

Carl Menger, a Public Engaged Intellectual, and Five Translations of His Newspaper Articles

RAIMONDO CUBEDDU
AND MARCO MENON

University of Pisa

Abstract: This paper presents, for the first time in English translation, five writings of Carl Menger that appeared in Austrian newspapers: *Crown-Prince Rudolf* (1889); *Survey on the Catholic University* (1901); *An Interview with Carl Menger* (1903); *The Conquest of the Universities* (1907); *The University Issue* (1908). The introduction outlines a historical contextualization of the pieces. These writings provide some vital information concerning Menger's ideas on education, university, and free scientific research. The first piece is an obituary of Crown-Prince Rudolf, and offers a rich description of Rudolf's educational path and Menger's attitude as a teacher. The other four pieces focus more on Menger's academic activity and his assessment of the Austrian cultural struggle between Catholicism and free research. It appears that, in Menger's view, the spirit of free inquiry and science is fundamentally incompatible with any religious worldview, whenever the latter affects the method of the researcher, and the results of her/his work.

Keywords: Carl Menger, Austrian School, Liberalism, Education.

INTRODUCTION

There are several reasons that justify the publication of these seemingly minor, secondary, and disparate writings by Carl Menger. One above all shall suffice: attention must be paid to anything that may contribute to shed light on the personality, thought, personal and political vicissitudes¹ of an author who unquestionably stands among the greatest, most innovative and influential economists and social philosophers of all times.

Here we present, in their first ever English translation, an obituary, two short articles on the university, and two interviews published in the Viennese press between 1889 and 1908.² Three of these writings are not even included in the bibliography attached by F. A. Hayek to Menger's *Collected Works*. Apart from cursory references, it is reasonable to maintain that these writings went almost unnoticed by historians and scholars. Though they contain no theoretical novelty or rethinking of the theses presented in the main works,³ they nevertheless reveal interesting aspects of Menger's broader worldview. He was not a "cautious conservative," as Hayek writes in his masterful essay *Carl Menger*;⁴ he was a reformer without statist or paternalistic inclinations. Rightfully, Menger can be counted as an exponent of "Josephinian"⁵ liberalism. He was recognized as such al-

ready at the time of Prince Rudolf's death (cf. Hamann 2016, p. 81). It was a highly dramatic moment in his life, as it clearly appears from the obituary published in the press the day after the Mayerling incident.

Crown Prince Rudolf (1889) appeared anonymously and therefore is not mentioned in the bibliography edited by Hayek. It is an important, heartfelt, and literally suggestive piece. Menger, without ever referring to himself, speaks passionately of Rudolf's education. He describes the Prince's voracious intellectual curiosity, cultural interests, and vast economic expertise; his distance from "Manchesterism"⁶ and protectionism; his openness to the modern world and its novelties; his sensitivity for social issues, and his mastery of socialist literature. Menger writes widely about Rudolf's sympathy for the most disadvantaged classes and his intentions to remedy misery and social inequality, reporting details of the trip to England that only an actual companion of the Prince could know. Ultimately, one gets the impression of the grief Menger suffered for his death, and cannot but conclude that the obituary outlines the profile of Menger's "ideal prince," without upsetting the imperial family.

This text not only sheds some light on the life of a man we still know very little about⁷. It also helps to unearth the context in which Menger and the Crown Prince conceived the pamphlet entitled *Der Oesterreichische Adel und sein constitutioneller Beruf* (published anonymously in 1878). It is interesting to observe how, in a court still dominated by Archduchess Sophie (Franz Joseph's mother) and Archduke Albrecht (Rudolf's uncle)—and their well-known conservative ideas about the role of the monarchy and its relations with Catholicism—an unusual decision was taken. The education of the Crown Prince was entrusted not to tutors belonging to the court circle, but to external teachers who would provide him with all the cultural knowledge of his time. The "liberal" inclination of these professors was well known to the Court, and consequently stigmatized. Interestingly, the tutor entrusted with the education of the Prince, Joseph Latour von Thurmburg, was supported by the Empress Elizabeth, but disliked by the Court for his alleged "liberal" tendencies (cf. Hamann 2016, pp. 33, 78-79). We do not know why Latour entrusted two notorious "liberals" such as Adolf Exner (professor of public law at the University of Vienna)⁸ and Menger⁹ with the task of instructing the Prince in disciplines as important and "politically sensitive" as law and economy. The relationship between the two lecturers and the Crown Prince grew far beyond the mere context of teaching,¹⁰ so much so that Exner considered Rudolf his little nephew (*kleines Nepötchen*) (cf. Coen 2007, p. 85). Similarly, the relationship with Menger brought forth not only the aforementioned pamphlet; the economist also became the companion of the Prince in his educational trips to Silesia, Switzerland, and England. During this tour they visited ports, the British Museum, the Bank of England; they met many bankers and entrepreneurs. In addition to the Empress Elizabeth, who was in England at that time, Rudolf met Queen Victoria, and became friends with the future King Edward VII. Later, on their trip back to Austria, Menger and Rudolf met Isabella II and the French President Patrice de MacMahon in Paris, Emperor Wilhelm I and Crown Prince Friedrich in Berlin (where they also met Otto von Bismarck) (Schumacher and Scheall 2020, p. 175; see also Hamann 2016, pp. 90ff). Once in Vienna, Rudolf and Menger had to face the harsh reactions aroused by the publication of *Der Oesterreichische Adel und sein constitutioneller Beruf*. Brigitte Hamann reports that the pamphlet was written during the stay in England, retells its editorial vicissitudes, and describes the reactions of the conservative newspaper *Das Vaterland*, which on various occasions suggested that the booklet was penned by Menger alone. Contributing to this rumour were, perhaps, the pamphlet's controversial remarks about the difficulty of studying political science in Austria: in particular, we are referring to the part which Hamann identified as specifically written by Menger alone. That criticism in fact reflects old complaints raised by Menger in previous writings, which he had already voiced in the *Separatvotum* of 1873.¹¹

Menger was undoubtedly one of the most important personalities Rudolf met during his educational path and intellectual life. Menger helped him to understand the relations between economic and social phenomena, and the importance of scientific innovations; he supported and enhanced his ideas on tolerance, and his repudiation of anti-Semitism and absolutism. Menger was the main source of the social policies presented by Rudolf in his writings,¹² and perhaps also of his religious ideas. Above all, he introduced the

Crown Prince into the circles of the Austrian liberal press.¹³ In fact, in 1881 Menger introduced him privately to Moriz Szeps, editor-in-chief and owner of the liberal newspaper *Neues Wiener Tagblatt*. The result was not only a journalistic and political collaboration, but above all an “unseemly” friendship¹⁴ that caused Rudolf many problems at the Court, and raised much criticism against him from the conservative press. As Hamann writes, this criticism manifested itself as a series of virulent attacks against the Crown Prince by anti-Semitic circles. Given Prince Rudolf’s friendship with Szeps, and the pre-eminence of Jews in his inner circle, the conservative press considered him a “servant of the Jews.” Moreover, since he began studying with Menger he always sided unequivocally against the discrimination of the Jews (cf. Hamann 2016, pp. 92-93, e 178ff). So much so that after Rudolf’s suicide, to Menger it “was repeatedly attributed the main responsibility for the Prince’s atheist, democratic, and republican conception of the world,” even if it seems unquestionable that his “Josephinism” was already developed *before* his meeting with the economist. From his early writings, it emerges that the Prince was “an opponent of the nobility, political Catholicism, and absolutism” already before 1876 (the year in which Menger assumed the position of his economics lecturer). As for Menger, in addition to some information about his family and his youthful journalistic activity at the *Neues Wiener Tagblatt* (a newspaper acquired in 1867 by Szeps), Hamann writes that in those years he published many articles in anonymous form. (As a lecturer of the Crown Prince, Menger was not allowed to publish in the newspapers in his own name). He wrote on economic issues, but also on several other topics. In his youth Menger acted as an “editorial secretary for the *Wiener Zeitung*,” and “led a very secluded life, as an authentic scholar; he had no family, and concentrated all his activity on the university and his own library”. He was also “very measured in his criticism of the Court and Austrian society,” “his political views did not appear in his books, but only in anonymous articles published in newspapers” (which are still almost all unidentified). Always according to Hamann, Menger’s inspiring model was the thinker and Freemason Joseph von Sonnenfels. In Menger’s library there are many books of Sonnenfels. There are also “numerous writings against anti-Semitism, the privileges of the Church, and the feudal nobility.” It is interesting to observe that “his social commitment was noteworthy, even far from obvious, for an economist of liberal orientation” (Hamann 2016, pp. 81-82, our translation). Menger’s non-socialist interest for the social question can be also inferred from his detailed review of Friedrich Kleinwächter’s *Die Grundlagen und Ziele des sogenannten wissenschaftlichen Socialismus* (Menger 1885), which contains an indirect but very informative criticism of Marx’s doctrine.

