

A DEÁK BIOGRAPHY AS CATALYST OF POLITICAL DISCUSSIONS (1880)

By

Viktor Menyhárt

In partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

Supervisor: Professor Maciej Janowski

Second Reader: Professor Balázs Trencsényi

Budapest, Hungary

2015

“Copyright in the text of this thesis rests with the Author. Copies by any process, either in full or part, may be made only in accordance with the instructions given by the Author and lodged in the Central European Library. Details may be obtained from the librarian. This page must form a part of any such copies made. Further copies made in accordance with such instructions may not be made without the written permission of the Author.”

Abstract

This thesis is a contribution to the literature that examines the relations of empires, liberalism and nationalism. It provides an analysis of political discussions from Britain, Hungary and Spain, channeled by a biography of Hungarian liberal leader Ferenc Deák. The objective of the thesis is to show in small scale how political practice was moving away from liberal ideas in these countries in the last quarter of the 19th century.

Table of Contents

Introduction	4
Sources	7
Methodology and framework	11
Plan of chapters.....	13
The Deák Memoir as Catalyst in the Discussion on the Eastern Question	18
The Deák Memoir as Catalyst in the Discussion on Ireland	32
The Deák Memoir as Catalyst in the 'Fuerista' Discussion.....	47
Conclusions	61
References.....	66

Introduction

In 1880 a biography of Ferenc Deák was published in London, and it was followed by a series of articles appearing in a Bilbao daily in Spain.¹ The English publication: *Francis Deák: A Memoir* was followed by its Hungarian translation in 1881.² My question is how the life of Deák inspired the authors, Florence Arnold-Forster, José Maria Lizana and the Hungarian translator Ágost Pulszky. Their principal domestic political concerns apparently did not have much to do with each other, but consequences can be drawn from their comments to the complicated relationship of liberalism and imperial frameworks. My thesis is that they indeed had very much to do with each other: all demonstrated that in 1881 retreating liberalism was preparing the ground for nationalist discourses.

In this essay, liberalism will mean certain principles, not political parties, even though occasionally it will party denominations also. It will mean a ‘loose constellation encompassing free trade, free labor, free association, free press, and formal equality’.³ The last point not only does mean personal equality before the law but also equality of territories that during the ancient regime’s empires held different privileges – namely, unitary state. 19th-century-liberalism worked in empires, not in nation states. By empire I understand composite monarchy, as defined by John Elliott.⁴ 19th century liberalism had to act within the loose political organization of

¹ Florence Mary Arnold-Forster, *Francis Deák, Hungarian Statesman: A Memoir* (London: MacMillan, 1880) <https://archive.org/details/francisdeakhunga00arnouoft> accessed 02.05.2015 and *Cartas irlandesas y húngaras por D. José María de Lizana precedidas de una carta vascongada de D. Antonio de Trueba* [Irish and Hungarian Letters by José María de Lizana preceded by a Basque Letter by Antonio Trueba] (Bilbao: La viuda de Delmas, 1881) http://bvpb.mcu.es/es/consulta/resultados_navegacion.cmd?posicion=1&forma=ficha&id=52 accessed 02.05.2015.

² Forster-Arnold Florence: *Deák Ferencz: életrajz* [Ferenc Deák: Biography]. (Buda-Pest: Franklin-Társulat, 1881). Translated by Ágost Pulszky.

³ Theodore Koditschek, *Liberalism, Imperialism, and the Historical Imagination: Nineteenth-Century Visions of a Greater Britain*. (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2011). 1.

⁴ John Elliott, “The Cultural and Political Construction of Europe,” *Past & Present* 137 (1992) 48-71.

empires, which bore centralizing traditions of early modern European monarchs but eventually were not able to create a unitary state. As Elliott demonstrated the attempts of implying unity on territories, which had held traditions of independent statehood, had achieved a varying degree of success. Many feudal privileges survived well into the 19th century and contributed to the building of unitary nation state. He noted:

In spite of such survivals [of feudal privileges], and in part because of them, there would be an accelerating European trend over the next two centuries towards the creation of unitary nation states. Composite monarchy, by contrast, looked weak and unimpressive.

Elliott enumerates many reasons that laid behind this perception, like royal absenteeism from peripheral capitals, distribution of imperial offices, religious diversity etc. A different approach seems valid for 19th century empires: to what extent they were able to identify themselves with social progress and Enlightenment. As Iván Zoltán Dénes highlighted, progress in the Austrian Empire was associated with absolutism while feudal privileges of the nobility were reactionary in the 18th century. When nobles started to curse liberal ideas absolutism had already turned against social progress.⁵

I understand in this essay liberalism as a toolkit in the hands of various political movements. The purpose of this essay is to present a case study on how the use of certain liberal doctrines were left behind as a result of the challenge by existing imperial frameworks at the end of the 19th century. I will talk about three cases from Austria-Hungary, Great Britain and Spain where liberal

⁵ Iván Zoltán Dénes, “Political Vocabularies of the Hungarian Liberals and Conservatives before 1848,” in: *Liberty and the Search for Identity*, ed. Iván Zoltán Dénes (Budapest: Central European University Press, 2006), 158-159.

ethics and principles were questioned and eventually defeated, leaving the scene for the victorious nationalist agendas.

By nationalism I understand a 19th century movement that wanted to create and/or alter, the boundaries of the political entity it understood as its own, challenging the very structure of empires. The reason behind was the surviving memory and working political institutions from the Middle Ages. The restoration of past glory by the most modern means in the competition of the nations became the most important target of national movements. There was no English or Spanish national party in the 19th century, they had enough space. But there was an Irish, sometimes a Hungarian, and a Basque.

This thesis cannot be a general study of the topic. It is limited to the analysis of authors whose works dealt with the political career of the Hungarian liberal nationalist leader Ferenc Deák (1803-1876). These works exerted only a minor effect on readership; however, describing their context may well provide a valuable insight into general concerns of liberal discourses.

The person of Deák has been subject of uncountable historical works. He was the only leader from the Age of Reforms in Hungary (1825-1848) not sentenced to death or forced to flee the country after the defeat of the War of Independence in 1849. This fact converted him into the unquestioned leader of Hungarian nobility. He led negotiations with the court of Vienna about the possible restoration of the political rights of Hungary that eventually led to the Settlement of 1867 creating the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy. He is among the most important figures of 19th century Hungarian history. This paper is not intended to analyze Deák's oeuvre. Its intention is to show how this oeuvre was negotiated shortly after his death.

Sources

The principal sources that convey a liberal discourse negotiating the personality of Ferenc Deák are thus Florence Arnold-Forster's *Francis Deák: A Memoir* and José María Lizana's *Cartas Húngaras* [Hungarian Letters]. These books occupy a distinguished position as primary sources all along the analysis. All the other primary and secondary sources are researched regarding their contribution to our knowledge about authors or the books themselves, to find out the motives that induced the writers to immerse into the absorbing task of political essay writing. The reason why the book of Florence Arnold-Forster occupies the central position is not its literary or scientific value. The book itself hardly can be called an adequate biography as it centers only on the political career of Ferenc Deák, with the exception of very few anecdotes from his life. The lack of biographical details and this almost exclusive focus on politics enables us to see how an English liberal writer regarded Hungarian politics in 1881 and it makes the book an important document of 19th century political thought.

Florence Arnold-Forster started to think about writing the book in 1876 during a brief visit to Hungary. It was published in 1880 and it was reviewed by the English press in that year and 1881. There was reason to hope that it would be eventually a successful publication. First of all, the lasting impression that the revolution of 1848 and the war for Hungarian independence made on the British public. Second, the role the Habsburg state in the Eastern Question. It was a major problem of international diplomacy how the power vacuum caused by the decline of the Ottoman Empire would be filled and it was a topic extensively commented in the British press. The third and most interesting conjunction was the comparison of the state of affairs in the Austro-

Hungarian Monarchy and in Great Britain at the time when the Irish national movement got a new impetus under the leadership of Charles Stewart Parnell.

My assumption that dealing only with the second and the third points will provide interesting insights into the 19th century political thought, to the extent possible apart from the views constructed about the revolutionary events. To neglect however, the links to 1848 and 1849 would double the error. On the one hand, as their memory was living at that time, it contributed to the general interest when Austria-Hungary became part or the object of public discussion. On the other, the author herself pointed out that a reason why she published the book on Deák was to counter to some extent the enormous literature written on his popular opponent, Lajos Kossuth. In short, the memory of 1848 cannot be neglected in this work, but as it already formed part of the past at that time, we should consider it as providing colors for the background rather than the central element in our case study.

Arnold-Forster created her narrative of the political career of Deák using mainly German and French secondary sources. Thus novelties about her hero cannot be found in the book in historical sense.⁶ However strange it may be, the book was destined to be a tool for popularizing the ideas that had led to the constitution of the Dualist system. Moreover, her social position makes it probable that it is an original work and not something commissioned for purposes of state propaganda. It very probably reflects the own views of its author.

⁶ Her referenced sources included the following works:

- Éduoard Sayous, *Histoire des Hongrois et de leur littérature politique de 1790 à 1815*. (Paris, Germer-Baillière, 1872).

- Walter Rogge, *Franz Deák*. *Unsere Zeit* (1876) 12 (7) 481–503.

- Émile de Laveleye: *L'Allemagne depuis la guerre de 1866*. 8. Deák Ferencz. *Revue des Deux Mondes* (1868) 38 (2) 5–40.

- Anton Csengery, *Franz Deák* (Leipzig, Duncker – Humblot, 1877). Translated from Hungarian to German by Gustav Heinrich.

The original printings are available in the Arnold-Forster Papers, Materials for life of Deak, 5036, Trinity College Library Manuscript Collection, Dublin (hereinafter TCD MS).

Now, the fact that this is a contemporary opinion on the subject would not be sufficient to suggest the independent historical study of the book. There might have been many other people around Europe who dealt with politics, read newspapers and were acquainted with the subject to construct an opinion on the Dualist system and divulged it. Neither does the importance of the book come from the fact that it was the first book published on Deák in English, as it reached only a modest circulation.⁷ However, the views of Florence Arnold-Forster seem interesting because of her social position. The distinguished social position of the author, as stepdaughter of William Edward Forster, the Chief Secretary for Ireland of the British government during the Land War, is telling about how important the Austro-Hungarian Empire was for the nineteenth century ‘educated classes’ as they liked to call themselves at that time.

Although its characteristics are different, the same reasoning is true about the principal Spanish source for this work, the essays of José María Lizana. If Arnold-Forster’s *Francis Deák* was a narrative almost exclusively of the political career of Deák, it can be said that Lizana used it very selectively. If *Francis Deák* was a genuine work using secondary sources, the work of Lizana is rather a selective translation of the latter, with some original comments.⁸ It indicates that the author either did not have another source of information or simply thought a selective translation was enough for his purpose. It was published first as a series of newspaper articles and only in the last paragraph of the last essay a reference appears to the English edition. The author almost left no room to find out that the work is not based on his original research, which seems to suggest that he absolutely agreed with the ideas he picked up from his source. Though it is a poorly original work, it seems also unlikely that Lizana would have had any connection suggesting that

⁷ 750 copies were printed out in 1880. Among them one year later 343 were still on stock. Invoice from MacMillan&Co to Florence Arnold-Forster. Correspondence, 5027:215, TCD MS.

⁸ Lizana himself only mentions the book of Arnold-Forster as his source about Hungarian matters. Lizana, *Cartas húngaras*, 75.

his book was commissioned to spread Austrian state propaganda. He had the same social position as Arnold-Forster, linking him to the well-to-do, politically conscious upper middle classes. Moreover, the obvious purpose of the book is the recovery of the historical rights of the Basque Provinces with which no Austro-Hungarian interest can be identified.

The social context for both works will be reconstructed from a variety of sources. First of all, the *Irish Journal* of Florence Arnold-Forster covers the period of the Irish Land War from 1880 to 1882. It was published with a profound introductory study of T. W. Moody in 1988.⁹ From the study the character of life and the political connections of Arnold-Forster's family can be generally revealed, and the diary in itself provides a valuable, detailed insight into their everyday life. Moreover, the diary gives the opportunity to examine in depth how the same person was thinking about political matters of different empires. Two kinds of note enable us to do so. First of all, explicit reflections and occasional comparison of Hungarian and Irish events are recorded in the journal. Second, the fact that we possess two works by the same author – the only two editions ever published from her pen –, one on Hungarian and the other on Irish subject, provides room for a deeper comparative analysis about how her ideas were put into two, completely different context.

The context cannot be reconstructed by comparisons taken from her own work or remarks recorded by her as it would make the analysis one-sided at least on the level of sources. To avoid that, there are other sources which, if not completely but at least partially, reflect how the public received the ideas of Arnold-Forster. First of all, many book reviews from 1880 and 1881 survived, published in regional and also national papers.¹⁰ The number of reviews is quite high,

⁹ *Florence Arnold-Forster's Irish journal*, edited by T.W. Moody and Richard Hawkins with Margaret Moody (Oxford: Oxford University Press, New York: Clarendon Press, 1988).

¹⁰ Materials for life of Deak, 5036, TCD MS.

and reflects countless shades of English public opinion. On the other hand during the research I had the opportunity to consult the correspondence of Arnold-Forster from the period that covers the years of preparation and also the years of public circulation of the book, while she was already very much immersed into the Irish affairs.¹¹ Besides polite acknowledgements on account of the publication of the book valuable comments can be found in the letters, just like the cited invoice from her editor Alexander MacMillan. Her most ardent correspondent, not surprisingly, was Hungarian: Ágost Pulszky, M. P., professor of law of the Budapest University, who was born and educated in London as son of emigrant parents and wrote beautifully in English. His comments on Austro-Hungarian and British politics betray as much interest as Arnold-Forster had in this respect, and his opinion resembles much our English author.

