

Peter Geiger / Tomáš Knoz / Eliška Fučíková /
Ondřej Horák / Catherine Horel / Johann Kräftner /
Thomas Winkelbauer / Jan Županič

Czech-Liechtenstein Relations Past and Present

A Summary Report

by the Czech-Liechtenstein Commission of Historians / English Edition



Czech-Liechtenstein Relations Past and Present
Summary Report

Publications by the Czech-Liechtenstein Commission of Historians

Summary Report, English Edition

Members of the Czech-Liechtenstein Commission of Historians

Peter Geiger, Schaan, Co-Chairman

Tomáš Knoz, Brno, Co-Chairman

Eliška Fučíková, Prague

Johann Kräftner, Vaduz-Vienna

Thomas Winkelbauer, Vienna

Tomáš Dvořák, Brno (since 2015)

Ondřej Horák, Olomouc (since July 2012)

Ferdinand Trauttmansdorff, Vienna (since 2015)

Marek Vařeka, Ostrava (until June 2012)

Catherine Horel, Paris (until 2014)

Jan Županič, Prague (until 2014)

Secretaries

Petra Sojková, Brno

Sandra Wenaweser, Schaan (until 2014)

Alexandra von Reden, Vienna (2015–2017)

Sophie Wistawel, Vienna (since 2017)

Peter Geiger / Tomáš Knoz / Eliška Fučíková / Ondřej Horák /
Catherine Horel / Johann Kräftner / Thomas Winkelbauer / Jan Županič

Czech-Liechtenstein Relations Past and Present

A Summary Report by the Czech-Liechtenstein Commission
of Historians

English Edition

Vaduz 2020

hwfl

This Summary Report was written and unanimously adopted by the Commission of Historians in December 2013 in German, then translated into Czech and published in both languages.

First published 2014 in German (Vaduz) and in Czech (Brno)

English Edition, Vaduz 2020

Translated by Graeme Dibble, reviewed by Abigail Ryan Prohaska and by the Czech-Liechtenstein Commission of Historians

Copyright © 2020 Verlag des Historischen Vereins für das Fürstentum Liechtenstein, Vaduz, and the Czech-Liechtenstein Commission of Historians

Printed by Druckerei Gutenberg, Schaan / Liechtenstein

ISBN 978-3-906393-90-2

Cover: Lednice (Eisgrub), Liechtenstein Castle, the garden façade in English Neo-Gothic, built in 1842–45 by Georg Wingelmüller and Johann Heidrich according to plans by Peter Hubert Desvignes

© LIECHTENSTEIN. *The Princely Collections, Vaduz–Vienna*

Contents

A Word of Introduction	7
Foreword	9
Preface to the English Edition	11
I. Introduction	13
a. The Czech-Liechtenstein Commission of Historians and its activities 2010–2013	15
b. Sources, literature, research, methods	23
II. The Liechtensteins in the course of time	27
a. The Middle Ages and the Early Modern Age (c. 1100–1805)	29
b. The 19th Century	48
c. The 20th Century	59
III. Main issues	71
a. Sites of memory and constructing a historical image of Liechtenstein	73
b. The Liechtensteins and art	93
c. Land reform and confiscatio	130
IV. Conclusions	171
a. Summary theses	173
b. Desiderata and possible further steps	180
c. Prospects	183
Appendix	185
a. Archival sources	187
b. Source editions	192
c. Literature	194
Workshops and publications	229
a. Workshops	231
b. Publications by the Czech-Liechtenstein Commission of Historians	240
Index	243

A Word of Introduction

This joint summary report by the Czech-Liechtenstein Commission of Historians represents an important milestone in the relations between both of our countries. On the one hand, the Commission of Historians examined the joint history of Bohemia, Moravia and Silesia, as well as the House of Liechtenstein, while on the other, they looked at the relations between both our countries in the 20th century. The commission's findings have contributed greatly towards better mutual understanding and have created a valuable basis for the continued cooperation between the two countries.

The depth and thoroughness of this three-year work by the Commission of Historians is impressive, and this extensive publication sheds light on the remarkable and still visible mark that the House of Liechtenstein left behind on Bohemia, Moravia and Silesia. The Commission of Historians also examined complex periods in the relations between our two countries and identified issues which both sides see differently. It is therefore incumbent on both of our countries to assess the wide-ranging results of the Commission of Historians and make them accessible to the general public so as to deepen our mutual understanding and overcome stereotypes. We share the Commission's opinion that we should build on the positive aspects of our shared history.

The Commission of Historians' work represents the public image of the positive development in the relations on both sides following the re-establishment of diplomatic ties on 8 September 2009. Political, economic and cultural cooperation has reached a remarkable level over a relatively short period of time. The atmosphere of trust creates room for even more fundamental cooperation and allows for current issues of interest to be studied in more depth.

Jan Kohout
Minister of Foreign Affairs

Aurelia Frick
Minister of Foreign Affairs

Vaduz / Prague, 13th January 2014

Foreword

Following three years of work the Czech-Liechtenstein Commission of Historians presented its summary report to the people and governments of the Czech Republic and the Principality of Liechtenstein.

In 2009 the Czech Republic and Liechtenstein established diplomatic ties, thus ameliorating a situation which had lasted since 1945. In 2010 the governments of both countries established a commission of historians in order to examine the development of relations within the context of their rich history to the present day.

The basis of this report, which concluded the work of the Commission of Historians in 2013, was formed by four, two-day academic workshops which were attended by between twelve and eighteen speakers; this yielded the publication of four books of conference proceedings with around sixty essays in a German and a Czech edition. In addition, several academic projects were commissioned which were either published as part of the conference volumes (projects commissioned from the Czech contingent of the Commission), or as an independent publication (the Liechtenstein contingent of the Commission). The results of the projects were also included in the conference proceedings. Three German-language research volumes were additionally published from the Liechtenstein work. Commission members also carried out their own research work. They also collaborated with various specialists and institutions, which mainly included archives, museums and universities in Brno (Brünn) and Prague. Throughout the period, the Commission was involved in discussing and assessing various issues regarding Czech-Liechtenstein relations.

The Commission has presented the summary report in a concise, compact and readable form in four main chapters. The Introduction (Chapter 1) contains the basis, assignment and mandate of the Czech-Liechtenstein Commission of Historians, as well as describing its activities from 2010 to 2013, the character and scope of the sources and literature, and a summary of the methods used.

A historical overview of the Princely House of Liechtenstein (chapter II) guides the reader through its ancestral history from the Middle Ages to the present, following the continuity as well as historical upheavals that it experienced, especially in the 17th and 20th centuries. From the 18th century on, the Liechtensteins were also the reigning princes of the Principality of Liechtenstein, which meant that Czech-Liechtenstein relations took on the character of relations between two states.

In the chapter entitled Main Issues (chapter III), historical images and stereotypes are looked at as “sites of memory”, which interconnect Liechtenstein and the Lands of the Bohemian Crown to this day. The next subchapter looks at art and its place in the history of the Princely House of Liechtenstein as a means of ancestral representation. Important and still current themes address the family’s reaction to the foundation of Czechoslovakia, the introduction of land reform after 1920, the attitude of the Liechtensteins both before and during the Second World War, and during the post-war period of confiscation

On the basis of its research, the Commission formulated certain conclusions, put forward open questions and research desiderates, also modest recommendations.

The Commission of Historians, consisting of four specialists each from the Czech and Liechtenstein sides, worked independently, academically and in a collegial atmosphere. The summary report was unanimously approved by all the members of the Commission.

The Commission is grateful for the help and cooperation of all of the speakers, authors, researchers, archives, institutions which held workshops, universities in Vienna, Prague and Brno, representatives from both governments, both ministries of foreign affairs, and in particular the two Commission secretaries, Sandra Wenaweser and Petra Sojková.

The Czech-Liechtenstein Commission of Historians:

*Peter Geiger / Tomáš Knoz / Eliška Fučíková / Ondřej Horák /
Catherine Horel / Johann Kräftner / Thomas Winkelbauer / Jan Županič*

Brno / Schaan, 31th December 2013

Preface to the English Edition

In December 2015 the Czech-Liechtenstein Commission of Historians received a new mandate given jointly by the governments of the Principality of Liechtenstein and of the Czech Republic. One of the goals of this new mandate is to spread the knowledge of the common history of both countries.

The Commission, partly renewed, has decided, among other activities, to publish an English edition of its Summary Report in addition to the German and Czech language versions. Thus, researchers, universities, media and interested individuals all over the world will have an easier access to its content and to a better understanding of the often unknown relations between the Czech Republic and the Principality and family of Liechtenstein. These relations date back to the Middle Ages and underwent dramatic changes during the 20th century, the consequences of which are felt even at the present time.

The English version of the Summary Report has been translated and published without changing the content of the already published language versions. An index has been added.

The Czech-Liechtenstein Commission of Historians:

*Peter Geiger / Tomáš Knoz / Tomáš Dvořák / Eliška Fučíková / Ondřej Horák /
Johann Kräftner / Thomas Winkelbauer / Ferdinand Trauttmansdorff*

Vaduz / Brno, 24th May 2019

I. Introduction

a. The Czech-Liechtenstein Commission of Historians and its activities 2010–2013

(1) Background, objectives

In Prague on 8 April 2009, the Liechtenstein Minister of Foreign Affairs, Aurelia Frick, and the Czech Minister of Foreign Affairs, Jan Kohout, signed a “Joint declaration on establishing diplomatic relations between the Principality of Liechtenstein and the Czech Republic.”¹ In addition they issued a “Memorandum of understanding on the future Co-operation between the two countries”. Among other things this document also established a “*joint Czech-Liechtenstein Commission of Historians,*” which was to address “*the joint history of Bohemia, Moravia and Silesia and the Princely House of Liechtenstein, as well as relations between the two countries during the 20th century,*” with the objective of “*contributing towards the mutual understanding of their common history, their hopes and challenges, and in so doing, create a sustainable basis for future fruitful cooperation.*”²

The establishment of the Czech-Liechtenstein Commission of Historians was an important part of the process of restoring diplomatic relations. The Commission was to shed light on historical issues that left the situation existing since 1945 deadlocked.

On 7 April 2010, the ministers Aurelia Frick and Jan Kohout signed a special “Memorandum of Understanding” in Vaduz, the subject of which was the establishment of the Czech-Liechtenstein Commission of Historians. The document repeated the objectives and outlined work methods, financing and public relations. The work of the Commission of Czech-Liechtenstein Historians was to be independent of any political bodies.³

¹ Joint declaration from 8th of September 2009, in: Horčička/Marxer (publications of the Czech-Liechtenstein-Commission of Historians, vol. 7, Vaduz 2013, p. 236.

² Memorandum of Understanding from 8th September 2009, *ibid.*, pp. 237–239.

³ Memorandum of Understanding from 7th April 2010, *ibid.*, pp. 239–240.

(2) Appointments, composition, establishment

The Commission was established for three years and the ministers appointed a total of eight academics, with four from Liechtenstein and four from the Czech Republic. Each then appointed one co-chairperson.

Liechtenstein:

PD Dr. *Peter Geiger* (Co-Chairman), historian, Schaan

Prof. Dr. *Catherine Horel*, historian, Paris

Dr. *Johann Kräftner*, art historian, Vaduz – Vienna

Prof. Dr. *Thomas Winkelbauer*, historian, Vienna

The Czech Republic:

Prof. PhDr. Mgr. *Tomáš Knoz*, Ph.D. (Co-Chairman), historian, Brno

PhDr. *Eliška Fučíková*, CSc., art historian, Prague

Doc. PhDr. *Jan Županič*, Ph.D., historian, Prague

PhDr. *Marek Vařeka*, Ph.D., historian, Hodonín (until June 2012)

JUDr. Mgr. *Ondřej Horák*, Ph.D., legal historian, Olomouc (from June 2012)

Each party appointed one commission secretary:

Liechtenstein: *Sandra Wenaweser*, translator, Schaan

Czech Republic: Mgr. *Petra Sojková*, specialist in German studies, Brno

The Commission began work in Vienna in December 2010. During its first meeting it established rules of procedure, a study plan and timetable.

(3) Financing

Each of the participating countries bears the costs for its appointed commission members and the work of researchers employed by the particular party. The prince contributed towards half of the costs of the Liechtenstein commission.

(4) Work methods

Each year the Commission had between three and four work meetings, which were organised and presided over by the co-chairmen. The Commission also organised academic workshops and commissioned several research projects. Outside of the meetings, the internal communication between the members of the Czech-Liech-

tenstein Commission of Historians was mainly carried out in advance electronically, and in work meetings.

The Czech-Liechtenstein Commission of Historians regularly updated both ministries of foreign affairs on their activities, also through annual reports.

The co-chairmen of the Czech-Liechtenstein Commission of Historians occasionally informed the public of its activities through the media, both in Liechtenstein and in the Czech Republic.

The Czech-Liechtenstein Commission of Historians worked independently and professionally in a friendly and collegial atmosphere.

(5) Work meetings

The inaugural session of the Czech-Liechtenstein Commission of Historians took place on 16 December 2010 in Vienna, followed by the first work meeting on the same day. Over the course of the three years there was a total of 11 work meetings:

1st meeting	Vienna	16	December 2010
2nd meeting	Prague	10	February 2011
3rd meeting	Bučovice	11	April 2011
4th meeting	Vienna	16	June 2011
5th meeting	Vranov u Brna	12	November 2011
6th meeting	Prague	6	February 2012
7th meeting	Vienna	18	June 2012
8th meeting	Brno	3	December 2012
9th meeting	Prague	25	April 2013
10th meeting	Schaan	27	September 2013
11th meeting	Prague	13	December 2013

(6) Workshops

The Czech-Liechtenstein Commission of Historians organised four academic workshops. Each of these was attended by between 12 and 18 speakers as well as other discussants.

11 – 12 November 2011, Vranov u Brna

Liechtenstein Places of Memory in the Bohemian Lands

18–19 June 2012, Vienna

The Liechtensteins: Continuities – Discontinuities

2–4 December 2012, Brno

The Liechtensteins and Art

26–27 April 2013, Prague

The Princely House of Liechtenstein, Liechtenstein and Czechoslovakia in the 20th Century

More than 60 papers were given at the four aforementioned seminars. Other leading academics were present at the workshops as lecturers and discussants. The interdisciplinary approach of the workshops was guaranteed by inviting experts from various academic backgrounds. In addition to historians there were also art historians, sociologists, lawyers, political scientists, landscape architects, geographers and musicologists. The interdisciplinary approach and diversity of methods infused discussions with a fruitful vitality.

The plurality of the institutions was also reflected in the institutions from where the experts came: Masaryk University Brno, Charles University Prague, Ostrava University, Palacký University in Olomouc, the Mendel University of Agriculture and Forestry Brno, Universität Wien, Universität Zürich, the History Department and the Department of Art History of the Czech Republic Academy of Sciences, the Moravian Regional Archive, Liechtenstein-Institut Bendern, Prague City Archive, Liechtenstein-The Princely Collections, Vienna-Vaduz.

The Czech-Liechtenstein Commission of Historians has published the results of these workshops in four compact and comprehensive volumes in both Czech and German.

(7) Research projects

The Czech-Liechtenstein Commission of Historians commissioned a series of specific research projects. The Liechtenstein section of the Commission initiated and financed six extensive research projects which were published in German in separate publications as part of the Liechtenstein version of the publication board of the Czech-Liechtenstein Commission of Historians. The researchers also spoke at the aforementioned Commission workshops. With the help of Masaryk University's Faculty of Arts (Philosophy), the Czech section of the Commission initiated and financed four smaller projects that were presented as part of the Commission's

workshops and published in German and Czech in the four workshop volumes of the Commission.

The aforementioned extensive research projects initiated by the Liechtenstein section are:

- Christoph Maria Merki: *Liechtensteinische Güter und Rechte in Böhmen, Mähren und Schlesien vom Spätmittelalter bis ins 20. Jahrhundert. Zur Besitzgeschichte der grenzüberschreitenden Dynastie Liechtenstein* [The land holdings and rights of the Liechtensteins in Bohemia, Moravia and Silesia from the Late Middle Ages to the 20th century. The history of the possessions of the transboundary dynasty of the Liechtensteins.]
- Josef Löffler: *Die Verwaltung der Herrschaften und Güter der Fürsten von Liechtenstein von der Mitte des 18. Jahrhunderts bis 1948* [The administration of the dominions and land holdings of the Princes of Liechtenstein in the Czech lands from the mid-18th century until 1948].
- Susanne Keller-Giger: *Zwei Länder – ein Fürstenhaus. Ein Beitrag zur wechselvollen Geschichte der Beziehungen zwischen dem Fürstentum Liechtenstein und den böhmischen Ländern, der Tschechoslowakei und der Tschechischen Republik* [Two countries – one princely house. A contribution to the rich and eventful history of the relations between the princely house of Liechtenstein and the Czech lands, Czechoslovakia and the Czech Republic.]
- Rupert Quaderer: *Liechtenstein und die Tschechoslowakei nach dem Ersten Weltkrieg. Versuche einer Annäherung: Bodenreform – Errichtung einer Gesandtschaft in Prag – Völkerbund* [Liechtenstein and Czechoslovakia after the First World War. Attempt to reconcile different approaches on: land reform – establishing a diplomatic representation in Prague – the League of Nations].
- Václav Horčíčka: *Die Enteignungen von liechtensteinischem Vermögen in der Tschechoslowakei 1945 bis 1948* [Confiscations of holdings of Liechtenstein citizens in Czechoslovakia between 1945 and 1948].
- Roland Marxer: *Die Beziehungen Liechtensteins zur Tschechoslowakei und zu deren Nachfolgestaaten seit dem Zweiten Weltkrieg. Nachwirkungen und Entwicklungen bis heute* [The relations between Liechtenstein and Czechoslovakia and its successor states since World War II. Consequences and further developments until today.]

The aforementioned smaller research projects initiated by the Czech section are:

- Michal Konečný: *Lednicko-valtický areál. Krajina paměti nebo odraz vzorníkové literatury?* [The Lednice-Valtice Area. The Landscape of Memory or the Reflection of a Sample of Literature?]
- Radka Miltová: *Mytologická tematika v moravských rezidencích Liechtensteinů jako součást rodové paměti* [Mythological Themes in the Liechtensteins' Moravian Residences as Part of Ancestral Memory]
- Vladimír Maňas: *Hudba na dvoře Karla I. z Lichtenštejna* [Music in the Court of Karl I von Liechtenstein]
- Karina Hoření – Alžběta Steinerová – Vojtěch Drašnar – Kamila Kohoutková: *“Vytváření Lichtenštejnů”. Současný sociologický diskurz o lichtenštejnské otázce v Česku* [“Creating the Liechtensteins”. A contemporary sociological discussion on the theme of the Liechtensteins.]

(8) Publications by the Czech-Liechtenstein Commission of Historians

The Czech-Liechtenstein Commission of Historians has brought out four publications from the workshops (in German and Czech versions), three research tomes (in German and Czech versions) and this summary report representing its conclusions.

- Workshop books
- tome 1: Peter Geiger – Tomáš Knoz (eds.): *Liechtensteini-sche Erinnerungsorte in den böhmischen Ländern / Místa Lichtenštejnské paměti* [Liechtenstein Sites of Memory in the Bohemian Lands]. 2012.
 - tome 2: Peter Geiger – Tomáš Knoz (eds.): *Die Liechtenstein: Kontinuitäten – Diskontinuitäten / Lichtenštejnové: kontinuity – diskontinuity*. [The Liechtensteins: Continuities – Discontinuities]. 2013.
 - tome 3: Peter Geiger – Tomáš Knoz (eds.): *Die Liechtenstein und die Kunst / Lichtenštejnové a umění* [The Liechtensteins and Art]. 2013.
 - tome 4: Peter Geiger – Tomáš Knoz (eds.): *Das Fürstenhaus, der Staat Liechtenstein und die Tschechoslowakei im 20. Jahrhundert / Lichtenštejnové, Lichtenštejnsko a Československo ve 20. století* [The Liechtensteins, Liechtenstein and Czechoslovakia in the 20th Century]. 2013.

- Research books
- tome 5: Christoph Maria Merki – Josef Löffler: *Das Haus Liechtenstein in den böhmischen Ländern vom Mittelalter bis ins 20. Jahrhundert – Güter, Rechte, Verwaltung*. 2013 [Czech edition 2016]. [The House of Liechtenstein in the Czech lands from the Middle Ages to the 20th century]
 - tome 6: Susanne Keller-Giger – Rupert Quaderer: *Das Fürstentum Liechtenstein, die böhmischen Länder und die Tschechoslowakei – Geschichte der zwischenstaatlichen Beziehungen*. 2013 [Czech edition 2016]. [The Principality of Liechtenstein, the Czech lands and Czechoslovakia – History of the bilateral interstate relations]
 - tome 7: Václav Horčíčka – Roland Marxer: *Liechtenstein und die tschechoslowakischen Konfiskationen von 1945. Vom Zweiten Weltkrieg bis zur Gegenwart*. 2013. [Czech edition 2016]. [Liechtenstein and the Czechoslovak confiscation measures of 1945. From World War II up to the present days. 2013]
- Summary report
- tome 8: Peter Geiger – Tomáš Knoz – Eliška Fučíková – Ondřej Horák – Catherine Horel – Johann Kräffner – Thomas Winkelbauer – Jan Županič: *Liechtensteinisch-tschechische Beziehungen in Geschichte und Gegenwart, Synthesebericht der Liechtensteinisch-Tschechischen Historikerkommission, Vaduz 2014 / Czech Edition: Česko-lichtenštejnské vztahy v dějinách a v současnosti. Souhrnná zpráva Česko-lichtenštejnské komise historiků, Brno 2014. [Liechtenstein Czech Relations Past and Present. Summary Report by the Czech-Liechtenstein Commission of Historians]*

(9) Summary Report

The Czech-Liechtenstein Commission of Historians prepared this summary report jointly. The members of the Commission were divided into representative pairs, who prepared individual parts of the report based on their academic profile.

The Commission then undertook the final discussions and approved the report unanimously.

The summary report has been provided to both foreign ministries of both governments. It was then published by the Commission.

(10) Concluding work 2013

The Czech-Liechtenstein Commission of Historians concluded its work at the end of 2013. Whether there will be any further projects carried out, as recommended by the Commission, will depend on the will and intentions of the governments of both countries.

b. Sources, literature, research, methods

(1) Sources

The sources in Czech and German were studied in various archives across many countries – in the Czech Republic, Liechtenstein, Austria, Switzerland and Germany. To be named in particular are the National Archive in Prague, the Moravian Regional Archive in Brno (Brünn), the Provincial Archive in Opava (Troppau) (and their subordinate district archives), the Archive of the Prince of Liechtenstein in Vienna, the National Archive in Vaduz, the Federal Archive in Bern and the Federal Archive in Berlin. Many other smaller, local archives were additionally used, accessed by subject specialists and members of the historians' commission.

Amongst the sources were several legal testimonials from the 1920s relating to land reform, as well as the period of confiscation after 1945 and the legal disputes since the 1990s.

Sources also include buildings, memorials and monuments, illustrated material, also newspapers, the media and records from oral history.

In certain circumstances the older literature can serve as sources, for example, for the appropriate evaluation of historical events relevant to the time.

(2) Literature

Very extensive and varied specialist literature, though often scattered, exists on the issues examined by the Czech-Liechtenstein Commission of Historians, mainly in German and Czech. This applies to the history of the Liechtenstein Princely Family, but also to the history of the Principality of Liechtenstein, the history of the Lands of the Bohemian Crown and its successor states. The important task here was to make use of the literature and revelations existing on both sides in a cooperative review.

In recent times, Moravia in particular has provided literature on the Liechtensteins, which targets not only a specialist readership, but also the general public. It records the rich cultural history which the Liechtensteins left in Moravia in the form of chateaux and palaces, churches, vineyards, and so on.

(3) Research

Significant research achievements have been made in the overall complex of the area under investigation by both Czech and Liechtenstein historians. These have examined the reciprocal relations and problems between the Lands of the Bohemian Crown / Czech lands and Liechtenstein, which were published as separate works (e.g. Dallabona, Horák, Horčíčka, Vařeka), or as part of larger works (e.g. Beattie, Geiger, Haupt, Knoz, Quaderer, Winkelbauer, Županič). The Czech-Liechtenstein Commission of Historians was able to base its research on these valuable findings

Current interest centres on the elucidation of the events in the twentieth century, on one hand the process of Czechoslovak land reform in relation to the Liechtenstein family and the Principality of Liechtenstein, on the other in particular the confiscations carried out based on the Decrees of the President of the Republic (the so-called Beneš Decrees) of 1945. The Commission did not set out to judge the Decrees, but very much so the labelling of the Princes of Liechtenstein and other citizens of Liechtenstein as “Germans”, although the Principality was a neutral state in both the First and Second World Wars. Other things to keep in mind were the context of the time and the national argumentations reaching far back in history, likewise the grounds for the deadlock lasting decades in inter-state relations until 2009.

(4) Methods

The Czech-Liechtenstein Commission of Historians formulated special historiographical issues relating to the general topic. These included a chronological view of the development of the Princely House of Liechtenstein and its property, from its first appearance in Moravia in the Late Middle Ages until the abrupt break in the twentieth century. It likewise examined the relationship between the Principality of Liechtenstein and the Bohemian lands, respectively Czechoslovakia and the Czech Republic to the present day. To this end, the Commission proposed several research projects. At the same time, seminars were organised by the Commission, which were attended by specialists from various fields who helped to answer some of the Commission’s questions. The Commission set out the main areas of research as “sites of memory”, “continuity and discontinuity”, “art and prestige”, “land reform and confiscation”, also “repercussions lasting until the present day». Various methods, depending on the topic, were used to examine the different issues: general historical methods, legal-historical approaches, reflections from art

history and cultural history, and in individual cases approaches from sociology, political science, cultural geography, landscape architecture and music history. A comparative approach was also considered to be important.

The academic work of the members of the Czech-Liechtenstein Commission of Historians included looking for, evaluating and analysing primary sources and the literature, oral presentations and academic discussions, written records of the new findings, and finally publishing the results and conclusion

II. The Liechtensteins in the course of time

a. The Middle Ages and the Early Modern Age (c. 1100–1805)

The ancestors of the Liechtenstein princes came to the Bavarian March of Austria in the latter part of the 11th century as free noblemen, retainers and vassals of the Margraves of Cham and Vohburg.⁴ The so-called Cham-Vohburgs, or Rapotonen-Diepoldingers, were a Bavarian family from the upper nobility who in the second half of the 11th century brought a “*sufficient number of warriors desirous of settlement*”⁵ to the short-lived Hungarian March on the Morava and Leitha rivers, on an outpost to the east in front of the Austrian March. The future lords of Liechtenstein may have entered the service (ministeriality) of the Babenbergs shortly after 1080, when the Vohburgs withdrew from the power circle of the Babenbergs as supporters of King Heinrich IV in the investiture controversy. At any event, in 1142 the Austrian margrave, Heinrich II ‘Jasomirgott’, asked King Conrad III to intervene on behalf of his ministerial, Hugo von Liechtenstein-Petronell. Hugo was the first well-known representative of the family,⁶ who a few years earlier had built the Liechtenstein castle near Mödling and had received free tenure of the Petronell estates on the Danube from the King of the Romans, which until then he had held as a fief granted by Diepold III of Cham and Vohburg.

Around the year 1200, the Liechtenstein family split into three lines with residences in Liechtenstein, Petronell and Rohrau, which the individual lines began to base their names on. Midway through the 13th century, the Liechtensteins became part of the Austrian Estate of Lords (*ministeriales Austriae*), which after 1246, following the death of the last of the Babenbergs, Friedrich II ‘the Quarrelsome’, “*blocked off the social ladder*”.⁷ In the period from the mid-13th century to the start of the 14th century, the family lost the estates of Liechtenstein, Petronell and Rohrau. The forefather of all the later generations of the family was Heinrich I of Liechtenstein (died 1266), who from 1239 was recorded as being

⁴ The Austrian Liechtensteins took their name from Liechtenstein Castle near Mödling, and the Styrian Liechtensteins from Liechtenstein Castle near Judenburg. These are two families of different origins which began to merge through marriage from the 13th century on.

⁵ Weltin, Max: *Ascherichsbrügge. Das Werden einer Stadt an der Grenze*. NÖLA, Mitteilungen aus dem Niederösterreichischen Landesarchiv 10, 1986–1987, pp. 1–42, here p.15.

⁶ Between 1130 and 1143, Hugo I is mentioned at least seven times with the attribute of “von Liechtenstein” (six times in the *Traditionscodex* of the monastery in Klosterneuburg). Dopsch, Heinz: *Liechtenstein – Herkunft und Aufstieg eines Fürstenhauses*. In: Brunhart, Arthur (ed.): *Bausteine zur liechtensteinischen Geschichte, Studien und studentische Forschungsbeiträge*. Zürich 1999, p.11.

⁷ Weltin, Max: *Ascherichsbrügge*, p.21 ff.

the vassal of Duke Friedrich II. He built up a new complex of estates from the castles of Altlichtenwarth and Neulichtenwarth (the latter was called St. Ulrich since 1570). In the battle against the Hungarians at Leitha River in 1246, where the Austrian duke lost his life, leaving no heirs, Heinrich I was the standard bearer of the Austrian army.

In January 1249, Ottokar II, who had been the margrave of Moravia since 1247 and in 1248 had been chosen by the aristocratic opposition (who were in revolt against his father, King Wenceslas I), as the “*younger king of Bohemia*” (*rex iuvenis Boemorum*), transferred the village (*villa*) of Mikulov (Nikolsburg) in southern Moravia to Heinrich von Liechtenstein with everything that belonged to it (including a castle which is not explicitly mentioned in the charter), as a reward for his services to Ottokar II and his father (by his mediation during their conflict). This conferring of a fief on an influential Austrian aristocrat (*ministerialis Austriae*) based in the Moravian–Austrian border region was one of the measures which, if not consciously prepared, then at least facilitated the takeover of Austria by Ottokar II in November 1251. Heinz Dopsch believes that during this seizure of power in Austria by the Bohemian successor to the throne, Heinrich I von Liechtenstein was pulling the strings.⁸ In 1260 he was one of the leading figures in Ottokar II’s assumption of power in Styria. After acquiring Mikulov, Heinrich appears among the *nobiles regni Bohemie*. From that time on, he and his successors were known as “of Liechtenstein and Mikulov”. The acquisition of the Mikulov estate – or rather the tenure of estates in both countries with different territorial lords, who frequently waged war against one another and feuding nobles – forced the lords of Liechtenstein to pursue a policy of mediation or manoeuvring between Moravia and Austria. “*Mikulov enabled the Liechtenstein family to go on to pursue a purposeful ‘see-saw policy’ [Schaukelpolitik] in the border region between Moravia and Austria, but also between the Bohemian kings, the Moravian margraves and the Austrian dukes – an opportunity which the Liechtensteins were to cleverly exploit in subsequent centuries.*”⁹ The Liechtensteins’ “*Moravian–Austrian double vassalage*” naturally entailed an “*equal measure of risk and opportunity*”.¹⁰

In the 1260s, the accord between Ottokar II and the provincial upper nobility, consisting of counts, free noblemen and former Babenberg ministerials, began to break down, and in the early 1270s it turned into open conflict as a result of the monarch’s curtailment of the power of the provincial aristocracy. The transfer

⁸ Dopsch: *Liechtenstein – Herkunft und Aufstieg*, pp. 27–29.

⁹ *Ibid.* p. 28.

¹⁰ Lackner, Christian: *Aufstieg und Fall des Hans von Liechtenstein zu Nikolsburg im 14. Jahrhundert*, p. 253.

of power in Austria to King Rudolph of Habsburg therefore took place relatively smoothly. The Viennese peace treaty concluded between Rudolph of Habsburg and Ottokar II in 1277 confirmed Friedrich von Liechtenstein, the eldest son of Heinrich I, as the possessor of the estate of Mikulov. (In 1279 Heinrich II took over the castle and estate of Mikulov from his brother Friedrich.) In 1278 the brothers Heinrich II von Liechtenstein and Mikulov (died 1314) and Friedrich von Liechtenstein and Falkenstein (died 1290), the sons of Heinrich I, fought in the army of King Rudolph at the Battle of Dürnkrut, in which Ottokar II fell. In 1295/96 there was a revolt by the Austrian provincial nobility and with it Heinrich II and Friedrich von Liechtenstein against Duke Albert I. However, the uprising was quickly suppressed. Heinrich II von Liechtenstein managed to reach a settlement with King Albert and keep hold of the Mikulov estate. In contrast, the Falkenstein estate in the Weinviertel, which the Liechtensteins appear to have inherited after the dynasty of the same name died out (1228), was confiscated. In the 14th century it passed into Liechtenstein hands once again as pawn.

Hartneid II von Liechtenstein (died 1350), the son of Heinrich II, secured himself a largely independent and privileged position among the upper nobility of Moravia and Austria in the battles between King of Bohemia Johann of Luxembourg and the Habsburgs Albert II and Otto. In 1332 Johann of Luxembourg exempted Hartneid's Moravian property from provincial tax and freed Hartneid himself from the authority of Moravian law (the provincial court). It appears that the Liechtensteins renounced this privilege of their own free will, for if they could not be summoned before the provincial court, *"they themselves could not have anyone summoned, and that robbed them of participation in the provincial community, which essentially represented a disadvantage for them."*¹¹ In 1334, in return for his faithful (military) service – for example, in the wars against the Hungarian king and the Austrian duke – and also as compensation for the damage his estates had suffered during those battles, the Bohemian king enfeoffed Hartneid with the territorial lord's castle of Děvičky (Maidburg, now a ruin), including the small town of Strachotín (Tracht) and four villages in Moravia belonging to it, all of which were incorporated into the Mikulov estate. Around the middle of the 14th century, the lords of Liechtenstein entered into an "on-off" coalition with the territorial lords and provincial nobility which depended on the momentary interests of the dynasty.¹²

¹¹ Jan, Libor: *Die Anfänge der liechtensteinischen Kontinuität*, p. 52.

¹² Press, Volker: *Das Haus Liechtenstein in der europäischen Geschichte*, p. 19.

The time of Johann (Hans) I von Liechtenstein (died 1397), whom the duke of Austria Albert III of Habsburg appointed as his steward in 1368, seems to have marked the beginning of an unstoppable rise for the dynasty in terms of social status and property thanks to its close ties with the Habsburgs. In a short space of time, Johann became by far the most influential advisor of Albert III, and the number of castles and estates he held in both Moravia and Austria increased enormously. In 1370 he managed to acquire the estate of Lednice (Eisgrub) in southern Moravia. In 1385 he purchased the castle of Rabensburg in Austria with all appurtenances, and he made it the centre of the estate for the villages which were already in the possession of the Liechtenstein dynasty as well as those which the family was to acquire in the future between the rivers Thaya and Zaya. In 1389 Margrave Jobst enfeoffed the brothers Johann, Hartneid and Georg von Liechtenstein with the estate of Břeclav (Lundenburg) in southern Moravia on the river Thaya. Under Johann, the Liechtensteins also gradually managed to secure the estates of Valtice¹³ and Mistelbach in the north-eastern corner of Lower Austria.

In 1386 the King of the Romans and Bohemian king Wenceslas IV appointed Johann von Liechtenstein as his advisor, despite the fact that he was in the service of another prince as steward to Duke Albert III, and gave him a house in the Lesser Town (Malá Strana) of Prague, linking this with an express wish that Johann would spend more time at the royal court in Prague. In the same year, Johann concluded an inheritance contract with his brothers and nephews – the first Liechtenstein family covenant. Individual members of the dynasty were not to have ownership rights to the total property, but only usage rights. Under the formal pretext of upholding the principle of the indivisibility of property, Johann was granted significant privileges (especially in relation to the extra possessions he acquired).

From 1370 on Duke Albert III, who suffered from a constant lack of money, gave his steward numerous castles, villages, towns and tolls in pledge. Over 25 years Johann von Liechtenstein appears to have paid the Austrian territorial lord more than 100,000 pounds in pledges, purchases and loans.¹⁴ In addition, he purchased numerous aristocratic and ecclesiastical estates. In 1394 he had in his possession as many as 30 important castles, towns and estates in the Habsburg lands as well as about 10 estates centred on Mikulov (Nikolsburg) in southern

¹³ The town of Valtice (Feldsberg) along with part of the territory of the former estate was ceded to Czechoslovakia by Austria in 1919, as a consequence of the Treaty of Saint-Germain-en-Laye.

¹⁴ For comparison: the total annual revenue of the territorial lord of the duchy of Austria at that time amounted to 33,000 pounds. Lackner, Christian: *Hof und Herrschaft*. Rat, Kanzlei und Regierung der österreichischen Herzoge (1365–1406). Vienna 2002, p. 33.

Moravia. In that year Johann and the other Liechtensteins suddenly fell out of favour with Duke Albert III – perhaps as a result of some courtly intrigue. What the Liechtensteins were accused of can only be surmised. Was it primarily their close ties with “foreign” princes, i.e. the Bohemian king and Moravian margrave, or the rather too ostentatious, brazen and (even by the standards of the time) not always legal way in which they had accumulated wealth? In any event, the case of the Liechtensteins was characterised by one of the leading experts as a “show trial”.¹⁵ Some of their Lower Austrian possessions were confiscated, including (as in 1296) Falkenstein, which was finally recorded as Liechtenstein property again in an urbarium from 1414. In 1395, after the swift and unconditional surrender of the Liechtensteins who had been imprisoned in autumn 1394, Johann and his brother Hartneid received Feldsberg (Valtice), which had previously been their free property, as a fief from the Austrian duke. After his fall from grace, Johann spent almost all of his time in Moravia. In 1408 Duke Leopold IV (Albert III having died at the end of August 1395) converted the fief of Feldsberg (Valtice), conferred upon his steward Heinrich von Liechtenstein, back into a free tenure. The nephew of Johann I, Christoph I (died ca. 1412), was also to be found in the company of Habsburgs again soon after the family catastrophe. In 1406 he was able to acquire Wilfersdorf in Lower Austria from the lords of Maissau, and in 1407 Steyregg in Upper Austria.

After his downfall in 1394, Johann I von Liechtenstein lost more than two thirds of his property in Austria. Despite that, the financial balance sheet of his life was an impressive one. *“At no time before or afterwards in the history of the House of Liechtenstein did such an extensive expansion of property occur within a single generation. Johann left his nephew a largely integrated complex of property that he had created in the Moravian–Austrian border region, which was many times greater than the legacy he himself had taken on.”*¹⁶

The resurgence of the Liechtensteins took place at a time of tension between Bohemia, Moravia, and Austria. When King Wenceslas IV, along with the Moravian margrave Prokop, was arrested by his brother Sigismund, King of the Romans, and they were handed over to the Austrian dukes Albert and William as prisoners, Johann II (died ca. 1411), Heinrich V (died ca. 1418) and Hartneid V (died 1426/1427) von Liechtenstein helped them to escape in 1403. Nevertheless, the Liechtensteins succeeded in maintaining good relations with the Austrian duke William. Volker Press summed up the politics of the Liechtensteins in the

¹⁵ Lackner: *Aufstieg und Fall*, p. 261.

¹⁶ Dopsch: *Liechtenstein – Herkunft und Aufstieg*, p. 49.

decades around 1400 as follows: “*One of the consequences of the 1394 reduction in property was that the dynasty concentrated its attention more on the Moravian side, where [its] property remained undiminished – in the Lower Austrian disputes at the beginning of the new century, the Liechtensteins held back. The fact that Johann II sat on the council of the Moravian margraves Jobst and Heinrich V and served as steward to Duke Leopold [IV] illustrates the dual anchoring of the dynasty very clearly [...]. After Johann’s death, Heinrich became his successor as governor in Znojmo (Znaim); [...]. The location of his estates made him the obvious choice to broker a truce in 1414 which brought to an end the conflicts between Austrian and Moravian nobles that had devastated the land.*”¹⁷

During the Hussite Wars, the Liechtensteins were among the most loyal allies of King Sigismund and the Austrian duke Albert, who from 1423 was also the territorial lord of the Moravian margraviate, and this resulted in the Liechtenstein estates being laid waste by the Hussites several times. Hartneid V von Liechtenstein, who accompanied King Sigismund to Prague in 1420 during his coronation expedition, was temporarily entrusted with overseeing the most important Moravian castle – Špilberk (Spielberg) in Brno (Brünn). In 1422 King Sigismund gave Hartneid, Georg, Johann, Christoph and Ulrich von Liechtenstein the town of Podivín (Kostel) as a free holding, whereby they continued to consolidate their southern Moravian possessions. However, in 1426 the Hussites managed to recapture Podivín. During this campaign Břeclav also fell into their hands; Feldsberg (Valtice) in Lower Austria and Mikulov in Moravia were burnt to the ground.

