Published in final edited form as:

Stud Hist Philos Biol Biomed Sci. 2007 December ; 38(4): 679–686. doi:10.1016/j.shpsc.2007.09.004.

Science, medicine and nationalism in the Habsburg Empire from the 1840s to 1918

Tatjana Buklijas and Emese Lafferton

Historians of science and imperialism today are eager to understand how science and medicine participated in the building and maintaining of empires, and how they were shaped by this experience.¹ The empires dominating current historiography of science and medicine are all European countries with overseas colonies. By contrast, the Habsburg Monarchy in the European East, with its uniquely complex socio-political milieu, creative culture, and highly successful educational system and institutions in which outstanding scientists were schooled and worked remained largely out of sight.² Yet, it has been argued that the Habsburg dynasty with its history reaching back to the Middle Ages was the original global colonial power.³ But by the nineteenth century, the geographically contiguous conglomeration of lands which enjoyed different levels of autonomy under the Habsburg rule came to be regarded, like Russia and the Ottoman Empire,⁴ as a medieval relic that fit none of the modern forms of state organization.⁵ Neither a nation-state nor a colonial empire with extra-European acquisitions, it nevertheless exhibited characteristics of both. At the primetime of European nation-building, the multi-ethnic Habsburg Monarchy was facing increasing internal ethnic tensions, while it also strove to maintain its historical role of political stabilization in Central-Eastern Europe and the Balkans. Like the colonial powers, the Habsburg Empire mobilized strategies of differentiation, inclusion and exclusion to impose order over its vast territories, diverse cultures and political groups. Notions of cultural supremacy, espoused by Germans, Magyars and Italians, or of the ‘civilizing mission’, extending beyond the imperial periphery and into the neighbouring Ottoman Empire,⁶ will be familiar to scholars of British or French scientific colonial enterprises. But the Europe-wide process of nation-building in the era of industrialization, economic growth and political reform did not bypass the Habsburg lands. In 1867, the empire divided into two virtually independent parts, ruled from Vienna and Budapest and together called the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy. Geographical distances were shorter here than in the colonial empires and cultural differences less distinct and in some cases more difficult and sensitive to interpret. Geopolitics was informed by regional cultural traditions that occasionally involved strong connections to rival centres outside the Habsburg borders, as evident from the case of Italians in the Adriatic region,⁷ or that of ethnic Romanians in the Eastern Hungarian

¹The literature is vast and geographically and thematically diverse. For a historiographical and bibliographical review see Drayton (1995); Cunningham & Andrews (1997); and MacLeod (2000).

²Cultural historians of the Habsburg Monarchy have begun to use the tools provided by the studies of imperialism and postcolonialism, but their scholarship has hitherto not extended to science and medicine. See Feichtinger, Prutsch & Csáky (2003).

³Gruzinski (2001) argues that the Catholic monarchy run by the Habsburgs in the sixteenth century was the first global power, not entirely centrally administered, linking and connecting knowledge systems and trade networks from Iberia, Italy, Netherlands and Austria to the Americas and South Asia.

⁴For comparative studies on the nature and strategies of empire in the rival Russian, Habsburg, Ottoman and British Empires, see Lieven (2003) and Miller & Rieber (2004).

⁵In contrast to this image of political backwardness, both the inhabitants of the Habsburg Empire in its final decades and historians have sometimes interpreted it as an ‘experimental station’, a ‘laboratory of world history’ where national and class conflicts characteristic of modernity were produced and observed. See Coen (2007).

⁶On the idea of ‘civilizing mission’ see for instance Conklin (1997). On the Austro-Hungarian Empire’s ‘civilizing mission’, see more in Chahrour and Lafferton in this section.

⁷See Topp in this section.

territories. As this section argues, Austro-Hungarian science and medicine both affected and were informed by the tensions between colonialism and nationalism, separatist and unifying forces in the empire, and by the rich metropolitan culture resulting from ethnic diversity and political dynamics.

Recent scholarship on science and empire has deeply transformed our understanding of science in both the imperial centres and in the colonies, as well as the dynamics of scientific exchange between them. It attempts to escape the diffusionist approach, which contends that reliable knowledge is made in the centre, from where it is then diffused to a periphery. Instead, it explains imperial relations in terms of multiple exchanges and negotiations, and studies the encounters between different knowledge systems—including indigenous and colonial, elite and popular⁸—in diverse locations of the empire.⁹ As a result, notions of centre and periphery are fundamentally redefined and their dynamic relations are understood in terms of both centripetal and centrifugal forces, the circulation of ideas and practices, and intercultural encounters. For instance, recent historiography explores how Western sciences responded to new imperial challenges which shaped, in response, the colonizing countries and their intellectual life. In particular, how the imperial system influenced different branches of science by generating knowledge which would not otherwise exist, such as tropical medicine, racial anthropology, survey astronomy and economic botany.¹⁰ These knowledges could not and would not appear in an isolated metropole. But they are also more than just Western responses to the imperial situation: to a great degree, these branches of modern science are the product of the intercultural encounter and thus co-produced in the imperial context.¹¹ Furthermore, many of these knowledge and practices are themselves tools for making certain places central and others less so. Centres, just like peripheries, are not given or discovered, but defined and constructed.