Methodology and framework

The most important methodological reference for me is the book of Theodore Koditschek on liberalism, imperialism and historical imagination.¹² In this book Koditschek analyzes the relationship of British liberalism to empire-building. His subjects are writers of history, who deeply influenced British historical thinking. Not just historians: besides Thomas Babington Macaulay as a major figure, he designates Sir Walter Scott, an author who with his romans influenced to the largest extent what British people thought about history. Not only does he explore the problematic relations of British liberals to colonies but also reflects on the problematic relations of liberals to Ireland. The main value of his work for me is that it is a book

¹¹ Correspondence, 5027, TCD MS.

¹² Theodore Koditschek, *Liberalism, Imperialism, and the Historical Imagination: Nineteenth-Century Visions of a Greater Britain*, (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2011).

where the author ‘has (...) chosen to occupy the space between theory and microhistory’.¹³ The value of this approach is that beyond the discovery of theoretical implications it makes possible to reveal personal attitudes.

My focus nonetheless is different: while Koditschek deals with historians who profoundly shaped historical imagination, I am dealing with individuals whose contribution to historical imagination was not so original. What makes them important is their social position. Arnold-Forster, Lizana or Pulszky wrote nothing comparable to Scott or Macaulay, but still, they were well-connected and well-educated representatives of the upper-middle classes – nonetheless, unlike millions of people, they indeed entered the podium of history for brief moments and they were around important events for more time. Their works on Deák, in my opinion, are true representations of the political views of upper-middle class liberals around Europe. This is a value that I think makes possible a generalization in a social sense.

It is another difference to Koditschek that while he focused only on the British Empire, within this thesis I will also refer to Spanish and Austro-Hungarian imperial frameworks. The entangled existence of liberal public will be described with the help of the correspondence of the actors. Moreover, the British press also provided a common ground they all met, which is also a source material for this writing.

Koditschek contributes to a literature that had already investigated the relations between empire and liberalism. It was Uday Singh Mehta who wrote the breakthrough book *Liberalism and Empire* in 1999.¹⁴ He states that liberalism should not be understood as something going on in

¹³ Jennifer Pitts, Review of *Liberalism, Imperialism, and the Historical Imagination: Nineteenth-Century Visions of a Greater Britain* by Theodore Koditschek. *The American Historical Review* (2012) 117 (3): 933.

¹⁴ Uday Singh Mehta, *Liberalism and Empire: A Study in Nineteenth-Century British Liberal Thought*. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1999).

the European center, while imperialism is associated with the colonies. He gives a new reading of liberal theorists like John Stuart Mill or John Locke, assuring that the encounter of the colonial other reversed the fundamental liberal propositions. As the colonial other appeared ‘strange’ to the liberal theorist, all the fundamental liberal principles were reversed. This advanced an exclusionary trait in liberalism to the colonies which nonetheless explains the restrictions applied in political participation in the European core.

Andrew Sartori, the main critic of the book of Mehta, calls the attention to the nature of ideas on politics, here I will highlight only one point. He states that ideas always originate from the historical context. He says that even though it is mentioned by Mehta, historical context in his book in practice is restricted to an inferior role with respect to the articulation of the ideological form. In this thesis, I hope, this ‘inevitable textualism’ of political theory will be adequately compensated by the use of surviving archival material.¹⁵

Plan of chapters

This thesis is divided into three chapters. The first deals with consequences the Eastern Question had for Hungarian liberals. The educative biographies published around the turn of the century of Ferenc Pulszky, the father of Ágost,¹⁶ and William Edward Forster¹⁷ will be of great help to situate the thesis in political history. These books chiefly help to define the liberal point of view in the Eastern Question, and as they bear traces of correspondence between Forster and Ferenc

¹⁵ Andrew Sartori, "The British Empire and Its Liberal Mission." *The Journal of Modern History*, 78 (2006) 626.

¹⁶ József Ferenczy, *Pulszky Ferencz életrajza* [The Biography of Ferenc Pulszky] (Pozsony: Stampel Károly, s. a.) accessed 5 May 2015 http://mtda.hu/books/ferenczy_jozsef_pulszky_ferenc_eletrajza.pdf.

¹⁷ T. Wemyss Reid, *Life of the Right Honourable William Edward Forster* (London: Chapman and Hall, 1888), accessed 2 May, 2015, <http://www.archive.org/details/liferighthonour00reidgoog>.

Pulszky, Ágost's father, also politically active at that time, point out to the interaction between the English and Hungarian liberals in Balkan politics. As for the Eastern Question, secondary literature will be consulted to the extent necessary by using the works of István Diószegi.¹⁸

To have an understanding about the era in which Hungarian liberals acted, biographies on Ferenc Deák were consulted.¹⁹ It would be erroneous not to take into account the literature born about the reception of the Austro-Hungarian Settlement in Britain. The book by Tibor Frank contains important references to the widespread interest that embraced Kossuth who was repeatedly mentioned as the greatest orator of the time and the general interest in Hungarian affairs.²⁰ Regarding the nature of the Austro-Hungarian political system, the studies László Péter must be referred here.²¹

In the second chapter I will analyze the problems of the Irish question from a liberal point of view. When Florence Arnold-Forster's book on Deák was published in 1880, her stepfather W. E. Forster was appointed Chief Secretary for Ireland. Florence Arnold-Forster as a woman of vivid political interest was a support for her father and many times shared his burdens. She showed up in the House of Commons where Forster spent as much time as in Dublin Castle. Her principal political concern was not any more the distant matter of Eastern Europe but the daily preoccupation about the fate of his father's bill. In her diary occasionally appearing remarks about Deák serve to highlight the contribution Deák made to the stability of the Austro-Hungarian Empire. Also, this contribution separates him in the eyes of Arnold-Forster from the Irish

¹⁸ István Diószegi, *Az Osztrák-Magyar Monarchia külpolitikája* [The Foreign Policy of Austria-Hungary], (Budapest: Vince, 2001).

¹⁹ Ferenc Pölöskei, *Deák Ferenc utolsó évei* [The Last Years of Ferenc Deák] (Budapest: Éghajlat, 2004), Deák, Ágnes, *Deák Ferenc* (Budapest: Vince, 2003), Béla K. Király, *Ferenc Deák* (Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1975).

²⁰ Tibor Frank, *Picturing Austria-Hungary. The British Perception of the Habsburg Monarchy 1865-1870* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2005).

²¹ László Péter, *Hungary's Long Nineteenth Century. Constitutional and Democratic Traditions in a European Perspective*. Collected Studies. Ed. Miklós Lojók (Leiden: Brill, 2012).

nationalist politicians. The Hungarian policy that led to the Dualist Settlement eventually meant a sympathetic reconciliatory movement in contrast with the social agitation of the Irish political party. The fact that Arnold-Forster did not notice the difference the Land War caused in Irish history is significant for the imperial engagements of liberal politics.

The third chapter will lead us to the Basque Provinces. As the title of the essays of Lizana shows, already in 1881 the Basques were concerned about the international context of their political views. However, as Ander Delgado Cendagortagalarza shows the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy as a model was referred to only in 1881 and later comparisons were drawn more with Ireland.²² This contribution most probably is thanks to the fact that Lizana read the British press and acquired the book of Arnold-Forster. The Spanish arguments help us to find out much about the importance of imperial historic institutions in liberal political thinking. The Spanish author, José María Lizana, most probably, used exclusively the book of Arnold-Forster in his essays dealing with the Dual Monarchy. The selective use of the source material provides opportunity to examine the main points of the discourse of Lizana. The domestic significance of the book of comes from his association with liberal intellectuals participating in a discourse to recover political rights of the Basque Provinces. The publication of the book in 1881 coincided with the formation of the regionalist Euskalerría society, a group that preceded the birth of the Basque national movement by more than a decade.

The secondary literature about the intransigent movement in the Basque Provinces is immense. Many Spanish and non-Spanish scholars, dealing with the birth of Basque nationalism, go back

²² Ander Delgado Cendagortagalarza, “El Fuerismo, El Home Rule Bill y La Política Británica: El Contexto Internacional En Los Inicios Del Movimiento Nacionalista Vasco (1890-1903)” [The Fuerism, the Home Rule Bill and the British Politics: The International Context in the Beginnings of the Basque National Movement]. *Historia Contemporánea* 25 (2002), 289-317.

to this movement that had not crossed the barrier of loyalty yet. Among them, Jon Juaristi occupies a distinguished place who indeed gives an account of the collected essays of Lizana.²³ Others like Daniel Conversi and Javier Fernandez Sebastian were consulted for general knowledge about the movement without much about Austro-Hungarian analogies.²⁴ About Lizana himself, the second volume of the work on the mayors of Bilbao contains a biographical study.²⁵

What is the significance of the similarities and common traits of British, Austria-Hungarian and Spanish contexts? In my opinion they reflect the change liberalism underwent around the third and fourth quarter of the 19th century. Florence Arnold-Forster had a distinctively liberal profile and she shared it absolutely with his Hungarian correspondent, Ágost Pulszky. The concerns of Arnold-Forster's writings and Pulszky's letters are telling, they are all about the shocking experience that liberalism ceased to be the 'popular' side of politics in the second half of the nineteenth century. A contest in the wake of the eighties for English liberals was the Irish Land War, the agrarian movement targeting the landlord-tenant relations, which were until then based on private agreements. For the Hungarian liberals, their role in the foreign policy of the Habsburg state and, to be more concrete, the occupation of Bosnia-Herzegovina proved to be a crucial issue. In Spain, the liberal attitudes toward vestiges of imperial structures, namely the provincial political identities eventually shaped an exclusionist nationalist discourse. They were all

²³ Jon Juaristi: *El linaje de Aitor. La Invención de la Tradición Vasca* [The Geneology of Aitor. The Invention of the Basque Tradition] (Madrid: Taurus, 1998).

²⁴ Daniele Conversi, *The Basques, the Catalans, and Spain : alternative routes to nationalist mobilization* (London : C. Hurst, 1997), Javier Fernandez Sebastian, *La génesis del fuerismo. Prensa e ideas políticas en la crisis del Antiguo Régimen (País Vasco, 1750-1840)* [The Genesis of Fuerism. Press and Political Ideas in the Crisis of the Ancient Regime (The Basque Country 1750-1840)] (Madrid: Siglo XXI de España, 1991).

²⁵ *Bilbao desde sus alcaldes: diccionario biográfico de los alcaldes de Bilbao y gestión municipal, en tiempos de revolución liberal e industrial* [Bilbao from Its Mayors: Biographical Dictionary of the Mayors of Bilbao and Municipal Management during the Liberal and Industrial Revolution. Ed. Joseba Agirreazkuenaga (Bilbao: Ayuntamiento de Bilbao, 2002).

conflictive issues, and as the liberal attitudes were changing, the political significance of liberalism was also affected. The discourse on the life of Ferenc Deák around 1880 makes possible to put these, at first sight randomly selected stories into the same framework. They appear to be the same story: how political occurrences started to challenge and surpass European liberalism at that time.

The Deák Memoir as Catalyst in the Discussion on the Eastern Question

The objective of this chapter is to demonstrate, through a discussion on Florence Arnold-Forster's Deák memoir, the inability of Hungarian liberals to guide imperial foreign policy. This book owes its birth to international politics. It was conceived during Arnold-Forster's Eastern European journey in 1876. The sources of this chapter reveal how the British public reflected on the role of Austria-Hungary in the Balkans. Arnold-Forster's Deák memoir also served Ágost Pulszky, member of a leading liberal family to formulate a critical opinion on Austria-Hungary's Balkan politics through personal correspondence. His reflections are valuable because they show in small scale how political climate in dualist Hungary gradually abandoned liberal principles in favor of an empire-building nationalism.

In this chapter, not only the Deák memoir itself and newspaper reviews connected to its birth will be used, but also documents that preceded its publication. The memoir was conceived in an encounter between leading politicians Ferenc Pulszky, father of Ágost, and William Forster, stepfather of Florence. Between them Balkan politics was treated directly. This encounter provided the framework from which the Deák memoir ultimately sprung up. The reflections of the parents unrelated to the Deák biography nonetheless confirm Hungarian liberal discontent with imperial foreign policy.

The memoir of Arnold-Forster contributed to the discussion in the press about Austro-Hungarian mission and interests in the Balkans. The Eastern Question was considered important for British foreign policy but for the British public it was a distant one and more connected to colonial than national matters. For Austria-Hungary it was an elementary issue intimately connected to the very existence of its empire. Within this empire, liberal politicians in Hungary also considered

the Eastern Question crucial for the unity of the Hungarian state, the eastern half of the Austro-Hungarian Empire. Hungarian liberal politicians recognized that national transformation of the Balkans threatened their own state with disintegration and created an agenda to prevent this unfavorable outcome. This chapter will show that Hungarian liberal foreign policy objectives were hard to reconcile with Austro-Hungarian imperial reality and ultimately failed to dominate foreign policy decision-making.

The Eastern Question has to be understood as was one of the cornerstones of mid-19th century international politics in Europe. It was about the Ottoman Empire, which gradually lost their territories in the Balkan Peninsula and Africa, leaving a power vacuum behind. The weakening of Ottoman power was reflected by territorial disintegration. Egypt became practically independent from the Istanbul government under Muhammad Ali Pasha (1805-1848) who even waged war on the Ottoman Sultan. Serbia acquired autonomy in 1817 and Greece rose to independence in 1829. From the end of the 18th century, Russia periodically waged war on the Ottoman state and assumed the role of protector of the Ottoman Empire's Christian subjects. Britain however, was interested in sustaining the unity of the Ottoman Empire under British protection. The Ottoman Empire became a front zone between two emerging colonizers.