There is no clear information on how much Rudolf’s tragic death and the subsequent controversies influenced Menger’s mood. It does not seem to have had a particular influence on his scientific production, since in the immediately following years he published important essays on currency and money. Perhaps he was bolstered by his unwavering passion for teaching.

Shortly after his retirement in 1903, in an interview for the newspaper *Die Zeit* Menger talks widely about his burning passion for studying and teaching, and the desire to train not only his students, but also the future Austrian ruling class. The center of his activity as a teacher can be naturally identified with the Faculty of Law. Menger devoted much attention to the reform of the faculty’s study plan, often diverging from the prevailing orientations. However, contrary to a widespread academic custom, he did not tailor his reform proposals to his own discipline, though he was aware of the radical innovation fueled by his writings. The theoretical and practical social sciences, as well as the theory of institutions, were profoundly influenced by his groundbreaking works. Like his interlocutors, he did not ignore the strong international relevance of the Austrian School. The brief but meaningful interview we offer in its first English translation under the simple title of *An Interview with Carl Menger* (1903) sheds light on the genesis of the Austrian School. The term Austrian School was introduced disparagingly during the *Methodenstreit*. Menger used the phrase “österreichische Schule von Volkswirten” for the first time in a review in 1889 (Menger 1889; cf. Schulak and Unterköfler 2011, pp. 26-27).¹⁵ This was before the publication of the famous essays by Böhm-Bawerk, *The Austrian Economists* (1891), and by Wieser, *The Austrian School and the Theory of Value* (1891) (Respectively, Böhm-Bawerk 1891 and Wieser 1891), which made the Austrian School known even among non-Germans.¹⁶

This passion for research and teaching emerges also from three other writings: *Survey on the Catholic University* (1901), *The Conquest of the Universities* (1907), and *The University Issue* (1908). These writings must be read and studied in light of some trends that threatened the intellectual and scientific autonomy of Austrian universities. The transformation processes initiated after 1848 found a first fulfillment with the adjustment of the Austrian universities to the Prussian model (cf. Aichner 2015). The main protagonist of that reform was the Minister of Education Leopold von Thun und Hohenstein, a Catholic conservative capable of combining Prussian modernity with Austrian tradition. He found a balance between full academic freedom and the need to prevent universities from becoming vehicles of revolutionary ideas. While respecting the autonomy of the universities, his prudent political influence managed to control the appointments of professors, thus guaranteeing a certain cultural uniformity for almost a generation. After the end of his mandate in 1860, the university progressively emancipated itself from such influence to become eventually a bastion of “Josephinian” spirit. Things went differently for the public schools. Despite the rupture of the Concordat and the *Reichsvolksschulgesetz* (1868-1869), under the pressure of the conservatives the Catholic Church gradually regained a certain influence on public education. But the public school’s “re-Catholicization” process accelerated drastically thanks to the Christian-social party led by the future mayor of Vienna, Karl Lueger.¹⁷

Founded in 1893, the *Christlichsoziale Partei* was a Christian-oriented mass party that intercepted the fears and interests of the Viennese petty bourgeoisie of German nationality. However, it was neither strictly Catholic nor nationalist. For the Christian-socials, Vienna was indeed a Christian and German city, but it was nonetheless the capital of the Empire. This fact allowed them to occupy a middle-of-the-road position between nationalist and anti-Catholic pressures (the Pan-Germans of the *Los von Rom* movement), and the ultramontanist influences that instead had a strong support in the Catholic suburbs. In fact, the Christianity of the Christian-social was not so much a confessional one, as a cultural and identity-based one. This was not an unambiguous position. The party was essentially centered on the figure of Lueger, an intelligent man of great political cunning, who knew how to make the most of the “Christian-social” characterization of his party, and how to take a position according to the opportunities. Depending on the need, he was able to identify an internal or external enemy, and to gain support in his own favor often resorting to an anti-Semitism as much instrumental as effective.¹⁸ His political vision, which placed the needs of the Viennese “Christian people” at the center, was so flexible that it could simultaneously oppose Social Democrats, Jews, Pan-Germans, liberals, capitalists, and progressive elites who appeared to threaten the socio-economic equilibrium of the Viennese petty bourgeoisie. The academic world, according to his worldview, was ruled by an elite of free thinkers and Jews, and thus was to be considered with suspicion.

To counteract the progressive distancing of the universities from clerical and political control, the Christian-socials supported the project of a Catholic university in Salzburg, an idea in favor of which a *Verein* was formally established in 1884, and that the Austrian episcopate revived in 1901 (cf. Surman 2015, p. 333; Surman 2012, pp. 129, 337, 345-46) arousing a wide debate in the *Neue Freie Presse* in which Menger himself took part. The newspaper conducted a survey about the project and published it on 25 December 1901. The *Neue Freie Presse* interviewed, among others, Friedrich Jodl, Anton Menger, Eugen von Philippovich, and Ernst Mach. Menger’s contribution is a first formulation of his conception of the nature and purpose of the university. He clearly and decisively articulates the same “Josephinian” liberal spirit that had reaffirmed itself in the 1870s. Menger supported the clear-cut separation between Church and State, but above all the idea that the university, in order to live up to its task of teaching and research, must be a place of free intellectual activity not predetermined by “an object of knowledge already prescribed in advance in its decisive aspects.” Even if it is not explicitly stated, it is possible to suppose that Menger was referring to the dogmas of the Catholic faith which, having already been assumed from the outset as the content of knowledge revealed to man by God, could only be accepted on authority and defended. Obviously this does not mean that a researcher cannot adhere to a confession, or have religious convictions, but these views have no right of citizenship in the context of scientific research. Scientific activity consists exclusively in the search for truth, and the religious views of the researcher must be subordinated to the

needs of this activity. For this reason, while scientists of Catholic faith are clearly admissible, a “Catholic science” or a “Catholic university” are not admissible to the extent that they conceive a confessional characterization of research. According to Menger, scientific research is either free from presuppositions of faith or is not extant.

Lueger’s party progressively managed to gain the support of the local clergy—not without arousing the prudent distrust of the Vatican—thanks to a series of clerically-oriented legislative initiatives between 1904 and 1905 (cf. Sergio 2016, p. 288; Boyer 1995, pp. 164-174).¹⁹ Although these initiatives concerned only the schools and not the university, they were an unequivocal sign of the Christian-social religious and cultural hegemonic plan. The academic world saw itself as neutral towards politics and religion, and aimed at the preservation of the status quo, resisting as much as possible the pressure of student movements that were characterized by increasingly anti-liberal orientations (mainly Pan-German and Catholic in nature, but also socialist and Zionist).

In the summer of 1907, two documents contributed to the escalation of the conflict: the decree of the Holy Inquisition *Lamentabili sane exitu* and Pius X’s Encyclical *Pascendi Dominici Gregis*. Together, they represented a formidable condemnation of modernism, and drew a dividing line that would redefine political alliances in Austria. *Pascendi* harshly condemned what the Pope defined as the synthesis of all heresies, that is, the attempt to reconcile the Catholic faith with modern science and philosophy, in particular with the thought of Kantian derivation. In the eyes of the Catholic teaching this was equivalent to a denial of the supernatural and divine character of revelation, given that the modernists treated religion as a purely human, if not subjective phenomenon (see Vian 2012). Within the liberal and progressive circles the impression was that the Pope was pursuing a radically anti-modern crusade. He claimed the primacy of the dogma of faith and papal infallibility over scientific research, and therefore over the free circulation of ideas.²⁰ In mid-November, in a cultural and political landscape already agitated by the Encyclical and the clashes between students at the universities of Graz and Vienna, the sixth Catholic Convention²¹ took place. Lueger intervened on the 16th and his speech on the need to “re-Catholicize” the Austrian universities, probably one of the most controversial of his career, sparked a series of reactions that contributed to a further widening of the gap between the clerical and anticlerical front. The chain-reaction led to a reconfiguration of the political conflict along a path that, until that moment, had remained in the background, given the preponderance in the public sphere of various claims of cultural-national character.