When the Austrian provincial marshal Otto of Maissau was stripped of power in 1430, not only was a competitor of the Liechtensteins in the Moravian–Austrian border region eliminated, but some of the property of the lords of Maissau also fell into their hands. Around the middle and second half of the 15th century, the Liechtensteins continued their attempts to link their Austrian and Moravian interests with considerable success. During the military conflicts between Emperor Friedrich III and his brother Albert VI, Heinrich VII von Liechtenstein (died 1483) was on Albert’s side. His brother Johann V (died 1473), on the other hand, entered the fray as a Moravian lord with the Bohemian king George of Poděbrady in 1461 to liberate the emperor, who was under siege in the Viennese castle. The background to this political split within the dynasty was that Heinrich’s family seat, Steyregg, lay within the power sphere of Duke Albert, whereas Mikulov, Johann’s main seat, fell within the sphere of influence of the Bohemian king. After the death of Albert VI (1463), Friedrich III granted mercy to the for-

¹⁷ Press: *Das Haus Liechtenstein*, p. 21 ff.

mer aristocratic opposition, and with it Heinrich von Liechtenstein. In the early 1470s, however, Heinrich was involved in a conspiracy of nobles against Friedrich III. In 1473 he was named governor of Moravia by the Hungarian king Matthias Corvinus, who also ruled the lands of Moravia and Silesia which bordered Bohemia. Heinrich von Liechtenstein “*was at that time a natural mediator between Friedrich III and the Austrian provincial aristocracy, between Vladislaus Jagiellon and Matthias Corvinus*”.¹⁸ In 1479 he was designated arbitrator in the border dispute between Moravia and Austria. In 1487 his brother Christoph III (died post-1506) was installed in the office of Austrian provincial marshal by Matthias Corvinus, who in the mid-1480s conquered the eastern part of Lower Austria and frequently resided in Vienna, and in 1489, after the lords of Pottendorf died out, bestowed the office of Austrian arch-cupbearer upon him. After the death of the king (1490) he lost these offices. However, Friedrich III soon became reconciled with his former adversary, appointing Christoph his advisor and in 1493 provincial marshal once again.

A Liechtenstein urbarium established in 1414¹⁹ records nine estates located north and south of the Moravian–Lower Austrian border: Mikulov (Nikolsburg), Drnholec (Dürnholz) (in the possession of the Liechtensteins from the end of the 14th century) and Břeclav (Lundenburg) in Moravia, and Valtice (Feldsberg), Falkenstein, Rabensburg, Mistelbach, Hagenberg and Gnadendorf in Lower Austria. The 15th and 16th centuries saw the formation of the Liechtensteins’ future large estates through a process of gradual expansion. In comparison with the dynamic expansion of property in the second half of the 14th century and in the days of the Liechtenstein brothers Karl, Maximilian and Gundaker at the close of the 16th and first half of the 17th century, however, the 15th century and first two thirds of the 16th century represented an epoch of “*stagnation and crisis*” in the development of Liechtenstein property tenure.²⁰

In the late Middle Ages “*the dual anchoring in Austria and Moravia*” (Volker Press) afforded the House of Liechtenstein exceptional room for manoeuvre. “*It thereby joined the circle of European dynasties which were able to play a significant role from peripheral territorial units, such as the Savoys on the French border,*

¹⁸ Ibid., p. 25.

¹⁹ In general Christoph Maria Merki described this urbarium, not without justification, as “*something like a fideicommissum avant la lettre*”, because it records the property of most members of the dynasty. Merki, Christoph Maria: *Liechtensteinische Güter und Rechte in Böhmen, Mähren und Schlesien vom Spätmittelalter bis ins 20. Jahrhundert*. In: Merki, Christoph Maria – Löffle, Josef: *Das Haus Liechtenstein in den böhmischen Ländern vom Mittelalter bis ins 20. Jahrhundert*. Güter, Rechte, Verwaltung. Vaduz 2013, p. 32.

²⁰ Merki: *Liechtensteinische Güter*, pp. 47–58.

*the Oldenburgs and Holsteins in the north of Germany, and the Percys, dukes of Northumberland, between England and Scotland. The Liechtensteins thus established a starting position for themselves for the modern age as 'border barons'.*²¹ The political situation fundamentally changed in 1526–1527 after the death of Louis II in the Battle of Mohács when Archduke Ferdinand I managed to link the Austrian lands with the lands of the crown of St Wenceslas and St Stephen through a personal union into a “composite state” (John H. Elliott et al.), or a “monarchical union of estates-states (Ständestaaten)” (Otto Brunner) – or more precisely: into a state composed of composite states, or a monarchical union of monarchical unions of aristocratic states.

In 1504 the three branches of the house of Liechtenstein in existence at that time concluded an inheritance agreement which newly emphasised the unity of the dynasty (the establishment of seniority, the transferral of all the dynasty's fiefs to the oldest member of the family, an intra-dynastic retroactive or pre-emptive right). Mikulov became the main seat and centre of the estates of Christoph III, his nephews Georg VI (died 1548) and Erasmus (died 1524) obtained Steyregg, and Feldsberg (Valtice) became the centre of the estates of Hartmann I (died 1542). The Steyregg branch died out in the male line in 1548. The Mikulov branch, whose members – Leonhard I (1482–1534) and his nephew Johann VI von Liechtenstein (1500–1552) – allowed the Anabaptists under the leadership of Balthasar Hubmaier to settle in Mikulov in the summer of 1526, had to sell the castle and estate of Mikulov in 1560, became utterly impoverished and finally ceased to exist in 1691

From 1560 on, the Feldsberg (Valtice) branch of the lords of Liechtenstein remained significant; it supported Lutheranism on its estates in Austria and the Unity of the Brethren in Moravia and employed many evangelical pastors. In 1563 Hartmann II von Liechtenstein (1544–1585) was granted possessions in Austria by feoffment. In October 1568 he married Anna Maria, Countess of Ortenburg, the niece of Count Joachim of Ortenburg, a prominent leader of the Lutheran nobility in the Bavarian duchy who in 1563 introduced the Reformation to his county, which was directly subject to the emperor, and thereafter had to wage fierce disputes with Duke Albert of Bavaria for many years. The marriage resulted in five sons, two of whom died in childhood, and four daughters, two of whom survived into adulthood. In 1573 Hartmann served as the imperial commissioner who was responsible for settling border disputes between Austria and Moravia. He was advisor to Maximilian II and Rudolph II and an important creditor to these two emperors. In 1575 he managed to recover the estate of Lednice, sold between 1572

²¹ Press: *Das Haus Liechtenstein*, p. 26.

and 1573, from Wolfgang II of the Mikulov branch, thus laying the foundations for the extraordinary expansion of Liechtenstein property in Moravia in the following generation. Hartmann concentrated the dynastic property in Moravia and in Austria “below the Enns” [i.e. Lower Austria], as a result of which he sold the estate of Steyregg in Austria “above the Enns” [i.e. Upper Austria] to the brothers Helmhart, Wolfgang and Bernhard Jörger, the last of whom married Hartmann’s daughter Judith. He died a staunch Lutheran in Lednice/Eisgrub in 1585. At the time of their father’s death, his sons Karl, Maximilian and Gundaker were aged only sixteen, seven and five, and his daughters Katharina and Judith thirteen and nine. In his will Hartmann impressed upon their guardians that not only were his children to be brought up in the Protestant religion but also that this creed was to be maintained and disseminated among his subjects and *“no pastor or other teacher is to be suffered who will not contribute to this [creed], as far as I have the right to command”*. Hartmann further stipulated that as soon as it were possible his three sons were to be encouraged to study and learn Latin and Czech (*“Behaimbisch”*). He placed a special emphasis on his sons learning to speak Czech fluently, because a knowledge of this language was necessary for attending sessions of the Moravian Diet and provincial court.²² His widow, Anna Maria, relocated to Wilfersdorf and outlived her husband by 19 years. Unlike her sons, she remained loyal to the Protestant faith throughout her life, as did her daughters Katharina and Judith.

After the division of property in 1591 and the death of the oldest member of the dynasty, Johann Septimius, in 1596, the Feldsberg (Valtice) branch of the lords of Liechtenstein was mainly represented by the three sons of Hartmann II: Karl (1569–1627), Maximilian (1578–1643) and Gundaker (1580–1658). On the legal basis of an agreement about the division of the legacy concluded by the three brothers in Feldsberg (Valtice) in 1598, the first-born Karl received the estates of Feldsberg (Valtice) and Herrnbaumgarten in Lower Austria and the estate of Lednice (Eisgrub) in Moravia from his parents’ inheritance. The Lower Austrian estates of Rabensburg and Hohenau went to Maximilian, and Wilfersdorf and Ringelsdorf to Gundaker.

The preconditions for the Liechtensteins’ ascendancy into the exclusive group of the three richest noble families in the Habsburg monarchy (together with the Esterházy and Schwarzenbergs) were established by Karl von Liechtenstein, *“a solitary figure of historical greatness, who does not fit any mould and is feared*

²² Testament in Czech (Eisgrub (Lednice), 23 June 1585) and in German (Vienna, 24 July 1585). Sammlungen des Fürsten von Liechtenstein, Hausarchiv (henceforth LIECHTENSTEIN - THE PRINCELY COLLECTIONS, Urkundensammlung (henceforth US); copies LIECHTENSTEIN - THE PRINCELY COLLECTIONS, Familienarchiv (henceforth FA), box 267.

and hated, needed and envied by others".²³ Karl was brought up as a Lutheran. At the school of the Unity of the Brethren in Ivančice/Eibenschitz in Moravia, he became friends with Charles of Žerotín, five years his senior, the future leader of the Moravian Estates, with whom he undertook a joint Grand Tour to France in 1587. In 1588 he studied at the University of Siena at the same time as Zdeněk Vojtěch Popel of Lobkowitz. In the years which followed, he appears to have spent a period of time up until 1593 as chamberlain at the court of Archduke Matthias in Vienna. After being elected supreme provincial judge of the Moravian margraviate for the first time in 1589, he held various offices on behalf of the Moravian Estates, particularly after 1593. In 1595, a year before becoming the oldest member and head of the House of Liechtenstein, he married Anna, one of the two daughters and heirs of Jan Šembera of Boskovice and Černá Hora, who owned a magnificent Renaissance chateau in Bučovice (Butschowitz). In 1597 Karl's brother Maximilian married Anna's sister Katharina. In the same year, they came into their inheritance: Černá Hora and Úsov (Mährisch Aussee) went to Karl, Bučovice and Pozořice (Posorschitz) to Maximilian. Through this inheritance, the brothers Karl and Maximilian von Liechtenstein were "*suddenly catapulted into the elite of the Moravian nobility*".²⁴ Both of them were linked by marriage to the tradition of the Mikulov branch of the House of Liechtenstein. In the 16th century at least two male members and two female members of this branch married women and men from the House of the lords of Boskovice.

In 1599, 1600 and 1602 the brothers Karl, Maximilian and Gundaker converted from Lutheranism to Catholicism, thereby clearing the way for themselves and their descendants to secure influential positions at the Habsburg courts in Prague and Vienna, in the imperial army and in the provincial and state administration. In 1602 Karl von Liechtenstein purchased the Moravian estate of Plumlov (Plumenau) with the town of Prostějov (Prossnitz). In 1606, ten years after he became the senior member of the Liechtenstein dynasty, he obtained the consent of his brothers in Feldsberg (Valtice) to the establishment of a strict dynastic fideicommissum through an inheritance agreement which meant that the "property of the first-borns" formed an inalienable and indivisible whole with the rest of the dynasty's property in the possession of the three brothers and their descendants. The head of the family (ruler of the dynasty) was no longer, as had been customary

²³ Press: *Das Haus Liechtenstein*, p. 49.

²⁴ Winkelbauer, Thomas: *Repräsentationsstreben, Hofstaat und Hofzeremoniell der Herren bzw. Fürsten von Liechtenstein in der ersten Hälfte des 17. Jahrhunderts*. In: Bůžek, Václav (ed.): *Život na dvorech a v rezidenčních městech posledních Rožmberků*. Opera historica 3. České Budějovice 1993, pp. 179–198, here p. 181.

until then, the oldest male member (the seniority principle), but the first-born son of the ruling line (primogeniture, majorat). In the years of escalating conflict between Emperors Matthias and Ferdinand II on the one hand and the Protestant nobility in their lands on the other hand, the brothers Karl, Maximilian and Gundaker managed to “*position themselves optimally in the power game between the Emperor and the separatist Estates and exploit the political situation to achieve the visions and objectives of the dynasty*”.²⁵ In 1612 the “ruler” of the house of Liechtenstein at his written request was accorded first place (“precedence”) at all the gatherings of Estate of lords of Austria below the Enns (here including the Bishop of Vienna) and Moravia (here with the exception of the Bishop of Olomouc/Olmütz). In 1622 Ferdinand II removed Prince Karl and his descendants in the primogeniture as well as their servants and subjects from the jurisdiction of the Moravian provincial court and granted him the right to collect tariffs, surcharges and tolls on his estates just like the Bishop of Olomouc. In the following centuries, the princes of Liechtenstein were always *primi inter pares* among the aristocracy of Lower Austria and Moravia.

In May 1600 Karl von Liechtenstein, as a financial specialist adept in business matters, was summoned to the privy council of Emperor Rudolph II. After the dismissal of both leading privy councillors, Wolf Rumpf and Paul Sixt Trautson, in September 1600 he was provisionally entrusted with administering the office of High Steward (Obersthofmeister) and presiding over the privy council at the instigation of the influential imperial private secretary Johannes Barvitius. Karl von Liechtenstein’s relationship with Rudolph II was evidently subject to dramatic ups and downs. After enjoying a short period as a favourite and almost omnipotent leading minister of the emperor, he fell out of favour in the summer of 1601. However, he initially remained director of the privy council and administrator of the office of High Steward. After a dispute over precedence with Count Friedrich of Fürstenberg, who was summoned to the privy council in August 1602, Liechtenstein finally decided to leave the court at the end of October 1602. This – at first merely short-term – “fall” by Karl von Liechtenstein in autumn 1602 is regarded as a victory for the Roman–Spanish party at the imperial court.²⁶ In December 1602, at a time when the financial crisis of the imperial court had reached a new height, Karl von Liechtenstein *via facti* reassumed his old offices as he

²⁵ Oberhammer, Evelin: “*Viel ansehnliche Stuck und Güeter*”. *Die Entwicklung des fürstlichen Herrschaftsbesitzes*. In: Oberhammer, Evelin (ed.): *Der ganzen Welt ein Lob und Spiegel. Das Fürstenhaus Liechtenstein in der frühen Neuzeit*. Vienna – Munich 1990, pp. 33–45, here p. 34.

²⁶ Šiloukal-Zlinský, Karel: *Lichtenštejn a jeho účast na vládě Rudolfa II.* (1569–1607). Prague 1912, p. 79.

was granted the authorisation to deputize for the emperor during his illness, when he completely cut himself off from the outside world. In mid-August 1603 Karl von Liechtenstein surprisingly departed for his Moravian estates without asking to be discharged.

In January 1604, on the basis of a vote by the Moravian provincial judges and the highest provincial officials, the emperor appointed him provincial governor of Moravia, which meant that among other things Karl von Liechtenstein took over command of the military defence of the country. In early May 1605 an uprising which had broken out in Hungary in November 1604 under the leadership of the Transylvanian (Siebenbürgen) prince Stephen Bocskay due to the violent Counter-Reformation measures of Rudolph II spread to Moravia, and Hungarian divisions began to terrorize and set fire to southern Moravia. It was not until early August that a large-scale counteroffensive by a united Bohemian–Moravian army began, which managed to temporarily put a stop to the incursions. In early July 1606, after another incursion into nearby Brno (Brünn), the Hungarians were defeated by divisions of the Moravian Estates under the command of Karl von Liechtenstein and Weikhard of Salm.

In October 1606, after a two-and-a-half-year tenure as provincial governor, Karl von Liechtenstein took over the running of the imperial court in Prague once again after his conditions were accepted (appointment as High Steward rather than just as administrator of the office of High Steward, presidency of the privy council and unlimited access to the emperor). Karl now formed a closer attachment to the Roman–Spanish camp. In the Habsburg fraternal feud he (at first secretly) favoured Matthias's side. Nevertheless, the emperor still bestowed a great palatinate upon him on 30 March 1607 and on 8 August signed a princely diploma which he laid aside for a long time but apparently then invalidated before it had been issued. Karl von Liechtenstein tendered his resignation on 23 July but initially remained in Prague. His successor as High Steward, or rather administrator of the office of High Steward, was cardinal Franz Dietrichstein.

Archduke Matthias, for whom Karl von Liechtenstein now openly showed his support, admitted him into his privy council in autumn 1607, and in December 1608 rewarded him, who together with Charles of Žerotín, the new provincial governor, had brought the Moravian Estates over to Matthias's side in the dispute between the Habsburg brothers, with elevation to the rank of hereditary prince. Prince Karl thus became the first “new prince” of the 17th century. As a result of rivalry with the very powerful cardinal Melchior Klesl, in April 1609 Karl felt himself compelled to withdraw temporarily from the political scene into seclusion. From his estates (especially his seat in Lednice/Eisgrub) he tried to continue hatching political schemes and maintaining contacts with other disaffected Catho-

lic lords, such as Seyfried Christopher Breuner and Charles of Harrach, but also with leading loyal representatives of the Protestant Estates (especially Charles of Žerotín). The conflicts between Karl von Liechtenstein, the leading representative of the disaffected Austrian and Moravian Estates, and Cardinal Klesl, the virtually omnipotent *valido* of the new emperor, intensified once again, especially after Matthias's election as emperor in 1612. Nevertheless, in 1614 Karl von Liechtenstein was granted the duchy of Opava (Troppau) as a fief

During the Estates Uprising in 1619–1620, the rebels seized Karl's Moravian estates. After the Battle of White Mountain (Bílá Hora; 8 November 1620), Duke Maximilian of Bavaria designated Karl von Liechtenstein as his representative in the conquered Bohemian kingdom. Karl presided over a special court of justice ordered by Emperor Ferdinand II and the execution of the 27 leaders of the Estates Uprising who had been arrested on the Old Town Square in Prague on 21 June 1621. In January 1622 Emperor Ferdinand II designated him governor and viceroy of Bohemia with almost unlimited powers. He held this office until his death in 1627. In 1622 Karl was the first member of the house of Liechtenstein to be admitted into the Order of the Golden Fleece and was granted the Silesian duchy of Krnov/Jägerndorf as a fief. In addition, he received the estates (mostly confiscated from Ladislav Velen of Žerotín) of Moravská Třebová (Mährisch Trübau), Zábřeh (Hohenstadt), Šumperk (Mährisch Schönberg), Kolštejn (Goldenstein) [from 1948 on Branná] and Ruda (Eisenberg) in northern Moravia as a gift from the emperor. In 1622 or 1623 Karl also purchased the large estate of Lanškroun (Landskron) in north-eastern Bohemia and the estates of Kostelec nad Černými lesy (Schwarzkostelez), Uhříněves (Auřinowes) and Škvorec (Škworetz) east of Prague, which had been confiscated from Albert of Valdštejn (Albrecht von Wallenstein) and had originally belonged to the House of Smiřický. In subsequent years he expanded his property with a great many small estates through arondation measures.

After the death of the Bohemian governor in February 1627, the following year Ferdinand II ordered an investigation into alleged illegal transactions and accumulation of wealth by Karl von Liechtenstein during his participation in the Prague “coin consortium” of 1622–1623. After criticisms raised by many parties were initially declared unfounded by the investigative committee, Ferdinand III ordered that the investigation be reopened shortly after his accession to the throne (1637). Following a stay of proceedings in 1640, it became apparent in 1654 that long after the state bankruptcy of 11 December 1623 Karl von Liechtenstein had paid for the estate of Kostelec nad Černými lesy/Schwarzkostelez, which he had purchased in August of that year, using “long” coins – which was, of course, common practice among the “war profiteers” of those years. Thereupon Kostelec

nad Černými lesy and the incorporated estates of Škvorec (Skworetz) and Křenice (Křenitz) were confiscated from Prince Karl Eusebius, the son and heir of Prince Karl, and it was only after a settlement whereby Karl Eusebius undertook to pay a sum in excess of a million gulden – i.e. to repurchase the estates – that this property was returned to him. In May 1665 Emperor Leopold I finally granted Prince Karl Eusebius von Liechtenstein a general release, according to which Karl Eusebius agreed to pay 275,000 gulden in damages and in return was released from any claims which could be brought against him because of his father. However, the Liechtenstein case was finally brought to an end once and for all in November 1681 with the emperor's decision to waive an additional debt amounting to 70,000 gulden which was claimed by the court chamber.

But let us return to the generation of Prince Karl Eusebius's father. Karl's younger brother Maximilian (who was nine years his junior) made a career for himself in the military. In 1608 he was promoted to chief artillery officer (Oberstfeldzeugmeister) to Archduke Matthias. In 1613 he became imperial counsel and chief equerry (Oberststallmeister). In 1620 he played a decisive part in the victory of the forces of the Catholic League and the emperor in the Battle of White Mountain. In 1623 he was elevated to the rank of imperial prince at the same time as his brother Gundaker. In settlement of the emperor's debts he received the estate of Ždánice/Steinitz, south of Bučovice/Butschowitz, from the confiscated property of Charles of Kounice (Karl von Kaunitz), which had already come into his possession in 1597 by inheritance, as well as other small estates in Moravia. In 1633 he and his wife Katharina (née Šemberová of Boskovice and Černá Hora/Černoorská von Boskowitz) founded a monastery of the strict reform order of the Minims at the Marian pilgrimage church in Vranov u Brna (Wranau) as well as a Liechtenstein family tomb as a final resting place for members of all the lines of the dynasty (only Prince Gundaker and his direct descendants had themselves interred at the parish church in Wilfersdorf). Prince Maximilian died without heirs in 1643 at the Hungarian fortress of Győr (Raab) as its commander and imperial field marshal. His property was divided up between his brother Gundaker and his nephew Karl Eusebius. In 1633 Prince Gundaker had the estates of Moravský Krumlov (Mährisch Kromau) and Uherský Ostroh (Ungarisch Ostra) in southern Moravia, two confiscated "rebel estates" that he had purchased in 1622–1623, elevated to the (short-lived) principality of Liechtenstein by Ferdinand II and the town of Moravský Krumlov (Mährisch Kromau) renamed Liechtenstein. By the time the Krumlov (Kromau) estate was handed over to Gundaker's younger son Ferdinand Johann in early 1647, the name of Liechtenstein had ceased to be used for the town of Moravský Krumlov, and a new division into two estates also dealt a fatal blow to the aforementioned "principality".

The Liechtensteins were among the main beneficiaries from the profits of property confiscations in the Lands of the Bohemian Crown after the Battle of White Mountain. According to one probably slightly overvalued estimate, 41% of the total acreage of the estates held by the princes of Liechtenstein around the year 1900 was acquired between 1620 and 1650.²⁷ During the Thirty Years War the number of subject houses ruled over by the Liechtenstein dynasty in Moravia alone increased from 4,758 to 16,156. After 1640 Karl Eusebius von Liechtenstein had 9,349 serfs in Moravia, and his uncles Gundaker and Maximilian 3,906 and 2,204 respectively. In 1619, that is prior to the Battle of White Mountain, Karl had 3,672 serfs in Moravia, Maximilian 1,086 and Gundaker none. Up to the end of the 17th century, the number of Liechtenstein serfs in Moravia continued to grow to a total of 19,110, which corresponds to approximately a fifth of all subject houses in Moravia. In 1637 Karl Eusebius and his uncles Maximilian and Gundaker had a total of 1,856 serfs on the estates in north-eastern Lower Austria. By the year 1667 the number of serfs of the Liechtenstein dynasty in the Weinviertel had risen to 1,871 and by 1701 to 2,055. In Bohemia, according to data in the tax roll around the year 1655 “only” 1,112 “homesteads” (*usedlosti* – a unit of taxation) belonged to Prince Karl Eusebius, which probably corresponds to approximately 1,700 to 1,800 subject homes of various categories. If we include the estates of Kostelec nad Černými lesy (Schwarzkostelez), Uhříněves and Škvorec u Prahy (Auřinowes and Škworetz), from which the exchequer received revenues at that time, this gives us a total of 1,510 “homesteads”, i.e. as many as 2,500 subject families in Bohemia. The princes of Liechtenstein, by far the richest aristocrats in Moravia and in Austria below the Enns, thus occupied eighth place in the “league table” of noblemen in Bohemia in terms of the number of subjects on their estates.

Like his nephew Prince Karl Eusebius, “head and ruler” of the house of Liechtenstein from 1632 on, Old Prince Gundaker, lived outside the imperial court on his estates. That may have been why for a long time the dynasty failed to achieve the desired objective of promotion among the imperial Estates, “a seat and vote” on the princes’ bench of the Imperial Diet of the Holy Roman Empire. Until approximately 1690 the Liechtensteins lacked the financial means for further expansion of their property tenure. If we leave aside the repurchase of the Břeclav (Lundenburg) estate by Karl Eusebius in 1638 and various arondation measures as well as the purchase of the northern Bohemian estate of Rumburk (Rumburg) in 1681 by Prince Anton Florian, the grandson of Prince Gundaker, the Liech-

²⁷ Pircher, Wolfgang: *Verwüstung und Verschwendung. Adeliges Bauen nach der Zweiten Türkenbelagerung*. Vienna 1984, p. 38.

tensteins did not acquire any new property worth mentioning during those years. However, in 1641 Karl Eusebius still held nine estates in Moravia, five estates in Bohemia and the duchies of Opava (Troppau) and Krnov (Jägerndorf) in Silesia as well as Valtice (Feldsberg) in Lower Austria.

Prince Johann Adam Andreas (1657–1712), the son and successor of Karl Eusebius and commissioner of two monumental Viennese palaces, is rightly considered a “financial genius”. He managed – undoubtedly aided by the general economic boom – to significantly increase the revenues from his estates through a radical reorganisation and rationalisation of administration and management (e.g. personnel savings and – despite his subjects’ ultimately unsuccessful complaints to the emperor – a drastic increase in compulsory labour services). He acquired the estates of Šternberk (Mährisch Sternberg) (1695–1699) and Karlovec (Karlsberg) (1699) in northern Moravia as well as Hodonín (Göding) in southern Moravia (1692), Judenau near Tulln (1701), Červený Hrádek (Rothenhaus) in northern Bohemia (1708) and other estates in Lower Austria and Hungary for probably at least 3.6 million gulden. His rule also saw the further expansion of the art collections established by his grandfather and greatly enlarged by his father Karl Eusebius, especially the famous picture gallery.

Johann Adam also finally succeeded in purchasing two “islands of imperial immediacy”, namely the lordship of Schellenberg (1699), which was subject to the Empire, and the imperial county of Vaduz (1712), from the heavily indebted family of the counts of Hohenems. With the death of Johann Adam in 1712, Karl’s branch of the house of Liechtenstein died out in the male line. In 1713 his daughter Maria Theresia (1694–1772) married the nephew of Prince Eugene, the field marshal Thomas of Savoy-Carignano, who died of smallpox in 1729. She left her mark on history as the founder of the Savoy Academy in Vienna, which in 1776 was merged with the Theresian Academy (*Theresianum*) and the Savoy Institute for Noble Ladies, still in existence today. After her death, the property she had inherited and the purchased estates of Rataje nad Sázavou (Rattay) and Kounice (Kaunitz) in Bohemia went to the majorat.

It is estimated that around the year 1710 the Liechtenstein estates and other properties in Austria, Moravia and Bohemia (i.e. without the Silesian duchies and properties in Hungary, Vaduz and Schellenberg) covered an area of about 1,750 km² – almost exactly ten times as much as around the year 1590. Around the year 1710, 74% of the property was located in Moravia, 17% in Bohemia and 9% in

Austria. 120 years earlier (after the loss of Mikulov/Nikolsburg) 83% of the estates had been located in Austria and only 17% in Moravia.²⁸

In 1713, Johann Adam Andreas's heir of approximately the same age, Prince Anton Florian (1656–1721) from Gundaker's line, obtained a seat and vote in the council of the imperial princes, but only *ad personam*, because in his will, owing to personal antipathy, Johann Adam Andreas had bequeathed Schellenberg and Vaduz not to him, the future ruler of the dynasty, but to Joseph Wenzel (1696–1772), Anton Florian's nephew, who had not yet come of age. In 1718 Joseph Wenzel exchanged Schellenberg and Vaduz with Anton Florian for the Bohemian estate of Rumburk, and in 1719 at Anton Florian's request Emperor Karl VI elevated Schellenberg and Vaduz to the imperial principality of Liechtenstein. Anton Florian owed this success not least to the fact that – as the second-born son – he was the first since the generation of the brothers Karl, Maximilian and Gundaker to permanently enter the service of the Habsburgs, and in 1695 – after being recalled from Rome, where he had been imperial ambassador at the papal court since 1691 – he was entrusted with the very important offices of tutor (ayo) and High Steward to the archduke and later Spanish king and emperor Karl. Even after the death of Emperor Joseph I (1711) and Karl VI's return to Vienna, Anton Florian continued to hold the top-ranking courtly office of (now imperial) High Steward until his own death.

In 1723, during the rule of the first member of the Gundaker line to lead the dynasty, the house of Liechtenstein's battle to secure a powerful voice in the Imperial Diet (since 1663 in permanent session at Regensburg) – a battle which Prince Gundaker had waged consistently but unsuccessfully from 1629 on – was at last crowned with success. This finally removed a harmful stain on the family's prestige, since other hereditary princely dynasties – notably the Eggenbergs, Lobkowitzs, Dietrichsteins, Auerspergs and Schwarzenbergs – had established themselves on the princes' bench of the Imperial Diet much earlier. This achievement was ultimately "*thanks to Anton Florian, who arranged, so to speak, higher ordination for Johann Adam's financial transaction* ."²⁹

Among the other princes who ruled in the 18th century, the most important was the aforementioned Joseph Wenzel (who ruled from 1748 to 1772 after having exercised guardianship over the underage Prince Johann Nepomuk Karl [1724–1748] from 1732 to 1744). As a diplomat (1735/36 in Berlin, 1737–1741 in Paris),

²⁸ Merki: *Liechtensteinische Güter*, p. 102.

²⁹ Press: *Das Haus Liechtenstein*, p. 57.

military commander and reformer of the artillery, he rendered great service to the Habsburgs and the continuing existence of their monarchy. As director-general of the Austrian artillery, an office which Joseph Wenzel took over in 1744, at the start of the Second Silesian War and in the midst of the War of the Austrian Succession, he made a decisive contribution – in part through his private property – to the modernisation of the Austrian artillery. The outstanding merit of Joseph Wenzel was “*establishing a new generation of field guns, howitzers and mortars of all manner of shapes and dimensions of [strictly standardised] calibres, which in the military campaigns of the following decades proved themselves to such an extent that with only slight modifications they formed part of the standard equipment of the Austrian artillery for more than a hundred years*”.³⁰ During the Seven Years War he also managed to more than double the number of guns in the space of four years, from 202 in 1756 to 458 in 1760. “*This prince, who was de facto head of the family for 36 years, from 1732 to 1744 and from 1748 to 1772, was a stabilizing pillar of the dynasty after the extinction of Karl’s line and an important figure in its history. For as long as he lived, he managed to reconcile the various interests of different members and lines of the family under a single banner*.”³¹

In 1772 the inheritance of Joseph Wenzel was taken over by his nephew Franz Josef I (1726–1781), who was succeeded after only nine years by his son Alois I (1759–1805). After a brief military career, Alois I concentrated “*entirely on managing his estates and through agricultural and industrial modernisation showed that he was a far-sighted lord of the manor*”.³² In 1783 he purchased the estate of Radim in Bohemia, thus unifying the properties of Kostelec nad Černými lesy/Schwarzkostelez, Uhříněves/Auřinowes, Škvorec/Škworetz, Rataje nad Sázavou/Rattay and Kounice u Prahy/Kaunitz near Prague) into a single complex. He initiated extensive economic reforms on his estates in the lands of Bohemia and Austria, and in 1787 he divided them into five “*inspectorate districts*”. The inspectors, who represented a new level of authority between the central princely administration and the individual estates, received extensive instructions entitled “*Economic Reform*”, in which Prince Alois emphasised that his determination to reform and innovate stemmed “*not only from the mere necessity of supporting our private welfare, but also the welfare of our subjects and officials, which will also bring a certain benefit to the state*”. In this endeavour, everyone was to keep

³⁰ Kunisch, Johannes: *Liechtenstein, Joseph Wenzel*. In: *Neue Deutsche Biographie* 14, 1985, p. 518 ff; cited here from the internet version: <http://www.deutsche-biographie.de/sfz51267.html> (accessed 15 September 2013).

³¹ Merki: *Liechtensteinische Güter*, p. 98.

³² Press: *Das Haus Liechtenstein*, p. 61.

in mind a basic tenet: “*The example of the lord of the manor holds up a mirror to his subject and promotes the welfare of both of them.*”³³ In 1792 two economic advisors were appointed to coordinate the economic reforms. The organisational structure created around the year 1790 “*essentially, though of course with further distinctions, remained in operation until the 20th century*”.³⁴ Another of Prince Alois I’s innovations – inspired by Emperor Joseph II’s reforms for civil servants – was the introduction of so-called Conduitelisten (tables of all the officials on one site with details of their education, language skills, duties performed and way of life) and a pension system for officials on the estates and officials of the central princely administration (1786–1787). From 1790 on, Alois I’s major building projects in Vienna, Lower Austria and Moravia were directed by the famous architect and inventor Joseph Hardtmuth as the prince’s “court” architect. The bibliophile prince founded the Liechtenstein fideicommissum library, which during his rule became one of the largest and most valuable libraries in the Habsburg monarchy. In the Majoratshaus in Vienna’s Herrengasse, Prince Alois I had erected a huge library hall with a double row of columns, which soon came to be regarded “*as an outstanding Viennese sight*”.³⁵

³³ Cited from Winkelbauer, Thomas: *Haklich und der Korruption unterworfen. Die Verwaltung der liechtensteinischen Herrschaften und Güter im 17. und 18. Jahrhundert.* In: Oberhammer, E. (ed.): *Der ganzen Welt ein Lob und Spiegel.* Vienna – Munich 1990, pp. 86–114, here p. 95.

³⁴ Löffle, Josef: *Die Verwaltung der Herrschaften und Güter.* In: Merki, Christoph Maria – Löffle, Josef: *Das Haus Liechtenstein in den böhmischen Ländern vom Mittelalter bis ins 20. Jahrhundert – Güter, Rechte, Verwaltung.* Vaduz 2013, pp. 169–208, here p. 42.

³⁵ Haupt, Herbert: *Liechtenstein, Alois I. Josef von.* In: *Historisches Lexikon des Fürstentums Liechtenstein*, Bd. 1. Vaduz 2013, pp. 526 ff., here p. 527.

b. The 19th Century

In Paris on 12 July 1806, representatives of sixteen southern and western German states signed the Treaty of the Confederation of the Rhine. No-one doubted the fact that this was the swan song of the thousand-year Holy Roman Empire. The signatories to the treaty, which established the Confederation of the Rhine, seceded from the empire, gave up their titles which they used on these lands and rejected the imperial laws. The French emperor, Napoleon I, became the protector of this new confederation, thus turning the Confederation of the Rhine into his own satellite territory. The Confederation of the Rhine was an important ally of France and according to the treaty an army of 63,000 men had to be raised, a number which grew substantially as more states joined the confederation. The seat of the confederation diet was in Frankfurt, a free imperial city, which managed to preserve its importance even during the times of change at the start of the 19th century. The new order was essentially a copy of the old relationship between France and Austria, where it was characteristic of the first partner to find allies in order to destabilize the position of the second. At the same time, the Illyrian Provinces were established under French patronage. Napoleon even tried to support the Hungarian separatists, which naturally met with failure, as at that time it was in the Hungarian nobility's interest to support the Habsburg monarchy.

In light of these circumstances, according to the emperor Francis II there was no sense in the continued existence of the Holy Roman Empire. The Habsburg ruler was convinced that the agony of the medieval empire should not be prolonged and so on 6 August 1806 he announced that he was abdicating from the Holy Empire's throne and dissolving the empire. He also gave up his name and henceforth was known as Francis I, Emperor of Austria. The Habsburg empire in Central Europe was replaced by the empire of the Bonapartes.

One of the founding members of the Confederation of the Rhine was the ruler of Liechtenstein, though it is interesting that, this aside, he never demonstrated any kind of initiative. He was not present at any of the negotiations, either in person or through an envoy. Johann I also never officially left the union of the Holy Roman Empire. Nevertheless, this was an event of considerable significance. While a number of larger states were dissolved and their territories were absorbed by their more successful neighbours, at this time of violent change Liechtenstein not only survived but became a sovereign state. Although its importance was minimal, it was part of the Confederation of the Rhine and its representative sat at the confederation diet in Frankfurt.

Prince Johann I of Liechtenstein (1760–1836) was well aware of the principality's importance for his family's standing. It was thanks to his tenure that the Liechtensteins remained among the high nobility, while subordination to another state would obviously have meant the definitive loss of this expensively acquired status. Therefore, as early as 1805 he tried to mediate through the French ambassador in Vienna to ensure the safety of his country and avert the risk of annexation. However, his position was far from easy – as an Austrian army officer he owed his allegiance to the emperor, but as a ruler he had to prioritize the interests of Liechtenstein. Therefore, to prevent his subjects in the confederation army from fighting against Austria he paid a Nassau duke to recruit and retain a unit of forty soldiers to take the place of Liechtenstein soldiers in the confederation army. Liechtenstein was also part of France's strategy as it made a weak forward defensive position for the Habsburg empire. Therefore, an alliance with Liechtenstein at that point corresponded with France's aim of weakening the power of Austria. In France's view, Liechtenstein was part of Central Europe, which also applied in the long run to other German states such as Bavaria.

Johann's position, however, had been made significantly easier by paragraph VII of the Treaty of the Confederation of the Rhine, forbidding its individual rulers from entering into the service of foreign powers. As the prince was an Austrian general, a rank he was not willing to surrender, he passed on the throne to his third son, Karl (1803–1871). It is a matter of debate why he omitted his first son, Alois (1796–1858), and his second son, Franz (1802–1887). Perhaps by so doing he wanted to emphasize the formality of such a step. Naturally, Prince Karl never ruled over the principality from 1806 to 1813 as he was too young to be involved in political or administrative matters. His reign was merely an insignificant episode and sometimes his name does not even appear on the lists of Liechtenstein rulers. The events at the start of the 19th century were so precipitous and dramatic that they called for a truly capable man and not an inexperienced child. Therefore, despite the fact that Johann I had officially stepped down, in reality the reins of government were still in his hands.

Here it is necessary to examine a complex and hitherto unanswered question relating to the relationships between the Liechtenstein prince, Johann I, the French emperor, Napoleon I, and the Austrian emperor, Francis I. It was of considerable importance that the French foreign minister, Charles-Maurice de Talleyrand-Périgord (1754–1838), was well-disposed towards the Liechtenstein prince. Evidently, the two first met during discussions on the Peace of Pressburg, where Talleyrand represented France, whilst Liechtenstein and Count Ignaz Gyulai (1763–1831) led the discussions on behalf of the Austrian emperor. Shortly afterwards, Talleyrand intervened on behalf of Johann with the emperor and helped to preserve

the sovereignty of his principality. However, just as important was the fact that Napoleon recognised and appreciated Johann I as an exceptionally capable military leader. It is also possible that he saw him as his potential agent in the Viennese court, and it is also possible that he considered him as a candidate for the German throne should its leader prove to be too independent. On the other hand, Francis I evidently considered Johann as his informer in the Confederation of the Rhine and even around Napoleon.

Throughout the existence of the Confederation of the Rhine, Liechtenstein was a calm province which was unaffected by war. The end of French dominance came with the three-day “Battle of the Nations” at Leipzig from 16 to 19 October 1813, where Napoleon I was defeated and his German satellite structure fell like a house of cards, thus ending the period of rapprochement between Liechtenstein and France. Liechtenstein once more turned towards Austria. It was no longer part of Central Europe for France, while the Danubian monarchy began to see it as a shield against the unification of the German regions³⁶

Bavaria had left the confederation even before the Battle of Leipzig, and several other states, including Liechtenstein, were to follow its example. Johann now carried out this step in his own name and not that of his son, Karl, meaning he was once more in charge of the government. The Liechtenstein prince also took part in the Viennese Congress, which from November 1814 to May 1815 met in the Austrian capital to discuss the future configuration of the European continent. When in February 1814 Napoleon left the island of Elba for the French coast to restore his empire, the Liechtenstein contingent was among those armies which contributed towards his final defeat at the Battle of Waterloo. On 8 June 1815, shortly before his capitulation, the great powers approved the Treaty of the German Confederation, which gave rise to a new territorial unit on the lands of the former Holy Roman Empire. The Principality of Liechtenstein entered into the German Confederation as a full member and it remained an integral part of it until the Austro-Prussian War of 1866.

One of the outcomes of this conflict was the end of the German Confederation, which signalled the end of Austrian dominance in this area, and was a fundamental step towards the creation of the German Empire in 1871. After the breakup of the confederation, its states were given full sovereignty (those which had not been annexed by Prussia). This also applied to diminutive Liechtenstein, and immediately its ruler was confronted by a number of new issues. These did

³⁶ Horel, Catherine: *Cette Europe qu'on dit centrale. Des Habsbourg à l'intégration européenne (1815–2004)*. Paris 2009, p. 40.

not only relate to the delegation of certain state affairs to the principality in the Danube monarchy, but also to the position of the ruling dynasty within Austro-Hungary. After centuries the Liechtensteins were among the highest aristocracy of this empire and the majority of their property was to be found there. While the dynasty owned only 189 hectares of land in the principality,³⁷ in Austria in 1913 the size of their estates reached 207,959 hectares, placing them amongst the richest landowners in Europe. In first place were the Esterházy in Hungary, who thanks to their lines of princes and counts were the largest landowners in the Habsburg monarchy. In second place were the Schwarzenbergs, whose estates were mainly to be found in Bohemia. The Liechtensteins were in third place.³⁸ The largest part (Ca. 160,000 ha) of this property was to be found in the Lands of the Bohemian Crown. However, the Liechtensteins also owned small estates in Hungary (96 ha), Saxony (169 ha) and Prussia (164 ha).³⁹ The majority of the estates belonged to the reigning prince, but some belonged to other branches of the family. This applied to Moravský Krumlov/Mährisch Kromau, which was owned by the secundogeniture of the family from 1771 until it came to an end in 1908.⁴⁰

Whilst the status of the members of the non-reigning branches was clearly defined⁴¹ the status of the reigning prince and his closest relatives in the monarchy was not consolidated until the mid-19th century following several supreme rulings by Emperor Franz Joseph, some of which later became enshrined in the law.