The Austrian Empire had fashioned itself for the 16th century as defender of Western Christianity against the Ottoman Empire. However, the successful conquest of Hungary in 1699 was followed by mostly unsuccessful campaigns in the 18th century and its advance stopped at the Hungarian border. Orthodox Christians in the Balkans were Slavic people, and Russia increasingly appeared as protector of the Slavs during the 19th century. The Austrian Empire, also inhabiting large Slavic population, felt uneasy by Russian advance in the Balkans. Austria considered this advance so dangerous that in spite of life-saving Russian military aid in 1849, made threatening steps against

Russia when the latter was attacked by Britain, France and the Ottomans in the Crimean War (1853-1856).

The threat from Russian expansion created a space for potential cooperation between Britain and Austria. The Balkans became increasingly important for Austria when it was excluded from its traditional spheres of influence following the Italian and the German national unification (1866). As the east became more important, reconciliation with Hungary was implemented. After 1867, the Hungarian nobility was not anymore excluded from imperial foreign policy.

The Hungarian liberal foreign policy was very anti-Russian, but its effect on the imperial politics was limited.²⁶ When Count Gyula Andrassy became chancellor of Austria-Hungary, he also knew that sooner or later European Turkey, as the patrimony of the Ottoman Empire was called at that time, would transform into nation states. He and the Hungarian liberals considered that the Monarchy should be the protector of the newly-born states. With an active and supportive policy they meant to influence Balkan politics in accordance with the interests of the Monarchy. It was very important from this standpoint that the Monarchy should support the national movements and it should not appear to the Balkan national movements as a new oppressor. Friendly relations and protection for Balkan states would have also hindered nationalist claims threatening the territorial integrity of the Monarchy.

Andrassy knew that the Monarchy alone is weak to ensure Balkan national transformation sought some kind of great power guarantee against Russia's obvious objections. With Austria-Hungary as protector in the Balkans, Russia would have been obviously excluded from the Peninsula. To Andrassy's disappointment, before 1876, no other great power was interested in antagonizing

²⁶ Diószegi, *Az Osztrák-Magyar Monarchia külpolitikája*, 61.

Russia. Andrassy also had to face domestic opponents. He represented the Hungarian liberal viewpoint, and it was alien to the traditions of the Habsburg Empire. German liberals, in power in the western half of the empire, had no intention to intervene in the Balkans. Conservative circles preferred the traditional delimitation of interests for they considered the Balkans an adequate territory to get compensation for the losses in Italy and Germany.

Florence Arnold-Forster's Deák biography came into being thanks to her interactions with Hungarian society. Her Hungarian contacts were born in September 1876 when she accompanied her stepfather, William Forster in a journey to Constantinople. Forster was a prominent politician of the English Liberal Party. As the reason of the journey Reid, Forster's biographer, gives the torment raised in the English public by newspaper accounts of Ottoman repressions against Bulgarians.²⁷ Behind this press campaign laid the fact that William Ewart Gladstone, British Prime Minister until 1874, decided his return to politics. Gladstone chose to return by flaming public indignation against the pro-Ottoman policy of the Conservative Disraeli Government. In the middle of Gladstone's campaign, Forster left London for continental Europe to start his journey to Constantinople. Arnold-Forster was helping him as much as she could, with taking notes or writing full accounts from his dictations, which betrays her keen interest in politics and the trust of her stepfather had in her.²⁸

The Forsters travelled through Hungary, where their stay was brief.²⁹ Forster was such an important personality that he was invited to the Belgian royal court for dinner, but from this

²⁷ T. Wemyss Reid, *Life of the Right Honourable William Edward Forster* (London: Chapman and Hall, 1888), accessed 2 May, 2015, <http://www.archive.org/details/liferighthonour00reidgoog>, 108.

²⁸ Florence Arnold-Forster to Francis Arnold, 21 September 1876, Arnold-Forster Papers, Correspondence, 5027:120, Trinity College Library Manuscript Collection, Dublin (hereinafter TCD MS).

²⁹ Reid, *Life of Forster*, 117. The letters of Forster to his wife date on the 2nd September 1876 at 'Schmöcks' (Ger. Alt Schmecks, today Starý Smokovec, Slovakia) and on the 12th at Bucuresti, having already visited Belgrade.

thesis' point of view he established the most important contact in Budapest with Ferenc Pulszky, the director of the National Museum. Pulszky, having lived in England for more than ten years as an émigré, and having worked as a correspondent of the Daily News in Italy, must have had an excellent command of English. Needless to say that English at that time was not the lingua franca in continental high society circles. In this respect, the contact with Pulszky was evidently useful for Forster to gather information; Arnold-Forster indeed refers to her father's modest German and French knowledge as a barrier of social interaction that 'wonderfully rose to the occasion' when needed.³⁰ Not only because of facility of talk, but also for his social position was Pulszky important for Forster.

The exchange of ideas between Pulszky and Forster must have been crucial for Arnold-Forster in the formation of an image on Hungarian politics. Even though neither Forster nor Pulszky bore any office at that time, they were both influential politicians. Pulszky, liberal reformer before 1848, represented Hungarian interests in London during the War for Independence and later participated in the activism of Kossuth-led groups of emigrants. He established contact with many representatives of the English press, and became correspondent of the Daily News in Italy during the decisive years of unification.³¹ He left Kossuth and joined Deák, and became a supporter of the Dualism in 1866, therefore got royal pardon, returned Hungary and participated in politics. Even though he never acquired office other than Member of the Parliament and director of the National Museum, his influence was well-known. Until Deák's death, he was considered as one of his chief advisers along with Antal Csengery. Pulszky's flat inside the building of the National Museum, next to the building where the Parliament used to sit, served as a salon for intellectuals

³⁰ Florence Arnold-Forster to Francis Arnold, 21 September 1876, Correspondence, 5027:120, TCD MS.

³¹ Ferenc Pulszky, *Életem és korom* [My Life and Age], (Budapest: Franklin-társulat, 1884), accessed 5 May 2015. <http://mek.oszk.hu/13300/13330/pdf/>

and influential politicians every Saturday during the seventies.³² To these gatherings all the influential members of society were invited from time to time, making the host a center of the social life, recent literature tends to call him the ‘the Dualism’ Culture Pope’.

Even though literature suggests that no foreign visitor of the better circles could miss to pay a visit at Pulszky’s house, there is no trace of evidence that Forster and his daughter participated at even one of these Saturday gatherings during their brief stay in Budapest.³³ Nonetheless, Reid cites a letter from Forster to his wife about their joint Danube journey and visit to Belgrade. It is written that it was Pulszky who arranged a boat to cross over the river to the Serbian capital.³⁴ And if Reid should be mistaken, a proper letter of Arnold-Forster mentions Pulszky as member of their ‘Danube quintet’ circle of travelers, where much politics were discussed.³⁵ How this acquaintance came, I was unable to find out. But it is sure that in 1876 a more or less regular exchange of letters started, primarily about the weakening of the Ottoman Empire and the space it was leaving behind in the Balkan Peninsula. It was a major political challenge for both Britain and Austria-Hungary.

After Belgrade the group separated and Forster with her daughter continued his journey to Constantinople to gather information on the spot about Balkan politics. From what sources did this 19th century liberal politician gather information? He established contacts with correspondents of English newspapers, Ottoman officials, Armenian, Bulgarian and Greek

³² Hajnalka Merényi, “A Pulszky-szalon” [The Pulszky Salon], *Budapesti Negyed* 46 (2004), accessed 5 May, 2015. <http://epa.oszk.hu/00000/00003/00033/merenyi.html>.

³³ Merényi, “A Pulszky-szalon”.

³⁴ Reid, 118.

³⁵ Florence Arnold-Forster to Mary Ward, 6 November 1876, Correspondence, 5027:125, TCD MS.

community leaders. The political aim of his journey is obvious if we take into account his strict daily schedule of meetings.³⁶

Austro-Hungarian connections accompanied them even in Istanbul. Arnold-Forster mentions their visit to the Austrian embassy, where they were received by Count Ferenc Zichy. Arnold-Forster must have been impressed by the reception, as the manners of Count Zichy were positively compared to those of an Italian envoy. The positive atmosphere must have been enhanced by a bottle from Tokaj, said to have been bottled to honor Forster.³⁷

These small anecdotes that survived in the correspondence of Arnold-Forster, are mentioned to have an idea about the circumstances among which the young English lady met with Hungary and formed an image of its politics. I think these circumstances were common rather than unique when it was about the reception of an influential politician and his daughter. The Forsters naturally found their way to the Hungarian upper-middle class circles, and conversations with them made Arnold-Forster interested in Austro-Hungarian political system.

The Forster-Pulszky friendship deepened, letters during their voyage back from Istanbul to Vienna were sent from Pulszky's son Ágost's address to London, just like a poem written by Forster on the board of the Danube steamship between Orsova and Mehadia.³⁸ Pulszky, as an influential member of the Hungarian liberal political elite, found an important contact in Forster's person. There are several letters published in the book of Reid from Forster to Pulszky, which help us to understand the approach of the liberals to the Eastern Question.

³⁶ Florence Arnold-Forster to Francis Arnold, 21 September 1876, Correspondence, 5027:120, TCD MS.

³⁷ Ibid.

³⁸ Ágost Pulszky to Florence Arnold-Forster, 25 September 1876, Correspondence, 5027:121, TCD MS.

Basically, Hungarian and English liberals' approach was similar. It seems that both English and Hungarian liberals thought the national transformation of the Balkan was sooner or later inevitable.³⁹ As Forster put it in a letter to Pulszky, the Turkish rule would weigh down on the shoulder of whoever wants to sustain it. For this reason, English Liberals rejected the actively pro-Ottoman policy of the Conservatives which ultimately aimed at keeping away Russian expansion from the Suez maritime road to India. The British Conservative government propaganda depicted Russians with very dark colors to gain public support for pro-Ottoman politics.⁴⁰

Forster, returning from his journey to London, informed Pulszky about English press reactions. He mentioned demonstrations that started in Budapest against Russia in his letter from 24 October 1876, and in line with the Liberal Party line, he qualified them as exaggerations.⁴¹ There is another remark that it was impossible to foresee whether Russia would declare war on Turkey.⁴² It seems that he very much noted the differences of opinion that existed between English and Hungarian liberal points of view. His prediction about the uncertainty of Russian military intervention is in contrast with Hungarian liberals' convictions as they took Russian intervention for granted. Andrassy in September had already counted on the Balkans Russian occupation.⁴³

Other letters from Forster date to an even tenser period in the Eastern crisis, January and March of 1878. Russian forces already had crushed Ottoman resistance and were on their way to Constantinople in January. At that point the English-Austro-Hungarian cooperation seemed possible as Disraeli wanted to stop Russian expansion at any price. Forster, however, insisted on

³⁹ Diószegi, *Az Osztrák-Magyar Monarchia külpolitikája*, 60.

⁴⁰ Reid, *The Life of Forster*, 149.

⁴¹ Reid, *Life of Forster*, 152.

⁴² Ibid.

⁴³ Diószegi, *Az Osztrák-Magyar Monarchia külpolitikája*, 65.

the anti-war sentiment of the English public and shared with Pulszky his impressions about the internal divisions of the English government. Forster suggested that the danger of war was passed away and the English war party was not something Austro-Hungarian war party could rely on.⁴⁴

His predictions seem to target that Hungarian liberals cool down. On 15th February 1878 the English fleet entered the Dardanelles to stop Russian advance and Andrassy suggested declaration of war on Russia in alliance with England. In his letter from 11th March Forster refuted his own previous declarations and put that they had a real scare of war.⁴⁵ He put that Russian reticence supported greatly the war party in England. He also wrote that Bosnia and Hercegovina would be shortly occupied by Austria-Hungary once the Congress of the great powers approved it. In this last letter to Pulszky, Forster summarized the English liberal approach to the Eastern Question: “the Turk in Europe is worse than dead”.⁴⁶

In the light of the Hungarian liberal approach, that would have been acceptable. It was unfortunate for the Hungarians that Andrassy was unable to represent this political line and was forced to divert his focus to repel Russian expansion. It turned out that Austro-Hungarian political elite could not be united to support Hungarian liberal plans. Consequently, Andrassy had to face serious criticism coming from his Hungarian liberal hinterland. It is important to note that Pulszky senior also participated in the campaign against the military occupation of Bosnia, – he wrote long essays for the daily *Egyetértés* – which meant the surrender of the liberal doctrine.⁴⁷

The discussion of the parents was continued by son and daughter. Arnold-Forster in the end of the Deák memoir gave a generous evaluation about the Eastern policy of Andrassy when she

⁴⁴ Reid, *Life of Forster*, 185.

⁴⁵ Ibid, 190.

⁴⁶ Ibid.

⁴⁷ Ferenczy, József, *Pulszky Ferencz életrajza* [The Biography of Ferenc Pulszky] (Pozsony, Stampel Károly, s. a.] accessed 5 May 2015 http://mtda.hu/books/ferenczy_jozsef_pulszky_ferenc_eletrajza.pdf. 91.

wrote that Deák would have acted the same way as Andrassy if he had been alive.⁴⁸ Andrassy at that time was celebrated on the imperial level as the chancellor who finally brought success to Vienna after the humiliating defeats in Germany and Italy that reinforced this perception.

