

Instilling the Idea of ‘Double’ Identity

Yulia Komleva

IWM Junior Visiting Fellows’ Conference Proceedings, Vol. XXXII © 2012 by the author

Readers may redistribute this article to other individuals for noncommercial use, provided that the text and this note remain intact. This article may not be reprinted or redistributed for commercial use without prior written permission from the author. If you have any questions about permissions, please contact the IWM.



One of the important, yet still unachieved goals jointly proclaimed by the governments of the European Union relatively long ago is to shape the feeling of collective identity of EU citizens. It is certainly a long and profound process, and it does not presume to oust the national consciousness of Europeans and supplant it by a “post-national cosmopolitanism.” The idea is to create a “double” European identity, which seeks to preserve particular national identities while at the same time cultivating the feeling of belonging to a larger European community. In its essence, such a goal is by no means new, and it would therefore be helpful to recall similar practices of the past. For instance, the government of the Austro-Hungarian Empire also faced the problem of instilling a double identity in its subjects, aiming to foster the feeling of belonging to both the great fatherland and to a smaller particular homeland.

The idea of national identity and belonging to a specific nation can be considered a learned or habituated phenomenon. In many cases it was constructed or modified by those in power in order to sustain their status, or by either social or political organizations struggling for power. To achieve cohesion and solidarity among the guided masses, they had to invent ideological “clumps” by emphasizing common traditions, values, and history. Basic knowledge of common national traditions, values, and history is normally achieved with the help of education, especially elementary and secondary schooling. This is what the government can effectively manipulate to produce the desired identity, and such was the case with the Habsburg government in the multinational, multicultural, and multiconfessional Austro-Hungarian monarchy.

The so-called Austrian Empire, officially created in 1804, though actually possessing statehood from 1749 until 1848 and then again from 1849 until 1860, was an absolute monarchy in its form of government but not a uniform centralized state. Moreover, its Bohemian and Austrian regions belonged to the Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation until 1806, but Hungary, Galicia, and Dalmatia did not. Likewise, Hungary was a member of the German Confederation, while Galicia, Dalmatia, and the Lombard-Venetian kingdom were not. Only in 1849, with the era of neoabsolutism, was the idea of a centralized state first implemented. Until that moment reference was rightfully made to

the “imperial and royal Austrian states.”[2] Later on, as a result of the Austro-Hungarian Compromise of 1867, the former Austrian Empire was transformed into a constitutional monarchic union between the crowns of the Austrian Empire and the Kingdom of Hungary, with the territory being divided into the Austrian half of the Dual monarchy, also known as Cisleithania, and the Hungarian part, known as Transleithania. All of these transformations, political entanglements and territorial legacies made the process of cultivating the notions of identity and loyalty complicated and problematic for the subjects/citizens of the monarchy.

In the second half of the nineteenth century—marked by the radicalization of national movements and the aspirations of European states to transform themselves into nation-states—the Habsburg government had the very complicated task of inventing some form of supranational identity as an alternative to the ‘awakening national consciousness.’ Producing some kind of common identity was essential to moderating the contentious situation.

The implementation of this task required, along with other important objectives, the creation of a standardized educational system, with history to be the key discipline used to instill in schoolchildren patriotism and loyalty to the ruling house. However, the creation of a common mythology and “patriotic” education of pupils was by no means trouble-free in Austro-Hungary: first, teaching history had a complicated and delicate commitment not to distort historical facts while emphasizing the stories and legends of glorious ancestors, and second, the smaller nationalist elites (Czech, Hungarian, Italian, Croatian, Serbian, Polish, Ruthenian, Slovak and Slovene) almost everywhere produced their own national myths, depicting an image opposite to that created by the central government. As a result, a whole series of historical figures, myths, and traditions were implicitly in competition with official state rhetoric.[3]

Nevertheless, the Habsburg government managed to establish a very effective modern educational system in the Austrian half of the Dual monarchy that combined due state control with necessary respect towards the various nationalities of the monarchy.[4] In opposition to the nationalistic policies of suppressing national minorities’ elements in schooling (which were exercised, for example, in the Hungarian part of the monarchy and by Polish local authorities over Russines), the Habsburg government sought in the Austrian half to combine both national elements and the idea of the dynasty as a central cementing core. In this essay I try, on the basis of studying the major educational decrees and instructions issued between 1849 and 1917[5], as well as the most commonly used History school textbooks of the time (1) to demonstrate how History as a school subject was employed by the Habsburg government to implement the idea of the common greater fatherland, and (2) to detect the main “methods” of transmitting the “double identity” in teaching history in Austrian schools from the middle of the nineteenth century until the dissolution of the Dual monarchy.

