

## **Lecture 7**

### **The Polish Question 1831-1863**

#### **(Part I. From 1831 to the Revolution of 1848)**

### **Introduction**

The period between 1831 and 1863 was one in which the 'Polish question' emerged as a major international problem. The Poles, however, unlike the Italians, the Germans and even in some ways the Hungarians, did not succeed in achieving national independence or unification. This failure had become evident by 1864 and indeed between that date and 1914 the impact of the Polish problem on international relations was virtually nil. At the same time, within the different areas of Poland, the problem of how to emancipate the dependent peasantry was becoming ever more pressing. The national problem and the peasant problem existed side by side, and though peasant discontent sometimes fueled national unrest, for the most part, the hostility of the peasantry to the manor proved a source of continual weakness to the Polish cause.

### **I. The Emigration**

The crushing of the 1830 Uprising in the Kingdom of Poland had been followed by the emigration of between 5,000 and 7,000 revolutionaries, most of whom eventually made their way to France. This 'Great Emigration' included the poets Mickiewicz and Słowacki, the historian Lelewel and the pianist and composer Chopin, as well as other prominent political and cultural leaders, statesmen, generals and journalists. Most of its members were junior officers – regular soldiers in the army of the Kingdom of Poland

had for the most part been forced to accept the Russian amnesty. As a consequence, 75% of the emigration were of *szlachta* origin, though mostly without substantial means.

The members of the Emigration did not see themselves as defeated refugees. They were welcomed as heroes as they progressed through Germany and were convinced that they were the harbingers of an imminent international revolution which would destroy despotism and would make possible the resurrection of Poland within its 1772 frontiers, a goal which they all sought.

The Emigration was deeply divided politically as the rifts which had already become manifest during the November Uprising soon became even more apparent in the conditions of exile. The Conservatives were led by the great aristocrat Adam Jerzy Czartoryski, who had been a key figure at the court of the Tsar Alexander I. He saw the Polish problem as, above all, a diplomatic question. His aim was to preserve the unity of the Poles in emigration in anticipation of a general European war, which would lead the Western powers, in their own interest, to re-establish Poland as a buffer against Russian expansionism. He hoped to create some links with Austria, whose policies in the Balkans seemed to be leading to a clash with Russia. Internally, he favoured a constitutional monarchy and the slow emancipation of the peasantry by the granting of freeholds, with compensation for the nobility.

His left-wing opponents within the Emigration were organized in the Polish Democratic Society, founded in March 1832. Initially, its supporters were convinced that the resurrection of Poland was dependent on the European revolution which they thought to be imminent, and as a consequence, they participated in the activities of the Italian

Carbonari and the French and German revolutionaries. In the words of one of their number, Józef Kajetan Janowski:

When the future of Poland depends upon the progress of humanity, then he who does not uphold the continuous progress of humanity, does not wish the happiness of Poland.<sup>1</sup>

With the collapse of the anticipated revolutions in 1833, there came a change in mood, and the left came increasingly to the view that only activity in Poland could bring about the restoration of a Polish state. As Joachim Lelewel wrote in January 1834:

It is my belief that the Polish nation can not resurrect itself except at home and by its own forces...not counting upon [outside] help.<sup>2</sup>

By December 1836, the process of crystallization had reached the point at which a 'Manifesto of the Polish Democratic Society' could be produced, described by Robert Leslie as 'the most influential document in the history of Poland in the nineteenth century'.<sup>3</sup> In its preamble, it asserted that Poland, long the bulwark of Europe in the East had fallen on difficult times because the democratic principle 'had degenerated into caste privilege depriving the masses of their just place in the constitution'. This obsession with 'caste privilege' was the main reason for the debacle of the 1830 Uprising. If during the insurrection, the Polish authorities had appealed to the masses

the people would have risen as one man, would have braced the gauntlet of war on their vigorous arm and crushed the invaders without foreign aid; Poland, from the Oder and the Carpathian mountains to the Borysthenes and the Dvina – from the Baltic to the Black Sea would have founded her independence upon the general happiness of her sons.

The manifesto continued;

If our next revolution is not to be a sad repetition of the past, the first battle-cry must be the emancipation of the people, their restoration, unconditionally to the ownership of the soil of which they have been plundered, the restitution of their rights, the admission of all, without distinction of birth or creed, to the enjoyment of the blessings of independence.

As a consequence, the Democratic Society favoured the emancipation of the peasantry without compensation being paid by the peasants, through the abolition of their obligations to their landlords and the granting to them of the freehold of the land which they at present cultivated. No provision was made for the landless, in accordance with the views of Wiktor Heltman, the chief theorist of the Society, who saw history as a struggle between the principles of individualism which tended to anarchy, and collectivism which led to despotism. The goal was to create a class of self-sufficient farmers who could find a middle way between the dangers of anarchy and collectivism. Certainly a feature of the Manifesto was its idealization of the Polish peasantry, of which its authors had only the scantiest knowledge:

The suffering people with us do not resemble the suffering people of western Europe; ours have not been contaminated by the corruption and selfishness of the privileged classes; they possess still all the simplicity of their ancient virtues, integrity, devotion, religious feelings, manners benign and pure. Upon a soil so fresh and untainted, and tilled by the honest arm of fraternity and liberty, the old national tree of equality will easily shoot up and flourish anew.

Like other conspiratorial organizations, the Democratic Society adopted a rigid and centralized system or organization, with its headquarters first in Poitiers and then, after 1840, in Versailles. Its goal was to send delegates to the Polish lands, who could lead the expected revolutionary upsurge there. For the moment, it was clear that the Kingdom of Poland, exhausted by the insurrection of 1830 and subject to severe Tsarist repression was not suitable terrain for its activities. Neither was Prussian Poland which was undergoing a major agricultural transformation following a Prussian government decree of 1823. This severed the connection between the village and manor through the cession by the former of a percentage of peasant land (between 33 and 50%) in return for

freedom from labor dues. Although the Prussian legislation had originally been opposed by the more conservative landlords, in fact it worked in favour of the landowners, so that most nobles in the province in the 1830s and 1840s were preoccupied with modernizing their estates. In addition, although a large class of impoverished landless labourers emerged as a consequence of the Prussian reform, it also led to the creation of a significant group of prosperous peasants, who had nothing to gain from revolution. Under these circumstances, the main focus of revolutionary conspiracy in the 1830s and 1840s was Galicia, to which a significant number of refugees had moved after the failure of the 1830 Insurrection.

Galicia was in some ways a fertile soil for this revolutionary activity. The province had been acquired somewhat reluctantly by the Habsburg monarchy as a result of the first partition of Poland in 1772, and the half-hearted measures of reform introduced there had led to considerable social disruption, without creating any firm basis for stable rule. The Habsburg officials had seen the area as reminiscent of what their own state had been like before the reforms introduced under Maria Theresa and later under Joseph II. In their view, permeated as it was by the ideas of the Enlightenment, the problems of the area were essentially social, economic and political, rather than national, although they were aware of the ethnic differences in the province. They saw Galician society in an extremely negative light. In their opinion, the dominance of the Polish nobility had created an economically unbalanced structure, characterized by exploitative relationships marked by extortion, graft, fraud and the naked use of force. They were concerned with what they perceived as widespread idleness, dissipation, drunkenness and the lack of genuine piety, and wanted to establish a 'well-ordered police state',

marked by social discipline and by the re-education of the inhabitants of the province to improve their 'moral character'.<sup>4</sup> This was to be achieved by undermining the social and economic monopoly of power enjoyed by the Polish *szlachta*, by improving the position of the unfree peasantry, by encouraging reform in both the Roman and Greek Catholic churches in the province and by elevating the status of the latter, and by breaking up Jewish communal autonomy in order to transform the Jews into 'useful subjects.'

A whole series of reforms were introduced with these goals in mind, which undermined the position of the previously dominant elites. The local *sejmiki* were abolished, elected municipalities, whose privileges were guaranteed by Magdeburg law, were abolished and were replaced by bureaucrats appointed from Vienna. A consultative Assembly of Estates was set up in L'viv, made up of representatives of the magnates, the gentry (referred to in the legislation as 'knights') and the clergy. It was similar to other such bodies in the Austrian provinces and it was solely advisory in character, with the right to send petitions to the Emperor.

