessons. Educators assumed that using a child's hometown as the starting point for learning about science, history, and geography would make these subjects easier to understand. They also believed that this information would help a child develop a stronger bond with where they lived, providing the starting point for patriotic development. These assumptions help to explain why the curriculum for the earliest years of schooling, which every child received, so heavily emphasized the cultivation of local identity.

Heimatkunde was obviously inseparable from the term *Heimat*, which often held Romantic and nationalist connotations among German speakers (Blickle 2002). Habsburg education officials tried to steer clear of these broader philosophical debates, however, and simply used the term to refer to a child's hometown and province. Despite this intent, in pedagogical circles and in daily life, the concept of *Heimat* was still used to communicate a sense of belonging that transcended easily

https://doi.org/10.1017/nps.2024.100 Published online by Cambridge University Press

defined boundaries. This was especially the case in non-German-speaking schools where the concept remained linked to the idea of national belonging (Almasy 2017, 12–20; Eberthart 2013, 71–88).

Romantic notions about the virtues of the rural *Heimat* also continued to permeate discussions of *Heimatkunde.* The subject became an important part of the school curriculum at a time when Austria was experiencing dramatic social, cultural, and political changes due to industrialization and urbanization. As more people migrated to cities, conservative traditionalists began to worry about the impact these developments would have on society. They considered teaching children about where they lived an important step in helping children see the value of rooted communities (Moore 2020, 89–90). This perspective aligned perfectly with those who felt that teaching children to love their *Heimat* would help to ameliorate social and political challenges and foster a sense of patriotism among the Monarchy's citizens. These assumptions echoed similar developments in Germany, where the concept of the *Heimat w*as increasingly used in a way that would enhance the cohesion of the newly united German state. Just as in Austria, the love of *Heimat* was seen as the foundation for state and national loyalty (Confino 1997, 97–189).

The curriculum for *Heimatkunde* began as locally as possible, with lessons centered around the schoolhouse. For example, teachers would use maps of the classroom and the school to establish a foundation for future geography classes, and students would learn about the plants in the school flowerbeds and gardens as an introduction to natural science. Gradually lessons would expand to include the town and ultimately the province where students lived (*Lehrpläne für Volks- und Bürgerschulen in Schlesien* 1876, 5; *Normal-Lehrpläne für die kärnterischen Volksschulen* 1875, 6; "Zum Unterricht in der Heimatkunde" 1890). Considering the design of this curriculum, most theorists considered *Heimatkunde* to be an essential part of education. For students to be successful in future history, geography, and science classes, they first needed the strong foundation provided by *Heimatkunde* in their early years ("Der erdkundliche Unterricht in einer fünfklassigen Volksschule" 1876; *Zentralblatt für pädagogische Literatur* 1871).

Heimatkunde was also considered essential to developing students' love for their home and ensuring that this attachment would grow into robust patriotism as they grew older. This assumption is not surprising since the prevailing pedagogy assumed patriotism developed out of more local forms of loyalty. As the *Blätter für Erziehung und Unterricht*, a journal published by the German pedagogical association in Prague, reminded readers, theses loyalties were intertwined. "The love of the fatherland and the *Heimat*" could only spring from an "inner devotion toward the place where we spent our childhood." Schools had the sacred task of using *Heimatkunde* to "cultivate" this love, which reflected "a beautiful and noble feeling which has been planted by our God" (*Blätter für Erziehung und Unterricht*, 1875). Even if they refrained from the melodramatic flourishes used by the *Blätter für Erziehung und Unterricht*, most mainstream educational leaders agreed with the general sentiment. *Heimatkunde* was vital to the development of local, national, and state identity.

Theory aside, in the classroom, *Heimatkunde* lessons more or less resembled the type of geography, history, and science lessons that would be taught in future years. The primary difference was that they exclusively focused on the town and province in which the school was located. The history portion of the curriculum contained a blend of local history as well as local legends and folktales (*Lehrpläne für Volks- und Bürgerschulen in Schlesien* 1876, 5, 12). As previously discussed, geography lessons used local maps to teach basic geographic concepts. As in *Vaterlandskunde*, these classes also explained the physical and human geography of the region as well (*Lehrpläne für Volks- und Bürgerschulen in Mähren* 1876, 5, 7, 30–31; *Lehrpläne für allgemeine Volksschule mit deutscher Unterrichtssprache in Böhmen* 1912, 2–4, 22; Curriculum for German-language *Burgerschulen* in Bohemia, ÖStA Fasz 4196, 3676). Much to the frustration of many teachers, approved materials for *Heimatkunde* were always in short supply. It was not profitable for printers to produce maps for small towns and less populous provinces. As a result, teachers had to make their own materials or use maps of the entire Monarchy, a tool hardly suited for in-depth discussion of local areas.

https://doi.org/10.1017/nps.2024.100 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Textbooks were in equally short supply. Slovene-speaking schools, for example, often used the same readers throughout a child's early years in school. While these books contained historical vignettes, legends, and folktales about the Slovene-speaking regions of the Monarchy, they were not written specifically for individual regions or provinces (Almasy 2018, 278–305).