Most of these insights and approaches aptly apply to the Habsburg case, as demonstrated by articles in this section. In the eighteenth century, the military and medicine together transformed the land belt along the Ottoman Empire border, between the Adriatic and Wallachia, into a large army base and then a tight *cordon sanitaire*, with the main task of protecting from plague epidemics.¹² Medical institutions and knowledge created for and in the area known as the *Militärgrenze* were later exported into the Ottoman Empire, where they were renegotiated and adjusted to Turkish goals and needs.¹³ In this process, the peripheral border region thus, in a way, itself became a centre. Yet simultaneously, the same medical institutions and knowledge were challenged in Vienna by the new generation of medical professors looking out to Germany for models of education and research.¹⁴ The dynamic interaction between Vienna and other centres, regional and international, to which different ethnic groups were tied linguistically and historically is evident in the analysis of asylum planning in Austria.¹⁵ Furthermore, the study of the Habsburg context enriches some of our key concepts in European culture. Consider, for instance, the way in which—as Ernest Gellner argued in a posthumously published work on Wittgenstein and Malinowski—

⁸See Fan (2004) on nineteenth-century natural history knowledge and practices as the products of the cross-cultural encounter between Britain and China, involving elite and popular discourses as well as folk knowledge, and the participation of a wide range of Chinese and British actors, such as gardeners, herbal doctors, hunters, merchants and missionaries.

⁹For general overview and literature, see Drayton (1998; 1999).

¹⁰For colonial empires, see Drayton (1999), for European ones, see MacLeod (1997).

¹¹Kapil Raj demonstrates this through examples from botany, cartography, scientific education, and colonial administration in South Asia. See Raj (2006); also Fan (2004).

¹²On the military border, see, for instance, Rothenberg (1966) and Kaser (1997); on the *cordon sanitaire*, see Lesky (1957), Rothenberg (1973) and Bratescu (1979). On the making of the medical institutions for the border region, see Lesky (1959) and Horn (2006).

¹³See Chahrour in this section.

¹⁴See Buklijas in this section.

¹⁵See Topp in this section.

nationalisms, anthropology and language philosophy are knowledge systems invented in response to and as recipes for what Gellner calls the 'Habsburg dilemma' (Gellner, 1998). As we see in this section, trying to make sense of the multi-ethnic Kingdom at the time nationalist tensions, Hungarian ethnography and physical anthropology simultaneously forged the modern concepts of ethnicity and race and participated in the construction of the nation as well as Hungarian liberalism.¹⁶

Colonialism studies have recently come up with an insight that is key to the study of the Habsburg situation. Importantly, they point out the lack of interaction between nationalism studies and colonial history when they call for a more integrated study of strategies of European nation-building and imperialistic tendencies in the colonial project (Cooper & Stoler, 1997). As Ann Stoler and Frederick Cooper put it, "The 'nation-state' has become too centered in conceptions of European history since the late eighteenth century, and 'empire' not centered enough" (Cooper & Stoler, 1997, p. 22). Yet if nation-building and empire-building were mutually constitutive projects in nineteenth-century European overseas rule, national and imperial impulses worked strongly intertwined in Central and Eastern European empires. The models of rule instituted in these contiguous territories and their continuous challenge, however, prove different from those in colonial cultures, transported and then reshaped overseas.

The cultural effects of the tensions between movements for ethnic and regional emancipation and the multi-ethnic empire are addressed throughout the section. Similar issues have occupied political scientists and historians ever since the disintegration of the empire in 1918.¹⁷ These scholars studied how, in the last decades of the long nineteenth century, the Habsburg Empire maintained its integrity against the growing forces of nationalist separatism.¹⁸ More recently, the break-up of the multi-ethnic states created from the former Austro-Hungarian lands, Yugoslavia and Czechoslovakia—and, simultaneously, the emergence of the supranational European Union—have renewed interest in the conditions of the break-up and survival of multi-ethnic and multi-denominational states. Centripetal forces—the dynasty, with the emperor as its powerful symbol, but also the Catholic Church, aristocracy, army, imperial bureaucracy, as well as the centrifugal ones—movements for national and regional emancipation—have all received substantial historiographical examination.¹⁹ Yet how these historical forces informed scientific disciplines, and how sciences contributed to legitimating or undermining the political system is not well understood.

Just as colonial expansion profoundly influenced Western European culture and science in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, multi-ethnic coexistence and its tensions shaped Central European modernist culture. This was especially visible in urban centres, as captured in the illuminating metaphors for the Monarchy's twin capitals around 1900, proposed by Carl Schorske and Péter Hanák: Vienna as the "garden" and Budapest as the "workshop". In a series of essays published in the 1960s and '70s, Schorske argued that the

¹⁶See Lafferton in this section.

¹⁷For the purposes of this section, we focus on English and German language publications accessible to Western readers. Influential older discussions include Redlich (1920–26) and Kann (1950). For classic theories of the causes of nationalism, inspired by the Austro-Hungarian experience, see Gellner (1983) and Hobsbawm (1987; 1990). For more recent discussions, see Wingfield (2003), Judson & Rozenblit (2004), and Ramet, Felak & Ellison (2002). For a useful recent wide-ranging collection of relevant original sources, see Trencsényi & Kopeček (2006) (vols. 3–4 are published in 2007).

¹⁸See standard histories of the Habsburg Monarchy in the long nineteenth century: Taylor (1976) and Rumpler, (1997). For a standard history of Hungary, see Kontler (2006) and especially for the period in question, Romsics & Király (1999), Ger (1995) and Janos (1982). For an influential early-twentieth century interpretation of the demise of the Monarchy, see Jászi (1971 [1929]); on Jászi and the surrounding intellectual and political milieu, see Litván (2005).