Real power in the province lay in the hands of the Governor, who was appointed by the Emperor, and who ruled through his deputies, who headed the 19 districts (*kreise*) into which the area was now divided (One of these was Bukovina, previously under Turkish rule, which was governed as part of Galicia until 1848). The previously privileged position of the nobility was undermined. Nobles lost their tax-exempt status and their control of the judicial system and their control of their serfs was also now regulated by the state.

As elsewhere in the Monarchy, the Austrians introduced the principle of religious toleration. This was of enormous significance for the previously oppressed Greek Catholic majority in the province. The Austrians now referred to the confession as 'Greek Catholic' rather than as 'Uniate', hoping in this way to raise its status. In 1784, they established a university in L'viv and created an Institute (the *Studium Ruthenum*) to train Greek Catholic priests and which originally used as its language of instruction a combination of Church Slavonic and the Ukrainian vernacular. In 1808, they re-established the Greek Catholic Metropolitanate of Saint George in L'viv, divided into two eparchies based in L'viv and Przemyśl.

Attempts were also made to improve the position of the peasantry. Serfdom was abolished and landless peasants were allowed to leave the village, provided they left behind a replacement. Landlords were also no longer able to evict peasants. Peasants were now allowed to marry without permission of their landlord and to apprentice their children to a craft. Peasant land was not to be appropriated to domainal land and the judicial powers of the landlord were considerably reduced, with peasants given the right to make complaints to the local administration. Labour dues were now limited to three days a week in most cases. Joseph's attempt to replace the labor tribute entirely by a form of rent foundered in the face of aristocratic opposition. Nevertheless as a consequence of these changes the Galician peasant became, in the words of the foremost student of agrarian relations in the province, Roman Rozdolski, 'at least an object of law, and not, as before, outside any law.'<sup>5</sup>

Joseph also hoped to 'reform' the Jewish population of Galicia, on the lines of the reforms he was introducing elsewhere in the monarchy. In return for a guarantee of

the right to practice their religion and to dwell securely in the Empire, Joseph expected the Jews to diminish their 'separateness' and transform their educational system and occupational structure, so that they would become 'useful and productive' subjects. In 1789, he promulgated a Toleration Edict for the Jews of Galicia, similar to those which he had already issued to the Jews in Lower Austria, the Czech Lands and Hungary.

According to its preamble:

The Monarch has found it necessary and useful to annul the differences which legislation has so far maintained between his Christian and Jewish subjects and to grant the Jews living in Galicia all the rights and liberties which our other subjects enjoy. Galician Jews will therefore from now on be treated like all other subjects as regards their rights and duties.<sup>6</sup>

The Jews were granted restricted civic (municipal) rights and attempts were made to 'productivize' them, in accordance with Physiocratic principles. In addition, a network of schools for young Jews was set up and Jews were also permitted to attend German or Polish schools. Jews were now obliged to take surnames and to keep their official records in German, while the scope of Jewish communal autonomy was severely restricted. In addition, Jews were now obliged to serve in the army

The reforming drive of Joseph II did not withstand the widespread aristocratic and clerical opposition which it evoked in the Empire, in Hungary, the Czech lands and the Austrian Netherlands. Fear of the French revolution also led his successors, Leopold II (1790-1792), Franz II (1792-1835) and Ferdinand II (1835-1848) to abandon any serious attempts to reform the monarchy, although the abolition of serfdom and some of the centralizing policies were retained. Indeed, in the period after 1815 Franz and his principal minister, Metternich, became the main bulwarks of the attempt to restore the pre-revolutionary order in Europe.

The half-hearted character of the reforms introduced by the Habsburgs in Galicia had the effect of significantly destabilizing the province. Those members of the *szlachta*, whose claim to noble status was now called into question became increasingly disaffected. By the middle of the nineteenth century, only 30,454 people were recognized as having noble status in Galicia out of a total population of 4,920,300 (slightly more than 0.6%), an enormous reduction from the times of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth when the percentage was between 8 and 10.<sup>7</sup> Even in the first days of Austrian rule, the authorities had recognized the noble status of around 95,000 people (3.4% of the population).<sup>8</sup>

Moreover, in spite of their intentions, the reforms had not led to a significant improvement in the position either of the peasantry or of the Jews and both groups remained significantly alienated. For the peasantry, the belief that they could count on the support of the state further undermined their willingness to accept the oppression of the manorial system. After Karol Borkowski, a Polish noble revolutionary, was captured in Galicia in the 1830s, he found himself placed under the guard of two Polish-speaking soldiers. When he remonstrated with them that they too were Poles, they replied, 'Oh no, we are subjects of His Majesty the Emperor'.<sup>9</sup>

Initially, the conspirators had little success. The majority of landlords felt that they had too much to lose, even though they protested their devotion to the Polish cause. There also developed, particularly among the great magnates a movement analogous to that which had been established in the Grand Duchy of Poznań, which under the name of 'Organic work' was attempting to make use of the opportunities provided by Austrian rule to introduce reforms, largely of an economic nature into the province. Its leader,

Prince Leon Sapieha saw his goal as the creation of those institutions which were necessary for the creation of a modern social system – savings banks, credit banks, schools and railways. However, in Galicia the peasantry in the eastern part of the province was divided from the landlords by the deep religious and ethnic divide. Even in the western, largely Polish part of the province, national consciousness had had little impact as yet on the peasants. Thus the attempt in 1833 by Colonel Józef Zaliwski, who had come from Paris to spark off a revolution among the peasantry by establishing small partisan detachments in Galicia and crossing the frontier into the Kingdom of Poland, failed utterly. So too did the attempt to establish small revolutionary groups linked with the Carbonari and with Joachim Lelewel's 'Young Poland' movement. These groups, of which the most important was the Association of the Polish People (*Stowarzyszenie Ludu Polskiego*), set up in 1835 by an emissary of Young Poland, Szymon Konarski, were able to find support only among the petty intelligentsia in L'viv and the Free City of Kraków and among some estate officials. Symptomatic of the atmosphere which prevailed in this movement was the well-known revolutionary song 'Cześć wam Panowie Magnaci', which condemned the upper classes for their half measures in 1831 and threatened the nobility with the gallows should there be another uprising.

The self-confidence of the revolutionaries was considerably misplaced, as was evident even to some members of the Democratic Society. An emissary sent to Galicia, Seweryn Goszczyński, reported back to France on 27 December 1838 that revolutionary agitation would not succeed among the peasantry among whom feelings of hostility towards the nobility were dominant and that students, though enthusiastic, were too rash and inexperienced to be employed in conspiracy, though they would prove useful once

the insurrection was under way. The only element among whom agitation was likely to prove successful was the nobility, both among those who owned land and among estate officials. On the basis of this report, the Central Committee instructed local cells to attempt to win over public opinion by the propagation of democratic ideas, particularly among the 'enlightened classes'. The goal should be the creation of conditions in which a revolutionary organization could be established in the country, to await a more propitious time for an insurrection. In spite of this caution the conspirators were easily detected by the Austrian secret police, and by the early 1840s all revolutionary activity had ceased in Galicia.<sup>10</sup>

Soon however conditions became more propitious for the revolutionaries. The economic difficulties of the 1840s increased the grievances of the peasantry both in the Grand Duchy of Poznań and in Galicia. In the former the accession of the new Prussian King, Frederick William IV led to the adoption of a more liberal policy. Flottwell's campaign of Germanization was abandoned and the extradition treaty with Russian allowed to lapse. In these conditions, many Poles from the other partitions came to the Grand Duchy, including some 3000 men seeking to avoid conscription in the Kingdom of Poland, and a number of revolutionary movements were established here which sought to advance the Polish cause by enlisting the support of the peasantry. This development of political activity in Poznania encouraged similar phenomena in western Galicia, particularly in the area around Tarnów.

The emergence of what seemed like a significant political movement in Poznania, western Galicia and the Free City of Kraków had a major impact on the Central Committee of the Polish Democratic Society in Versailles. Its members became

convinced that they would be deeply compromised if they did not support the new mood in the country. After some debate, the Central Committee gave in to pressure from its adherents in Poland and agreed in the winter of 1843-4 to prepare for an insurrection, taking as its programme the Manifesto of 1836. Its outbreak was set for 1846.