Considering the fact that German-language readers were written for use in German-speaking schools across Austria, they were even less useful for *Heimatkunde* lessons. As a result, a handful of publishers printed textbooks specifically designed for the class. These were designed to concisely communicate basic historical and geographic details about individual provinces. They contained exhaustive, often pedantic, details about major waterways, mountain ranges, and natural resources found in the province as well as overviews of its major cities and towns. At times, these later discussions often resembled the structure of travel guides, with descriptions of important government, religious, and cultural sites found in each of these locations (Aichberger 1907; Schirmer 1892). Pedagogical journals supplemented these meager offerings with sample lessons that offered similar descriptions of local historical locations as well as local legends and folktales they could use in class ("Österreichs Heldenjünglinge Hermann und Hisel" 1879; "Erzählungen aus der Geschichte der Steiermark" 1875).

As important as these lessons were, there was a general consensus that the best way to teach *Heimatkunde* was by taking students on trips to see the things they had learned about in the classroom ("Der Unterricht in der Heimatkunde" 1887; *Instructionen für dem Unterricht an den Gymnasien* 1884, 140). Weather, budget concerns, and time constraints obviously limited the frequency of these excursions, but at a minimum, teachers were encouraged to take students to see local landmarks, sites, and monuments. According to the prevailing pedagogy, "experiencing" the *Heimat* not only helped students better learn the material, but it was also essential to helping them learn to love their home. In service of this goal, the *Pädagogische Rundschau* even suggested that schools should encourage parents to take their children on these visits as well, sharing their family history as they wandered from place to place. Doing so would help to further reiterate the bonds between family, *Heimat*, and country ("Über den ersten Geschichtesunterricht in der Volksschule" 1908).

For times when such visits were not possible, teachers were encouraged to have a collection of historical and geological artifacts on hand to use as visual aides (Presslauer 1914, 4–5). The president of the Central Commission for Research and Preservation of Artistic and Historical Monuments even petitioned the Ministry of Religion and Education to prioritize sending well-trained teachers to "archeologically important regions" so they could help with excavations, give public lectures, and assist local museums. This was a period when museums dedicated to local history were being established throughout the Monarchy, and the commission believed that local teachers had an essential role in ensuring that its work was successful (Letter from the president of the Central Commission for Research and Preservation of Artistic and Historical Monuments, ÖStA, Box 1716, 19731, May 10, 1906; Wolff 2010).

Even though *Heimatkunde* was intended to be a gateway for future years of school, many educators took time to remind their colleagues that the importance of teaching about the *Heimat* did not end with *Heimatkunde.* It was vital that they continued to cultivate *Heimat* loyalty whenever possible. Ludwig Battista, who taught in Vienna, wrote a series of editorials for the *Österreichische Pädagogische Warte*, explaining how teachers could embed the "*Heimat* principle" within every aspect of the later years of education. Reviewing local history and geography was an easy place to start, especially since this material was embedded within the curriculum. Battista also included more novel suggestions. For example, local myths and folktales could be used in language classes, while the dimensions and measurements of local rivers and mountains could provide a foundation for mathematics lessons (Battista August 5, 1911, 229–230; September 5, 1911, 239–241). Such innovations would mean that local and regional identities were consistently reinforced. Battista's concerns reveal the extent to which *Heimat* identity was as equally constructive as national identity. Even though educators assumed that both were innate elements of the human condition, the fact

https://doi.org/10.1017/nps.2024.100 Published online by Cambridge University Press

that schools devoted so much time to cultivating these identities reveals that someone's love for his/her place of birth or nation was not as intrinsic as pedagogical theory assumed. Instead, the increased emphasis on local and national identities in Habsburg schools reflects the political and cultural shifts occurring in the Monarchy during the last quarter of the nineteenth century.

By its nature, *Heimatkunde* was meant to cultivate regional identities, not national ones. Because of how the class defined *Heimat*, everyone who lived in a province shared the same identity, regardless of their nationality. For example, the German and Slovene speakers of Carniola both shared a common Carniolan identity. German and Czech speakers in Bohemia were both considered Bohemian. Because education officials designed *Heimatkunde* to help children realize that their communities were part of a greater whole, many hoped it would help to soothe nationalist animosity. As the *Deutsch-österreichische Lehrer-Zeitung* explained, through these lessons, children not only learned that all people shared "common humanity and purpose," but that everyone, regardless of their nationality, was equal. Building on the notion that the Habsburg Monarchy was a family of nations, the journal wrote that teaching children to love their *Heimat* and their country helped them to realize that both were part of a larger "European family of nations." Such an understanding could lessen the discord between nations, between states, and help children not to "fear what is foreign" ("Patriotismus und Kosmopolitismus" 1901, 267–268).

The Nation as Stereotype

History and geography lessons, especially when embedded into *Heimatkunde* and *Vaterlandskunde*, were designed to develop local and national identities. School leaders believed these identities would, in turn, strengthen the patriotic sentiments of students. They would also learn to see their fellow citizens as members of the same family of nations. This process would not only make children loyal members of the Habsburg state as they grew older, but it would also help to mitigate national antagonism. While this was the goal, the way schools taught about national groups may have unintentionally limited the scope of its success. As previously mentioned, prevailing pedagogy accepted without question that national and regional identities were a natural part of the human condition. Moreover, it also believed that language was the foundation of national groups and that each nation's culture, dress, behaviors, and even physical traits were an innate part of its identity (Presslauer 1914, 11; Hannak 1875, 91–93). All too often, these assumptions relied on stereotypes and, in extreme cases, reduced national groups to caricatures. They also hardened national categories, requiring children to have a clear and distinct national identity.