Ágost Pulszky, son of Ferenc, participated in the military operations during the Bosnia occupation. Unlike Arnold-Forster, in many of his letters destined to her, Pulszky referred to the occupation as a mistake. The younger Pulszky, who nonetheless gave very positive and supportive feedback on the already published Deák memoir, wrote critically about the paragraph treating Andrassy's foreign policy. His own words should speak for him:

In this respect my wishes go with your opinion, but I am afraid events will not prove them to be entirely well-founded, and through time may bring changes, until now we have only endangered ourself (sic) with the occupation of Bosnia, without rendering it any adequate benefit.⁴⁹

In another letter he put it very clearly that Andrassy's policy was not in accordance with Deák's views, as direct encouragement to the Balkan people would have fared better than a "grudgingly ruled Bosnia and a Russian-incomplete Bulgaria."⁵⁰

In an interesting political analysis, the younger Pulszky concluded that the dead-end foreign policy was in fact the result of the protective commercial policy as opposed to free trade. His opinion was that it paralyzed all attempts of 'natural political friendship' with the new states, these were sacrificed to defend Austrian and Bohemian industrial interest, along with Hungarian

⁴⁸ Arnold-Forster, *Francis Deák*, 302.

⁴⁹ Ágost Pulszky to Florence Arnold-Forster, 1 May 1880, Correspondence, 5027:173, TCD MS.

⁵⁰ Ágost Pulszky to Florence Arnold-Forster, 12 September 1880, Correspondence, 5027:193, TCD MS.

agricultural interests. He added that this created a demand in Hungary for a custom border between the Western and Eastern halves of the Monarchy. He qualified this plan opposite to the whole political scheme and an idea that only provided room to criticism against the whole system, heating internal tensions. To describe the incapacity of the ruling elite in dealing with the political situation he wrote angrily that the government had no better idea than keeping the half-ruined country squires in state offices. His complaints did not cease, in his letter to Arnold-Forster from May 1882 he was still writing that “Bosnia was eating the marrow out of our bones.”⁵¹

The Eastern Question was a familiar concern for the Hungarian political thought, it was included in the debate between Kossuth and Deák about the consequences of the Dualist system for Hungary. Precisely with a view to the awakening Balkan nationalities Kossuth predicted that any agreement with Habsburgs would eventually lead to disintegration.⁵² Deák advocated the opportunities to develop the system of Dual Monarchy further. As we can see, the Hungarian liberal elite was absolutely conscious of the importance of the Eastern Question for the existence of the Danube Monarchy.

What is more exciting is that the English liberal circles were also conscious of the danger the Balkans meant for the Monarchy. Arnold-Forster wrote in the second page of her book that the Eastern Question might later prove fatal to the existence of the Compromise of 1867. She also noted in her Contemporary Notes that during the occupation of Bosnia, Hungarian lives were sacrificed in a policy contrary to the interests of Hungary.⁵³ Kossuth, Deák’s greatest opponent criticized the Settlement as in his opinion it would subordinate Hungary to Austria’s interests and

⁵¹ Ágost Pulszky to Florence Arnold-Forster, 11 May 1882, Correspondence, 5027:228, TCD MS.

⁵² Király, *Ferenc Deák*, 180-183.

⁵³ Contemporary Notes 1880-1882, Materials for life of Deak, 5036, TCD MS.

Hungary would be destroyed together with the Austrian Empire.⁵⁴ Arnold-Forster did not go as far as Kossuth, but she still perceived Hungarian interest subordinated to the empire in Balkan matters.

The voices of the Eastern Question in the Deák biography were quite obvious. Some English newspapers reviewing Arnold-Forster's book perceived it as a piece of literature around the Eastern Question. The *Academy* for example referred to it as an important contribution in that respect, and noted that the occupation of Bosnia and Hercegovina added important factors to the already complicated future of the Monarchy. By that, the author meant the increase of the non-ruling South-Slavic element.⁵⁵ The *Manchester Guardian* (today *Guardian*) refuted the same statement as Pulszky the younger did in his letter: that Deák would have approved the annexation of Bosnia to the empire. The author wrote that it was universally opposed in Hungary and also called the attention that it destroyed the equilibrium between the races that made workable the Dualist system.⁵⁶

The last argument in this respect is provided by Ferenc Pulszky's biographer, József Ferenczy. He indeed informs about the role Pulszky held in the press campaign against the Bosnia occupation. Ferenczy's tone, however, is rather excusing. "He admits now that his point of view about the occupation was wrong and considers his strong attack on the government's Eastern

⁵⁴ Lajos Kossuth, "A közös államiság végveszélybe sodorja Magyarországot" [Shared Sovereignty Puts Hungary at Extreme Risk], *Negyvenkilencz* 4-5 (1867). accessed 3 June 2015, <http://mek.niif.hu/04800/04882/html/szabadku0182.html>.

⁵⁵ Cutting from *The Academy*, 15 May 1880, Materials for life of Deák, 5036, TCD MS.

⁵⁶ Cutting from *The Manchester Guardian*, 26 October 1880, Materials for life of Deák, 5036, TCD MS.

policy erroneous, but still, what he wrote about it, reflected the tones of public opinion at the time.”⁵⁷

As a conclusion it can be stated that liberals both in Britain and Hungary perceived the Eastern Question as a major threat to the Austro-Hungarian political regime. Both groups believed that eventually the disintegration of the Ottoman Empire would happen and new or enlarged nation states would occupy its place in the Balkans. Hungarian liberals did not want to oppose this process, rather they intended to influence foreign policy taking this long-term outcome into consideration. The Forster-Pulszky correspondence suggest that liberals in Hungary considered the Bosnia occupation as a major foreign policy failure and their frustration was approved by some of the English liberal papers. Not only it damaged the empire’s delicate national balance, but also blew out prospective liberal Balkan alternatives.

Arnold-Forster’s remarks about the future of Austria-Hungary in the East in her book are contradictory, they indicate both distrust and hope. On the one hand she doubted how this political system could be maintained. It seems though that she supported Andrassy’s foreign policy, at least her idea supposing Deák’s approval of it seems as a moral justification. She expressed support for the overall positive outcome for the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy whose existence was considered as vital in Eastern Europe – for the British Empire. Her remarks mean that Andrassy’s foreign policy was unanimously supported by the truest liberal principles. Her fellow liberals in Hungary did not think so, but their principles became increasingly marginal.

⁵⁷ Habár ma ön maga is bevallja, hogy az occupatio kérdésében elfoglalt álláspontja hibás volt és tévedésnek nevezi a kormánynak akkori keleti politikája ellen folytatott erős támadását, mindamellett meg kell adni, hogy cikkeiben, miket e tárgyban akkor írt, a közhangulatot tolmácsolta. Ferenczy, *Pulszky*, 90-91.

The liberal foreign policy doctrine was followed by a more imperialist one by the turn of the century. Foreign political objectives were associated with the treatment Hungary's non-Magyar ethnic groups received. At the time when Hungarian liberals adopted their ideas about a protective national transformation of the Balkans, Hungarian legislation was generous with Hungary's non-Magyar languages, culture and education. But as Hungarian political leaders started to trust assimilation more, equal opportunity of cultures was a dead letter. As early as in 1869 Deák was voted down in the Parliament in a debate where he demanded equal treatment for the Magyar and the Serb national theaters. As Szabó stated, nobility's liberalism did not even live up to the collapse of the Monarchy.⁵⁸ This statement seems in parallel with abandoning liberal foreign political goals where mainly the same ethnic groups were concerned as in domestic politics.

⁵⁸ Miklós Szabó, „The Liberalism of the Hungarian Nobility”, in *Liberty and the Search for Identity*, ed. Iván Zoltán Dénes (Budapest: Central European University Press, 2006), 236.

The Deák Memoir as Catalyst in the Discussion on Ireland

In this chapter I will analyze how the retreat of liberal principles is reflected in the sources connected to the Deák biography of Florence Arnold-Forster. In the sources the political achievements of Ferenc Deák serve as a pretext to talk about Ireland. Besides the Deák memoir itself, the sources include notes from the diary of Arnold-Forster, book reviews from British newspapers and letters of Ágost Pulszky. First, to have an understanding on the political questions which according to the sources are related to Deák, a short introduction will be given into the history of Ireland. I will continue with the source analysis how the discussion on Deák provided room for reflection on the social aspect of the Irish land question. In the second part of the analysis I will present sources where Irish national movement and the possibility of Irish self-government are being discussed.

First of all it must be understood that Ireland was a major problem for English liberals throughout the 19th century. The troubled history of Ireland hides some explanation for this complicated relation. The Glorious Revolution of 1688, the defeat of Catholic King James Stuart II and the takeover of William of Orange was followed by a series of penal laws against Catholic believers. To impede restoration of the of the dethroned Stuart dynasty in England, Ireland or Scotland, Catholic priests were persecuted, Catholic landowners were encouraged to convert into Anglicanism and generally Catholicism was cleared from the higher spheres of society. In England and Scotland no significant portion of the population retained the Catholic faith. However, in Ireland, indigenous population remained essentially Catholic. During the 17th century following a series of wars land was redistributed. Protestant landowners resettled from

England or Scotland owed 85 percent of the island's territory. In the Dublin Parliament no Catholic could take seat, it was an institution of the ruling Protestant elite until the Irish Parliament was incorporated into the Westminster Parliament in 1800.

Catholic emancipation started after the Papacy recognized the Protestant Hanoverian dynasty as the legitimate ruler of Britain in 1767 and finally renounced Catholic restoration in Britain. However, Catholics in Ireland remained excluded from political power well into the 19th century. The outlawed status of Catholicism was coupled with the low social status of the Gaelic peasantry. After initial relief measures in the end of the 18th century Catholic emancipation was completed in 1829 when public opinion accepted Catholic equality, as political intervention of Catholic states in England seemed less and less probable. But this came very slowly. Catholic Irish leader Daniel O'Connell was elected Member of Parliament in the twenties as part of the campaign for emancipation. He was not allowed to take his seat in Westminster because he was Catholic. The widening Catholic middle classes thus started to engage in an Irish Catholic discourse instead of supporting liberalism.⁵⁹

The Irish peasants gained firsthand experience on the daily operation of laissez fair when a Whig government changed the conservative Robert Peel in 1846. It was the time of the Great Famine, where blight destroyed totally the Irish potato crop. Peel had intervened, bought corn to avoid soaring food prices. After long parliamentary struggle he abolished the Corn Laws that had protected English corn producers. When the Whig government of Lord Russell came to power laissez fair doctrines became more seriously supported. The government decided that no public intervention should disturb market operation as it should regulate itself. As the whole country

⁵⁹ J. H. Whyte, "The Age of Daniel O'Connell," in: *The course of Irish History*, ed. T. W. Moody (Dublin: Mercier Press, 1994), 249.

depended on the potato, mass starvation started. Many people died and more emigrated from the Ireland, the country's population fell by 20-25 percent in a few years. Naturally the government could not be blamed for the blight and the excessive dependency of Irish agriculture but the handling of the famine left its hallmark on Irish consciousness.

Emigration and the famine death toll significantly altered economic conditions in Ireland by 1850. The average size of farms grew that allowed to breed cattle besides potato and grain production. To avoid farm division, early marriages became rare, unmatched people abounded and emigration to industrial or overseas territories became a life strategy. But still, farmers' bad feelings towards landlords persisted.

The landed property in Ireland was accumulated in huge estates of certain aristocratic, mostly Protestant families who rented the land to mostly Catholic peasants. The contractual period was normally one year. If the landlord wanted to convert his field into pastures the peasant was not defended and he had to leave the land. In the seventies economic depression again threatened with mass eviction. Protests started all over Ireland and the unlimited authority of the landlords was challenged by laborers strike. The reference point for the tenants was the 3Fs, Fair Rent, Fixity of Tenure and Free Sale of belongings, established 10 years before by a parliamentary commission. Those landlord that not accepted the rent that was fair according to the Land League, had to face the strike of the workers. This meant the openings of the Irish Land War.

One of the most important actors in the Irish Land War was William Edward Forster. During the Great Famine of the forties he actively participated in the coordination of Quaker relief works and called the public in England to support the starving in Ireland just like other charitable

organizations did.⁶⁰ In 1880 Forster, by that time a leading liberal politician, was selected Chief Secretary of State for Ireland to handle the complicated land question. He traveled frequently from London to Dublin and back. Her stepdaughter Florence was the family member who most frequently accompanied Forster to his offices in London and Dublin. Her diary from the time of the Irish Land War serves as a unique source for historians dealing with the topic. In this diary she also follows the fate of her memoir on Ferenc Deák. The publication of the latter book occurred some weeks after William Forster took the office of Chief Secretary.

Parts of the memoir talk about the Hungarian peasantry and the abolition of serfdom in Hungary in 1848. She describes how Hungarian society looked like before 1848: according to her, Hungary at that time was a society when nobility was everything and the rest is nothing.⁶¹ She describes with horror that the peasants held no political rights, and did not have a right to a landed property as it should belong only to the nobility.⁶² Advantages of the feudal system to the serfs are not taken into account. For instance, the fact that landlords had very limited powers on peasants' holdings, scenes of mass eviction were absent unlike in Ireland when landlords faced no legal constraints in their dealings with their property. In the dark disenfranchised period before 1848 the hero of the peasants is Deák, who, as a benevolent leader, wants to improve their social status, elevating them into the ranks of free propertied people.

Arnold-Forster values very positively Deák's fight for equality before the law and the abolishment of feudal personal dependencies. Nonetheless there is an interesting remark. First, she writes that though Deák fought for the rights of the peasants, it did not mean that he was

⁶⁰ Ibid 270.

⁶¹ Arnold-Forster, *Francis Deák*, 15.

