Abstract. The paper deals with the issues of constructing a supranational identity in the Austrian Empire. Originally being a reaction to revolutionary ideas transferred from France throughout Europe, conservative ideology appeared to influence the political development of Austria until the downfall of Habsburg monarchy in 1918. The early Austrian conservatism referred to a significant patriotic myth, based on the loyalty towards the ruling dynasty and their empire, represented as the “family of peoples”. The philosophical, political and historical works published by Friedrich von Gentz, Adam von Müller Nitterdorf and Joseph von Hormayr turned into a base for “Dynastic patriotism” with supranational patterns aimed to integrate all the involved peoples into members of the Empire. The myth included the specially constructed historical narrative, political and social philosophy, and the theological support. The myth became a ground for conservative political course of Clemens von Metternich and Francis I and made an impact on the further development of the national problem in the Empire, the Austrian political culture, the German politics of Vienna, and the further development of the Austro-Prussian dualism in Germany.
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I. INTRODUCTION

Multicultural and multilingual states and empires of the modern era remain to be a subject to study in research works. Formation of national identities in conditions of undefined ethnic boundaries and multilateral interaction in various spheres of social life is one of the core problems for scholars involved in studying the cultural, political, social, intellectual history, history of daily life, and beyond. Researchers come to a conclusion, that the emergence of national identity in these conditions has its own features, which appear especially vivid within contacts of several ethnic and cultural communities being on the same stage of identity development.
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Central and Eastern Europe and Balkans appear to be a special case for study: from the late medieval period they became a subject to processes of emergence, expansion, and disintegration of major political entities including several numerous communities. Existence of these empires ended after World War I with the establishment of states based on the ethnocratic principle, which faces a problem of ethnic minorities remaining on the top of the agenda for politicians and researchers.

What generally remains underexplored is the issues of supranational identities in political units based on the consolidation of various ethnic communities via political and historical myths. The ethnic identity in such political entity enters into tensions with the emergence of political nation, forming and proclaiming its sovereignty for a relatively homogeneous community. Supranational identity construction referred to various methods: political practice, representation of ruling dynasty and monarch, presenting and disseminating the certain ideology and beyond. Issues of forming a state patriotic myth, which played a significant role in political mobilization and supporting the ruling regime require a detailed study, which can be based on numerous approaches.

The Habsburg monarchy case during the first third of the XIX century brings special attention towards itself due to different reasons. During this period emergence of German and non-German national movements, and so the ideologies of liberalism and conservatism took place in Central and Eastern Europe. The Austrian conservatism had been evolving since 1805 from emerging political movement to de-facto leading ideology of the Empire, having a tight cohesion with the Imperial patriotism (Reichspatriotismus). Since 1809 the official patriotic myth based on works of early conservative intellectuals had been working on preserving the Habsburg Empire as a single entity with a secondary role in Europe during the Napoleonic dominance until 1813-1815. Afterwards, it became a dominating ideology, defining the development vector of the Austrian Empire in numerous aspects until 1832, and an important part of Austrian political culture, keeping its role also after the downfall of Habsburg monarchy in 1918.

The intellectual heritage of early Austrian conservative theorists concerning the establishment of imperial
supranational patriotism is a subject to study within the paper. A special emphasis is set on the means of constructing the imperial patriotic myth aimed to consolidate a society consisting of several heterogeneous ethnic communities: historical narrative, political constitution concepts, philosophical grounds of the implemented politics, objects of art, and beyond.

The chosen period from 1805 to 1832 starts from the Prellburg peace treaty when conservative group and activities emerged in Vienna appeared, and ends with the death of Friedrich von Gentz and new activation of German national movement against the repressive policy of Austrian chancellor Clemens von Metternich.

II. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

The issues of imperial patriotism, early Austrian conservatism, and the establishment of Austrian supranational patriotism have been a subject to study in various approaches. One of the main concepts determining the research is “Agglutinative Empire” presented by J.F. Patrouch [14] based on the fact, that establishment of the Habsburg monarchy was an outcome of constant territorial growth touching upon heterogeneous lands. Later T. Baycroft, M. Hewiston and M. Cornwall defined the Austrian (Austro-Hungarian) empire as a group of nations co-existing in conditions of cultural and historical conflict in the area of mixed ethnic settlement [1, pp. 171-192]. According to M. Cornwall, the attempt to construct a supranational empire with state patriotism failed due to the growing ethnicization of Germany, Hungary and Czech lands, led to antagonism between Germans and non-Germanic peoples, growing throughout the XIX century.

The second main concept implemented in the research is the representation of power, including the compound of methods and objects used to construct a certain image with political, social, ideological and other purposes [3; 4; 7; 10; 11]. It referred to historical myth, loyalty towards the ruling dynasty and constructing its image on legitimacy patterns, architectural image of the capital city, state symbols, philosophical grounds of the political system, theological grounds and ecclesial policy. A. Lindmayr-Brandl published one of the main contemporary studies based on the approach [10], and H. Rumpler touched upon the relations between state and church in the empire [16].

The heritage of Friedrich von Gentz, Adam Müller and Joseph von Hormayr is also a subject to study. Gentz and his philosophy of politics, which has made a deep impact on Metternich policy, is often presented as the main figure of early Austrian conservatism, and one of the core figures of Vormärz reaction. He is also recognized as one of the architects of repressions against national movements and their ideology, “a secretary of Carlsbad”.

Joseph von Hormayr, who is also one of the main figures for the emergence of romanticism and imperial patriotism referring to historical heritage, appears to be a controversial figure in historiography. His activities between 1805 until 1813 become subject to study within the paper, and his heritage is widely studied in Austria in the Austrian national identity discourse. The main discussion here is to define the historian either as a state patriotm advocate, or a liberal due to change of his views after persecution in 1813-1814 [9].

Historiography of Adam Müller’s views deals with his image as a presenter of the theological grounds of Vormärz political regime, religious concept of social constitution and an advocate of the estate society. His heritage is often revisited in contemporary Germany and Austria in the context of romanticism, which is connected with discussion on the following development of society and political institutions in Europe and Germany [21].

The aim of the paper is to give a complex assessment to interaction between intellectual grounds and practice of imperial patriotic myth in the Habsburg empire between 1805 and 1832, based on the concepts of “Agglutinative empire”. The conservative ideology presented in the period integrated into imperial myth and supported its positions until 1832 when the new growth of national movements in Central and Eastern Europe provoked a major crisis, which turned into Revolutions in 1848-1849 [8; 13; 14].

The role of early Austrian conservative thought in forming the Austrian identity, historical myth and political culture can be a subject to further study. Their heritage left a complex impact on development of the Habsburg Empire in the XIX century, Austrian Republic during the interwar period and after 1945 when the country has been separated from Germany.

III. METHOD

The analysis plan includes an interpretation of the following sources:

(1) Political philosophy works by Friderich von Gentz: Österreichisches Manifest vom Jahre 1809 (The Austrian Manifesto from the year 1809); Österreichisches Manifest vom Jahre 1813 (The Austrian Manifesto from the year 1813); Über politische Freiheit und das Verhältnis derselben zur Regierung (On political freedom and its attitude towards the Government); Über die Moralität in den Staatsrevolutionen (On Moral within State Revolutions), An die Deutschen Fürsten und an die Deutschen (To the German Princes and to the Germans);
(2) Historical works by Joseph von Hormayr\(^3\):
Kritis-diplomatische Beytrage zur Geschichte Tirols im Mittelalter (Critical and Diplomatic Essays on Tyrolean Medieval History); Geschichte der gefürsteten Grafschaft Tirol (History of the Tyrolean principality); Österreichischer Plutarch (The Austrian Plutarch), Kaiser Franz und Metternich (Emperor Francis and Metternich);