This revolution proved a disaster. In Poznań, the uprising was betrayed by a half-hearted conspirator and its leader, Ludwik Mierosławski and almost all his collaborators were arrested. Similarly, in the Kingdom of Poland, a feeble attempt at sparking off a peasant uprising was suppressed by the very peasants who were to be its main beneficiaries.

It was only in Galicia and in the Free City of Kraków that the revolution had any impact, and this was not of the sort for which the revolutionaries had been hoping. The whole of southern Poland had been very seriously affected by natural catastrophes in the 1840s and this had led to substantial peasant unrest. Alarmed by this situation, the Polish landlords had put forward various schemes in the Galician Diet for the abolition of the labor tribute. No action was taken by the Viennese authorities, largely because of the paralysis of the central government which had resulted from the mutual hostility of its two principal figures, Metternich and Kolowrat. The situation in western Galicia in fact had much in common with that which had prevailed among the French peasantry during the *grande peur* in 1789. Wild rumours circulated that the nobility intended to slaughter the peasants. Uncertain of the ability of the Austrian government to protect them, peasants began to form themselves into bands for the purpose of self-defence. The tense climate was exacerbated by the incompetence of the Governor of Galicia, the Archduke Ferdinand d'Este, and by the willingness of the Austrian authorities to allow a revolt to

take place in Kraków, since this would facilitate their plans for the annexation of the Free City.

Thus when the noble revolutionaries in Galicia proclaimed their insurrection, the peasants in the areas of Tarnów, Rzeszów, Wadowice, Nowy Sącz and Sanok turned on them savagely, killing some and handing over others to the Austrian authorities.

Everywhere they proclaimed their intention of acting on behalf of the Emperor and that their action was directed solely against the landlords and their agents. There seems to have been very little anti-Jewish activity.

In spite of what was widely believed among the Polish nobility, the Austrians did not initiate this movement. However, in some areas, local officials, notably the kreishauptmann in Tarnów, Joseph Breinl, did try to conciliate the peasantry by promising them rewards if they acted against the nobility. The rising was almost entirely confined to the Polish-speaking western areas of Galicia. Some peasants in mountainous areas, where labor services were not a source of conflict did, in fact, support the insurrection. In all, perhaps, 1,100 people were killed, 3000 arrested and 430 manor houses burnt.

The insurrection was able to take power briefly in the Free City of Kraków. Here the Revolutionary Council proclaimed the abolition of the labor tribute in the small rural area which surrounded the Free City and on 23 February 1846 issued an appeal 'To Our Israelite Brothers', which promised the abolition of all distinctions between Jews and other citizens, the first such act on the Polish lands. Given the debacle elsewhere on the Polish lands, this uprising was doomed from the start and after a week it was suppressed

by the intervention of Austrian troops. The Free City of Kraków was then incorporated into Galicia.

The consequences of the events of early 1846 on Polish political thinking cannot be exaggerated. The insurrection had been based on the assumption that the people, won over by the generosity of the nobility in granting them the freehold of their lands would rise up spontaneously against foreign rule throughout the area of the former Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. In the words of one of the revolutionaries, Bronisław Trentowski in 1847:

Hitherto we have counted with certainly upon the people and today we see that the nation is only the *szlachta*. Confidence in our strength has been extinguished leaving behind only a silent and painful feeling of shame... Not long ago everyone believed, everyone was certain that the Fatherland would by itself throw off its yoke and that soon, perhaps tomorrow or the next day. Now we may not yet think of an independent Poland. Before we may work again for this most holy of political objects, we must see to the end of the social war that has flared up between the peasantry and the noble order. There are those who say that there will be a Poland. But when? After 100, 200, 300 years.<sup>11</sup>

Under these circumstances, the majority of the nobility came to believe that revolution could only lead to disaster and that the only way forward was to cooperate with the partitioning powers for limited goals which would lead to the establishment of a more healthy basis to society. Their views in Galicia were well expressed by the writer, Count Alexander Fredro, who now argued that a contented Galicia would be a source of strength to the Habsburg Monarchy, since it would demonstrate that Slavs could live in peace under Austrian rule. In the wider context, a number of people, most notably the later Viceroy of the Kingdom of Poland, Count Alexander Wielopolski, now began to argue that only a compromise with the Russians would serve the national interest. In his *Lettre d'un gentilhomme polonais sur les massacres de Galicie adressee au Prince de*

*Metternich*, he accused Metternich of being a ‘crowned Jacobin’, far worse than his

Russian counterparts:

Like you and together with you, the Russians dethroned our king and destroyed our institutions and our liberties: they however leave intact social order; public justice has been exercised by them with an iron hand, but through the agency of the laws; they have never given up to murderers the sovereignty of the Tsar.<sup>12</sup>

Not all the revolutionaries were prepared to abandon their views. The Democratic Society remained convinced that the basic strategy remained correct, only the tactics had been faulty. Ludwik Mierosławski, who had broken down under interrogation, used his trial in Berlin as a political demonstration in favour of the Polish cause and won some German liberal support. But in general confidence in the ability of the Poles to achieve their objectives by revolution had been drastically undermined.

This had a considerable impact on Polish behaviour during the revolution of 1848. In this year, the Poles essentially placed their hopes in the German revolution, looking particularly to the German left, which was convinced that the first stage of any German revolution would involve a war against Russia, in which the Poles hoped to participate. Polish hopes were misplaced on two counts.

In the first place, the King of Prussia had no intention of being forced by the revolutionaries into a war with Russia. This emerges clearly from a conversation recorded in the life of Max von Gagern, a member of the Nassau diplomatic service, and a delegate to the Frankfurt Assembly.<sup>13</sup> According to Von Gagern, one of the most representative figures of the ‘Third Germany’ (the smaller States in contradistinction to Austria and Prussia), and of the German Liberals of 1848, on 23 March 1848, he was received by the King of Prussia in the presence of Baron Heinrich von Arnim, the Prussian Minister for Foreign Affairs. After Gagern had spoken about the position in Germany, the King, moved to tears, asked his advice, admitting that ‘Germany is in full dissolution,’ Gagern continued:

‘Your Majesty will permit me in this solemn hour to touch upon matters completely outside my official instructions. What your Majesty has done and announced in the last few days to save Germany from imminent danger would, *before* March 18, have united us all and secured us...against any movement, from outside or inside...now only a newer, and still bolder, decision - to wage foreign war - can save us from anarchy and dissolution. But not as you Majesty has hinted, a war against France, which at present would not be acceptable, but a war against Russia.’

The King: ‘What? Aggression against Russia?’

Me: ‘Freeing the Poles will entail war against Russia.’

The King: ‘But Poland will never re-arise. She is at peace and the strongest measures have been taken.’

Me: ‘Seeing the magic influence which the idea of nationality now exercises, how can we hope to strengthen the unity of our own nation, and to assert our own nationality, if we oppress and flout that of others? Only a liberation of Poland can save your Majesty and us all.’

The King: ‘By God, never, never shall I draw the sword against Russia.’

Me: ‘Then I look upon Germany as lost.’<sup>14</sup>

Even more important, the outbreak of revolution in Prussian Poland revealed the gulf between German and Polish aspirations for the province. Although the new government which came to power in Prussia on 29 March pursued a relatively liberal policy towards the Polish majority in Poznan, and even allowed the formation of a Polish army corps, the Prussian army was determined to take steps to prevent the province being dislodged from the Prussian state. In early April almost all the Polish levies were dissolved and the resistance of those few who refused to obey this order was overcome by early May. When on 24 July, the question of Poland came up before the Frankfurt parliament, the German liberals showed themselves barely more sympathetic to Polish aspirations than the Prussian army.

Under these circumstances, the revolutionaries in Galicia lacked any real faith that they could achieve their objectives on their own and the progress of the revolution here was almost entirely dependent on events elsewhere in the monarchy, above all in Vienna. In March, following Metternich’s flight from Vienna, Polish liberals and revolutionaries, including some members of the Democratic Society met in L’viv and on 14 April set up a Central National Council (*Rada Narodowa Centralna*), which was to be

both a representative and an executive body. Its members agreed on a common programme, which was notable in that it only called for the autonomy of Galicia and did not mention Polish independence. In addition, they demanded the abolition of labor services.