¹⁹For instance, on the emperor, see Redlich (1929), and, more recently, Beller (1996) and Ger (2001); on the role of the army, see Deák (1990).

rise of populist politics in the late nineteenth century pushed an entire generation out of the political realm and into the artistic and literary scene.²⁰ This resulted, he maintained, in an unusually rich and cohesive trans-disciplinary modernist culture that included innovation in architecture (exemplified in the work of Otto Wagner and Adolf Loos), painting (Gustav Klimt, Oskar Kokoschka, Egon Schiele), music (Gustav Mahler, Arnold Schönberg), literature (Arthur Schnitzler, Hermann Bahr) and psychiatry (Sigmund Freud). Schorske's work was followed by numerous scholars who focused on different areas of Viennese urban life.²¹ Hanák complemented this picture of Vienna as a “garden” of esoteric culture with the image of Budapest as a “workshop”, using Hungarians' own notions of the brilliant centres where the intelligentsia gathered: the cafés and editorial offices. He contrasted the inward-looking, strongly individualistic and aesthetic Viennese culture with the more socially engaged and public-oriented Budapest intellectual and artistic milieu.²² Emerging as a major centre of European culture during the second half of the nineteenth century, Budapest served as the cradle of sophisticated intellectual and artistic achievements exemplified by the work of figures such as Endre Ady, Ferenc Molnár, Gyula Krúdy in literature, Béla Bartók, Zoltán Kodály, and Franz Lehár in music, Ödön Lechner in architecture, Sándor Ferenczi in psychoanalysis, and Oszkár Jászi, Tivadar Herzl, Georg Lukács, Michael and Karl Polányi, and Karl Mannheim in philosophy, science, and political thinking.

Gathering places of artists, cafés and editorial offices were certainly central to nourishing the Austro-Hungarian intellectual and creative talent, but one should add another space to these: the *gymnasium*, high school, emblematic of the legacy of a successful educational system.²³ The “Centennial exhibition of the Nobel prize” at the Nobel Museum, also published as a book, was divided into two parts: creative people and creative milieus. The fifteen selected environments included, remarkably, both Budapest and Vienna.²⁴ For Vienna, the café stood for the environment where future Nobel laureates met and the book shows pictures of Karl Landsteiner and Julius Wagner-Jauregg. For Budapest, the exhibition focused on the *gymnasium*, where Albert Szent-Györgyi, George de Hevesy, George von Békésy, Eugene Wigner, as well as Leó Szilárd, Edward Teller, Theodore von Kármán, and John von Neumann all went to school. These different civic cultures, formed out of different historical experiences, explain why Austrian and Hungarian responses to the common social and political crisis, eventually leading to the Monarchy's disintegration, diverged. Schorske's argument has since been criticized from various vantage points,²⁵ but the general images of urban culture in the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy richly informed by its multi-ethnic population have survived.²⁶

Yet the corresponding interactions between socio-political processes and science and medicine have remained little studied. Social and political historians have regarded these fields as external to their projects. In contrast to the weakly institutionalized history of

²⁰These essays were later united in a book: Schorske (1981a).

²¹Most famously, Janik & Toulmin (1973) and McGrath (1973). Johnston (1972) admirably attempted a wide-canvas survey of practically all areas of intellectual and artistic activity, from literature to science. Yet the wide scope resulted, at least in some areas such as medicine, in a superficial and erroneous treatment.

²²See Hanák (1998). On Budapest's turn-of-the-century intellectual and artistic culture, see also Lukács (1988), Frigyesi (1998) and Gyáni (2004); on politics and popular culture, see Freifeld (2000). On other Austro-Hungarian cities, see Babejova (2003), King (2002), Hofmann & Wendland (2002), Purchla (1993), and Spector (2000).

²³On education in the changing society of the Austrian half, see Cohen (1996).

²⁴Larsson (2001): “Budapest: the investigative education” pp. 166–7 and “Vienna: upheaval and regeneration” pp. 206–209.

²⁵For a summary of critiques, see Beller (2001); for not stressing the overwhelming predominance of Jews in the urban cultural life, see Beller (1989); for misunderstanding the nationalist nature of Austrian liberalism, see Judson (1996), and for focusing exclusively on high culture and ignoring the important contribution of the working classes to fin-de-siècle Vienna, see Maderthaner & Musner (1999).

²⁶To the café, editorial office and *gymnasium*, we should add the meeting place of Habsburg historians in recent years: the innovative multilingual online portal <http://www.kakanien.ac.at>, which takes its name from Robert Musil's ironic term for his disintegrated homeland.

science, history of medicine has a long tradition in Central Europe—Vienna had regular lectures from 1833 and a chair from 1869; at Pest, history of medicine was taught, although with several interruptions, from 1835; but both were preceded by Krakow (1809—and a considerable body of writing.²⁷ Much of it is, however, rather internalist, focusing on medical developments without taking their socio-political environment into account.²⁸ In the successor countries, language barriers and political and cultural isolation in 1945–1990 made investigation of the common Central European history difficult and the integration of innovations in international historiography largely impossible. ‘Western’ historians of science and medicine in the Habsburg Monarchy for the most part focused on the University of Vienna but treated it together with other German-speaking universities, without considering its specific socio-political circumstances.²⁹ They acknowledged the central place of Vienna in the educational itineraries of the nineteenth century (medical) students and in the making of modern medicine but did not venture beyond the Vienna General Hospital's clinical wards and dissection halls to try to explain the specific conditions in which this medical culture was created. Only occasionally would scholars acknowledge the significance of Prague, the eternal second university of the Austrian part of the empire whose foundation actually predated Vienna, but it was a Czech historian who provocatively argued that the interaction between these two schools was so close and their development so mutually dependent that we should speak of “the medical school of Vienna and Prague”.³⁰ The role of the Budapest medical school and its relations to Viennese medicine is even more neglected.