Such reductive notions were hardly limited to school lessons. Instead, they were a common part of the prevailing ethnographic theories of the time. The tendency to define nations by stereotypes was common in ethnography museums and scholarly works (Wolff 2010, 286–294). In fact, the way in which Austrian schools described the nations of the Habsburg Monarchy echoed those found in the *Kronprinzenwerk.* This twenty-four volume work, originally commissioned by Crown Prince Rudolf, showcased the diversity of the Monarchy with in-depth discussions of its lands and peoples. As in *Heimatkunde* and *Vaterlandskunde* lessons, these descriptions relied heavily on generalized ideas of national culture and behavior and were accompanied by a rich collection of images (Batersdorf 2005; Judson 2015, 326–328). Given this fact, it is not surprising such interpretations were found in textbooks and materials published by pedagogical journals.

Whenever lessons introduced a new country or ethnic group, they inevitably described how its people dressed, what they ate, and how they behaved ("Die Indianer" 1889; Petritsch 1875, 1; *Lehrpläne für Volks- und Bürgerschulen in Mähren* 1876, 5, 7, 30–31; *Verordnung des Ministers für Cultus und Unterricht vom 23. April* 1898, 11). When discussing the Monarchy's different nationalities, these descriptions were commonly folded into lessons about the medieval period. These classes explained the movement of these groups throughout Central Europe and, as a result, they tended to describe characteristics and traits within the context of the group's development. Early Germans, for example, had "powerful builds, blue eyes, blonde hair" and tended to wear

https://doi.org/10.1017/nps.2024.100 Published online by Cambridge University Press

"simple clothes" made of animal skins and furs, while the Huns were described as having a "slight build, a sparse beard, an upturned nose, and a dark skin color" (Gindely, *Lehrbuch der Geschichte für Bürgerschulen* 1885, 70–72). These physical descriptions were sometimes followed by information about the behavior of the group and how these qualities influenced their society. At a minimum, most German-language textbooks had such descriptions for the ancient Germans. Reflecting the nationalist consensus popular at the time, members of the German tribes were "loyal, pious, heroic, chaste, [and] hospitable." It was also not uncommon for authors to mention the fact that Germans had "simple morals," were courageous in battle, had a "deep religiosity," and had a deep "love of freedom" (Tupetz 1908, 36–38; see also Rebhann 1915, 10; Kraft and Rothaus 1892, 85).

Similar descriptions of the cultural characteristics of the Monarchy's other national groups were less consistent. In particular, it is notable, given the structure of the Dual Monarchy, that very little time was spent on early Hungarians. While every textbook had an extensive overview of the evolution of the Hungarian state and the achievements of the Hungarian kings, few had much to say about the Hungarians themselves. Descriptions of the Slavs were more common and were less positive than those of the Germans. Even though it was not unusual for authors to highlight the importance of family to early Slavs and their ability to overcome tribal differences during periods of crisis, they were always portrayed as less developed than the Germans (Zeehe and Heiderich 1907, 11; "Die Slaven" 1900).

Textbooks written by the prolific historian Anton Gindely directly contrasted these groups, offering a strange comparison of their attitudes toward women. Even though both "shared the blessings of fertility and abundance," in his assessment, the Germans had a "high regard for women" and wives were not "the slaves of men" as in other societies, but rather "were their true companions" (Gindely, *Lehrbuch der Geschichte für Mädchen-Bürgerschulen* 1885, 23; Kraft and Rothaus 1892, 85). This stood in sharp contrast to Slavic tribes, where women "had to obey the men and perform all of the hard work alone…They were [the] property of their husbands and in times of famine would be left to starve" (Gindely, *Lehrbuch der Geschichte für Mädchen-Bürgerschulen* 1885, 23). Since this example was incorporated into a textbook used in girls' schools, it was likely a way for Gindely to fulfill the curricular mandate to include material about the experience of women and girls. While it was not unusual for textbooks written for boys' schools to claim that women were viewed as equals in Germanic tribes, few echoed this stark contrast with early Slavic society.

Descriptions of the contemporary nations of the Monarchy were incorporated into lessons on human geography. For the most part, this information was limited to population statistics that subtly but significantly reminded students that two or more nationalities shared many of Austria's provinces. In many textbooks, authors also included descriptions of each group. When doing so, educators relied on the official classifications established by the Habsburg government. As Jan Bernot's and Rok Stergar's article in this volume aptly reveals, the development of national categories was hardly a linear process. It was fraught with debate and disagreement. The school curriculum steered clear of these complexities, and instead simply presented each nationality as an innate reality.

Often the material about each nation was innocuous. Franz Frisch, for example, told students that Slovaks were "poor, but hardworking" and described the green wool jackets commonly worn by Slovak men. In some cases, the language used to evaluate national groups was condescending. Such was the case with F. J. Graf von Silva-Tarouca's *Vaterlandskunde* textbook. He claims that the Germans of the Monarchy were most noted for "their industriousness, their courage, their diligence" and that the Czechs represented "the best of all Slavs" thanks to the fact that they excelled in "every aspect of cultural life." He praises the Poles of Galicia for their physical and mental agility and their ability to master foreign languages, but also mentions they were "easily excitable." By contrast, the Ruthenians were "stronger and bigger" and were "more deliberate and quieter," making it "difficult to dissuade them from their goals." Assessing the South Slavs, he praises the Slovenes and Croats for their bravery and determination, especially in resisting the Ottoman

https://doi.org/10.1017/nps.2024.100 Published online by Cambridge University Press

incursions in earlier times. He also lamented the fact that Ottoman dominance left the Serbs "culturally backward" (von Silva-Tarouca 1914, 39, 61, 76).