The relative weakness of the revolutionary upsurge, partly the result of the widespread fear among landowners of a new 1846 left the initiative in the hands of the new Austrian governor, Franz von Stadion. He displayed unusual political skill, appealing for support to the now increasingly nationally conscious Ukrainian majority in the eastern part of the province. This policy had been initiated already in February 1847 when the Austrian government proposed to divide Galicia into its eastern and western parts. In February of the following year, Stadion gave permission for the publication of a Ukrainian newspaper. He also attempted to secure Jewish support by calling on the Austrian authorities in April 1848 to abolish all special taxes paid by Jews. In addition, and most importantly, he did what had not been done in the aftermath of the 1846 *jacquerie*, he managed to persuade the Imperial government on 23 April to abolish labor dues, which effectively pacified the countryside in the Austrian interest. As a result, he was able to re-establish Austrian control in Kraków in April and in L'viv in November.

The emergence of a self-conscious Ukrainian (still calling itself Ruthenian) nationalism in 1848 came as a great surprise to the Poles, who saw it as, above all, a result of the Austrian practice of the principle 'divide et impera'. In fact, it was the consequence of a much longer-term development in the whole of the area, which has been well described by John-Paul Himka:

Few historians of Eastern Europe would dispute that the single most important occurrence in that region from the Age of Enlightenment until World War 1 was the diffusion of national consciousness to the primarily rural masses of the population. It was this process that laid the foundations for the emergence of independent East European states after the Great War and that made the national

antagonisms in the region so explosive during the first half of the twentieth century.<sup>15</sup>

The national consciousness of the almost entirely rural Greek Catholics of eastern Galicia developed in stages. In the generation before 1848 a small Ruthenian intelligentsia began to emerge, the product of the educational and religious reforms of Joseph II. By the early 1840s, for instance, approximately 400 Ukrainian students were enrolled at the University of L'viv. It was in these years that its members passed, in the words of the historian Jan Kozak from being 'Galician-Ruthenian patriots' to a form of all-Ukrainian patriotism.<sup>16</sup> This was in spite of the fact that in 1809 the *Studium Ruthenum* had been abolished, that from 1817, the university had offered instruction solely in German and that secondary education was only available in German and Polish. In 1812, the compulsory primary education established by Joseph II had been abolished and it was only in a restricted number of elementary schools that instruction was available in a form of Ukrainian. This situation caused significant degree of polonization among the younger generation. In addition, the Greek Catholic hierarchy, above all the Metropolitan Mykhailo Levyts'kyi, was strongly hostile to the national revival. In these years, two Ukrainian dictionaries and several grammars (one in German)<sup>17</sup> were published and substantial progress was made on creating a literary Ukrainian language, which would use the modern Cyrillic civil alphabet and would reflect the local vernacular, rather than Church Slavonic. This was above all the work of the first conscious literary figures in the area, the Ruthenian Triad (*Rus'ka triitsa*), Markiiian Shashkevych (1811-1843), Ivan Vahylevych (1814-1888) and Iakiv Holovats'kyi (1811-1866). It was they who in 1837 published the first book in the vernacular, *Rusalka dnistrovaia* (The Nymph of the Dniestr), which because it was banned by the local censor, had to be published in Buda. It is necessary to emphasize the tiny extent of this nascent intelligentsia. It was not possible in these years to establish a Ukrainian newspaper and the first part of one of the principal literary products of these

years, the two-volume anthology *Vinok Rusynam* (1846-47) had a circulation of barely 140. An important role in the national revival was played by the Czech officials who were sent to the province, who saw the position of the Ukrainians as analogous to that of their nation a generation previously and who became strong supporters of Austroslavism. Both Vahylevych and Holovats'kyi conducted extensive correspondences with a number of the principal figures in the Czech national revival, above all Josef Dobrovsky and Karel Zap. The Greek Catholic hierarchy was for the most part hostile to the national awakening, seeing it as likely to undermine the faith of villagers and threaten their close links with the Habsburg authorities.

By 1846, a degree of political crystallization had begun to develop. The 'Ruthenian Triad' was basically hostile to the Polish revolution of 1846, seeing it as noble-dominated and its leaders as unwilling to recognise the national separateness of the Ukrainian people, whom they considered, at best as a separate Polish 'tribe'. Although initially the conspiratorial Polish groups in Galicia had won some support among the nascent Ukrainian intelligentsia, their refusal to accept any degree of national separateness soon led to estrangement. There had been for instance, strong and successful opposition to changing the name of one of the principal Polish radical groups, *Stowarzyszenie Ludu Polskiego* (The Association of the Polish People) to *Stowarzyszenie Ludu Polskiego i Ruskiego* (The Association of the Polish and Ruthenian People). Holovats'kyi expressed his view after the collapse of the revolution in an extended article written under the pseudonym Havrylo Rusyn, which appeared in the *Jahrbuecher fuer Slawischer Literatur, Kunst und Wissenschaft* published in Leipzig on 25 June 1846.<sup>18</sup> He adopted an Austro-Slav position, proposing that the government support the Ukrainians, since 'in essence they are in a position to constitute a powerful bulwark against revolutionary machinations in Galicia, which have many times shattered themselves on the rocks of Ruthenian loyalty.' He strongly praised the policies implemented in Galicia by Joseph II and in particular his educational reforms. Were the

Austrians to return to such policies, then ‘Austria would have such loyal Galician subjects in its civil and military service as the loyal Czechs and Croats, loyal as are the Ruthenian priesthood and the simple people’. He also attacked the views expressed by Wielopolski in *Lettre d’un gentilhomme polonais*. In his view only the nobility had ‘much to hope from Russia’, in which landlords could oppress their peasants with impunity.<sup>19</sup>

It was during the revolution of 1848 that the Ukrainians of Galicia for the first time entered modern politics. As the Ukrainian publicist, Father Vasylyl’ Podolyns’kyi pointed out in his Polish pamphlet *Słowo prestrógi* (A Word of Warning, Sanok, 1848),<sup>20</sup> four different orientations were struggling for supremacy within the Ukrainian political leadership in Galicia in 1848. The strongest force at this time was Austro-slavism, which was supported by the Greek Catholic hierarchy, including the Greek Catholic bishop-coadjutor of L’viv, Hryhorii Iakhimovich and the Metropolitan, Mykhailo Levits’kyi. It was organized in the Central Ruthenian Council (Holovna Rus’ka Rada) which was established on 2 May to act as a counterweight to the Polish National Council. Its organization was encouraged by Stadion and it undertook widespread political agitation, collecting thousands of signatures in support of its objectives, the most important of which was the division of Galicia along the San river into two administrative entities.. The degree of political mobilization was considerable. Nearly 200,000 people signed a petition advocating such a division. In addition, twenty-five Ukrainian deputies sat in the lower house of the parliament established on 25 April. In a resolution of 10 May published in *Zoria Halitska*, one of the Ukrainian newspapers established in 1848,<sup>21</sup> the Central Ruthenian Council asserted:

We Galician Ruthenes [*rusyny halyts’ki*] belong to the great Ruthene [*rus’ki*] nation, which speaks the same language and numbers fifteen million, of whom two and a half million live on the land of Galicia [*Halich - halitska*]. This nation was once independent, it had its own literary language, its own laws, its princes, in a word, it lived in prosperity, was wealthy and powerful.<sup>22</sup>

Its Austro-slavism led it to support the Habsburg dynasty and oppose the revolutionary challenge to its position . Thus in the summer of 1848 the Greek Catholic hierarchy forbade the priesthood from celebrating masses on the anniversary of the execution of two Polish revolutionaries, Józef Kapuściński and Wiktor Wiśniowski. At the same time, they organized prayers in gratitude for Radetzky's victory in Italy. The Austro-slav position was clearly articulated by the Ruthenian politician, Kyrylo Blonsky in October 1848, when he made clear his opposition to the revolutionary program of 1848, whose initiators were 'the Magyars, the Poles and the German republicans' and whose goal was:

the overthrow of the monarchy, so that Bohemia, Moravia, Silesia, Austrian Styria, Tyrol and Illyria could be incorporated into Germany, a Magyar republic created including the lands which were dependent on it and a Poland with subject Ruthenes. Then these areas would be Germanized, Magyarized and Polonize<sup>23</sup>