The only exception to the historiographical lacuna in the politically and socially informed study of medicine and science was, until recently, the history of psychoanalysis, with its fascinating founding figure and swaying cultural influence in the twentieth century. In the 1970s, the interest of the circle around Schorske in connections between Freud's work and the politics and culture of *fin-de-siècle* Vienna, combined with the new trends in social history and history of medicine, stimulated research into ways in which madness, neuroses and social deviance were framed in Viennese culture.³¹ More recent work has, however, extended the scrutiny to wider realms of the history of psychiatry, including psychiatric institutions, sexology and cultural meanings of disease, in a more systematic fashion and to wider geographic areas, encompassing the Austrian provinces as well as the Hungarian Kingdom.³² Only very recently have other areas of science and medicine begun to be studied in their relation with politics and culture: for instance, the political affiliations of the Vienna medical faculty in the nineteenth-century (Seebacher, 2006); science in the milieu of a bourgeois family (Coen, 2006a); the impact of urban transformation on disciplinary development (Buklijas 2005); the movement for science education of working classes amongst the educated elites;³³ or the interactions between working class culture, Social

²⁷The work of Max Neuburger and Erna Lesky stands out in the rich Viennese tradition. Lesky (1965) is still the standard history of medicine at the University of Vienna in the nineteenth-century. In Hungary, the 1905 the Budapest Royal Medical Society founded a history of medicine collection in 1905, the National Library for the History of Medicine was established in 1951 and the Semmelweis Museum of Medical History, located in the house where Semmelweis had been born, in 1964. The medico-historical journal *Orvostörténeti Közlemények* (*Communicationes de Historia Artis Medicinae*) has been published since 1968. In Yugoslavia, Lujó Thaller was appointed the first professor in history of medicine in Zagreb in 1927; a history of medicine department was founded in 1960 at the Yugoslav (today Croatian) Academy of Science and Arts by Mirko Dražen Grmek, while the journal *Acta historiae medicinae et pharmaciae* (from 1976, *Acta historiae medicinae, stomatologiae, pharmaciae et medicinae veterinae*) was published in Belgrade from 1961 until the dissolution of Yugoslavia.

²⁸An approach that steered clear of the socio-political concerns was even commended: see Pellegrino (1978) in his review of the English translation of Lesky's book: “[it] is a model of historical scholarship (...) She eschews lengthy philosophical and socio-cultural ‘background’ in favour of simple and chronological statement of facts.”

²⁹For instance, Eulner (1970); on medical education: Bonner (1963; 1995) and Warner (1998, pp. 297–314).

³⁰Matoušek (1967). The University of Prague was established in 1348 and the University of Vienna in 1364.

³¹Schorske (1981b), McGrath (1986) and Haynal (2002).

³²The following list does not claim to be comprehensive: Haiko, Löwenthal-Leupold & Reissberger (1981), Sengoopta (2000), Oosterhuis (2000), Topp (2004; 2005; 2007), Hofer (2004), Lafferton (2003a; 2003b; 2006).

Democratic politics and a medical discipline in the making (Hofer, 2004/5). Most of the latter are focused on Vienna and while they build on the premise that the city owed its cultural richness to its position as the imperial capital, they rarely venture beyond the metropolitan limits. An example of a more comprehensive, *longue durée* exploration of the political and cultural tensions at work in the history of Austrian sciences is offered by a study of the relation of race, gender, and nationalism in Austrian ethnography and anthropology (Fuchs, 2003). Tensions between imperial unity and local independence grounded in diversity characterized not only the scientific study of the peoples but also of the space occupied by the Habsburg Empire.³⁴

The present section embraces a wider perspective, with all but one article set outside Vienna, stressing the need for de-centring historical investigations of science and medicine in the Austro-Hungarian Empire. By supplementing the view from Vienna, the seat of the Habsburgs, with views from Hungary, the Monarchy's more neglected half, as well as views from the Austrian provinces and from the mighty neighbour, the Ottoman Empire, we hope to offer a perspective that is both balanced and illuminating. To reverse the traditional perspective, the section begins not in Vienna, but beyond the borders of the Habsburg Monarchy, in the Ottoman Empire, in the era when Austrian diplomacy headed by Prince Clemens von Metternich played a world-leading role. Marcel Chahrour's article on "'A civilizing mission'?: Austrian medicine and the reform of medical structures in the Ottoman Empire (1838–1850)" focuses on Austrian physicians who, around 1840, headed the reform of medical education and public health under the support of the reformist sultans in the era of socio-political change and opening to the West. The Ottoman Empire, once the Habsburg arch-enemy, was now seen as a sphere of influence and a political ally. The traditional historiography portrayed this medical venture as a triumph of progress, the pinnacle of Austria's 'civilizing mission' to the Orient. Yet, as Chahrour shows, the primary aim of Austria was to reform the epidemic control measures in the Eastern Mediterranean. With the growth of trade between the Ottoman Empire and the West, a 'Europeanized' medical education seemed to guarantee equal levels of protection as quarantine but at lower cost. In public health, the multinational Habsburg Empire offered a suitable model for its southern, rural and diverse neighbour. Although the project at first seemed successful, it soon began to show cracks, caused by the incompatibility between the demands of Europeanized medicine and the Ottoman society. The replacement of the Austrian physicians with French ones in the 1850s had to do equally with the general 'imperialist rivalry' in the 1850s, as discussed by political and economic historians, and with the completion of the quarantine cutback project.

Moving westward, the section continues with a study of how social and medical sciences contributed to the formation of ethnic, national and imperial identities in Central Europe. Emese Lafferton's 'The Magyar Moustache: The Faces of Hungarian State Formation, 1867–1918' explores how, in the decades around 1900, Budapest anthropologists and ethnographers tried to make sense of the Hungarian Kingdom and its multi-ethnic complexity.³⁵ Through their endeavours to create the very concepts of ethnicity and race, these scientists participated in the construction of the nation as well as Hungarian liberalism.

