

**Habsburg H-Net Discussion Network**  
**Reports of the U.S. Representative in Vienna, 1877**

From: <http://www.h-net.org/~habsweb/sourcetexts/frus.htm>

**Reports of the U.S. Representative in Vienna, 1877**

---

PAPERS RELATING TO THE FOREIGN RELATIONS of the UNITED STATES  
transmitted to Congress December 2, 1878.  
Washington: Government Printing Office, 1878.

---

No. 20.

Mr. Kasson to Mr. Evarts.

[No. 30.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,  
Vienna, December 14, 1877. (Received December 31.)

SIR: During the last week the "delegations" assembled at Vienna. They constitute the common legislature of the empire, but it is a legislative body peculiar to Austria-Hungary, and without a parallel in the other countries of the world. I have studied its characteristics with interest, remembering that there was at one time, in some quarters of America, a project of a dual government for the Union, as a modus vivendi for North and South.

The seventeen provinces of Austria constitute Cisleithania, which has a complete legislature (Reichsrath) composed of two houses, and a responsible ministry of its own. Of Cisleithania Francis Joseph is Emperor. Hungary, Transylvania, Slavonia, and Croatia constitute Transleithania, which also has a complete legislature (Reichstag) composed of two houses, and its own responsible ministry. Of Transleithania Francis Joseph is King. Each of the two governments include a ministry of national defense, of finance, of the interior, of public works, of justice, of agriculture and commerce, and of education. Neither has a ministry of foreign affairs, nor of war, except so far as the latter is braced under the term "national defense." Each of these bodies, the Cisleithania legislative council and the Transleithania diet, elects a delegation of its own members, which meets annually and alternately at one of the two capitals, Vienna and Pesth, with very limited powers, to regulate common affairs, the army, navy, and external relations. Each delegation is composed of 60 members- 20 peers and 40 representatives. Each delegations met in separate chambers, even in different parts of the city; and

[end of page 24]

---

all measures must be adopted by both, with the reserve that if they do not so agree they must meet in congress. On such occasions a majority of the united vote determines the result, which is conclusive without subsequent sanction of their constituent bodies.

There is also a third and common cabinet of administration composed of three ministers only, that of foreign affairs, of finance, and of war. This common ministry is responsible to the delegations only, as the other two ministries are responsible to their respective legislatures. It occupies a ministerial bench in the chamber of each delegation, passing from one to the other as business requires, and responding to interpellations in each.

The delegations pass only the budgets for foreign affairs, for the expenses of the common department of finance, and for the army and navy. These expenditures are ordinarily and respectively about 4,500,000, 2,000,000, and 110,000,000 of florins, equivalent to not quite half of these amounts in dollars. They also fix the numbers to be enrolled in the army, and duration of service, &c. While the finance minister is in charge of the disbursement of the entire sums, he has nothing to do with the levying and collecting of the revenues, except the proceeds of the customs tariff (from 17,000,000 to 20,000,000 florins) and some other small miscellaneous receipts which come into his treasury. The two separate legislatures must provide and pay over the balance of the sums as voted by the delegations, in the proportions which they must separately agree upon, and which, under the compromise now expiring, was 68.8 per cent. from Austria and 31.4 per cent. from Hungary. All taxes are separately voted, as they may separately be disbursed, by Cisleithania or Transleithania, each in its own jurisdiction. No superior power exists to check their extravagance or to force the fulfillment of contracts. There is no common tribunal except the common executive, who bears a different title in each country. \* \* \* The reserved rights of each monarchy are in almost perpetual conflict. In respect to tariffs, as I explained in a former dispatch (No. 23,) they are in radical antagonism. They are antagonistic in terms of their interest in taxation and in their views of foreign policy. Add to these, differences in race and language, and in history, and there appear at once ample obstructive elements in the way of agreeing to any compromise which shall definitely fix their different rights and responsibilities, their relative privileges and burdens. Almost inevitably, what pleases one branch of the empire is displeasing to the other.

The common government of such as dualism has no enviable position. Its movements must be slow and halting, if not equivocal.

As King of Hungary, the monarch received the Hungarian delegation at 1 p.m. on Wednesday, at the palace; and as Emperor of Austria, he received the Austrian delegation at 3 p.m. To each he made the same speech from the throne. It dealt only in generalities, expressing the hope that, as he had been compelled, so far, in the Oriental war to impose only ordinary burdens on his people, so it would continue to be till the war ended.