This mainly concerned the right of extraterritoriality. This was a privilege for members of the Habsburg-Lorraine house and was rarely bestowed, even in a monarchy with members of the reigning family or families which had previously ruled.⁴² These privileged people were not subject to the normal courts of the monarchy, but only to the office of the supreme court marshal, and this also applied to their moveable property. However, extraterritoriality did not extend to real assets

³⁷ Of which only 11 hectares were arable land. The rest consisted of forest.

³⁸ Horel, Catherine: *Die Enteignung des Adels in Ungarn nach 1945. Eine vergleichende Perspektive*. In: Liechtensteinisch-Tschechische Historikerkommission (ed.): *Das Fürstenhaus, der Staat Liechtenstein und die Tschechoslowakei im 20. Jahrhundert*. Vaduz 2013, p. 105.

³⁹ These were parts of estates which spread into neighbouring states: Rumburg/Rumburk (Saxony) and Jägerndorf/Krnov (Prussia).

⁴⁰ From 1802 Gross-Ullersdorf (Velké Losiny) was also part of the property of this side of the family. After the line of Rudolph (1838–1908) died out, Mährisch Kromau (Moravský Krumlov) was inherited by his relatives from the family of Kinsky princes, Gross-Ullersdorf (Velké Losiny) went to a member of the primogeniture line, Prince Alois (1869–1959), father of the future reigning prince, Franz Josef II.

⁴¹ They were part of the Austrian aristocracy and their position in the court derived from Habsburg traditions and regulations.

⁴² During the 19th century this privilege was also acquired (in addition to the Liechtensteins) by the Bourbon (family of King Charles X), Braganza, Cumberland and Sachsen-Weimar families.

(land ownership including fideicommissum), which continued to be subject to the normal imperial courts and offices. In this respect, Liechtenstein was unique in the Habsburg monarchy. On the one hand, it was a sovereign state, while on the other, its reigning prince belonged to the nobility of the Habsburg monarchy.

The Liechtensteins were granted the right of extraterritoriality by a supreme ruling from Emperor Francis Joseph on 30 July 1851 (and a decree by the ministry of justice no. 183 from 10 August of the same year incorporated into the imperial code). However, this right only applied to the reigning prince, his wife and children. Therefore, this only applied to Alois II and his successor in the office of Liechtenstein ruler, i.e. only the reigning prince's immediate family. As this privilege did not even extend to the successor of the Liechtenstein throne once he had reached adulthood, in 1880 Johann II asked the Austrian emperor to extend the privilege of extraterritoriality to all members of the house and also to extend the privileges of the prince himself. Extraterritoriality was also to be extended to the princely residency, his means of transport (horse and carriages) as well as his immediate passage through customs inspections. However, these claims were rejected outright by the Austro-Hungarian foreign minister, Baron Heinrich Karl von Haymerle (1828–1881), who was only willing to accept the extraterritoriality of the family palace on Bankgasse. However, Prince Johann II did not stay very often in Vienna, prioritizing his rural estates in Feldsberg (Valtice) (at that time Lower Austria) or Lednice in Moravia. It is therefore of little surprise that he tried to extend the extraterritorial rights to this chateau, and in the end he was successful. On 24 October 1880, Baron Haymerle announced to the prince's representative that a supreme ruling by the emperor on 3 October 1880 extended the extraterritorial privilege, which until then had applied only to the palace on Bankgasse, to other residencies of the sovereign Liechtenstein rulers.

Johann II was less successful in matters concerning other family members. This was why the request for extraterritoriality was restricted to two of his siblings: Princess Theresia (1850–1938) and Prince Franz (1853–1938), later Franz I. When the decree was issued, Theresia was his only unmarried sister (in 1882 she married the Bavarian prince, Arnulf), then Franz, as the only brother of the childless Johann II, inherited the Liechtenstein throne, which he took up in 1929. Haymerle recommended a revised request and Emperor Francis Joseph approved it with a supreme ruling on 3 October 1880. The extension of extraterritorial rights became publicly known through a decree by the imperial minister of justice no. 134 on 5 November 1880.

However, in the case of Prince Franz, the privilege of extraterritoriality caused certain misgivings. Unlike his brother, who exercised his authority as the reigning prince and maintained a distance from Vienna, he had been in the Aus-

tro-Hungarian diplomatic service since 1878 and was, therefore, a state employee of the Danube monarchy. This was evidently why he was not recognised in Austria after the disintegration of the empire in 1918, unlike his brother, as his privileged status was not based on the norms of international law, but solely on ceremonial and diplomatic recognition of him as an individual.

The issue of citizenship was also complicated as all the members of the Liechtenstein family were citizens of Liechtenstein. Although it was possible to hold dual citizenship based on the laws of the Principality, according to Austrian law you lost Austrian citizenship if you accepted nationality of another country. Despite the fact that both countries had been so closely linked since the mid-19th century, there was a considerable legal problem at work here. The situation was resolved in 1887 when the status of Liechtenstein citizens was modified by a special decree by the Austro-Hungarian foreign minister, Count Gustav Kálnoky. This stated that the members of the Liechtenstein family from the first sovereign leader, Johann I, were not Austrian citizens, and only possessed those rights which were accorded to citizens of the Austrian empire.⁴³

Therefore, the members of the Liechtenstein primogeniture constituted quite a remarkable group of Austrian citizens-noncitizens. They had the same rights as citizens of the empire, though in reality they were not Austrian citizens. The majority of the family members was subject to imperial law, but some of them had the right of extraterritoriality and therefore had the same status as members of the Habsburg-Lorraine dynasty. The exclusive status of the dynasty was further strengthened by a supreme ruling by Emperor Francis Joseph from 1903. At the wedding of Prince Alois (1869–1955) and the emperor's niece, the archduchess Elisabeth Amalie (1878–1960), the emperor announced that this was bringing together two ruling dynasties, thus raising the Liechtensteins above the other princely families of the Habsburg monarchy.⁴⁴

In addition to the legal status of the Liechtenstein family members, there was also the complicated issue of the Liechtenstein property. The right of extraterritoriality applied to the moveable property of the ruler and his nearest family, while the non-moveable property located in Austro-Hungary naturally remained an inseparable part of the monarchy. Therefore, all of the Liechtenstein estates on

⁴³ However, this privilege only applied to the Liechtenstein primogeniture. The secundogeniture in Mährisch Kromau (Moravský Krumlov) and Gross-Ullersdorf (Velké Losiny) had no such rights.

⁴⁴ Elisabeth Amalie was the youngest daughter of the emperor's brother, Karl Ludwig (1833–1896) and his third wife, Maria Theresia of Braganza (1855–1944). She was therefore the half-sister of the heir to the throne, Francis Ferdinand d'Este (1863–1914) and the aunt of the future emperor, Charles I (1887–1922).

the territory of the Austro-Hungarian monarchy were subject to the local laws and the princes had to pay the appropriate taxes and fees for them. The ruling prince only had full sovereignty over his property in the Principality. According to imperial law no. 61 from 1868, the issue of fideicommissum (in particular their creation, confirmation, substantive changes, etc.), was a matter for government ruling and had to be approved by the imperial council, and it was in this way that some property matters of the Liechtenstein dynasty were dealt with in the mid-19th century. Law no. 62 from 16 May 1874 was an expansion of the ancestral fideicommissum of the ruling princes of Liechtenstein relating to more estates in Bohemia and Moravia, and on 12 January 1893 a Liechtenstein family agreement announced by Prince Alois II in August 1842 was incorporated as law no. 15/1893 into the Cisleithanian Code.

The law from 1893 was to be a matter of the greatest importance for the dynasty, and the issue of how it was incorporated into the Czechoslovak legal system became the subject of a long-running court case which the Liechtensteins had with the Czechoslovak Republic after 1918. There were several aspects to the document. Most importantly, it confirmed the validity of the older family agreements: the fideicommissum negotiated by the brothers Karl, Maximilian and Gundaker von Liechtenstein from 1606, and the will of Prince Hartmann von Liechtenstein from 1672.

The first agreement from 1606 introduced the so-called fideicommissum substitution, or a means of inheriting property and prohibiting the transfer of the Liechtenstein estates away from the family. The succession was based on the principles of primogeniture, which excluded women and clergymen, including members of knightly orders. They could only manage the ancestral estates after obtaining a papal dispensation allowing them to return to laity. Hartmann's will from 1672 further strengthened the powers of the head of the family and established the rules of succession. The inheritor of the family fideicommissum could only be a member of the family who had concluded an equal marriage (i.e. a marriage to someone from an equally elevated aristocratic family), approved by the ruling prince and the other Liechtensteins, and on the condition that they were of the Catholic faith.⁴⁵

Alois II's family agreement supplemented and further developed these two documents. It modified the status of the princely family as a ruling dynasty, it linked the office of Liechtenstein ruler to the function of head of the family and

⁴⁵ Hartmann's will only related to the Gundaker side. It applied to the whole family only after the older (Karl's) line died out in 1712. All the property (including Vaduz and Schellenberg) was thus transferred to the Gundaker side.

enshrined the rules of succession based on the principles of *fideicommissum* from 1606. The Liechtenstein throne was thus inherited according to the rule of primogeniture for the descendants of Prince Johann I (1760–1836), and if this line were to die out in the men's stem, the right of succession was transferred to the younger Moravský Krumlov / Mährisch Kromau side. If the whole family were to die out, then the rights of rule and inheritance passed to the women and then to their male descendants, if they came from an old aristocratic family.

An extremely important element of the agreement from 1842 was the section dealing with the economic aspect of the exercise of ruling rights. An integral part of the Principality of Liechtenstein was in fact capital, which enabled the rulers to lead a reasonably aristocratic life. Revenues from the local princely demesne had been too low and were not even enough to cover the costs of managing the Principality. Originally the entire capital was deposited in the bank of the Swabian Circle, but on the basis of an agreement from 1754, part of it was transferred to a cash *fideicommissum* secured by returns from the Moravian estates of Úsov (Mährisch Aussee), Šternberk (Sternberg) and Karlovec (Karlsberg). After the demise of the Holy Roman Empire, an agreement from 1809 meant that the remaining Swabian capital was invested in Austrian government bonds with an annual interest rate of four per cent. According to an agreement from 1842, both funds represented grants to the Liechtenstein Principality and could not be reduced or further transferred. The proceeds from the bonds and the cash *fideicommissum* could only be used to cover the costs of managing the Principality, to extend its territory, to modernize the country, or to further increase its capital.

The exclusive holder of all these assets and revenues was the reigning prince, not the other members of the family. He was also obliged to maintain the territorial integrity of Liechtenstein in its entirety (which also meant the capital and cash *fideicommissum* from the Moravian estates), and to expand the territory of his country further if possible. If in the future it were feasible to expand the Principality through a peace treaty, international agreement or marriage, then that area and its inhabitants would constitute an integral part of Liechtenstein.

However, the status of the ruling prince of Liechtenstein also raised many issues within the Habsburg monarchy. In terms of international law, the question of hereditary membership of the House of Lords was a particularly thorny issue. The groundwork for the creation of this institution was Schmerling's (February) constitution of 1861. An Imperial Council edict not only established the Chamber of Deputies, with delegates sent by individual diets elected on the basis of curial law, but also the House of Lords with members appointed by the emperor. The bicameral system was maintained even after the enactment of dualism and the acceptance of the December Constitution in Cisleithania in 1867. With-

in the European monarchies, the Austrian House of Lords constituted a special form of upper chamber, which was similar to the British House of Lords. It was not only for adult members of the Habsburg-Lorraine dynasty, the landowning aristocracy and members of the high clergy, but also for those appointed by the monarch; the so-called lifetime members were men who had rendered outstanding merits to state and church, sciences and arts. Ancestral aristocracy was determined by inherited membership, which no untitled Austrian citizen could aspire to. On the basis of Section 3 of the “Constitutional law on Imperial representation” of 26 February 1861, the privilege of hereditary membership was restricted to “adult members of local noble families with extensive land property to whom the emperor granted the hereditary title of Imperial Counsellor”.⁴⁶ The reigning prince of Liechtenstein, who during the entire constitutional rule in Austria had been Johann II, received this dignity immediately after the issuing of the February Constitution in 1861. Already in his lifetime this matter attracted extraordinary attention. Johann II was the only ruler of a sovereign state who was also a member of parliament of another country.⁴⁷

Although at the time these laws and decrees strengthened the status of the Liechtensteins within the monarchy, after the outbreak of war in 1914, and especially after the demise of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, they were to become more of a millstone as they appeared to demonstrate a large dependency on Vienna. Moreover, in 1880 the Liechtenstein prince gave his formal consent for the interests of the Principality abroad to be continued to be represented by the Danubian monarchy. This step raised the question among many foreign politicians and lawyers as to whether the Principality was indeed independent, when in fact it was only confirming the status quo. Most of the time the Liechtensteins toed a pro-Austrian line, and with respect to their ties to the Vienna Court and taking into account the small military-economic importance of the state, the notion of any independent foreign policy was illusory. The sovereignty of Liechtenstein, like that of other German states, was not associated with factors of political power.

⁴⁶ Paragraph 3 of the Constitution of 21 December 1867, which changed the wording of the Constitution of 26 February 1861, read as: “*Hereditary members of the House of Lords are representatives of those domestic noble families who own estates lying within the kingdom and lands represented at the Imperial Council and on whom the emperor conferred the hereditary dignity of Imperial Counsellor.*”

⁴⁷ It was not such a problem for the other family members. In 1871 hereditary membership from the primogeniture was acquired by Prince Franz (1802–1887), which was then inherited by his son, Alfred (1842–1907), and then by his grandson, Franz (1868–1929). From 1861 this privilege was then given to the head of the Mährisch Kromau (Moravský Krumlov) secundogeniture. Several members of the dynasty were appointed lifetime members of the House of Lords.

The country had no major geopolitical significance for Austria or for any other neighbouring state. It itself had no ambitions regarding the surrounding lands, while it was not viewed for possible annexation by other countries. Moreover, even during the existence of the German Confederation, when the Principality kept an envoy at the seat of the German Confederation in Frankfurt, in certain cases the prince would ask for the assistance of Austrian diplomats. For example, when in 1860 the young Johann II wanted to visit Queen Victoria, he asked Count Rudolf Apponyi, the Austrian ambassador at the British royal court, to mediate. He then turned to the state secretary of the foreign office, Lord John Russell, emphasizing that he was asking for his help as a foreign minister rather than the royal court directly because Johann II was not just an Austrian aristocrat, but above all an independent ruler.

There was also some confusion (especially abroad) caused by the fact that even though the capital of the Principality of Liechtenstein was Vaduz, the majority of the central offices were situated in Austria, particularly in Vienna. The prince's residences included three Viennese palaces (a city palace on Bankgasse, a summer palace in Rossau and a palace on Herrengasse,⁴⁸ the chateaux at Feldsberg (Valtice) and Lednice (Eisgrub) (the prince had no grand residence in Liechtenstein until the reconstruction of Vaduz Castle), while the final resting place of the prince and other members of the dynasty was traditionally the family tomb in Vranov (Wranau) near Brno (Brünn).

The de facto government of the Principality, which was subordinate to the provincial administration in Vaduz, was located in the capital of the monarchy. Most of the Liechtenstein central bodies were to be found in Vienna in the city palace with windows opening onto Bankgasse and Minoritenplatz, which was located near the Austro-Hungarian foreign ministry. The country's administration was dealt with almost exclusively by citizens of the monarchy, some of whom were later given honorary Liechtenstein citizenship or (very rarely) were ennobled by the prince. The most important office was that of the Court Chancellor at the head of the authorised court council, which represented the central administrative body of the princely estates in the Danube monarchy. In addition to the court council, he was a member of the court of chancery and the privy council, whose responsibilities usually included supervising matters concerning the Principality of Liechtenstein. There was also the seat of the political appellate for the Principality of Liechtenstein and the appeal court for the Principality of Liechtenstein. Both institutions were appellate bodies. The first of these dealt with appeals

⁴⁸ This palace was pulled down in 1913 and replaced by a modern building.

against decisions by the Liechtenstein provincial government, and the second dealt with decisions of the provincial court in Vaduz. The prince's cabinet chancellor, as well as the family archives, a remarkable picture gallery and extensive fideicommissum library, were all located in the summer palace on Fürstengasse. However, the princely accounting department was situated outside of Vienna, in the castle at Bučovice (Butschowitz) in Moravia. It functioned as the central accounting and audit office for all the princely estates, as an audit office for the princely funds, and the supervisory institution for Liechtenstein's 22 administrative and 24 forestry offices. Only the office of the local princely estates was located in Vaduz, but this did not have a great role to play due to the small size of the crown assets in the country.

This situation remained the same until the outbreak of the First World War. As in the past, some members of the Liechtenstein family continued to work in the diplomatic service, while other members of the family fought as officers of the Austro-Hungarian army at the front. The end of the war and the collapse of the Austro-Hungarian Empire brought no territorial change for the Principality of Liechtenstein. In contrast to Austria, Hungary and Germany, Liechtenstein did not experience any revolutionary unrest. However, domestic political innovations and a reorientation towards Switzerland followed. The profound changes in the transformation of Central Europe after the war touched the country indirectly, the princely house very directly.

The 20th Century

(1) *Historical turning points*

The twentieth century was characterised by trauma and dislocation: two world wars, revolutions, the collapse of empires, the emergence of new nation-states, the heightening of ethnic tensions, the Cold War, democratic revolutions. It is within this context that the history of the Czech lands, the Principality of Liechtenstein, the Liechtenstein family and their relationships unfolded.

The Lands of the Bohemian Crown entered the First World War as part of the Austro-Hungarian Empire. After the defeat of the Central Powers and the collapse of the Danube monarchy, the Czechoslovak Republic was founded in 1918. From 1938, however, it existed in a truncated form – Slovakia separated in 1939 and the rest of the territory was occupied by the Germans as the ‘Protectorate of Bohemia and Moravia’ from 1938–1945. After the re-establishment of Czechoslovakia in 1945 followed the communist dictatorship since 1948. It ended decades later with a democratic revolution in 1989. In 1993, Czechoslovakia split into two separate states: the Czech Republic and the Slovak Republic.

One specific problem in the Lands of the Bohemian Crown, and subsequently in Czechoslovakia, was the occasionally conflictual coexistence of Germans and Czechs. In the 19th and early 20th centuries, attempts were made to address the issue of the coexistence of Czechs and Germans, though these were not of lasting success. During the interwar period in Czechoslovakia, a part of the Sudeten Germans demanded greater autonomy, but eventually these demands amounted to the annexation to Hitler’s Germany of those areas, where the Sudeten Germans were settling. This quest, spearheaded by the Sudeten German Party and taken up by Hitler, led the signatories of the Munich Conference to approve the secession of the Sudeten lands from Czechoslovakia and their absorption by Germany. The Munich Agreement and the subsequent brutal period of occupation of Bohemia and Moravia decisively deepened the gulf between Czechs and Germans. After the liberation in 1945, a solution has been seen in depriving “Germans” (and “Magyars”/“Hungarians”) of citizenship, and to expel them from Czechoslovakia while confiscating their property – all of which was based on Edvard Beneš’s presidential decrees. These measures were based on the principle of collective responsibility, without guilt or innocence being individually proven based on the rule of law. The decisive factor was a desire for punishment and retribution, which was understandable after the experiences from the period of occupation. Expul-

sion and confiscation were obviously problematic both in terms of the fundamental rights enshrined in the Constitution of 1920 (particularly part VI), as well as the principles of the Charter of the United Nations, which Czechoslovakia undertook to respect with its signature in June 1945. As for the displacement of “Germans” and the confiscation of their property, the Communist government later rubber-stamped this Czech nationalist solution. Successive governments since 1989 have also stood by this position, albeit with certain conditional exceptions.

In marked contrast, the parallel history of Liechtenstein unfolded much less dramatically. The small, unarmed, neutral country was not involved in either of the world wars, nor was it affected by Nazi occupation or communist dictatorship. However, during the First World War it suffered economic hardships, as did the population of Austria-Hungary, with whom it had shared a customs and monetary union since the 19th century. After the First World War, Liechtenstein inclined towards Switzerland in the form of a customs union, the use of the Swiss franc as its currency, and the use of the Swiss post. Switzerland also represented Liechtenstein diplomatically during the interwar period. Nevertheless, Liechtenstein was affected by the economic crisis, the result of which was unemployment and political unrest. During the period when Hitler took over Austria in 1938 and subsequently the whole of Europe, there existed in Liechtenstein from 1938–1945 a small, spirited Nazi party called the “Volksdeutsche Bewegung in Liechtenstein” (the German National Movement in Liechtenstein). It was not represented in parliament and was rejected by a large majority of the population, the government and the prince. Liechtenstein benefited during the Second World War from the national economic supply by Switzerland, and soon became part of Western economic expansion after the war.

Through the prince of Liechtenstein and his family, this country on the Alpine Rhine was still closely linked to the distant Czech lands in the first half of the 20th century, and after 1918 the prince and other family members were closely linked to Czechoslovakia as influential propertied aristocrats since the Late Middle Ages. There were two phases which led to the complete loss of this property – first, they lost more than half from 1920 to 1938 as a result of Czechoslovak land reform (with financial compensation), and they lost the rest after 1945 through confiscation.

The fate of the Czech (Bohemian) lands, Czechoslovakia and its population in the first half of the 20th century had repercussions for the Principality of Liechtenstein and the Liechtenstein princely family. The prince was both the head of state and the head of the family. He gradually lost 90% of his assets as a result of land reform and confiscation in Czechoslovakia. From the 1920s to the 1960s the prince and his family were plagued by financial difficulties. Soon it became impossible to follow the princely tradition of helping in an emergency when the country

had financial problems.⁴⁹ On the other hand, the principality very rapidly gained in importance for the prince. The centre of princely life, which had previously been his Moravian residences and Vienna, became the previously marginal areas on the Rhine: In 1938 Vaduz became the permanent residence of the prince.

(2) Four princes

Four princes from the Liechtenstein family reigned during the 20th century: Johann II from 1858–1929, his brother Franz I from 1929–1938, his nephew Franz Josef II from 1938–1989 and his son Hans-Adam II since 1989.

Johann II

Prince Johann II (1840–1929) resided at the Feldsberg (Valtice) chateau and in Vienna. He had numerous possessions in Moravia, Bohemia and Silesia, and was respected as a patron of cultural and religious institutions. Feldsberg (Valtice), which was originally located in Lower Austria, became part of Czechoslovakia in 1919 as a result of the new border demarcation set out by the peace treaty of Saint-Germain. Prince Johann II was unmarried and childless, and as a devout Catholic led a solitary life. He ruled the Principality and the Liechtenstein family for seven decades, during which he administered the large, widely scattered princely estates. He devoted himself to collecting art and he founded and supported cultural and scientific institutions. He also helped countless churches. He paid off the considerable debt which the Principality had run up with Switzerland for food during the First World War. He also took on the huge loss suffered by the state-owned bank, Liechtensteinische Landesbank, in 1928 as a result of fraud.

As a young 22-year-old prince in 1862, Johann signed the first constitution defining the Principality as a constitutional monarchy, and he also ratified a more modern constitution in 1921. This constitution, with numerous modifications, still applies to this day. Since 1921 it has defined the government of the Principality as a “hereditary constitutional monarchy with a parliamentary and democratic basis” (art. 2). In terms of legislation, the people elect a parliament – Landtag – (15 MPs, today 25), while the prince has the right to veto laws. Since 1921, the direct democratic rights have included the right to vote and the right to propose legisla-

⁴⁹ Quaderer, Rupert: “*Die Sehnsucht nach Deinem Geld ist unermesslich*”. *Das Fürstenhaus als finanzieller Nothelfer Liechtensteins in den Jahren nach dem Zweiten Weltkrieg*. In: Liechtensteinisch-Tschechische Historikerkommission (ed.): *Das Fürstenhaus, der Staat Liechtenstein und die Tschechoslowakei im 20. Jahrhundert*. Vaduz 2013, pp. 25–42.

tion and call a referendum on the constitution and laws. During Johann II's reign, after 1918 and the defeat and disintegration of the Austro-Hungarian monarchy, the tax and customs union with Austria was annulled and agreements were made with Switzerland. These related to a customs union, the Swiss franc and the diplomatic representation of Liechtenstein by Switzerland and not Austria as it had been until then. Liechtenstein had its own embassy in Vienna from 1919 to 1923, as well as in Bern from 1919 to 1933, and then again from 1944.

The relationship with Czechoslovakia, founded in 1918, was complicated, both for the prince personally and for the Principality. The Czechoslovak government did not approve of Liechtenstein's intention to open an embassy in Prague, while at the Paris Peace Conference, the foreign minister, Edvard Beneš, also worked to prevent Liechtenstein's admission to the conference. Prague also wanted to prevent Liechtenstein's acceptance into the League of Nations, though in this case this was in agreement with the other members of the League, apart from Switzerland, which voted to accept them. The Czechoslovak government did not recognize Liechtenstein as a sovereign state after 1918, principally owing to the land reform, which affected the Liechtensteins' extensive possessions. Land reform was, therefore, easier to implement if the Czechoslovak state was negotiating with the Liechtensteins as landowners and not Liechtenstein as a sovereign state and its representatives. Liechtenstein was only recognised by the Czechoslovak government in July 1938 once land reform had been carried out.

Johann II's demands, which attempted to prevent the land reform or moderate it, or at least to receive some compensation corresponding to the value of nationalizing and forcibly selling his property (instead of approximately one-fifth of its value), was not accepted. The Czechoslovak state and the interested parties from the Agrarian Party pushed to have the agricultural land distributed to the peasantry. For Czechoslovakia this was a revolutionary and complex business. Compensation to the full amount was beyond its financial means and so the negotiations surrounding the surrender and division of the property and compensation stretched on for years.

Despite this, the relationship between the prince and Czechoslovakia was not unfriendly. Prince Johann II, as with his brother, Franz I, "*attempted to have a non-conflictual relationship with Czechoslovakia*".⁵⁰ In the communities of the Liechtenstein estates, the German- and Czech-speaking inhabitants lived

⁵⁰ Dvořák, Tomáš: *Grenzverschiebungen und Bevölkerungstransfers auf den ehemaligen liechtensteinischen Herrschaften in Südmähren und die Frage der regionalen Identität*. In: Liechtensteinisch-Tschechische Historikerkommission (ed.): *Die Liechtenstein: Kontinuitäten – Diskontinuitäten*. Vaduz 2013, p. 222.

together more or less harmoniously and different types of loyalty were interlinked – Moravian (provincial patriotism), Czech or German-Austrian (language identity) and Liechtensteinian (loyalty towards the princely family). President Tomáš G. Masaryk visited Feldsberg (Valtice) in 1928. The visit was in the spirit of the equal coexistence of ethnic groups. The organisers and residents of the communities all contributed towards this, as did Masaryk’s speech, which was partly in German and partly in Czech.⁵¹ Johann II “the Good”, as people called him, died in 1929. His final resting place is in the Liechtenstein tomb below the pilgrimage church in Vranov near Brno (Wranau bei Brünn).

Several years earlier, Johann had already settled the question of the succession with the agnates of the family. The first heir to the throne was Prince Franz, the younger brother of Johann II. The other two legitimate princes had withdrawn from the succession (one being Alois, the father of Franz Josef). Therefore, Johann’s first successor in line was Franz, followed by their young nephew, Franz Josef. When determining the succession, the main concerns were to avoid additional costs resulting from inheritance tax.

Franz I

The urbane Prince Franz von Liechtenstein (1853–1938) was the Austro-Hungarian ambassador in St Petersburg in Tsarist Russia from 1894–1898, which was one of the most important diplomatic posts in the Danubian monarchy. Afterwards, as a versatile patron and an Austrian member of the Order of Malta during the First World War, he was an influential adviser to his princely brother, Johann. In his later years he exercised the office of reigning prince from 1929 to 1938. His Jewish wife, Princess Elsa, née von Gutmann, and Prince Franz married officially shortly after the death of Prince Johann, but they had been unofficially married by a priest a few years earlier. Franz I was a philanthropist and a good-natured man of peace, who opposed both the Communists and the Nazis. He appointed his successor, Franz Josef, at the end of March 1938, and died on 25 July 1938. A Requiem Mass was said in the parish church in Feldsberg (Valtice), and he was buried in the Vranov tomb. President Beneš sent Jan Černý, Governor of Moravia and Silesia and a former prime minister, to the funeral ceremony.

51 Ibid., p. 222.

Franz Josef II

Prince Franz Josef II (1906–1989) was in charge of the princely agenda as prince regent from 30 March 1938 when he was 32. He ruled from 25 July 1938 until his death in 1989. He was born in 1906 in Styria, the first son of Prince Alois von Liechtenstein and the Austrian archduchess, Elisabeth Amalie Habsburg-Lorraine. He lived with his parents in the Liechtensteins' castles, and in Velké Losiny (Gross-Ullersdorf) in northern Moravia from 1911 to 1914. He attended the Schottengymnasium in Vienna, where he graduated in 1925. He then studied forestry at the Agricultural University (Hochschule für Bodenkultur) in Vienna, where he graduated as a forestry engineer in 1929. Before taking up the succession in 1938, he managed the princely estates in Czechoslovakia which still belonged to the Liechtensteins after the land reform. This mainly concerned forestry.

When Hitler was ready to declare war on Czechoslovakia in September 1938 and only refrained from doing so because of the Munich Agreement, which gave him the Sudetenland, Franz Josef II sent a telegram to the Imperial Chancellor on 1 October 1938: “[I am sending you] *also in the name of the Liechtenstein Principality my congratulations on this great feat carried out for world peace and my sincere thanks*”. This telegram, sent in consultation with the cabinet offices in Vienna and the government in Vaduz, was an expression of relief.⁵²

Franz Josef had no sympathy for National Socialism, but he did have in mind the interests of his Principality which was threatened with forced integration into Germany, as well as the interests of the Princely family's property, which had been reduced by half by the Czechoslovak land reform. After the Third Reich occupied Austria in March 1938 and Czechoslovakia in September 1938 and March 1939, it appeared that the Liechtensteins had the opportunity to ask for the return of some of their property which had been confiscated by the Czechoslovak state as part of the land reform, under the condition that the Liechtensteins return any compensation awarded, or rather that they would surrender claims for any compensation which had not yet been paid. This process began in October 1938 and continued until spring 1941. The negotiations partly involved Berlin and partly involved the “Reichsprotektor” and the land office in Prague. The Prince entrusted the negotiations to Prince Karl Alfred and the German lawyer Albrecht Dieckhoff.⁵³

⁵² Hausarchiv Liechtenstein, Vaduz-Vienna, Korr. Kabinettskanzlei, 1938/172 – LLA RF 183/239. – Geiger, Peter: *Krisenzeit. Liechtenstein in den Dreissigerjahren 1928–1939*. Vaduz – Zürich 2000, Bd. 2, p. 243.

⁵³ Geiger, Peter: *Krisenzeit*, Bd. 2, pp. 242–249. – Geiger, Peter: *Kriegszeit. Liechtenstein 1939 bis 1945*. Zürich 2010, pp. 240–244.

Based on reports by General Otakar Zahálka, in the literature there appears a general statement that following the post-Munich demarcation of the borders, members of some aristocratic families whose property lay in the border areas, for example the Liechtensteins and the Schönborns, attempted to have the situation reviewed in favour of the Third Reich, partly because of fears concerning unfinished land reform. However, these measures also had economic justifications.⁵⁴ The attempts to change the borders have been documented in the case of the Liechtensteins, for example at Lanžhot (Lanshut), which remained within the Protectorate of Bohemia and Moravia, and was thus separated from the estate in Břeclav (Lundenburg).⁵⁵ The motivation for such actions has to be viewed not only from the perspective of Liechtenstein estate management, but also from the perspective of the everyday life of its inhabitants (destroyed infrastructure, loss of jobs in Břeclav, no access to the hospital in Feldsberg (Valtice), etc.).

The prince would have liked to buy back the following properties: the Lanškroun (Landskron) estate in the Sudetenland (his expropriated part), Rumburk (Rumburg), Ruda nad Moravou (Eisenberg), Hanušovice (Hansdorf) and several forestry areas, including those near Požořice (Posorschitz). In addition, after the Protectorate was established in 1939, he tried to reacquire the Kostelec nad Černými lesy (Schwarzkostelez) estate near Prague. The prince was mainly concerned with forestry. Together it made up some 29,000 ha and accounted for nearly one-third of the property which the prince had lost as a result of land reform.⁵⁶ The efforts to reacquire the lost land were unsuccessful and by March 1941 at the latest had been deferred “*until after the war*”, as Dieckhoff stated.⁵⁷

Franz Josef spent the war in Vaduz, where he married the countess Georgine von Wilczek in March 1943. He also often spent time in Vienna and with his parents in Velké Losiny (Gross-Ullersdorf). The property which was still owned

⁵⁴ Another of his reports provides information that, for example, Schönborn asked that his estate remain in its entirety, either on one or the other side, but not torn apart. *Mnichov v dokumentech II*. Prague 1958, p. 316. – Cf. Horčíčka, Václav: *Einige grundlegende Probleme des Wirkens der Familie Liechtenstein in den böhmischen Ländern während des Zweiten Weltkrieges*. In: Liechtensteinisch-Tschechische Historikerkommission (ed.): *Liechtensteinische Erinnerungsorte in den böhmischen Ländern*. Vaduz 2012, pp. 123–137. Czech version: Horčíčka, Václav: *Nástin problematiky působení rodu Lichtenštejnů v českých zemích v období druhé světové války*. In: Geiger, Peter – Knoz, Tomáš (eds.): *Místa Lichtenštejnské paměti*. (Časopis Matice moravské 131, 2012 – Supplementum 3). Brno 2012, pp. 107–121.

⁵⁵ Horčíčka: *Einige grundlegende Probleme*, pp. 129 f.

⁵⁶ Geiger: *Krisenzeit*, Bd. 2, pp. 247 f. – Keller-Giger, Susanne: *Bodenreform vor Souveränität*. In: Liechtensteinisch-Tschechische Historikerkommission (ed.): *Das Fürstenhaus, der Staat Liechtenstein und die Tschechoslowakei im 20. Jahrhundert*. Vaduz 2013, p. 48.

⁵⁷ Compilation by Dr. Albrecht Dieckhoff, Hausarchiv Liechtenstein, Vaduz, Korr. Kabinettskanzlei, 1944/16. – Geiger: *Kriegszeit*, Bd. 2, p. 242 f.

by the Liechtensteins after the land reform – forests and agricultural, industrial and entrepreneurial businesses – was also managed by the prince during the Protectorate with some assistance from staff who had worked here earlier and spoke mainly Czech, and less German.⁵⁸

Occasionally the prince would give donations in aid of emerging Nazi units – the Hitlerjugend, the SA and the SS, as well as to the “Winter aid relief” foundation, which was part of the “National Socialist Welfare Organisation” (*NSV-Winterhilfswerk*) – in the “Ostmark” (Eastern March, the Nazi name for Austria) immediately after the Anschluss, in the Sudetenland after the occupation, always on the lands of the princely estates. For example, following a request in autumn 1938, Franz Josef agreed to a one-off contribution towards establishing the SA in Krnov, Opava, Zábřeh, Břeclav, Šternberk, Moravská Třebova, Karlovec, Feldsberg (Valtice) and Lanškroun (Jägerndorf, Troppau, Hohenstadt, Lundenburg, Sternberg, Mährisch-Trübau, Karlsberg, Feldsberg and Landskron). This was mainly for providing uniforms. In November 1938 at the request of the SS the prince gave 15,000 reichsmarks towards establishing SS standards in Šumperk (Mährisch-Schönberg), Krnov and Opava. The prince promised 12,000 reichsmarks in 1938 and then again in 1939 to the aforementioned “Winter aid relief” in the Sudetenland – always for the needs of the lands on the prince’s estates. From 1942–1944 he also donated 30,000 reichsmarks annually towards the Red Cross war aid. The social donations were to alleviate poverty, the donations of political character were to placate larger as well as smaller overlords.⁵⁹

As the war dragged on it became increasingly obvious that Hitler would be defeated and Soviet troops would enter into eastern and central Europe. The Liechtensteins, therefore, began to fear that they would lose all of their princely property in Czechoslovakia as well as in Austria. Franz Josef II was concerned that, under the influence of the Soviets, the Liechtenstein property could be confiscated. From 1943 on, he personally tried to make contact with British and American diplomats in Switzerland and with the Swiss government in order to ensure that Liechtenstein property would not be treated as “enemy” property, but as the property of members of a neutral state, and that the property would be left untouched. It was this objective which led to the reopening of the Liechtenstein embassy in Bern, which had been closed in 1933 for economic reasons according

⁵⁸ Löffle, Josef: *Die Verwaltung der Herrschaften und Güter der Fürsten von Liechtenstein in den böhmischen Ländern von der Mitte des 18. Jahrhunderts bis 1948*. In: Merki, Christoph Maria – Löffle, Josef: *Das Haus Liechtenstein in den böhmischen Ländern vom Mittelalter bis ins 20. Jahrhundert – Güter, Rechte, Verwaltung*. Vaduz 2013, pp. 169–372.

⁵⁹ Cf. Geiger: *Kriegszeit*, Bd. 2, pp. 235–237.

to the Liechtenstein government. In December 1944 it was once again reactivated. Prince Heinrich, Franz Josef's 24-year-old brother, became Liechtenstein's chargé d'affaires in Switzerland. Franz Josef also sought to assign his brother, Prince Karl Alfred, to the Swiss general consulate in Prague as the Liechtenstein attaché, who was to represent Liechtenstein's interests in post-war Czechoslovakia. However, the foreign ministry in Berlin – while it was still making decisions in Prague – forbade it, though Bern, pragmatically agreed with the assignment of Karl Alfred.⁶⁰

On 14 May 1945, a few days after the German capitulation, Prince Franz Josef sent a telegram of congratulations (in the diplomatic language of French) to President Edvard Beneš, who had returned from exile: *“A l’occasion du retour de votre Excellence à Praha, mon peuple et moi font des vœux sincères pour votre Excellence et le bonheur futur du peuple Tchécoslovaque / François Josef Prince de Liechtenstein.”* The telegram was written as a communiqué between prince and president, or between two heads of state at the same level.⁶¹

However, Czechoslovakia did not recognise Liechtenstein as a sovereign state. It argued that Switzerland had cut off diplomatic ties with Czechoslovakia in 1939 and that this, therefore, also applied to Liechtenstein who, like Switzerland, had also failed to maintain links with the Czechoslovak government in exile. While Switzerland and Czechoslovakia quickly resumed diplomatic ties, Czechoslovakia refused to do likewise with Liechtenstein. The reasoning was the same as it had been during the interwar period – the desire to expropriate the still considerable property still held by the prince.

The confiscation decrees of the president of the republic, which lumped together all “Germans”, “Hungarians”, “enemies” and “traitors”,⁶² were also applied to the prince, other members of the Liechtenstein family and to other citizens of Liechtenstein. All of them were included among “Germans”. Everything was taken and then confiscated. Complaints, testimonials, court actions all came

⁶⁰ Geiger: *Kriegszeit*, Bd. 2, p. 268 ff., p. 284 ff.

⁶¹ LIECHTENSTEIN – THE PRINCELY COLLECTIONS Vaduz, Korr. Kabinettskanzlei 1945/14. – Geiger: *Kriegszeit*, Bd. 2, p. 492 ff.

⁶² The decrees are published in the Czechoslovak collections of laws: *Sbírka zákonů a nařízení republiky Československé*. Prague 1945–1948; *Sbírka zákonů a nařízení státu Československého*. Prague 1945. Important parts of the decrees are published in German as an appendix in Horčíčka, Václav: *Die Enteignungen von liechtensteinischem Vermögen in der Tschechoslowakei 1945 bis 1949*. In: Horčíčka, Václav – Marxer, Roland: *Liechtenstein und die tschechoslowakischen Konfiskationen 1945. Vom Zweiten Weltkrieg bis zur Gegenwart*. Vaduz 2013, pp. 122–139.

to nought. The Communist government, which seized power in 1948, ratified this confiscation⁶³

Both the princely family and Liechtenstein as a state refused to recognise the confiscation in 1945, for which they received no compensation, and continued to reiterate their property demands.

Hans-Adam II

In 1984, Franz Josef II appointed his son, Prince Hans-Adam, as his successor and executor of governmental rights. Since 1989, Hans-Adam II (born 1945) has been the reigning prince of Liechtenstein. He grew up in Vaduz, graduated from the Schottengymnasium in Vienna and the gymnasium in Zuoz, where he passed his final examination in 1965. After working in banking in London he studied business economics and economics at the University of St Gallen. He graduated in 1969 with a Licentiate. From 1970, on the authority of Prince Franz Josef II, he reorganised the administration of the ancestral property which had been transferred to the “Prince of Liechtenstein Foundation” – similar to the fideicommissum of old. One central pillar of the princely economy became the “Bank in Liechtenstein”, today’s “Liechtenstein Global Trust” (LGT). Apart from his princely duties, Prince Hans-Adam II did not act as a landlord, but as a manager and banker, and successfully too.⁶⁴ In 2004 he appointed Prince Alois (born 1968) as his successor and executor of governmental rights, and then published a book entitled *The State in the Third Millennium* in 2010.⁶⁵

(3) Conflicting opinions on confiscation

In terms of the Liechtenstein property in Czechoslovakia, although prince Johann II and prince Franz I considered the surrender of property as a result of the enforced land reform to be an unreasonable act, it was finally accepted under the pressure of circumstances. However, the confiscations from 1945, which were

⁶³ Horčíčka: *Die Enteignungen von liechtensteinischem Vermögen in der Tschechoslowakei 1945 bis 1949*. In: Horčíčka, Václav – Marxer, Roland: Liechtenstein und die tschechoslowakischen Konfiskationen 1945. vom Zweiten Weltkrieg bis zur Gegenwart. Vaduz 2013, pp. 9–139.