It was this point of view that led the Supreme Ruthenian Council to issue an appeal on 21 November 1848 calling on the Ukrainians in Hungary to support the Austrian army against the Magyar insurgents. Late in 1848 permission was given by the Imperial authorities for the Ukrainians to form military units. A 1400 strong Ruthenian Rifleman's Battalion was established but was not trained in time to take part in the suppression of the Hungarian revolution, although it did march into Slovakia in September 1849 and was reviewed in Kosice by the Russian General Ruediger. <sup>24</sup>

The pro-Polish orientation was much weaker. It was given political form in the Ruthenian Council (Rus'kyi Sobor), set up in May by the Polish National Council as a rival to the Central Ruthenian Council, which called for protection for the Ukrainians' language and culture, but supported the establishment of an independent Polish state and opposed the administrative division of Galicia. It had the support of one member of the

Ruthenian Triad, Ivan Vahylevych, a number of Polish nobleman of Rus' background, such as Leon Sapieha and the Dzieduszycy brothers and some polonized intellectuals, like Karol Cięglewicz . Vahylevych himself edited a short-lived weekly newspaper in Ukrainian printed in both Cyrillic and Latin characters , *Dnewnyk Ruskij* (a misnomer), which appeared between August and October.

For his part, Iakiv Holovat'skyi , the other surviving member of the Ruthene Triad, adopted an ambiguous position in 1848. Initially, he opposed the formation of the Supreme Ruthenian Council, writing to his brother that its creation was an intrigue of the government, which sought 'to strengthen its bureaucratic rule, using the Ruthenian nationality and language as a screen, under the banner of Red Rus,' He was convinced that Ukrainians would understand what was involved and would not break with the Poles, but , together with them, would seek to achieve a constitutional system.<sup>25</sup> He soon became disillusioned, writing to his brother Iosef on 13 June that '...we cannot trust our Lords and brothers, the Lachs. They want brotherhood, but at a high price – they want to make use of (poświęcić) our language, our nationality , all our resources to make possible the creation of an independent Poland.'<sup>26</sup> He accepted the post of local secretary of the Supreme Ruthenian Council in the town of Chortkiv, but still criticized the policy of the Council, which he saw as counterrevolutionary and supportive of the autocratic Austrian government .<sup>27</sup> He seems to have shared the views of his other brother Piotr, who was a member of the delegation of the Supreme Ruthene Council which was granted an audience by the Emperor in February 1849. 'Shame on us,' Piotr wrote to him, 'and we should be ashamed, when it becomes apparent to the world that in pursuit of our own national goals we have forfeited the sympathy of other nations and

have forgotten our honour...all our address [to the authorities] has achieved it to strengthen the government. We have not obtained anything in return...'<sup>28</sup> Yet, after the crushing of the revolution, Holovats'kyi again reverted to Austro-slavism, accepting from the Austrian authorities the newly-established Chair in Ukrainian Language and Literature which was created late in 1848 at the University of L'viv.

Holovats'kyi's waverings were not untypical of the more radical section of the developing Ukrainian intelligentsia. As Ivan Rudnytsky has pointed out, 'the rupture with Polish society was so painful that the generation of Ruthenian intellectuals which effected the break tended to lean far in the other direction.'<sup>29</sup> Moreover, there was no real willingness on the Polish part to recognize the existence of a separate Ukrainian nation. On 7 May, the Polish National Council did come out in favour of cultural equality between the two nations. But it also claimed that it alone represented both nationalities (*narodowości*). At the Slav Congress in Prague, where Austrophile tendencies clashed with the hope of some Poles to free themselves from Habsburg rule, the Czechs succeeded on 7 June in brokering a Polish-Ukrainian compromise. Under its terms, the Ukrainians agreed to postpone discussion of the question of the division of Galicia along the San river in return for a Polish commitment to the equality of the two nations in all administrative and educational matters. The dissolution of the conference as a result of the Austrian recapture of Prague made this resolution a dead letter, and the agreement was not followed by any further rapprochement between the two groups. Indeed both Poles and Ukrainians saw the agreement as little more than a tactical move which to which they were compelled to agree in order to avoid alienating the Czechs.

The two other political orientations which emerged in 1848 were the forces that were to dominate Ukrainian politics in Galicia in the second half of the nineteenth century: the view that Ukraine should seek to solve its problems on its own through self-determination and the Russophile orientation. Both of these movements were still in their infancy in 1848. Russophilism had been rather weak before 1848 and it was only the historian Denys Zubryts'kyi who (at least in private) had advocated the adoption of the Russian language. In 1848 he was supported by Iakiv Holovats'kyi's brother, Iosef and Anton Petrushevych. However, in the aftermath of the revolution, with the disillusionment occasioned by the failure of the Austrian authorities to divide Galicia along the San, this group emerged as a significant political force. Those who favoured an independent Ukrainian state were even weaker. The only persons to advocate this in 1848 seem to have been Anton Lubich-Mohyl'nits'kyi and the maverick Podoln's'kyi, who may have been influenced by Bakunin, and even he believed that the liberation of Ukraine was contingent upon national freedom for all Slavic peoples. The efforts of the Ukrainians would bear fruit, he wrote, 'only when all Slavs are restored to federative and liberal [states]'.<sup>30</sup>

The years between 1846 and 1848 also saw a considerable maturing of the political consciousness of the Jewish population of Galicia. The effect of governmental policies aimed at integrating the Jews and transforming them into 'useful and productive citizens' had been greatly to exacerbate the already existing divisions in the Jewish world. A minority was strongly committed to the idea of reform from above. They were also greatly attracted to the German language and German culture, which they saw as embodiments of universal, secular and liberal values. A majority of the Jews in Galicia,

where hasidism was becoming increasingly important, were strongly opposed to these policies. They were seen merely a more subtle form of Christian evangelization and those who supported them were believed to be motivated by base and material considerations.

It was in the first decades of the nineteenth century that hasidism came to dominate the religious life of much of Jewish Galicia. Hasidism had begun as a small circle of disciples around the charismatic Israel ben Eliezer (the Baal Shem Tov or Besht) in Midzhybizh in Podolia. After the Besht's death, the centre of gravity of the movement moved to Mezrich in Volynia, where the key figure was Dov Ber, the *magid* (preacher) of Mezrich. He sent his followers over the whole area of the former Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, rebbe Menahem Mendel to Vitebsk, rebbe Shneur Zalman to Liady and rebbe Levi Yitshok to Berdichev.

It was at this time that two major hasidic dynasties became established in Galicia, that linked with the court of rebbe Elimelekh (died 1787), and that of the Ruzhiner tsadikim<sup>31</sup> founded by rebbe Israel Friedman of Ruzhin in Podolia, and who moved in the late 1830s to Galicia. Why did hasidism so quickly become dominant in Galicia? Much of the recent research on the origins of this movement has sought to discredit the older view of people like Hillel Ben-Sasson that the movement should be seen as a form of social protest by the lower Jewish social orders against their worsening general position and the increased stratification of Jewish society. It is certainly the case that the Besht was no social revolutionary and did not seek in any way to overturn the established order of Jewish society. Yet in Galicia in the early nineteenth century, as was also the case in the Tsarist Empire, hasidism appealed to those who saw no advantage for themselves in the policies which sought to transform and integrate the Jews. The new

government activism, with its increased taxation and involvement in the internal affairs of Jewish life, was clearly a major factor in the popularity of hasidic religious revivalism. So too was the economic and political backwardness of Galicia. It was above all in the smaller towns and townlets, bypassed by such progress as was occurring towards the emergence of a more market-based economic system, that the movement established its main strongholds.

Given this economic and political backwardness, it is not surprising that the forces which sought to integrate the Jews into the wider society and acquire civil rights for them were much weaker than the forces of religious conservatism. Who were the reformers? We lack a satisfactory modern study of the Jewish enlightenment, the *Haskala*, which went through a whole series of transformations, changing as it moved eastwards from Germany and over the three generations in which its influence was dominant within the modernizing minority in the Jewish world.