History as a Tool for Fostering the Idea of Common Fatherland

Generally speaking, it became typical for the government to educate its subjects towards a love of the fatherland in the middle of the eighteenth century. The educational system of the Habsburg monarchy was subjected to considerable reforms under Maria Theresa and Joseph II in pursuit of pragmatic goals for the state. To bring up loyal and obedient citizens, useful to their fatherland, was the main purpose of primary schools (which since 1781 became mandatory for all children from ages 6 to 12), as well as *Gymnasien* (which provided advanced education) and universities.

As early as 1694, history as a secular discipline in the universities of the Habsburg monarchy was assigned a function of imparting this feeling of love and pride for the fatherland. Some decades later, in 1735, Emperor Charles VI decreed that “a ‘*studium historicum*’ was obligatory in all *Gymnasien*.”[6]

In 1775, during the period of Maria Theresia’s school reform, the Piarist father Gratian Marx gave the teaching of history the form it would take until 1848, and, with relatively insignificant changes, until the end of the Habsburg monarchy. According to Marx’s plan, the schoolchildren were first taught the history of different countries and peoples in a synchronic fashion, while in their last year of schooling they studied the history of the fatherland, meaning the history of the House of Austria in particular.

During the first half of the nineteenth century, the Austrian government continued to follow the established tradition of educating subjects towards love of and loyalty to fatherland. Moreover, state regulation of instruction tightened, with textbooks and course syllabi needing to be approved by state officials. The strongest obstructions to educational reform were eliminated in 1848 with the fall of Prince Klemens von Metternich and the old government and the appointment of a new cabinet committed to change.[7]

The new Ministry of Religion and Instruction began to prepare a comprehensive reform of secondary and higher education. The famous *Entwurf der Organization der Gymnasien und Realschulen in Österreich*, introduced in 1849, provided the basic framework for academic secondary education in Austro-Hungary for most of the late nineteenth century. According to it, the former six-grade *Gymnasium* and two-grade philosophy and academy course were united into an eight-grade *Gymnasium*. Additionally, the curriculum was reviewed, new regulations for *Gymnasium* teachers were introduced, and a general examination, known as the *Maturitätsprüfung*, was established, regulating graduate students’ admission to the universities.[8] The teaching of modern history, as it was specified in the *Entwurf*, was to concentrate primarily on Austrian history, with emphasis on events “affecting the specific fatherland and attention to major events in world history.”[9]

The responsibility for the process of school reform in the post-revolutionary period was borne by the under-secretary of state in the Ministry of Religion and Education Joseph Alexander Freiherr von Helfert (1820-1910), who was a known lawyer and parliamentary deputy as well. Being one of the most important representatives of a state-supporting, dynastically loyal, and “supranational” brand of conservatism, Helfert was convinced that the creation of an Austrian consciousness, pertaining to the entire state, could be achieved above all through the teaching of history.[10]

In 1853, Helfert called for the cultivation of “national history” (*Nationalgeschichte*), which he understood as the history of the Austrian Empire as a whole. For him *Nationalgeschichte* had exclusively political connotations, following from his definition of it as the “history of a population belonging together territorially and politically, bound together by the same sovereign authority, and being protected by the same laws. Austrian national history is for us the history of the entire Austrian state and the whole people, the organically intertwined parts of which consist of all those tribes, different in origin, culture, and custom, who live across the vast area of the Empire.”[11]

Nevertheless, reading textbooks of that period reveals that the Habsburg government did not seek to suppress the history of national minorities at the primary level. Ernst Bruckmüller in his survey devoted to the promotion of national consciousness through school education claims that at the elementary level schoolchildren were to be taught a sense of *Landespatritismus*, of belonging to their native region, as well as the feeling of *Gesamtstaatspatritismus*, or loyalty to the Austrian state and dynasty.[12] Identification with a particular linguistic group and a particular nation were also by no means missing.