⁶⁴ Merki, Christoph Maria: *Besitzverschiebungen. Vom Grundherrn zum Privatbankier*. In: Liechtensteinisch-Tschechische Historikerkommission (ed.): *Das Fürstenhaus, der Staat Liechtenstein und die Tschechoslowakei im 20. Jahrhundert*. Vaduz 2013, pp. 13–23.

⁶⁵ Liechtenstein, Fürst Hans-Adam von: *Der Staat im dritten Jahrtausend*. Triesen 2013 (first edition 2010). – Czech edition: Liechtenstein, Hans-Adam von: *Stát ve třetím tisíciletí*. Prague 2011.

never compensated for, were still considered to be unlawful by Prince Franz Josef II and other members of the family. This position was also shared by the state of Liechtenstein, which has to represent its citizens, prince, members of the Liechtenstein dynasty and others who were affected by confiscation.

On the other hand, the Czechoslovak side maintains its position that the confiscation of the Liechtenstein property was carried out in accordance with the law. These diverging, contradictory legal views concerning the confiscation of property in 1945 continue to this day.

(4) The diplomatic blockade

One of the consequences was that Liechtenstein and Czechoslovakia – and subsequently its successor states of the Czech Republic and the Slovak Republic – mutually denied formal diplomatic recognition. Contrary to expectations, this situation continued even after the revolution of 1989. Although both parties were willing to see this unusual situation resolved, certain conditions always had to apply: Czechoslovakia only wanted to recognise Liechtenstein sovereignty by establishing diplomatic ties *ex nunc*, and not from 1918 or 1945, and it only wanted to discuss the issue of confiscation after these diplomatic ties had been established. Liechtenstein, meanwhile, wanted confirmation of its sovereignty dating back to 1806 or to the foundation of Czechoslovakia (1918), and the issue of confiscation was to be resolved prior to establishing diplomatic ties, or at least to obtain a binding promise that serious negotiations would follow. Neither of the parties was prepared to compromise on their conditions. The promising start of the 1990s and the turn of the millennium came to nought.

(5) An illustrative dispute – “Scene around a Roman Limekiln”

The dispute surrounding Pieter van Laer’s small picture “Scene around a Roman Limekiln,”⁶⁶ which passed through three different courts, exemplarily illustrates the complexity of the situation. This work of art belonged to the prince until 1945 when it was confiscated, and since then it has been the property of the Czech state in the chateau at Feldsberg (Valtice). In 1991 the National Heritage Insti-

⁶⁶ Valtice (Feldsberg), chateau inventory, no. 724/597. – Cf. Mrázek, Josef: *Obráz Velká vápenka a majetkoprávní nároky Lichtenštejnů vůči ČR*. In: *Právní rádce* 9, 2001, no. 9, pp. I–XII.

tute in Brno (Brünn) loaned the picture to an exhibition in Cologne. The prince started an action in the German courts, and then (1998) at the European Court of Human Rights, all without success, and finally (2001) there was an action by the Liechtenstein Principality against Germany at the International Court of Justice in The Hague. This action was brought forward because the German Constitutional Court had argued that the Liechtenstein property had been confiscated in Czechoslovakia as part of German reparations. Liechtenstein put forward the defence that as a neutral state during the war it could not be included in German reparations. The International Court of Justice did not hear the case because during the time when the incriminating events occurred it did not yet exist, and therefore *ratione temporis* was not applicable. The basis of the Liechtenstein case was, therefore, left unaddressed – to the relief of the Czech party and to the disappointment of the Liechtensteins.

(6) Lifting the blockade, diplomatic relations since 2009

More intensive personal contact helped to develop trust between the two states and they came to the conclusion that it was necessary to find a pragmatic way to re-establish relations. The Liechtenstein family and the Liechtenstein state no longer linked the issue of confiscation and compensation to the issue of recognition and diplomatic ties. The hitherto differing interpretations of the historical processes and their influence on the present were to be jointly researched by a commission of historians. And so in 2009 diplomatic ties could be renewed.

The Czech ambassador in Switzerland is also accredited for Liechtenstein, just as the Liechtenstein ambassador in Vienna has been for the Czech Republic since April 2011. Since that time, there have been multilateral contacts on various levels.⁶⁷ The Czech-Liechtenstein Commission of Historians (with an equal number of Czechs and Liechtensteiners) was established in 2010 and finished its work at the end of 2013.

⁶⁷ Marxer, Roland: *Die Beziehungen Liechtensteins zur Tschechoslowakei und zu deren Nachfolgestaaten seit dem Zweiten Weltkrieg. Nachwirkungen und Entwicklungen bis heute*. In: Horčíčka, Václav – Marxer, Roland: Liechtenstein und die tschechoslowakischen Konfiskationen von 1945. Vom Zweiten Weltkrieg bis zur Gegenwart. Vaduz 2013. – Horčíčka, Václav: *Die Enteignungen von liechtensteinischem Vermögen in der Tschechoslowakei 1945 bis 1949*. In: Horčíčka, Václav – Marxer, Roland: Liechtenstein und die tschechoslowakischen Konfiskationen 1945. Vom Zweiten Weltkrieg bis zur Gegenwart. Vaduz 2013. – Cf. also the articles of Václav Horčíčka and Roland Marxer. In: Liechtensteinisch-Tschechische Historikerkommission (ed.): *Das Fürstenhaus, der Staat Liechtenstein und die Tschechoslowakei im 20. Jahrhundert*. Vaduz 2013.

III. Main issues

a. Sites of memory and constructing a historical image of Liechtenstein

(1) A sites of memory model

Pierre Nora created a sites of memory model,⁶⁸ although it is debatable how his concept could be applied to the historical conditions in Central Europe and to the history of the House of Liechtenstein in Central Europe. Nora very quickly established that what was relevant for France was not necessarily relevant for other countries, particularly multinational states. In the Habsburg monarchy it is possible to talk about different, or mutually competing, cultures of memory. Here the area of the empire is also a traditional theme: *imagines memoriae* must adapt to the *loci memoriae*. In this sense, different sites have their hierarchy: sites of culture (museums), sites of remembrance (cemeteries and monuments), sites of identity for individual groups, and finally sites of memory where emotion has to give way to reason.

In the Habsburg monarchy the same site could very often represent competing landscapes of memory.⁶⁹ This *spatial turn* is a particularly interesting issue for us because the Habsburg monarchy created from its territory with its great size and resulting ethnic-national diversity the topos of a whole state. This is of great significance for the historical and present-day borders within the monarchy and beyond. The movement of the borders in central, eastern and south-eastern Europe after 1918 altered the identity of the regions, because one important element here is the memory of the stability of the Habsburg lands. The collective identity of the region or crown land may collide with the identity of the state as a whole, the more so as in the Habsburg monarchy one common state was shared by several groups. Therefore, there emerges a collective consciousness on various levels. In 1925 the French historian Marc Bloch cast doubt on Emile Durkheim's thesis that representation, mentality, consciousness and memory are the sum of a collective process. What would happen, asked Bloch, if people migrated or converted? These were very common phenomena in the Habsburg monarchy, particularly after 1867, and this great geographical and social mobility left its mark on identity. Entire groups were assimilated by the "dominant culture" (*Leitkultur*),

⁶⁸ Nora, Pierre (ed.): *Les lieux de mémoire*. Nora, Pierre: *Realms of memory: rethinking the French past*. New York 1996–1998.

⁶⁹ This concept was formulated by Rudy Koshar as memory landscape, cf. Koshar, Rudy: *Die deutsche Erinnerungslandschaft 1870–1990*. In: Martini, Wolfram (ed.): *Architektur und Erinnerung*. Göttingen 2000, pp. 191 ff.

which in turn altered their collective memory. However, it is debatable whether or not they became “loyal servants to their master”, because even with their assimilation they adopted a national culture, which did not necessarily identify with the culture of the Habsburg dynasty.⁷⁰

Nation-building demanded distancing from the Habsburg monarchy, if not its outright rejection. There developed discussions about its role as the “prison of nations” and coloniser. National history was written and staged as anti-type. According to this view, the non-Germanic nations had been the victims of Habsburg rule for centuries. Historiography concentrated primarily on the period before Habsburg rule, emphasizing the defeats in key battles followed by repression and everything that separated their own nation from the Habsburg monarchy. The long shared history was criticised and rejected by parts of Czech historiography. Naturally, after the Second World War this trend became even stronger. The German language was taboo, Germans were expelled, and the small Jewish community and the various national minorities were discriminated by the communist regime. The erstwhile multiculturalism of the Habsburg monarchy died out and with it its most important legacy.

(2) *Liechtenstein sites of memory*

In this context, sites of memory can essentially be perceived in two ways. The first is abstractly thought as “locations in the human mind” which are used in constructing and deconstructing the past. The second is concrete, “points on a map”, which are connected with the subject of memory in one way or another and mediate its historical memory.⁷¹ These perceptions merge with one another on a number of levels: the memory created by the subject itself and the creation of a memory on a given subject (in this case, the Liechtensteins’ memory and remembering the Liechtensteins), and the place on a map with the location in the human mind (in our case, a monument connected with the Liechtensteins and the

⁷⁰ Horel, Catherine: *Die Habsburgermonarchie. Ein transnationaler Erinnerungsort?* In: Liechtensteinisch-Tschechische Historikerkommission (ed.): *Liechtensteinische Erinnerungsorte in den böhmischen Ländern*. Vaduz 2012, pp. 33–48. Czech version: Horel, Catherine: *Habsburská monarchie: transnacionální místo paměti?* In: Geiger, Peter – Knoz, Tomáš (eds.): *Místa Lichtenštejnské paměti*. (Časopis Matice moravské 131, 2012 – Supplementum 3). Brno 2012, pp. 7–22.

⁷¹ Hlavačka, Milan – Mares, Antoine (eds.): *Paměť míst, událostí a osobností. Historie jako identita a manipulace*. Prague 2011. – Cf. Halbwachs, Maurice – Namer, Gérard – Jaisson, Marie: *Kolektivní paměť*. Prague 2009.

historical memory that its mediation helps to create in the form of a collective consciousness).⁷²

The presence of the Liechtenstein family in the history of Central Europe can be characterised by the concept of *la longue durée*,⁷³ which brings with it a long-lasting and complex construction of the memory of this aristocratic family. When observing the sites of Liechtenstein memory, several defining features can be detected:

The Liechtenstein memory goes beyond the closed dimension of the memory of an aristocratic family and operates in an open space as a general memory. It influences the general memory and is influenced by it. The general historical memory reacts to the Liechtenstein memory, and the Liechtenstein memory reacts to the general memory. They have a reciprocal influence on one another, which leads to various types of deconstruction and reconstruction of memory. Liechtenstein sites of memory are, therefore, relatively complex configurations, the characterisation of which requires the use of different “objects, approaches, methods” (*objets, approches, méthodes*).⁷⁴ This also applies to sites of Liechtenstein memory as “points on a map” (whether that be a construction of the memory of the Liechtensteins or a construction of the Liechtensteins’ memory).

The memorial site at White Mountain, the crosses marking the site where the Bohemian lords were executed on Old Town Square, the monumental unfinished castle at Plumlov (Plumenau), the intricately shaped Valtice-Lednice (Feldsberg-Eisgrub) Cultural Landscape including the “Border Castle” in Hlohovec (Bischofswarth), the grave at the Pauline Monastery in Vranov (Wranau), Karl von Liechtenstein’s cenotaph in Opava (Troppau), these are all memorials which are not only part of the Liechtenstein ancestral memory, but part of the memory of Czech and Central European history.⁷⁵

⁷² Knoz, Tomáš: *Liechtensteinové, Morava a Valtice v 1. polovině 17. století. (Základní obrysy problematiky)*. In: Kordiovský, Emil (ed.): Město Valtice. Valtice 2001, pp. 301–315.

⁷³ Braudel, Fernand: *La longue durée*. Annales E.S.C. No. 4, octobre–décembre 1958, pp. 725–753.

⁷⁴ Le Goff, Jacques – Nora, Pierre (eds.): *Faire de l’histoire. Nouveaux problèmes. Nouveaux objets. Nouvelles méthodes*. Paris 1973; Rak, Jiří: *Bývalí Čechové. České historické mýty a stereotypy*. Prague 1994; Hojda, Zdeněk – Pokorný, Jiří: *Pomníky a zapomínky*. Prague – Litomyšl 1996.

⁷⁵ Knoz, Tomáš: *Erinnerungsorte der Liechtenstein: Einleitende Thesen*. In: Liechtensteinisch-Tschechische Historikerkommission (ed.): *Liechtensteinische Erinnerungsorte in den böhmischen Ländern*. Vaduz 2012, pp. 11–32. Czech version: Knoz, Tomáš: *Místa lichtenštejnské paměti. Úvodní teze*. In: Geiger, Peter – Knoz, Tomáš (eds.): *Místa Lichtenštejnské paměti*. (Časopis Matice moravské 131, 2012 – Supplementum 3). Brno 2012, pp. 23–47.

(3) *The image of the Liechtenstein family in Czech society*

Questions relating to the construction and development of the image of the Liechtenstein family, as well as its role in Central European and Czech history, can only be answered through research into those areas of the media which fostered this image. The construction of the image is not only limited by the type of medium (each of which has its own political goals, social engagement and target group), but also by the specific time context. Therefore, the image of the Liechtensteins can be spontaneously, or more artificially construed and implied, at the same time it can also be more of a group image than an individual one. In terms of the media, it seems necessary on one hand to question historiographical output. Superficially this seems to be designed for a relatively strictly defined and narrow circle of recipients, whereas in reality it plays a fairly important role (expert opinions from the political and legal worlds (Josef Pekař), popularizing works creating a generally perceived image of the particular theme, transporting the results of historians' work to the general public through media, etc.). Then it is necessary to look at the crucial area of education (textbooks), the image constructed by Liechtenstein monuments (guide books and texts), and the image portrayed by the mass media (newspapers, radio and television, and more recently electronic media). As was shown by the historical-sociological research carried out by the Czech-Liechtenstein Commission of Historians, it is precisely these media that over the past hundred years have not only communicated and transferred the image of the Liechtensteins in the Czech lands, but also have significantly influenced and even helped to create it.⁷⁶

In Czech historical memory, the princely Liechtenstein family is perceived as belonging to an aristocratic dynasty that tends to be problematic and even negative. This circumstance has been reflected in Czech historical output over the last two centuries, while on the other hand historiography reshaped historical memory. Why were Liechtenstein-owned Mikulov/Nikolsburg and the oldest eras of their Moravian domination practically ignored in Czech literature, when for some 700 years they had left their mark on the political-power map of the Moravian-Austrian border regions? There have been many books which have examined the changes to the Bohemian and Moravian nobility and their estates in the

⁷⁶ Drašnar, Vojtěch – Hoření, Kateřina – Kohoutková, Kamila – Steinerová, Alžběta (eds.): *Die Darstellung der Liechtensteiner: der aktuelle Diskurs der Erinnerung an die Liechtensteiner in Tschechien*. In: Liechtensteinisch-Tschechische Historikerkommission (ed.): *Das Fürstenhaus, der Staat Liechtenstein und die Tschechoslowakei im 20. Jahrhundert*. Vaduz 2013, pp. 237–256.

13th century, but why was there no focus on a family which from the start had been one of the most important and had achieved exceptional standing within Moravian aristocratic society? One explanation could be that the Liechtensteins belonged to those families which upset Czech historiographical notions of the Czech ethnic character of the Bohemian and Moravian nobility in the High and Late Middle Ages. From the mid-13th century until the Modern Age, the Liechtensteins, as a German-speaking family with its main residence in the Moravian borderlands, were a very prominent exception to the accepted thesis, which is perhaps why their significance in South Moravia in the 13th and 14th centuries was never given any particular emphasis.⁷⁷

A considerably more important site of memory is connected with the Early Modern Ages, the period of the Battle of White Mountain and Karl von Liechtenstein (1569–1627). Karl von Liechtenstein owned extensive estates in Moravia and Austria, and later also in Silesia and Bohemia, and he was the first member of the family to be raised to the status of prince. From the last decade of the 16th century to the first quarter of the 17th, he enjoyed a distinguished career in the Margraviate of Moravia, in the court of Rudolph II in Prague, after 1608 in the court of Rudolph's brother Matthias in Vienna, and after 1620 in the service of Emperor Ferdinand. Volker Press characterised him as being a key figure in the ancestral history, "*as a lonely figure of historic proportions, who does not fit into any pigeonholes, and who was also feared and hated, needed and envied*".⁷⁸ In Czech national memory and in a large part of Czech historiography since the mid-19th century, Karl von Liechtenstein is seen first and foremost as the imperial governor in the Czech kingdom following the Battle of White Mountain on 8 November 1620, and as the chairman of an extraordinary tribunal which tried the participants in the Czech Estates' Uprising and reached its savage peak on 21 June 1621 with the public execution of 27 nobles and burghers on Old Town Square in Prague. Along with the economic profiteering from the White Mountain confiscations, the Old Town execution is a historical event which has determined Karl von Liechten-

⁷⁷ Jan, Libor: *Die Anfänge der liechtensteinischen Kontinuität auf dem Gebiet des Rechts und des Grundbesitzes in Südmähren*. In: Liechtensteinisch-Tschechische Historikerkommission (ed.): *Die Liechtenstein: Kontinuitäten – Diskontinuitäten*. Vaduz 2013, s. 45–54. – Elbel, Petr: *Das Bild der Liechtenstein in der tschechischen Historiographie*. In: Liechtensteinisch-Tschechische Historikerkommission (ed.): *Liechtensteinische Erinnerungsorte in den böhmischen Ländern*. Vaduz 2012, pp. 173–181. Czech version: Elbel, Petr: *Obraz Lichtenštejnů v české historiografii*. In: Geiger, Peter – Knoz, Tomáš (eds.): *Místa Lichtenštejnské paměti*. (Časopis Matice moravské 131, 2012 – Supplementum 3). Brno 2012, pp. 165–172.

⁷⁸ Press, Volker: *Das Haus Liechtenstein in der europäischen Geschichte*. In: Press, Volker – Willoweit, Dietmar (eds.): *Liechtenstein – Fürstliches Haus und staatliche Ordnung. Geschichtliche Grundlagen und moderne Perspektiven*. ²Vaduz – Munich – Vienna 1988, pp. 15–85.

stein's negative historical image within the family as well as the role of lynchpin between old and modern history. Disregarding the type of media (whether it be academic historical literature, popularizing literature, political publications, etc.), and also disregarding the era and political form of the image, it is Karl von Liechtenstein who personifies the anti-Czech (German) and "reactionary" (Catholic) principles in histories of the Lands of the Bohemian Crown, which to a certain degree disregards historically proven facts about his life and work. Anton Gindely (1829–1892), the son of a Hungarian German and a Czech mother, was bilingual and published in both languages. Until his death he held the position of a supra-national Great Austrian and in his standard work on the Czech Estates' Uprising and the first years of the Thirty Years' War, which was published in 1880 based on primary sources, he reached the conclusion that after being appointed as the imperial governor in Bohemia in mid-January 1622, Liechtenstein "took full responsibility for the views of the ruling party there [...]. While until then he had moderated the many harsh orders [from the emperor] which had been given to him, from that moment he became one of the worst oppressors of the country [i.e. Bohemia]. There was to be no opposition to the draconian measures which would lead to its destruction. The minting contract which he concluded with the emperor [...] revealed his insatiable lust for money and set him on the path of criminality." Although Gindely was far from being a typical representative of Czech national historiography, he determined the general view of Liechtenstein as the personification of the post-White Mountain era as a "period of darkness", social suffering and the Germanisation of the Czech nation along the lines of the stereotypical "we suffered for three hundred years". This concept and contextualisation of the image of Karl von Liechtenstein (often short on facts but emotionally charged) also made its way into the history textbooks at the time, which perhaps had even more of an influence on the construction of the memory of the Liechtensteins than academic historiography. Within this context, around the year 1918 and then later around 1945 the idea emerged in Czech political society that the legal, political and property actions taken against the Liechtenstein family were "revenge for White Mountain". On the other hand, this naturally led to a reaction from Liechtenstein and non-Czech historians who created another stereotype which apologetically characterised a positive image as being factually correct, whereas the negative image had been the result of a politically motivated falsification of history.⁷⁹

⁷⁹ Winkelbauer, Thomas: *Karl von Liechtenstein und das "Prager Blutgericht" vom 21. Juni 1621 als tschechischer Erinnerungsort im Spiegel der Historiographie*. In: Liechtensteinisch-Tschechische Historikerkommission (ed.): *Liechtensteinische Erinnerungsorte in den böhmischen Ländern*. Vaduz 2012, pp. 51–71. Czech version: Winkelbauer, Thomas: *Karel z Lichtenštejna*

During the communist era the image of Karl von Liechtenstein constructed by Czech historians – both in academic publications, but mainly in those intended for the general public – remained basically the same. If anything, the addition of Marxist theory on class struggle produced an even more negative image. As part of the Commission of Czech-Liechtenstein Historians project, Petr Elbel discovered that even serious historians at this time, including Josef Polišenský, shared these ideas about the role of the Liechtensteins in Bohemian (Czech) history: *“The bank-ruptcy allowed for the greater concentration of estates in the hands of the largest looters: Waldstein, Liechtenstein, Dietrichstein and the likes. Although Waldstein may have lost his possessions several decades later, the possessions of the other looters would be held together for centuries. The fraudulent machinations of Liechtenstein were discovered and his posthumous trial stretched out over nearly a century before being quietly forgotten. For three centuries, Liechtenstein’s descendants were able to benefit from the sweat and calluses of tens of thousands of peasants on their extensive estates in Moravia and Silesia. It was their toil which gave rise to palaces in Vienna and elsewhere, which were maintained by the artificially created “independent” Principality of Liechtenstein, today a centre for tax evaders. It was only with the victory of the people’s democracy that the exploitation by the descendants of the bloody swindler, Karl von Liechtenstein, came to an end.”*⁸⁰ In his evaluation of the political application of this historiographical myth, Petr Elbel reached these quite fundamental conclusions: *“This quotation from Josef Polišenský represents the crudest form of placing the White Mountain myth in historiography, and is instructive in several respects. Here, on the basis of Karl von Liechtenstein’s ‘fraud’, the entire Liechtenstein family from the 17th to the 20th century is condemned. Everything the Liechtensteins created in this period is considered to be the result of Karl’s recklessness and fraud. This gives rise to the glorification of the presidential decrees, which Polišenský regards as an appropriate and just punishment for Karl’s crimes.”*⁸¹ As in the previous period, the aforementioned stereotypes also made their way into textbooks and other popularizing texts, influencing the public at large with its description of the aristocracy and the

a staroměstská exekuce 21. června 1621 jako české místo paměti v zrcadle historiografie In: Geiger, Peter – Knoz, Tomáš (eds.): *Místa Lichtenštejnské paměti*. (Časopis Matice moravské 131, 2012 – Supplementum 3). Brno 2012, pp. 49–62.

⁸⁰ Polišenský, Josef: *Tricetiletá válka a český národ*. Prague 1960, p. 140.

⁸¹ Elbel, Petr: *Das Bild der Liechtenstein in der tschechischen Historiographie*. In: Liechtensteinisch-Tschechische Historikerkommission (ed.): *Liechtensteinische Erinnerungsorte in den böhmischen Ländern*. Vaduz 2012, s. 173–181. Czech version: Elbel, Petr: *Obráz Lichtenštejnů v české historiografii* In: Geiger, Peter – Knoz, Tomáš (eds.): *Místa Lichtenštejnské paměti*. (Časopis Matice moravské 131, 2012 – Supplementum 3). Brno 2012, pp. 165–172.

church as the two elements in society which most exploited the common people of the Czech lands. Although this image of the Liechtensteins was subject to revision and demystification in the Czech lands after 1989, the older stereotypes still survived, perhaps influenced partly by the renewal of disputes between the Czech Republic and the Principality of Liechtenstein. Thomas Winkelbauer's analysis of an essay by Roman Vondra published in the rather influential journal *Historický obzor* (Historical Horizon), aimed at history teachers, shows that older stereotypes have survived. To a certain degree, this is also seen in the recent documentary of 2013 *Pod ochranou Žerotínů* (Under the Protection of the Žerotins). Although on one level the film describes the origin and fate of the Kralice Bible, the atmosphere of the White Mountain period is constructed through two opposing characters – the positively presented Charles the Elder of Žerotín, and the negatively portrayed Karl von Liechtenstein.⁸²

While the Baroque period left Liechtenstein stereotypes and myths in the form of architectural and artistic sites of memory, during the Second World War the construction of the image emphasised a coming to terms with the White Mountain era. In order to properly understand the issue, it is necessary to remind ourselves of a fact which has already been mentioned in another context – namely that the era of the White Mountain and the Second World War were two mutually linked elements in myth creation. Modern references to the historical acts of the Liechtensteins not only helped in the construction of contemporary ideas about the character of the family, but they also determined specific legal measures. In terms of the later development of Czechoslovak-Liechtenstein relations, there were some very important statements made by the Czechoslovak minister of agriculture shortly after the Second World War which justified placing the property of the Liechtensteins under National Administration and the accusations made against the head of the family (since 1938 Franz Josef II). The decision made on 26 June 1945 by the minister of agriculture to impose National Administration and appoint a national administrator included historical arguments. After stating that according to § 3 and 4, paragraph 1 of Decree no. 5 by the President of the Republic from 19 May 1945, which imposed administration, there then followed a historical interpretation: apparently the Liechtensteins had stolen their property from the original Czech owners as reward for services to the emperor and had therefore become “*enemies of the Czechoslovak nation*”. It was also very important to point out that in the recent past the Liechtensteins had identified themselves as belong-

⁸² *Pod ochranou Žerotínů* [Under the protection of the Žerotín]. Czech historical documentary film. Vista-Film Praha for Czech Television, 2013. Based on an idea by David and Lenka Rafael. Scriptwriter and director, Lubomír Hlavsa.

ing to the German nation. Allegedly during the war, the predominantly German administration of their property pursued partisans and provided information to the German army, they were accommodating towards the occupiers' demands (for example, in personnel) and were willing to provide war supplies. It is clear that this image differed in many respects from the actual facts (for example, according to the data, the Liechtensteins in the Protectorate of Bohemia and Moravia (Protektorat Böhmen und Mähren) on 1 April 1945 had a total of 215 employees, 191 of whom were Czechs and 24 Germans, while in the period of crisis at the turn of the 1930s Germans did not receive any preference over Czechs in the Liechtenstein administration or businesses), which were complicated and ambiguous, and often conditioned by the legal norms and regulations of the period (e.g., the right to choose a specific nationality in the census), or the interests of the prince given the circumstances of the time (presenting a Liechtenstein nationality to the Czech authorities before the war and after it, a cautious approach towards the German authorities which did not display any overt resistance at all to the perception of being part of the German nation). The Principality of Liechtenstein and the Princely House also had a complicated relationship with the legal system of the Third Reich, from which, on the one hand, the Liechtensteins expected the restitution of property that had been confiscated during the first land reform, though on the other hand, they did not recognize the Third Reich's annexations legally.⁸³

This complicated situation in the period immediately following the Second World War was combined with an absence of information concerning any family members' anti-Nazi activities (unlike the well-known acts and activities of other members of the Czech nobility) and with the proclamations coming from the ministry of agriculture, which at that time was run by the Communists; all this reinforced the stereotype of the Liechtensteins as an entity which had stood against the Czechoslovak nations and people over a long period. This stereotype also created some of the aforementioned simplistic shortcuts between Karl I von Liechtenstein as one of the main actors in the White Mountain national tragedy and the current roles of the family members. Naturally, after the Communist Party seized power, this stereotype was strengthened by the theory of class struggle presented by the official state using all the methods of state propaganda (textbooks, guidebooks to aristocratic monuments) as well as state power (local organisations and security services following the mood of citizens, the criminalisation of positive attitudes towards members of the "exploiting classes"). Nevertheless, such an

⁸³ Geiger, Peter: *Bemühungen um Rückgewinnung und Rettung fürstlicher Güter 1938 bis 1945*. In: Liechtensteinisch-Tschechische Historikerkommission (ed.): *Das Fürstenhaus, der Staat Liechtenstein und die Tschechoslowakei im 20. Jahrhundert*. Vaduz 2013, pp. 63–80.

approach contained within it a certain assumption of defiance, which even in these difficult periods led to a partial deconstruction of these stereotypes.

In comparison with other countries from the former monarchy which found themselves under the Soviet sphere of influence after 1945, the issue of Czechoslovakia and the Liechtensteins represents a special case. Although in Poland and Hungary the aristocracy were also stigmatised for their feudal legacy, they were not perceived and presented as a national enemy. In the case of the Hungarian aristocracy, for example, no-one ever doubted their patriotism. Here, unlike the situation in Czechoslovakia, their nationality was never an issue.⁸⁴ To a certain extent a similar situation could be found in Croatia, but firstly aristocratic families are a minority, and secondly the percentage of the Hungarian population is too low. The Croatian Hungarians were thematised as enemies of the nation, but this stigmatisation was never as important as it was in Czechoslovakia (in Slovakia the Hungarian aristocracy also played this role). In this context the Liechtensteins are a unique case as they are a foreign element which has dual significance – they are seen both as Germans and as irredentists, because, like the Germans and Austrians, they have their own state.

(4) *The image of the Czech Republic and the Czechs in Liechtenstein society*

Regarding the construction of the image of the Czech lands and the Czech Republic in modern Liechtenstein society it also thematizes the relationship between the populations of the two countries based on the continuity and discontinuity in the fate of the House of Liechtenstein in the Bohemian/Czech lands and the political turning points in earlier history and most of all in the modern period. Reports on Austria-Hungary as a neighbouring state also covered its various *Lands* including Tyrol and Lower Austria and also the Lands of the Bohemian Crown, particularly when the Liechtensteins were living there and had property there.

According to Peter Geiger, an “image” formed in Liechtenstein is based on reports in the local press which gave rise to a certain view of the Lands of the Bohemian Crown, Czechoslovakia, the Czech Republic and the people who lived there. However, this was never a differentiated image. Knowledge about the lands and people was at first circulated from the 1860s until 1918. Thereafter the “image” or the “images” have been changing until today: from the Lands of the Bohemian

⁸⁴ Horel, Catherine: *Die Enteignung des Adels in Ungarn nach 1945. Eine vergleichende Perspektive*. In: Liechtensteinisch-Tschechische Historikerkommission (ed.): *Das Fürstenhaus, der Staat Liechtenstein und die Tschechoslowakei im 20. Jahrhundert*. Vaduz 2013, p. 105–113.

Crown as “a remote but familiar part of the Danubian monarchy”; to “Czechoslovakia, an enemy of the church and a land-reformist Republic” after 1918; “a German Protectorate” from 1938 to 1939; a short-lived “new Republic of expulsion” in 1945; and a “repressive communist state in the Eastern Bloc” from 1948 on, to a “free Republic” after the political changes in 1989.

From the viewpoint of readers in Liechtenstein, the persons forming these “images” ranged from President Tomáš Garrigue Masaryk to Edvard Beneš, Klement Gottwald and Antonín Novotný, to Alexander Dubček, Gustáv Husák, to the representatives from the present day.

The ideological “images” varied constantly – from the hope of Czech-German reconciliation to criticisms of the land reform and the revanchist nationalist Beneš decrees with their expulsions and expropriation, the totalitarian communist regime and the inability of post-revolution governments to come to terms with the past. An atmosphere which had once been sympathetic towards old Bohemia (Czechs) was followed by eighty years of frosty relationships, which was then transformed by the current, normalising relations and growing friendly interests, though reports never stopped being sometimes critical or containing the above-mentioned issues of the relationship between Czechia and the ruling Liechtenstein family, the handling of its property during the land reform and especially the complete expropriations following the Second World War.

The sketchiness of the “images” that the local media had in Liechtenstein is demonstrated by the fact that although they wrote about political events and issues, they mostly reported about culture, art, music, literature or science. According to Geiger, an obvious reason for this lies in the simple fact that in Liechtenstein practically no-one spoke or speaks Czech. It is possible to point to several people, places, topics and issues in connection with the “sites of collective memory” of the Liechtenstein people relating to Czechoslovakia. Of the people represented in this memory the most important are “President Masaryk, the founder of the state”, “Beneš, the decrees president”, “Dubček, the reformer of the Communist Party” and “Havel, the dissident president”. Then there are the Liechtenstein princes connected with the Czech lands. Places include the princely grand chateaux at Lednice (Eisgrub) and Valtice (Feldsberg), the tomb at Vranov (Wranau), and cities such as Prague and Brno (Brünn). Frequent themes are the Sudeten Germans, land reform, Liechtenstein expropriation based on the decrees aimed at “Germans”, Czechoslovak Communism, the Prague Spring, the democratic revolution, the peaceful separation of Czechoslovakia into the Czech Republic and the Slovak Republic, and in general the welcoming of normalised relations with Liechtenstein. Some of the issues which remain open in the collective consciousness are the prin-

ce's claims for his expropriated property, while more to the background are the ethnic expulsions, which are still felt strongly in human terms.⁸⁵

(5) The role of sites of memory in constructing an image of the Liechtensteins

The size of the Liechtenstein family's historical property in the Lands of the Bohemian Crown and their relationship towards creating sites of memory also contains within it a level of "objectifying" the presence of the family and remembering it through sites of memory. It is perhaps not surprising to find that even the image constructed through sites of memory contains a certain internal conflict. One example of sites of memory working in contradiction are the crosses at the site of the execution of the "Bohemian lords" on the Old Town Square in Prague, while another is the chateau and cultural landscape at Lednice/Eisgrub.

In June 2011 there was an event on the Old Town Square in Prague which brought attention to this site of memory of the Czech nation. On the cobbles of the Old Town Square near to the Old Town Hall the art group Ztohoven added another cross to the 27 existing white crosses on the cobbles, which commemorated the 27 "Bohemian lords" executed in 1621. According to the group's spokesperson, the cross on the cobble was to symbolize the role of the Prague burgher, Martin Fruhwein, who was one of the radicals involved in the Estates' Uprising and who had only escaped execution on the Old Town Square because he had died earlier in prison. Although the art group's act may seem to be a marginal one, nonetheless it was a unique test of how a site of memory – which has evolved and has been visited under entirely different historical conditions – functions in the present.⁸⁶ Today's perception of the crosses on the Old Town Square as a kind of site of sacralisation, where in 1621 the activists from the Czech Estates' Uprising were executed, was viewed in the past within the context of the whole area of the

⁸⁵ Geiger, Peter: *Das Bild der böhmischen Länder, der Tschechoslowakei und Tschechiens in den liechtensteinischen Medien*. In: Liechtensteinisch-Tschechische Historikerkommission (ed.): *Liechtensteinische Erinnerungsorte in den böhmischen Ländern*. Vaduz 2012, pp. 215–242. Czech version: Geiger, Peter: *Obraz českých zemí, Československa a České republiky v liechtenštejnských médiích*. In: Geiger, Peter – Knoz, Tomáš (eds.): *Místa Lichtenštejnské paměti*. (Časopis Matice moravské 131, 2012 – Supplementum 3). Brno 2012, pp. 203–228.

⁸⁶ *Na Staroměstském náměstí je 28. kříž, přidala ho skupina Ztohoven*. Novinky.cz, 23 Jun 2011 17:08 Source: http://zpravy.idnes.cz/skupina-ztohoven-pridala-do-dlazby-na-staromestskem-namesti-28-kriz-1pz-/domaci.aspx?c=A110623_140948_praha-zpravy_sfo (cited 5 November 2013).

square as the centre of the kingdom and connected to the monument to Magister Jan Hus. The two monuments symbolize the rise and fall of two reformist waves in the Lands of the Bohemian Crown, and in terms of the “struggle for the meaning of Czech history” they also symbolize the “contact and conflict” between Czechs and Germans. Even more recently the idea of the Old Town Square as a site of memory has taken on new significance with arguments over the rebuilding of the Marian Column which originally stood near to the place of execution. The placing of the crosses and the removal of the Marian Column symbolised the victory of the Reformation over the Catholic Church and the victory of Czechs over Germans, while according to its opponents, rebuilding the column would negate this victory.⁸⁷ One important fact to be considered is that the “negative” personification of this site of memory was not reflected on the cardinals Harrach and Dietrichstein, the Prague Jesuits or even Emperor Ferdinand II, but only on Karl I von Liechtenstein as the head of the execution committee and disregarding his actual historical role. Liechtenstein was not a representative of the “foreign nobility” and a considerable part of his life (until 1599) pertained to non-Catholic Moravian estates. In any case, these stereotypes, along with the historical perception of the role of the Liechtensteins and the Dietrichsteins during the post-White Mountain confiscations, were apparent around the years 1918 and 1945 (“revenge for White Mountain”), as can be seen in Josef Pekař’s criticism of the land reform in general, though he concluded that it was necessary in the case of the Liechtensteins.⁸⁸

The antithesis to the crosses on the Old Town Square as a negative site of memory could be places which reflect the cultural activities of the Liechtensteins, such as Lednice/Eisgrub and the surrounding cultural landscape. This site has long been one of the most frequently visited monuments and landscape areas in the Czech Republic. The cultural landscape between Lednice and Valtice (Eisgrub and Feldsberg) is one of the most significant projects of its kind in Europe, and since the Baroque period has been the showcase of the Liechtenstein princes’ power and prestige. The summer palace in Lednice, rebuilt during the reign of Karl Eusebius von Liechtenstein and then by his son, Johann Adam Andreas, had an entirely different function as *architectura recreationis*, despite the fact that Lednice also had a crucial role in ancestral power. It was the only piece of Moravian property

⁸⁷ In evidence here is the so-called *damnatio memoriae*, as a consequence of change: In Czechoslovakia soon after 1918 several monuments and memorials celebrating the Catholic Church or the Habsburg empire were demolished. They were the victims of the foundation of the Czechoslovak Republic as they symbolized the power of the Habsburgs, who were juxtaposed against the idea of the “Hussite” nation.

⁸⁸ Petráň, Josef: *Staroměstská exekuce*. Prague 1971. – Pekař, Josef: *Omyly a nebezpečí pozemkové reformy*. 2nd edition. Prague 1923.

which remained in Liechtenstein hands after the sale of the original family property centred in Mikulov/Nikolsburg in 1560. As Michal Konečný points out, this property right did not become truly significant until the end of the 18th century when it finally began to resemble the Eisgrub-Feldsberg (Lednice-Valtice) cultural landscape. In relation to this it is necessary to emphasize that in Lednice the garden, in terms of its function, was probably more important than the chateau building, which remained the case until the Neo-Gothic renovations in the mid-19th century. During this time the architecture of Lednice chateau, as a site of ancestral memory, was programmatically shaped, and in this respect not only alluded to the Baroque and Theresian stages, but in particular to Hardtmuth's Neo-Classical notion of the architecture surrounding Lednice. The chateau was quite radically rebuilt, though some of the central older rooms were left, which were to symbolize the dynastic principle and the antiquity of the family. These elements were also expressed by the historicizing architecture, which referred to specific historical periods in the family's history, and also by the interior furnishings which consisted of real or quasi-historical objects (medieval armour) and works of art (pictures depicting the family's Late Medieval festivities), as well as heraldry and portraits of historically important members of the family. An important role in the ancestral memory was also played by the arts and crafts used in all of these renovations and modifications.⁸⁹ In order for the Lednice cultural landscape to work as a site of memory, it is important that visitors always used to come here for a predominantly positive experience, and that these positive emotions were then transferred to the (symbolic) evaluation of the role of the House of Liechtenstein as developers of the local area, as was shown in the aforementioned sociological study.⁹⁰

In this way the Liechtenstein sites of memory have together created the character of the landscape over a long period of time, particularly in Moravia. At the same time, a significant number of these sites were deliberately created by the Liechtensteins to demonstrate the family's ties to the land. The most important place in this respect is undoubtedly the Liechtenstein tomb in Vranov (Wranau)

⁸⁹ Geršic, Miroslav: *Lednice a Liechtensteinové*. In: Kordiovský, Emil (ed.): *Městečko Lednice*. Lednice 2004, pp. 192–202. – Kroupa, Jiří: *Lednický zámek doby barokní a klasicistní*. In: Kordiovský, Emil et al.: *Městečko Lednice*. Lednice 2004, pp. 355–385.