⁶² She cites the Corpus Juris, the collection of Hungarian laws: *omnis terrae proprietates ad dominum spectat*. Arnold-Forster, *Francis Deák*, 18.

against landlord property. Second, he considered necessary that contractual obligations about paying rent should be fulfilled and this is absolutely not a mark of slavery.

Why is this important? Because the mention of ‘slavery’ seems a reference to the agricultural crisis in Ireland. At the time when Arnold-Forster was writing that book, in Ireland the relation between Protestant landlords and Catholic tenants became tenser and tenser, but the Land League itself was far from being an exclusively farmer organization. Michael Davitt, the organizer of the movement achieved that Charles Stewart Parnell took the presidency of the League. Davitt also had connections to Republican groups in Ireland and in the United States. The targets of the League were influenced by all possible Irish political forces, some of them advocated dual ownership of the land between tenants and landlords, and others straightforwardly claimed land distribution to the farmers. ‘No Rent Slavery’ was a slogan of these radical groups.

Even though the Land League did not have its final objective clearly defined protestant landlords were nonetheless frightened by slogans like “Rent is slavery”. The moderate stance of Deák as a country gentleman himself during the 1848 revolution, when the abolition of serfdom was debated, seemed to provide adequate argument to counter Land League claims. Where Arnold-Forster writes that paying rent cannot be equal to slavery, it is probable that she did not mean slavery in a Hungarian context but in Ireland. She reveals her point of view on peasant land ownership citing Deák extensively:

‘Liberty was understood by many to mean liberty to benefit one class at the expense of another [.....]. Either let property be inviolable or let it cease to exist [....]. We are not acting in the interests of the poor

by ceasing to respect the right of property. Peasantry can become free and prosperous only through their own industry and energy, not by receiving gifts.’⁶³

This is a clear statement how liberals thought about property. Moreover, there is sentence was put in a separate paragraph: ‘with all his wish to see in Hungary a free and prosperous peasantry, Deák could not be brought to regard the obligation to pay rent as a mark of slavery.’⁶⁴ It seems that the emphasis Arnold-Forster put on the term ‘slavery’ in a short paragraph was a message for her British readership. In 1880 it could mean nothing else than the rejection of Irish Land League claims for land redistribution.

Unsurprisingly the journals that reviewed Arnold-Forster’s memoir understood the message and reflected on these passages as obvious references to the Irish land question. The *St James Gazette* depicts revolutionary times in Hungary when the peasantry forms wild conceptions on land redistribution. The journal states that Hungarian peasants considered paying rent as a mark of slavery and class oppression, just like the Irish peasants of the Land League. The article even suggests that Chief Secretary Forster should draw inspiration from the speeches of Deák in which the Hungarian leader rejects excessive popular claim.⁶⁵ The *Saturday Review* goes even further. They put that Deák advocated the advantages of landlord tenant relationship because industrial development would be impossible if the landlord should be in constant danger that the legislative body might deprive him of the land he has let on lease. Foreign money is needed to improve

⁶³ Ibid, 80.

⁶⁴ Ibid.

⁶⁵ Cutting from the *St James Gazette*, 3 September 1880, Materials for life of Deak, 5036, TCD MS.

industry in Hungary. Who would lend us any, asks Deák, on uncertain tenure? As per the *Saturday Review*, certain English Radicals should ‘profitably study’ this point of view.⁶⁶

The first daily of Scotland, the *Northern British Daily Mail* (the today *Daily Record*, the leading news brand in Scotland) expresses very straight the liberal point of view on the question of property. According to the author, Deák is praised on account of his balanced views between disinterested altruism for the peasantry and respect for the rights of property. The Land Leaguers are exhorted as an Irish brigade of pseudo-patriots, who mischievously advocate against the payment of rent. It cites the book on the ominous paragraph confirming that paying rent is not a mark of slavery, and philanthropy should be cautiously applied in the legislation.⁶⁷

The land question is extensively commented by the translator of the Deák memoir, Ágost Pulszky. Upon hearing the publication of the book, Pulszky offered Arnold-Forster to translate the book into Hungarian. His reports on provided occasion to talk about the Irish land situation in his letters to Florence Arnold-Forster. About the Irish matters he tells his opinion and references to the Deák memoir are limited to the translation process, he does not uses Deák in an Irish context. Nonetheless the Deák memoir served as his comments’ catalyst and they worth an analysis as they will lead us closer to the final conclusion.

His references about the peasants are revealing. He did not hide his intention to turn the Arnold-Forster memoir of into a means of liberal propaganda. This argument is supported by the fact that in Hungary the memoir was printed out in a cheap popular edition. Pulszky himself confessed that it was intended chiefly for peasants on an educative basis. In other words, peasants had to be gained for noble liberalism.

⁶⁶ Cutting from the *Saturday Review*, 28 August 1880, Materials for life of Deak, 5036, TCD MS.

⁶⁷ Cutting from the *Northern British Daily Mail*, 1 June 1880. Materials for life of Deak, 5036, TCD MS.

He considers that the success of liberalism in Europe is dependent on the triumph of English liberal home policy, and he emphasizes how important the role of Forster is in the reconciliation with Ireland.⁶⁸ Pulszky argues that Forster's efforts are admirable but it is difficult to change the mind of 'people led by priests'. The Roman Catholic clergy did support the land movement, but his statement reveals more the anticlerical traditions liberalism inherited from the Enlightenment than actual knowledge of the land movement leadership, ranging from Fenians (Irish Republicans) to home rulers.⁶⁹

Pulszky followed English political events on a daily basis; he refers to articles read in the English press. He congratulates Arnold-Forster upon the pass of the Compensation for Disturbance Bill in 1880. This bill was to support evicted tenants as the increased number of evictions led up to the embitterment of tenant resistance. To alleviate tension Forster submitted the Compensation Bill to the House of Commons. The Compensation for Disturbance Bill obliged landlords to give a sum of money to the evicted tenants as they were disturbed at their home. The significance of the Compensation Bill was that it already meant restriction on the landlords in evicting tenants for non-payment. Pulszky also predicted the Bill was ultimately and almost unanimously rejected by the House of Lords. Without this Bill nothing else was left for Forster than execute the existing laws until the new Land Law is prepared. Habeas Corpus in Ireland was partially suspended by the Coercion Act and made possible to arrest Land League agitators and force evictions. Parnell and his companion also spent months in prison.

The Compensation Bill meant to be a temporary relief for evicted tenants, but the definite solution was expected from the new Land Bill. Just as the Coercion Act and the Compensation Bill the

⁶⁸ Ágost Pulszky to Florence Arnold-Forster, 1 May 1880, Correspondence, 5027:173, TCD MS.

⁶⁹ Ágost Pulszky to Florence Arnold-Forster, 25 June 1880, Correspondence, 5027:187, TCD MS.

Land Bill meant a setback from liberal principles of property. Practically it introduced the dual ownership of land. Rents were to be fixed by special rent courts and tenants were enabled to sell their belongings. Pulszky referred to the bill as a good example of the liberal belief in gradual progress. The Irish nationalists are qualified as ‘obstructionists,’ and they seem equally unable to cope with the notion of gradual progress as the Radicals or the Conservatives.⁷⁰ Gradual progress however, was not considered by everybody as a Liberal value. ‘Cautious progress’ for example was precisely the slogan of the Hungarian Conservatives before 1848, opponents of liberals like Deák and Pulszky’s father.

Pulszky was indeed a keen observer. He was aware of the ambivalent nature of the land movement. He comments that the whole movement seems more a striving for nationality than even for an extreme land reform. With this statement he points out the very reason why Parnell embraced the Land League, to provide mass support for the Irish Parliamentary Party. In 1874, after secret ballot was introduced in Great Britain, Irish nationalists only gained half of the seats of Ireland. In 1886 they gained eighty-six seats out of a hundred and five. The electorate rewarded Parnell’s stance and that he even went to prison for his political convictions. Pulszky notes that the further the spirit of separation grows in Ireland the more drastic measures have to be applied, which will be followed by an even more difficult reconciliation process. For him what the Land Bill proposed seemed to fit the needs for half a generation. In his letter of 6 August 1881 congratulates that the Land Bill passed second reading in the House of Lords.

The importance of the Irish problem is underlined in a letter of 19 December 1880, when Pulszky writes that the fate of liberalism in Europe depends on the successful solution of the problem of

⁷⁰ Ágost Pulszky to Florence Arnold-Forster, s. a. Between March and August, 1881, Correspondence, 5027:210, TCD MS.

Ireland. By a liberal solution he refers to Forster's bill, and he is angry with the Conservative resistance in the House of Lords. He suggests that Hungarian nobles had went through all this during the time of Maria Theresa when the Urbarium Edict interfered with the relations between serfs and landlords.⁷¹ This edict in fact defended the peasants from private exploitation. Pulszky did not take into account a difference that was supposed to be crucial for liberals: the Irish peasants, who though penniless, were free tenants while Hungarian serfs did not possess personal freedom before 1848.

We have already talked about how Irish nationalist embraced land movement. On account of the Deák memoir, the Hungarian parallels with the Home Rule were also exposed in the English press. Several journal articles reviewing the memoir suggested a comparative perspective between Hungary and Ireland in terms of autonomy within an empire. The *Literary World* titled its book review straightforwardly *A Hungarian Home-Ruler* with clear reference to the Irish demands. This article talks about the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy, but it hints at Ireland. It describes the twelve years of existence of the dualist system as troubled and expresses its doubts whether it can be sustained facing the dangers of the Eastern Question. The importance that Hungary acquired is fictitious which is not backed either by strength or the number of population. The Austrian Empire is doomed to disintegration and consequentially Hungary's importance will also disappear. The complications of the Dual Parliamentary system's 'wheels within wheels' should not encourage the introduction of that system in Great Britain.⁷² Contrary to the *Literary World* the *St James Gazette* states that the Dualist system has generally worked well.⁷³

⁷¹ Ágost Pulszky to Florence Arnold-Forster, 19 December 1880, Correspondence, 5027:199, TCD MS.

⁷² Cutting from the *Literary World*, 30 July 1880, Materials for life of Deak, 5036, TCD MS.

⁷³ Cutting from the *St James Gazette*, 3 September 1880, Materials for life of Deak, 5036, TCD MS.

The *Spectator* talked about the obvious comparison between Hungary and Ireland and the memoir is characterized as a ‘vade-mecum’ for members of the Parliament and those who are concerned about Irish questions. The article cites a long passage from the memoir, an earlier speech of Deák in which he talks about patriotism. The *Spectator* qualifies the tone of this speech as melancholic as Deák described Hungarian history as “nothing but disastrous civil wars, and bloody struggles for the preservation of our very existence.” Deák argued that patriotism was not kept alive in Hungary like in other nations, it was not fed by memories of a great history or the sentiment of vanity. Deák meant that Europe was hardly aware of the existence of Hungary, it was rather considered a fertile but uncultivated province of Austria. “Our future in God’s hands; but to say the truth he must be a determined optimist who can believe that that it has any very bright prospect in store, though we must needs (sic!) hope for some improvement on the present.”⁷⁴ The *Spectator* states that an Irish Deák would have spoken in the same tone of melancholy. The problem, according to the journal, that Ireland though produced many of a Kossuth, has never produced a Deák.⁷⁵

This point of view that a law-abiding, conciliatory leader is missing from the ranks of Irish politicians was very much agreed by leading liberal circles. Arnold-Forster noted in her *Irish Journal* a conversation with Lord Enfield.⁷⁶ Praising the virtues of Deák, Enfield exclaimed that “if only the Irish had a man like Deák amongst them!” Arnold-Forster writes that she entirely agreed with him.⁷⁷ Deák was the object of conversations where he was put in line with politicians like Thomas Davis who created a common ground for Irish republican and Catholic emancipatory

⁷⁴ Cutting from the *Spectator*, 15.05.1880. Materials for life of Deak, 5036, TCD MS.

⁷⁵ Ibid.

⁷⁶ George Henry Charles Byng (1830-1898), eldest son of the 2nd earl of Strafford, liberal MP 1852-1874, parliamentary undersecretary of state for India, 1880.

⁷⁷ Arnold-Forster, *Irish Journal*, 214.

traditions in Ireland, defining to a larger extent the framework for an Irish national culture.⁷⁸ He conveniently died too early to participate in Fenian or other rebellious activities. Another favorite parallel was Camillo Cavour, the first Prime Minister of the united Italian Kingdom.⁷⁹

The character of Deák was used many times to depict English constitutional traditions in contrast with social revolutionary tendencies. M. E. Grant Duff, liberal MP who wrote the preface to Arnold-Forster's memoir, dedicated long passages to the comparison between Deák and John Hampden, the leader of the parliamentary party in challenging the authority of Charles I of England who stood trial in 1637 for his refusal to pay the infamous ship money. The thread, that provided ground for comparison was Deák's absolute popularity and wisdom in refraining excessive demands in his party.⁸⁰

The prospects of an independent or autonomous Ireland seemed nonsense for Pulszky, because he saw no linguistic difference and only a small difference in history.⁸¹ 'History' at that time was understood as chiefly history of states. Pulszky suggested, in other words, that the Irish did not have the right to independence because they did not have traditions of statehood and what they have is strongly connected to England. Pulszky did not speak about religious difference as a constitutive element of collective identity revealing again his anticlerical convictions.

In the press consulted the dominant line of comparison was between Britain to the Austrian Empire, and Ireland to Hungary. Pulszky however uses a rare one: that Ireland is the same for England as Croatia for Hungary. Croatia had held a historically separate legal personality and was considered to be in personal union with Hungary. Pulszky writes that self-government

⁷⁸ Thomas E. Hachey, John McCaffrey Lawrence, *The Irish Experience Since 1800: A Concise History* (New York: M. E. Sharpe, 2010). 47.