Since the Emperor's speech Count Andrassy has been interpellated in the Hungarian delegation touching his foreign policy. His opponents styled it "nebulous." He declared it to be neutral until the sphere of Austrian interests should be encroached upon, when he would know how to defend these interests. He also said that the other powers knew how

Austria had defined those interests; if he had been reticent here about them, it was because reticence was less likely to excite the susceptibility of other powers, and was conducive to the ultimate object of securing those interests. He affirmed that Austria-Hungary had full

[end of page 25]

---

liberty of action, unbound by any contract. This was in allusion to the reports of the alliance of the three Emperors. He proposed they should wait a few weeks till his Red Book should be published; and in that correspondence they would learn what had been his policy for several years, and to what it was leading. He clearly stated his conviction that the condition of the Turkish Government in the Christian provinces could not continue what it had been, and implied an admission of the necessity of revision of treaties on the Oriental question. He was confident in the assurance of protection to Austrian interests in the settlement to be made. The whole tenor of his speech confirms the conviction I have heretofore entertained, that an unwritten outline of policy to be adopted at the close of the war has been agreed upon or understood between the three imperial chanceries, and that England is more isolated than ever before in respect to the Oriental question.

I have, &c.,

JOHN A. KASSON.

[end of page 26]

---

No. 31.

Mr. Delaplaine to Mr. Evarts.

[No. 67.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,  
Vienna, May 19, 1877. (Received June 7.)

SIR: That a widely extended sympathy with the cause of Turkey in the existing conflict prevails in the kingdom of Hungary, not only among certain classes of the population and in part of the press, but with particular intensity in a minority of the members of the Diet, seems evidenced by the constant interpellations relative to the Oriental question, as well as in the forcible expressions employed, and in the sensitive and passionate demonstration of feeling. This sympathy may arise partly from a remembrance of the Russian effective agency in the suppression of the Hungarian insurrection of 1849, and in

a jealousy of the possible preponderance of the Slav element, not only within the realm, but on its immediate borders; yet more especially from a conviction of

[end of page 34]

---

the present detriment to the commerce of the country through the interruption of the navigation of the Danube, and an apprehension of its possible continuance.

This unfriendly spirit, however, could not be permitted to proceed to acts of hostility without producing incalculable evils to the empire; and I am of the opinion that the sagacious and prudent course hitherto pursued by the present leader of the foreign policy, will repress any ill-advised or premature rupture with either of the contending powers. The prevailing belief entertained here is that the war between Russia and Turkey will not only be obstinate, but also of long duration. There exist certainly weighty reasons for holding such an opinion. Still, on the other hand, there are facts which must be considered in favor of a contrary view.

The present contest is very different from the last between Germany and France. At present both the contending powers possess very reduced financial resources, as well as very impaired credit. The theater of operations, both in Europe and Asia, moreover, is a territory sparsely populated, deficient in roads and means of communication, and incapable of affording support to large armies, especially for an extended period of time, whereby the supplies must be exclusively drawn from home, and that source on both sides at a great distance removed from the scene of conflict. Whichever army may prove victorious, it cannot be maintained in the enemy's territory at the expense of the enemy, and every advance increases the cost and difficulty of its maintenance.

Accordingly it would seem unlikely that the present war, notwithstanding the alleged bravery, fanaticism, and endurance of the soldiers on both sides, may long continue; only the entry of a third power into the conflict could change the present situation and probable results. As the policy of free action declared by Austria-Hungary would allow a variance in the strict neutrality hitherto announced, accordingly as events might influence a change of attitude, it becomes necessary to attentively follow all official communications bearing upon the subject. The most recent interpellations in the Hungarian Diet, as before alluded to, emanating from the extreme left, were addressed to the minister-president. The member Iranyi inquired if the Hungarian government had adhered to the memorandum of Berlin, to the resolutions of the conference at Constantinople, and to the protocol of London; and, if in the affirmative, how it would act in order to conciliate its attitude with the terms of the treaty of Paris and with the interests of Hungary. The member Helfy interpellated the government in the following terms:

Inasmuch as the minister-president has declared that the monarchy had employed all its efforts for the maintenance of peace, and that now it used all its influence for effecting a localization of the war, the efforts for attaining this double aim having been rendered futile by the action of Russia, considering that through the events in Roumania the war

has assumed a further extension and has approached the frontier of Hungary, I desire to address the minister-president this question: Does he not believe that under such circumstances the moment has arrived for taking a firm and defined position, and does he in particular not intend to use all his influence with the minister for foreign affairs, in order to enforce, in concert with the other powers, the maintenance and observation of the treaty of Paris?