³³See the work of the group of scholars around the journal *Spurensuche: Zeitschrift für Geschichte der Erwachsenenbildung und Wissenschaftspopularisierung*, published by the Österreichisches Volkshochschularchiv: for a book-length discussion, see Taschwer (2002).

³⁴Coen (2007) argues that the discipline of climatography provided a way of unifying the natural and social diversity of the Habsburg Empire, by describing its climate as an 'uninterrupted series of transitions'. The change of the political space in 1918 resulted in a disciplinary transformation: with the breakdown of the empire, climatography adjusted to the new political circumstances by transforming itself, in terms of methods and research topics, from an imperial into a local, 'small scale' science: see Coen (2006b). On how geology was mobilized for drawing new borders in 1918, see Trgovcevic-Mitrovic (2003). Sander Gilboff has shown how Gregor Mendel's interest in quantifying the organic world should be seen in relation to his contribution to imperial biogeographical surveys of the 1850s: see Gilboff (1999).

The specific socio-political conditions of the ethnically most diverse European country³⁶ deeply affected the disciplinary climate of anthropology and ethnography, whose history, Lafferton claims, fits none of the models provided by historians of the British, French and German contexts. Furthermore, she disagrees with the scholarship that sees the Hungarian human sciences in this period as dominated by the idea of a biologically based racial hierarchy with ethnic Magyars on top.³⁷ Lafferton argues that, notwithstanding their nationalist inclinations, Hungarian scientists predominantly abstained from biological reasoning, were far more inclusive, and took pride in the richness of cultural and ethnic variation in order to strengthen the multi-ethnic image of the Kingdom and thus legitimate its existence. To prove this, she surveys a large field, from historicist painting and official census-taking through anthropological population measurements to ethnographic studies and displays at world exhibitions. While the attempts to define the 'true Magyar' racial types failed, the representational practices and disciplinary organizations that emphasized diversity flourished. The failure of the 'biological' model was related to the success of the 'cultural', which ultimately assisted state strategies of the assimilation of ethnic groups living in the same territory—albeit, from the mid-1890s, claims towards the dominant position of the Magyar would become more prominent in national politics and science alike.

The importance of maintaining the equilibrium between the multi-ethnic character of the empire and ethnic—but here also regional—identities is discussed in Leslie Topp's study of asylum planning, a branch of psychiatry, in the late nineteenth-century Austria. 'Psychiatric institutions, their architecture and the politics of regional autonomy in the late Habsburg Empire' examines the resources on which two provincial governments drew in the planning of psychiatric institutions between 1896 and 1902, to illuminate the relationship between regional autonomy, the imperial centre, and the international community. Her first example is the Austrian province of the Littoral with its capital Trieste, 'a multi-ethnic city that functioned in Italian in a multi-ethnic empire with a German-speaking central government'. Its government balanced claims for cultural and administrative autonomy, established in the city history and the Italian identity, and its interest in reinforcing economic links with the German centre. The asylum that was constructed after long negotiations offered a visual interpretation of Triestine identity as a mixture of Italian architectural heritage and German, as well as (central) Austrian institutional models. By contrast, in the imperial heartland of Lower Austria, the Christian Socials—the new mass political party elected amidst great political controversy in 1896—sent a rather different message with the new asylum Mauer-Öhling. Conscious of their visibility in the empire and of the need to fulfil their electoral promise of effective administration, they made a strong statement with an asylum whose simple, clean aesthetics followed the recent modernist tendencies in the Viennese architecture, most famously in the work of Otto Wagner. Its 'neutral', 'a-national' or 'international' modernist style embodied the values that formed the core of the Christian Social political project.

The investigation of medicine, empire and nationalism ends with a study on the imperial centre of Vienna where, as we learn from Tatjana Buklijas' 'Surgery and national identity in the late nineteenth-century Vienna', political and ethnic divisions in the middle class informed the split in the medical faculty. In the aftermath of the Austrian defeat by Prussia in 1866, the Vienna medical faculty hired Theodor Billroth, a world-leading surgeon and a Prussian. His reputation brought prestige to the ageing faculty but his views in the politically

³⁵Magyar is here designates the ethnic group, sharing the language and common origin, while Hungarian/Hungary refers to the political nation.

³⁶From 1867, Hungary was a practically independent country that occupied a large proportion of the imperial territory in the east and south, inhabited by 13 ethnic groups, none of which had a majority until the 1900s.

³⁷Turda (2004). For a recent study on eugenics in Central and Eastern Europe, see Turda & Weindling (2006).

heated 1870s provoked controversy. Billroth and his students stood for surgery grounded in the physiological paradigm, an elitist and science-oriented medical education, the university's independence from the state and the leading role of Germans in the empire. These views met strong resistance from part of the (Austrian-born) professoriate, who devised their surgical procedures using anatomical methods and who argued that the university had a duty to the state to supply medical education focused on clinically relevant knowledge to students from all regions, classes and ethnic groups. Against the German cultural leadership, they stood for an Austrian model of medicine grounded in the multiethnic character of the empire. The conflict in the professoriate was part of a larger process in which Austrian identity was forged in relation to the German one across the border. The surgeons' controversy was 'resolved' by allowing each of the opposed surgical-political orientations space to reign freely at one of the university chairs. This separate co-existence mirrored the precarious consensus in Austrian society at large.