(3) Works of Adam Müller devoted to the role of state in social development, social constitution and the role of catholic church in social development: Von der Notwendigkeit einer Theologischen Grundlage der Gesammten Staatswissenschaften und der Staatswirtschaft ins besondere (On the importance of Theological grounds towards the whole State theory and State economics in particular); Die Elemente der Staatskunst (The elements of Statehood Art); Inokulation der politischen Ungleichheit (Inoculation of Political Inequality); Von der National-Repräsentation (On the National Representation); Kaiser Franz I. von Österreich (Emperor Francis I of Austria)\(^4\);

(4) Correspondence between Gentz and Müller\(^5\) is analyzed to trace their impact on the evolution of political doctrines and the establishment of the imperial patriotic myth in the Austrian empire.

The work refers to a concept of an “Old empire”: “a multiethnic and multicultural entity obtaining significant influence on regional and global politics and referring to a certain political myth and ideology” [12, pp. 620-621]. The Myth concept, also including national and supranational myth is an important part of the survey. Myth as a narrative with social and political function aimed to maintain the identity of a certain community and to support its representation among other political entities. It also deals with state ideology as a compound consisting of views, concepts, theories, and beliefs having a certain social, political and cultural purpose.

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

After the breakout of the French Revolution and the following “export” of its ideas to neighboring countries disintegration of the Holy Roman Empire accelerated and ended in 1806 with its dissolution, destroying the existing relations in Germany and Habsburg possessions. The emergence of movements both advocating and denouncing the revolutionary ideas led to the discussion of development perspectives. Philipp von Stadion and the Imperial army Commander in Chief Archduke Charles tapped into this process, presenting the German national movement ideas spreading in occupied Germany, and in the kingdom of Prussia. One of the mottoes presented was “A cause of Austria is a cause of Germany” from Archduke Charles [5; 6; 15; 22; 23].

The downfall of the Habsburg universalism created a threat of collapse to their empire based on the personal union. The multiethnic empire including the Hereditary lands of Habsburgs and territories inhabited by non-Germanic ethnic groups faced a problem of consolidation on common ideology before the external threat. At that period of time three activists started to construct the new ideological grounds for the Austrian empire: Joseph von Hormayr, the head of the Dynastic, Court and State Archive; Friedrich von Gentz, a former Prussian public servant and Immanuel Kant student; and Adam Müller, a critic of Prussian reformers and advocate of strong monarchy and participation of the church in public and governmental activities.

Creating a conservative patriotic myth started in the German-speaking areas of Austria. The theory of conservatism appeared in works of Friedrich von Gentz, who presented them before his relocation to Vienna by issuing the German translation of “Reflections on the revolution in France” by Edmund Burke. Gentz has also started to create the image of Prussia as a state, where “the holy bonds between monarch and society collapsed”\(^6\), presenting the image of Austria as a “Family of peoples” under the power of Habszburgs. Gentz criticized the reformers in orientation to revolutionary ideas and presented the concept of conservatism constructing the political culture staying on “subject - monarch” dichotomy and dynastic patriotism.

Later being a secretary of Metternich, Gentz was labile in his views. Before his entry to Austrian service, he was an advocate of political reforms, freedom of speech and press as main parts of progress. He also presented “a warning against abuse of freedom” criticizing the concept of “absolute freedom” as an impossible concept. Civil freedom was based on social connections, mutual obligations and regulating the limits to preserve justice,


which led to the emergence of state and law as regulations, according to Gentz.

Political freedom by Gentz is a relative subject based on the number of limitations, and recognition from society towards its value correlating with civil rights and obligations to state and society. “The highest wisdom” according to Gentz is the ideal constitution based on strong state and law. Political freedom as a clear concept could not integrate into any type of constitution due to various life conditions for the state and society. And revolution as a mean of solving issues in state and society was inappropriate as breaking the social contract and moral rules. The critic referred to philosophical statements and facts from recent French events and wars against the French revolution, considering them as a required form of preserving the sustainable state as a guarantor of law and stability.