⁹⁰ Konečný, Michal: *Die Landschaft zwischen Eisgrub (Lednice) und Feldsberg (Valtice)*. In: Liechtensteinisch-Tschechische Historikerkommission (ed.): *Liechtensteinische Erinnerungs-orte in den böhmischen Ländern*. Vaduz 2012, pp. 141–148. Czech version: Konečný, Michal: *Krajina mezi Lednicí a Valticemi jako místo paměti*. In: Geiger, Peter – Knoz, Tomáš (eds.): *Místa Lichtenštejnské paměti*. (Časopis Matice moravské 131, 2012 – Supplementum 3). Brno 2012, pp. 123–130.

near Brno. This was a grandiose construction where the bodies of the deceased ancestors were close to God (they deliberately chose to place the remains of the Liechtenstein ancestors somewhere with a distinctly spiritual function, and not a parish chapel in the family's residential town or a castle chapel), and at the same time a building large enough to last the family a long time (when building the new tomb at the start of the 19th century, consideration was given to the possibility of providing space for as many family generations as possible). Another significant component is, therefore, the creation of a common site of memory for the whole family, leading to the construction of a distinctive dynastic consciousness. Unlike the sepulchral ideas of other aristocratic families, who preferred a system of separate graves according to individual lineages, from the outset the Liechtensteins wanted to express unity. The tomb's function as both a religious family sepulchre, a work of architectural beauty, and also a general site of memory demonstrates that the Liechtensteins were interested in making the pilgrimage to Vranov/Wranau (their ancestors were laid to rest under the floor of the Marian pilgrimage shrine), as well as the local parish administration's interest in maintaining contact with the Liechtensteins and on following the tradition of burying the deceased in Vranov, which the records show also continued during the communist era. The issue has also been raised concerning whether the remains of those family members who were buried in other places or in other countries could be moved to Vranov. In this respect the position of the Liechtensteins is unique amongst other aristocratic families in exile because they were buried in their own country and not abroad. However, this phenomenon would need to be examined in greater detail.⁹¹

In Moravia, and to an extent in Bohemia, Silesia and Austria, it is possible to find a great number of Liechtenstein sites of memory which were either built by the Liechtensteins in the past as a deliberate message to the next generation about the family's importance, or sites where this message was only of secondary importance. These include various different types of architectural and natural monuments, or identifiers attributing them to the Liechtenstein family. One example of a primary monument is Karl von Liechtenstein's cenotaph in Opava/Troppau; or, using interpretive signs, the architecturally interesting commemorative churches (e.g. Balzers) as well as the small memorials in forest trails (e.g. the hunting

⁹¹ Knoz, Tomáš: *Erinnerungsorte der Liechtenstein: Einleitende Thesen*. In: Liechtensteinisch-Tschechische Historikerkommission (ed.): *Liechtensteinische Erinnerungsorte in den böhmischen Ländern*. Vaduz 2012, pp. 11–32. Czech version: Knoz, Tomáš: *Místa liechtenštejnské paměti*. Úvodní teze. In: Geiger, Peter – Knoz, Tomáš (eds.): *Místa Lichtenštejnské paměti*. (Časopis Matice moravské 131, 2012 – Supplementum 3). Brno 2012, pp. 23–47.

grounds at Vranov u Brna / Wranau), commemorating the anniversary of the reign of Johann II von Liechtenstein. Elsewhere this could include heraldry identifying the builder and former owner of an important architectural or cultural monument (e.g. the coat of arms on the façade of the former Jesuit church in Opava (Troppau), the coats of arms on the castles in Uherský Ostroh (Ungarisch Ostra), Rabensburg and in Wilfersdorf), which served as indicators of his legal, social, economic and cultural level (*ranking indicator*). Similarly, there are charts with specific sites in the Moravian karst which not only refer to the presence of a specific family member in a particular place, but also to their interests and the part that they played in creating the local cultural landscape. If these identifiers are to be found at different types of monuments over a widespread area, as is the case of the Liechtensteins, then there is no doubt about their significance. It is possible to think of the border stones of the Liechtenstein estates and the forest hunting grounds as examples of sites of memory which had not primarily been intended as a message for subsequent generations, though were later to become this. This was especially the case when they were located in such a place as to attract widespread attention, such as the border stones of the former Liechtenstein estates on the ridge of the Jeseník mountains. Here there is an extensive complex of monuments which show the size of the former property and global reach of the Liechtenstein family within the history of the Czech-Moravian-Austrian lands. Naturally, in the case of building a primary site of memory it is possible to talk about a certain level of stylisation of such a site of memory, and that the image or stereotype generated by such a site of memory depends on how it is interpreted at the time as a “symbolic centre”, or how such an interpretation might be manipulated (in a different interpretation a monument designed specifically to show the cultural level of the owner might be seen as evidence of exploiting their subjects). Nevertheless, the sociological survey carried out for the Czech-Liechtenstein Commission of Historians showed that despite all the upheavals of the 20th century, the Liechtenstein sites of memory provide a mainly positive picture of the family, whether this is a realistic evaluation or secondary idealisation.⁹² This is still in evidence today when the chateau spaces of the former nobility, including the Liechtensteins, are presented as witnesses to intimate family life in history, without having to exaggerate their beauty

⁹² Vácha, Zdeněk: *Das Bild der Liechtenstein und die mährischen Denkmäler*. In: Liechtensteinisch-Tschechische Historikerkommission (ed.): *Liechtensteinische Erinnerungsorte in den böhmischen Ländern*. Vaduz 2012, pp. 195–214. Czech version: Vácha, Zdeněk: *Obráz Liechtenštejnů a moravské lichtenštejnské památky*. In: Geiger, Peter – Knoz, Tomáš (eds.): *Místa Lichtenštejnské paměti*. (Časopis Matice moravské 131, 2012 – Supplementum 3). Brno 2012, pp. 183–202.

and vanity. Unlike in the recent past, the chateau is presented as a residence and not as a centre of power and a place where subjects were oppressed.

(6) *Culture and art as a Liechtenstein site of memory and as an image of the Liechtenstein family*

The above example of the chateau cultural landscape in Lednice/Eisgrub shows how the image of the Liechtenstein family during the communist period could be altered when its activities in culture and art were taken into consideration, and not just those within the socio-political sphere. After being nationalised in 1945, many important Liechtenstein monuments were frequently used for purposes other than residential or cultural ones (barracks, agricultural buildings, stores). This situation then started to change towards the end of the 1950s when the former aristocratic estates, including the Liechtensteins' palaces, gradually began to function as museums describing life in historical times. In accordance with the theory of monument conservation of the time, some of the movables were restored to their original state, and in some cases these collections were used to create an artificial form of a chateau, often based on specific artistic styles (Bučovice/ Butschowitz as a museum of the Renaissance and Mannerism, Valtice/Feldsberg as a museum of the Baroque, Lednice/Eisgrub as a museum of Romanticism).

Even in this respect, however, the communist period was not a unified one and the image of the Liechtensteins was subject to contextual transformations (the more liberal sixties, the blunting of ideological principles in the eighties), and it is possible to detect a positive evaluation of the Liechtenstein family as supporters of culture, as a family which was continuously focused on changing the landscape and creating valuable architecture. Culture therefore took on a secondary political role as it significantly modified the negative image of the Liechtensteins as a family connected with the violent Counter Reformation, far removed from national feelings and socially alienated from the majority of the population of the Czech/ Bohemian lands. When creating its image of the memory of the Liechtensteins (from time to time strengthened by individual actions), it was typical for the official ideological view of socialist society to face contradictions, and not only with the correcting views of experts or well-read visitors with their romantic views of the cultural monuments, but also the conflictual economic interests of the nascent tourist industry, building on people's interest in history and cultural monuments. Various media at the time created this image of the Liechtensteins (and the aristocracy as a whole) as supporters of culture: academic and popularizing publications in history, art history and conservation; guide texts written by conservation

researchers and read out by professional and part-time guides at Liechtenstein monuments, which were expanded upon in booklets published by conservation institutes, as well as various radio and television documentaries and even entertainment programmes (some of which had educational goals as well as trying to increase tourism, which to a significant degree eliminated the critical-ideological view of a family).⁹³

Some situations often arise with a seemingly absurd effect that stands in opposition to this image of the Liechtensteins. For example, critical commentaries on the historical role of the aristocracy in the Czech/Bohemian lands were written into texts by a centrally run ideological commission. It is evident that the content in the 1950s was strongly biased in ideology, as we see from the introduction to the guided tours, binding at the time, which was always to be presented at the start of the tour through the objects with the intention of influencing the visitors' opinion of the former Liechtenstein palace owner during the tour: "*After the victory of the famed Red Army in 1945 and after the victory in February 1948, the parasite caste of the aristocracy was forever removed from our country. The entire shape of our state was transformed from the bottom up, and the people's awareness was also fundamentally transformed. The builders of socialism became our heroes, our workers and farmers, our activists and our innovators, etc.*"⁹⁴ In the 1950s and early 1960s, similar introductions could also be found in booklets about individual monuments or collections of monuments, even in the case where the authors of the history and art-history texts were obviously experts whose political beliefs were not overtly positive towards communist philosophy or socialist rule e.g. Jarmila Vacková in her booklet on Kroměříž (Kremsier).

Even though these openly ideological criticisms of the aristocracy, or specifically the Liechtensteins, began to disappear or became more covert (criticisms of the aristocracy's lifestyle, its life in luxury, highlighting the work of artists or even the peasantry, who through their innovation or labour participated in the building of the monuments and art works), they never disappeared entirely. In the opening dialogue to the light-entertainment programme *Dostaveníčko v Lednici [Rendezvous in Lednice]*, which was made by the Brno studio of Czechoslovak Television in 1984 (the year before Gorbachev announced glasnost and perestroika), the presenters announced in a fictional stage-type dialogue that the programme was in no way a celebration of the patrons of art and architecture from the Liechten-

⁹³ Drašnar, Vojtěch: *Obraz Lichtenštejnů v průvodcovských textech na moravských zámcích*. Unpublished bachelor thesis 2012 (History Department, Faculty of Arts, Masaryk University Brno).

⁹⁴ Uhlíková, Kristina: *Národní kulturní komise 1947–1951*. Prague 2004.

stein family, but more an appreciation of the work of the artists in their service. According to the commentary, the Liechtensteins“ [...] *knew how to benefit from the position of their chateau and feudal privileges, the favours from their rulers, backroom politics and even confiscations during the post-White Mountain era, so it could be said that the history of the chateau is in fact the history of the Liechtensteins [...]. In my opinion, however, history is more about the workers, artists and builders here [...]*”). However, in the programme that followed consisting of songs and romantic sketches, the Liechtensteins are presented in a positive light for creating the Lednice/Eisgrub cultural landscape and its romanticizing architecture, and Lednice/Eisgrub is even described as the pearl of South Moravia.⁹⁵ This attitude was not only presented in this programme, but was the general case for the whole period, and in a fundamental way shows that even in an era which failed to objectively assess the Liechtensteins’ role in the history of the Czech lands, it projected the image of them by stating what they had achieved in terms of collecting art, constructing various types of cultural landscapes and building useful as well as ornamental architecture.

Johann Kräftner and Herbert Haupt have both shown how involvement in art and culture can act in the long term as a positive element in the construction of a positive image, which also applies to family members who are otherwise liable to general criticism, personified by the aforementioned Karl I von Liechtenstein. Already on the shadow of Rudolph II, Karl was a commissioner of art works and a collector. After Rudolph’s death in Prague in 1612, interest in collecting art waned under his successors Matthias and Ferdinand. Artists and workshops no longer had any clear idea about their future, and so Karl took over the role previously occupied by Rudolph II. Commissions for works by Adriaen de Vries and mosaics made in *pietra dura* and created in Prague by Ottavio and Dionysio Miseroni, attained great importance in a collection of art objects that would be the foundation for subsequent princes of the Liechtenstein family (at the same time it is interesting that some of the works in Karl’s collection are sites of memory from the Battle of White Mountain). With his architectural commissions, Karl I von Liechtenstein managed to continue in the style of Renaissance architects and builders, and here, too, he laid the foundations which his son, Karl Eusebius I, could build on, continued even more successfully by his grandson, Johann Adam Andreas I, with his grandiose architectural commissions during the Baroque period, and Johann II von Liechtenstein during his reign in the later 19th

⁹⁵ *Dostaveníčko v Lednici [Rendez-vous at Eisgrub]*. Light-entertainment music programme. ČST Brno, 1984. Specialist advisor PhDr. Miroslava Nováková. Screenplay by František Brüstl. Directed by Jan Eisner.

century.⁹⁶ The Liechtensteins long-term activities as collectors always bore fruit during those difficult times in the family's history when crisis loomed. After the end of the Second World War, when the princely family with the loss of property in Czechoslovakia and the need to focus on developing their statehood on the Upper Rhine, exhibitions of art collections in Switzerland helped to construct a new family image. The exhibitions of the Liechtenstein Princely Collections which have been held in recent years in Moscow, Prague, Japan and in Singapore, and as exhibition projects in Beijing, Shanghai and again in Moscow in 2014 (to commemorate the 20th anniversary of the establishment of diplomatic ties between the Principality of Liechtenstein and the Russian Federation), are significant expressions of the Liechtenstein family's sites of memory and the construction of their positive image. It is no coincidence that one important episode in the relationship between the Liechtensteins (and then the Principality of Liechtenstein) and the Czech Republic was a dispute over the painting *Scene set around a Roman Limekiln* after 1989. This was followed by a positive turning point in relations connected to the establishment of diplomatic ties in 2009 and the organisation of the exhibition "Classicism and Biedermeier" at the Waldstein/Wallenstein Riding School in Prague from May to October 2010.⁹⁷ This last example might serve as a positive model for a site of memory and the construction of an image which might be possible to build upon in the future.

⁹⁶ Kräftner, Johann: *Die Familie Liechtenstein als Kunstsammler und Mäzene*. In: Liechtensteinisch-Tschechische Historikerkommission (ed.): *Die Liechtenstein: Kontinuitäten – Diskontinuitäten*. Vaduz 2013, pp. 263–274. – Haupt, Herbert: *Fürst Karl I. von Liechtenstein, Obersthofmeister Kaiser Rudolfs II. und Vizekönig von Böhmen. Hofstaat und Sammeltätigkeit*. Edition der Quellen aus dem liechtensteinischen Hausarchiv. Textband. Quellen und Studien zur Geschichte des Fürstenhauses Liechtenstein. 1/1. Vienna – Cologne – Graz 1983.

⁹⁷ Kräftner, Johann: *Das Liechtenstein Museum im 20. Jahrhundert*. In: Liechtensteinisch-Tschechische Historikerkommission (ed.): *Das Fürstenhaus, der Staat Liechtenstein und die Tschechoslowakei im 20. Jahrhundert*. Vaduz 2013, pp. 159–174. – Kräftner, Johann: *Liechtenstein Museum Wien. Biedermeier im Haus Liechtenstein. Die Epoche im Licht der Fürstlichen Sammlungen*. Munich 2005, pp. 126–127. – Mrázek, Josef: *Obraz Velká vápenka a majetkoprávní nároky Lichtenštejnů vůči ČR*. Právní rádce 9, 2001, no. 9, pp. I–XII. – Kräftner, Johann – Vondráček, Roman (eds.): *Klasicismus a biedermeier z knížecích lichtenštejnských sbírek*. Exhibition catalogue. Prague 2010.

b. The Liechtensteins and art

(1) The Middle Ages

By the 14th and 15th centuries, members of the Liechtenstein family were already important figures in central European royal courts. Although their residences and estates are well known, little is known about what the exteriors looked like and most especially their interior decoration and furnishings. Apart from a few exceptions, documentation is lacking about the role played by art as an important aesthetic and prestigious element. This omission can only be remedied with intensive research in the future.

Such research can lead to some interesting results, as is the case with the decoration of the Castello del Buonconsiglio in Trento. Georg III (II) von Liechtenstein (died 1444), the son of Hartneid III and Anna of Šternberk/Sternberg, with their residence in Mikulov/Nikolsburg, reached the pinnacle of his career in 1390 when he was made Bishop of Trent. His residence until 1407 was the Castello di Buonconsiglio, where he had the hall in the Eagle's Tower decorated in 1406 to 1407. The murals show scenes from the lives of noblemen and villagers over the 12 months of the year.⁹⁸ The paintings, which among other things depict the first snowball fight, have long been famous. What is less known was that these extremely interesting scenes were inspired to a considerable extent by art from the Bohemia milieu at the court of King Wenceslas IV. It is possible that the painters who worked on this fresco decoration in Trent may have come from Bohemia.⁹⁹

The uncle of Georg III, Johann I von Liechtenstein, steward to Duke Albert III of Habsburg, also had close contacts to the Bohemian milieu and one of the leading courtiers to Margrave Jost of Luxemburg, who placed a house at his disposal on Brno's Fish Market in 1365, and then another on the Upper Market in 1396.¹⁰⁰ Johann I was also a counsellor to King Wenceslas IV, who placed a house at his disposal on

⁹⁸ Kurth, Betty: *Ein Freskenzyklus im Adlerturm zu Trient*. Jahrbuch des Kunsthistorischen Institutes der k. k. Zentralkommission für Denkmalpflege 5, 1911, pp. 9–104. – Rasmo, Nicolò: *Die Fresken im Adlerturm zu Trient*. Rovereto 1962.

⁹⁹ More in Všečeková, Zuzana: *Biskup Jiří z Lichtenštejna a nastěnné malby v tridentské Orlí věži v kontextu malířství českých zemí na přelomu 14. a 15. století*. In: Geiger, Peter – Knoz, Tomáš (eds.): *Lichtenštejnové a umění*. (Časopis Matice moravské 132, 2013 – Supplementum 5). Brno 2013, pp. 227–248.

¹⁰⁰ Baletka, Tomáš: *Dvůr, rezidence a kancelář moravského markraběte Jošta (1375–1411)*. A collection of archival works 46, 1996, pp. 444 f.

Prague's Lesser Town Square opposite the St Nicholas presbytery in 1394. Johann II von Liechtenstein also lived in this house.¹⁰¹ The location of these houses is important as the Liechtensteins were to live in these places for the centuries that followed.

The sources pertaining to the older generations of Liechtensteins and their relationship towards art are still awaiting treatment by historians and experts and as for the monuments themselves there will surely be several surprising discoveries in the course of their revitalisation and/or restoration. Neither are there any significant documents to be found from the subsequent decades detailing the extensive architectural work of the Liechtensteins and their art-related activities. It was only towards the start of the 17th century that this situation would significantly change.

(2) *The Early Modern Age*

After the death of Hartmann II von Liechtenstein (1544–1585) and his brothers Georg Erasmus (1547–1585), Heinrich IX the Younger (1554–1585) and Johann Septimius (1558–1595), their inheritance bequeathed Hartmann's three sons represented considerable wealth: Valtice (Feldsberg), Lednice (Eisgrub) and Herrnbaumgarten in Lower Austria made Karl one of the richest nobles in Moravia; his brother Maximilian (1548–1645) inherited Rabensburg and Hohenau in Austria, Gundaker (1580–1658) inherited Wilfersdorf and Ringelsdorf.¹⁰² Over the subsequent decades the brothers put intensive effort not only into increasing their inherited property, but also shoring up their newly won political and social status also with the prestige endowed by art.¹⁰³

Karl von Liechtenstein (1559–1627), son of Hartmann II von Liechtenstein-Feldsberg (1544–1585) and his wife, Anna Marie von Ortenburg (1547–1601), together with Charles the Elder of Žerotín, was educated in Basel and in Geneva in the Protestant-Lutheran faith. He converted to Catholicism along with his brothers Maximilian and Gundaker in 1599. His marriage to Anna Maria of

¹⁰¹ Zemek, Metoděj – Turek, Adolf: *Regesta listin z lichtenštejnského archivu ve Vaduzu z let 1173 až 1526*. A collection of archival works 33, 1983, p. 216: 18th October 1386.

¹⁰² Haupt, Herbert: *Fürst Karl I. von Liechtenstein, Obersthofmeister Kaiser Rudolfs II. und Vizekönig von Böhmen – Hofstaat und Sammeltätigkeit*. Edition der Quellen aus dem liechtensteinischen Hausarchiv. Wien 1983, Textband, pp. 12–13.

¹⁰³ See also the paper by Knoz, Tomáš: *Lichtenštejnská zámecká sídla v kontextu moravsko-rakouské renesance a manýrismu*. Zámek Rabensburg. In: Geiger, Peter – Knoz, Tomáš (eds.): *Lichtenštejnové a umění*. (Časopis Matice moravské 132, 2013 – Supplementum 5). Brno 2013, pp. 83–125.

Boskovice/Boskowitz, the daughter of Jan Šembera Černohorský/Johann Schembera von Cernahora, not only meant a significant increase in his property, but also the likelihood of acquiring part of his father-in-law's art collection. In the same way, Maximilian von Liechtenstein probably also received a considerable inventory of art when he married Šembera's/Schembera's second daughter, Katharina.

Karl von Liechtenstein was greatly involved in the Moravian provincial institutions until the end of the 1590s. Emperor Rudolph II brought him to his court in Prague in 1600. As part of the emperor's privy council he now belonged for some years to the closest circle of imperial counsellors. Rudolph's privy council secretary, Johann Barvitiuss, recommended him for the vacant post of Chief Steward. Rudolph II had already taken an interest in the young convert three years previously, who at his wish had willingly given him those art works from his collection in Úsov/Aussee that he had inherited from Jan Šembera/Johann Schembera.¹⁰⁴

In Prague, Karl von Liechtenstein lived in a house on the corner of Lesser Town Square, probably in the aforementioned building. From the surviving diplomatic correspondence with the Gonzaga court in Mantua, it appears that as part of his duties arising from his courtly duties, Karl von Liechtenstein also took part in discussions surrounding the formation of the emperor's collections.¹⁰⁵

In 1602 the emperor Rudolf II presented Karl with "*einen Garten und Zubausung*" – a homestead with a garden in Pohořelec/Prague-Pohoreletz, which he purchased from the widow of Jacob Kurz von Senftenau, and had expensively fitted out for the astronomer Tycho Brahe to live in and observe the skies. The new resident was not Tycho's successor, Johannes Kepler (Tycho died in 1601), as would have been expected, but Karl von Liechtenstein.

We can imagine the house in Pohořelec on the outskirts of the town in a garden as perhaps a very comfortable suburban villa, which the new owner probably only used occasionally. Among those who visited here while they were in Prague was Duke Henry Julius of Brunswick.¹⁰⁶ Rudolph II's two illegitimate sons, Matthias and Charles, stayed here with their guardian, Paul of Krausenegg, in 1605.¹⁰⁷

¹⁰⁴ Haupt, Herbert: *Fürst Karl I. von Liechtenstein, Obersthofmeister Kaiser Rudolfs II. und Vizekönig von Böhmen – Hofstaat und Sammeltätigkeit*. Edition der Quellen aus dem liechtensteinischen Hausarchiv. Wien 1983, Textband, p. 13.

¹⁰⁵ Venturini, Elena: *Le collezioni Gonzaga. Il carteggio tra la corte cesarea e Mantova (1559–1636)*. Milano – Mantova 2002, p. 476 ff., reg. 800–828.

¹⁰⁶ Haupt, Herbert: *Fürst Karl I. von Liechtenstein, Obersthofmeister Kaiser Rudolfs II. und Vizekönig von Böhmen – Hofstaat und Sammeltätigkeit*. Edition der Quellen aus dem liechtensteinischen Hausarchiv. Vienna 1983, Textband, p. 102, footnote. 14.

¹⁰⁷ Sapper, Christian: *Kinder des Geblüts – Die Bastarde Kaiser Rudolfs II.* Mitteilungen des Österreichischen Staatsarchives 47 (Vienna 1999), p. 45.

In 1607, Karl von Liechtenstein resigned as Chief Steward after siding with Archduke Matthias, the future emperor, in a fraternal dispute with Rudolph II. He returned to his estates in Moravia and began extensive construction work in Feldsberg (Valtice) and Eisgrub (Lednice), which he had transformed into his summer residence. He also planned to build a castle in Plumlov/Plumenau and he had the castle- and parish churches repaired on the Liechtenstein estates. The account books contain the names of the architects Giovanni Maria Filippi, Giovanni Battista Carlone, Carlo Maderno and others.¹⁰⁸

When carrying out his projects, Karl von Liechtenstein favoured architects and builders working on his Moravian estates over those working in the imperial court, though this was different for sculptors. Lorenz Murman who had worked for him in Vienna merely represented the local standards, unlike Adriaen de Vries, the emperor's court sculptor.¹⁰⁹ He created two magnificent bronze statues for Karl von Liechtenstein: *Christ in Distress* in 1607 and *St Sebastian* between circa 1613 and 1615. Karl also kept in contact with the emperor's court painters: for example, Bartholomeus Spranger, Hans von Aachen, Roelant Savery and Joris Hoefnagel, whose works are mostly recorded in the inventories only under the subject without the artist's name.¹¹⁰

The art of the goldsmith played an outstandingly prestigious role for members of noble families and not only in the form of jewels, but also accoutrements adorning the elegant tables and sideboards for castle and palace banqueting halls. During his stay in Prague, Karl von Liechtenstein bought from the court jewellers and merchants the luxurious items they brought to Prague from throughout Europe. Later, when he returned to Moravia, he employed the services of jewellers from Brno (Brünn) and Vienna rather than the then fashionable masters from Augsburg and Nuremberg.

The most important jeweller's commission was the ducal hat, which Gottfried Nick from Frankfurt made for Karl von Liechtenstein in 1623 (the original is

¹⁰⁸ For a brief overview of construction activities cf. Haupt, Herbert: *Fürst Karl I. von Liechtenstein, Obersthofmeister Kaiser Rudolfs II. und Vizekönig von Böhmen – Hofstaat und Sammeltätigkeit*. Edition der Quellen aus dem liechtensteinischen Hausarchiv. Wien 1983, Textband, footnote. 5, pp. 41–44; and the corresponding regesta in vol. 2 – Quellen

¹⁰⁹ Leithe-Jasper, Manfred: *Adrian de Fries*. In: Kräftner, Johann (ed.): *Einzug der Künste in Böhmen*. Liechtenstein Museum Vienna, Vienna 2009, pp. 31–37.

¹¹⁰ Haupt, Herbert: *Fürst Karl I. von Liechtenstein, Obersthofmeister Kaiser Rudolfs II. und Vizekönig von Böhmen – Hofstaat und Sammeltätigkeit*. Edition der Quellen aus dem liechtensteinischen Hausarchiv. Vienna 1983, Textband, pp. 56–60, and the corresponding regesta in vol. 2 – Quellen, pp. 186–189, 220–223. – Fučíková, Eliška: *Die niederländischen Maler am Hof Kaiser Rudolf II. in Prag*, Kat., pp. 25–28.

no longer extant). Its shape was reminiscent of Rudolph II's crown and also (not by chance) vaguely reminiscent of the Bohemian crown of St Wenceslas.

The outstanding court gemcutters – the Miseroni and the Castrucci – also worked for the Liechtenstein court, as well as Jost Bürgi and Erasmus Habermel; clockmakers and makers of astronomical instruments and various technical inventions.¹¹¹

After the victory of the imperial troops at White Mountain, Karl I von Liechtenstein was appointed governor of the Lands of the Bohemian Crown, and so a residence in Prague worthy of his standing became a necessity. Karl von Liechtenstein opted for a similar approach to that of Albrecht of Waldstein: he purchased recently built or renovated houses on the west side of Lesser Town Square – *At the White Lion* and *At the Black Eagle*, and one which used to house the Imperial Council. In December 1623 he acquired a corner house in the direction of today's Neruda Street, which was one of the most impressive buildings there. This opened up almost the whole western front of the square to redevelopment.

The houses have been also documented in records in the so-called Old Manipulation Collection in the National Archives in Prague, which have gone unnoticed until now.¹¹² These sources give the precise date of the redevelopment of these four houses into one grand palace. They record the rapid pace of construction and also set out the costs involved. The documents cover the period from 1 January 1622 to 16 December 1624 and show the cost to be a total of 74,547 gulden (guilders). It states all the costs for demolition, debris removal, transport of material, for bricklayers, plasterers, masons, carpenters, chimney sweeps, stove builders, roofers, tilers, locksmiths, glaziers, upholsterers, for connecting water, buying nails and other ironmonger products: basically for everything that was required for construction. There also appear here the costs for an painter and for the purchase of canvasses and thread.

If we take into consideration that the most recently purchased corner house of the Lobkowitz family cost 1,080 gulden at the same period, then the amount for the construction of the palace is astronomically high. It is also necessary to remember what the engravings from the time tell us about the corner house, which was bought last and the outer appearance of which did not change appreciably

¹¹¹ Cf. Haupt, Herbert: *Fürst Karl I. von Liechtenstein, Obersthofmeister Kaiser Rudolfs II. und Vizekönig von Böhmen – Hofstaat und Sammeltätigkeit*. Edition der Quellen aus dem liechtensteinischen Hausarchiv. Vienna 1983, Textband, pp. 71–75. – More on the ducal hat in the catalogue *Liechtenstein – The Princely Collections*. New York 1985, pp. 33–35, no. 20.

¹¹² Cf. Fučíková, Eliška: *Lichtenštejnský palác v Praze*. In: Geiger, Peter – Knoz, Tomáš (eds.): *Lichtenštejnové a umění*. (Časopis Matice moravské 132, 2013 – Supplementum 5). Brno 2013, pp. 43–51.

until subsequent renovation work towards the end of the 18th century. All the costs related to the building work were covered by the rentmaster office, including the purchase of the house on the corner. This was why Karl Eusebius of Liechtenstein (1611–1684) had to produce documentation – receipts – that the government-issued money was then refunded in cash. This file is a verified copy of the original from this time.

Karl I von Liechtenstein died before the lavishly decorated Lesser Town palace could be realised, which had been planned to compete with the Waldstein palace which was under construction during the same period. However, for Karl Eusebius von Liechtenstein the unfinished palace was more of a burden, and when he wanted to stay there in the winter of 1637–1638 it had to be renovated for him.¹¹³

A plan by Marcantonio Canevale (1652–1711) from the late 17th century was found in the Ancestral Archive of the Ruling Princes of Liechtenstein [Hausarchiv des regierenden Fürsten von Liechtenstein],¹¹⁴ which gives a good indication of the size and layout of the palace's interior. Even after two renovations in the last quarter of the 18th century and later, its original Renaissance structure is still apparent.

Despite the fact that Karl of Liechtenstein felt very strongly about his personal prestige, this was not as apparent in his architectural projects. Although he spent enormous sums on mintage, thus becoming almost as well known in the country as the emperor, and he chose an extremely personal collection of pictures for his banqueting hall in Feldsberg (Valtice),¹¹⁵ he focused on extensive but less distinctive building, both in Feldsberg and Eisgrub (Valtice and Lednice) as also in Prague.

His plan to build a new parish – and chateau church in Feldsberg (Valtice) was never realised beyond a model of 1602. What role the architect Giovanni Maria Filippi, known only from the source documents, had in this building plan is not known. Giovanni Battista Carlone was in charge of the chateau renovations in Feldsberg (Valtice) and Eisgrub (Lednice). He was probably responsible as well

¹¹³ Cf. Fidler, Petr: *Valtický kostel Nanebevzetí Panny Marie*. In: Geiger, Peter – Knoz, Tomáš (eds.): *Lichtenštejnové a umění*. (Časopis Matice moravské 132, 2013 – Supplementum 5). Brno 2013, pp. 249–267. – Fidler, Petr: *Architektura des Seicento*. Baumeister, Architekten und Bauten des Wiener Hofkreises. Innsbruck 1990 (unpublished thesis), pp. 68–70.

¹¹⁴ Liechtenstein – The Princely Collections, Vaduz – Vienna, Hausarchiv (HAL), Plansammlung, PK 1167.

¹¹⁵ Fleischer, Victor: *Fürst Karl Eusebius von Liechtenstein als Baubherr und Kunstsammler (1611–1684)*. Leipzig 1910, p. 9 ff.. – Haupt, Herbert (ed.): *“Ein Liebhaber der Gemähl und virtuosien...”*, *Fürst Johann Adam I. Andreas von Liechtenstein (1657–1712)*. Band III/2. Vienna – Cologne – Weimar 2012, doc. 216a a 389a.

for the regulation plan of the town with the oversized main square in Feldsberg and the construction work for the Prague palace.¹¹⁶

Through marriage to Katharina of Boskovic/Boskowitz, Karl's younger brother, Maximilian, acquired Bučovice/Butschowitz Castle. Jan Šembera Černohorský/Johann Schembera von Cernahora of Boskovic had started its construction, inspired by Emperor Maximilian II's castle Neugebäude, which was erected outside the walls of Vienna, as they were situated at the time, and it still stands in the same location. outside the walls of Vienna. Bučovice is interesting not only because of its architecture with richly decorated arcades in the courtyard, but also the arrangement of the rooms on the ground floor with their extremely fascinating stucco-work and painted decorations. The discovery of the key to dating them might explain the function of these rooms, as the ceremonial hall was located on the first floor.

(3) A single-minded preoccupation with art, collecting, representation and cultural patronage

With Prince Karl I, the Liechtenstein family began its single-minded approach to art in the widest sense of the word. Prince Karl I's first steps were in architecture, something which almost threatened to get out of control with later generations, while he also began to compete with others – and it ought perhaps to be said, with Emperor Rudolph II – using the family's collecting tradition, which lasted generations until today, some 400 years later.¹¹⁷ Initially this collecting was limited exclusively to the prince's family and reached its peak in the last quarter of the 18th century with various ancestral collections, which were found in many places in the estates of the individual branches of the family and its members.

Under Prince Joseph Wenzel I von Liechtenstein (1696–1772) all these collections were brought together for the first time in the city-palace in Vienna and catalogued.¹¹⁸ Prince Johann I von Liechtenstein (1760–1836) then present-

¹¹⁶ Fidler, Petr: *Architektur des Seicento*. Baumeister, Architekten und Bauten des Wiener Hofkreises. Innsbruck 1990 (unpublished habilitation thesis); Kroupa, Jiří: *Zámek Valtice v 17. a 18. století*. In: Kordiovský, Emil (ed.): *Město Valtice*. Valtice 2001, pp. 155–196

¹¹⁷ Kräftner, Johann: *Die Familie Liechtenstein als Kunstsammler und Mäzene*. In: Liechtensteinisch-Tschechische Historikerkommission (ed.): *Die Liechtenstein: Kontinuitäten – Diskontinuitäten*. Vaduz 2013, pp. 263–274.

¹¹⁸ Fanti, Vincenzo: *Descrizione completa di tutto ciò che trovarsi nella galleria di pittura e scultura di Sua Altezza Giuseppe Wenceslao del S.R.I. Principe Regnante della casa di Liechtenstein [...] / Data in luce da Vincenzio Fanti*. Vienna 1767.

ed the whole collection for the first time to a qualified public in a gallery in the family's summer palace in Vienna-Rossau, in a form which we would today absolutely identify as a museum, i.e. a public or semi-public educational institution.¹¹⁹ The leap had thus been made from an ancestral/dynastic collection to a public form of collecting with all the attendant responsibilities that this collection merited in connection with its outstanding quality and the cultural policy of the family as a subject of public debate.

Prince Karl I initiated this process with his first activities surrounding this collection, he decided to eschew any shallow, modest form of collecting and tried to find and own even better and more dazzling artworks than the emperor – Emperor Rudolph II of Habsburg himself, who brought together a unique group of artists to Prague and compiled the most astounding collection of art. After Rudolph's death in 1612, Karl was able avail of the under-employed court artists residing in Prague, and owing to the lack of interest in art on the part of Rudolph's successors from the Habsburg family, he had now free rein to pursue his interests for a certain time.

Commissioning artists and dealing with the court workshops and court artists was a very important process, whereby they were recruited, employed and they quasi contributed to artistic development, becoming role models for other external workers. It would appear that the artistic climate at this time in the Lands of the Bohemian Crown was much more favourable than in other parts of the Habsburg monarchy. During the Late Renaissance and Early Baroque the desire for innovation in architecture, and the urge to experiment in other fields, in painting, music etc, garnered a hugely fruitful harvest especially in the Lands of the Bohemian Crown.¹²⁰

This factor is one of the major knock-on effects of private collecting. Artists tend to congregate where they can find work and where their works are collected. At the same time, they are also likely to settle in places where the market promises success. Therefore, collecting, which at one level is a purely private matter, beco-

¹¹⁹ Kräftner, Johann: *Das Liechtenstein Museum im 20. Jahrhundert*. In: Liechtensteinisch-Tschechische Historikerkommission (ed.): *Das Fürstenhaus, der Staat Liechtenstein und die Tschechoslowakei im 20. Jahrhundert*. Vaduz 2013, pp. 159–174.

¹²⁰ See also papers presented at workshops organised by the Czech-Liechtenstein Commission of Historians: Vlnas, Vít: *Škrétové a jejich obrazy pro Karla Eusebia z Lichtenštejna. A paper on the art trade in Baroque Prague*. In: Geiger, Peter – Knoz, Tomáš (eds.): *Lichtenštejnové a umění*. (Časopis Matice moravské 132, 2013 – Supplementum 5). Brno 2013, pp. 289–302; Mañas, Vladimír: *Tušení souvislostí. Hudba na dvoře Karla I. z Lichtenštejna na počátku 17. století ve středoevropském kontextu*. In: Geiger, Peter – Knoz, Tomáš (eds.): *Lichtenštejnové a umění*, pp. 127–137.

mes something that is in the higher interest of the public – in today’s terminology we would talk about the promotion of culture.

In the House of Liechtenstein this process – which spread like the proverbial stone thrown into water and to reverberate across the whole country in ever wider circles – was given important support by the writings of Prince Karl Eusebius, the son of the collection’s founder, whose instructions gave direction, meaning and order to the process of collecting, in many respects still valid today. Herbert Haupt examined these aspects in his workshops for the Czech-Liechtenstein Commission of Historians.¹²¹

In addition to the often quoted and famous statements about the importance of architectural works as permanent, eternal reminders of their founders, the work of Karl Eusebius contains incredibly knowledgeable and precise instructions on how to design and construct, which suggests that he had a broad knowledge of literature and a large library at his disposal. For example, Karl Eusebius refers in detail to Peter Paul Rubens’s book “Palazzi di Genova”, one copy of which still exists today in the *Princely Collection*. The work of Karl Eusebius possessive consists of instructions which admirably point towards practical needs, in today’s terminology we would talk about functionalist architecture which he promoted when he writes that: “*a riding hall should have no architectural embellishments on the inside, for at the tumult of the airs, that is when jumping, they would only be dislodged and would thus have been made in vain, and when dislodged would only be unsightly.*”¹²² He also racked his brain about where to place the clocks on the castle buildings. The clocks were to be visible from all sides and for everyone – no doubt to guarantee an orderly and structured working day.¹²³

When reading the chapter on gardens, and bearing in mind Prince Karl Eusebius’s expenditure for these horticultural developments, particularly for the local fountains,¹²⁴ it is easy to find in his treatise an explanation – evidently he took everything he wrote very seriously and in his treatises he reflected to a large degree on his own work: “*And because the soul of a garden is made up from rivulets and fountains, our gardens should be richly, that is copiously, endowed and embellished with fountains, and wherever a fountain can fit, then one should be placed there.*”

¹²¹ Haupt, Herbert: *Umění ve službách reprezentace. Knížata z Lichtenštejna jako zadavatelé a sběratelé v období baroka*. In: Geiger, Peter – Knoz, Tomáš (eds.): *Lichtenštejnové a umění*. (Časopis Matic moravské 132, 2013 – Supplementum 5). Brno 2013, pp. 9–24.

¹²² Fleischer, Victor: *Fürst Karl Eusebius von Liechtenstein als Bauherr und Kunstsammler (1611–1684)*. Leipzig 1910, p. 140.

¹²³ *Ibid.*, p. 143.

¹²⁴ Cf. Haupt, Herbert: *Fürst Karl Eusebius von Liechtenstein 1611–1684. Erbe und Bewahrer in schwerer Zeit*. Munich – Berlin – London – New York 2007.

*But it is not suitable to have fountains everywhere, for they must only be situated where they are a decorative work.*¹²⁵

His fondness of gardens is certainly the third invariable in the activity and work of the princely family: viewed historically, the mania for building, the breeding of horses and the preoccupation with gardens and horticulture have been an integral part of the activities of the Liechtensteins up to the present-day. Today, the cultivation of forest plants and growing rice are undoubtedly at the forefront of the princely family's interests.

Through the purchases of art works and investing large amounts over the past decades in restoring and reconstructing palaces and reopening museums in both palaces, today's reigning prince Hans-Adam II von Liechtenstein (born 1945) has honourably followed in the footsteps and traditions of his family as set out in Karl Eusebius's treatises. Enhancing prestige through art works may be different to 350 years ago, but with his palaces and collections – for example as part of the exhibitions in Asia – the prince continues to promote the interests of his family, their entrepreneurial activities and the country of Liechtenstein itself.

(4) Castle and church building activities of the Liechtensteins in the Lands of the Bohemian Crown

The expansion of the Liechtensteins' power in the Lands of the Bohemian Crown meant a greater need to increase their visibility, which led to the construction of large castles and churches in the Early, High and Late Baroque. A random selection of examples shows, on one hand, the powerful standing of the family, while on the other, their influence corresponded precisely to the social-political standing which the family had projected across the whole country.¹²⁶

The first castle project, albeit a rather absurd manifestation of the family's intentions, was a building in Plumlov/Plumenau. Indoctrinated by the writings of his father, Karl Eusebius, as a layman Prince Johann Adam Andreas I (1662–1712)

¹²⁵ Fleischer, Victor: *Fürst Karl Eusebius von Liechtenstein als Bauherr und Kunstsammler (1611–1684)*. Leipzig 1910, p. 145 ff.

¹²⁶ Knoz, Tomáš: *Lichtenštejnská zámecká sídla v kontextu moravsko-rakouské renesance a manyrismu. Zámek Rabensburg*. In: Geiger, Peter – Knoz, Tomáš (eds.): *Lichtenštejnové a umění*. (Časopis Matice moravské 132, 2013 – Supplementum 5). Brno 2013, pp. 83–125. – On the theme of princely prestige see Haupt, Herbert: *Umění ve službách reprezentace*. Knížata z Lichtenštejna jako zadavatelé a sběratelé v období baroka. In: Geiger, Peter – Knoz, Tomáš (eds.): *Lichtenštejnové a umění*. (Časopis Matice moravské 132, 2013 – Supplementum 5). Brno 2013, pp. 9–24.

attempted to create an edifice of exceptional importance which would be worthy of the writings of antiquity and Renaissance treatises.

Today we must judge this building in the state we find it: it is incomplete and some sections are in ruins. Nevertheless, it has become a genuine manifesto of architecture – and also of architecture produced by an amateur.

We would certainly judge this work of architecture differently if it had been completed according to its enormous dimensions. The immense projecting columned facade would be incorporated in the appropriate scale into the courtyard in front of it, and the narrow building, which today determines its aesthetic appearance, would not have made any impression at all.