Traversing a vast geographical expanse and exploring the distinct disciplinary fields of medical education, public health, psychiatry, surgery, anthropology, and ethnography, these articles together argue that science and medicine both registered and co-produced the social and political tensions that characterised the Habsburg Empire in the studied period. As we show for the Habsburg Monarchy but hope to argue more generally, it was in the space of interplay between nationalism and imperial aspirations, regional concerns and 'central' impulses as well as international rivalries and internal interests that new forms of disciplinary knowledge and practices were created, to make sense of the empire.

Acknowledgments

This collection of articles originates in the workshop on Science and medicine in the multinational empires of Central and Eastern Europe at Department of History and Philosophy of Science, University of Cambridge on 23 June 2006 (<http://www.hps.cam.ac.uk/medicine/empires.html>). We thank the Wellcome Trust for funding the workshop. For their generous support, we are grateful to the staff of Department of History and Philosophy of Science, and especially Nick Hopwood. For the useful comments and questions, we thank the participants of the workshop: speakers, chairs and the audience. For their insightful comments on earlier versions of this introduction, we thank Deborah R. Coen, Nick Hopwood, Hans-Georg Hofer, Simon Schaffer and Sujit Sivasundaram, as well as the section contributors, Marcel Chahrour and Leslie Topp.

Literature

1. Babejova, E. *Fin-de-Siècle Pressburg: Conflict and Cultural Coexistence in Bratislava, 1897–1914*. Boulder: East European Monographs; 2003.
2. Beller, S. *Vienna and the Jews, 1867–1938: a cultural history*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 1989.
3. Beller, S. *Francis Joseph*. Harlow: Longman; 1996.
4. Beller, S., editor. *Rethinking Vienna 1900*. Vol. 3. New York, Oxford: Berghahn Books; 2001. *Austrian and Habsburg Studies*.
5. Bonner, TN. *American doctors and German universities: a chapter in international intellectual relations, 1870–1914*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press; 1963.
6. Bonner, TN. *Becoming a physician: medical education in Britain, France, Germany and the United States*. New York: Oxford University Press; 1995.
7. Bratescu G. *Seuchenschutz und Staatsinteresse im Donauraum (1750–1850)*. *Sudhoffs Archiv*. 1979; 63:25–44. [PubMed: 155328]
8. Buklijas, T. *Dissection, discipline and urban transformation: anatomy at the University of Vienna, 1845–1914*. University of Cambridge; 2005. PhD dissertation
9. Coen D. A lens of many facets: science through a family's eyes. *Isis*. 2006a; 57:395–419. [PubMed: 17059106]

10. Coen, D. Scaling down: the “Austrian” climate between Empire and Republic. In: Fleming, JR.; Jankovic, V.; Coen, D., editors. *Intimate universality: local and global themes in the history of weather and climate*. Sagamore Beach: Science History Publication; 2006b. p. 115-40.
11. Coen, D. Eddies in the Currents of Empire: Mountain Climates in Imperial Austria; Workshop Laboratory of Nature; Castasegna, Switzerland. 14–17 June 2007; 2007.
12. Cohen, GB. *Education and middle-class society in imperial Austria, 1848–1918*. West Lafayette: Purdue University Press; 1996.
13. Conklin, AL. *A Mission to Civilize: The Republican Idea of Empire in France and West Africa, 1895-1930*. Stanford: Stanford University Press; 1997.
14. Cooper, F.; Stoler, AL., editors. *Tensions of Empire. Colonial Cultures in a Bourgeois World*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press; 1997.
15. Cunningham, A.; Andrews, B. *Western Medicine as Contested Knowledge*. Manchester: Manchester University Press; 1997. Introduction; p. 1-23. Idem (Eds.)
16. Deák, I. *Beyond Nationalism: A Social and Political History of the Habsburg Officer Corps, 1848–1918*. New York: Oxford University Press; 1990.
17. Drayton R. Science and the European Empires. *Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History*. 1995; 23:503–10.
18. Drayton, R. Knowledge and Empire. In: Marshall, PJ., editor. *The Oxford History of the British Empire: The Eighteenth Century Vol. II*. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 1998. p. 231-53.
19. Drayton, R. Science, Medicine, and the British Empire. In: Winks, RW., editor. *The Oxford History of the British Empire: Historiography, Vol. V*. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 1999. p. 264-77.
20. Eulner, H-H. *Die Entwicklung der medizinischen Spezialfächer an den Universitäten des deutschen Sprachgebietes*. Stuttgart: F. Enke; 1970.
21. Fan, F. *British Naturalists in Qing China: Science, Empire, and Cultural Encounter*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press; 2004.
22. Feichtinger, J.; Prutsch, U.; Csáky, Moritz. *Habsburg postcolonial: Machtstrukturen und kollektives Gedächtnis*. Innsbruck: Studienverlag; 2003.
23. Freifeld, A. *Nationalism and the Crowd in Liberal Hungary, 1848–1914*. Baltimore and Washington, D.C.: Johns Hopkins University Press and Woodrow Wilson Center; 2000.
24. Frigyesi, J. *Béla Bartók and Turn-of-the-Century Budapest*. Berkeley: University of California Press; 1998.
25. Fuchs, B. “Rasse,” “Volk” “Geschlecht”: Anthropologische Diskurse in Österreich, 1850–1960. Frankfurt: Campus; 2003.
26. Gellner, E. *Nations and Nationalism*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press; 1983.
27. Gellner, E. *Language and Solitude: Wittgenstein, Malinowski and the Habsburg Dilemma*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 1998.
28. Ger , A. *Modern Hungarian Society in the Making. The Unfinished Experience*. Budapest: Central European University Press; 1995.
29. Ger , A. *Emperor Francis Joseph. King of Hungarians*. New York: Boulder-Columbia University Press; 2001.
30. Gliboff S. Gregor Mendel and the laws of evolution. *History of Science*. 1999; 37:217–35.
31. Gruzinski S. Les mondes mêlés de la monarchie catholique et autres “connected histories”. *Annales*. 2001; 56:85–117.
32. Gyáni, G. *Identity and Urban Experience: Fin-de-Siècle Budapest*. New York: Columbia University Press; 2004.
33. Haiko P, Löwenthal-Leupold H, Reissberger M. “Die weisse Stadt”: der “Steinhof” in Wien: Architektur als Reflex der Einstellung zur Geisteskrankheit. *Kritische Berichte*. 1981; 9:3–37.
34. Hanák, P. *The Garden and the Workshop: Essays on the cultural history of Vienna and Budapest*. Princeton: Princeton University Press; 1998.
35. Haynal, AE. *Disappearing and Reviving: Sándor Ferenczi in the History of Psychoanalysis*. London: Karnac Books; 2002.
36. Hobsbawm, E. *The Age of Empire 1875–1914*. New York: Pantheon Books; 1987.