⁷⁹ Arnold-Forster, *Irish Journal*, 214.

⁸⁰ M. E. Grant Duff, Preface to *Francis Deák*, x.

⁸¹ Ágost Pulszky to Florence Arnold-Forster, 19 December 1880, Correspondence, 5027:199, TCD MS.

granted by the Croat-Hungarian agreement of 1868 was the price Hungarians had to pay just as England has to pay with some kind of self-government for Ireland.⁸²

This price however is subordinate to the question whether a liberal government is able to resolve it. Ireland is a crucial test for English liberals. Only England is able to prove that order and content can be arrived at by law and reform which Bismarck and his petty imitations deny. He notes that the importance of the liberal success comes from the fact that Europe is on the brink of military despotism and an iron hand is gradually closing its grasp.⁸³

After some break in the correspondence, Pulszky retook writing in May 1882 hearing the news of the Phoenix Park murders. After the resignation of Forster from the position of Chief Secretary for Ireland his immediate successor, Lord Frederick Cavendish and his deputy Thomas Burke was killed 6 May 1882 by Irish nationalist radicals. Pulszky expresses his shock over the event and refers to the Irish as an unimpressionable and lawless population. Also he talks with admiration about the impartial manner in which Irish issues were discussed despite what happened.⁸⁴

As usual in politics, Irish nationalists had to fight for each and every result. But it is out of the question that Parnell and his party was victorious in the Land War. The target of the Land League originally was alien to the national movement. By the integration of Land League objectives into the national movement its social basis was spectacularly extended. The elections of 1886 brought a landslide victory of the Irish Parliamentary Party in Ireland, obtaining 86 seats out of 105.

⁸² Ibid.

⁸³ Ibid.

⁸⁴ Ágost Pulszky to Florence Arnold-Forster, 16 May 1882, Correspondence, 5027:223 TCD MS.

The Liberal Party however, sacrificed power for Gladstone's missionary zeal in Ireland. The Prime Minister thought of Ireland with remorse, and his speeches were full of reminders about the English misrule of Ireland. As early as his first government (1868-1874) he furthered Irish emancipation by disestablishing the privileges of the Church of Ireland, the Irish branch of the Anglican Church. He furthered the cause of an Irish university. To be successful in Ireland however his attempts were not enough. Liberals almost lost every seat in Ireland in 1886 against nationalists, fact that convinced Gladstone that self-government should be granted to Ireland if the cause has such a strong popular support.

The conclusion, after looking at the Irish land question and national politics through the mirror of the reflections given to the Deák memoir, cannot be anything else than liberals had to face the dangers stemming from the implementation of their own ideas. The widening of voting rights and the introduction of secret ballot did not strengthen their forces but worked for Irish nationalism. Also, penalizing liberal principles of unlimited property rights and the suspension of Habeas Corpus in favor of a socially more conscious legislation in Irish matters harmed their popularity in England.

Finding mass support by the land question was an undeniable success of the Parnellite party. Channeling financial resources from the United States decisively contributed to its eventual victory. Nonetheless it involved cooperation with radical elements whose political objectives were far beyond Parnell's idea of constitutional Irish self-government within the British Empire. The significance of the Land War as merger of social and national issues could be perceived as far as in Hungary. The reactions of politicians and journalists on the account of the Deák memoir reveal that none of these two aspects went unnoticed for the observers. Among them, Ágost Pulszky was the one who aptly sensed that this resembles very much a Bismarck-type exercise

of power, the combination most harmful for liberalism, which finally would undermine its political weight.

The Deák Memoir as Catalyst in the ‘Fuerista’ Discussion

This chapter treats the formative years of the Basque national movement. Its importance comes from the fact that Basque nationalism became the most important political force in the Basque Country in the 20th century. The objective of this chapter is to shed some light upon the formation of the regionalist political discourse from which the Basque nationalism stemmed up. Radical Basque nationalism gained notoriety in Spanish national and international public opinion in the last fifty years. The ETA (Euzkadi ta Askatasuna, The Basque Country and Freedom) organization has been committed to achieve independence of Basque-inhabited territories of Spain and France by armed fight from 1961. This policy of armed resistance was given up only in 2011.

Even though media was overwhelmed with its violent actions, Basque nationalism has been always more than ETA. Until 1939, the end of the Spanish Civil War, national mobilization reached such a success that population in the provinces of Guipuzcoa, Biscay and Alava moved to support the Basque National Party, a right-leaning Christian Democrat movement. This party achieved territorial autonomy in the tumultuous period of the Second Spanish Republic (1931-1939) and governed the Basque Country, just created out of the three provinces above. The Spanish nationalist forces led by General Franco destroyed Basque autonomy following their victory in the Civil War. The party was illegalized, but after the Spanish democratic transition in the seventies it returned to power. It is still the strongest political party in the Basque Country, and it has been governing the region for most of the time since the democratic transition.

The *fuerista* movement preceded the foundation Basque National Party (1895) by fourteen years, being constituted in 1881. Their name ‘fuerista’ comes from their defense of the *fueros*, the

medieval Spanish charters defining political liberties. Even though this movement was still not separatist, by its constant vindication of historical autonomy of the Basque Provinces within Spain shaped and contributed to the creation of a modern political community. Their ideas on the historical individuality of the Basque people closely resembled Hungarian noble liberal ideas, which is not a surprise, if we consider that the movement mainly consisted of people belonging to the same social class: country nobility. The content of the *fueros*, royal privileges granted in the Late Middle Ages, prescribed a unique legislation in the Basque territories: the population living there became exempt from certain royal taxes, torture was prohibited and obtained a freeman condition without being subjected to any landlord other than the Lord of Biscay, who was the Castilian King. It did not provide perfect equality as the lands of the family could not be divided in the foral system. Still, these rights can be paralleled with the privileges granted on territorial basis (in the Hungarian Kingdom see for instance the *Szeklers*, the *Hajdus* or *Jászkuns*). In addition to the real advantages of the foral system, its origin was mystified in the course of the times, and converted from royal donation into an ancestral right.⁸⁵ By the 19th century, the *fuego* also became the object of the legendery-fuerist literature that also fomented myth around this Basque tradition.

In this chapter an analysis will be provided how the legacy of Ferenc Deák inspired their discourse. The main source of this chapter is the *Cartas húngaras*, the Hungarian Letters by José María Lizana, which treated the politics of Ferenc Deák.⁸⁶ As Delgado states, Lizana's essays were part of the campaign accompanying the foundation of the fuerista political association in

⁸⁵ Juan Aranzadi, "Raza, linaje, familia y casa-solar en el país vasco" [Race, Lineage, Family and Household in the Basque Country], *Hispania* (2001): 889-890. <http://hispania.revistas.csic.es/index.php/hispania>.

⁸⁶ *Cartas irlandesas y húngaras por D. José María de Lizana precedidas de una carta vascongada de D. Antonio de Trueba* [Irish and Hungarian Letters by José María de Lizana preceded by a Basque Letter by Antonio Trueba] (Bilbao: La viuda de Delmas, 1881). http://bvvpb.mcu.es/es/consulta/resultados_navegacion.cmd?posicion=1&forma=ficha&id=52 accessed 02.05.2015.

the city of Bilbao.⁸⁷ The association *Euskalherria* included people with a liberal background who nonetheless shared concerns about the building of a unitary state in Spain. The essays of Lizana based on the book of *Francis Deák: A Memoir*, by Florence Arnold-Foster, the book already discussed in the previous chapters. In this chapter, I will highlight the main elements used by the fuerista discussion to shape the political community. In order to do so, I will compare the essays of Lizana to the book of Arnold-Foster. Lizana relied almost exclusively on Arnold-Foster about Deák and Hungary. This fact enables us to highlight what elements of Arnold-Foster's liberal discourse were used in Lizana's essays. We will see that reflections on the need of Basque political individuality abound.

The association started its political activity with clear references to the international context. Their journal, *La Unión Vasco-Navarra* [Basque-Navarrese Union] states that the Basque provinces should get the same self-government Hungary had achieved and the Czech Lands and Ireland are about to receive.⁸⁸ It seems that the publication of Lizana's essays coincided with this programmatic article. Not only did Lizana publish on the Austro-Hungarian reconciliation, but also on the Irish national movement. His Irish and Hungarian letters were published in the journal *El Noticiero Bilbaino* and seems to serve as a more detailed explanation of the fuerista program. However, as Delgado demonstrates, following the publication of Lizana's memoir and the subsequent reviews, references about Hungary disappeared from the Basque press. For international references, fuerista attention turned more exclusively toward Ireland. It seems that the use of the Austro-Hungarian reconciliation of 1867 – when Hungary gained self-government

⁸⁷ Delgado "El fuerismo, el home rule bill y la política británica," 291.

⁸⁸ *La Unión Vasco-Navarra*. Nuestros deseos [Our desires]. April 20, 1881.
http://prensahistorica.mcu.es/es/publicaciones/ficha_pub.cmd?idPublicacion=8062.

from the Austrian Empire – in the incipient Basque national movement comes solely from Lizana's encounter with Arnold-Forster's memoir.

The fact that Hungarian politics made an impression on the Basque national movement reveals two things. On the one hand, the increasing influence of the British press on political thinking. Apparently Lizana did not have connections to Hungary, but he knew English, which provided him a larger space to look for material fitting his purposes. The novelty of his approach in the Spanish public immediately gained him publicity. On the other hand, absences are also revealing. Lizana mentions newspapers he read, like *The Graphic* and *The Times*.⁸⁹ As we saw in the previous chapters, many newspapers including *The Times* reviewed Arnold-Forster's memoir. A review like the one in *The Times* might have called Lizana's attention to the Hungarian analogies with the Basque situation. This fact indicates the central role the British press held in European public opinion. In our case, it appears to be the one and only channel through which Lizana acquired information on the affairs of Austria-Hungary.

Lizana considered that Hungary can be a good example for Basque political aspirations because Basque territories in Spain, just like Hungary within Austria, had a long tradition of political self-government. The provinces of Biscay, Gipuzkoa and Álava were privileged territories of the Spanish Crown until 1876. Navarre, the other territory where significant Basque-speaking population lived, was an independent kingdom in the Middle Ages, until 1512 when it was conquered by the Castilian troops. This conquest made the unification of peninsular Spain complete. Until 1839, Navarre was administered retaining its own administrative structure by a viceroy like the American colonies of Spain.

⁸⁹ José Maria Lizana, *Recuerdos* [Memories], (Bilbao, Casa de Misericordia, 1885), 9. 30 May 2015, <http://www.liburuklik.euskadi.net/handle/10771/25718>.

The estates in these territories continued to hold their political power after the Bourbon dynasty succeeded the Hapsburgs in 1700. The 19th century meant a sequence of civil wars between liberals and traditionalists on the question of royal succession, the latter camp supporting Prince Carlos, younger brother of the deceased Fernando VII. Even though civil war affected the whole territory of Spain the traditionalist camp had the most obvious support in the Basque Provinces and in Navarre.

During the last Carlist War (1872-1876), many liberals fled the Basque Provinces for France, like José María Lizana. According to his memoirs, he learnt English during his exile in Bayonne.⁹⁰ Upon the defeat of the traditionalists, the Madrid government converted the Basque territories into mere provinces of Spain and transferred most of the competencies of their diets to the central administration. The *fueros* that meant the political power of provincial estates were suppressed. This provoked a wave of discontent in all the territories. The Madrid government nonetheless left important competences of taxation in the hands of the Basque Provinces. This was unknown for other territories of Spain where charters were lost a time ago. However, the local elite was brought under the umbrella of the *fuerista* or intransigent movement that targeted the recovery of the entire provincial administration. The movement based on the doctrine that the Basque lands have historical rights of to govern themselves.

Turning to the analysis of Lizana's letters it stands out he took many references about Deák's personal qualities. Lizana says that the Settlement of 1867 between Hungarians and the Habsburgs was the merit of Ferenc Deák who recovered the liberties of the country.⁹¹ He underlines that political greatness is not overshadowed by the lack of splendor and brilliance of

⁹⁰ Ibid.

⁹¹ Lizana, *Cartas*, 52.

his appearance. Moreover, it is highlighted by his eloquent speeches and writings and his determinacy with which he influenced the destiny of Hungary.⁹²

Lizana almost exactly echoed the few anecdotes that did appear in the book of Arnold-Forster. For instance, he mentions the fact that Deák refused to participate in the celebration of the coronation of Francis Joseph in 1867 and instead godfathered the daughter of a humble waitress of the hotel he lived in. There is a citation from Prime Minister Count Gyula Andrassy who said to Emperor Francis Joseph that it is impossible to honor Deák with wealth or titles as he ignores them all.⁹³ The British press reviews characterized Arnold-Forster's memoir as a compendium of Hungarian history, rather than an adequate biography of Deák; precisely because it contained almost no references on his personal life. Nonetheless Lizana used these remarks to create a sympathetic image for Deák.

Lizana took these small anecdotes from Ferenc Deák's life as parallels with politicians of the Basque Provinces in Deák's generation. These people were local notables who served in lawsuits among municipalities or as envoys to the court or as members of the provincial diet. Pedro Novia de Salcedo, José Miguel de Arrieta Mascárua or Mateo Benigno de Moraza⁹⁴ ardently defended the Basque territorial regime against Madrid. According to Lizana they were altruistic people who served the public without receiving any material compensation for their work. In a nostalgic way the positive memory of the past is contrasted with present corruption. People who now administer the Basque territories are just "*politicians*"⁹⁵ as they are called in the United States, sent by the central government; their unique objective is only getting rich. They make use of the offices they were granted and disregard and sell public interests if it is beneficial to them. Lizana

⁹² Lizana, *Cartas*, 52-53.