The construction of Plumlov Castle was begun in 1680,¹²⁷ when Prince Karl Eusebius was still alive, on the site of a medieval fort which had been heavily damaged during the Thirty-Years' War. Its architectural scheme is clearly governed by the theoretical demands of Vignola and Palladio, which quite simply overwhelm the observer with their monumental order of columns, especially when it comes to the only façade which was completed and was originally intended as the courtyard façade. The development of this façade and the use of a classical row of columns remained completely trapped in that *horror vacui*, which is characteristic of many architectural works north of the Alps from Germany to the Netherlands, where the guidelines contained in the so-called *Säulenbücher* were put into practice purely mechanically, without any understanding of proportion, of building architectural tension, in short, without any proper knowledge and understanding of architectural composition. In keeping with one of the main requirements in Karl Eusebius's *Werk von der Architektur* [A Work on Architecture], it was important to use rows of columns: "*The arrangement of the 5 orders of columns is so sublime that it is impossible to embellish anything without them, no altar, no church, no pulpit, no triumphal arch or any other type of gate, no house, it is necessary to create these 5 everywhere and build in one way or another; without this structure no embellishment can come about; without them all buildings look shabby, faded, without shine, style, honour, glory and popularity.*"¹²⁸

The length of the façade was also important. In one section of his treatise, Karl Eusebius discusses the various options for buildings and clearly prefers a square shape, as here the facades are all of the same length and have the same number of windows. He rejects buildings with a circular floor plan, as this results in an unpleasant interior layout and because you are not impressed by the length

¹²⁷ Kühndel, Jan – Mathon, Jaroslav: *Plumlovský zámek a jeho knížecí architekt.* Prostějov 1937.

¹²⁸ Fleischer, Victor: *Fürst Karl Eusebius von Liechtenstein als Bauherr und Kunstsammler (1611–1684).* Leipzig 1910, p. 98.

of the façade: “*This round shape would cause untold damage to the palace exterior, as it would remove the building’s grandeur and handsome appearance if it were short and small and quite repulsive to view.*”¹²⁹

The first design for the garden in Vienna Rossau palace, probably by a Venetian architect,¹³⁰ was entirely in the spirit of the tradition of Andrea Palladio and Sebastiano Serlio, and corresponded perfectly to the ideal of a square palace, as Karl Eusebius preferred: “*[...] because we want it to stay within our prescribed palatio in quadro, and that is why we want to mention it [the polygonal building structure], because our family saw pictures of such buildings in their French books and talked about them. The pavilion and gallery do not have to follow [this model], but exclusively our prescribed style, which has been expertly developed by our ancestors, and was, and de facto will be, carried out well, with praise and beauty in Italy (Walschlandt). With its buildings, Italy ist upstaging the whole world, and therefore this and no other approach should be followed, as its style is handsome, beautiful and majestic.*”¹³¹ With this paean to the art of Italian architecture, the prince not only showed the way for the next generation. These theories were clearly followed by Johann Adam Andreas I, Karl Eusebius’s son, which helps to explain why Johann Bernhard Fischer von Erlach was fighting such a losing battle at the start, as in his imagination he worked with architectural models which were much more heterogeneous and airy, not to mention the realisation of his “castle on the hill”, which was designed on a circular ground plan.

In Prague in 1668 the construction of the Černín/Czernin Palace began according to a design by the Italian architect Francesco Caratti and was completed in 1697. This enormous palace likewise lives in its façades from the monumentality of its column placement, which here also represents the single repetitive embellishment of the façade. However, in Plumlov/Plumenau the spaciousness of this facade is entirely lost in the attempt to divide it into storeys and introduce at least three classical rows of columns, when the desired five weren’t feasible. Therefore, this façade, with its almost unpleasant compactness, was a prime example in demonstrating that the number of motifs and their concentration in each construction considerably limits the strength of their statement.

Perhaps, however, because of this concentration, this almost surreal building with its unique position high above the banks of the lake, became a unique

¹²⁹ Ibid., p. 180.

¹³⁰ First published by Kräftner, Johann (ed.): *Oasen der Stille. Die grossen Landschaftsgärten Mitteleuropas*. Vienna 2008.

¹³¹ Fleischer, Victor: *Fürst Karl Eusebius von Liechtenstein als Bauherr und Kunstsammler (1611–1684)*. Leipzig 1910, p. 183.

manifestation of the imperious architecture of Early Baroque, which can clarify to anyone how important these building activities were for the self-esteem of the princely family and their prestige.

In this context it becomes all the harder to understand that this castle was never completed, not only as an overall project, but not even in the wing where the exterior had at least been finished. The interior of this wing remained more or less incomplete. Although the stucco and fresco decoration had been commissioned and partially finished, much of the other work was never even started. On 17 January 1687, Prince Johann Adam Andreas concluded a contract for the fresco decoration with the Viennese fresco artist Johann Georg Greiner,¹³² who, like the other artists in similar cases, had to adhere to the prince's specifications: " [...] *the prince determined the subject matter of all seven frescoes and chose graphic templates for them containing seven different scenes.*"¹³³ Therefore, the prince's approach and certainty were already in evidence in his very first project – just as we would witness in his later building projects: Johann Adam Andreas was the actual decision-maker and not his architects, painters or stuccoers, who used their skills to realize his wishes. As had happened at the stage of architectural planning, the individual compositional aspects of the (engraved) models were transferred to the frescoes as well and restructured as new compositional units. Ultimately, it is a pity that only an incomplete torso remains of this castle.

The second new building which was to represent the grandezza of the princely house was a castle in Lanškroun/Landskron.¹³⁴ Fate, however, decided otherwise and it was likewise never completed. The Family Archive of the Reigning Princes of Liechtenstein contains a folder with projects by Carlo Fontana from 1696, which very probably relate to this building: the architect was recommended to the prince by the emperor's ambassador in Rome, Max Guidobald Martinitz, and the architect was paid 100 scudi for his plans.

In the end, the building following this original project was eventually completed by Domenico Martinelli after this project as reference, again in monumental form, the appearance of which has been preserved in an engraving by Delsenbach. These engravings are often the only sources of information not only about such buildings, but also gardens and interior decoration. They were evidently made in

¹³² Cf. Miltová, Radka: *Mytologická tematika v moravských rezidencích Lichtenštejnů jako součást rodové paměti*. In: Geiger, Peter – Knoz, Tomáš (eds.): *Místa Lichtenštejnské paměti*. (Časopis Maticе moravské 131, 2012 – Supplementum 3). Brno 2012, pp. 131–142.

¹³³ Kühndel, Jan – Mathon, Jaroslav: *Plumlovský zámek a jeho knížecí architekt*. Prostějov 1937.

¹³⁴ On the construction of the castle in Landškroun (Landskron) see Lorenz, Hellmut: *Domenico Martinelli und die österreichische Barockarchitektur*. Vienna 1991, p. 186 ff.

the context of another important project which was intended, speaking in a very general sense, to show off the most important achievements in art to a wider public. Delsenbach and Salomon Kleiner's minutely detailed ink drawings have also been preserved, as well as several templates for engravings of the main works from the Princely Collections. There are even individual engravings and extremely rare early colour prints, some even with subscriptions, as is shown in the documents in the Ancestral Archive of the Reigning Princes of Liechtenstein.¹³⁵

Unfortunately, Martinelli's building, like this collection of engravings, had to remain incomplete. After laying the foundation stone in the presence of the architect on 8 June 1699, the first problems were encountered in building the foundations on the rocky ground on the outskirts of Lanškroun. By 1704, one third of the work had been completed under the supervision of Gabriele de Gabrieli (1671–1747). Afterwards, however, construction was hampered by a lack of funds. On 25 June 1712, Gabrieli invoiced for the completed, though undecorated, building. In 1714 the building, still surrounded by scaffolding, was engulfed in flames and badly damaged. A new truss was built in 1717 and repairs began on the orders of Anton Florian von Liechtenstein (1656–1721). Following another fire the castle was demolished in 1756, save for one tower buttress.

The third major project involved the chateau buildings in Feldsberg and Eisgrub (Valtice and Lednice). During the period of the High Baroque (when they were extensively remodelled), they unified in a perfectly prototype manner the themes of a rural estate, the duality of summer and winter residences, also the theme of gardens, while later they became more closely linked with countryside administration, agricultural themes and the horse-breeding.

In addition to the chateau buildings mentioned above, there also many other types remained within the existing building stock from the previous eras, which, with their extant, multifarious strata from previous eras, had to be adapted to the new ideals of public image, life and economic activities.

In its basic structure Feldsberg (Valtice) was nothing more than a medieval moated castle which was regulated in the Renaissance and later, especially in the 17th and 18th centuries, remodelled into a grandiose Baroque residence for all to admire.

The first extensive renovation work led to the emergence in 1623 of the "*palazzo in fortezza*" called the "princely residential building," which now had to embody the architectural ideal of a princely residence.¹³⁶ There is no need here to

¹³⁵ Liechtenstein – The Princely Collections, Vaduz – Vienna, Hausarchiv HAL, FA, box. 69.

¹³⁶ Kroupa, Jiří: *Zámek Valtice v 17. a 18. století. In: Kordiovský, Emil (ed.): Město Valtice. Valtice 2001, pp. 155–196, here pp. 158–161.*

delve too deeply into the individual phases, but it is very interesting to see how this residence was systematically developed for various functions typical of courtly life. The princes Karl Eusebius and Johann Adam Andreas endeavoured to accomplish a sensitive modernisation of the chateau using the help of the “family architects” Johann Bernhard Fischer von Erlach and Domenico Martinelli. However, the decisive steps in this direction were to be taken by their successors, Anton Florian and Joseph Wenzel von Liechtenstein, during whose reign the chateau itself – and by extension the owner, Joseph Wenzel – were admired by the fastidious empress, Maria Theresa.

From the 1720s on, Antonio Maria Nicolao Beduzzi (1675–1735) and Anton Johann Ospel¹³⁷ (1677–1756) enhanced the embellishment of the building and gave the chateau an entirely new appearance. This gave both the exterior and the interior of the chateau a buoyant, almost rococo aura, the pinnacle of which was undoubtedly the newly renovated chateau chapel with its sculpture and frescoes, an embodiment of the lightness and elegance of rococo at the Viennese court. On the other hand, Ospel’s new utility buildings to the chateau complex created a cour d’honneur for the chateau, a “Spanish stable” and the large riding school. It was not until much later, under Prince Alois I (1759–1805), that the chateau theatre was built (and torn down in 1844)¹³⁸ and an autonomously functioning noble residence took shape.

The nearby chateau in Eisgrub (Lednice) was built in a similar way over several generations until a self-contained summer residence emerged, which in the mid-19th century had to make way for the completely new concepts of a landscape garden and an English rural stately home, as we shall see later.

With the stables in Lednice, Prince Johann Adam Andreas I had created his first large work akin to the proportions that we know only from palatial buildings – it is no coincidence that Hans Sedlmayr, one of the great experts in Austrian Baroque, spoke about a “chateau for horses”.¹³⁹ The chateau and the other buildings underwent intensive renovation, which together with the huge amounts already invested in the gardens by Prince Karl Eusebius, turned it into one of the most beautiful princely residences of the first half of 18th century in the German regions. In one engraving, Johann Adam Delsenbach managed to capture the last image of this beautiful, now forever lost building complex, which presents us with

¹³⁷ Salge, Christiane: *Anton Johann Ospel (1677–1756). Ein Architekt des österreichischen Spätbarock*. Munich – Berlin – London – New York 2007.

¹³⁸ Höß, Karl: *Fürst Johann II. von Liechtenstein und die bildende Kunst*. Vienna 1908, p. 255.

¹³⁹ Sedlmayr, Hans: *Johann Bernhard Fischer von Erlach*. (Grosse Meister, Epochen und Themen der österreichischen Kunst: Barock). ²Vienna 1976.

the ideal image of a Baroque building ensemble, in which the urge for prestige, architecture, nature and entrepreneurship were combined to form one permanent unity.

Without doubt the most significant monument was Fischer's *Marstall* – stables – with its horse boxes manèges, facilities and sculptural decorations. Here, too, we find on one hand the most attractive and exquisite courtly quality (for example, Giovanni Guiliani's sculpture or the marble water troughs in the stables), and, on the other, spatial grandeur and an almost minimalist care in detail, revealing how these ideal aristocratic buildings could have such a large influence on art and architecture, as well as on the common populace of small country towns and villages.

To return to the large chateau complex in Feldsberg (Valtice), part of it also includes an extraordinarily impressive and monumental parish church, in its dimensions on one hand and almost minimalist architecture on the other, the epitome of aristocratic architecture in the countryside.¹⁴⁰

The decision to build the parish church of the *Assumption of the Virgin Mary* was made under the later prince Karl von Liechtenstein in 1602. However, the driving force in the background was probably Karl's younger brother, Maximilian von Liechtenstein, who in the 1620s and early 1630s provided the impetus for the Liechtensteins' building work in Lower Austria and the Lands of the Bohemian Crown.

Karl's plan to build a new parish and chateau church in Feldsberg (Valtice) did not get further than a model made in 1602.¹⁴¹ The tense political situation, the impending religious conflict, the fraternal feud in the House of Habsburg and finally the Bohemian Estates' Uprising together with the commitment of Prince Karl von Liechtenstein in the office of Governor in Prague postponed the building project to the distant future.¹⁴²

After Karl's death in 1627, responsibilities were handed over to the uncle and guardian of the 16-year-old Karl Eusebius, Prince Maximilian von Liechtenstein, and in 1629 he commissioned the project from Giovanni Giacomo Tencalla. On 26 October 1631, the young prince laid the foundation stone of the new building in the presence of his family and Cardinal Francis/Franz von Dietrichstein. This

¹⁴⁰ The following chapter is based on the main points from the essay by Fidler, Petr: *Valtický kostel Nanebevzetí Panny Marie*. In: Geiger, Peter – Knoz, Tomáš (eds.): *Lichtenštejnové a umění*. (Časopis Maticе moravské 132, 2013 – Supplementum 5). Brno 2013, pp. 249–267.

¹⁴¹ Petr Fidler, *Architektur des Seicento*.

¹⁴² Fidler, Petr: *Architektur des Seicento. Baumeister, Architekten und Bauten des Wiener Hofkereiches*. Innsbruck 1990 (unpublished diploma thesis).

scene is recorded on a lead medallion.¹⁴³ In 1637 the stucco work was supposed to start on the church shell, which had been completed except for one shallow cupola. In 1638 the masonry for this cupola was completed and on 1 September, Bernardo Bianchi and Giovanni Tencalla concluded another contract with the stuccoers.

However, catastrophe struck on 23 October 1638: the cupola and tambour collapsed, undoubtedly the pride and joy of the owner; from this point on, the name of Giovanni Giacomo Tencalla no longer features in the Liechtenstein sources. In 1641 the Brno building master Andrea Erna was commissioned to repair the damaged scaffolding, tear down the right-hand wall of the side chapel and put a new one in place, demolish the four pillars and pendentives down to the cornice, and to complete the vault in the transept with a flat dome

Not until after the Westphalian Peace of 1648 was it possible to think about continuing the construction work. In 1653 the prince once again called on Giovanni Tencalla to come to Valtice to supervise the work. Tencalla added the necessary designs for the stonemasons and the Brno building master Giovanni Erna, whose people, together with the foreman, Antonio Cerisola (Zirisola), ensured its completion. On 21 June 1671 the finished church could finally be consecrated.¹⁴⁴

Because of the missing cupola a religious building was completed that was far removed from the ideals of the patron's architectural manifesto, as Fidler verifies. Although Karl Eusebius probably had his name and full title placed on the façade, it says much about his attitude to this church that he does not mention it among the buildings in his *Work on Architecture*.¹⁴⁵

Nevertheless, this contribution towards the development of religious architecture in the Lands of the Bohemian Crown and in Austria is very significant, as Petr Fidler summarizes: "*The Feldsberg parish and chateau church demonstrates that the Liechtenstein owners were well informed of the current architectural trends and were open to innovative solutions. [...] It is difficult to overestimate the developmental significance of the Feldsberg church. The spatial concept of the aisle-less church hall with its side chapels and crossed and projected (although unrealised) cupola and tambour, represent a break in the tradition of the plainer post-Tridentine basilica concept with its side chapels, as was seen in the Viennese*

¹⁴³ Haupt, Herbert: *Fürst Karl Eusebius von Liechtenstein 1611–1684*. Erbe und Bewahrer in schwerer Zeit. Munich – Berlin – London – New York 2007, p. 40. – Fidler, Petr: *Architektura des Seicento*, p.116.

¹⁴⁴ Fleischer, Victor: *Fürst Karl Eusebius von Liechtenstein als Bauherr und Kunstsammler (1611–1684)*. Leipzig 1910, p. 27.

¹⁴⁵ Fidler, Petr: *Valtický kostel Nanebevzetí Panny Marie*. In: Geiger, Peter – Knoz, Tomáš (eds.): *Lichtenštejnův umění*. (Časopis Matice moravské 132, 2013 – Supplementum 5). Brno 2013, pp. 249–267.

*Paulist and Jesuit church.*¹⁴⁶ It would appear that the Feldsberg disaster had a negative impact outside the immediate geographic framework of the Danube and forced owners and architects to be cautious. Although the Prague Dominican church of St. Magdalene by Francesco Carratti (who, incidentally, began his career in the service of the Feldsberg-Liechtensteins), did have a tambour, but only with a cross vault. In the case of the Jesuit church in the historic city in Prague in 1648 a timber dome was installed over the cross vault.¹⁴⁷ Today's tower finial was incidentally borne of historicist ideas and was not completed until the time of Prince Johann II.

Many other, smaller family estates were also created following the example of the extensive residential complex at Feldsberg (Valtice). Feldsberg, therefore, became a model across the whole of the country, for the craftsmen who were employed at the various building sites, and even familiarised the population with the latest developments in a quasi automatic way. The success of rustic baroque, which in some places still appeared as an authentic style and part of life until the 20th century, came from the widespread and self-evident dissemination of this style by the church as well as the aristocracy.

One volume of the Liechtensteins' Ancestral Archive contains and summarizes several, though not all, of these commercial buildings belonging to the Liechtenstein family.¹⁴⁸ The clearly functional appearance of these buildings is remarkable, featuring hardly any ornamentation or embellishment, but impressive in their functionality and proportions, as well as in the materials used in their design. It is in the simplicity of these buildings that the quality of the bulk of old rural architecture is to be found. This has now largely disappeared, leading to the destruction of the cultural landscape, which had long been inspired and supported of the nobility's and the church's exemplary building activities.

(5) The Liechtenstein family's contribution to the development of landscape gardening and architecture in the 19th century

In the 17th and early 18th century, the Liechtenstein family contributed greatly towards the arts and cultural development and thus to culture in the Lands of

¹⁴⁶ Fidler, Petr: *Architektura des Seicento. Baumeister, Architekten und Bauten des Wiener Hofkreises*. Innsbruck 1990 (unpublished diploma thesis), pp. 96–97.

¹⁴⁷ Fidler, Petr: *Valtický kostel Nanebevzetí Panny Marie*. In: Geiger, Peter – Knoz, Tomáš (eds.): *Lichtenštejnové a umění*. (Časopis Matice moravské 132, 2013 – Supplementum 5). Brno 2013, pp. 249–267.

¹⁴⁸ Liechtenstein – The Princely Collections, Hausarchiv HAL, Plansammlung, PK 566.

the Bohemian Crown in general. This was followed by another phase of renewal from the 1780s to the mid-19th century which reached a hitherto unprecedented dimension.¹⁴⁹

Prince Franz Josef I (1726–1781) made the first ground-breaking decision in this context when in 1773, shortly after the inheritance of the majorat in 1772, he arranged the sale of the Baroque sculptures by Giovanni Giuliani in the garden of the Summer Palace in Rossau and transformed it into an English landscaped garden.

In an almost symbolic act he also parted from the epoch and ideas of the Baroque and turned towards the new ideas of the Enlightenment borne on a backdrop of fantasies hovering in the background of a cult of nature, which his sons, the brothers Alois I (1759–1805) and his successor Johann I (1760–1836) felt obliged to uphold when on the majorat throne.

Prince Johann I also completed his “landscaped garden” project in Rossau, and from 1828–1832 created a complex based on plans by the garden inspector Krammer, which ought not to be too costly, but “*in any case had to be a perfect and beautiful thing*,”¹⁵⁰ as the prince stated when ordering the commission. Therefore, an “English garden” was created which combined art and nature in an exemplary manner. In the central point of the complex, where Johann Bernhard Fischer von Erlach’s garden belvedere had originally stood since the late 17th century, the architect designed a semi-circular greenhouse containing monkeys and parrots. “*The pillars are painted in the style of rocks, and the illusion is helped ideally the most by the artificially assembled stone formation. The seedlings of evergreen trees are combined with them, a stream is led under an arch, and proud swans swim on the clear ripples. Silver pheasants roam around labyrinthine passages, and a unique, magical radiance through the windows inset with stained glass infuses this building, which genuinely is one on its own [...]*”¹⁵¹ was how one contemporary described the greenhouse. Here the Baroque character of the garden belvedere and the according garden is seamlessly transferred to a new world, the artificiality of Johann Bernhard Fischer von Erlach’s grotto, probably the basis for the whole building

¹⁴⁹ Cf. Körner, Stefan: *Die Gärten des Fürsten Aloys I. von Liechtenstein in Eisgrub, Feldsberg und Wien*. Gartenkunst um 1800 zwischen Ästhetik und Ökonomie. Diplomarbeit, Freie Universität Berlin 2004; Konečný, Michal: *Krajina mezi Lednicí a Valticemi jako místo paměti*. In: Geiger, Peter – Knoz, Tomáš (eds.): *Místa Lichtenštejnské paměti*. (Časopis Matice moravské 131, 2012 – Supplementum 3). Brno 2012, pp. 123–130; Fidler, Petr: *Valtický kostel Nanebevzetí Panny Marie*. In: Geiger, Peter – Knoz, Tomáš (eds.): *Lichtenštejnové a umění*. (Časopis Matice moravské 132, 2013 – Supplementum 5). Brno 2013, pp. 249–267.

¹⁵⁰ LIECHTENSTEIN - THE PRINCELY COLLECTIONS, H 1194, planning permission from 21 March 1828.

¹⁵¹ Weidmann, F. C.: *Der Wintergarten am Pallaste Sr. Durchlaucht des Fürsten von Liechtenstein*. Wiener Zeitschrift für Kunst, Literatur, Theater und Mode, 1831, pp. 658 ff.

and incorporated by him after he had been unable to implement his original plan of locating it in the palace building. It is transformed here into a once-removed experience of nature, very similar to “lifeworlds”, which today entertain the public everywhere. The motto was captured in an inscription “DER NATUR UND IHREN VEREHRERN” [Nature and its admirers] on the archway that had been renovated by Josef Kornhäusel in 1814, which stands at the entrance to today’s public park. In accordance with this motto, they also set up a pen for chamois and a menagerie.

What might superficially have seemed like a change in style from Baroque and Rococo to modern Neo-Classicism and Biedermeier, was in reality a fundamental change in social and economic life. Just as today, the period was determined by the fear of depleted resources. Whole forests were burned down for the glass-making industry (where the Liechtensteins had not been particularly successful) and for the increasing tonnage of iron, which at the start was still smelted using charcoal; the Liechtensteins endeavoured to secure a foothold here as well.¹⁵² People thought the only way to solve these problems was to plant fast-growing trees. Therefore the idea behind the new landscape gardens was motivated by two forces: one was the “back-to-nature” motive – based on a mix of aesthetics and intellectual history – and the second was a more realistic economic one, where the landscape garden was an experimental area for new, fast-growing types of plants.

With a view to sustainable production, Prince Johann I experimented with new varieties of cereal crops and trees, and by importing Swiss cattle, English mares and Arab stallions endeavoured to increase profits from the long-neglected branch of animal husbandry.¹⁵³ This also marked the end of another Baroque institution, the breeding of the famous Liechtenstein horses with their extremely curved noses. The importance of animal production for Johann I can be seen as well in the case of the 250 Merino sheep that were adventurously smuggled in from Spain by Johann’s estates manager Petri in 1803 (two years before Johann became a majorat lord) to the prince’s model estate in Loosdorf in Lower Austria’s Weinviertel.¹⁵⁴

The Liechtensteins amalgamated these new agricultural ideas and unprecedented aesthetics in its landscaped gardens in Moravia and in Lower Austria. The

¹⁵² Stekl, Hannes: *Österreichs Aristokratie im Vormärz. Herrschaftsstil und Lebensformen der Fürstenhäuser Liechtenstein und Schwarzenberg*. Vienna 1973, p. 21 f.

¹⁵³ Christe, Oskar: *Feldmarschall Johannes Fürst von Liechtenstein. Eine Biographie*. Wien 1905, p. 160 f. – Stekl, Hannes: *Österreichs Aristokratie im Vormärz. Herrschaftsstil und Lebensformen der Fürstenhäuser Liechtenstein und Schwarzenberg*. Vienna 1973, p. 16.

¹⁵⁴ Christe, Oskar: *Feldmarschall Johannes Fürst von Liechtenstein. Eine Biographie*. Vienna 1905, p. 16.

vast areas in the border areas between Lower Austria and South Moravia were recultivated and remodelled, and with their castle and recreational buildings, which we still admire to this day, produced a new, hitherto unknown cultural image of landscape – a unique cultural landscape.

This landscape was purely based on economics. Prince Pückler-Muskau's bankruptcy resulting from his construction projects in East Prussia (Muskau, Branitz) – where all ideas of entrepreneurship were sacrificed to aesthetics – were from the outset deliberately abandoned, which led to long-term economic viability.¹⁵⁵

One important aspect of this sensitive ecological balance was the opportunity to create artificial ponds. These were linked to winter work and guaranteed employment and a salary to people, one of the main concerns of Prince Alois I and Johann I, on whose initiative these English landscapes were created; the employees would otherwise have mainly been without work during this season. The excavated material yielded was used to remodel the landscape and give it a completely new face.¹⁵⁶ At the same time it also significantly increased economic return: at a time when the Christian fasting prescriptions were still generally observed, it was possible to attain large profits from fish farming

To ensure that this landscape also corresponded to the princely lifestyle and prestigious image there was a systematic promotion of the major and minor architectural projects. Pride of place of course goes to the many palatial buildings, which were used as residences and – to a lesser degree – as recreational buildings; they were pioneers in new architectural art and spread the new canon of forms, which ultimately and naturally was to impact the influence of rural architecture just as had happened during the High Baroque. Especially since the mid-18th century and the end of patrimonial management, it was particularly this scaled-down canon of forms that provided the main aesthetic influence, and although it was inspired in a general way by antiquity, in reality it took its inspiration from the prototype architecture of the nobility.

There are two groups of buildings here which can certainly serve as direct models. The first of these were the large agricultural buildings on the aristocratic estates, in particular those of the Liechtensteins, whose architecture was often transferred 1:1 to simpler rural buildings, mostly on very different scales.

One of the most influential thinkers here was undoubtedly the architect and inventor Joseph Hardtmuth (1758–1816), whose prototype architecture in the

¹⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 164 ff.

¹⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 167.

countryside has hitherto been far too little appreciated.¹⁵⁷ He not only built the Neu Hof near Lednice/Eisgrub as a model agricultural estate for the Liechtensteins, but also countless other farms for breeding sheep, horses and cattle on a large scale. Unfortunately, because many of them were demolished when they no longer served their function, today we only know about several of these farms from collections of Liechtenstein projects which are stored in the South Moravian Archive in Brno (Brünn), albeit incompletely. Nevertheless, their simple but elegant architectural minimalism influenced rural architects for almost a century.

The same can be said of the buildings which Josef Hardtmuth designed under Liechtenstein patronage for the church in relation to the new directives resulting from the church reforms of Joseph II. These pre-eminently involved parish churches, such as the opulent church in Česká Třebova/Böhmisch-Trübau, as well as very simple churches, which determined the scales and standard for more than half a century until the arrival of historicism in the 1870s. These models also provided orientation for much weaker forces, such as Franz Engel (ca 1776–1827; the church in Bučovice/Butschowitz) or Josef Poppelak (1780–1859; Schratzenberg), who was responsible for the smaller churches under patronage. In the case of the modest church of St Bartholomew in Hlohvice, which was built from 1832–1835, the planner and architect who worked on the design remained anonymous, at least according to the research we have today.

In one of his last shows of strength, Prince Johann II von Liechtenstein (1840–1929) tried to influence the culture of the country again in a similar manner. He transformed himself from a prince who looked innovatively forwards, as was mentioned, to a prince who wanted to consciously preserve what already existed and to resort to proven methods from the past when creating something new. This applied in particular to his architectural activities, where he came to embody the opposite of what had previously fascinated his ancestors: he could not impact the future, instead he wanted to turn back the clock to a certain extent. In the extensive Lednice park he was responsible for recreating the Baroque appearance of the garden parterre in front of his father's chateau, which with its Neo-Gothic aesthetic had been inviolable even for Johann II.¹⁵⁸ Under the guidance of the court garden manager, Wilhelm Lauch, entirely new gardens were developed from 1883, which gave the chateau its early historicist style, which it still has today. Here,

¹⁵⁷ See Kräftner, Johann: *Joseph Hardtmuth und die Landbaukunst der Liechtenstein an der Wende vom 18. zum 19. Jahrhundert*. In: Liechtensteinisch-Tschechische Historikerkommission (eds.): *Die Liechtenstein und die Kunst*, Vaduz 2014, pp. 295–313.

¹⁵⁸ Höss, Karl: *Fürst Johann II. von Liechtenstein und die bildende Kunst*. Vienna 1908, p. 257.

Prince Johann II and his gardener returned to Baroque as the “imperial style”,¹⁵⁹ which during the historicist movement led to an enormous revival throughout the entire Monarchy of this architectural style, which attained such a unique flowering especially in the House of Liechtenstein.

In direct connection with the Liechtensteins’ efforts to promote garden culture and agriculture, at the instigation of the prince, the Higher Fruit and Horticultural School was established in Lednice/Eisgrub in 1895, whose first director was Wilhelm Lauch. “*Thanks to the kindness of the prince, pupils were able to test their theoretical knowledge practically on the sample areas of a park, and thus acquire an education that enabled them to work in the future as worthy pioneers of modern landscaping in the interests of soil culture,*”¹⁶⁰ wrote Höss about this era of close links between gardens, sustainable management and the education of future generations. This research and educational institution still exists today as part of the Mendel University, which was founded in 1919 as the College of Agriculture.

Completely in the spirit of historicism, especially Gothic, prince Johann II was also familiar with the Middle Ages; nor was the Renaissance unfamiliar to him. He almost obsessively bought a large number of castles in various states of dilapidation and had them renovated, often borne on high flights of fancy. Not only the ancestral Liechtenstein castle in Hinterbrühl and Vaduz chateau were restored; also Šternberk/Sternberg Castle in Moravia is a prime example of his treatment of such buildings. In most cases, he supervised a stylistically appropriate furnishing and decoration of the castles with items that occasionally came from his own Princely Collections, but in many cases purchased quite deliberately as appurtenances from the leading art dealers of the time. The inventory books for the Princely Collections in Vienna contain remarks about the objects, paintings, maiolica and other decorative art objects that were sent to Šternberk/Sternberg. It would be very interesting to compare these documents with the objects that are still kept in the Šternberk collections.

With his museum in Rossau in Vienna, Prince Johann II wanted to create a harmonious “*Gesamtkunstwerk*”, a synthesis of the arts, entirely in the spirit of Wilhelm von Bode, who stated that a building had to be in harmony with its history, furniture, as well as the pictures and objects of applied art.

Johann II’s biography was published in 1908, more than twenty years before his death, and there is a separate chapter dedicated to religious art,¹⁶¹ which cer-

¹⁵⁹ On the “imperial style” see Sedlmayr, Hans: *Johann Bernhard Fischer von Erlach*. Vienna 1976, p. 213 ff.

¹⁶⁰ Höss, Karl: *Fürst Johann II. von Liechtenstein und die bildende Kunst*. Vienna 1908, p. 258.

¹⁶¹ *Ibid.*, p. 267–313.

tainly represents a sizeable chunk of the prince's work, where he dedicated himself to the reconstruction, construction and furnishing of churches far beyond the remit of the patron's parishes all over his domain.

If we begin with the furnishing of churches, his most important act of patronage was undoubtedly the donation of the so-called Zwettler Altar in 1891 to the parish church in Adamov/Adamsthal, which has served as the main altar in the parish church since it was founded in 1857.

The number of churches which Johann II had restored or newly built is almost unbelievable, all of them in the spirit of historicism and primarily Neo-Gothic, but often stale, uninspired and empty. Here, too, the prince was indeed primarily following in the footsteps of his father, who had started to build these churches in a Neo-Gothic style in the last years of his life. Johann Heidrich was an architect who completed the chateau in Lednice/Eisgrub, and built the St Cyril and Methodius Chapel for Johann II in Břeclav/Lundenburg from 1853–1856 in memory of his healing and as house of prayer for the labourers working in Břeclav on the northern railway line for Emperor Ferdinand. The real jewel in Prince Johann's architectural crown is the Church of the Visitation of the Virgin Mary in Poštorná/Unter-Themenau near Břeclav, which was built from 1894–1898 based on a design by the architect Karl Weinbrenner, and which became part of a complex consisting of a presbytery, a school and a doctor's residence. On one side of the church we see the clear influences of contemporary Viennese architecture, in particular the Church of Our Lady of Victory on the Mariahilfer Gürtel by Weinbrenner's teacher, Friedrich Schmidt, which visibly served as inspiration. On the other hand, the building stands out because of the exceptional quality of the materials, perfectly fired shaped clinkers, and colourfully glazed roof tiles from Liechtenstein production.

This production site was in the same place, in Poštorná/Unter-Themenau, which was famous for its "paving and mosaic slabs and tiles" (12 million of which were produced annually). The earthenware and clinker-brick factory produced about 100,000 pieces of piping, forming pieces and other stoneware, and about 1 million clinker tiles per year; the roof-tile, drainage pipes and tile factory made 3½ million pieces annually, and the stove-tile/glazed-tile factory made around 400,000 each year.¹⁶² This source of materials was extremely influential on the architecture of the region in Vienna and almost the entire Monarchy, and no architect could cope with the demands made on him without those products, nor without the Wienerberger company products. In particular, the high quality of

¹⁶² *Ibid.*, p. 292.

the hard-fired and in part often robustly coloured glazed clinker products greatly influenced the local colour of South Moravian architecture. These glazed roof tiles from Poštorná were also used for the new roof of St Stephen's in Vienna when the ruined cathedral was restored after the Second World War.

The breadth of perspective and the social conscience of the prince and his officials can be seen in some marginal details about this factory complex in Poštorná. “*The factory has a restaurant with a large canteen for workers and a room for travellers, a spa and a large park. The factory also includes 20 residential buildings with 77 family apartments, where the clerks and some of the workers live. 160 workers' families received land designated for building on with a minimum area of 800m² each,*” wrote Johann's biographer, Karl Höss.¹⁶³

(6) The musealisation of the world – from Prince Johann I's Viennese museum to the “restoration” and donation of collections in Bohemia, Moravia and Silesia by Johann II

We may speak of a museum of the House of Liechtenstein from approximately 1705 onwards, when the Liechtensteins finished moving to the Majorathaus in their new city palace on Bankgasse in Vienna. For the first time, Prince Johann Adam Andreas I could gather together all of the objects which he and his family had collected over the previous centuries in the halls of the bel étage on the second floor. We no longer have a contemporary description of the palace or what it contained. The basic information concerning the general contents of Johann Adam Andreas I's collection only appeared with the discussions surrounding the prince's legacy when he died in 1712, and an inventory of his estate which was not drawn up until 1733. It is designated through black seals on the recto and vermilion-red sealing wax on the verso of the paintings. A more precise overview is given by the first catalogue of this gallery, which was published in 1767 by Vincenzo Fantio, who also acted as the “*Inspettore della medesima Galleria*”.¹⁶⁴ Fantio begins with a general introduction to the paintings and continues to a precise description of the building and then a room by room description of the gallery and its contents, from the first chamber to the tenth, always with their “*quattro facciate*”. The pictures which were brought into the gallery by Prince Joseph Wenzel I von Liechtenstein

¹⁶³ Ibid., p. 292 ff.

¹⁶⁴ Fantio, Vincenzo: *Descrizione completa di tutto ciò che ritrovarsi nella galleria di pittura e scultura di sua altezza Giuseppe Wenceslao del S. R. L. principe regnante della casa di Liechtenstein...*, Vienna 1767.

were labelled with a star by Fanti, so we are able to have some idea of what the gallery contained when Johann Adam Andreas I died.

It is possible to think of this gallery as a museum, even though it was still not accessible to the general public, but only to artists who were able to gain access to it. We know that Georg Raffael Donner saw the *Apollo* by François Duquesnoy, and copied it in a statue cast in lead. It is interesting that at the time the work of this great sculptor working in Rome was considered to be from classical antiquity and was probably copied as such by Donner. This copy, which was privately owned in Vienna and then in New York, has been part of the Princely Collections for several years now.

This admission for Viennese artists into the prince's gallery is so important because for the first time they had access to contemporary international art, an access that was all the more important because the princes of Liechtenstein collected mainly contemporary art, they commissioned works from living artists and enabled artists in Vienna to keep up with the latest developments in art.

With the growing neglect of this city palace over the subsequent decades and its mothballing because of the modernisation of the older city palace in Herrengasse in a Neo-Classical style, after 1790 the collection was looking to be housed elsewhere, particularly as the original rooms were becoming crowded and a large part of the collection had to be kept in different places.

The gallery was rehoused in the summer palace in Rossau, where, since the late 18th century, the Liechtensteins had been puzzling over how to use a place that was currently in a twilight sleep. There had been no festivities there for a long time and the building was rented out for the most part. In the 1790s the Liechtensteins were considering the first proposals for its new use; the Baroque hall with its marble Kehlheim tiles, which still pave the Hercules hall, were replaced by solid walnut parquet flooring. The ceiling paintings by Antonio Bellucci were transferred there from Bankgasse starting in 1807 and removed from their original location in order to make room for major renovation work there as well.

However, the Liechtensteins did not shy from complex alterations in order to make a museum out of the airy summer palace. Probably under the supervision of Joseph Hardtmuth, four of the original six windows in the light-flooded corner halls, projecting into empty space like pulpits, were simply bricked over. Major alterations were also carried out in the Hercules hall and the gallery adjoining the north of the building, which had originally been linked on the ground floor by five openings, through which the Hercules hall was lit also from the north side; this also occurred in the upper section of the wall, where the five openings led to the rooms on the mezzanine, which were also closed off. The entire surface including paintings by Pozzo – only documented today in watercolour copies – was painted

over in uniform grey to correspond to the Neo-Classical taste of the day. All these measures were taken to increase the size of the area for hanging paintings, which would otherwise have been very restricted in the Baroque palace; without this “violation” it would have been impossible to hang large objects such as Peter Paul Rubens’s *Decius Mus* cycle.

The first archival sources testifying to this approach are from 1804, when, through the agency of Antonio Canova in Rome, 11 plaster casts of ancient sculptures and several of his works were ordered and purchased for installation “in the House’s Museum in the Rossau Garden”. A letter from 26 September 1804 instructed Canova to “procure copies” of sculptures for the prince, for which he would be paid 1,000 gulden by the Liechtenstein banker Carl Ricci.

How volatile these decisions were in the history of this museum, or gallery as it was still called, can be paradigmatically demonstrated in a description of the next steps that were taken. A report from the court chancellor sent on 3 May 1805 to Prince Johann I (his brother and predecessor, Alois I, died in March of that year) made the following recommendation: “*The completion of this museum would accrue costs of more than 60,000 gulden. Therefore, Your Highness, we believe that it would be advisable to sell some of the recently purchased replicas, which in our view would cover the costs already incurred not only for the already arising packaging but also at least partially provide the financial means for paying for the services of Canova and Ricci.*” The expenditure for the 15 statues was estimated at 486 scudi (836 gulden) with a further 200 gulden for packaging. The expected charge for the transportation from Rome to Ancona was estimated at 4,220 gulden. “*The cost of the freight from Ancona to Trieste is negligible, but the opposite is true from Trieste to the specified place,*” stated the report.

The prince followed the report’s recommendations and asked Canova and Ricci to “*sell the purchased copies of the statues, for the best possible price*”.¹⁶⁵ Apparently, this sale did not take place after all, as we see from several photos of the Hercules Hall from the earliest documents still showing its Neo-Classical remodelling until the later casts from the end of nineteenth century, evidently several of them.

Another document refers to the appointment of the gallery director. On 13 January 1806, a notice was delivered to the *Kammermaler* (chamber artist) Josef Anton Bauer, the youngest of three famous brothers, on the “trusteeship of the princely picture gallery” following the death of the previous gallery inspector, Johann Dallinger. Bauer was responsible for both the picture gallery and the col-

¹⁶⁵ LIECHTENSTEIN - THE PRINCELY COLLECTIONS, Hofkanzlei, R-7/35.

lection of copperplate engravings. He was to live in Dallinger's official apartment in the prince's house on Vordere Schenkenstrasse (today's Bankgasse).

On 19 October 1808 an instruction was issued to director Bauer concerning a gallery employee, Dallinger junior, and his attempts to move the gallery: *"In light of the fact that the gallery should have been moved and furnished by May the 1st of this year, nevertheless the order has still not been issued by today's date, and so we give order that he is responsible for seeing that this takes place by November the 15th [...]"*.¹⁶⁶ It apparently took approximately three years after the first relocations of the pictures before the gallery could open to paying visitors in 1810.