Mr. Tisza immediately replied:

The point in the treaty of Paris cited by the honorable member in reference to the Oriental question and to Roumania was not inserted for the interest of Austria-Hungary, and the member will not find in the treaty that any one power has engaged to interfere in case any other should interfere. The powers have the right certainly, but only in the case of aggression, and this case is not presented now; for it is not as aggressors, as we well know, but in pursuance of a previous agreement that the Russians have entered this country. Roumania is not neutralized by the treaty of Paris, Austria-

[end of page 35]

---

Hungary has no reason to regret it, and we should hesitate even to accept in future a condition of this kind. I have already said that Austria-Hungary would not suffer the creation of a new state of things at the frontiers which might become a source of danger to her, and the government would adopt, in order to prevent such an eventuality, all such measures as the situation might demand.

This is all that I can say to-day upon this subject. There is exists between members of the Diet and the government a material difference with regard to responsibility. A member may express his wishes, and exhibit at will the most flattering ideas, while the government, on the other hand, is held accountable for every word uttered. It is obliged sometimes to keep silence, even when it sees the measures pursued by it with the most honest intentions, qualified, now on one side, then on the other, with epithets of treason to the country. Now, a similar expression should not be employed, excepting under full consciousness and conviction; precisely because such an epithet should not be used in reference even to an error inadvertently but honestly committed, therefore it should not be hastily and prematurely used. [Approbation] We follow with attention the current of public opinion and the development of events, and we shall have recourse to such measures as circumstances may require; but when a government, which has assumed all the responsibility, is so careful of the blood and treasure of the nation, that government does not deserve a reprimand, and it is not precisely such a government which deserves that, when the occasion arrives, the nation, on its part, also should not waste its blood and treasure. [Enthusiastic applause.]

The member has said that if the government asks not for instructions but a dictatorship, it would do better simply to send home the members of the Diet. Mark what takes place in England. Do not the results of the last debate signify that the hands of the government are

left free? [Cries of "very true."] The foreign policy cannot be directed by means of parliamentary instructions, and there is but one course to be pursued. If the representative body has not confidence in the government, the vote in its favor should be left in the minority, and that confidence should be accorded to another government. [Commotion] Such is constitutional usage. I know that it would be a meager consolation to Hungary if history should one day say, "It was the Tisza ministry which caused Hungary's ruin!" Although I have the firm hope that we shall succeed, through our patriotic efforts, in preserving the country from every danger, still I wish, in order that the government may act freely during the recess, to induce the chamber to pronounce before separation upon the question of knowing if it has sufficient confidence in the government, in order to leave with it the direction of affairs."

The chamber accepted this answer by a large majority.

Both parliaments, Austrian and Hungarian, have voted a lengthened adjournment, to take place on the occasion of the Whitsuntide holidays.

The former have decided to occupy the interval before reassembling, in pursuance of an invitation of the city of Trieste, in a visit and examination of the new maritime constructions of that city, and afterwards also of the naval arsenal at Pola, returning by the new railway through the province of Istria, for the purpose of inspecting that work.

I have, &c.,

J. F. DELAPLAINE.

---

---

No. 32.

Mr. Delaplaine to Mr. Evarts.

[No. 77.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,  
Vienna, June 28, 1877. (Received July 16.)

SIR: In the sitting of the Hungarian Diet on the 26th, the debate on the Oriental policy of the government was continued.

Count Albert Appony declared, amid the plaudits of the chamber, that he and his colleagues of the conservative party were in favor of a conservative policy in the Oriental question, and for the maintenance of Turkey, and that the best means for assuring protection to the interests of the country consisted in manifesting respect for treaties. Upon this

[end of page 36]

---

point, said the orator, the feelings of the nation are so unanimous that it would seem as if the government could scarcely lend itself to any policy opposed to the national sentiment.

Mr. Benjamin Kallay, a former consul-general of Austria-Hungary at Belgrade, endeavored to demonstrate that Panslavism, so far as it aimed at a union of all the Slave populations of Europe, did not actually have existence. The Slave population who were not Russians did not in the least admit that Russia had for its mission the regeneration of Europe. The struggle by Russia for the possession of Constantinople had lasted during many past generations, and although it may still meet interruptions, he believed that the result would yet be accomplished. He deprecated, however, the formation of new states at the frontiers, which might become a danger to the monarchy; yet he hoped that the struggle now engaged in might prove a final one. He insisted that reforms were indispensable in Turkey, but all attempts had been wrecked; while he regarded the nation as doomed to decay under the theocratical form of Islamism, which absorbed all lawful rights.