37. Hobsbawm, E. Nations and Nationalism since 1780. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 1990.
38. Hofer, H-G. Nervenschwäche und Krieg: Modernitätskritik und Krisenbewältigung in der österreichischen Psychiatrie (1880–1920). Wien: Böhlau; 2004.
39. Hofer H-G. Dem Strom auf der Spur. Stefan Jellinek und die Elektropathologie. Blätter für Technikgeschichte. 2004/5; 66/67:165–98.
40. Hofmann, AR.; Wendland, AV., editors. Stadt und Öffentlichkeit in Ostmitteleuropa 1900–1939. Stuttgart: Steiner; 2002.
41. Horn S. 'eine Akademie in Absicht der Erweiterung der medizinisch – chirurgischen Wissenschaft...': Hintergründe für die Entstehung der medizinisch-chirurgischen Akademie 'Josephinum'. Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Gesellschaft zur Erforschung des 18. Jahrhunderts. 2006:21. in print.
42. Janik, A.; Toulmin, S. Wittgenstein's Vienna. New York: Touchstone; 1973.
43. Janos, AC. The Politics of Backwardness in Hungary: 1825–1945. Princeton: Princeton University Press; 1982.
44. Jászi, O. The Dissolution of the Habsburg Monarchy. Chicago: University of Chicago Press; 1971 [1929].
45. Johnston, W. The Austrian mind: intellectual and social history, 1848–1938. Berkeley: University of California Press; 1972.
46. Judson, PM. Exclusive revolutionaries: liberal politics, social experience, and national identity in the Austrian Empire, 1848–1914. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press; 1996.
47. Judson, PM.; Rozenblit, ML., editors. Constructing Nationalities in East Central Europe. Vol. 6. New York: Berghahn Books; 2004. Austrian and Habsburg Studies.
48. Kann, R. The multinational empire: nationalism and national reform in the Habsburg Monarchy, 1848–1918. New York: Columbia University Press; 1950.
49. Kaser, K. Freier Bauer und Soldat: die Militarisierung der agrarischen Gesellschaft an der kroatisch-slavonischen Militärgrenze (1535–1881). Wien: Böhlau; 1997.
50. King, J. Budweisers into Czechs and Germans: A Local History of Bohemian Politics, 1848–1948. Princeton: Princeton University Press; 2002.
51. Kontler, L. A History of Hungary. New York: Palgrave Macmillan; 2006.
52. Lafferton, E. A History of Hungarian Psychiatry, 1850–1908. Budapest: Central European University; 2003a. Ph.D. Dissertation
53. Lafferton, E. From Private Asylum to University Clinic: Hungarian Psychiatry, 1850–1908. In: Rousseau, GS., et al., editors. Framing and Imagining Disease in Cultural History. New York: Palgrave Macmillan; 2003b. p. 190–213.
54. Lafferton, E. What the Files Reveal. The Social Make-Up of Public Mental Asylums in Hungary, 1860s–1910s. In: Fangerau, H.; Nolte, K., editors. 'Moderne' Anstaltspsychiatrie im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert - Legitimation und Kritik. Medizin, Gesellschaft und Geschichte – Beiheft 26. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag; 2006. p. 83–103.
55. Larsson, U., editor. Cultures of Creativity: The Centennial Exhibition of the Nobel Prize. New York: Science History Publications; 2001.
56. Lesky E. Die österreichische Pestfront an der k.k. Militärgrenze. Saeculum. 1957; 8:82–106.
57. Lesky E. Österreichisches Gesundheitswesen im Zeitalter des aufgeklärten Absolutismus. Archiv für österreichische Geschichte. 1959; 122:1–228.
58. Lesky, E. Die Wiener Medizinische Schule im neunzehnten Jahrhundert. Graz: Böhrer; 1965.
59. Lieven, D. Empire. The Russian Empire and its Rivals. London: Pimlico; 2003.
60. Litván, Gy. A Twentieth-Century Prophet: Oscar Jászi. Budapest: Central European University Press; 2005.
61. Lukács, J. Budapest 1900. A Historical Portrait of a City and Its Culture. New York: Grove Weidenfeld; 1988.
62. MacLeod, R. On science and colonialism. In: Bowler, P.; Whyte, N., editors. Science and Society in Ireland. Belfast: Queens University Press; 1997. p. 1–18.