In Galicia, there were two separate groups of reformers, whose positions should be distinguished, although there was considerable overlap in their views of the world, the *maskilim*, or followers of the *haskala* and the reformers or integrationists. The *maskilim* took the view that a modernized and purified Hebrew should be the basis for the reform of the Jews. For the most part, they were politically believers in enlightened autocracy, sharing the popular Jewish distrust of the 'violent and anti-Jewish' masses. They bitterly opposed the rise of hasidism, which they saw as obscurantist and backward-looking, its leaders mostly confidence tricksters, deriving a good living from exploiting the gullibility of their ignorant followers. Among the principal exponents of the *haskala* in Galicia, were the Czech Jew, Herz Homberg, who was placed in charge of the Josephine network

of Jewish schools, the writer Josef Perl, author of *Megillei temirim*, a savage critique of hasidism, the philosopher Nakhman Krochmal, who attempted to combine the Hegelian concept of history as a succession of stages, each characterised by a dominant idea with a modernized version of the Jewish historical mission, Isaac Erter and Solomon Leib Rappoport.

The reformers were oriented to German political liberalism. They were not as interested in Jewish religious reform as the *maskilim*, although they did favour a modernized and more organized form of synagogue worship, such as had been instituted by Isaac Noah Mannheimer in the Seitenstettengasse synagogue in Vienna. Here, a pulpit had been introduced alongside the ark, to make possible sermons in German, a choir had been created and the liturgy reorganized by the famous cantor Solomon Sulzer. In addition, a women's gallery made it possible for women to take part in the service more fully. The political orientation of the reformers was liberal – they believed that changes in the position of the Jews would be linked with the establishment of a representative and constitutional government, responsible to an electorate, which would initially be somewhat restricted. They also believed strongly in education, primarily in German, as the road to Jewish reform.

Just as the strength of hasidism lay in small towns and townlets – Rymanów, Nowy Sącz, Belz, Ropchits, Leżajsk – so reformers were stronger in the largest towns of the province, Brody, Ternopil, the capital L'viv and Kraków. L'viv, the largest town in the province and its capital was, not surprisingly, a stronghold of both *maskilim* and Jewish integrationists. The conflict between the supporters and opponents of Jewish integration was very bitter here since, alongside a westernized minority, the town also

had a large Orthodox and hasidic population. Conflicts raged primarily over the school system. In 1831, after a number of objections from the provincial authorities, following Josef Perl's intervention with Metternich the Emperor gave permission for the establishment in the town of a 'Society for Spreading Useful Crafts among Israelites'. In addition, many Jewish youths also attended German primary and secondary schools, much to the disgust of the Orthodox. In 1844, a modern synagogue, the Tempel was set up. Its first rabbi, Abraham Kohn, died tragically in 1848 when he was poisoned by an Orthodox fanatic.

The integrationists were also divided among themselves over whether to favour a German or a Polish orientation. Until the 1860s, the German orientation, represented by the organization *Shomer Israel* was dominant. It was only with the establishment of provincial autonomy under Polish control that the pro-Polish orientation of *Agudas Achim* gained ground. The principal organ for the expression of assimilationist and pro-Polish ideas was now the weekly *Ojczyzna*.

In Kraków, the pro-Polish orientation dominated from the start. In 1839, a 'Society for the Spreading of Useful Crafts among the Israelites', modelled on the similar body in Lviv was set up, and the following year a 'Society for Self-education among Jews' was established. It included in its members a number of the Kazimierz Jewish elite, among them Dr Filip Bondy, Dr. Jonatan Warshauer, Dr. Józef Oettinger, Dr. Maurycy Krzepicki, Szachna Markusfeld and Jozue Funk. Already in 1830 a Jewish public elementary school had been created in Kazimierz and five years later a Jewish public Realschule was also set up. In 1837 these establishments were merged and made into a craft and commercial school, which by 1849-50 had 375 pupils.<sup>32</sup> A small number of

Jewish students attended the Jagiellonian University. In the academic year 1826-7, there had been three such students. Their number rose to 12 in 1846-7, 15 in 1850-51 and 26 in 1865-6, when they constituted 7.7% of the student body.

In 1831, an ardent Polish patriot, Rabbi Dov Ber Meisels was elected rabbi and in 1844, a modern Orthodox synagogue, the Tempel was opened. This synagogue, in its ritual, did not deviate from normative Jewish practice, but did introduce some important changes in the organization of worship. The bima (reading dais) was now placed in front of the ark, so that it could make possible the delivery of sermons, first in German and subsequently in Polish. A place for the choir was also built in the eastern wall and women were seated in a gallery, rather than behind a curtain.

During the revolutionary crisis of 1846-8, the Jews in the Habsburg Monarchy, were, for the most part, strong supporters of the movement in Austria, in Galicia and in the Free City of Kraków for the establishment of a liberal, constitutional state. As we have seen, the revolutionary council established in Kraków in February 1846 had proclaimed the equality of the Jews of the Free City. In response, some five hundred Jews including Ettinger, Warshauer, Funk and Krzepicki of the Self-education Society joined the insurrectionary army, which was enthusiastically welcomed by Rabbi Meisels. There was widespread enthusiasm in the Jewish community for the uprising. Both Meisels and Krzepicki called on the Jews to support the revolutionary 'as befits the free and brave sons of the motherland'.<sup>33</sup> This did not prevent some of the more reactionary Polish emigres, such as Wiktor Szokalski, a member of Adam Czartoryski's entourage in Paris, from accusing the Galician Jews of responsibility for the *jacquerie* which followed the outbreak of revolution in Kraków and Austrian Poland. Similar views were propagated in

the principal newspapers of the Czartoryski group (the Hotel Lambert) in the Emigration. According to *Dziennik Narodowy* and *Trzeci Maj*, the Jews had participated in the democratic movement to advance their own interests. The activities of Jews, as well as Frankists and other converts was 'harmful to the nation'.<sup>34</sup> At the same time, there was an increasing acceptance on the part of the Emigration that equality would have to be granted to the Jews. According to *Trzeci Maj* in October 1846, 'We concede that the Jews [Starozakonny] are entitled to have the same civic rights as we do.'

The humiliating collapse of the revolution and the incorporation of Kraków into Austria was followed by Austrian reprisals against those who has supported it. Some Jews were imprisoned and all restrictive anti-Jewish laws re-established. In addition, a fine of fifty thousand florins was levied on the Jewish community.

During the 1848 revolution in Galicia, Jews were divided in their political stance. Some took an active part in the political struggle, aligning themselves with the Poles. Others, however, did not support the national aspirations of the Poles and adopted a pro-Austrian stand, fearing the increasing strength of Polish antisemitism and the outbreak of anti-Jewish violence. In fact, there was much less anti-Jewish violence in Galicia in 1846 and 1848 than in other areas of Europe, including Alsace, Western Germany, the Grand Duchy of Poznań, the Czech lands and Hungary.<sup>35</sup> No anti-Jewish outrages took place during the *jacquerie* of February 1846, and when anti-Jewish violence threatened in the spring of 1848, an appeal from the Polish National Committee in L'viv calmed the situation.<sup>36</sup> It is not clear why this was the case. The main antagonism, both in the western and the eastern parts of the province was between landlord and peasant and it may be that at this stage, the local Jews enjoyed a degree of

trust in the villages which was unavailable to the landlords. This may explain the curious appeal to Jews in the countryside issued in Yiddish in L'viv in June 1848. 'Your words', it claimed, 'are listened to by peasants...you should therefore see to it that there is peace between the lords and the peasants.' It went on to assert that the Jews should make sure that the peasants understood that they had received their land because of an initiative of the landowners, who did not want to fight the Emperor.<sup>37</sup> Artur Eisenbach has argued that this pamphlet owes its origin to the attempts of the Hotel Lambert group to win over the peasantry for the Polish cause in the aftermath of the debacle of 1846.