Without a doubt, the Austrian government attached more importance to the upper levels of education and sought to direct policy there more than at the primary level[13], trying to shape the development of youth in an Austrian patriotic direction through the teaching of history. In Imperial Austria, the *Gymnasien* provided classical education for the political and socio-cultural elites. Until 1904, the *Gymnasien*, which taught in both Latin and Greek, were the only route to university entry and the world of intellect.[14] The other type of secondary education was represented by the *Realschulen*, which provided a much more practical education and taught modern rather than classical languages. *Gymnasien* were not always full eight-year establishments, however. In many places there were only four-year junior *Untergymnasien*, which could operate independently, since, along with preparing students for the senior *Obergymnasien*, they also taught each subject at a sufficient level to provide general training for a number of professions.[15] *Untergymnasien* sometimes served as a first stage, ensuring entry to senior *Realschulen* and professional schools.

According to the *Entwurf* of 1849, history (which was not yet separated from geography) was included on the list of mandatory subjects in the curriculum of *Gymnasien*.[16] The main, stated aims at the *Obergymnasium*-level were to provide an idea of major events in world history in their “pragmatic connections,” and to give “exact knowledge” of the historical development of the Greeks, Romans, and of the fatherland.[17]

First-year students at the *Obergymnasium* studied history for four hours a week, starting with the ancient period until the Barbarian Invasions, with the emphasis on the statehood, religion, arts and literature of the Greeks and Romans. In the second and third years, respectively, the history of the middle ages until the fifteenth century and modern history until the present were taught for three hours a week. The last year at the *Obergymnasium* was reserved for the history of the Austrian state, “with due regard for the history of its parts, especially the specific fatherlands,”[18] and the main issues of Austrian state statistics.

Emphasizing the history of the Habsburg monarchy within the modern history studies was duly explained in the instruction which accompanied the *Entwurf* of 1849. Educational officials thought that a general history of the modern period, being too difficult and complicated, would only create confusion among the pupils. It would therefore be reasonable for pupils between the ages of ten and fourteen to concentrate on the history of one major state, which should obviously be the Austrian empire. It was thought that children who were to leave school at fourteen to start work would benefit from such a curriculum as well.[19] The emphasis on constitutional developments and statehood was also characteristic of the teaching of history at the upper levels of schooling in Austria in the second half of the nineteenth century and the first decade of the twentieth.

According to the revised and amended curriculum for *Gymnasien* accompanied by new instructions issued by the Ministry of Education in 1884, a number of heroic figures from the history of the Habsburg House, like Maximilian I and Maria Theresia, were to gain among students a status of doctrinal certitude and distinctness.[20] The student of the first three years of the *Obergymnasium* examined the epochs of the Reformation, Absolutism, and Revolution as the main periods of modern history with the explanation of their historical meaning. As before, the last year was reserved for the history of the Austrian state.

The teaching of the history of the Habsburg monarchy was acknowledged to be problematic because of its complexity. The history of the Austrian state began with the union of the Bohemian and Hungarian crowns with the Austrian hereditary territories in 1526; yet, this event necessarily demanded an elucidation of the background which had led to it. All the events that happened after 1273, when Rudolf I of Habsburg became the King of the Romans, were grouped around the history of the Habsburg dynasty, which presented the main narrative. Thus the Luxemburg dynasty “had prepared in a certain sense the ground for the later position of power possessed by the Habsburgs.”[21]

The elucidation of the historical development that preceded the union of 1526 was concerned with the main territories, which were Inner Austria, Bohemia, and Hungary, while all other territories were discussed more briefly. The instructions of 1884 prescribed that teachers should emphasize those aspects which contributed to the formation of Austrian state-mindedness. It was thought that the truthful and objective presentation of the major events in the history of the Habsburg House would, by itself, awake in students a love for the ruling dynasty and fatherland. Teachers were to educate their pupils in a patriotic direction by imparting to them the great importance of the fatherland in world history and for the whole of humanity. The smaller, immediate homeland was not to be forgotten, however, and its history was to be studied as a part of a larger whole.[22]