On a surface level, Silva-Tarouca attempts to present most national groups in a favorable light, but the language and tone used to discuss the non-Germans of the Monarchy is reductive. Furthermore, he also reinforces the German nationalist belief that the Germans were the *Kulturträger* who helped the other nationalities of Central Europe develop political and cultural institutions. He directly attributes the cultural advancement of the Czechs to the Bohemian king Charles IV, who was "half German and half French," and explicitly claims that the Germans were responsible for teaching the Hungarians "in all of the fine arts of peace" and for "softening their manner" (von Silva-Tarouca 1914, 39, 68). Franz Frisch expresses similar sentiments in his textbook for *Vaterlandskunde*, arguing that the Czechs had become a true *Kulturvolk* because of their longstanding ties with the Germans (Frisch 1895, 3). Emanuel Hannak, who wrote several textbooks that were widely used in German-speaking schools and were translated into other languages, was equally as explicit. He refers to the Germans as "the Middle Ages' most notable *Kulturvolk.*" He then goes through great pains to delineate the ways in which the institutional developments in Bohemia, Poland, and Hungary were modeled on those occurring in the German states. In a statement that would have enflamed the nationalist sentiment of many Czechs, he even went so far as to argue that, thanks to its German kings, medieval Bohemia had "a German character" (Hannak 1875, 12–30). Such notions were omitted in translations of these textbooks used in non-German speaking schools. Instead, as previously mentioned, these versions used this space to discuss the history of the national group associated with the school's language. Consistent with pedagogical support for cultivating national identity, these lessons became an essential tool for presenting a positive interpretation of the nation's cultural development (Almasy 2018, 282–305; Bruckmüller 1999, 511–530; Maxwell 2009, 34–55).

Overall, it is not surprising that lessons in German-language schools offered such a flattering portrayal of the German nation. In German nationalist pedagogical journals, contributors often waxed lyrically about the virtues of the German people when discussing the importance of educating children to love their nation ("Der Deutsche Schulmeister" 1914; "Die Begabung des deutschen Volkes" 1906). It is also important to note that the Germans were not the only national group to conceive of themselves in this way. The Poles of Galicia also thought of themselves as the "bearers of civilization" who helped to elevate Ruthenian culture (Wolff 2010, 217). Even though such chauvinistic notions did not directly challenge the idea that the Monarchy was a family of nations or contest the rights of national groups within shared spaces, it nevertheless perpetuated a sense that Austria's nationalities existed within a hierarchy. In turn, this assertion challenged the notion that each group was equal, threatening to exacerbate national conflict.

Such notions also made it easier for some nationalist-minded teachers to reinforce the belief that Austria was, at its core, a German state, which directly undermined the goal of teaching that it was a multinational family of nations. For example, at a meeting of German-speaking teachers in Prague in 1897, Emil Ressel, a teacher in Ehrenberg, spoke about the importance of defending the status of German culture in Austria. Toward the end of his speech, Ressel proclaimed, "We live in a state where each city, each building, each great deed gives testimony to the German spirit and German perseverance." Throughout Austria, the Germans "were and still are the authentic and actual *Kulturträger*" (Ressel 1897). Similar views occasionally found their way into German nationalist pedagogical journals, especially when describing the nationalist conflict over education. It was not uncommon for teachers to reinforce the claim that the Monarchy rested on a "German foundation" and to plead for like-minded Germans to defend this foundation ("Für unser deutsches Volkstum" 1904; "Die Lehrerversammlung in Brünn" 1898).

Such notions only served to aggravate the struggle between nationalist groups in the Monarchy. Political solutions designed to mitigate this conflict unintentionally weakened the non-national *Heimat* articulated in school lessons. Agreements like the Moravia Compromise of 1905 not only divided school administration along national lines, but they also gave tacit permission for educators

https://doi.org/10.1017/nps.2024.100 Published online by Cambridge University Press

to prioritize the teaching of national identity over local identity in the curriculum. They also hardened national classifications even more than they had been previously. This tendency is best demonstrated in Bohemia and Moravia. It is worth reiterating that in the late nineteenth century, the curriculum in these regions mandated that schools teach about the province. This not only included its geography but also its nationalities. The curriculum also required the teaching of local history, legends, and folktales. This structure was consistent with the requirements laid out by the Ministry of Religion and Education and could be found throughout Austria, including in other multinational provinces (*Lehrpläne für Volks-und Bürgerschulen in Mähren* 1876, 6–7; *Lehrpläne für allgemeine Volksschulen in Böhmen* 1885, 14; *Lehrpläne für Volks-und Bürgerschulen in Schlesien* 1876, 5; *Normal-Lehrpläne für die kärnterischen Volksschulen* 1875, 5). While individual teachers could have only focused on German or Czech speakers in these lessons, doing so would have been contrary to the intended goal of the curriculum.