Gentz evolved as to a conservative ideologist after the defeat of Austria in the war of 1809 against France, stopping to present the monarchy with representation and constitutional basis. He started to present a monarch as a defender of state and order, and their symbol. This approach turned into the main political doctrine of Gentz, the base for political practice of Francis I and Clemens von Metternich, and representation of imperial power in the monarchy. Rulers turned into “best representatives of their peoples fighting for their happiness”. Originally, it referred to Germans, later it was extrapolated to all Habsburg possessions.

Dissemination of new ideology took place with involving other intellectuals, both Germans and representatives of non-Germanic elite speaking German and agreeing with the preservation of the current political system. It led to state control over newspapers and journals: official Wiener Zeitung published more pro-governmental materials, and Österreichischer Beobachter, a new newspaper appeared under recommendations of Gentz. Both bulletins were representing the Habsburg regime as favoorable, criticizing the liberal activists and opposition media. Metternich supported these initiatives, and inspired the activities of Gentz against the national movement and its ideology, defending the constitution of the Austrian Empire [18].

As a result, the conservative ideology introduced by Gentz became a base for Metternich’s political practice until 1832, when the German national movement showed its abilities to repel the attacks from the Viennese government in all-German context. Also, non-Germanic national movements emerged as an opposition to Metternich and his governments protesting against “Germanization” and secondary status [17].

The role of Gentz as a founder of Austrian conservatism and official patriotic myth consists of his philosophical thought used to criticize political practices and ideologies of opposing movements and to justify the purpose of the autocratic political regime as a guarantor of legitimacy, progress and social freedom. Introduction of Gentz to Metternich led to practices of repression towards national movements and revolutionaries, and dissemination of the idea, that monarch appears to be a real symbol of all community, regardless of the ethnic background of his subjects. Nevertheless, the non-Germanic peoples recognized this idea as a ground for Germanization [19].

Official patriotic myth in the Habsburg Empire between the years 1805-1832 also integrated a vast historical narrative by Joseph von Hormayr. He started to create a general history of the Habsburg Empire referring to all lands united under the dynasty and including the major monarchs, ecclesial and cultural characters from all main parts of the monarchy. As a historian, Hormayr started his studies based on the regional material in Tirol, criticizing its transition to Bavaria. “Critical and Diplomatic essays on Tyrolean Medieval history” referred to ecclesial archives, and their communication with the emperor and local population. It led to presenting the image of the duchy as a “Holy land of Austria” disregarding the fact, that local identities did not connect themselves with Habsburgs and other of their Austrian possessions. “History of principality of Tirol” presented in 1806 and 1808 was a continuation of the work. The work became an ideological basis for Tyrolean uprising of Andreas Hofer in 1809-1810 referring to religious theses and presented by Hormayr as a part of defending the homeland. Tyroleans according to Hormayr were also Germans alongside the rest of the German population in Austria and the “Old Empire”. These ideas had a correlation with the works of Ph. Palmer, J.G. Fichte and E.M. Arndt giving a priority to German culture and insisting on the formation of the German national state.

The imperial historical narrative under Hormayr appeared in the “Austrian Plutarch” issued according to the Ancient Greek model. The following principles were implemented by historian:

(1) Including the monarchs, politicians and war chiefs, who were advocates of strong government and state able to resist the outer threats, e.g. Ladislaus Postum, Matyáš Corvin, Maximillian I, Charles V, Ferdinand III, Leopold I, Maria Theresia, Francis I, Albrecht von Wallenstein, Count von Kaunitz, Count von Zinzendorf, Prince Eugene of Savoy;

(2) Presenting the image of the Catholic Church and its significant role in preserving the identities of German and non-Germanic peoples, e.g. in chapters devoted to Franz von Dietrichstein and Peter Pazmanyi. These essays were aimed to integrate the Catholic church into Austrian conservatism, and contained critics against Reformation and its role in German history, also being a part of ideological campaigns against Prussia [16; 20];

(3) Creating the image of Habsburg monarchy as a cultural centre of Europe, including into the work essays

devoted to Jan Amos Komensky and Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart;

(4) Demonstrating recognition of non-Germanic monarchs and politicians as a part of integration of non-Germanic lands into monarchy, e.g. by including the essays devoted to Jan Žižka, Jiří z Poděbrad, János and Matyáš Corvines. It should have created the legitimating image of integration processes in Central Europe;

(5) Consolidating the Habsburg possessions around the ruling dynasty, where it was possible. Their leadership has received an image of the inevitable, natural and successful step for the development of all peoples, and referred to various attempts of creating a single empire in Central Europe [19].