⁹³ Lizana, *Cartas*, 53.

⁹⁴ Ibid.

⁹⁵ Lizana, *Cartas*, 54. The original is in English and italics as well.

says that these people were brought to the Basque Provinces by the “*Castilian wind of the 68 revolution*”.⁹⁶ The parallel between Deák and Basque notables finally concludes with the identification of ‘alien’ Castilians with theft and abuse. On the contrary, local Basques are praised. The comparison with Deák helped Lizana to demonstrate that for the Basques were a superior community to the Castilians.

Republicans deserve no better treatment from Lizana. He takes up a story included in the English memoir. Arnold-Forster narrates that after the defeat of Königgrätz, Deák was summoned to see Emperor Francis Joseph, who asked him what should be done after the lost battle. Deák replied that peace must be signed with Prussia and then the constitution of Hungary should be restored. The Emperor asked if he did so, would Hungary would give soldiers to continue the war. Deák plainly said no, and the Emperor taking into consideration his courage, agreed.⁹⁷ There is only one difference between the accounts of Arnold-Forster and Lizana. The Spaniard adds to the story that Deák was a true royalist because he was able to say the truth to the Emperor while many republicans would have used flatteries only. If we look for the origin of this association of ‘flattery’ with ‘republicans’ in Arnold-Forster’s book we find that she uses it, but in another context. Arnold-Forster attributes Deák’s uprightness with his sovereign to the ideal of loyalty, which thought to have disappeared from considerations of rational politics.⁹⁸ Her account is unrelated to the personal encounter after the battle of Königgrätz. It seems that Lizana aspired to highlight the Deák’s moral stance in concrete situation, which also helped to put more emphasis on the inferiority of his political opponents.

⁹⁶ Ibid. The original is italics as well.

⁹⁷ Lizana, *Cartas*, 74 and Arnold-Forster, *Francis Deák*, 237.

⁹⁸ Arnold-Forster, *Francis Deák*, 311.

Both Arnold-Forster and Lizana highlight the central role that Deák held in Hungarian politics and the respectful atmosphere around him, even by political opponents. Arnold-Forster's account starts with the description of Deák's funeral (1876). She describes how the death of the leader united political opponents in the grief, stating that people from all social ranks and nationalities attended the procession. Fifty-two counties sent earth to cover Deák's grave. Even though he was Francis Joseph's political opponent for much time, he earned royal confidence, Queen Elizabeth sent a wreath to his bier.⁹⁹

Lizana even makes a mistake in his zeal to demonstrate how much Deák dominated Hungarian public feelings. Arnold-Forster narrates an episode that Lizana took from her about the 1843 elections to the Hungarian Diet. Deák was elected, but he rejected the seat due to corruption employed even by his own party during the election campaign. Arnold-Forster referred to Zsedényi¹⁰⁰, as a member of the Diet who commented on Deák's absence. According Arnold-Forster's account, Zsedényi said that "the purest character of Hungary is missing from the Chamber".¹⁰¹ Lizana nonetheless attributed these words to Count Széchenyi, one of the most important politicians Hungary ever had.¹⁰² It is true that Ede Zsedényi was a member of the Diet that time, nonetheless, he did not reach Count Széchenyi's fame. Count Széchenyi as an aristocrat, was not likely to speak up in the Chamber of Deputies where these words were told. We depend on guesses whether Lizana simply made a mistake out of linguistic ignorance or it was intentional that he used his source creatively to confirm Deák's popularity.

In Lizana's discourse it was Deák's moderate and reconciliatory approach to politics that made him an exemplary leader. For Lizana, moderate politics first of all includes loyalty to the

⁹⁹ Lizana, *Cartas*, 54, Arnold-Forster, *Francis Deák*, 312.

¹⁰⁰ Ede Zsedényi (b. Pfannschmidt, 1804-1879), politician, member of the Hungarian Diet for Szepes County.

¹⁰¹ Arnold-Forster, *Francis Deák*, 55.

¹⁰² Lizana, *Cartas*, 54.

monarch. Lizana condemns those Hungarians who maintained separatist political positions after the defeat of the War for Independence in 1849. Among them figures General Klapka, who, according to Lizana, sustained criminal intelligence with Italians.¹⁰³ Another negative example is the party of [Kálmán] Tisza. This party refrained from any act that would imply the recognition of Francis Joseph as King of Hungary in the diet of 1861. Lizana characterizes Klapka's and the Tisza party's behavior as disastrous and separatist while Arnold-Forster writes that their triumph would mean the end of reconciliation.¹⁰⁴ It was Deák's benevolent influence that impeded this insult.¹⁰⁵

Not only were the personal qualities of Deák applauded by Lizana, but his respect of the laws also provided space for analogies with the Basque territories. We saw in the previous paragraph that both Lizana and Arnold-Forster considered important Deák's respect to imperial authorities. However, the two elevate Deák's adherence to the law into a heroic dimension even at the price of conflict with the sovereign monarch. The 19th century, especially the second and the third quarter abounded in constitutions in Spain, as political changes and coup d'états followed each other. Political instability was permanent. In Austria, the revolutions of 1848 were also followed by constitutions and imperial decrees that did not last more than a few years.

The rejection of unstable political situation led Lizana to compare the short-lived constitutions with the durability of the historical rights. Lizana chooses the historical legal order even when a modern constitution is granted by the monarch, which happened many times during the first period of Francis Joseph's reign (1848-1867). Lizana calls this sequence as 'policy of red tape'

¹⁰³ Lizana, *Cartas*, 57.

¹⁰⁴ Lizana, *Cartas* 58, Arnold-Forster, *Francis Deák*, 174.

¹⁰⁵ Ibid.

led by state bureaucracy. The stability of the feudal structures of the Spanish composite monarchy were therefore contrasted with modern attempts to alter the system.

Lizana enumerates the disadvantages of imperial constitutions. Besides their short life span, their imposed or granted character as opposed to the organic development of historic institutions is another aspect. The lack of organic development makes these constitutions of arbitrary royal suppression. Lizana cites Deák that there is no guarantee that a future ruler would keep a previously granted constitution. Its character as a ‘granted’ by royal mercy is not a promising – if something is unilaterally granted, it can be unilaterally revoked.

Lizana was nonetheless modern enough to state that adherence to the law is by no means equal to rigid insistence on obsolete laws. To avoid charges from this direction Lizana mentions that Deák indeed approved law amendments incompatible with a well-ordered state, like the abolition of nobles’ right to armed resistance against the king.¹⁰⁶ Nonetheless, modifications must be made through the legislative body where the actual laws were born. Suppressing laws by absolute or military power means the denial of the whole constitutionalist principle.

‘Laws of the nation’ seem crucial in Lizana’s book that goes beyond ordinary legality. They are defining elements of the political community. Adherence to laws in reality means adherence to the community. The invocation of the laws are confirmations of the national self. As the laws are embedded in the nation law-abiding behavior helps to achieve successes. For example, Lizana attributes to Deák’s respect of the law that Deák did not participate in the war for independence against Austria, saying that the only tool against the arbitrary action of the central power is the law.¹⁰⁷ If the law is oppressed, the nation has to protest to preserve its inviolability and not to

¹⁰⁶ Lizana, p. 69.

¹⁰⁷ Ibid, 56.

assist in unlawfulness.¹⁰⁸ Lizana presents Deák's policy as a constant invocation of the law and contrasts it with the law infringements of the Vienna government. Moreover, he presents in a way if protests were enough to make the central power retreat.

Lizana seems to suggest that laws define the political community. This can be deduced from an episode. After suppressing the Hungarians in 1849 Emperor Francis Joseph first thought about the restoration of the Hungarian constitution ten years later in 1859. The imperial government demanded that the Hungarians should approve the imperial constitution first as a precondition to convoke the Diet. Deák protested that first the legal authority of the Diet should be recognized by the government and then the Diet can negotiate in the name of Hungary. Lizana cites Deák's famous speech that the Hungarian nation should suffer to preserve the rights inherited from its ancestors instead of resignation.¹⁰⁹ The primacy of political communities was at stake at this fight, and the empire fell against the Hungarian nation.

Lizana includes citations from Deák where a slight sense of superiority of the Hungarian constitution to other nations' can be traced. For instance, Deák states that Hungary maintained her own laws, other provinces of the Austrian Empire had lost them. Deák also says that even if the Hungarians were not obliged to reject a constitution imposed on them they would opt for the historic constitution of Hungary which was born together with the nation itself and because of the fact that it fits best to the needs of the people and it is more durable than any kind of imposed constitution.¹¹⁰ Something which "was born together with the nation" expresses a strong identification upon which no debate can be made.

¹⁰⁸ Ibid, 57.

¹⁰⁹ Amit erő és hatalom elvesz, azt idő és szerencse ismét visszahozhatja, de amiről a nemzet félve a szenvedésektől önmaga lemond, annak visszaszerzése mindig nehéz és mindig kétséges.

¹¹⁰ Ibid, 62.

The inclusive nature of the historical constitution is also an important feature for Lizana, something he took from Arnold-Forster. After the Hungarian defeat of 1849 it is written by both that in that paralyzed state *all the Hungarians* guarded their affection to the lost laws and institutions. In reality, like in other European constitutional states, a smaller percentage of the population could vote. The idea that all Hungarians would embrace a constitution seems exaggerated. According to Arnold-Forster's picturesque description *in the humblest peasant homes the recollection of the national constitution, now so ruthlessly trampled under foot, was never suffered to die out.*¹¹¹ It is hosted sacred memories of the past and hopes about the future, that the *ancient* constitution of Hungary will be restored.¹¹² Only the door should be opened to dwell upon the proliferation and all the manifestations of these sacred feelings – and the politics of Deák eliminated the darkness from that door.¹¹³ Here we can see how ordinary people serve as elements of illustration in the big picture painted with the colors of the ancient régime, living in harmony with the laws and the destiny ordered to them. As usual for notables of the ancient regime, lower class people were expected to follow their superiors.

The fuerista movement organized itself into a political association in 1881. At that time, Hungary was not providing any spectacular novelty comparable to 1867 or 1849. Even leading Spanish intelligentsia made objective mistakes today unthinkable when talking about Hungary. Juan Iturralde y Suit, for example, in his review on the book of Lizana, stated that the Hungarians lost their right due to their rebellion in 1815, while this date only figures at Lizana as the year when the Vienna government started to harness Hungarian liberties.¹¹⁴ His account on the book is

¹¹¹ Arnold-Forster, *Francis Deák*, 119.

¹¹² Lizana, *Cartas*, 72.

¹¹³ *Ibid.* 72.

¹¹⁴ Juan Iturralde y Suit, *Bibliografía*. Review of the *Casrtas irlandesas y hungaras* by José Maria de Lizana. *Revista Euskera* s. a., and *Ibid.* 52.

nonetheless very positive and echoes the analogy of the suppressed Basque institutions with those of Ireland and Hungary.

As a conclusion it can be stated that Lizana found a valuable parallel to define the political objectives of his group. The historical constitution of Hungary defined as much the Hungarian national discourse as the *fueros* came to dominate the Basque national movement. When Sabino Arana, the founder of Basque nationalist movement stepped to the stage in 1891 his slogan was *Jaungikoa eta lege zaharrak* – God and the old laws.

José Maria Lizana who belonged to the same class of local notables as the liberal Hungarian country gentleman. His discourse resembles much the Hungarian discourse of historical rights and territorial self-government, but ideas of social inclusion are lacking, probably because of the strong myth of collective Basque nobility. This statement is supported by the comparison of his essays with the memoir of Arnold-Forster. It was not him who invented the concept of *fueros*. There is a whole bulk of literature dealing with the literary traditions of the Basque Country aimed at the construction of a lost paradise image, where the *fueros* secured equality of the noble Basque people. For our purpose his work was nonetheless very important, as it demonstrated how national movements building upon similar structures end up using the same techniques. The structure was provided by the transforming elements of composite monarchies in both cases.

It is significant in the Basque case that José Maria Lizana did not continue to be a member of *fuerista* movement. The popularity of intransigent principles went on a serious decline among the industrial revolution that boosted economy in the north of Spain and their discourse seemed increasingly obsolete. Nonetheless, corruption that permeated fin-de-siècle Spanish politics did not leave much room for parties other than liberals and conservatives and on many occasions seats were denied to *fueristas* because of corrupt election practices. Even though Lizana was much affiliated with figures representing *fuerista* ideas, he turned towards the Conservative Party,

and became a senator. With his wealth and family relations he is rightly considered as a member of Vizcayan oligarchy.

The country nobility that survived centuries struggle with the central power saw the opportunity of political survival in the same national-liberal discourse in Hungary and in the Basque Provinces. The fact that the Basque national movement was not constituted firmly by 1881 in the Basque Country reveals the weaknesses of the country nobility. Unlike its Hungarian fellow, it was unable to hold a firm grip on the national dialogue. The fuerista movement remained significant in the Basque Country until the public considered their approach adequate to regain the charters associated with the Basque national character. When it became obvious that the Spanish monarchy will not restore their rights the opposition radicalized and a new, nationalist group formulated its exclusively Basque national ideology with growing eco in the local society, including the harsh rejection of Spain and the Spanish people. The 1867 Settlement in Hungary, however, provided the power the conservative Basque nobility only hoped to desire, and the political weight of its Hungarian counterpart class was preserved well into the 20th century.