In the following days, the liberal and progressive press gave ample space to the reactions to Lueger’s speech. The mayor tried in vain to run for cover with a letter addressed to ten university professors and published on November 21 in the *Neues Wiener Tagblatt*. On November 22 Tomáš Masaryk, who was professor of philosophy at Charles University in Prague and a member of parliament, with an urgency motion asked the government for guarantees against the will of the Christian-socials to stifle the freedom of research in the universities.²² On November 24, Menger published his article *The Conquest of Universities*²³ which aroused an immediate reaction from the *Reichspost*, a newspaper close to the Christian-socials, although not an official party organ. Almost a year later, a more significant reaction to Menger’s article would appear, namely Alois J. Peters’ book *Klerikale Weltauffassung und Freie Forschung. Ein offenes Wort an Professor Dr. Karl Menger*, a 400 page strong Catholic reply to Menger’s article, which literally rebuts line by line *The Conquest of the Universities*. Peters, a talented apologist, decided to reply to Menger’s little article because the founder of the Austrian School, with “rare cleverness, . . . treated or even just touched upon practically all the aspects for which . . . the ‘clerical worldview’ entails unbearable troubles for the scientific conscience, and for which . . . it seems to be scientifically unsound” (Peters 1908, p. 6).

This is the first book which deals with Menger’s worldview broadly understood. Curiously enough, it does not discuss his economic doctrine, but only his views on religion, morality, and politics, and condemns them as fundamentally flawed. According to Peters, Menger’s social philosophy is based on an unfairly prejudiced rejection of God’s existence, and therefore must be rejected as ultimately arbitrary.²⁴

Further reactions by Viennese academic personalities to Lueger's speech were published in the *Neue Freie Presse* of November 26. Among them should be noted at least those of Friedrich Jodl²⁵ and Ernst Mach. In the first days of December the parliamentary debate following Masaryk's urgency motion took place. It issued in a conciliatory resolution according to which all parties (including the Christian-social party) agreed on the need to guarantee the autonomy of the universities. The issue seemed to be settled for good. But the "Wahrmund affair" was imminent, and all the tensions accumulated in those weeks would explode in the *Kulturkampf* of the following months.

Ludwig Wahrmund²⁶ was professor of canon law at the University of Innsbruck. Politically close to the German nationalists and a liberal Catholic, he was a member of the *Leo Gesellschaft* which he left in 1902 due to his growing intolerance for the Church. In open contrast to Lueger's speech of November 16, and in the wake of the debate sparked by the Encyclical, in mid-December Wahrmund ventured into a controversy against conservative Catholics in Tyrolean newspapers. Already in this first occasion he expressed himself in a very violent way against his opponents, defining them as "parasites" that should be driven out of the universities by any means. But it was during two public conferences held on January 18 and 20, respectively in Innsbruck and Salzburg, that the tension significantly rose and that Wahrmund became a case of public relevance.²⁷

The text of the lectures was published a few weeks later. *Katholische Weltanschauung und freie Wissenschaft*²⁸ was an openly anticlerical pamphlet in which the Catholic faith was portrayed as retrograde and primitive. The dogma of the immaculate conception, as well as of papal infallibility, were attacked in a rather rude way. Wahrmund, as a university professor, was in effect an employee of the State, and as such he was protected in his freedom of research and teaching. However, since he portrayed the Catholic faith in a demeaning manner, he was perceived as having transcended the boundaries of scientific freedom, committing a crime formally punished by the penal code.²⁹ The public prosecutor of Vienna had eventually the volume confiscated. Predictably, given the already electric atmosphere after the events of the previous two months, the Catholics reacted with disdain, and vigorously protested in the streets and in the press. The situation worsened when, on March 17, *Das Vaterland* published an interview with the apostolic nuncio Gennaro Granito Pignatelli di Belmonte who declared that two weeks earlier he officially requested Wahrmund's resignation to the foreign minister Alois Lexa von Aehrenthal.³⁰ The liberal press (above all the *Neue Freie Presse*) began to defend Wahrmund as a champion of scientific freedom, and to attack the "clerical party" as dogmatic and intolerant.

The cultural conflict soon moved to the political level. By now the only distinction possible was the one between clerical and anticlerical, with the result that new tactical alliances between liberals and nationalists emerged. On May 16 the Catholic students occupied the University of Graz to counter the battle cry of the liberal press inciting anti-clerical students to protest if Wahrmund did not return to his teaching after a short period of vacation. The University had to close for the summer semester.³¹ On June 1, when Wahrmund's lectures resumed in Innsbruck, Catholic students also proclaimed a strike, and the provincial government had to decide to close the university for the entire semester. Since the suspension of Wahrmund's course was perceived as a Christian-social triumph, the liberal students, joined by the Pan-Germans, proclaimed a general strike that gradually involved all the Cisleithanian universities (Galicia excluded). On 7 June 1908 Menger expressed his opinion on the issue of the universities in an interview for the *Neues Wiener Tagblatt*.

Crown-Prince Rudolf (1889)

Kronprinz Rudolf, *Neue Freie Presse*, 31 January 1889, pp. 9-10.

Crown-Prince Rudolf was a young man who had not yet been allowed to play a role in the history of the Empire. Nevertheless, his personality awakened in the populace a realization that noble forces were ripening in this Prince, a prince who in the future would have spread an aristocratic glow all over Austria. Prince Rudolf was a figure who did not go unnoticed in the intellectual life of the country, despite the reserve his rank imposed on him. His person aroused great feelings and raised the splendor of the throne thanks to his penchant for science and art. He absorbed the essence of the modern era; he possessed a sense of the greatness of the present but also of its weaknesses and pains. Even in the last years of his life, he devoted himself with all the energy of his charming personality to the examination of the social question, to which he was driven not only by his duty as the future monarch, but also by compassion for the poor and the miserable. This sentiment arose from the depths of his soul. He wanted to make his own judgment on the great issue that triggers the struggle for the division of earthly goods. He immersed himself in the reading of socialist literature in order to obtain awareness of the duty of a monarch concerning this conflict which convulses all countries, and he made use of the results of careful research. Thus he investigated, surrounded by the most grandiose pomp, the causes of the lament that arose from the deepest layers of society. In the imperial castle, which embodies the highest power and the greatest abundance, the heir to the throne sat and reflected on the needs of the working class.