The established format was not subjected to any substantial change under the modified curriculum versions in subsequent years. The word *Heimat* was replaced by *Kronland* to refer to specific fatherlands in the formal instructions for the teaching of Austrian history in the gradual year of the *Obergymnasium*, but without any essential change in content. However, the instructions of 1900 reflect a considerable increase in awareness of the politically sensitive nature of teaching history. It was recommended that the teacher be

especially careful discussing the territories of the Habsburg Empire with ethnically mixed populations, seeking not to hurt national sensibilities while adhering, at the same time, to historical truth.[23]

“Methods” of Creating the “Double Identity”

While the Austrian government acknowledged the so-called rights of national collectives, it was necessary, in order to defuse tensions between them, to construct some common identity that reconciled national feelings with loyalty to the House of Austria as a symbol of supranational unity. History textbooks used in the schools of the Austrian half of the Dual monarchy reveal the form that was sought for this “double identity” of future citizens.

First of all, studying the History schoolbooks shows that native regional and national myths were central to historical education at the elementary and secondary levels.[24] In primers and textbooks one finds national heroes and legendary ancestors whom children would have recognized from family education, prior to any official schooling (for example, the chieftain of Germanic tribes Hermann, the mythological foremother of the Czech people Libuše, one of the most popular Hungarian saints Szent István, the 9th century ruler of Great Moravia Prince Svatopluk I, the founder of the bishopric of Salzburg Saint Rupert, the hero of Slovene folklore Martin Krpan, the Croatian historical and folklore hero Matija Gubec, etc.).

After having familiarized themselves with regional and national heroes, schoolchildren would learn “Austrian history,” which was presented to them through the official canon of historical figures from Habsburg public mythology. Beginning with Leopold I, “the Glorious” (976-94), the first Babenberg in the Austrian March, figures studied included Leopold III (1095-1136), subsequently Saint Leopold, and Rudolf I (1273-91), the founder of the Habsburg dynasty’s claim to imperial status (who, of course, occupied the central place). Among other key personalities were the famous reformers Emperor Maximilian I (1493-1519) and Empress Maria Theresia (1740-80), the Emperors Joseph II (1780-90) and Franz II (I) (1792-1835), and, eventually, the ruling Emperor Franz Joseph (1848-1916).

As a third trend in government policy for teaching history in schools, links between the Habsburg public mythology and national heroes were created by incorporating national and regional legends into the dominant history of Austria. Only some national heroes were selected, however: those who could be presented as loyal to the Habsburg House and, therefore, well-integrated with the Austrian patriotic content of the curriculum.[25] For instance, Czech king and Holy Roman Emperor Charles IV (1316-1378), especially famous in Prague (where many landmarks bear his name), was connected to Rudolf IV Habsburg (1358-1365), as the latter was his son-in-law. The counts of Cilli, the most important late medieval noble family in the territory of present-day Slovenia, were shown as vassals of the Habsburg dynasty, and their faithful allies in the early fourteenth century. Miklós Zrínyi (1508-1566) known across Europe for his involvement with the Battle of Szigetvár, and who is seen as a hero by both Hungarians and Croats, was represented as serving the Habsburg Monarchy. Heroes from more recent history were

also included, like Tyrolean patriot Andreas Hofer (1767–1810), who fought for Austria against French and Bavarian forces during the Napoleonic Wars, and whose family, after his death as a martyr, was given a patent of nobility by Franz I, the emperor of Austria.

“Controversial” heroes and themes conflicting with the image of a greater friendly fatherland, were, however, omitted from the history curriculum. There was no mention of episodes such as the rivalry of Czech king Ottokar II Přemysl (c. 1233-1278) and Rudolph of Habsburg (1251-1276) for the territories of Austria, Styria, Carinthia, Carniola in the 13th century, or the execution at the stake of Czech priest Jan Hus, or the Defenestration of Prague of 1618, when the Czech aristocracy threw the Habsburg’s regents out of a third floor window. The most recent movement for the unification of Italy, “*il Risorgimento*”, was skipped as well.