The orator, in terminating, expressed his approval of the policy hitherto followed by the government, and his conviction that no fear need be entertained, whatever turn events might assume.

The minister-president, Tisza, rose to speak, while silence and profound attention prevailed in the chamber. He declared that it was an erroneous assertion frequently advanced that the policy followed was in opposition to public opinion, which he explained, however, by the fact that the antagonists of that policy, by their constant association with each other, readily and *bonf fide* held to and believed as the public opinion of the country that which was simply the sentiment of their political friends.

Further, if the government had listened to and followed the suggestions of certain members, at least six hundred thousand children of the country would have been withdrawn from their occupations and their families, and some hundreds of millions in fresh imports and charges would have laid upon the shoulders of the nation. And what would have been the object of such a course? To protect our interests? They have been already protected, without such sacrifices. He believed when the public opinion shall be enlightened and become aware of this, its verdict will be that the government has acted wisely.

It has been incessantly repeated that while the nation possesses a powerful and valiant army, it is unnecessary to follow a timid and reserved policy. To that he would reply that if the army is well equipped the merit of that does belong to those who have constantly opposed the appropriations for that purpose. Besides, a powerful army does not present a reason for engaging in premature action, but, on the contrary, it affords us the ability to await tranquilly the march of events. That he would still add one observation to those who uttered praises of the army, and that was, that in this respect they were quite correct,

but, on the other hand, that various expressions of distrust and suspicion against certain officers of the army were inappropriate, and should at least have been refrained from. He would not pretend that members of the army had not, like others, their sympathies and their antipathies; but what he would sustain was, that in the army reigned the sense of duty, and that it would accomplish this duty with enthusiasm and under all circumstances.

The Hungarian minister-president then referred to his preceding declarations. The policy of the monarchy has reserved for itself a full and entire freedom of action, and no power accuses it of entertaining

[end of page 37]

---

subversive tendencies. In relation to the presumed occupation and to the mobilization, nothing had been decided at the last ministerial council, where the question had been brought forward. He did not pretend that the counsellors of the crown did not occasionally, although not in that conference, discuss generally similar eventualities, inasmuch as the contrary would indicate on their part indifference or remissness.

However, he was able to assure the chamber that within circles having the prerogative of decision no person would venture to prescribe to the ministry for foreign affairs any change in the present relations of possession and force at the frontiers. He continued to remark that, after what had just been said, he believed that it was incumbent upon him to repeat once more, that neither as regarded mobilization nor with reference to the eventuality that, according as matters might develop themselves, the army might be called to cross the frontiers at some point, could he give any binding promise for the future, because such promise was indeed impracticable, inasmuch as by such promise the monarchy would be deprived, in certain eventualities, of availing itself of the most efficient means of defending its interests. That he would further repeat the assurance that the government was bound by no engagement on any side, and he added, that for more than a year past it had often been reproached because the only idea guiding its foreign policy was the protection of the interests of the Austro-Hungarian monarchy to the exclusion of all sympathies and antipathies. He declared that the blood and treasure of the Austro-Hungarian people should be spared as far as practicable, and that no burdens should be laid upon them which could be avoided. Still he indulged the well-founded hope that when eventualities might demand, the collective populations of the monarchy would with enthusiasm and devotion respond to the call of their sovereign.

Under that conviction, he believed that they should calmly regard even the most threatening appearances, and he besought the members of the house to reflect that the constantly recurring mention of danger which did not exist indicated no manly courage. Besides, it was calculated to agitate the nerves of the people, which result might cause depression when the moment of action should arrive, and they would disbelieve the existence of danger when danger was staring them in the face.



The delivery of the speech was followed by loud plaudits of the chamber. Both the Austrian and Hungarian journals report that it has exercised a most assuring and encouraging influence. Even a telegraphic dispatch from the Emperor has been addressed to the minister-president in evidence of his satisfaction, in the following words:

MY DEAR TISZA: I cannot omit, and my love for my country urges me, to congratulate and to thank you for your patriotic speech.

A telegram from Count Andrassy followed in these words:

I congratulate you on your speech, which was so admirable that I am disposed to feel envious of you.

I have, &c.,

J. F. DELAPLAINE

Copied with permission from the Habsburg H-Net Discussion Network  
<http://www.h-net.org/~habsweb/>

Contact James Niessen for questions about the Habsburg website:  
[niessen@mail.h-net.msu.edu](mailto:niessen@mail.h-net.msu.edu)