Prince Rudolf was prepared for such a study by his entire educational path. He was perhaps the first crown prince of Europe to receive a complete economic education. As a boy, when he was mature enough, he devoted himself for two years to the study of economic science at the behest of his father. This teaching was not a trivial affair, as is often the case for the children of princes, equipping them with a purely showy ability: the Crown-Prince had to attend fourteen hours of economic science lessons every week. A love for this science had already been transmitted to him by his educator, Lieutenant Marshal von Latour, a man of great economic learning. The Prince even then had many questions that were raised by the discovery of the laws that determine the development of prosperity. It was remarkable to observe the seriousness with which he followed economic disputes. He relentlessly committed himself to forming his own opinion, and in this effort he was supported by a penetrating interpretative ability and a memory that permitted him to remember every single fact and every single number. Lessons included theoretical economics, economic policy, the science of finance, and Austrian and European statistics. In these lectures the greatest freedom prevailed. Even when an interest for the most zealous care of national interests was impressed upon him, he was nevertheless presented with the fundamental doctrines of economic science in total absence of prejudice and with an approach as much distant from the Manchester School as from protectionism, whose sole purpose was, and remained, the truth. This knowledge of economic laws exerted a strong influence on the character and on the lively mind of the Prince. From his questions and observations it was possible to realize that the young man was already fully aware of his supreme calling. He always brought back the discussion to the connection between the financial situation of a state and its position of power and was tireless in illuminating all aspects of this truly pivotal issue. The thought that a poor budget and a great debt would lead to the weakening of empires never left him, and he listened with curiosity when this subject came up. He was aware of the past history of Austria, and his youthful spirit was seized by concern when fear of a return to a similar condition assailed him. Yet his warm spirit also found a way to express itself in the conversation that often followed the class. Prince Rudolf did not belong to any economic party. He was friend of the people through and through. With a meekness that otherwise only ripens with experience, he always turned his gaze to the torments of the poor and spoke favourably of the methods that a prince could use to curb misery. He was not interested in theory but in the practical possibility of pouring balm on the wounds of society. He wanted to support those who stagger, to relieve the afflicted. With the utmost dedication, he absorbed the essence of economic science, and at seventeen he spent most of his free time composing essays on economic science. Among his papers one could find about forty of these essays, which often deal

with topics of a very practical nature. He wrote a treatise on the defense of woods from devastation; on the connection between the forest law and the law on hunting; on the improvement of vine cultivation; on the necessary measures against the spruce bark beetle; on the condition and reform of agriculture. His literary ability was already manifesting itself even then, and he knew how to embellish the treatment of such sober themes with the golden thread of artistic talent. In these discussions an autonomous spirit revealed itself, which often surprised the reader with unexpected turns and original observations. In addition, the Prince maintained the freshness and naivety of a child. From all his utterances emerged love and reverence for his father, a love kindled by the utmost veneration and an unusual tenderness towards his family. Once he had become familiar with different monetary systems, he was shown a Sovereign, a Napoleon, a Golden Mark, and a piece of eight Austrian florins. He observed them closely and carefully. When the minting technique was discussed and attention was drawn to the perfect execution of the portraits of the individual sovereigns, he said, laughing, “my dad is the most handsome, isn’t he?”

The Prince’s economic education ended with an examination at which the Emperor was present, and to which the President of the Supreme Court, Anton von Schmerling, the Governor of the National Bank, Privy Councilor Pipitz, and Latour were invited as guests. The Prince was remarkable not only for his knowledge but also for the way in which he expressed his opinions. This showed that he could only absorb those intellectual elements which were authentically part of his training and not those which had been mechanically instilled in him. The Emperor favored his son’s inclination for economic issues, and so it was decided that the Prince would make a trip to the great industrialized countries in order to see with his own eyes the progress being made in technical discoveries and industry. First of all, the Prince visited the possessions of Archduke Albrecht in Silesia, which are an unrivaled model of perfect land use. At the time, American competitors had begun to exercise pressure upon European agriculture, and Archduke Albrecht decided to make a major change by switching from cereal to livestock farming. On the fields where wheat was previously planted, grass was sown for forage, and the Prince could see with his own eyes the intense alteration which European agriculture was undergoing. He was tireless in asking questions, carefully observed each machine, let himself be taught about the fertilization systems, went around the fields, and even visited the stables. Archduke Albrecht, however, is also one of the greatest Austrian industrialists. So the Prince visited the ironworks where steel is prepared in giant converters by means of the Bessemer system and then milled into rails. The Prince was subsequently a guest of Count Heinrich Larisch [von Moennich] in Karwin. There he had the opportunity to understand the connection between agricultural industries and farming, to admire systems for the perfect management of property, to visit sugar and alcohol factories, and to enter the deep shafts of a coal plant. After seeing the work of the great industries of Austrian Silesia, perhaps for the first time, he traveled to Switzerland and visited the birthplace of the well-known watch industry. Then he went to England. During these trips, he developed all the gentleness of his way of being. No one could have guessed that that traveler was the son of a powerful monarch. The Prince was always full of youthful serenity and great modesty in front of the men who accompanied him. He showed a great deal of care for the well-being of his assistants. In London he was introduced to a new world, and with unstoppable zeal he tried to examine thoroughly the foundations of the English Empire’s power, which rests on countless pennants of ships, on the chimneys that rise everywhere, and on the fabulous domination of steam engines. The Prince was genuinely interested in the traffic of this commercial state. He visited the Bank of England, which mirrored the trade of the whole world. The top officials of the Bank accompanied him on this tour, and the Crown Prince smiled when they handed him and all his assistants a million pound note to arouse in his spirit a notion of the wealth of this institution. Then he visited the famous Glyn bank where he learned about the business system of a great English private bank. He was shown the books in which were recorded millions of deposits entrusted by the public to such an institution; he caught a glimpse of the enormous scale of the business undertaken by such a company. He went to the harbor, visited the great ocean-going ships that make trade with tropical countries possible, and spent many days at the British Museum. The endurance of the Crown Prince manifested itself very clearly during a visit to this famous institute. Two ornithological collections were exhibited in a huge room, and the director of the institute reviewed

the first series, which he believed to be the most interesting, with the Prince alongside him. Prince Rudolf carefully observed the birds of distant lands. The hours passed by, the whole company was exhausted, and only the Prince fully maintained his endurance. At the end of the first series, the company hoped that the Prince might feel the need to rest. Instead, he said, “and now, let us see the second series.” Full of surprise, the Englishman exclaimed, “I never saw such tenacity in a Prince before.” After London, the prince visited the most important industrial cities of Great Britain and the factories of the famous pioneers of the English industry. In Bradford the Prince met one of the captains of English industry. In England everyone knows the name of Mr. Salt. Born to a needy family, Salt owes his immense wealth to a stroke of good luck. For some time it had been considered impossible to use Peruvian sheep’s wool in spinning. For this reason, a certain company, which had tried in vain to do so, was on the verge of failure. But one day Salt showed up to buy all its supplies of wool. The scene of this negotiation is described in a novel by Boz (Charles Dickens). Partly out of pity, and partly in jest, they sold the supplies to Salt at a ridiculously low price. He worked on it and made a fabric which he called alpaca, because sheep in Peru are called so. Salt gained enormous wealth which he used with unparalleled generosity to help the poor. The Prince also visited the factory of a man who had followed a similar path in life: the Lister plant, which is also in Bradford. Lister worked in vain for a long time to invent a machine that, by combing the woolen thread, could replace physical with mechanical strength. After spending many years in fruitless experiments, he was on the verge of despair. But one evening he observed the way his daughter combed her long blond hair before going to bed. Suddenly he had the idea of building a machine that imitated the shape of the comb, and thus the huge English worsted yarn industry was born. Later, Lister made another epochal invention. Scraps from silk production were usually thrown away and had no use. Lister built a factory to spin and weave these scraps into fabrics that were soon used throughout England. Thus the silk fleece industry was born. The Prince met yet another of these heroes of English industry. John Brown, also of humble origins, with the support of Napoleon, had discovered a procedure for milling large plates of enormous thickness. Almost all the navies of the world were armed by him. The Prince also visited the port of Liverpool and discovered something new every day. He visited a spinning mill and a steel mill in Sheffield. Nor did he remain a stranger to English intellectual life. He was a guest of the universities of Glasgow and Edinburgh, and so great was the sympathy that the heir to the throne aroused in the Scottish students that he was surrounded by an almost dangerous crowd of students and members of the public. He was always committed to broadening the scope of his knowledge and also visited Pentonville prison, which is organized according to the Pennsylvania system of individual cells. The Prince asked the inmates the reasons for their detention and was very surprised when most of them replied that they were convicted for arson. Once the tour was over, the director of the penitentiary remarked, “the poor believe it is more honorable for them to serve a sentence for arson; in truth they are murderers and thieves for the most part.” The Prince also visited Dublin, the capital of Ireland, and, full of the impressions received in Great Britain, he traveled back home via Boulogne, Paris, and Berlin. Originally, he also intended to travel to southern Europe, but, in France, news of the passing of his grandfather, Archduke Franz Karl, reached him.