Things changed dramatically in the first decade of the 20th century. After the nationalist compromises went into effect, the teaching of local history almost exclusively focused on either the Germans or the Czechs of the area. For example, the curriculum for German-speaking schools in Bohemia in 1912 required schools to teach Bohemian history, the ancient Germans, "German heroes," and the German people of Bohemia. While the more general lessons about Bohemian history ostensibly discussed the Czechs, the emphasis was clearly on German speakers (*Lehrpläne für allgemeine Volksschule mit deutscher Unterrichtssprache in Böhmen* 1912, 2–4, 5–8, 22). A similar change took place in Moravia. When establishing the parameters for teaching Moravian history, the curriculum specifically required educators to teach about the German nation on every "suitable occasion" (*Lehrpläne für allgemeine Volksschule mit deutscher Unterrichtssprache in Mähren* 1915, 10–11). In this context, even the seemingly straightforward statistics presented in textbooks could be utilized to serve nationalist aims. Identifying how many Czech speakers and German speakers lived in a certain area could make it seem as if the national composition of these spaces were hardened and inflexible (Gindely 1886, 109–110; Zahra 2008). It helped to create a sense of "German spaces" and "Czech spaces."

This nationalization of *Heimat* identity was also reflected in pedagogical circles. For example, the songbook *An meine Heimat*, published in 1900 for use in schools, contained several songs describing Austria as a "German *Heimat*" and reinforced the idea that Austria was primarily a German land. Many of these songs further reiterated the standard notion that Germans were the *Kulturträger* of the Monarchy. One even drifted into noxious chauvinism that attacked the Slavs for "shirking" their duty to the state, the Romanians for their "vain delusions" of autonomy, and the Hungarians for "drawing their own path and scoffing [at the stability of] the Monarchy." Only the Germans worked for Austria (Hofmann 1900, 6–8, 30–32).

Conclusion

Developments like these do not mean that the layered identity cultivated in Austrian schools was doomed to failure nor do they suggest that Habsburg civic education was unsuccessful. Instead, they suggest that the curriculum would have continued to adapt to the political and cultural developments taking place in the 20th century. Because of the disruptions created by the First World War and the fact that the Monarchy collapsed under the strains of these disruptions, it is unknown what these adjustments would have been. This fact does not diminish the importance of understanding Habsburg civic education and the way it both accommodated and influenced the development of identities. Austria not only permitted but even encouraged constituent nations to develop their national identity. By crafting a layered identity predicated on the idea of the state as a family of nations, Habsburg authorities hoped to accommodate nationalist demands in a way that would strengthen loyalty to the state.

At the same time, this process was influenced by the prevailing attitudes of the time and reflected the notion that nations were an innate part of the human condition and that nations themselves had

https://doi.org/10.1017/nps.2024.100 Published online by Cambridge University Press

innate qualities and characteristics. By aligning the teaching of national identity with official classifications, Habsburg civic education also helped to harden national categories, ignoring the complexity of how these categories developed. Nevertheless, one must avoid the temptation to see these developments as proof that Austrian schools served only as battlelines for an intractable nationality conflict. Even the most strident mainstream nationalist pedagogical leader continued to be robustly patriotic and supportive of the Habsburg dynasty and the state. If anything, they often tried to show that their nation was the *most* patriotic. Moreover, the theoretical framework behind the layered identity continued to argue that national loyalty was essential to patriotic development. The changing intersection of local, regional, national, and state identity in Austrian schools illustrates the malleability of Habsburg administration and its efforts to adapt to the changing political realities of the early 20th century. It also demonstrates the growing power of Austrian civil society and the ways in which political and social groups influenced the state and its behavior. As a result, the curriculum of Austrian schools offers a compelling look at an effort to use modern education to cultivate an alternative to an exclusively national sense of loyalty.

Financial support. This work was supported by Fulbright Austria (Fulbright Mach Fellowship); and Eastern Connecticut State University (John Fox Slater Fund for Historical Research, AAUP-CSU Faculty Research Grant).

Disclosure. None.

Works cited

Archives

Oberösterreichisches Landesarchiv (OÖLA), Linz Landesschulrat (LSR)

Österreichisches Staatsarchiv (ÖStA), Vienna Allgemeines Verwaltungsarchiv: Ministeriums für Kultus und Unterricht (AVA: MKU)

Primary Sources

Aichberger, Julius. *Kleine Heimatkunde von Oberösterreich. Ein Wiederholungsbüchlein für Volksschüler*. Vienna: A. Pichlers Witwe & Sohn, 1907.

Battista, Ludwig. “Das Heimatprinzip auf den hoheren Stufen der Volksschule.” Österreichische Pädagogische Warte. Lehrer- und Lehrerinnen-Zeitung. August 5, 1911, September 5, 1911.

Blätter für Erziehung und Unterricht. July 2, 1873.

Blätter für Erziehung und Unterricht. January 24, 1875.

“Der deutsche Schulmeister.” *Pädagogische Zeitschrift: Organ des steiermarkischen Lehrerbundes Graz.* November 10, 1914.

“Der erdkundliche Unterricht in einer fünfklassigen Volksschule.” *Pädagogische Zeitschrift: Organ des steiermarkischen Lehrerbundes Graz.* March 31, 1876.

“Der Lehrer als Staatsbürger.” *Freie Lehrerstimme. Organ der jüngeren Lehrerschaft.* October 1, 1895.

“Der Unterricht in der Heimatkunde – noch immer zu viel Papier und zu wenig Anschauung.” *Pädagogische Zeitschrift: Organ des steiermarkischen Lehrerbundes Graz.* June 20, 1887.