As we have seen, Stadion himself attempted to secure Jewish support by calling on the Austrian authorities in April 1848 to abolish all special taxes paid by Jews. This did not stop Jews from being among those who participated in the formation of delegations from the towns of L'viv, Kraków and Tarnów which called in its address of 6 April 1848 for the summoning of a National Assembly. It affirmed:

[The] main and indispensable foundation [of this Assembly] should be the representation of the nation, irrespective of class and religion....The prosperity of states depends on a free and harmonious development of all national forces, on their being used for the common good. A genuine love of the motherland can only exist if the motherland makes no distinction between its children...It seems to us therefore that the classes and religions existing in the nation should be granted equal civic and political rights...[and] that all taxes connected with religion as well as religion-based exclusions and restrictions should be abolished.<sup>38</sup>

The revolution certainly saw considerable political mobilization among the Jews of Galicia. Jews played an active role in the national councils established in L'viv and Kraków and joined the National Guards established in many Galician town. In L'viv and Kraków, separate detachments commanded by Jewish officers were established. A Yiddish weekly, *Lemberger yidishe tsaytung* was established under the editorship of Abraham Mendel Mohr.<sup>39</sup> Shortly before the opening of the parliament, delegates from

the kehillot (Jewish communal bodies) all over Galicia assembled in L'viv and drew up a memorandum demanding full equality.<sup>40</sup>

Jews were particularly prominent in the revolution in Kraków. On 3 May 1848 (the anniversary of the adoption of the Polish constitution of 1791) the members of the Kraków Jewish Self-education Society issued an appeal. At this moment, when the peoples of Europe were freeing themselves from the 'the oppression by tyrants', when the Jews too were being granted rights for which they had been waiting for such a long time, it was 'the duty of an Israelite to evoke in himself love for the motherland, to be permeated by patriotism for the country in which he was born and awake among his co-religionists a holy zeal for the cause of freedom ...We shall show the world that we have the Maccabees' blood in our veins, that our hearts, like the hearts of our forefathers, respond warmly to everything that is noble and sublime.'<sup>41</sup> On 1 October, the Jewish cultural association of Kraków met and prepared a memorandum for submission to parliament calling for the granting of full legal equality for the Jews.<sup>42</sup>

Three Jews were elected to the Reichsrat in 1848, from Brody (Rabbi Mannheimer), from Stanislaviv and from Ternopil. In a subsequent by-election, Rabbi Meisels was elected from Kraków, by an electorate made up of both Christians and Jews. He expressed well the views of those Jews who supported more moderate Polish aspirations and the revolutionary constitution of April 1848:

...the future of our Polish Motherland can only be secured through organic work [work to raise the economic, social and cultural level of the country] not through the dissolution of society...Realizing the needs of humanity in its present phase, I am an ardent believer in the principles of freedom, in the development of political rights, in all citizens having a share in these rights... I regard these principles a true democracy which far from lowering, raises everything, which does not destroy but constructs and consolidates the new constitution by love.<sup>43</sup>

The Jewish identification with the Polish cause was bitterly resented by the emerging Ukrainian movement. The leaders of the 'Ruthene Triad' held the Jews responsible for the economic backwardness of the Ukrainian countryside and, as agents for the Polish nobility, for the oppression of the Ukrainian peasantry. On 19 June 1848, the Ukrainian political leadership declared itself unequivocally against the emancipation of the Jews.<sup>44</sup> More favourable views on the granting of equal rights to the Jews were expressed by a number of members of the more radical Ukrainian intelligentsia, such as Vasil Podolyns'kyi and Ivan Hrabianka.

During the revolution, the government conceded the principle of equal rights for the Jews. The extent to which the rhetoric of the revolution had affected Jewish attitudes can be seen in behaviour of a group of Jews in Tyshmenitsa and Zhovkva. In August 1848 they approached the Polish liberal, Franciszek Smolka, asking for his support in their aspiration for full Jewish emancipation. They also submitted a petition to the Austrian parliament which had been elected in June. In it they argued that it was the old governments and laws which had isolated the Jews from the Poles and the restrictions imposed on the Jews had weakened the Jewish spirit of freedom. The revolutionary ideas of liberty, fraternity and equality had now crushed superstitions and prejudices and awoken the Jews from their lethargy. The hour of salvation had struck for all people. All people, Christians as well as Jews were entitled to equal rights, 'all the rights of Man', which were 'a noble principle of democracy', the foundations of the European temple of freedom. Only 'through an alliance of all religions can freedom stand up to the storms of the century and survive for ever'. Their goals, they concluded, were to raise the educational level of the Jews, encourage agricultural settlement and increase the

knowledge of Polish culture.<sup>45</sup>

Smolka must have been rather put out by the fervent democratic and integrationist zeal of the petitioners. He told them he supported their demands, but cautioned them, should they achieve legal equality, to use their new rights 'cautiously and with prudence, not to the disadvantage of the Christian population, for this would provoke a reaction and result in another restriction of their rights.'<sup>46</sup>

The petition from Tysmenitsa and Zhovka was not the only one submitted at this time. Petitions were also sent to the revolutionary parliament in Vienna by leaders of many other kehillot. They argued that although the government had now proclaimed the principle of equality before the law, the special taxes on Jews had not been abolished and anti-Jewish discrimination had been maintained in a number of areas of economic life. They called for the establishment of full legal equality and religious freedom.

The Jewish parliamentary representatives also spoke against the restrictive legislation affecting the Jewish community. When the question of special Jewish taxes was discussed at the beginning of October 1848, Rabbi Mannheimer argued that their abolition should be enacted not so much because this was in the interests of the Jews as for the sake of the

dignity of this legislative chamber. You are the parliament, the first constitutional National Assembly. There is not doubt that the question whether you want sanction this abnormal, inhuman tax must be solved here. Do you want to legalize this injustice.<sup>47</sup>

In the event, on 5 October, the Parliament voted overwhelmingly by 242 votes to twenty to abolish all taxes which were levied on a particular group in society, including those on the Jews. Further discussion of the Jewish issue in parliament was forestalled by its dissolution by Alfred Windischgraetz. However, the constitution promulgated by the

new Emperor, Franz Joseph I on 4 March 1849 confirmed the principle of full equality before the law, admitted Jews to civic rights and granted them the right to settle anywhere in the country and to purchase any sort of property. In practice, however, serious obstacles still remained in Galicia to the admission of the Jews to municipal citizenship or to settle outside the Jewish quarter in a number of towns. In addition, some though not all of the former restrictions were re-introduced after the crushing of the revolution.

The revolutionary crisis was finally brought to an end in 1849 with Russian help. In effect, the Austrian government had won by default, because of outside intervention and the divisions among the revolutionaries. Austria would never be as powerful after 1848 as it had been in the post-1815 period. Indeed the revolution was to leave a lasting legacy, both in the Monarchy as a whole and in Galicia. The violence of the peasant-noble conflict in western Galicia came as a devastating blow to the Polish hopes, dominant from the time of the emigration following the uprising of November 1830 in the Kingdom of Poland, of restoring Polish statehood by insurrectionary conspiracy. It was now clear that a long period would have to be devoted to internal reform before the issue of independence could again be raised. The influence of those who opposed revolution and who sought compromise with the partitioning powers was greatly enhanced.

The revolution in Galicia also saw the emergence of a self-conscious Ukrainian nationalism and of all those groupings which were to dominate Ukrainian politics in Galicia down to the collapse of the Habsburg state. During the revolution, the main Ukrainian organization, the Supreme Ruthenian Council had emerged as a major political

force, which was able to collect thousands of signatures in support of its objectives and also succeeded in electing twenty five Ukrainian representatives to the parliament set up during the revolution. It was at this time too that the Galician –Rus’ Matytsia was established, in imitation of the similarly named Czech institution. It was intended to promote education and popular culture and was one of the most significant factors in the development of a Ukrainian national consciousness in the 1850s and 1860s.

At the same time, the abolition of the labor tribute ended the principal source of conflict in the countryside, both Polish and Ukrainian. However, the way that peasant emancipation was introduced meant that most peasant holdings were barely sufficient to provide a subsistence. Disputes also continued over disputed rights to common grazing land and to forests, where the emancipation law mostly favoured landlord interests. The land question had thus not been resolved, and returned to plague Galician politics in the second half of the nineteenth century.

For the Jews, the years of the revolution had seen an unprecedented political mobilization. The declaration of the revolutionary Kraków government in favour of Jewish equality, the campaigns for the revolutionary parliament, which were accompanied by expressions of solidarity between Christians and Jews, and the final achievement of equal rights aroused widespread enthusiasm. The disillusionment occasioned by the crushing of the revolution and the return of many of the old restrictions was thus all the more hard to bear.