These studies and travels laid the foundations of the Prince’s political and economic ideas. In his heart lived a desire for justice that made all the privileges of the social classes repugnant to him. The scion of the proudest and noblest lineage felt and thought like a citizen. A strong sympathy bound him to the men who maintained the State with their spirit and their work, and the greatest thing we can say about him is that he loved the people, whom he was meant to rule, with all his soul. All the hopes aroused by his finely formed personality are now crushed. The loss is so great that lips cannot find any word of consolation. With what fidelity he was attached to Vienna, with what sincerity he praised his country, with what pride the Prince handled the pen, he who one day should have held the scepter! He was surprised by the tragic fate that has already befallen, throughout history, so many friends of the people who stand on the steps of the throne. He wanted to help the poor of the earth, he wanted to mitigate the stark contrasts of the current situation. Now he himself is just as wretched: death, which spares neither the great nor the small, makes everyone equal.

Unspeakable is the grief of such a loss. Austria buries a man who, with daring effort, would have fought for the highest peaks, a man who was a promise for the future of our country.

Survey on the Catholic University (1901)

Die katholische Universität. Eine Enquête, *Neue Freie Presse*, 25 December 1901, p. 4.

That today's State, like the Catholic church, cannot entrust the professional training of its officials to an independent power, that the training of State servants and other officials serving public life is a *politicum* in eminent sense, can no longer be doubted by any impartial observer. Similarly, today's universities are not only institutions for the training of senior officials: they are centers of research, whose most intimate essence is the free longing for truth guided solely by the personal persuasion of the researcher—and not a yearning to pursue an object of knowledge already prescribed in advance in its decisive aspects. Therefore, that an educational institution such as the one planned for Salzburg, an institution that will be, as regards research and teaching, under the control of the episcopate, can be granted the rank and rights of a university, and in particular the right to bestow academic titles and honors, is something that must be seriously questioned.

The view that an institute of this kind is necessary due to the fact that the worldview of the Catholic Church does not find any place in research and teaching in Austrian universities is based on a lack of information. The freedom of teaching and learning that reigns in our universities bestows to any research and teaching orientation the ambit of free activity corresponding to its intrinsic value for science. Counteracting strong faith or its active expression would contradict the spirit and the whole essence of our universities. Catholics of unwavering faith have in fact often held chairs in large numbers at Austrian universities: perhaps they have never been as numerous as today. The idea that these scholars, including some who are a source of pride for science, have somehow been neglected, is so false that rather in fact the opposite is true—clearly within the limits of what is permitted by the law.

The view often spread by the opponents of free research, namely that young people at the universities are deprived of their faith, rests on an erroneous view of the influence that universities in our age have on the religious thought of the university youth. Their influence on professional training and, therefore, on future professional practice, including their influence on the deepening of general culture, is in any case very significant: indeed, decisive. In our age, so many uncontrollable influences are exercised on the religious and political opinions of the students that the universities, leaving on principle the sphere of faith to the individual conscience and to the care of the Church, claim no merit whatsoever as regards the profession of religious faith by some students. But neither do they have any responsibility for it. The universities confront all factions in the religious and political sphere in a completely neutral way.

Only the future will reveal what purpose the educational institution planned for Salzburg will really serve. It is possible that it will find its main task, in accordance with party directives, in the battle against free research and teaching. It is also possible that it will evolve into a kind of boarding school for the children of the families of the higher social classes, especially for those of them who need special help with university studies or a certain leniency with exams. In any case, it won't be a university, namely a higher education institution dedicated to free research and teaching.

An Interview with Carl Menger (1903)

Bei Karl Menger, *Die Zeit*, 19 July 1903, pp. 4-5; Die österreichische Schule, *Die Zeit*, 20 July 1903, p. 4.

He is hard to find. If you come at ten in the evening, he has not yet come home; if you ask at seven in the morning, he has already left. This physical alertness is matched by the intellectual agility of the sixty-three-year-old scholar, whose retirement, officially announced yesterday, caused great chagrin in his circle of students and admirers. I had already given up hope of being able to talk to him before he left, but then I got a letter inviting me to visit him. I met him in his comfortable fourth-floor bachelor flat in Währinger Straße,

with the windows overlooking the Votivpark: airy, large, open, just as he likes it. A sly smile appears on his distinctive face and is reflected brightly in his eyes from behind his glasses. “Yes, now my retirement has come. It was not easy. I still feel vigorous, but I know I can no longer expect too much from my health, and so I want to have leisure and quietude, not for idleness, but for the studies and works that I still want to complete.” When I ask him what these works are about, he prevaricates: “Let’s wait until they are finished.”

Then he goes on to talk about his tenure as a professor, the resignation from which was so hard for him. He said, “I have given myself body and soul to my tenure as a professor. I have been an ardent educator, and I am proud of my pedagogical achievements. My strength lay in recognizing talents and promoting them. Among my students there are some brilliant names: Böhm-Bawerk, Philippovich, Wieser, Robert Meyer, Mataja, and many others who obtained their *Venia legendi* with me. I name them with affection and pride, and my joy for these brilliant new recruits is mixed with a little melancholy for the fact that the Emperor took someone away from me by appointing him minister. But thank God there are still others, and now I can go serenely. Philippovich and Wieser remain: the former is an extraordinary social politician, who stands out as a universalist, that is, as one who unites all orientations together; Wieser, on the other hand, who has been proposed as my successor, distinguishes himself as a theorist and also for his scientific treatment of the problems of public finance. They complement each other.”

Menger’s principal exertions consisted in taking his students by the hand and explaining to them difficult scientific problems. In this he was facilitated by his psychological expertise. “I did not presuppose any prior knowledge in my students. Apart from some notions of Roman and canon law, most of them did not have a correct idea of the social sciences. First, I was concerned with bringing to life the concepts of this science in the light of the historical development, in the form of an interesting and popular lesson.” His method was successful. Menger’s reputation extended beyond Austria’s borders and attracted students from all corners to Vienna, craving knowledge. Today there are “a great many of Mengerians” [*Mengerianer in Menge*] in England, America, and especially in Italy. Jokingly, the scholar says he is “almost more famous in America today than in Austria.”

“But,” he adds, “it was a totally different thing when I started teaching. Foreigners dominated Austrian universities: [Lorenz von] Stein in Vienna, [Bruno] Hildebrand in Graz, [Peter] Mischler in Prague, [Karl Theodor von] Inama [-Sternegg] in Innsbruck. The Austrians bowed to the fame of [Wilhelm] Roscher and had a subordinate role. They simply lacked the ability to assert themselves independently.”

Menger was the first in his discipline to raise Austrian science to a level of equality. Those were years of hard battle. Today the contrasts are blurred, and the Austrian School of Economics founded by Menger has a stature recognized on an equal footing with the others.

To secure his work, Menger was attentive to the new generation. This explains the passionate dedication to his role as professor, the pedagogical subtlety with which he acted so powerfully on the malleable minds of young people. But it wasn’t easy. “Maybe you don’t know how difficult the profession of a university teacher is. The role of professor consumes the man, and this is another reason why I asked for retirement. Exams in the morning, lessons at noon. You leave one room and enter another. Often a professor loses his sense of direction. And perhaps the students also believe that the lesson was prepared without difficulty, since it was easy and entertaining. But just such a lesson requires scrupulous preparation that often keeps you busy for two or three hours. In fact, every example must be chosen with care. Everything must be examined, articulated, and arranged according to a certain point of view.” It was certainly difficult, but Menger got what he wanted. “Once upon a time, when it came to assigning social sciences teaching, people looked around for local teachers in vain; today, there are perhaps more than are required. The direction I have taken has also ensured that local teachers in social sciences are now available not only for universities but also for other educational institutions, for academies of international affairs and diplomats, and so on.”

If in the past the Austrian was looked down on, the fact that the post at the French Academy of Sciences, which remained vacant after the death of Roscher, was no longer entrusted to a German, but to an Austrian—Karl Menger himself—can also be seen as proof of a fundamental change.

When Menger talks about his students he manifests a boundless and warm affection. How he read the soul of the poor exam candidate! The student trembles and stammers and does not utter a word because of his agitation. But there he meets the friendly gaze of the professor's eyes, a brief nod in words, he takes him as if it were by the hand, and—lo and behold!—the student becomes confident, speaks and answers, and passes the exam. Many students will hold a fond memory of Menger.