“Der slavische Lehrerkongress in Prag.” Tiroler Lehrer Zeitung, October 1, 1908.

“Die Außerordentliche Versammlung des Deutsch-Österreichischen Lehrerbundes.” *Pädagogische Zeitschrift: Organ des steiermarkischen Lehrerbundes Graz.* November 12, 1899.

“Die Begabung des deutschen Volkes.” Pädagogische Rundschau: Zeitschrift für Schulpraxis und Lehrerfortbildung. November 1906.

“Die Indianer.” *Pädagogische Rundschau: Zeitschrift für Schulpraxis und Lehrerfortbildung.* July, 1889.

“Die Lehrerversammlung in Brünn.” *Deutsch-österreichische Lehrer-Zeitung, Organ des Deutsch-österreichische Lehrerbundes.* October 15, 1898.

“Die Pflege des Patriotismus in der Schule.” *Pädagogische Zeitschrift: Organ des steiermarkischen Lehrerbundes Graz.* May 31, 1879.

Die Schul- und Unterrichtsordnung für allgemeine Volksschulen. Verordnung des Ministers für C. u. U. vom 20 August 1870, 2nd ed. Prague: Heinrich Merhs Verlag, 1887.

“Die Slaven.” *Pädagogische Rundschau: Zeitschrift für Schulpraxis und Lehrerfortbildung.* November, 1900.

https://doi.org/10.1017/nps.2024.100 Published online by Cambridge University Press

"Die Sprachgrenze des deutschen Volkes." *Deutsch-österreichische Lehrer-Zeitung, Organ des Deutsch-österreichische Lehrerbundes.* January 15, 1901.
Egermann, Josef. "Die Geschichte in der Volksschule." *Blätter für Erziehung und Unterricht*. April 10, 1872.
"Erzählungen aus der Geschichte der Steiermark." *Pädagogische Zeitschrift: Organ des steiermarkischen Lehrerbundes Graz.* May 20, 1875.
"Erziehung zum Patriotismus." *Pädagogische Zeitschrift: Organ des steiermarkischen Lehrerbundes Graz.* September 30, 1880.
Frisch, Franz. *Geographische Bilder aus Österreich-Ungarn zur Belegung des Unterrichtes in der Vaterlandskunde*. Vienna: A. Pichlers Witwe & Sohn, 1895.
"Für unser deutsches Volkstum." *Deutsch-österreichische Lehrer-Zeitung, Organ des Deutsch-österreichische Lehrerbundes.* April 21, 1904.
Gindely, Anton. *Lehrbuch der Geschichte für Bürgerschulen, Ausgabe für Knabenschulen*, vol. 1, 7th ed. Prague: F. Tempsky, 1885.
Gindely, Anton. *Lehrbuch der Geschichte für Bürgerschulen, Ausgabe für Mädchenschulen*, vol. 2, 11th ed. Prague: F. Tempsky, 1893.
Gindely, Anton. *Lehrbuch der Geschichte für Mädchen-Bürgerschulen*, vol. 2 7th ed. Prague: F. Tempsky, 1885.
Gindely, Anton. *Österreichische Vaterlandskunde für die 8. Classe der Gymnasien*. Prague: F.Tempsky, 1886.
Güttenberger, Heinrich Ferdinand. "Wie wir den Kindern das Heimatgefühl erhalten sollen." *Österreichische Pädagogische Warte. Lehrer- und Lehrerinnen-Zeitung.* January 1, 1909.
Hannak, Emanuel. *Oesterreichische Vaterlandskunde für die höheren Klassen der Mittelschulen*. Vienna: Alfred Hölder, 1875.
Hannak, Emanuel. *Österreichische Vaterlandskunde für die unteren Klassen der Mittelschulen*, Vienna: Alfred Hölder, 1896 (Identical edition published in 1902).
Hofmann, Emil. *An meine Heimat: Lieder aus Deutsch-Österreich*. Vienna: Deutscher Turnerbund Wien Verlag, 1900.
Instructionen für dem Unterricht an den Gymnasien, 1884.
Katschinka, Anton. "Zur Geschichte des Deutsch-österreichischen Lehrerbundes." *Deutsch-österreichische Lehrer-Zeitung, Organ des Deutsch-österreichische Lehrerbundes.* December 1, 1902.
Kraft, Josef, and Johann Georg Rothaus. *Anton Gindelys Lehrbuch der Geschichte für Bürgerschulen*, vol. 1. Vienna: F. Tempsky, 1892.
"Lehrer – Erzieher unseres Volkes!" *Pädagogische Zeitschrift: Organ des steiermarkischen Lehrerbundes Graz.* June 20, 1887.
Lehrpläne für allgemeine Volksschulen in Böhmen nach dem Erlass des k.k. Landesschulrathes vom 18. Juli 1885. Prague: Heinrich Merch, 1885.
Lehrpläne für allgemeine Volksschule mit deutscher Unterrichtssprache in Böhmen. Vienna: A. Pichlers Witwe & Sohn, 1912.
Lehrpläne für allgemeine Volksschule mit deutscher Unterrichtssprache in Mähren. Brünn: Verlag des k.k. Mähr. Landesschulrates, 1915.
Lehrpläne für Volks- und Bürgerschulen in Mähren. Vienna: A. Pichlers Witwe & Sohn, 1876.
Lehrpläne für Volks- und Bürgerschulen in Schlesien. Vienna: A. Pichlers Witwe & Sohn, 1876.
"Mein Vaterland." *Pädagogische Rundschau: Zeitschrift für Schulpraxis und Lehrerfortbildung.* October 1907.
Netopil, F. "Die Entwicklung und Pflege des deutschen Volkstums in der Schule." *Deutsch-österreichische Lehrer-Zeitung, Organ des Deutsch-österreichische Lehrerbundes*. September 15, 1898.
Niemetz, Joseph. *Die Cultur des Bauerstandes und die Stellung der Volksschullehrer*. Linz: Verlag des Oberösterreichischen Lehrervereins, 1884.
Normal-Lehrpläne für die kärnterischen Volksschulen. Klagenfurt: Joh. & Fried. Leon., 1875.
"Österreichs Heldenjünglinge Hermann und Hirsel." *Pädagogische Zeitschrift: Organ des steiermarkischen Lehrerbundes Graz.* November 10, 1879.
"Patriotismus und Kosmopolitismus." *Deutsch-österreichische Lehrer-Zeitung, Organ des Deutsch-österreichische Lehrerbundes.* August 1, 1901.
Pennerstorfer, Ignaz. *Lehrbuch der Geschichte für Bürgerschulen*, vol. 1. Vienna: Manzsche k.u.k. Hof-Verlags- und Universitäts-Buchhandlung, 1897.
Petritsch, Fann. *Oesterreichische Vaterlandskunde für Volks- und Bürgerschulen*, vol. 1. Vienna: Self-Published, 1875.
Presslauer, Raimund. *„Kennst du deine Heimat? "Ein Büchlein für forschende Wanderer und wandernde Forscher*. Vienna: F. Tempsky, 1914.
Rebhann, Anton. *Lehrbuch der Geschichte für Realschulen andere verwandte Lehranstalten und Reformrealgymnasien*, vol. 2, *Geschichte des Mittelalters und der Neuzeit bis zum westfälischen Frieden.* Laibach: Ig. V. Kleinmayr F. Bamberg, 1915.
Reiterer, Josef. "Zum Unterricht in der Geschichte." *Pädagogische Zeitschrift: Organ des steiermarkischen Lehrerbundes Graz.* June 30, 1891.
Ressel, Emil. "Die Pflichten des deutschen Lehrers gegen seine Volksstamm." *Pädagogische Zeitschrift: Organ des steiermarkischen Lehrerbundes Graz.* October 31, 1897.
Schirmer, Wilhelm. *Heimatkunde des Herzogthums Schlesien*. Bielsko: W. Fröhlich, 1892.
"Schule und Nationalität." *Pädagogische Rundschau: Zeitschrift für Schulpraxis und Lehrerfortbildung.* April 1, 1892.
Tupetz, Theodor. *Bilder aus der Geschichte für Mädchenbürgerschulen*. Vienna: F. Tempsky, 1908.