Instead, stress was given to key historical personalities who were popular with all nationalities, recognized extensively as common heroes, and, of course, oriented towards the Habsburg monarchy, constituting emotional links between subjects of different nationalities. Those were, first of all, military heroes like Prince Eugene of Savoy (1663–1736), who in service of the Imperial court in Vienna defeated the Ottomans; Josef Graf Radetzky (1766–1858), an Austrian general of Czech origin, immortalized by Johann Strauss I’s *Radetzky March*; as well as civil figures and scientists, like Joseph Ressel (1793-1857), the Czech-Austrian engineer and inventor of the steamship.

The idea of a common “glorious past under the Habsburgs” was naturally conveyed through emphasizing the most brilliant battles in history, like the Battle of Mohács of 1687, which resulted in a crushing defeat of the Ottomans by the forces of Leopold I Habsburg; the Battle of Kolín of 1757, when the Habsburg army defeated the Prussians under Frederick the Great during the Seven Years’ War; and the battle of Wachau, which presented the “Austrian contribution” to the Great Battle of Nations at Leipzig, where Napoleon was defeated in 1813. Finally, every textbook volume closed with the state anthem, the so called “*Kaiserhymne*“, the words of which were translated into the languages of all the nations of Austro-Hungary.

According to yearly school reports, the most popular history textbook was one written by Anton Gindely.[26] Gindely (1829-1892), a professor of history at the universities of Prague and Olomouc and member of the Austrian Academy of Sciences, was a typical representative of the so called “Austrian” patriots, people who were able to think “transnationally.” He believed that writing history from the European point of view and presenting historical events within a European context would awaken a general, monarchy-wide Austrian consciousness, and that all particularistic aspirations and nationalistic separatist movements would then easily and quickly disappear.[27] His idea was to create a common history which considered equally the historical memories and cultural contributions of all the nations of the Danube monarchy. Nevertheless, Gindely felt that the duty of history was to serve the truth, and he wrote in an unemotional and laconic style, without great pathos or perlocution, for he believed that “the value and worth of the Austrian state would logically become clear from a study of the subject.”[28]

Though “Gindely’s reader” became the classic textbook for studying history in schools, texts written by other authors were also in use. Manuscripts of all school textbooks, however, were to be submitted by publishers to the Ministry for Religion and Education. The provision of “double” identity was core to the evaluation of textbooks by experts, who ensured that national content did not eclipse the idea of a greater fatherland. If the discussion of national myths and state histories competed with the required Habsburg-Austrian narrative focus, the book was rejected. For example, history schoolbooks were especially criticized and rejected for depicting an earlier “Greater Croatia” or the medieval “Greater Hungary,” or for expressing exaggerated German or Slavic sympathies.[29] The reports on the evaluation of textbooks’ content prove that the state authorities were extremely watchful with regard to manuals in all languages of the monarchy.

Conclusion

Examining the major educational decrees and instructions on schooling matters demonstrates that history as a school subject was continually and increasingly exploited by the Habsburg government in order to educate future subjects/citizens of the monarchy in a patriotic direction, imparting to them a feeling of love for the ruling dynasty and the importance of the common greater fatherland. Textbooks indicate that schoolchildren in the Austrian half of the Danube monarchy were taught a solid amount of amazingly versatile material in history and that the Habsburg government did not seek to suppress the national feelings of its multiethnic and multicultural population. From the middle of the nineteenth century until the dissolution of the Dual monarchy, the Austrian history curriculum combined, in a sophisticated manner, (1) giving place to national ancient myths and legendary ancestors, (2) emphasizing successful rulers from the House of Austria, (3) depicting national heroes as loyal to the Habsburg dynasty, (4) stressing a common “glorious past” under the Habsburgs and common “transnational” military and civic heroes, and (5) avoiding controversial themes that could hurt students’ national feelings. Due to such a policy, the feeling of belonging to one’s native land was taught along with the feeling of loyalty to the Habsburg state and ruling house, thus instilling a “double” identity.

To what extent this educational policy was effective is a complicated question which demands further research. In any case, it contributed to the fifty years subsistence of the Danube monarchy as a supranational united political structure. The social and political essays, memoirs and writings of those who lived and were educated in the Austrian half of the monarchy testify to the fact that not all living in the “long” nineteenth century of state-building and nationalist upheavals were convinced nationalists. Many famous persons, as well as scholars of authority who advanced opinions of national identity and consciousness, were influenced by the schooling policies of the Habsburg government.