Menger was not involved in politics. He had neither the time nor the will. But he follows Austrian political affairs with great attention and has harsh words of reproach for his fellow citizens, whom he loves from the bottom of his soul. “Believe me”—his voice sounded almost bitter when he said these words—“the worst enemy of the Germans are the Germans themselves. When talent emerges among another people, it is promoted and exploited, while we Germans repress it.” Menger seeks and finds his calling in his profession, in the work in which he has put his efforts and which he has created. He was filled with satisfaction for being able to say to the Minister of Education, “my pride lies in the fact that you let me go because you have someone else. The greatest merit of the university professor consists in taking care that, in time, his replacement is already present.”

The Austrian School of Economics

Court counsellor Prof. Karl Menger writes to us:

“I would be really grateful if, in view of the friendly words with which you accompanied my retirement from the University of Vienna, you would allow me to publish the following observations in your prestigious newspaper:

The “Austrian School of Economics” is by no means a personal relationship between teachers and students; it has never been something like this. The members of the group of scholars who are designated with this name are completely independent researchers bound only by certain theories (on which it is not necessary to dwell now). However, they work in different scientific areas, diverge from each other in numerous respects, and do not even remotely follow any authority. Since this group of economists attracted more attention abroad than at home, it was called the Austrian School, a denomination that has therefore become common even in our country.

The effort of this school did not consist in preventing, or even merely complicating, the reciprocal exchange of teachers between Austrian and German universities. I myself have repeatedly proposed foreigners alongside local teachers, and the Vienna Faculty of Law has always adhered to the principle that a more suitable foreign scholar should be preferred to a less suitable and less deserving local one. We have only tried, when necessary, to legitimately claim professorships in our country by means of scientific achievements.”

The Conquest of the Universities (1907)

Die Eroberung der Universitäten, *Neue Freie Presse*, 24 November 1907, p. 1.

Free research and its main centers, the universities, have always been a thorn in the side of the representatives of clerical interests. Clericalism rests on a rigidly established conception of the world, which in part corresponds to the childhood of humanity, to the beginnings of civilization. Science, on the contrary, equipped with the most refined research tools and extended to the whole globe thanks to a network of observatories and research centers, proceeds restlessly and tirelessly in its work. Its conception of the world, built on its continuously advancing conclusions, is in constant flux and cannot, for this reason, be in harmony with opinions dating back to a distant past, partly to the Babylonian and Egyptian civilizations and also to a nomadic culture. The contrast between the two conceptions is as deep as can be and is necessarily as ancient as the coexistence of rigid dogmatism and free, progressive science.

The geocentric perspective, that is the doctrine according to which our earth is at the center [of the universe] and man is the end of the whole, necessarily had to be abandoned by the academic world in the light of the new Copernican system. The same thing happened to the doctrine of the flat earth in the light of the explorations of Columbus and his successors who established beyond any doubt the sphericity of the earth. Science, following geological and paleontological researches and discoveries, could no longer remain anchored to the biblical chronology of the formation of the earth and the origin of organisms, just as it could no longer maintain the doctrine of the sinfulness of earning interest on capital and the prohibition of usury in the light of the development of modern commerce and its undeniable needs.

Absolute faith in and uncritical submission to authority, neither mitigated by the testimony of the senses nor by rational reflection—typical of the infantile, nay, old-patriarchal phase of social development—has necessarily become unsustainable in the light of the appeals of Descartes to the intellect and of Bacon to experience as criteria of scientific knowledge.

In this conflict of ideas, science and its representatives have never taken the position of the attacker. Research, in its striving for objective truth free from party interests, has quietly gone on its laborious path. The idea of exploiting the results of research against religion was for the most part foreign to the attitude of the world of scholars. If the results were not in harmony with the dogmas of religious faith, the researchers would make these results public only with hesitation, even with the greatest inner conflicts. We know of numerous examples of researchers and scholars who, in the face of the most cruel threats to life and property, did not betray their conviction. We would therefore look in vain for examples of men of science who, in the face of the most rigid dogmatism, resorted to violence or wiliness.

On the contrary, the clerical parties, when the representatives of free research had scientific reasons for dissent, have all too often persecuted and denounced them and, if endowed with the necessary power, have stolen their offices, imprisoned them, in single cases even tortured and executed them. Their falsity is evident when the representatives of objective research, if the results of their research have become uncomfortable in the eyes of the representatives of rigid dogmatism, are accused of being enemies of religion (or are even denounced as supporters of sedition and subversive ideas) by these most aggressive of all opponents.

Those who do not belong to the world of scholars might rather wonder why the representatives of objective research would show such caution in the face of the rigid dogmatism of individual religious communities. The reason for this lies in the respect that free research shows towards religious views. Such views are not the result of experience and scientific research but originate from the needs of the human soul.

Objective research never was an opponent of religion. At Austrian universities, the theological faculties have the same rights as the secular ones; no one would exert pressure on these faculties. Numerous deans, coming from these faculties, were freely elected. But now imagine the situation that would arise if the party of Dr. [Karl] Lueger actually carried out its program and “conquered” the Austrian universities. Imagine what kind of lectures on history, prehistory, astronomy, geology, paleontology, and so on, would be held at the universities thus conquered.

As for the other attacks waged against the Austrian universities in the context of the Catholic Convention, they were rejected by so many colleagues, and in so lucid a manner, that any other word about them would be superfluous. I just want to answer a single objection, because it represents the main argument with which, in certain circles, consensus is created against universities. Mr. Lueger criticized the students, as has often happened on previous occasions, because they would partly spend their time drinking and playing cards. Which is, if we leave aside the exceptions present in every profession and in all the universities of the world, definitely false. Viennese students—and what applies to them, as far as I know, also applies to students of other Austrian universities—are, like anyone who knows what is required of exam candidates, generally well prepared, eager for knowledge, and laborious. In this respect they are not second to the students of any other foreign university. It is definitely not the students’ fault if Mr. Lueger had the opportunity to observe them only at the tavern. On occasion he might also take the trouble to attend pub-

lic libraries, auditoriums, seminars, and exam rooms. Hopefully, he will discover that he has merely sought out the student who works to certify his knowledge in the wrong places.

Undoubtedly there are, in every profession, more or less efficient and diligent workers. However, the Viennese student, on average, is certainly not one of those to whom any particular criticism can be addressed. Also in this respect, Mr. Lueger missed the target by far.

The University Issue (1908)

Die Hochschulfrage. Aus einem Gespräch mit Hofrat Professor Dr. Karl Menger, Herrenhausmitglied, *Neues Wiener Tagblatt*, 7 June 1908, p. 2.

Court counsellor Prof. Dr. Karl Menger receives his visitors in his office, sitting at his desk full of books and papers. The *Wahrmund* affair and the *suspension of lectures* at Austrian universities give him a great deal to worry about.

“The Wahrmund affair,” says professor Menger, “has undeservedly become a controversy. With his pamphlet, Wahrmund did nothing but report what has already been disseminated for decades in popular-scientific literature on the subject in question. Any well-stocked private library houses a book or a pamphlet of similar content. What is remarkable in the case of Wahrmund’s pamphlet is only the skillful rearrangement of old material. In addition to this, however, Catholic theologians have demonstrated the presence of objective inaccuracies. The pamphlet would have gone absolutely unnoticed had it not been for some *tactical mistakes* that made the Wahrmund case a political one.”

Do you believe, Professor Menger, that in the current situation some specific questions of principle must be resolved, which, according to several interpretations, characterize the case?

“No, I do not think so. To overcome the difficulties in which the Government, the Parliament, and academic circles have now ended up, it is necessary to leave aside all clichés and proceed objectively and logically. *We must restore the discourse on the threat to academic freedom to its proper dimension.* I cannot envisage a campaign of conquest against the universities. Professor Masaryk presented it very clearly in his latest, great speech. Just think of the spiritual and real power available to the universities. On the one hand, universally recognized and certain scientific results; on the other, higher education institutes around the world and academic teachers who constantly work in contact with each other. How much knowledge and how much energy are gathered there! Contrast this with the speech given at the Catholic Convention by Dr. Lueger. I think in that case his temperament took over. Incidentally, the Minister of Education [Gustav] Marchet, who is generally esteemed as an honest and outspoken man, made some convincing statements about academic freedom of teaching at the budget commission.”