https://doi.org/10.1017/nps.2024.100 Published online by Cambridge University Press

"Über den ersten Geschichtesunterricht in der Volksschule." *Pädagogische Rundschau: Zeitschrift für Schulpraxis und Lehrerfortbildung.* January, 1908.
"Über den Geschichtsunterricht in der Volksschule." *Pädagogische Rundschau: Zeitschrift für Schulpraxis und Lehrerfortbildung.* October 1895.
Verordnung des Ministers für Cultus und Unterricht vom 23. April 1898, Z. 10331, an Sämmtliche k.k. Landesschulbehörden, betreffend einen neuen Normallehrplan für Realschulen. Vienna: k.k. Schülbüchen-verlag, 1898.
Von Silva - Tarouca, F. J. Graf. *Lehrbuch der Vaterlandskunde für die oberste Klasse der Mittelschulen in Osterreich*. Vienna: Carl Fromme, 1914.
"Werken und Pflegen des Patriotismus in der Volksschule." *Pädagogische Zeitschrift: Organ des steiermarkischen Lehrerbundes Graz.* November 30, 1888.
Zeehe, Andreas. *Österreichische Vaterlandskunde für die VIII. Gynasialklasse*. Laibach: Ig v. Kleinmayr & F. Bamberg, 1907.
Zeehe, Andreas and Franz Heiderich. *Österreichische Vaterlandskunde für die VIII. Gymnasialklasse*, 2nd ed. Laibach: Ig. V. Kleinmayr F. Bamberg, 1907.
Zentralblatt für pädagogische Literatur. July 1871.
"Zum Unterricht in der Heimatkunde." *Pädagogische Zeitschrift: Organ des steiermarkischen Lehrerbundes Graz.* May 31, 1890.
"Zur Pflege des Patriotismus in der Volksschule." *Pädagogische Rundschau: Zeitschrift für Schulpraxis und Lehrerfortbildung.* February, 1894.