The first guidebooks tell us that from the outset the installation of the pictures in the gallery was carried out by artists, starting with Dallinger, Bauer and then later Friedrich Amerling, and not always delighting the taste of the visitors. In his "Guidebook to Vienna" published in 1866, Gustav Friedrich Waagen could not avoid some critical remarks when he wrote: *"We owe him [Prince Johann I] a great debt for these artistic treasures which have been made accessible to the general public for the first time in such a liberal manne . This gentleman has made commendable efforts to ensure that the hitherto poorly represented Italian school of art has been augmented by numerous purchases to his collection, which visitors can easily identify thanks to the initials J.L. Although some truly fine pictures have been acquired in this way, nevertheless, the connoisseur of art can only regret that in the majority of cases the gentleman was not supplied with sufficiently expert advice, and that in many of the cases they do not correspond with the names of the masters whose authorship has been given. For a significant number of the pictures I was able to judge relatively easily whether it was an original by a great master, or whether the picture was of noted artistic value, regardless of erroneous authorship. Other pictures, for example, the so-called Holy Family by Raphael, I preferred to pass by in silence. The impression made by the gallery is also exceptionally weakened by the large number of fakes and mediocre paintings. Moreover, the connoisseur's enjoyment is hindered or spoiled by a whole range of other factors [...]. In truth it is phenomenal that it never struck any of the owners of this important collection to publish a catalogue, whilst the most minor collector would deem this to be a necessity. [...] Although in the greater halls on the first floor the majority of the pictures are properly lit and arranged according to individual schools, in the fourteenth room on the second floor the lighting is entirely unsatisfactory, many of the pictures are hung in darkness so that it is impossible to see them, while in*

¹⁶⁶ LIECHTENSTEIN - THE PRINCELY COLLECTIONS, Hofkanzlei, H-7/61

*some rooms various schools are wildly mixed together.*¹⁶⁷ It is easy to understand Waagen's criticisms. A watercolour by Baron Raimund von Stillfried-Rathenitz from the momentous fin-de-siècle period in Vienna around 1900 depicts the Great Gallery with Rubens' *Decius Mus cycle*, where a deep green still dominates, with which Joseph Hardtmuth – according to the findings made during restoration work carried out in 2000 – had plunged all rooms during his reconstruction work in the palace. The palace rooms had also been deprived by the windows being walled up of the originally superlative natural lighting, although there would never have been space to hang the pictures without this action. If we compare this watercolour with recently discovered and coeval photographs of the individual halls and views of the walls taken by Stillfried, we can see – especially on the photos – that the choc-à-bloc confusion of the installation is nothing less than claustrophobic.

This picture is more or less the same as the situation after the renovation work carried out by Wilhelm von Bode, whose credo was to unite all the artistic genres and their combined presentation in terms of history and content. At any rate, the criticism concerning the lack of a catalogue was soon answered. In 1873 Jakob Falke published a catalogue with the following introduction: *“The Liechtenstein gallery has lacked a catalogue for close to a century. By publishing this inventory we have tried to meet the wishes and demands of the public, of whom we would also ask for their patience, as in the future it will be necessary to carry out many improvements.”* In the introduction Falke also dealt with the issue of artists being questionably or wrongly identified when he wrote: *“For those of you who know the Liechtenstein gallery well, you will find in this catalogue a wide range of names that have been changed. However, we cannot rule out that in the future some of the other works will require changes. In uncertain cases, we have preferred to use the names contained in the inventory of the princely fideicommissum, albeit with a question mark to prevent further erroneous accreditation from exacerbating any existing discrepancies.”*¹⁶⁸

At the end of his introduction, Falke outlines another two basic problems. When he wrote that, *“some paintings have a star in front of the number: those are the ones which the time-pressed visitor should give extra attention to in order to save time searching through the large number”*, he was actually pointing out that the density and presentation of the paintings in the gallery prevented the material from being properly appreciated. Falke wrote in the last sentence that this should be corrected in the near future: *“Other pictures are labelled with a star: these may*

¹⁶⁷ Waagen, Georg Friedrich: *Die vornehmsten Kunstdenkmäler in Wien*. Vienna 1866, pp. 258 ff.

¹⁶⁸ Falke, Jakob von: *Katalog der Fürstlich Liechtensteinischen Bilder-Galerie im Gartenpalais der Rossau zu Wien*. Vienna 1873, introduction (unpaged).

be removed in subsequent thorough alterations.” We can, therefore, see that the whole process of renewal was very gradual and did not involve any revolutionary overhaul.

The next catalogue published in 1885 already showed evidence of this heralded “reviewing”; it included fewer objects: “This because specific pictures that were defined in earlier catalogues as not worthy and suitable for removal were labelled with a “=“ and have now been factually and definitively removed from the gallery,” wrote Falke in the introduction.¹⁶⁹

During this period the gallery was well attended; the rise in the number of visitors was also due to the gallery taking up the challenge to compete with the imperial collections concentrated in the new Kunsthistorisches Museum; this is perhaps demonstrable through the catalogues, which were published relatively quickly in succession, constantly re-edited according to the state of re-hanging and adaptations.

A series of Court Office documents from 1926 in the Liechtenstein Ancestral Archive contains among other things “*Visiting regulations at the Viennese Majoratshaus*”¹⁷⁰ on Bankgasse with information about the furnishings of several areas designated for tours and how they are organised. It is clear that although at this time the palace served as the prince’s main residence in Vienna, some parts were open to the public under certain conditions. It was possible to tour the palace following a prior telephone appointment made with the head doorman. The entrance fee was 2 Austrian schillings per person and 20 groschen for the cloakroom. The tour route through the palace was strictly set out: “*From the cloakroom to the large waiting hall on the ground floor, which houses valuable porcelain, then the main stairs to the first floor and the room with paintings, and then on to the Salon and dining room, to the courtly rooms with a collection of paintings, then up the stairs to the second floor, where it is possible to see the state rooms, which the visitor can then leave through the red Salon opposite the apartment of His Highness Prince Franz. After the large main staircase, visitors return to the entrance.*” They had obviously also thought about marketing: “*The announcement of the new rules for visitors is published in the daily newspapers and through announcements from the Austrian Federal Ministry for Education.*” Consideration was given to the sale of postcards and it was also recommended “*to assemble a brief, unillustrated guide to the palace. [...] His Highness (Prince Franz) mentioned that for this purpose it was perhaps even sufficient to have multiple copies of a sheet of paper.*”

¹⁶⁹ Ibid., introduction, page 1.

¹⁷⁰ LIECHTENSTEIN – THE PRINCELY COLLECTIONS, Hofkanzlei, 522/26.

These overly detailed and long-winded descriptions and quotes admirably demonstrate the importance the gallery must have had for the Liechtenstein family and all of the majorat lords. It is only when we realize the important role which indeed the gallery played in the life and work of the princes that we can understand the extent to which the Liechtensteins campaigned for art and issues relating to other galleries and museums. In Austria these efforts recently gained general recognition thanks to an exhibition of donations from Prince Johann II to the new Vienna City History Museum and its excellent catalogue.¹⁷¹ In Brno (Brünn) similar exhibitions sought to draw attention to the various benefactors who had donated paintings and works of art to the Moravian Gallery in Brno.

If we look at the materials in the Ancestral Archive of the Ruling Princes of Liechtenstein, we can see in volume after volume detailed documentation of who these donations were intended for. The list of beneficiaries covers the whole spectrum, from the large Viennese galleries to the smallest collections and museums in the Austro-Hungarian periphery. One of the binders shows a painstakingly reproduced list of beneficiaries¹⁷²

Mährisches Gewerbe-Museum Brünn/Brno; Franzens-Museum Brünn/Brno; Rudolfinum Prag/Praha; Zentral-Kanzlei (Prag für Ministerien), abgegeben Lobkowitz-Palais Präsidium (Wien); Museum in Reichenberg/Liberec; Museum in Troppau/Opava; Forstmeister Friedrich in Jägerndorf/Krnov; Graz, Ferdinandeum in Innsbruck; Francisco-Carolinum in Linz; Landes-Galerie-Linz; I. Stürmer. Brunn am Gebirge; Museum "Revoltella" in Triest; Museum-Verein in Bozen; Kaiser Friedrichs-Museum Berlin; Stadtmuseum in Znaim/Znajmo; Mistelbach. Dr. Tokupil; Deutsche Stellenvermittl. Brünn/Brno; Maehrischer-Kunstverein in Brünn/Brno; Krahuletz-Verein Eggenburg; Städt. Museum Carolinum-Augusteum Künstlerhaus in Salzburg; Siebenhirten b. Wien Bürgermeisteramt; Germanisches-Museum in Nürnberg; Nationalmuseum in München; Städtische Gompersz-Galerie in Brünn/Brno; Gräfin Hompesch in Meran; Kirche zum heil. Herzen Jesu in Unterwindthorst (Bosnien); Museum in Spalato; Universität Lund Schweden; Frau Dvorak; Für Grafen Karl Khuen. Grusbach/Hrušovany nad Jevišovkou; Kirche in Altlichtenwarth N.Österr. Pfarrer Karl Heyer; Leo Popper, Karlsbad/Karlovy Vary; Graf Heinrich Karl Thun Komptur des Malteser Ritt. Ordens Schloss Maidelberg/Divčí Hrad CSR.

¹⁷¹ Kassel-Mikula, Renata (ed.): *Johann II. von und zu Liechtenstein. Ein Fürst beschenkt Wien. 1894–1916*. Katalog zur 300. Sonderausstellung des Historischen Museums der Stadt Wien. Vienna 2003.

¹⁷² LIECHTENSTEIN – THE PRINCELY COLLECTIONS, Fasz.. "Geschenke auswärts". Akten und Korrespondenzen der Sammlungen 1858 bis 1929 (Fürst Johann II.).

This completely random list of recipients seems like a wild mix. There are some very important endowed institutions missing in the list of beneficiaries, such as the Galerie der Akademie der bildenden Künste, the Österreichische Staatsgalerie (today Belvedere), the Kunsthistorische Museum in Wien, the aforementioned Historische Museum der Stadt Wien (today Wien Museum). Nevertheless, it is very clear how varied Prince Johann II's list of recipients was and the important place occupied by museums in the Lands of the Bohemian Crown and Silesia.

It seems that the development of the latter institutions was very important for the prince. Today the museums of applied arts in Prague and in Brno (Brünn) and the Silesian Provincial Museum Opava/Troppau owe much to the sponsorship policy of Prince Johann II for a significant part of their important collections. Höß's biography of Prince Johann II from 1908 contains a detailed overview of these donations,¹⁷³ starting with objects donated to Viennese institutions, followed by donations to the Erzherzog Rainer-Museum für Kunst und Gewerbe (Mährisches Gewerbemuseum; Museum of Applied Arts, the Art-Industrial Museum of Archduke Rainer, Moravian Industrial Museum) in Brno (Brünn), the Gesellschaft der Kunstfreunde (Society of Friends of Art in Olomouc/Olmütz (Muzeum umění olomouc), Kaiser Franz Josef-Museum für Kunst und Gewerbe (Kaiser Franz Museum of Art and Applied Arts/Slezské zemské muzeum (Silesian Provincial Museum) in Opava/Troppau, the Museum of Applied Arts of the Prague Chamber of Trade and Commerce/ Uměleckoprůmyslové muzeum) Museum of Decorative Arts of the Chamber of Trade and Commerce, the Painting Gallery of the Society of Patriotic Friends of Art (Národní galerie v Praze,) and the Museum of the Kingdom of Bohemia in Prague.

As part of a workshop contribution for the Czech-Liechtenstein Commission of Historians, Martina Lehmannová (Straková) examined the donations to the Moravian Industrial Museum.¹⁷⁴ The Moravian Industrial Museum, now the Museum of Decorative Arts, is one of the oldest institutions of its kind. It was founded on 10 November 1873 under the patronage of Emperor Franz Joseph I

¹⁷³ Höß, Karl: *Fürst Johann II. von Liechtenstein und die bildende Kunst*. Vienna 1908, pp. 87–208.

¹⁷⁴ Cf. Lehmannová, Martina: *Lichtenštejnský mecenát ve prospěch Moravského průmyslového muzea*. Podíl Jana II. z Lichtenštejna na utváření místa paměti. In: Geiger, Peter – Knoz, Tomáš (eds.): *Lichtenštejnové a umění*. (Časopis Matice moravské 132, 2013 – Supplementum 5). Brno 2013, pp. 193–210. – Cf. also Straková, Martina: *Historie děl pozdně gotické sochařské a malířské tvorby z darů Jana II. z Liechtensteina dochovaných na území České republiky*. In: Chamonikola, Kaliopi (ed.): *Zdaleka i zblízka. Středověké importy v moravských a slezských sbírkách*. Brno 2009. – Straková, Martina: *Mecenáš Moravského průmyslového muzea Jan II. z Lichtenštejna*. Bulletin Moravské galerie v Brně 62, 2006, pp. 141–148.

and the sponsor Archduke Rainer, whose name was also part of the institution from 1907 to 1919 (Erzherzog Rainer-Museum für Kunst und Gewerbe). The museum soon managed to establish a circle of capable supporters including Theodor Rotter von Offermann, Count Friedrich Sylva-Taroucca, Count (Altgraf) Hugo Francis Salm-Reifferscheidt, Friedrich Wannieck, Knight Friedrich Bauer and, most importantly, Johann II of Liechtenstein. From the time of its establishment the patrons contributed 1,000 gulden annually to the museum, and from 1887 Prince Johann annually donated double that amount. Another 1,000 gulden was donated by Prince Johann in 1879 for the construction of a new building.

The prince's first donations arrived at the museum on 15 December 1880. They included a total of 88 items ranging from an Egyptian mummy, to works from the Italian Renaissance and modern British ceramics. Amongst some of the most noteworthy objects was a small folding altar carved from bone from Embriachi's workshop from the 15th century. In 1884 he gave the museum a collection of 43 Italian textile samples which he obtained from the famous collection of the German canon Franz Bock. At the museum's request, the prince bought several valuable pieces of Italian faience from Faenza, as well as Spanish majolica from Richard Zschille-Grossenhain's collection, which was sold at auction at Christie's in London in 1899.¹⁷⁵ There the director of Opava's Decorative Arts Museum, Edmund Wilhelm Braun (with whom the prince worked closely in establishing the museum in Opava/Troppau), bought six pieces of majolica. The rarities among the items which the prince donated to the Brno Museum included a cassone (wedding chest) with scenes from the story of Marcus Curtius (donated in 1894), which was evidently purchased for the prince by the Florentine dealer Stefano Bardini. Bardini sent photographs of the objects to the prince, who then indicated those which he wished to acquire. After these items arrived in Vienna, they were carefully recorded in the inventories and the prince decided where they would go: to one of his palace galleries or as a donation to one of the museums he patronised. The Ancestral Archive of the Ruling Princes of Liechtenstein in Vienna has kept records, including photographs, which document this entire process.¹⁷⁶ In the same year (1894), the prince visited the Brno museum in person. The result of his visit, which he was obviously pleased with, was another huge donation: a stove from Winterthur (1640–1644), which had been on loan to the museum since 1890.

¹⁷⁵ Höss, Karl: *Fürst Johann II. von Liechtenstein und die bildende Kunst*. Vienna 1908, p. 168.

¹⁷⁶ LIECHTENSTEIN – THE PRINCELY COLLECTIONS, Fasz.. “Ankäufe in Florenz (Bardini)” and Fasz.. “Geschenke auswärts”. Akten und Korrespondenzen der Sammlungen 1858 bis 1929.

In addition to its outstanding quality, it is of particular interest due to its unique state of preservation. There were hundreds of other objects which, like the stove, museums received in the form of a loan for exhibitions, and after the exhibitions had ended the prince would leave the objects. This cooperation came to an end in 1918, at least in the case of the Museum of Applied Arts in Brno (Brünn), which was apparently no longer interested in continuing it. However, the prince continued to work with the Silesian Provincial Museum in Opava/Troppau until his death in 1929.¹⁷⁷

However, Johann II not only donated objects of applied art to the Moravian Industrial Museum in Brno (Erzherzog Rainer-Museum für Kunst und Gewerbe in Brünn). In 1881 he gave them 26 paintings from the Liechtenstein collections; from masterpieces of early Italian painting to important Flemish and Dutch masters, to paintings from the 19th century, which were then added to the collections. It is interesting that many paintings ended up in Brno (Brünn), which reflected the personal taste of the prince, especially regarding his contemporaries. His taste tended towards “mood” Impressionism (Stimmungs-Impressionismus), which was extremely popular in Vienna at that time, although he showed no interest in Vienna’s avant-garde artists. One has the overall impression that the prince preferred to send paintings which “reflected the spirit of the time” to Moravian institutions rather than having them exhibited in Vienna, in his own galleries, or even owning them. Eugen Jettel, an artist from Janovka/Johnsdorf in Moravia, is represented in this collection by the painting *Deciduous Forest* from 1868, and Robert Russ by a beautiful large-scale veduta *The Villa Borghese Garden in Rome* from 1889. There were also watercolours amongst the donations. Baron Raimund von Stillfried, who was the first to photographically document the Liechtenstein gallery in Vienna, and to whom we owe thanks for the only documentation of the gallery in a watercolour is represented by the work *A View into the Interior of St Stephen’s Cathedral in Vienna* (1895), and Rudolf von Alt by the spectacular work *View of Pernštejn/Perntein Castle Court*. In contrast, the names of other masters such as Friedrich von Friedländer, Josef Straka, Hans Schwaiger and Ludwig Ehrenhaft, have fallen into obscurity. Höss also mentions “two painted plaster reliefs by the English artist Robert Anning Bell, which attracted attention at the spring exhibition in the Wiener Künstlerhaus (1900).” And further Höss wrote politely in his biography: “These reliefs that show ‘Music and dance’ and a ‘Mer-

¹⁷⁷ Lehmannová, Martina: *Lichtenštejnský mecenát ve prospěch Moravského průmyslového muzea. Podíl Jana II. z Lichtenštejna na utváření místa paměti*. In: Geiger, Peter – Knoz, Tomáš (eds.): *Lichtenštejnové a umění*. (Časopis Matice moravské 132, 2013 – Supplementum 5). Brno 2013, pp. 193–210.

maid' have an extraordinarily decorative effect thanks to the charming group of characters and the subtle harmony of colours".¹⁷⁸ The prince was much more a follower of the Wiener Künstlerhaus, a Viennese bastion of conservative views of art, rather than the new art societies such as the Hagenbund or the Viennese Secession. Paintings from these donations were seen recently¹⁷⁹ at an interesting exhibition at the Moravian Gallery in Brno (Brünn). In 2009 already, the Moravian Gallery had organised an exhibition of Gothic sculpture entitled *From Far and Near. Medieval Imports in Moravian and Silesian Collections*, which also contained 20 paintings respectively sculptures donated to this institution's collections by Prince Johann II.

As Lehmannová also concluded,¹⁸⁰ the prince looked to the past when donating. Only when they involved technical innovations, did he donate items from contemporary applied arts, mainly artistic ceramics, for which he had a particular predilection, since he had his own factory in Poštorná/Unter-Themenau. Accordingly, the prince's donations also included products from English companies such as Howell and James, Mos Gibbs, Minton & Comp., A. B. Daniell and Dalpech,¹⁸¹ as well as contemporary Spanish designs. All of these companies were pre-eminent because of their innovative industrial products. With his donations the prince was following a line of thought which was behind the establishment of the museums of applied arts, the goal of which was to "promote" the arts and crafts, while it also suited his own interests as an industrialist and producer of such products.

The prince also had a very special relationship with institutions in Olomouc (Olmütz). Here he greatly helped the *Society of Friends of Art*, which organised exhibitions in the newly adapted spaces of an old city house, for example, 1908's "Altösterreichische ("Cisleithanian") Painters 1800–1848".¹⁸² This exhibition received tremendous help in the form of loans from the Princely Collections, mainly paintings which are still part of the Princely Collections to this day, while there were some donations made to other institutions. This first group includes Gauer- mann's painting *Landscape before a storm* (1837), and *Košice Cathedral* (1852) by Jakob Alt.

The prince also had a very warm life-long relationship with the Kaiser Franz-Joseph Museum für Kunst und Gewerbe (Emperor Francis Joseph Museum of Arts and Crafts, today's Silesian Museum) in Opava/Troppau.¹⁸³ As a patron of

¹⁷⁸ Höss, Karl: *Fürst Johann II. von Liechtenstein und die bildende Kunst*. Vienna 1908, p. 167.

¹⁷⁹ In 2013.

¹⁸⁰ Lehmannová, Martina: *Lichtenštejnský mecenát ve prospěch Moravského průmyslového muzea*, pp. 193–210.

¹⁸¹ Höss, Karl: *Fürst Johann II. von Liechtenstein und die bildende Kunst*. Vienna 1908, p. 169.

¹⁸² Cf. Höss, Karl: *Fürst Johann II.*, pp. 176 ff.

¹⁸³ Cf. Höss, Karl: *Fürst Johann II.*, pp. 182–193.

this institution, to mark the 40th anniversary of the emperor's rule and the ideas surrounding the new museum building, he first of all donated land measuring 697 square yards followed by the considerable sum of 12,000 crowns. The new building was opened on 27 October 1895. In 1908 the new director of the museum, Dr Edmund Wilhelm Braun, wrote a list of the prince's donations to the museum since 1855 for Höss's publication: "[...] *in addition to a large number of valuable art-history works for the library, 24 old German engravings by Aldegrever, Altdorfer, B. Beham, Binck, Cranach, Dürer, Hirschvogel, Meckenem and Schongauer to the collection of copperplate engravings, 33 valuable oil paintings and water-colours, and more than 350 major works of sculpture and applied arts from all branches [...].*"¹⁸⁴

Among the paintings, the already noted names of the Viennese Biedermeier appear here again, and then contemporaries of Johann II, including Jettel, Ludwig Hans Fischer, Adolf Kaufmann (born in Opava/Troppau), Adolf Zdrasila, Alois Schönn, Ludwig Passini, Alfred von Schrötter, Emil Strecker, Josef Gisela and Josef Kinzel occur, as do the names of German and French painters, ultimately just as unknown and without significance

The applied arts are of a quite different category – reliefs, Gothic and Renaissance statues, plaques, medals and bronzes, furniture, glass and especially ceramics – whereby the prince and Braun and his intensive travelling as far as Spain managed to compile an outstandingly exquisite collection. The range of art objects also includes here parts of the famous Liechtenstein Sorgenthal dinner service, which was made between 1784 and 1787.

We must also mention Braun's epochal exhibitions at the Silesian Museum. The exhibition of early Viennese porcelain in 1903 had more than 800 objects, among them for the first time was the large porcelain bowl by the Viennese Dupaquier manufactory, which with its date of 17.5 (read 1725) is probably the oldest dated piece by this manufacturer; Braun was the first to discover this dating in 1902. This was followed by an exhibition of objects by Austrian goldsmiths (Braun even mentions the mysterious silver of Albert of Saxony-Teschen in the catalogue) in 1904, and in 1905 by an exhibition of East Asian porcelain and an exhibition of German, Italian and Dutch drawings, in 1906 by a large exhibition of European porcelain, and in 1907 by an exhibition of bronzes, all taking full advantage of the Princely collections. It almost seems as though the gallery of the Silesian Museum in Opava/Troppau was an exhibition hall for the Princely Collections.

¹⁸⁴ Höss, Karl: *Fürst Johann II.*, p. 183.

In 1910, Braun also exhibited the large, and magnificent dinner service of Albert of Saxony-Teschen, which was then displayed again exactly one hundred years later at an exhibition at the Metropolitan Museum in New York, and at the last exhibition of the Liechtenstein Museum in Vienna in 2010 as part of a spectacular show. Relationships in the field of art are clearly more enduring than those on a political level.

Finally, we will examine the donations associated with Prince Johann II and Prague, where the former Kunstgewerbliches Museum der Handels- und Gewerbekammer (Museum of Applied Arts of the Chamber of Trade and Commerce) still exists today as the Museum of Applied Arts. One of the truly princely gifts was a bronze sculpture of a well with Venus and Cupid with a dolphin by Benedikt Wurzelbauer of Nuremberg, which was originally installed in the palace of the Lobkowitz family in Prague. It later came to be owned by the Waldsteins and in 1652 was taken by the Swedes to Stockholm as war booty. After several owners it made its way to Berlin and through Wilhelm von Bode it was offered to Alfred Ritter (knight) von Lanna, another great patron of the Kunstgewerbliches Museum der Handels- und Gewerbekammer (Museum of Applied Arts) in Prague. After a prolonged search for a patron who could help Prague acquire the sculpture, the sponsor was found in Prince Johann II, who wished to secure this sculpture for the museum.

Another institution in Prague supported by the prince was the Picture Gallery of the “Society of Patriotic Friends of Art” in the Rudolfinum, which exhibited paintings that sometimes came directly from the prince’s gallery in Vienna. *“His Highness parted with these paintings certainly with a heavy heart and left them to the museum in the knowledge that only the best is good enough for a public collection,”* wrote Höss.¹⁸⁵ By this he meant paintings such as the portrait *Jasper Schade van Westrum* by Frans Hals, with the carved and painted heraldic frame bearing the year 1645. The prince had acquired this painting for 43,000 francs at an auction of the Wilson collection in Paris in 1881. Another masterpiece donated by Johann II to the Picture Gallery was *Young Woman on a Balcony* by Gerrit Dou from the Orléans collection. Finally, we might also mention the painting *Forest Cave* by Gustav Courbet, an important work of early 19th-century French painting and a unique acquisition in the princely gallery, which the prince, with great generosity, parted with.

¹⁸⁵ Höss, Karl: *Fürst Johann II.*, p. 196.

c. Land reform and confiscatio

(1) Land reform and confiscation – a comparison

With the defeat and break-up of Austria-Hungary and the foundation of Czechoslovakia in 1918, the Princely House of Liechtenstein also entered a new era. As a consequence of the Czechoslovak land reforms, nationalisation and forced sale, they lost more than half of their land which lay in Moravia, Bohemia and Silesia (though with compensation).

Nevertheless, they still owned considerable possessions in forestry, castles and palaces, and industrial enterprises. However, in 1945 everything was confiscated without compensation, which affected not only the prince, but another 38 citizens of the Liechtenstein Principality.

The following section will present a comparative view of land reform and confiscation. Afterwards, the details of both interventions into private ownership will be made more specific in the case of the Liechtensteins through an objective interpretation of the historical context and arguments that were put forward at the time.¹⁸⁶

The characteristics of state interventions into private property in Czechoslovakia

A fleeting comparison of the situation after the First World War and after the Second World War apparently manifests two diametrically opposed worlds. However, a closer examination reveals a number of parallels and connections.

After the two world wars, there was extensive state intervention which sought to redistribute private property. Although after 1918 this was restricted mainly to the agricultural sector (land reform), after 1945 this was expanded to the whole economy (confiscation, nationalisation)

The motivations for these measures were also similar, with social, national, economic and political causes and aims. After 1945 the ethnic-national dimension emerged as dominant, though this had remained mainly in the background during the interwar period. There had also been a fundamental political shift, with the Communist Party acquiring a pivotal position. While the radicalism of the post-war years of the First Republic (1918–1938) gradually died down and relationships

¹⁸⁶ Cf. Horák, Ondřej: *Liechtensteinové mezi konfiskací a vyvlastněním. Příspěvek k poválečným zásahům do pozemkového vlastnictví v Československu v první polovině dvacátého století*. Prague 2010.

became consolidated with the passing of time, the Third Republic (1945–1948) seemed more like a temporary solution with a semi-totalitarian character particularly as the Communists took over leading positions in 1948. This then led to a total take-over of power by the Communists in 1948.

From the perspective of the traditional view of property protection, the extensive land reforms are seen as particularly problematic. Whereas the first land reform (1919–1935) was basically one unified project, the second land reform consisted of three different and relatively independent parts: post-war confiscation and property distribution (1945), the first land reform revised (1947) and new land reform (1948).

With regard to the Liechtensteins' property, we shall focus on the inter-war land reform and the post-war confiscation based on the decrees of the president of the republic. Both of these interventions were a consequence of the wars, and in addition to dealing with social and economic problems, their main objective was to transfer political power. While the inter-war land reform was evolutionary and long-term in nature with a large number of statutory regulations, the post-war confiscation required few regulations and was speedy and radical, although also subject to numerous legal prescriptions.

However, from the juridical point of view each of these two situations were subject to an analogous pattern and similar legislative and technical instruments. On a political level, the land-reform interventions had been announced in the so-called Washington Declaration (18 October 1918) and the *Košice Government Programme* (5 April 1945). The legal beginnings and the prologue to the main laws of both post-war interventions were regulations preventing the disposal of the property concerned – Act no. 32/1918 Collection of acts and regulations (hereinafter Coll.) and the Decree of the President of the Republic no. 5/1945 Collections (hereinafter Coll.).

The main provisions for the interwar land reform were approved in 1919 and 1920, and in 1945 for post-war confiscation. These mainly concerned the so-called annexation act no. 215/1919 Coll. and in the case of the confiscation of agricultural property this pertained to the Decree of the President of the Republic no. 12/1945 Coll. These provisions were a reflection of the turbulent post-war atmosphere and an attempt to fundamentally intervene in land tenure. The annexation act (1919) was characterised by the fact that it did not carry out land reform but only enabled it. However, in the case of the confiscation decrees (1945) aimed mainly at German and Hungarian nationals, this led to a change in ownership rights directly by law (*ex lege*) – and as confiscation implies – without compensation. The decisive factor in the differing solutions after 1918 and 1945 was the situation in the international scene, which had undergone a fundamental change between the wars, and in

relation to the defeat of Nazism was to influence the fate of Europe and its eastern components for more than forty years.

The presidential decrees affecting property relations were a faithful mirror of the times and reflected aspects of continuity and discontinuity. Continuity can be seen in:

1) the idea of significant intervention in private property, which is also reflected on a legal-constitutional level (see below), 2) specifically in relation to the inter-war land reform (§ 9 of the annexation act set out the seven categories of property which could be “taken without compensation”, which prefigured the confiscation based on the presidential decrees), and 3) the anti-aristocratic and anti-German inspired land reforms and confiscations (visible in the “revenge for White Mountain” rhetoric).

Discontinuity existed in 1945 mainly in the staffing of key positions, which was also reflected in the speed and radicalism of the solutions: in 1945 the Communists replaced the Agrarians and were given the crucial ministries of agriculture and the interior, which were to draw up and implement the central decrees. They accomplished this skilfully and used the decrees for their own political ends.

Terminology

After 1918, the keyword was socialisation, while after 1945 it was more about nationalisation. From the viewpoint of the assignee, this could mean takeover by the state (nationalisation), by the province (provincialisation) and by the municipal authorities (municipalisation), by cooperatives (cooperativisation) or by private individuals; from the viewpoint of previous owners there was expropriation (takeover with compensation) or confiscation (takeover without compensation).

Expropriation with (adequate) compensation is a legitimate legal tool at the state’s disposal. Confiscation is a sanctioning measure which is unacceptable unless used as a punishment. Although the constitution from 1920 (§ 109) and the constitution from 1948 (§ 9) allowed for “expropriation without compensation”, which other countries also had as part of their constitutions after the First World War, including Germany (art. 153 of the Weimar constitution from 1919), nevertheless, in interwar Czechoslovakia expropriation without compensation to the former owner only occurred with property belonging to members of the Habsburg-Lorraine dynasty.

The international dimension

After both world wars, intervention in private ownership occurred in the overwhelming majority of European countries, whether as a result of the war or occu-

pation (restitution and confiscation), or measures aimed at reforming the economy (nationalisation, land reforms).

1) After the First World War, land reform was carried out in twenty-two European countries, particularly in the lands “east of the Elbe” where the large estates and the associated political power were often in the hands of the German or Hungarian aristocracy. Of the larger countries (with a population over one million), only France and Switzerland were not included. Apart from Russia, which underwent land collectivisation from 1928–1934, elsewhere in Europe there was a strengthening of small and middle-sized farmers at the expense of land ownership by the large estates. Of the thirteen countries in central and eastern Europe (again excluding Russia), after Romania, land reform in Czechoslovakia (1919–1935) was the second most extensive, and based on the percentage of annexed land of the total area, Czechoslovakia was third after Latvia and Estonia.¹⁸⁷

2) The most radical intervention came after the Second World War. In addition to the land reforms that were often connected to the confiscation of enemy property, many countries also chose to nationalize key areas of industry based on economic, strategic and ideological reasons. This was a highly debated issue not only in countries orientated towards the Soviet Union, but also in western Europe (e.g. Great Britain, France and Italy).¹⁸⁸

After the Second World War, the confiscation measures were closely associated with reparation claims for damage caused during the occupation and the war. The agreement on reparations from Germany, on the establishment of the Inter-Allied Reparations Agency and the return of monetary gold was signed in Paris on 21 December 1945 (published under no. 150/1947 Coll.) by eighteen signatory states, including the British dominions. Of the major countries only the Soviet Union and Poland were not represented, though the confiscation measures also applied to them. In international comparison, the Czechoslovak version of confiscation was among the most severe, based as it was on an ethnic outlook

¹⁸⁷ Cf. Maslov, Sergej S.: *Princip soukromého vlastnictví v pozemkových reformách poválečné Evropy*. Prague 1927. – Sering, Max (ed.): *Die agrarischen Umwälzungen im ausserrussischen Osteuropa*. Berlin – Leipzig 1930. – Most recently, see also: Roszkowski, Wojciech: *Land reforms in East Central Europe after World War One*. Warsaw 1995.

¹⁸⁸ In greater detail in Kuklík, Jan: *Znárodněné Československo. Od znárodnění k privatizaci – státní zásahy do vlastnických a dalších majetkových práv v Československu a jinde v Evropě*. Prague 2010, pp. 322 ff. – From the older literature cf. Mates, Pavel: *K procesu nacionalizace průmyslu zemí střední a jihovýchodní Evropy v letech 1944–1949*. In: *Právněhistorické studie* 20, 1977, pp. 93–112.

regardless of nationality and individual guilt, and in particular the way it established the conditions for exoneration.¹⁸⁹

Specific land reforms were mainly carried out in those countries which had recently fallen into the Soviet sphere of influence. Of the thirteen countries in central and eastern Europe, land reform in Czechoslovakia (1945–1948) was the second most extensive after Poland, while viewed from the point of view of the percentage affected in relation to the overall agricultural land, Czechoslovakia came in fourth place.¹⁹⁰

Naturally, each of these land reforms had its own specific characteristics, whether in terms of size or the actual process, but there were also a number of features in common: a) they were the first, most basic problems which the new regimes dealt with, b) they were carried out in a radical manner by the communist parties, which thereby significantly increased their standing in rural areas, c) to implement them, land was used which had been confiscated. However, the land reforms in the people's democratic countries eventually led to agricultural collectivisation along the Soviet model.¹⁹¹

(2) State intervention after 1918 (land reform)

The political and legal background

The interwar land reform is normally framed within the years 1919 (the adoption of the annexation act) and 1935 (the dissolution of the State Land Office). However, on a political level we can already see the beginning of these reforms in the so-called Washington Declaration from 18 October 1918, announced by the interim Czechoslovak government led by Tomáš Garrigue Masaryk, according to which there would be wide-ranging social and economic reforms, in particular the expropriation of large estates for local colonisation.¹⁹²

As early as 9 November 1918, a short act (no. 32 Coll.) had been approved *on the seizure of the large estates*, which signalled the start of the reforms on a legal level.

¹⁸⁹ For more information on individual countries see Böhmer, Otto (ed.): *Deutsches Vermögen im Ausland. Internationale Vereinbarungen und ausländische Gesetzgebung*, Bd. 2. Cologne 1951. – For the situation in Czechoslovakia see Pešek, Jiří (ed.): *Německé menšiny v právních normách 1938–1948. Československo ve srovnání s vybranými evropskými zeměmi*. Brno – Prague 2006.

¹⁹⁰ Cf. Průcha, Václav: *Srovnání pozemkových reforem v evropských lidově demokratických zemích*. In: *Zemědělství na rozcestí 1945–1948*. Uherské Hradiště 1998, p. 59.

¹⁹¹ In more detail see Rychlík, Jan: *Kolektivizace ve střední a východní Evropě*. In: *Kolektivizace venkova v Československu 1948–1960 a středoevropské souvislosti*. Prague 2008, pp. 13–29.

¹⁹² Cf. Klimek, Antonín (ed.): *Vznik Československa 1918*. Prague 1994, pp. 317–320.

This was followed on 16 April 1919 by act no. 215 Coll. *on the confiscation of large landed estates* (the so-called annexation act), which started off the land reform. It had the character of a framework law whose practical implementation could only occur after the adoption of regulations which moderated the original radicalism – particularly with regard to international obligations.

The annexation applied to all agricultural landed property larger than 150 hectares or 250 hectares of all landed property, which was more than 4 million hectares of land (roughly 29 % of all land in Czechoslovakia). Apart from seizing without compensation the property of members of enemy states, members of the former royal Habsburg-Lorraine family, aristocratic foundations, traitors, etc. (§ 9), the principle of compensation for seized property was enacted. The state had not yet expropriated landed property through this act, it was only entitled to take over the annexed property and distribute it. After the central sequestration act, there followed a series of other legal regulations which developed and supplemented it. One of these was act no. 318 Coll. from 27 May 1919 *on providing land to small tenants* – allowing them to buy land on which they had worked since at least October 1901.

The State Land Office (henceforth Land Office) was established to carry out the land reforms: act no. 330 Coll. from 11 June 1919 established its authority and remit. It represented the state in all matters relating to the implementation of the land reform. The Agrarian Party had a large say in both its activities and the reforms as a whole, and Agrarians were appointed as its president, firstly Karel Viškovský until 1926 and then Jan Voženílek until 1935.

Following long negotiations on the annexation act, the *Act of Allotment* no. 81 Coll. was added on 30 January 1920, which established the principles for acquiring confiscated land. The preference was for parcelling out and allocating land to individual ownership, usually the so-called indivisible family property (§ 30n.), though there was a newly created institute of so-called residuary estates (§24). It was also possible (in addition to the acreage of up to 500 hectares according to § 11 of the annexation law) to release other annexed property to the former owners (§ 20).

The issue of compensation

The last in the series of large acts was the *Act of Compensation* no. 329 Coll. from 8 April 1920, which regulated the takeover of confiscated property and the level of compensation for the original owners. Compensation was to be commensurate with average prices from 1913 to 1915 with foreclosure by the power of sale, while for units of a larger size it was to be decreased further. In view of the devaluation of the crown, this meant that the value of the land was lower than the current

market level. The valuation of the property was carried out by the Land Office, which also negotiated with the original owners over the price and finalised any agreements on the price. Only the takeover of annexed property then led to its expropriation.

From the very start of the land reforms, questions of compensation and establishing the amounts led to bitter quarrels. The land committee of the National Assembly finally agreed on 14 April 1919 on expropriation with compensation (sixteen votes from the Agrarians, National Democrats and People's Party against 12 votes from representatives of the Social Democrats, the Czech Socialists and the Progressive Party).

According to § 35 of the compensation act, there would be no compensation for property taken from enemies of the state and members of the former royal Habsburg-Lorraine family, if this did not contradict the peace treaties concluded with the allied powers during the World War. In the case of members of defeated countries the peace treaties did in fact prohibit this.¹⁹³ This meant therefore that the land reforms carried out on the property of German and Hungarian nationals went before an international court of arbitration and the amount of compensation was higher than according to the amendments in the compensation act.¹⁹⁴

According to § 36, property from aristocratic foundations could be taken without compensation. However, the majority of them had been transformed (they lost their aristocratic character and changed their names) and ceased to exist for other reasons. As a result, the only people not to get compensation were members of the former imperial family, which was in accordance with the peace settlement and act no. 354 Coll. from 12 August 1921 on the assumption of estates and property to be taken over by the Czechoslovak state according to the peace treaties.

¹⁹³ Cf. art. 297 Versailles, art. 267 Saint-Germain, art. 250 Trianon and art. 177 of the Neuilly peace treaties

¹⁹⁴ The Czechoslovak-German court of arbitration was based on art. 304 of the Versailles peace treaty, while the Czechoslovak-Hungarian one was based on art. 239 of the Trianon peace treaty; the first was established in Geneva, the second in The Hague. More detail in Kubačák, Antonín: *Provádění pozemkové reformy na majetku cizích státních příslušníků v období první republiky*. Vědecké práce Národního zemědělského muzea 29, 1991–1992, pp. 33–72, esp. pp. 45 f.

Unfinished land reform

During the interwar period, land reform has in fact not been fully completed. The 1930s saw the conclusion of the so-called “general agreements” on the deferral of finalizing land reform, according to which land would be left to its owners for undisturbed use until 1955 or 1967 (this related to 212,304 ha, of which 6,658 ha was agricultural land). On 1 January 1938 there remained approximately ten percent of all confiscated land (435,668 ha, of which 25,262 ha was agricultural land) in the state of seizure. From the overall confiscated land of 4,068,370 ha (1,312,721 ha of agricultural land), the owners were finally left with 1,831,920 ha, of which, however, only 418,858 ha was agricultural land. The new beneficiaries acquired 1,800,782 ha of land, of which 868,601 ha was agricultural.¹⁹⁵

(3) Land reform and the House of Liechtenstein

The Czechoslovak land reform carried out after 1918 also affected the Liechtensteins’ property. The princely house was against its implementation, arguing that the prince was the head of a foreign country. Initially, the Czechoslovak government was unsure of what approach to take. Nevertheless, on 15 August 1920, the prime minister, Vlastimil Tusar gave a speech in the National Assembly stating that the landed property of the prince of Liechtenstein was subject to the general rules of land reform.¹⁹⁶

Losses and compensation

In the newly founded Czechoslovakia of 1918, the Liechtensteins (or rather the ruling prince) owned a total of 160,000 ha of land (excluding Velké Losiny/Gross-Ullersdorf). Because of the land reform they had to give up approximately 91,000 hectares, 57,000 ha of which was forestry and 34,000 ha was agricultural land. This was the equivalent of 5% of all of the land expropriated in Czechoslovakia as part of the land reform. Nevertheless, in Czechoslovakia in 1938, they still

¹⁹⁵ Cf. Pavel, Antonín: *Československá pozemková reforma*. In: *Pozemková reforma* 19, 1938, no. 3, pp. 33–39.