“Only two things,” continues Professor Menger, answering our question,

“can be points of reference for the academic authorities in *further discussion of the matter*: the *protection of the autonomy of the universities* and the question of how to *smoothly end the student strike*. The Innsbruck suspension order was justified on the basis of a ministerial rule of 1873. The ordinance exists, but in fact it was almost never observed. In the single faculties this resulted from the necessity of the circumstances. With this weak justification, therefore, very little can be done. But, on the other hand, *the behavior of the Innsbruck faculty was inconsistent*. In April they decided to suspend completely Wahrmund’s canon law course scheduled for the summer semester, while later he was given the opportunity to decide whether or not to hold the seminar. All in all, the effort to calm the current atmosphere is reduced to skilled tactics.

The only possibility that remains, after all, is that of a *compromise*. And I believe it will be found. Tactical mistakes have been made, and I guess, from certain indications, that there is awareness that mistakes have been made. *Due to superior necessities, finding a compromise will not be too difficult.*”

NOTES

- 1 Only recently, drawing on the unfinished and unpublished biography planned by Karl Menger at the end of the 1980s (whose papers are accessible at the “Menger collections at Duke University’s David M. Rubenstein Rare Book and Manuscript Library”), Scheall and Schumacher (2018, 2020) presented some important and valuable information about Menger’s family, life, and the vicissitudes concerning the legal recognition of his son Karl (see also Menger 1994; Becchio 2009).
- 2 On Menger’s activity as a journalist, see Yagi 2011, p. 18.
- 3 Namely, *Grundsätze der Volkswirtschaftslehre* (1871), *Untersuchungen über die Methode der Socialwissenschaften, und der Politischen Oekonomie insbesondere* (1883), *Zur Theorie des Kapitals* (1888), *Geld* (1892). On Menger’s thought and philosophical background, see Cubeddu 2021.
- 4 Cf. Hayek 1992. One can see the best example of it in Menger 1891. Schumacher and Scheall (2020, p. 178) write that Karl “described his father as ‘a liberal economist, with some conservative leanings’”.
- 5 As maintained in Kauder 1959, pp. 63-64.
- 6 “Manchesterism” was a British political and economic movement of the 19th century. Led by Richard Cobden and John Bright, it advocated free trade, *laissez faire*, as well as general economic and political freedom.
- 7 Apart from the essays of Scheall and Schumacher, this gap is filled only partially by Yagi’s already mentioned essays, and moreover by the obituaries written by other “Austrians” who actually knew Menger in person: Zuckerkandl 1911; Mises 1921; Schumpeter 1921; Wieser 1923 (Böhm-Bawerk died in August 1914). We are really looking forward to the biography Scheall and Schumacher are working on.
- 8 On Exner, and on his academically important family, see Coen 2007; Hamann 2016, p. 80.
- 9 On the basis of the already mentioned unfinished biography planned by Karl Menger, Schumacher and Scheall (2020, p. 172) write that it was Latour himself who invited Menger to become the Crown Prince’s teacher, and that “Franz Joseph agreed to Menger’s appointment as his son’s teacher in October 1875.”
- 10 Notes and schemes of these 1876 lectures have been published in Menger 1994.
- 11 See Menger 1887, and cf. Hamann 2016, pp. 49, 101f. On the origin of this writing, see also Schumacher and Scheall 2020, p. 174; Scheall and Schumacher 2018, p. 658.
- 12 Now collected and published in Hamann 1987.
- 13 In particular, on Menger’s collaboration with Crown Prince Rudolf, see Yagi 2011, pp. 26f. Drawing on E. W. Streissler’s introduction to Menger 2004, Yagi also writes that in these lectures one can perceive Adam Smith’s influence on Menger. This appears to be quite questionable, given what Menger himself wrote about Smith in those years. See Menger 2018, a volume comprising all the writings where Menger criticizes Smith’s doctrine.
- 14 This correspondence was published in Szeps 1922. On this theme, apart from the already mentioned essays by Scheall and Schumacher, see Ikeda 2010, p. 16.
- 15 It is important to note that Menger never used the term *Psychologenschule*, nor the term *economia pura* (“pure economy”), which would become quite popular in the later German and Italian debates on the Austrian School.
- 16 This is not a matter of secondary importance. The first edition of the *Grundsätze* was translated into English only in 1950; the *Untersuchungen* were translated in 1963.
- 17 On Karl Lueger, charismatic leader of the Christian-social party and mayor of Vienna from 1897 to 1910, see at least Geehr 1990; Boyer 1995; Boyer 2010.
- 18 According to Boyer (1981), Lueger’s antisemitism was more instrumental than actual. This is not to deny that it involved an extremely dangerous exclusion mechanism. But see also Beller 1989 for a very different interpretation, according to which antisemitism belonged to the very essence of the Christian social ideology.

- 19 For a general reconstruction of the condition of the Austrian Church at the time, see Wodka 1959, pp. 338-63.
- 20 See Arnold and Vian (Eds) 2017. In particular concerning Austria, see in the same volume Sohn-Kronthaler 2017.
- 21 On the *Katholikentage* see Hofrichter 1966, specifically pp. 38f., where Hofrichter presents the context of the Catholic Convention of 1907, and pp. 50f., where he discusses the issue of the university.
- 22 On the fascinating figure of Masaryk, see David 2020.
- 23 This article was mentioned in Coen 2007, p. 243, but the reference is not fully correct. In Cubeddu 2019, pp. 132-134, 191-193, the text is presented in its historical context, and translated for the first time in Italian.
- 24 Peters' book is nowadays difficult to find. The authors of the present article make available a digital copy of the volume to anyone interested. For a historical reconstruction and philosophical analysis of Peters' reply to Menger, see Menon 2021.
- 25 Friedrich Jodl was a moral philosopher known for his anticlerical stance. He was an active member of the *Freie Schule* association. See Fuchs 1984, pp. 149f.; Gimpl 1990; on the *Verein Freie Schule* cf. Boyer 1995, pp. 174-186.
- 26 On the "Wahrmund affair", the classical source remains Höttinger 1949; see also Geehr 1990, pp. 188-191; Boyer 1995, pp. 186-211.
- 27 Cf. Surman 2019, pp. 435-439.
- 28 Wahrmund 1908. After a short time the pamphlet received a reply by a Jesuit (Fonck 1908). As it appears from the *Katalog der Carl Menger-Bibliothek in der Handels-Universität Tokio*, Menger had a copy of Wahrmund's book.
- 29 Boyer 1995, p. 192.
- 30 The vicissitude, whose protagonists are the papal nuncio and the foreign minister Aehrenthal, has been reconstructed in detail by Wank 2020, pp. 54-56.
- 31 Cf. Johnston 1972, p. 60; Surman 2019, p. 430.