Secondary sources

Almasy, Karin. *Kanon und nationale Konsolidierung. Übersetzungen und ideologische Steuerung in slowenischen Schulbüchern, 1848–1918*. Vienna: Böhlau, 2018.
Almasy, Karin. "Heimat und Welt in konzentrischen Kreisen. Wissenskanon und Vorstellungswelten in slowenischen Volksschullesebüchern um 1900", in *Dynamiken in der Wissensproduktion. Räume, Zeiten und Akteure im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert*, Manfred Pfaffenthaler and Wolfgang Göderle, eds., 1–25. Bielefeld: Transcript, 2017.
Baiersdorf, Paul. 2005. "Kronprinzenwerk and the Nationalitätenproblem in Austria-Hungary," *East Central Europe* 32 (no. 1-2): 239–247.
Blickle, Peter. *Heimat: A Critical Theory of the German Idea of Homeland*. Rochester, NY: Camden House, 2002.
Bruckmüller, Ernst. "Patriotic and National Myths: National Consciousness and Elementary School Education in Imperial Austria," in *The Limits of Loyalty: Imperial Symbolism, Popular Allegiances, and State Patriotism in the Late Habsburg Monarchy*, Laurence Cole and Daniel Unowsky, eds, 11–35. New York: Berghahn Books, 2007.
Bruckmüller, Ernst. "Patriotismus und Geschichtsunterricht: Lehrpläne und Lehrbücher als Instrumente eines übernationalen Gesamtstaatsbewußtseins in den Gymnasien der späten Habsburgermonarchie," in *Vilfanov zbornik: Pravo - zgodovina – narod = Recht - Geschichte – Nation*, Vincenc Rajšp and Ernst Bruckmüller, eds., 511–530. Ljubljana: Založba, 1999.
Burger, Hannelore. *Sprachenrecht und Sprachengerechtigkeit im Österreichischen Unterrichtswesen, 1867-1918*. Vienna: Verlag der österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1995.
Cohen, Gary B. *The Politics of Ethnic Survival: Germans in Prague, 1861-1914*, 2nd ed. West Lafayette, IN: Purdue University Press, 2006.
Confino, Alon. *The National as Local Metaphor: Württemberg, Imperial Germany, and National Memory, 1871-1918*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1997.
Deak, John. *Forging a Multinational State: State Making in Imperial Austria from the Enlightenment to the First World War*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2015.
Eberthart, Helmut, "… auf heimatlicher Grundlage…. Viktor Geramb undder Heimatschutz 1918-1938," in *Identität, Politik, Architektur: Der "Verein für Heimatschutz in Steiermark,"* Antje Senarclens de Grancy, ed., 71–88. Berlin: Jovis, 2013.
Engelbrecht, Helmut. *Geschichte des österreichischen Bildungswesens*, vol. 4, *Erziehung und Unterricht auf dem Boden Österreichs, Von 1848 bis zum Ende der Monarchie.* Vienna: Österreichischer Bundesverlag, 1986.
Green, Andy. *Education and State Formation: The Rise of Education Systems in England, France, and the USA*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1990.
Harp, Stephen L. *Learning to be Loyal: Primary Schooling as Nation Building in Alsace and Lorraine, 1850-1940*. Dekalb: Northern Illinois University Press, 1998.
Höbelt, Lothar. "'Well-tempered Discontent': Austrian Domestic Politics," in *The Last Years of Austria-Hungary: A Multi-National Experiment in Early Twentieth-Century Europe*, Mark Cornwall, ed. Exeter: University of Exeter Press, 2002.
Jászi, Oscar. *The Dissolution of the Habsburg Monarchy*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1929.
Judson, Pieter M. *Guardians of the Nation: Activists on the Language Frontiers of Imperial Austria*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2007.
Judson, Pieter M. *The Habsburg Empire: A New History*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press, 2015.
Kann, Robert. *The Multinational Empire: Nationalism and National Reform in the Habsburg Monarchy, 1848-1914*, vol. 1. New York: Columbia University Press, 1950.

https://doi.org/10.1017/nps.2024.100 Published online by Cambridge University Press

King, Jeremy. *Budweisers into Czechs and Germans: A Local History of Bohemian Politics, 1848-1948*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2002.

Lehning, James R. *Peasant and French: Cultural Contact in Rural France during the Nineteenth Century*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1995.

Maxwell, Alexander. *Choosing Slovakia. Slavic Hungary, the Czechoslovak Language and Accidental Nationalism*. New York: I. B. Tauris, 2009.

Moore, Scott O. *Teaching the Empire: Education and State Loyalty in Late Habsburg Austria*. West Lafayette, IN: Purdue University Press, 2020.

Unowsky, Daniel. *The Pomp and Politics of Patriotism: Imperial Celebrations in Habsburg Austria, 1848-1916*. West Lafayette, IN: Purdue University Press, 2005.

Von Nuys, Frank. *Americanizing the West: Race, Immigrants and Citizenship, 1890 – 1930*. Lawrence: University of Kansas Press, 2002.

Weber, Eugen. *Peasants into Frenchmen: The Modernization of Rural France, 1870-1914*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1976.

Wolff, Larry. *The Idea of Galicia: History and Fantasy in Habsburg Political Culture*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2010.

Zahra, Tara. *Kidnapped Souls: National Indifference and the Battle for Children in the Bohemian Lands, 1900-1948*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2008.

Ziegler-McPherson, Christina A. *Americanization in the States: Immigrant Social Welfare Policy, Citizenship, and National Identity in the United States, 1908-1929*. Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2009.

Cite this article: Moore, Scott O. 2025. "Vaterland, Heimat, and the Family of Nation: Education and Identity Formation in Late-Habsburg Austria". *Nationalities Papers*: 1–20, doi:10.1017/nps.2024.100

https://doi.org/10.1017/nps.2024.100 Published online by Cambridge University Press