Moreover, according to the latest studies, “nationalists largely failed in their efforts to nationalize the population of the Austrian half of the Dual Monarchy,” though they dominated political parties, legislative institutions and the press.[30] In the final decades of the monarchy nationalists wrestled heavily against “popular indifference to national forms of self identification, loyalty to non-national institutions, multilingualism in both private and public life, a refusal to order one’s life according to nationally prescriptive

principles.”[31] Thus the educational policy of the Habsburg government in the Austrian half of the monarchy appears to have been relatively effective in manipulating the consciousness of its citizens, even if it did not prevent the general dissolution of the Dual monarchy, which was caused by a complicated range of multifaceted reasons.

Notes:

1. This research is sponsored by the Mikhail Prokhorov Foundation.

2. Ernst Bruckmüller, “An Ehren und an Siegen reich,” in Monika Flacke (ed.), *Mythen der Nationen: ein Europäisches Panorama* (München: Koehler und Amelang, 1998), 269.

3. Ernst Bruckmüller, “Patriotic and National Myths: National Consciousness and Elementary School Education in Imperial Austria,” in Laurence Cole and Daniel L. Unowsky (eds.), *The Limits of Loyalty : Imperial Symbolism, Popular Allegiances, and State Patriotism in the Late Habsburg Monarchy* (New York: Berghahn Books, 2007), 11.

4. See e.g.: Joachim von Puttkamer, “Framework of Modernization: Government legislation and Regulations on Schooling in Transylvania (1780-1914),” in Victor Karády, Borbála Zsuzsanna Török (eds.), *Cultural Dimensions of Elite Formation in Transylvania (1770-1950)* (Cluj-Napoca, 2008), 15-23.

5. Namely: *Entwurf der Organisation der Gymnasien und Realschulen in Österreich. Unveränderter Abdruck des Texts vom Jahre 1849* (Vienna, 1879); Reichsvolksschulgesetz vom 14. Mai 1869, in *Reichsgesetzblatt für das Kaisertum Österreich* (Vienna, 1869); *Instructionen für den Unterricht an den Gymnasien in Österreich* (Vienna, 1884); *Lehrplan und Instructionen für den Unterricht an den Gymnasien in Österreich* (Vienna, 1900); *Verordnungsblatt für den Dienstbereich des Ministeriums für Cultus und Unterricht* 1908, Nr. 18, 190; *Lehrplan und Instructionen für den Unterricht an den Gymnasien in Österreich* (Vienna, 1913); Das Schulerneuerungsprogramm des Vereins “Freie Schule,” in *Pädagogische Jahrbuch*, Bd. 39 (Wien: Wiener Pädagogischen Gesellschaft, 1916), 140-144.

6. Bruckmüller, “Patriotic and National Myths,” 23.

7. Gary B. Cohen, *Education and middle-class society in imperial Austria* (West Lafayette, Ind.: Purdue University Press, 1996), 21.

8. See *Entwurf der Organization der Gymnasien und Realschulen in Österreich* (Vienna: Ministerium für Kultus und Unterricht, 1849).

9. *Ibid.*, 30.

10. Bruckmüller, “Patriotic and National Myths,” 24.

11. Joseph Alexander Frh. von Helfert, *Über Nationalgeschichte und den gegenwärtigen Stand ihrer Pflege in Österreich* (Prague: Verlag der J. G. Calve’schen Buchhandlung, 1853), 1-2.

12. Bruckmüller, “Patriotic and National Myths,” 22.

13. *Ibid.*, 23.

14. Steven Beller, *Vienna and the Jews, 1867-1938: A Cultural History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 49.

15. Helmut Engelbrecht, *Geschichte des österreichischen Bildungswesens: Erziehung und Unterricht auf dem Boden Österreichs*, Bd. 4. (Vienna: Österreichischen Bundesverlag, 1986), 15.

16. *Entwurf der Organization der Gymnasien und Realschulen*, 20.