Trevelyan’s characterization of the revolution is thus less appropriate in Galicia than that of Namier. This was indeed the ‘seed-plot’ of later Galician history. It was an important phase in the establishment of pro-Habsburg sentiment among the Polish elite

in the province and paved the way for the autonomy which was to be granted in the 1860s. It marked the Ukrainians' achievement political maturity and saw the emergence of those political forces which were to dominate Ukrainian politics in Galicia in the second half of the nineteenth century. It also was a significant stage in the transformation of view of the Jewish elite of the province from an integrationist position to a belief that the Jews were a proto-nation like the other emerging nations of the area. What makes it so fascinating is the way these different movements and aspirations both conflicted and inspired each other.

---

<sup>1</sup> Józef Kajetan Janowski, 'Spomnienia przeszłości – widoki na przyszłość' quoted in Robert F. Leslie, *Reform and Insurrection in Russian Poland 1856-1863*, London 1963, 7

<sup>2</sup> Letter of c.27 January 1834, quoted in H. Wiśkowska (ed.), *Listy Emigracyjne*, Kraków, 1948, I, 240.

<sup>3</sup> Leslie, *Reform and Insurrection in Russian Poland*, 12. The document is reprinted in full in B. Baczek (ed.), *Towarzystwo Demokratyczne Polskie – Dokumenty i Pisma*, Warsaw, 1954, 18-26.

<sup>4</sup> The Austrian view of the province was well summed up in the report prepared on the province by its first Governor, the Czech Count Anton Perglen. See Franz A.J. Szabo, 'Austrian First Impressions of Ethnic Relations in Galicia: The Case of Governor Anton von Perglen', *POLIN*, 12, 49-60.

<sup>5</sup> Roman Rozdolski, *Stosunki poddańcze w dawnej Galicji*, 2 vols. Warsaw, 1962, I, 261.

<sup>6</sup> Majer Bańban, *Dzieje Żydów w Galicji i Rzeczypospolitej Krakowskiej 1772-1868*, L'viv 1914 (reprinted Kraków, 1988), 47

<sup>7</sup> Ostaszewski-Barański, *Rok żądze 1848*, 75. An even lower estimate is given in Franciszek Wiesiołowski, *Pamiętnik z r. 1848*, L'viv, 1868, 7. Both are cited by Lewis Namier in *1848: The Revolution of the Intellectuals*, London, 1946, 12.

<sup>8</sup> Paul Robert Magosci, *A History of Ukraine*, Seattle, 1996, 390

<sup>9</sup> Karol Borkowski, 'Pamiętnik historyczny o wyprawie partyzanckiej do Polski w roku 1833', in *Biblioteka Pisarzy Polskich*, VII, Leipzig, 49.

<sup>10</sup> The report is reprinted in Stefan Kieniewicz (ed.), *Rewolucja Polska 1846r.*, Wrocław, 1950, 3-8

<sup>11</sup> Bronisław Trentowski, *Wizerunki duszy narodowej z końca ostatniego szesnastolecia*, Paris, 1847, 2-3.

<sup>12</sup> *Lettre d'un gentilhomme polonais sur les massacres de Galicie adressee au Prince de Metternich*, Paris, 1846, 39

<sup>13</sup> L von Pastor, *Leben des Freiherrn Max von Gagern, 1810-1889* (1912), 230-4, quoted in Lewis Namier, *1848: The Revolution of the Intellectuals*, 55.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, 56.

<sup>15</sup> John-Paul Himka, *Galician Villagers and the Ukrainian National Movement in the Nineteenth Century*, Edmonton, 1988, 3.

- 
- <sup>16</sup> Jan Kozik, *Ukrai\_ski ruch narodowy w Galicji w latach 1830-1848*, Kraków, 1973, 5
- <sup>17</sup> Iosyf Levyts'ki, *Grammatik der ruthenischen oder kleinrussischen Sprache in Galizien*, Przemy\_1, 1834. The other two, Ivan Vahylevych and Iosyf Lozyns'ki appeared in 1845 and 1846 respectively.
- <sup>18</sup> Havrylo Rusin (Iakiv Holovats'kyi), 'Zustaende der Rusinen in Galizien,' *Jahrbuecher fuer Slawischer Literatur, Kunst und Wissenschaft*, IV (Leipzig, 1846), 361-79. The article is discussed in some detail by Jan Kozik in his *Ukrai\_ski ruch narodowy w Galicji*, 277-85.
- <sup>19</sup> *Ibid.*, 282.
- <sup>20</sup> This is discussed in Peter Brock's chapter 'Ivan Vahylevich (1811-1866) and the Ukrainian National Identity', in Andrei S. Markovits, Frank E. Sysyn (Eds.), *Nationbuilding and the Politics of Nationalism; Essays on Austrian Galicia*, Cambridge, MA, 1982, 136 and in Fedor Steblyi, 'Vasil Podolins'kyi's *Slowo przestrogy*', unpublished paper presented at a conference of Jews, Poles and Ukrianians in Galicia held at the Insitut fuer die Wissenschaft von Menschen, Vienne in June 1992.
- <sup>21</sup> The newspaper is described in Jan Kozik, *Mi\_dzy reakcj\_ a rewolucj\_*. *Studia z dziejów ukrai\_skiegoruch narodowego w Galicji w latach 1848-1849*, Warsaw- Kraków, 1975, 178-9.
- <sup>22</sup> *Zoria Halytska*, 1848, no. 1
- <sup>23</sup> Quoted in Kozik, *Mi\_dzy reakcj\_ a rewolucj\_*, 93
- <sup>24</sup> Kozik, *Mi\_dzy reakcj\_ a rewolucj\_*, 146-7
- <sup>25</sup> *Ibid.*, 200
- <sup>26</sup> *Ibid.*
- <sup>27</sup> On this see Kozik, *Ukrai\_ski ruch narodowy w Galicji*, 184-5
- <sup>28</sup> Kozik, *Mi\_dzy reakcj\_ a rewolucj\_*, 206-7
- <sup>29</sup> Quoted in Kozik, *Ukrai\_ski ruch narodowy w Galicji*, 287.
- <sup>30</sup> Quoted in Steblyi, 'Vasil Podolins'kyi's *Slowo przestrogy*'.
- <sup>31</sup> David Assaf, *Derekh hamalkut: R.Yisrael miruzhin*, Jerusalem, 1997.
- <sup>32</sup> Majer Ba\_aban, *Dzieje \_ydów w Galicji*, 114.
- <sup>33</sup> Quoted in Artur Eisenbach, *The Emancipation of the Jews in Poland, 1780-1870*, Oxford, 1991, 327
- <sup>34</sup> Artur Eisenbach, 'Hotel Lambert wobec sprawy \_ydowskiej w przededniu Wiosny Ludów', *Przeegl\_d Historyczny*, 3 (1976), 396.
- <sup>35</sup> On this see Eisenbach, *The Emancipation of the Jews in Poland*, 347
- <sup>36</sup> Eisenbach, *The Emancipation of the Jews in Poland* 349.
- <sup>37</sup> Ba\_aban, *Dzieje \_ydów w Galicji*, 166
- <sup>38</sup> Quoted in Eisenbach, *The Emancipation of the Jews in Poland*, 355.
- <sup>39</sup> Eisenbach, *The Emancipation of the Jews in Poland*, 344.
- <sup>40</sup> *Ibid.*
- <sup>41</sup> Ba\_aban, *Dzieje \_ydów w Galicji*, 162
- <sup>42</sup> Majer Ba\_aban, *Historia \_ydów w Krakowie i na Kazimierzu*, Kraków, 1936, reprinted 1991, II, 741-6
- <sup>43</sup> Quoted in Eisenbach, *The Emancipation of the Jews in Poland*, 355.
- <sup>44</sup> Kozik, *Ukrai\_ski Ruch Narodowy w Galicji*, 192-4, 203.
- <sup>45</sup> K. Widman, *Franciszek Smolka, jego \_ycie i zawód publiczny*, L'viv, 1886, 279, 870, 876. Quoted in Eisenbach, *The Emancipation of the Jews in Poland*, 345.
- <sup>46</sup> *Ibid.*
- <sup>47</sup> Filip Friedman, *Die galizischen Juden im Kampfe um ihre Gleichberechtigung 1848-1869*, Frankfurt a.M, 71.