Conclusions

Béla Király wrote in his biography on Ferenc Deák, characterizing the political climate in the last years of Deák's life in Hungary:

Once the Compromise had been enacted, the gentry, whatever of its party affiliation, felt secure and was content simply to reap the profit of its gains. Its liberalism was on the wane and its nationalism on the rise.¹¹⁵

My thesis serves as an example that nationalism was on the rise and classical liberalism on the wane not only in Hungary, but also in other places of Europe. In the first chapter we could see that the Hungarian liberalism failed to impose its agenda on Austro-Hungarian foreign policy on the Balkans. The second chapter demonstrated the challenge English liberalism had to meet in Ireland where national politics became tied to social issues. The third chapter gave an analysis on how surviving structures of composite monarchies became reference point in the formation of national communities and outweighed liberal elements in the political discourse.

The legacy of Deák served as a catalyst for political writing in very different issues. This thesis is an attempt to point out the interconnectedness of European politics where seemingly distant factors exerted influence on each other. From this point the development of 19th century press has the greatest importance, as it made possible that people know details about political issues of foreign countries.

¹¹⁵ Béla Király, *Ferenc Deák*, 182.

What made the legacy of Deák of such an adequate catalyst? Why people acting in different political contexts embraced it and negotiated it? This thesis intends to answer this question, stating that those who negotiated the political legacy of Deák in 1880-1881 were ultimately part of the same discussion, the discussion of waning liberalism. Liberalism provided the drive of European history at times when the continent was governed by absolutist regimes which were opposed to progress. It should be noted that liberalism triumphed when more radical ideologies like socialism were already in the air. When on power, liberals not only had to face with challenges coming from conservatives but also from socialism or radical nationalism, ideologies that in many respects went further than liberals thought acceptable.

It would be an exaggeration to state that liberalism was already declining in 1880. But the three discourses I analyzed demonstrated certain uneasiness about prospects of the future. Florence Arnold-Forster's contradictory remarks about Austro-Hungarian foreign policy betrayed that in a given situations the liberal principle, that is, the promotion of national movements against the authoritarian Ottoman power was not represented by anyone, as Andrassy had to sacrifice his liberal agenda for dynastic expansion. Arnold-Forster nonetheless applauded Andrassy's achievements that brought stability to the region. It seems that as soon as a liberal politician became associated with an imperial agenda, it was easier to accept for fellow liberals. The failure of the liberal agenda nonetheless caused uneasiness.

Uneasiness can also be traced facing the Irish challenge. The parallels drawn by Arnold-Forster and Pulszky demonstrates the strength of the Irish national challenge that successfully incorporated social issues to political agendas. Gladstone was keen to remedy Irish grievances that partially came from the remorse felt on the centuries' long treatment of the Irish as conquered people. The disestablishment of the protestant Church of Ireland as state religion was a measure

that benefitted Catholics in 1869 during the first Gladstone government. However, Gladstone's challenges rose during his second premiership.

Deák served as a justification narrative for Arnold-Forster and the British press to underpin the inviolability of property rights, cornerstone of liberal politics. The movement of Parnell proved so successful that made the liberal government accept measures that meant the infringement of these rights. It is a demonstration of Gladstone's far-sightedness that he accepted that tenants should have the right to a 'fair' rent and its calculation became the right of independent land courts. This step was followed later by government promotion of peasant land purchase which resulted in the liquidation of landlordism in Ireland and made Irish tenants owners of the land they tilled. Reactions given to the Deák biography demonstrate the strength of property rights' arguments that opposed this outcome.

Hungarian autonomy within the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy was Irish nationalists' utmost desire which made Deák a reference point for Irish nationalist leaders like Arthur Griffith. In our case however Deák's image was used by the enemy camp. Gladstone became equally devoted to Irish Home Rule but during the Irish Land War this was also not predictable. Pulszky's reactions reveal Hungarian liberal understanding of a political community, for him linguistic and historical differences were not sufficiently present to support Irish self-determination. For British liberals who had to govern a huge empire, Deák was appreciated as a peripheral politician eager to reconcile with imperial reality. Thus Deák's image served to criticize Parnell: his bonds to radical American-Irish circles reflected disloyalty to Britain, his parliamentary obstruction meant disrespect for British constitutional politics, and his support to protesting poor as a dangerous subversion of social order, all contrasted with Deák's respect for legality. This tension finally caused a rupture in the liberal party in 1886. Tensions within the liberal party were nonetheless

clear before: for many the methods of Parnell were unacceptable, just like for William Forster himself who resigned as Chief Secretary for Ireland in his protest against Gladstone's agreement with Irish nationalists.

The Deák biography became a channel of discussion of Basque territorial rights thanks only to the reach of English press, unrelated to direct, personal connections. José Maria Lizana, a local notable, was adherent of a movement that aimed at the recovery of Basque territorial autonomy. Basque liberals in 1876 were put in a difficult situation. Articulations of provincial rights had long characterized the regional political discourse from the time Spain started to construct a modern unitary state. In contrast with the Hungarian experience of 1867, for the Basques 1876 meant that liberal reforms were to be done through Madrid.

Deák's image served to sustain a relentless but not violent resistance against this scheme. Even though the fuerista movement was liberal, not conservative, Lizana put emphasis on those elements of Deák's discourse which targeted the restoration of Hungarian political individuality. In contrast with Arnold-Forster's memoir, Deák was used in a more conventional way, by a group of intellectuals aimed at political self-determination. Deák's own preference to continue within the framework of the Habsburg Empire was shared by Lizana, who did not propose separation from Spain. The language of relentless resistance however, influenced political loyalties very much. It marked the boundaries of a political community and as it was defined, the application of a more radical agenda became possible.

The reconstruction of intellectual frameworks, affiliations served to demonstrate the interconnectedness of the analyzed discourse. It revealed motivations for people who decided to enter the scene of public discussion. It is clear that Florence Arnold-Forster saw a political model in the dualist Austro-Hungarian Monarchy that enabled Hungarians to pursue national goals

without doing any harm to the unity of the Habsburg state. Basically it served the same purpose for Lizana, who demanded Basque autonomy swearing loyalty to the Spanish Monarchy. Ágost Pulszky however, who lived within the scheme so desirable for the Basque author, revealed much of its limitations.

Political influence of parties holding liberal denominations was solid around 1880. Connecting these discussions through the political legacy of Ferenc Deák serves to demonstrate that certain liberal principles were waning, and had to be adapted to the changing political environment. Challenges posed by socialist and nationalist ideas, uncertainties of political communities' boundaries contributed to the reformulation of liberal agendas. Liberalism was formed by empire as much as it transformed empires. It must be noted however, that empires could coexist with liberalism and could rise up to the challenge the changing world meant for them. It was a dangerous marriage for both: in Hungary, the imperial framework proved stronger and the opportunity of democratic transformation gradually disappeared. British liberals were more successful: though Ireland posed a challenge to them, they did not lose ground until 1922. In the Basque Country, liberal principles disappeared from the regionalist discourse by the turn of the century just like in Hungary. The scene became dominated by Socialism, Basque and Spanish nationalism.

Liberalism was the driving political force in Europe in an age when hierarchical order of loyalties was abolished for the sake of equality. Empire, on the contrary, was the political structure based on this hierarchical order. The empire was destined to pass as claims for equality became stronger. Liberalism could make its compromises with empire. Consequentially, it got no better treatment. It was replaced by other ideologies that were more inclined to satisfy the hunger for equality.

References

Agirreazkuenaga, Joseba ed. *Bilbao desde sus alcaldes: diccionario biográfico de los alcaldes de Bilbao y gestión municipal, en tiempos de revolución liberal e industrial* [Bilbao from Its Mayors: Biographical Dictionary of the Mayors of Bilbao and Municipal Management during the Liberal and Industrial Revolution. Bilbao: Ayuntamiento de Bilbao, 2002.

Aranzadi, Juan. "Raza, linaje, familia y casa-solar en el país vasco" [Race, Lineage, Family and Household in the Basque Country]. *Hispania* 209 (2001): 879-906. <http://hispania.revistas.csic.es/index.php/hispania>. (6 June 2015).

Arnold-Forster Papers. Correspondence. 5027. Trinity College Library Manuscript Collection, Dublin.

Arnold-Forster Papers. Materials for life of Deak. 5036. Trinity College Library Manuscript Collection, Dublin.

Arnold-Forster, Florence Mary. *Francis Deák, Hungarian Statesman: A Memoir*. London: MacMillan, 1880. <https://archive.org/details/francisdeakhunga00arnouoft> (2 May 2015)

Cartas irlandesas y húngaras por D. José María de Lizana precedidas de una carta vascongada de D. Antonio de Trueba [Irish and Hungarian Letters by José María de Lizana preceded by a Basque Letter by Antonio Trueba]. Bilbao: La viuda de Delmas, 1881.

http://bvvpb.mcu.es/es/consulta/resultados_navegacion.cmd?posicion=1&forma=ficha&id=52

(2 May 2015)

Conversi, Daniele. *The Basques, the Catalans, and Spain : Alternative Routes to Nationalist Mobilization*. London: C. Hurst, 1997.

Deák, Ágnes. *Deák Ferenc* [Ferenc Deák] Budapest: Vince, 2003.

Delgado Cendagortagarza, Ander. “El Fuerismo, El Home Rule Bill y La Política Británica: El Contexto Internacional En Los Inicios Del Movimiento Nacionalista Vasco (1890-1903)” [The Fuerism, the Home Rule Bill and the British Politics: The International Context in the Beginnings of the Basque National Movement]. *Historia Contemporánea* 25 (2002), 289-317.

Dénes, Iván Zoltán ed. *Liberty and the Search for Identity*. Budapest: Central European University Press, 2006.

Diószegi, István, *Az Osztrák-Magyar Monarchia külpolitikája* [The Foreign Policy of Austria-Hungary]. Budapest: Vince, 2001.

Elliott, John. “The Cultural and Political Construction of Europe.” *Past & Present* 137 (1992) 48-71.

Fernandez Sebastian, Javier. *La génesis del fuerismo. Prensa e ideas políticas en la crisis del*

Antiguo Régimen (País Vasco, 1750-1840) [The Genesis of Fuerism. Press and Political Ideas in the Crisis of the Ancient Regime (The Basque Country 1750-1840)] Madrid: Siglo XXI de España, 1991.

Frank, Tibor. *Picturing Austria-Hungary. The British Perception of the Habsburg Monarchy 1865-1870*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2005.

Ferenczy, József, *Pulsky Ferencz életrajza* [The Biography of Ferenc Pulszky] Pozsony: Stampel Károly, s. a. http://mtda.hu/books/ferenczy_jozsef_pulsky_ferenc_eletrajza.pdf. (5 May 2015).

Hachey, Thomas E., John McCaffrey Lawrence. *The Irish Experience Since 1800: A Concise History*. New York. M. E. Sharpe, 2010.

Iturralde y Suit, Juan. Review of *Cartas irlandesas y hungaras* [Irish and Hungarian Letter] by José Maria Lizana. *Revista Euskera* s. a.

Juaristi, Jon: *El linaje de Aitor. La Invención de la Tradición Vasca* [The Geneology of Aitor. The Invention of the Basque Tradition]. Madrid: Taurus, 1998.

Lizana, José Maria. *Recuerdos* [Memories]. Bilbao: Casa de Misericordia, 1885.
<http://www.liburuklik.euskadi.net/handle/10771/25718>. (30 May 2015).

Király, Béla. *Ferenc Deák*. Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1975.

Koditschek, Theodore. *Liberalism, Imperialism, and the Historical Imagination: Nineteenth-Century Visions of a Greater Britain*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2011.

Kossuth, Lajos, "A közös államiság végveszélybe sodorja Magyarországot" [Shared Sovereignty Puts Hungary at Extreme Risk], *Negyvenkilencz* 4-5 (1867).
<http://mek.niif.hu/04800/04882/html/szabadku0182.html>. (3 June 2015).

Mehta, Uday Singh. *Liberalism and Empire: A Study in Nineteenth-Century British Liberal Thought*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1999.

Merényi, Hajnalka, "A Pulszky-szalon" [The Pulszky Salon], *Budapesti Negyed* 46 (2004)
<http://epa.oszk.hu/00000/00003/00033/merenyi.html>. (5 May, 2015).

Moody, Theodor W., and Richard Hawkins with Margaret Moody eds. *Florence Arnold-Forster's Irish journal*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, New York: Clarendon Press, 1988.

Moody, Theodor W. ed. *The course of Irish History*. Dublin: Mercier Press, 1994.

Nuestros deseos [Our desires]. *La Unión Vasco-Navarra*. April 20, 1881.
http://prensahistorica.mcu.es/es/publicaciones/ficha_pub.cmd?idPublicacion=8062 (6 June 2015).

Péter, László. *Hungary's Long Nineteenth Century. Constitutional and Democratic Traditions in a European Perspective*. Collected Studies. Ed. Miklós Lojkó. Leiden: Brill, 2012.

Pitts, Jennifer. Review of *Liberalism, Imperialism, and the Historical Imagination: Nineteenth-Century Visions of a Greater Britain* by Theodore Koditschek. *The American Historical Review* 117 (2012) 933-934.

Pölöskei, Ferenc, *Deák Ferenc utolsó évei* [The Last Years of Ferenc Deák] Budapest: Éghajlat, 2004.

Pulszky, Ferenc, *Életem és korom* [My Life and Age]. Budapest: Franklin-társulat, 1884.

http://mek.oszk.hu/13300/13330/pdf/_5 5 May 2015.

Reid, T. Wemyss. *Life of the Right Honourable William Edward Forster*. London: Chapman and Hall, 1888. <http://www.archive.org/details/liferighthonour00reidgoog> (2 May 2015).

Sartori, Andrew. "The British Empire and Its Liberal Mission." *The Journal of Modern History*, 78 (2006), 623-642.