17. Übersicht über die Hauptbegebenheiten der Weltgeschichte in ihrem pragmatischen Zusammenhange; genauere Kenntniss der geschichtlichen Entwicklung der Griechen, Römer und des Vaterlandes. Ein sicheres Wissen der hiezu nöthigen geographischen Verhältnisse hat damit in Verbindung zu stehen (*Entwurf der Organization der Gymnasien und Realschulen*, 31).
18. *Entwurf der Organization der Gymnasien und Realschulen*, 32.
19. Bruckmüller, “Patriotic and National Myths,” 25.
20. *Instructionen für den Unterricht an den Gymnasien in Österreich* (Vienna, 1884), 149.
21. Bruckmüller, “Patriotic and National Myths,” 25.
22. *Ibid.*, 26.
23. *Ibid.*
24. For primary schooling see e.g.: *Lesebuch für österreichische allgemeine Volksschulen. 5* by J. Vogl, Franz Branky, Koloman Moser (eds.) (Wien: K.k. Schulbücherverl., 1886); *Lesebuch für österreichische allgemeine Volksschulen.4* by Karl Kummer, J. Vogl, Franz Branky, Koloman Moser (eds.) (Wien: K.k. Schulbücherverl., 1891); *Lesebuch für österreichische allgemeine Volksschulen. 5* by J.Vogl, Franz Branky, Koloman Moser (eds.) (Wien: K.k. Schulbücherverl. 1891); *Lesebuch für österreichische allgemeine Volksschulen: Ausgabe in fünf Theilen* by Georg Ullrich (ed.) (Wien: k.k. Schulbücher-Verl., 1884); *Lesebuch für österreichische allgemeine Volksschulen: Ausgabe in acht Theilen* by Georg Ullrich, J.Vogl, Franz Branky (eds.) (Wien : k.k. Schulbücher-Verl., 1888); *Lesebuch für österreichische allgemeine Volksschulen. 4 (4. Schuljahr)* by Emanuel Reinelt (ed.) (Wien: Tempsky, 1901); *Lesebuch für österreichische allgemeine Volksschulen. 5 (5. Schuljahr)* by Emanuel Reinelt (ed.) (Wien: Tempsky, 1905); *Lesebuch für österreichische allgemeine Volksschulen. 6 (7. und 8. Schuljahr)* by Emanuel Reinelt (ed.) (Wien: Tempsky, 1908); *Lesebuch für österreichische allgemeine Volksschulen.* by Josef Bielig, Franz Czerny (eds.) (Wien: Tempsky, 1907). For secondary schooling see e.g.: *Deutsches Lesebuch für österreichische Gymnasien.* by Karl Ferdinand Kummer, Karl Stejskal (Wien: Manz, 1887), in 8 parts; *Deutsches Lesebuch für österreichische Gymnasien* by Karl Ferdinand Kummer, Karl Stejskal (eds.) (Wien: Manz, 1898), in 8 parts; *Deutsches Lesebuch für österreichische Gymnasien* by Karl Ferdinand Kummer, Karl Stejskal (eds.) (Wien: Manz, 1910); *Deutsches Lesebuch für österreichische Gymnasien* by Franz Jelinek, Artur Brandeis (eds.) (Wien: K. k. Schulbücher-Verl., 1910), in 8 parts.
25. Bruckmüller, “Patriotic and National Myths,” 16.
26. See *Zeitschrift für die österreichischen Gymnasien*, vols. 11-61 (Wien: C. Gerold, 1860-1910).
27. Novotná, Markéta. Antonín Gindely (1829-1892). URL: <http://jindrich.wz.cz/pvh/gindely.html>
28. Bruckmüller, “Patriotic and National Myths,” 27.
29. *Ibid.*, 27-28.
30. Tara Zahra, Alison Frank, Pieter Judson. Conference Report, American Historical Association Meeting 2006, Session 100: “Sites of Indifference to Nation in Habsburg Central Europe”, in *Humanities and Social Sciences Net Online* [e-journal] URL: <http://h-net.msu.edu/cgi-bin/logbrowse.pl?trx=vx&list=h-german&month=0603&week=a&msg=4Gz7SD8pZSCL7ZXvgqxpGQ&user=&pw=>.
31. *Ibid.*

Preferred citation: Komleva, Yulia. 2012. Instilling the Idea of ‘Double’ Identity: History Curriculum in the Schools of Austro-Hungary. In: Re-thinking European Politics and History, ed. A. Pasieka, D. Petruccelli, B. Roth, Vienna: IWM Junior Visiting Fellows’ Conferences, Vol. 32.