The historical narrative became a part of the legitimation of the Habsburg monarchy. Hornayr reconstructed the representation of the ruling dynasty with constructing the historical lineage from early Habsburgs and monarchs of non-Germanic lands to multiethnic and multicultural empire existing in favour of the commonwealth. It complied with the theses of Gentz on “Family of peoples” and formed the image of the empire within mobilization against France. These works also became a subject to propaganda for advocates of the “war of the German honour” in 1809 in the Imperial army, and for successful implementation of the Gesamtstaat ideology [15].

After 1809, when Austria suffered a major defeat with the following exclusion of reformers from Austrian politics conservative ideology turned into a de-facto major concept of development for the empire and a leading practical doctrine. Clemens von Metternich invited Gentz to be his secretary and an ideologist. Before that, he managed to present his reflections on balance of powers in Europe, and its breakup due to revolution and its “export”, and stated that preserving Austria as a multiethnic empire under Habsburg rule with relevant representation. New state symbols became evidence of the process: new imperial hymn, and new official press.

Prioritizing the Habsburg possessions higher, than the formal leadership in Germany became a turning point in Austrian politics: choice of Vienna appeared to be a separate way from the rest of German territorial states and Prussia. Nevertheless, Gentz in 1813-1814 addressed all German princes as a base for German identity due to the sacred nature of their power. Moreover, the official manifesto from Francis I partly criticized Prussia, basing on the theses of Gentz. The trend continued after the Congress of Vienna and the emergence of the new political system of Austria, Germany and the rest of Europe, and due to new “Conservative turn” in relations between state and society.

Dissemination of Romanticism ideas, appealing to Medieval heritage and “organic” connections between a monarch and his subjects, and so the growth of confessionalism in Germany alongside with the strengthening the positions of conservative politicians contributed to success of this ideology. It led to the decline of social and political reformism, and to the launch of the struggle against the national movement. In the context of Austria, both movements and parties of Austrian Germans and non-Germanic peoples became a subject to persecution. The supranational patriotic myth gained a theological impulse: though the reconstruction of Josephinist practices appeared to be impossible, the opposition towards state participation in ecclesial affairs was also persecuted, e.g. Bernard Bolzano, an advocate of “Rationalist Theology”.

Theological justification of sacred bonds between a monarch and his subjects referred to works by Adam Müller von Nitterdorf. Being a friend of Gentz, he entered the Austrian public service and converted to Catholicism, turning into one of the leading critics of Prussia. Before that he issued “The elements of Statehood”, where he gave characteristics of law and statehood of preceding periods and justified their development based on theological postulates.

During his service in Vienna, Müller founded the Austrian political Romanticism, presenting the postulates of state patriotism: human existence within the state, church and religion as social institutions working for adequate life of society, estate system as a base for social stability and political system. This system contained criticism towards the representation: according to Müller, it was not possible to consider the political interests of all social groups within one structure. On the contrary, he presented “the people’s organization”: conservation of the estate system as “a natural outcome of inequality” and a base for “civil peace”. According to Müller, state and society were “living organism, containing the interacting invisible elements and self-regulation”⁹, what appeared to be an idea uniting all members of the community with the loyalty towards the state and monarch. The struggle of social and political groups received a definition of “limitedness”. Citizens should recognize the state as a synonym to government, predominantly a monarchist one.

The philosopher did not make any difference between Germans and non-Germanic peoples, showing his support towards the supranational community, where the monarch is a living embodiment of social and political order, and so a personified part of statehood. Theological postulates became integrated into Müller’s ideas, also receiving a reply even in protestant Prussia, where he took part in educating the Crown prince [21].