REFERENCES

- Aichner, C. 2015. The Reforms of the Austrian University System 1848-1860 and their Influence on the Process of Discipline Formation. In: Simões, A., Diogo, M. P., Gavroglu, K. (eds.). *Sciences in the Universities of Europe, nineteenth and twentieth Centuries. Academic Landscapes*, pp. 293-309. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Becchio, G. (ed.). 2009. *Unexplored Dimensions: Karl Menger on Economics and Philosophy (1923-1938)*. Bingley: Emerald.
- Beller, S. 1989. *Vienna and the Jews, 1867-1938: A Cultural History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Böhm-Bawerk, E. 1891. The Austrian Economists. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences* 1(1): 361-384.
- Boyer, J. W. 1981. *Political Radicalism in Late Imperial Vienna: Origins of the Christian Social Movement*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- _____. 1995. *Culture and Political Crisis in Vienna. Christian Socialism in Power, 1897-1918*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- _____. 2010. *Karl Lueger (1844-1910). Christlichsoziale Politik als Beruf*. Wien: Böhlau.
- Coen, D. R. 2007. *Vienna in the Age of Uncertainty. Science, Liberalism & Private Life*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press.
- Cubeddu, R. 2019. *Individualismo e religione nella Scuola Austriaca. Con in Appendice un articolo di Carl Menger La conquista delle università 1907*. Pisa: Edizioni ETS.
- _____. 2021. *Il valore della differenza. Studi su Carl Menger*. Livorno: Salomone Belforte.
- David, Z. V. 2020. *Tomáš G. Masaryk a Scholar and a Statesman: The Philosophical Background of His Political Views*. Budapest: Helena History Press.
- Fonck, L. 1908. *Katholische Weltanschauung und freie Wissenschaft: das wissenschaftliche Arbeiten Professor Wahrmunds*. Innsbruck: Rauch.
- Fuchs, A. 1984. *Geistige Strömungen in Österreich, 1867-1918*. Wien: Löcker Verlag.
- Geehr, R. 1990. *Karl Lueger. Mayor of Fin de Siècle Vienna*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press.
- Gimpl, G. 1990. *Vernetzungen. Friedrich Jodl und sein Kampf um die Aufklärung*. Oulu: Universität Oulu.
- Hamann, B. (ed.). 1987. *Kronprinz Rudolf. «Majestät, ich warne Sie...». Geheime und private Schriften*. München: Piper.
- _____. 2016. *Kronprinz Rudolf*. München-Berlin: Piper.
- Hayek, F. A. 1992. Carl Menger. 1840-1921. In: *The Collected Works of F.A. Hayek*, Vol. IV, *The Fortunes of Liberalism. Essays on Austrian Economics and the Ideal of Freedom*, ed. P. C. Klein, pp. 61-107. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Hofrichter, P. 1966. *Die österreichischen Katholikentage des 20. Jahrhunderts (bis 1933)*. Wien: Universität Wien.
- Höttinger, M. 1949. *Der Fall Wahrmund*. Wien: Universität Wien.

- Ikeda, Y. 2010. Carl Menger's Liberalism Revisited. In: Hagemann, H., Nishizawa, T., Ikeda, Y. (eds.). *Austrian Economics in Transition*, pp. 3-20. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Johnston, W. M. 1972. *The Austrian Mind: An Intellectual and Social History, 1848-1938*. Berkeley, Los Angeles and London: University of California Press.
- Kauder, E. 1959. Menger and His Library. *Economic Review* 10(1): 58-64.
- Menger, C. 1887. Separatvotum des Professor Dr. Karl Menger betreffend die Stellung der Volkswirtschaftslehre, der Statistik und Staatsrechnungswissenschaft im Studienplan. In: *Gutachten und Anträge zur Reform der juristischen Studien*, erstattet von den rechts- und staatswissenschaftlichen Fakultäten der österreichischen Universitäten, pp. 55-60. Wien.
- _____. 1889. Nationalökonomische Literatur in Oesterreich. *Wiener Zeitung*, 7 March 1889: 2-4.
- _____. 1891. Die Social-Theorien der classischen National-Oekonomie und die moderne Wirthschaftspolitik. In: *The Collected Works of Carl Menger*, Vol. III, ed. F. A. Hayek, pp. 219-245. London: The London School of Economics and Political Science, 1935.
- _____. 1895. Rezension von Friedrich Kleinwächter, «Die Grundlagen und Ziele des sogenannten wissenschaftlichen Socialismus». *Zeitschrift für privates und öffentliches Recht der Gegenwart*, 12(1): 639-644.
- _____. 1994. *Carl Menger's Lectures to Crown Prince Rudolf of Austria*, eds. Streissler, E. W. and Streissler, M. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- _____. 2018. *Scambio, valore e capitale. Scritti su Adam Smith*, ed. R. Cubeddu. Torino: IBL Libri.
- Menger, K. 1994. *Reminiscences of the Vienna Circle and the Mathematical Colloquium*, eds. Golland, L., McGuinness, B., and Sklar, A. Dordrecht: Springer Science.
- Menon, M. 2021. Un'ignorata risposta cattolica a Menger: il libro di Alois J. Peters "Concezione clericale del mondo" e "libera ricerca", del 1908. In: Cubeddu, R., Menon, M. (eds.). *Un altro Menger. Scritti polemici*. Macerata: Liberilibri, pp. 229-286.
- Mises, L. 1921. Karl Menger. *Neues Wiener Abendblatt*, 26 February 1921: 1.
- Peters, A. J. 1908. "Klerikale Weltauffassung" und "Freie Forschung". *Ein offenes Wort an Professor Dr. Karl Menger*. Wien: Georg Eichinger.
- Scheall, S. and Schumacher, R. 2018. Karl Menger as Son of Carl Menger. *History of Political Economy*, 50(4): 649-678.
- Schulak, E. M. and Unterköfler, H. 2011. *The Austrian School of Economics. A History of Its Ideas, Ambassadors, and Institutions*. Auburn: Ludwig von Mises Institute.
- Schumacher, R. and Scheall, S. 2020. Karl Menger's Unfinished Biography of His Father: New Insights into Carl Menger's Life through 1889. In: Fiorito, L., Scheall, S., Supryniak, C. E. (eds.). *Research in the History of Economic Thought and Methodology: Including a Symposium on Economists and Authoritarian Regimes in the 20th Century*, pp. 155-189. Bingley: Emerald.
- Schumpeter, J. A. 1921. Carl Menger. *Zeitschrift für Volkswirtschaft und Sozialpolitik*, 1(1): 197-206.
- Sergio, M. L. 2016. Le «imperiose esigenze della conservazione sociale». Il cattolicesimo politico in Austria e nel Tirolo nella corrispondenza della Segreteria di Stato vaticana (1904-1911). *Studi Germanici*, 9(1): 285-347.
- Sohn-Kronthaler, M. 2017. "Petrus locutus est per Pium". The Reception of Pascendi dominici gregis in Austria as Reflected in Episcopal Sources (1907-1914). In: Arnold, C., Vian, G., (eds.). *The Reception and Application of the Encyclical Pascendi*, pp. 93-107. Venezia: Edizioni Ca' Foscari.
- Surman, J. 2015. Imperiale go-betweeners. Józef Dietl und Tomáš Garrigue Masaryk zwischen Imperium, Wissenschaft und Nationalpolitik. In: Buchen, T., Rolf, M. (eds.). *Eliten im Vielvölkerreich: Imperiale Biographien in Russland und Österreich-Ungarn (1850-1918)*, pp. 311-337. Berlin-Boston: De Gruyter.
- _____. 2012. *Habsburg University 1848-1918: Biography of a Space*. Wien: Universität Wien.
- _____. 2019. University scandals and the public sphere of Imperial Austria. *European Review of History—Revue européenne d'histoire*, 26(3): 428-452.
- Szepe, J. (ed.). 1922. *Kronprinz Rudolf: Politische Briefe an einen Freund 1882-1889*. Wien: Rikola.
- Vian, G. 2012. *Il modernismo. La Chiesa cattolica in conflitto con la modernità*. Roma: Carocci.
- Wahrmund, L. 1908. *Katholische Weltanschauung und freie Wissenschaft: ein populärwissenschaftlicher Vortrag unter Berücksichtigung des Syllabus Pius X und der Enzyklika "Pascendi Dominici Gregis"*. München: Lehmann.
- Wank, S. 2020. *In the Twilight of Empire. Count Alois Lexa von Aehrenthal (1854-1912). Imperial Habsburg Patriot and Statesman. Volume 2: From Foreign Minister in Waiting to de facto Chancellor*, eds. Adlgasser, F., Höhn, M., Knaak, A. Wien: Böhlau.
- Wieser, F. 1891. The Austrian School and the Theory of Value. *The Economic Journal*, 1(1): 108-121.
- _____. 1923. Karl Menger. In: *Neue österreichische Biographie: 1815-1918*, vol. 1, pp. 84-92.
- Wodka, J. 1959. *Kirche in Österreich. Wegweiser durch ihre Geschichte*. Wien: Herder.
- Yagi, K. 2011. *Austrian and German Economic Thought. From subjectivism to social evolution*. Abingdon-London: Routledge.
- Zuckerkindl, R. 1911. Menger, Karl. *Zeitschrift für Volkswirtschaft, Sozialpolitik und Verwaltung*, 19(1): 251-264.