63. MacLeod R. Introduction. *Osiris Nature and Empire: Science and the Colonial Enterprise*. 2000; 15:1–13.
64. Maderthaner, W.; Musner, L. *Die Anarchie der Vorstadt: das andere Wien um 1900*. Frankfurt/M.: Campus; 1999.
65. Matoušek O. The medical school of Vienna and Prague. *Medizinhistorisches Journal*. 1967; 2:99–106.
66. McGrath, W. *Dionysian art and populist politics in Austria*. New Haven: Yale University Press; 1973.
67. McGrath, W. *Freud's Discovery of Psychoanalysis: The Politics of Hysteria*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press; 1986.
68. Miller, A.; Rieber, AJ. *Imperial Rule*. Budapest: Central European University Press; 2004.
69. Oosterhuis, H. *Stepchildren of Nature: Krafft-Ebing, Psychiatry, and the Making of Sexual Identity*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press; 2000.
70. Pellegrino ED. Review: *The Vienna School of Medicine of the 19th Century*, by Erna Lesky. *The Quarterly Review of Biology*. 1978; 53:146–7.
71. Purchla, J. *Krakau under österreichischer Herrschaft 1846–1918. Faktoren seiner Entwicklung*. Vienna: Böhlau; 1993.
72. Raj, K. *Relocating Modern Science: Circulation and the Construction of Knowledge in South Asia and Europe, 1650–1900*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan; 2006.
73. Ramet, SP.; Felak, JR.; Ellison, HJ., editors. *Nations and Nationalisms in East-Central Europe, 1806–1948: A Festschrift for Peter F. Sugar*. Bloomington: Slavica Press; 2002.
74. Redlich, J. *Das österreichische Staatsproblem und Reichsproblem: geschichtliche Darstellung der inneren Politik der Habsburger Monarchie von 1848 bis zum Untergang des Reiches*. Vol. 2. Leipzig: P. Reinhold; 1920–26.
75. Redlich, J. *Emperor Francis Joseph of Austria: A Biography*. New York: Macmillan; 1929.
76. Romsics, I.; Király, B., editors. *Geopolitics in the Danube Region. Hungarian Reconciliation Efforts, 1848–1998*. Budapest: Central European University Press; 1999.
77. Rothenberg, GE. *The Military Border in Croatia, 1740–1881; a study of an imperial institution*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press; 1966.
78. Rothenberg GE. *The Austrian Sanitary Cordon and the Control of the Bubonic Plague: 1710–1871*. *Journal of History of Medicine and Allied Sciences*. 1973; 28:15–23.
79. Rumpler, H. *Eine Chance für Mitteleuropa. Bürgerliche Emanzipation und Staatsverfall im Habsburgischen Vielvölkerstaat*. Vienna: Überreuter; 1997. *Österreichische Geschichte 1804–1914*.
80. Schorske, C. *Fin-de-siècle Vienna: politics and culture*. New York: Vintage Books; 1981a.
81. Schorske, C. *Fin-de-siècle Vienna: politics and culture*. New York: Vintage Books; 1981b. *Politics and patricide in Freud's Interpretation of dreams*; p. 181–207. idem
82. Seebacher, F. 'Freiheit der Naturforschung!' Carl Freiherr von Rokitsky und die Wiener Medizinische Schule: Wissenschaft und Politik im Konflikt. Wien: ÖAW; 2006.
83. Sengoopta, C. *Otto Weininger: sex, science and the self in imperial Vienna*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press; 2000.
84. Spector, S. *Prague territories: national conflict and cultural innovation in Franz Kafka's fin de siècle*. University of California Press; 2000.
85. Taschwer, K. *Wissenschaft für viele: zur Wissenschaftsvermittlung im Rahmen der Wiener Volksbildungsbewegung um 1900*. University of Vienna; 2002. PhD dissertation
86. Taylor, AJP. *The Habsburg Monarchy, 1809–1918*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press; 1976.
87. Topp, L. *Architecture and truth in fin-de-siècle Vienna*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 2004.
88. Topp L. *Otto Wagner and the Steinhof Psychiatric Hospital: Architecture as Misunderstanding*. *Art Bulletin*. 2005; 87:130–156.
89. Topp, L. *The Modern Mental Hospital in Late Nineteenth-Century Germany and Austria: Psychiatric Space and Images of Freedom and Control*. In: Topp, L.; Moran, J.; Andrews, J.,

- editors. *Madness, Architecture and the Built Environment: Psychiatric Spaces in Historical Context*. New York: Routledge; 2007. p. 241-61.
90. Trencsényi, B.; Kopeček, M., editors. *Discourses of Collective Identity in Central and Southeast Europe*. Vol. 1–2. Budapest: Central European University; 2006.
 91. Trgovčević-Mitrović, Lj. *Nauka o granicama: Jovan Cvijić na Konferenciji mira u Parizu 1919–20* [The science of borders: Jovan Cvijić at the Paris peace conference, 1919–20]. In: Luthar, O.; Perovšek, J., editors. *Zbornik Janka Pleterškega*. Ljubljana: SAZU; 2003. p. 313-18.
 92. Turda, M. *The idea of national superiority in Central Europe, 1880–1918*. Lewiston: Edwin Mellen; 2004.
 93. Turda, M.; Weindling, P.J., editors. *Blood and Homeland. Eugenics and Racial Nationalism in Central and Southeast Europe, 1900–1940*. Budapest: Central European University Press; 2006.
 94. Warner, J.H. *Against the spirit of system: the French impulse in nineteenth-century American medicine*. Princeton: Princeton University Press; 1998.
 95. Wingfield, N.M. *Creating the Other. Ethnic Conflict and Nationalism in the Habsburg Central Europe*. Vol. 5. New York: Berghahn Books; 2003. *Austrian and Habsburg Studies*.