The final version of the conservative myth in Müller’s work appeared in the essay “Francis I, the Austrian emperor”. Here a concept of “Family of peoples” united with Habsburgs and their virtues found a personified embodiment and turned into an image capable of further propaganda. Müller stated, that emperor should maintain his contact with the people, and use his power in a reasonable way. Emperor Francis I managed to implement

an organic constitution also due to his personal features. The following elements of his biography were the cornerstone of the image: references to the Napoleonic warfare period and contact maintenance with the government in Vienna, language competences and mastering the languages of non-Germanic peoples of the Austrian empire, abilities to contact with representatives of various social groups. The most important part of the emperor’s portrait was the loyalty to his ancestry and their cause, the continuation of the best features of Maria Theresia and Joseph II. The Emperor appeared to be a person combining virtues. The image had significant traces of Romanticist ideas referring to Medieval heritage and practices of the period [9].

In this way the image of an ideal monarch managed to preserve the nature of its power, being a means of consolidation for subjects, regardless of their ethnic background. Müller justified paternalism towards the subjects of monarch as a natural element of political life in order to maintain the public order. Müller as an advocate of the estate-based society, conserving the social and political constitution and creating the image of the ruler with its representation considered these patterns as natural and obligatory, disregarding the fact that it could provoke the conflict with national movements, including the German one.

V. CONCLUSIONS

Conservative patriotic myth in the Habsburg Empire contributed to the establishment of its political structure and ethnic constitution in the XIXth century, and the definition of the official ideology for this political entity. The myth referred to works of Friedrich von Gentz, Joseph von Hormayr and Adam von Müller Nitterdorf, and the following elements from their heritage integrated into state ideology and its representation:

1) Recognition of the monarchic power as a natural one, and so the right of the monarch for an absolute power. For Austria, it meant the role of the emperor as a head of state, where all subjects despite their ethnic background had a status of the part of “the family of peoples”. Visual representation of power, and so the historical narrative by Joseph von Hormayr were working for it. They used the postulates of Romanticism, dynastic and state patriotism with loyalty towards the ruling sovereign and his authority. Hormayr’s historical works included both German and non-Germanic historical personalities, who played an important role in European culture and emergence of the Habsburg empire;

2) Denying the nation as a basis for state and its constitution. Here all three activists referred to contrast towards the main opponent of Austria in Germany – the kingdom of Prussia, where the formation of German national identity became a part of political transformation and made an impact on local identities. Postulates of conservatism by Gentz and Müller had a priority here: both of them were advocates of centralized political constitution. This system was to function with the support of church and its activities in preserving the myth on sacred power of the emperor and his rights. It neglected the “Natural human rights” theory and the civic approach towards relations between state and society;

3) Recognizing the priority of Catholic church in society and statehood. Gentz, Hormayr and Müller considered the secular state as a failed one, on the contrary stating that a government cannot invade to theological postulates and practices. The most conservative doctrines became the base for official patriotic myth, and opposition towards them became subject to persecution. It was a part of neoconfessionalist turn in Germany and Austria;

4) Representation of the Habsburg Empire as a natural, historically and politically justified state. According to them, it had a mission of preserving peace, stability and the sacred beginning of the monarchy. The postulate became a basis for Austrian foreign policy, and for opposing the national movements inside the empire;

5) Society should have been directed by official authorities. Conservative newspapers and journals were to oppose liberal and nationalist media and intellectuals referring to these approaches. They were to be excluded from political life.

These conservative postulates integrated into statehood and political practices of Francis I and Metternich regime, and so into German and foreign policies of the Austrian empire. Inside the Empire, this ideological system functioned until 1832 when national movement in Germany demonstrated its sustainability and managed to repel the repressive policies inspired by Metternich. After the deaths of Müller and Gentz, the maintenance of official political myth faced a significant crisis, evolving into a long-lasting decline of the political system in the Empire.
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