¹⁹⁶ Keller-Giger, Susanne: *Zwei Länder – ein Fürstenhaus. Ein Beitrag zur wechselvollen Geschichte der Beziehungen zwischen dem Fürstentum Liechtenstein und den böhmischen Ländern, der Tschechoslowakei und der Tschechischen Republik*. In: Keller-Giger, Susanne – Quaderer, Rupert: *Das Fürstentum Liechtenstein, die böhmischen Länder und die Tschechoslowakei. Geschichte der zwischenstaatlichen Beziehungen*. Vaduz 2013, pp. 9–197, here p. 44 f.

owned landed estates totalling 69,000 ha, mainly forestry areas; their agricultural land covered only occasional farms.¹⁹⁷

Following the sequestration of property it was forbidden to transfer ownership and be subject to easement. However, the owner could continue to manage his existing estates. In one of the first actions, the property could be bought by its long-term tenants. In 1919 and 1920, the Princely House of Liechtenstein sold a total of 4,000 ha of land to these tenants, in two further actions these were smaller parcels and construction areas totalling 160 hectares. They were paid higher prices for this property than was later fixed for the property taken by the state¹⁹⁸

After the actual land reform began in 1921, agricultural land was the first to be confiscated, then forest. The Liechtenstein estates administration negotiated throughout the twenties and even the thirties with the Czechoslovakian land office on the respective conditions. This concerned the size of the areas and compensations. The princely family handed over 65,530 ha directly to the Land Office, including 20,340 ha agricultural land and 45,190 ha woodland. The state paid compensation of 121.3 million Czechoslovakian crowns (47.9 million crowns for the agricultural land, 73.4 million crowns for forest). However, only around 80 million crowns were paid to the princes from the total compensation of 121.3 million crowns, around 19 million crowns remained blocked in the Czechoslovakian Postal savings bank (Postsparkasse); in 1945 moreover around 20 million crowns in compensation were still outstanding from the land reform.

Conditions were attached to the assets the Liechtensteins were permitted to keep: they were to see to the preservation of natural beauty spots and architectural monuments, namely palaces and castles; pension costs were to be borne for pensioners and active employees (all together around 2,000 persons), in 1930 estimated at 40.2 million crowns, likewise patronage costs were to be covered for churches and parishes.

¹⁹⁷ The data here often varies, cf. Löffle, Josef: *Die Verwaltung der Herrschaften und Güter der Fürsten von Liechtenstein in den böhmischen Ländern von der Mitte des 18. Jahrhunderts bis 1948*. In: Merki, Christoph Maria – Löffle, Josef: *Das Haus Liechtenstein in den böhmischen Ländern vom Mittelalter bis ins 20. Jahrhundert – Güter, Rechte, Verwaltung*. Vaduz 2013, pp. 169–372, here p. 195. – Horčíčka, Vaclav: *Die Konfiskationen des Eigentums des Fürsten von Liechtenstein in der Tschechoslowakei*. In: *Liechtensteinisch-Tschechische Historikerkommission* (eds.): *Das Fürstenhaus, der Staat Liechtenstein und die Tschechoslowakei im 20. Jahrhundert*, Vaduz 2013, pp. 81–91.

¹⁹⁸ Cf. Löffle, Josef: *Die Verwaltung der Herrschaften und Güter der Fürsten von Liechtenstein in den böhmischen Ländern von der Mitte des 18. Jahrhunderts bis 1948*. In: Merki, Christoph Maria – Löffle, Josef: *Das Haus Liechtenstein in den böhmischen Ländern vom Mittelalter bis ins 20. Jahrhundert – Güter, Rechte, Verwaltung*. Vaduz 2013, pp. 169–372, here p. 196.

After fideicommissum was abolished in Czechoslovakia in 1924, in 1925 the existing fideicommissum estates were transferred to the private ownership of the reigning prince. A family foundation looked after the family members from 1929 onwards. Prince Johann II died in 1929; after this considerable sums in inheritance tax were due.

All in all, the land reforms meant losses for the Liechtensteins of more than half their property and at the same time a significant decrease in income. This signalled the start of the economic problems which the princely house faced until the 1960s.¹⁹⁹

Case study: Kostelec nad Černými lesy (Schwarzkostelez)

To the south-east of Prague, the prince owned the large estate of Kostelec nad Černými lesy (Schwarzkostelitz), to which parts of the estates in Uhříněves/Aurinowes and in Škvorec/Skworetz also belonged. With an area of approximately 12,000 ha, it was one of the prince's largest estates. With the first land reform – and with regard to its structure – this was reduced by a good 8,600 ha.

Firstly, the entire unit was sequestrated. Afterwards, the Land Office gradually took individual measures; the appropriate parts of the estate were taken from them and distributed to interested parties. Other parts of the estate were sold by the prince, parts were released from confiscation and returned to the ownership of the prince. Nine farms situated in Kostelec, the sizes of which ranged from 140 to 280 ha, which had been worked by tenants, were taken by the Land Office. The total was 1,500 ha. Small plots were left to tenants, small farmers and landless farmers. Farms of between 50 and 140 ha became residual estates, which in 1923 were sold either to local tenants or public institutions.

From 1925 the individual forest parts in Jevany/Jewan (belonging to Kostelec nad Černými lesy) were divided and sold by the prince. These parcels were smaller in size, between 30 ares to 1.5 ha. There were negotiations about the larger forest areas between the Land Office, the individual municipalities and the prince after 1928. In total 40 towns and municipalities expressed interest in the allocation of landed property. From 1930 on, the prince's forests within Kostelec nad Černými lesy were nationalised indefinitely, covering a total area of more than 4,400 ha.

¹⁹⁹ Merki, Christoph Maria: *Liechtensteinische Güter und Rechte in Böhmen, Mähren und Schlesien vom Spätmittelalter bis ins 20. Jahrhundert. Zur Besitzgeschichte der grenzüberschreitenden Dynastie Liechtenstein*. In: Merki, Christoph Maria – Löffle, Josef: *Das Haus Liechtenstein in den böhmischen Ländern vom Mittelalter bis ins 20. Jahrhundert – Güter, Rechte, Verwaltung*. Vaduz 2013, pp. 9–167, here pp. 133 ff.

The example presented here based on the case of the large estate of Kostelec nad Černými lesy, occurred to a large extent across the whole republic (depending on the type of estate, as estates with fields and fewer farmsteads and forests were more liable to be affected).²⁰⁰

The question of sovereignty

The question of Liechtenstein sovereignty played an important role in 1918 when applying the Czechoslovak land reforms to the property of the prince. Attempts by the prince and the government of the Principality of Liechtenstein, with diplomatic support from Switzerland, to have the sovereignty of Liechtenstein recognised, were ignored. Requests from Liechtenstein to open a consulate in Prague were rejected. Neither were they able to participate at the Paris peace conference, as a result of the urging of the Czechoslovak minister of foreign affairs, Edvard Beneš. Liechtenstein's attempt to be represented by Switzerland was likewise rejected in Prague.²⁰¹

It was only in 1935 that the Czechoslovak authorities declared internally that the land reform on the Liechtenstein estates was complete. When the issue was reopened in May 1938 and Liechtenstein asked again to be recognized and to be represented in its interests by Switzerland, the Czechoslovak government agreed. Thus in July 1938, after two decades of delay, the Principality of Liechtenstein was recognised as a sovereign state. However, subsequent events – the Munich Agreement, the occupation, the establishment of the Protectorate of Bohemia and Moravia, the outbreak of World War Two, liberation in 1945 – meant that the progress in the relations between the Czechoslovak Republic and the Principality of Liechtenstein achieved in July 1938 was once again shelved. For in May 1945 the Czechoslovakian government had no wish to resume the state of affairs reached in 1938.

²⁰⁰ Susanne Keller-Giger examined this issue using sources from the Czech archives. Cf. Keller-Giger, Susanne: *Bodenreform vor Souveränität*. In: Liechtensteinisch-Tschechische Historikerkommission (eds.): *Das Fürstenhaus, der Staat Liechtenstein und die Tschechoslowakei im 20. Jahrhundert*, Vaduz 2013, pp. 43–52, here p. 52; Keller-Giger, Susanne: *Zwei Länder – ein Fürstenhaus. Ein Beitrag zur wechselvollen Geschichte der Beziehungen zwischen dem Fürstentum Liechtenstein und den böhmischen Ländern, der Tschechoslowakei und der Tschechischen Republik*. In: Keller-Giger, Susanne – Quaderer, Rupert: *Das Fürstentum Liechtenstein, die böhmischen Länder und die Tschechoslowakei. Geschichte der zwischenstaatlichen Beziehungen*. Vaduz 2013, pp. 17–182.

²⁰¹ Cf. also Beattie, David: *Liechtenstein's campaign for international recognition 1919–1922*. Conference lecture in Olomouc 2010. (In print.)

Attempts to regain and protect the princely estates 1938–1945

With the Munich Agreement and the subsequent occupation of the Czechoslovak border areas by Germany, a considerable part of the prince's remaining estates fell under the control of the Third Reich. After the occupation of the remainder of Czechoslovakia, i.e. its Bohemian and Moravian parts, and the establishment of the Protectorate of Bohemia and Moravia, these estates were also subject to the occupying German power.

From October 1938 until the spring of 1941, the prince tried to either regain some of his estates which he had lost to the Czechoslovak land reform, or to receive compensation or increased sales prices. These efforts, as well as attempts to re-purchase property, were unsuccessful.

From 1943 on, the course of the war led the prince, the princely house and the government of Liechtenstein to fear for Liechtenstein estates in a restored Czechoslovakia after the war and perhaps also in Austria in the event that the Czechoslovak government, under sovjet influence, would act in a confiscatory manner against the Germans and in case the Red Army would also occupy Austria and a corresponding government would come to power. Prince Franz Josef II attempted a counteroffensive by seeking contact with the western Allies and with Swiss representatives. In December 1944 the Liechtenstein diplomatic mission was reopened in Bern, having been closed since 1933. The prince also tried to place a Liechtenstein attaché in the Swiss embassy in Prague. However, all of these undertakings proved to be in vain.²⁰²

(4) State intervention in 1945: National Administration, confiscation, nationalisation

The first part of this subchapter will present the general legal framework surrounding the seizure, confiscation and nationalisation of property based on President Edvard Beneš's Decrees together with the government, and in the following section there will be an evaluation of their application to the property of the prince of Liechtenstein, other members of this family and other state nationals of the Principality of Liechtenstein.

In April 1944, President Beneš gave a speech from exile in London where he discussed property measures against the German population living on the territory

²⁰² Cf. Geiger, Peter: *Kriegszeit. Liechtenstein 1939 bis 1945*. Zürich 2010. Vol. 2, pp. 240–244, 268 ff.

of the former Czechoslovakia. The *Košice Government Programme* of April 1945 then defined the completion of the land reform in favour of Czech and Slovak farmers and at the expense of the German and Hungarian inhabitants. The programme dealt with retribution, actual and historical culpability, a radical solution of the issue on Czech-German relations involving confiscation and expulsion, economic renewal and reconstruction as well as national/ethnic transformation of society and economy.

Preparation

The roots of the post-war intervention in private property can be seen during the course of the war, both in the home resistance and the resistance abroad (in London and Moscow). Views on how to solve the German question became radicalised after the intensification of Nazi repression, particularly with the home (Czechoslovak) resistance (and, paradoxically, greater with the non-communist resistance than the communist).²⁰³

The main political document which pointed the way forward after the Second World War was the *Košice Government Programme* of 5 April 1945 (XVI chapters), which was drawn up mainly by the Communist Party while representatives of the democratic parties only managed to push through a few corrections. It looked in detail at the German and Hungarian minorities as well as their property (chapters VIII, X, XI and XII), chapter XI dealing specifically with land reform and chapter XII looked at economic reform and briefly at the issue of nationalisation. In the end the later decrees to do with confiscation transcended the framework set by the government programme, which apparently was due to the influence of the legislature of the Slovak National Council (SNR)

National Administration

The legal basis for the post-war intervention into enemy property was laid out in the Czech lands by a presidential decree of 19 May 1945 no. 5 Coll., *on the invalidity of some transactions involving property rights from the time of loss of freedom and concerning the National Administration of the property of Germans, Hungarians, traitors and collaborators and certain organisations and institutions*. This document was based on the constitutional decree of 3 August 1944 no. 11 of the Official Journal of Czechoslovakia *on the reform of legal order* and dealt with similar issues to the decree of 1 February 1945 no. 2 of the Official Journal of

²⁰³ Cf. *Cesta ke Květnu. Vznik lidové demokracie v Československu do února 1948*. Vols. I–II. Prague 1965; Vondrová, Jitka (ed.): *Češi a sudetoněmecká otázka 1939–1945*. Dokumenty. Prague 1994.

Czechoslovakia *on the emergency measures to ensure economic life in the liberated territory*, which had been drafted in exile since 1942 and which has been, at the same time, replaced by Decree Nr. 5.

Decree no. 5/1945 Coll. had two different objectives – to secure the property in question one the one hand and restitution as well as correcting past injustices on the other hand. § 1 of the decree stated that all property transfers and any acts concerning property rights, dealing with moveable or immoveable, public or private property, were invalid if they had been carried out after 29 September 1938 under pressure from the occupation or national, racial or political persecution. This applied to property which had been confiscated as a result of Aryanisation or Germanisation measures (confiscations, forced auctions) as well as property from forced contracts. The definitive legislation on restitution was an act from 16 May 1946 no. 128 Coll., *on the invalidity of certain legal-proprietary proceedings from the period of lack of freedom and the claims emerging from this invalidity and from other interventions into property rights*.

The second objective of the decree no. 5/1945 Coll. was preliminary seizure of property which was then to be subject to state intervention – land reform, confiscation or nationalisation. The legal instrument of “National Administration” was established to deal with this matter. This did not yet entail the transfer of the right of ownership, rather it restricted the scope of exercising this right. It applied mainly to the property of “publicly unreliable persons of the state” (§ 2), and National Administration was also applied to businesses (factories) where it was necessary for the smooth running of production and economic life (§ 3).

In § 4 officially unreliable persons were listed as: a) persons of German or Hungarian nationality, and b) persons who carried out activities against the sovereignty, independence, integrity, democratic and republican organisation, safety and defence of the Czechoslovak Republic, who incited such acts or intentionally supported the German and Hungarian occupiers in any way. § 4 under letter b) listed those organisations whose members were deemed to be unreliable persons of the state. § 6 of the decree considered Germans and Hungarians to be “people who had chosen German or Hungarian nationality” in any census since 1929, or who had become members of national groups, formations or political parties encompassing German and Hungarian nationals (this corresponds with § 2 of decree no. 12/1945 Coll.).

With decree no. 5/1945 Coll. (enforced from the day of its announcement, i.e. 23 May 1945), legal transactions of the owners, holders and administrators of property placed under National Administration were invalid, and these persons were obliged to refrain from intervening in the negotiations of the National Administration (§ 20). If any of the provisions of the decrees were violated, in particular

interference in the legitimate activity of the National Administration, this constituted an offence that was to be punished with up to five years' imprisonment and a fine of up to ten million crowns or complete or partial confiscation of property (§ 26). The appropriate court carried out the library registration of the National Administration notes in the Land Registers (§ 15).

The Košice/Kaschau government envisaged all decrees as being the nationwide (Czechoslovakian) standard, and in this sense the decree of 19 May 1945 included specific provisions reflecting the position of the Slovak National Council. This Council, however, then gave no consent to nationwide legal effectiveness. One contentious issue was Jewish restitution, which was controversial owing to the Aryanisation measures undertaken by Slovak authorities during the war. Eventually the Slovak National Council issued its own regulation on National Administration on 5 June 1945 no. 50 of the Collection of Regulations of the SNC (hereinafter Coll. SNC).

Confiscation based on decrees no. 12 and no. 10

The post-war confiscation in the Czech lands²⁰⁴ was mainly carried out on the basis of a decree from 21 June 1945 no. 12 Coll., *on the confiscation and expedited allotment of agricultural property of Germans and Hungarians as well as traitors and enemies of the Czech and Slovak nation*, and a decree from 25 October no. 108 Coll., *on the confiscation of enemy property and on the Funds of National Restoration*.²⁰⁵

²⁰⁴ Several months before the adoption of the nationwide regulations in Slovakia, they applied their own legislation which to a significant degree (particular for the question of confiscation exemptions for ethnic Germans who had taken an active part in the antifascist resistance) influenced legislation in the Czech lands (see Cambel, Samuel: *Slovenská agrárna otázka 1944–1948. O dvoch polohách agrárnej revolúcie na Slovensku, v českých krajinách a problém generálnej pozemkovej reformy*. Bratislava 1972, pp. 40 ff., 62 ff.). This was a directive from the presidium of the SNC (Slovak National Council) *On the confiscation and expedited allotment of the agricultural property of Germans, Hungarians and traitors and enemies of the Slovak nation* from 27 February 1945 no. 4 Coll. SNC, later the revised regulations of the SNC from 23 August 1945 no. 104 and from 14 May 1946 no. 64 Coll. SNC, which led to the expansion of the those to be confiscated to include legal entities and all ethnic Hungarians, regardless of citizenship (according to the original regulation, property of up to 50 ha was not subject to confiscation for ethnic Hungarians who had Czechoslovak citizenship on 1 November 1938). Decree no. 108/1945 Coll. had nationwide validity and had been prepared in agreement with the SNC. More detail in Šutaj, Štefan – Mosný, Peter – Olejník, Milan: *Prezidentské dekréty Edvarda Beneša v povojnovom Slovensku*. Bratislava 2002; Beňa, Jozef: *Slovensko a Benešove dekréty*. Bratislava 2002; Šutaj, Štefan (ed.): *Dekrétý Edvarda Beneša v povojnovom období*. Prešov 2004.

²⁰⁵ For a legal comparison of the confiscation decrees cf. Knapp, Viktor: *Osídlovací právo hmotné*. Prague 1949.

Both regulations were based on similar principles and had many features in common, but at the same time were different in some essential respects: the first concerned agricultural property, and had two different legislative goals – repressive and reforming; the second one had a largely repressive character for all the other types of property. Their preparation and implementation fell under the Ministry of Agriculture (Julius Ďuriš) and the Ministry of the Interior (Václav Nosek), which had been strategically occupied by the Communist Party.

The decrees themselves were a problem from a technical-legislative perspective (and most criticised by contemporary historians). They were issued in a hurry, they were not linked to general legislation or even to each other, and they dealt with key issues in different ways. Decree no. 12 in particular represented a loose framework which had to be developed further. This happened through official explanatory commentaries from the Ministry of Agriculture, although even these were subject to criticism. Decree no. 108 was more thoroughly prepared. The judicial decisions of the (Supreme) Administrative Court also had an important role to play.²⁰⁶

Confiscation occurred directly from the decree (*ex lege*) and with immediate effect (i.e. the date of publication, which for agricultural property was 23 June 1945, for non-agricultural property, 30 October 1945). Confiscation by definition implies that compensation was not offered, although both decrees nevertheless further emphasised this.

According to decree no. 12, agricultural property was confiscated for the purposes of land reform from:

- 1) all ethnic Germans and Hungarians, regardless of citizenship, apart from those persons who actively participated in the struggle for the preservation of the integrity and liberation of the Czechoslovak Republic;
- 2) traitors and enemies of the Republic of whatever nationality and citizenship, particularly those who expressed their hostility during the crisis and during the war from 1938 to 1945 (the categories were mentioned in § 3 para. 1 and the corresponding definitions in decree no. 108)
- 3) shareholder companies and other companies and corporations whose administrations intentionally and knowingly served the German war effort or fascist and Nazi goals.

According to decree no. 108, all property was to be confiscated from

²⁰⁶ Cf. Mikule, Vladimír: *Dekrety prezidenta republiky o postavení Němců a jejich dnešní právní význam*. In: Jech, Karel (ed.): *Němci a Maďaři v dekretch prezidenta republiky*. Studie a dokumenty 1940–1945. Prague – Brno 2003, in particular pp. 76–82.

1) the German Reich, the Hungarian Kingdom, public corporations, the NSDAP (Nazi Party), Hungarian political parties and other German and Hungarian juristic persons;

2) individuals of German or Hungarian “nationality”, with the exception of those persons who can prove that they remained loyal to the Czechoslovak Republic and that they had not committed at any time offences against the Czech and Slovak nations, and furthermore, had either taken part in the liberation of Czechoslovakia or had been subject to Nazi or fascist terror;

3) individuals who had carried out activities against the sovereignty, independence, integrity, democratic and republican organisation, safety and defence of the Czechoslovak Republic, who incited such acts or consciously observed other persons doing so, or who intentionally supported the German and Hungarian occupiers in any way, or who during the period of greatest threat to the Republic (according to § 18 of decree no. 16/1945 Coll., the period from 21 May 1938 to 31 December 1946) favoured Germanisation or Hungarisation on the territory of the Czechoslovak Republic, or were hostile to the Czechoslovak Republic or to the Czech or Slovak nations; also individuals or legal persons who tolerated such activities by people administering their property or business.

Collective responsibility, conditions of exoneration

The confiscation decrees were based on the principle of the collective responsibility of ethnic Germans and Hungarians, now expressed as a general legal rule, regardless of the person’s individual guilt. There were two different confiscation regimes for the property of Germans and Hungarians and for the property of other nationalities, which differed in the presumption of guilt and the conditions of exoneration.

When defining the conditions of *exculpation* (exoneration), or for exceptions from confiscation for ethnic Germans and Hungarians, decree no. 12/1945 Coll. (§ 1 para. 2) was stricter than the later decree on the state citizenship of these persons, no. 33/1945 Coll., (§ 2 para. 1) or the confiscation decree no. 108/1945 (§ 1 para. 1 no. 2). While in the last two regulations they allowed exceptions for people who “remained loyal to the Czechoslovak Republic and had not committed offences against the Czech and Slovak nations, and had either taken part in the liberation of Czechoslovakia or had been subject to Nazi or fascist terror”, according to decree no. 12 such exception was only for people who “actively participated in the struggle for the preservation of the integrity and liberation of the Czechoslovak Republic”. There was, therefore, the paradoxical situation, and one which is difficult to comprehend given the tragedy of the world war, that even Jewish persons of German

ethnicity had their agricultural property confiscated despite having lived through the concentration camps.²⁰⁷

It would undoubtedly be interesting to examine further the political behaviour of the German-speaking and Czech-speaking (and, of course, “mixed”) staff on the Liechtenstein estates from 1933, and in particular during the period of occupation between 1938 and 1945. Such research may face the challenge of difficult access to relevant sources

“German and Hungarian Nationality”

According to § 2 of decree no. 12/1945 Coll., persons are considered to be of German or Hungarian “nationality” who declared their German or Hungarian “nationality” in any census after 1929, or if they became members of national groups, formations or political parties encompassing German and Hungarian nationals. According to § 2 para. 2, exceptions from this definition would be based on a special decree. From discussions about the decree in government as well as requests from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs as part of interdepartmental comment procedures, it emerges that it should have included members of allied and neutral states and persons of Jewish origin.²⁰⁸ However, this related legislation, which would have mitigated the unsuitable (in the case of members of allied states) or cruel (for persons of Jewish origin) application of the decree, was never issued.

In addition, judicial decisions (until 1949) had concluded that registration of “nationality” in the census according to § 2 para. 1 had only been a decisive criterion if the person had registered as German or Hungarian “nationality”. Registering as a “nationality” other than German or Hungarian, “*whether Czech, Slovak or any other, particularly Jewish*”, was not in itself “*sufficient proof of nationality*” and it was “*therefore necessary to always investigate these people to see whether through their lifestyle, behaviour and demeanour they did not express sufficiently their inner feeling of belonging to the German or Hungarian nation in a different way.*”²⁰⁹

The implementation of confiscatio

The designation of people whose property was to be confiscated would be done through a public announcement which was hung on the notice board of the dis-

²⁰⁷ Cf. Knapp, Viktor: *Osídlovací právo hmotné*. Prague 1949, esp. pp.150–153.

²⁰⁸ Cf. Jech, Karel (ed.): *Němci a Maďaři v dekretech prezidenta republiky. Studie a dokumenty 1940–1945*. Prague – Brno 2003, pp. 278–280.

²⁰⁹ Boh. adm. 2013/48. In: *Bobuslavovova sbírka nálezů správního soudu ve věcech administrativních. Year 29. Findings from 1948 (1805–2033)*. Prague 1949, pp. 525–526.

strict national committee where the confiscated land was situated, or by another method, usually within these municipalities. This designation was also linked with ascertaining the German or Hungarian “nationality” of the owners and other conditions of confiscation. However, while decree no. 108 contained explicit modifying provisions regarding the confiscation regulation (§ 1 para. 1 no. 4), decree no. 12 was doing so insufficient (cf. § 1 para. 3, § 3 para. 2).

Agricultural property which was subject to confiscation was described in decree no. 12 (§ 4) as agricultural and forestry land, the buildings and equipment that are part of it, factories from the agricultural industry, moveable appurtenance (livestock and equipment) and all rights associated with the holding of confiscated property or part thereof. This scope of application was partly modified by official notes. Fishponds were also considered to be agricultural property. However, residential houses and villas with a garden of 1000 m² were not considered as agricultural property.²¹⁰ According to decree no. 108 (§ 1 para. 1), property which had not been confiscated as belonging to agricultural property included immovable and movable property, included immoveables, personal property and property rights (such as receivables, securities, deposits, intellectual property), with the exception (§ 2 para. 1) of personal property which was necessary for covering the needs for life or for the personal pursuit of the employment of disabled people and members of their families (such as clothing, duvets, linen, domestic tools, food and machines).

The confiscated agricultural property was administered by the National Land Fund, established by the Ministry of Agriculture, until it was surrendered to the beneficiaries. For all other property there was the funds for National Restoration, established at the settlement funds in Prague and Bratislava.

Distribution of confiscated property

The two decrees (§ 7–13 of decree no. 12 and § 6–14 of decree no. 108) also regulated the distribution of confiscated property. The issue of distribution and compensation (for agricultural property) was regulated in more detail by the decree from 20 July 1945 no. 28/1945 Coll., *concerning the settlement of Czech, Slovak or other Slavic farmers on the agricultural land of Germans, Hungarians and other enemies of the state*, which represented the second key legal regulation from the first phase of land reform. The issue of non-agricultural distribution was dealt with in act no. 31/1947 Coll., *concerning several principles applying when dividing*

²¹⁰ Hoffmann, Josef: *Konfiskace nepřátelského majetku a osídlení*. Konfiskace a osídlení zemědělské půdy nepřátelské. In: *Nové zákony a nařízení Československé republiky, 1945*, year. 7, nos. 3–4, pp. 329 f.

enemy property, as well as by governmental rulings, in particular no. 106/1947 Coll., *concerning the distribution of confiscated small businesses*. The decrees were accompanied by a series of other regulations, often of an internal character.²¹¹

The scope of confiscatio

In Czechoslovakia as a whole 2,946,395 ha of land was confiscated, of which 1,651,016 ha was agricultural land. In the Czech/Bohemian lands, a total of 2,400,449 ha of land was confiscated, of which 1,405,070 ha was agricultural land (in the borderlands 1,955,076 ha, of which 1,306,941 ha was agricultural). Smaller beneficiaries received 1,037,255 ha of mainly agricultural land and the remaining 1,360, 224 ha (mostly forestry) was kept by the state or was divided among public institutions and corporations. Unlike in the Czech lands, in Slovakia the process of confiscating and distributing land was slower. Of the 578,638 ha which was subject to confiscation, by 1948 only approximately 72,000 ha of land had in fact been confiscated and distributed. This accelerated after February 1948 and by 1 March 1949, 545,946 ha of land had been confiscated, with smaller beneficiaries receiving 183,463 ha. More than 5,000 industrial companies were also confiscated that were not subject to nationalisation and a large amount of other property (homes, valuables, etc.).²¹²

Nationalisation

Nationalisation was enacted over two main stages (October 1945 and April-May 1948). In 1945 the vital areas of the economy were nationalised: mines and important industrial enterprises, the food industry, banks and private insurers, followed by small and medium-sized businesses after the Communist coup in 1948.

The first phase of nationalisation was carried out mainly on the basis of decrees from 24 October 1945, nos. 100 to 103 Coll. (no. 100, *concerning the nationalisation of the mines and certain industrial enterprises*; no. 101, *concerning the nationalisation of certain enterprises in the food industry*; no. 102, *concerning the nationalisation of banks*, and no. 103 *concerning the nationalisation of private insurers*). When legislating for nationalisation, expropriation dominated (compen-

²¹¹ For the distribution of confiscated property Knapp, Viktor: *Osídlovací právo hmotné*. Prague 1949, esp. pp.191–274.

²¹² Cf. Lacina, Vlastislav: *Pozemková reforma v Lidově demokratické Československé republice*. In: *Zápas o pozemkovou reformu v ČSR*. Prague 1963, pp. 216–219 and 230–232; Lhota, Václav: *Znárodnění v Československu 1945–1948*. Prague 1987, p. 231.

sation given), but there was also scope for confiscation as enemy property was nationalised without compensation.²¹³

Although the *Košice/Kaschau Government Programme* of April 1945 did not legislate for nationalisation in detail, the parties of the National Front supported this project and it had already been discussed both by the resistance at home and in exile. Understandably, post-war society welcomed nationalisation, as it did in many other countries, including in western Europe. However, the whole project was accompanied by a series of disputes relating to the scope and speed of nationalisation, as well as the question of compensation, etc.²¹⁴

From June 1945 all of the relevant ministries drew up their own plans, though the key position fell to the Ministry of Industry, headed by the Social Democrat Bohumil Laušman, who organised the nationalisation of the mines and other vital industrial enterprises. The nationalisation of the food industry fell under the Ministry of Food, the decrees concerning the nationalisation of finance (banking and private insurers) fell under the Ministry of Finance.

Although the decrees were based on a unified idea, each of them had their own specific characteristics: decree no. 100/1945 Coll., became a model from a legislative-technical perspective as it legislated for a series of common issues, and the other decrees merely referred to it.

In some cases the decrees applied to all of the enterprises of a specific kind (mines, banks, insurers), for the majority, though, nationalisation was limited by the number of employees or the volume of production. The limit was usually set at above 500 employees, in some cases above 400, 200 or 150 employees, for the majority the decisive time period was the years 1938–1940.

Nationalisation took a special form of state ownership. Nationalised businesses were transformed into national enterprises as independent legal bodies: they operated independently of the government so the state did not guarantee their obligations, but they were required to give part of their profits to the state budget. Nationalisations took place as a rule with compensation being paid. The amount was to correspond to the general price recorded according to official prices on the day the decree was announced, or according to the official estimate minus liabilities. Compensation was the remit of the competent minister in agreement with the Minister of Finance (in Slovakia with the appropriate representatives).

²¹³ For more details see Kuklík, Jan: *Československé zákonodárství ve vztahu k Německu a osobám německé národnosti v letech 1940–1948*. In: Pešek, Jiří (ed.): *Německé menšiny v právních normách 1938–1948. Československo ve srovnání s vybranými evropskými zeměmi*. Brno – Praha 2006, pp. 120 f., documents 172 f.

²¹⁴ See also Hlušíčková, Růžena (ed.): *Znárodnění 1945*. Vols. 1–2. Prague 1982.

According to Václav Lhota, as part of the first stage of nationalisation, 2,475 industrial enterprises were brought under state control (2,287 in the Ministry of Industry and 188 in the Ministry of Food) and incorporated (on 1 February 1948) into 327 national enterprises (205 in the Ministry of Industry and 122 in the Ministry of Food); though other researchers give even higher figures, usually around 3,348 enterprises/technical units (most recently by Václav Průcha and Jan Kuklík).²¹⁵

Legal issues

There were certain legal controversies surrounding the post-war intervention in ownership relations, in particular the issue of the transfer of ownership of property. As a result of the social changes after 1990, some contentious legal issues (connected to confiscation) were reopened and examined in specialist journals (e.g. Viktor Knapp, who since 1945 had looked at this theme academically, partially revising his former opinions).²¹⁶

1) In the literature and the legal decisions of the time, the opinion predominates that intervention (confiscation and nationalisation) as well as the acquisition of ownership derived directly by law (*ex lege* and *ex tunc*).²¹⁷ However, the determination of the legal norms for confiscation and nationalization do not provide us with a clear answer to the question of when the transfer of ownership took in fact place and what role the decisions of the state authorities had. Austrian and then Czechoslovak law was established on the principle of intabulation and a two-phase acquisition of ownership (§ 321, 423–425, 431 and 444 *ABGB*), and so there are two possibilities to be considered: 1. either goods are acquired through confiscation and nationalization exclusively based on legal grounds and for the transfer of ownership the take-over of legal possession, usually by registration into public books (Intabulation) was required in addition, or 2. the state acquired directly *ex lege* the natural ownership without requiring intabulation, which then

²¹⁵ Cf. Lhota, Václav: *Znárodnění v Československu 1945–1948*. Prague 1987, pp. 206–211; Průcha, Václav et al.: *Hospodářské a sociální dějiny Československa 1918–1992*. Vol 2. Brno 2009, pp. 94 and 103; Kuklík, Jan: *Znárodněné Československo. Od znárodnění k privatizaci – státní zásahy do vlastnických a dalších majetkových práv v Československu a jinde v Evropě*. Prague 2010, pp. 322 ff..

²¹⁶ Cf. esp.. Kindl, Milan – Knapp, Viktor: *K některým otázkám konfiskace podle dekretů prezidenta republiky č. 12 a č. 108/1945 Sb.* Právník 133, 1994, no. 7, pp. 620–628, and a related polemic by Eliáš, Karel: *Ještě jednou k některým otázkám konfiskace podle dekretů prezidenta republiky č. 12/1945 Sb. a č. 108/1945 Sb.* Právník 133, 1994, no. 11, pp. 971–980.

²¹⁷ For the legal basis of confiscation, cf. Knapp, Viktor: *Osídlovací právo hmotné*. Prague 1949, esp. pp. 150–153, esp. pp. 154–164; on nationalisation cf. Nešpor, Zdeněk: *Znárodnění dolů a průmyslu*. Tome 1, Proces znárodnovací. Prague 1948, esp. pp. 17–38.

only had a declaratory character. The second alternative (following the opinions of Professor Randa), eventually prevailed.²¹⁸

2) Historically, as well as more recently, there have been discussions on the necessity and effects of an official decision, as to whether the conditions for confiscation or nationalisation were met whether it was a constitutive, declaratory or only informing (registration) act. Historically, at that time the prevailing opinion tended to be that it was a declaratory decision and its issuance was necessary only in cases of doubt (an announcement, for example, sufficed)²¹⁹ However, the situation was complicated by the fact that a different set of conditions for “persons of German and Hungarian nationality” on the one hand, and for “traitors and enemies of the Republic” on the other has been applied. In addition, some of the key substantive and procedural issues (e.g. delivery) were not addressed uniformly within the decree legislation.

However, we believe that for a change in ownership, a confiscation or nationalisation decree (although declaratory *ex tunc*) should have always been publicly issued (this is also related to the use of legal remedies and the legal control of the acts of administrative authorities by the judiciary).²²⁰

Nationality or Citizenship?

The issue of the relationship between “nationality” and “citizenship” brought many complications, particularly in practice. A publication from the Ministry of the Interior at the time stated that: “[...] *the decrees concerning the confiscation of property nos. 12/45 and 108/45 Coll., as well as the decree on National Administration no. 5/45 Coll., are based on the principle of ethnicity, which means that they relate to ethnic Germans regardless of their citizenship. [...] Consequently, confiscation would apply to the property of members of any state if they are of German ethnicity. However, to the extent as the notion of nationality as interpreted by us [i.e. in the then Czechoslovak Republic] does not correspond to the opinions prevailing in west Europe, where for instance citizenship also implies the determination of nationality, this may sometimes lead to unwelcome international difficulties, in particular if a member of a friendly or allied country is affected. That is why if such*

²¹⁸ Cf. Randa, Antonín: *Právo vlastnické dle rakouského práva v pořádku systematickém*. Prague 1922, pp. 194 ff.

²¹⁹ On confiscations cf. the decision of the (Supreme) Administrative Court dated 31 December 1946 (Boh. adm. 1512/46) and also by the High Court in Prague dated 28 June 1993 (sp. ref. 4 Cdo 40/92).

²²⁰ The only exceptions would be cases where the property had been directly individualised in a general legal regulation (such as in § 1 para. 1 no. 4 law no. 311/1948 Coll., where eight water Management companies had been explicitly mentioned).

cases arise, files on the relevant proceedings should be submitted to the Ministry of the Interior or the Ministry competent for this matter."²²¹

Furthermore, the attitudes of the state authorities to ethnic Germans or Hungarians that were nationals of allied or neutral states differed according to individual ministries. Eventually, even the Communist-controlled ministries of the interior and agriculture had different approaches. This can be seen in the reaction to a notice from the Ministry of the Interior dated 17 September 1945 no. Z-17827/1945, which established an exemption for Austrian citizens who were not to be considered as "Germans" according to the anti-German regulations if they had not committed an offence against Czechoslovakia or its allies. The Ministry of Agriculture tried to strictly limit the scope of application of this determination with a view to the confiscation of agricultural property.²²² The Ministry of the Interior issued another decree solely for its own department on 8 April 1946 no. 1700-28/3-46-107Vb/3 concerning the confiscation of property of ethnic German members of friendly and neutral states, clearly defining the question of guilt: Only if such persons according to § 1 para. 1 no. 3 of decree no. 108/1945 Coll. carried out "*activities against the sovereignty, independence, integrity, democratic and republican organisation, safety and defence of the Czechoslovak Republic*", their property was subject to confiscation²²³

(5) The National Administration and the confiscation of Liechtenstein landed property²²⁴

Based on the aforementioned decree no. 5 from 19 May 1945 and no. 12 of 21 June 1945, the Liechtenstein forestry and agricultural businesses were placed under National Administration on 26 June 1945 (the national administrator was Gustav Artner, a professor at the University of Agriculture in Brno [Brünn]). The Communist minister of agriculture, Julius Ďuriš, announced the imposition of enforced

²²¹ Cf. Šebestík, Josef – Lukeš, Zdeněk: *Přehled předpisů o Němcích a osobách považovaných za Němce*. Prague 1946. Section I. Interpretation, esp. p.12.

²²² Jech, Karel (ed.): *Němci a Maďaři v dekretech prezidenta republiky. Studie a dokumenty 1940–1945*. Prague – Brno 2003, p. 281.

²²³ For other statutory instruments concerning the decree cf. Jech, Karel (ed.): *Němci a Maďaři v dekretech prezidenta republiky. Studie a dokumenty 1940–1945*. Prague – Brno 2003, pp. 373–374.

²²⁴ On the whole issue especially Horčíčka, Václav: *Die Enteignungen von liechtensteinischem Vermögen in der Tschechoslowakei 1945 bis 1948*. In: Horčíčka, Václav – Marxer, Roland: *Liechtenstein und die tschechoslowakischen Konfiskationen von 1945. Vom Zweiten Weltkrieg bis zur Gegenwart*. Vaduz 2013, pp. 9–139.

administration already on the day before in a public appearance on 25 June, with special emphasis on the Liechtenstein case. Before decree no.12 had been issued, the Social Democratic prime minister, Zdeněk Fierlinger, announced on 8 June that the property of Germans, Hungarians, collaborators and traitors would be confiscated

Still in the first half of June 1945 the Liechtensteins had attempted to forestall the National Administration and confiscation. The central director of the prince's property administration, František Svoboda, visited the Ministry of Agriculture, and the Swiss consul general also intervened, with all members of the Czechoslovak government receiving a memorandum with detailed arguments from the Liechtenstein side.

Already at the end of July 1945, one month after the introduction of the forced Administration, all agricultural property was confiscated. Over a few days the district national committees gradually declared the confiscation of the estates lying in the territory of Bohemia, Moravia and Silesia. On 29 July 1945, the representatives of the Ministry of Agriculture and further state organs subdivided the confiscated land on the former Liechtenstein estate at Úvaly/Auwal in central Bohemia. On 31 July 1945 the district national committee in Olomouc/Olmütz informed the public about the confiscation of the prince's agricultural property. Subsequently in August and September 1945 the Central Directorate of State Forests and Farms took over the Liechtensteins' property, on behalf of the Ministry of Agriculture. The confiscated land was then to be transferred to individual cities, municipalities or other new owners. Naturally, this only occurred in certain individual cases. In 1945 the town of Český Brod/Böhmisch Brod received almost all of the forestry in Doubravčice/Doubrawtschitz from the former Úvaly estate, amounting to 845.75 ha. In 1949 the town of Břeclav/Lundenburg was given a castle and land of approximately 6 hectares. What had been to be considered as agricultural land, forestry, or as industrial enterprises and who was therefore competent for takeover and administration became the subject of disputes between the various governmental institutions, as was the case with the National Administration of the breweries in Břeclav and Lanškroun/Landskron.²²⁵

The National Administration was not capable of managing all estates entrusted to it. For this reason, on 2 February 1946 the Ministry of Agriculture formally transferred the Liechtensteins' property which was under National Administration and not subject to the Central Directorate of State Forests and Farms, to be

²²⁵ Horčíčka, Václav: *Die Enteignungen von liechtensteinischem Vermögen in der Tschechoslowakei 1945 bis 1948*. In: Horčíčka, Václav – Marxer, Roland: *Liechtenstein und die tschechoslowakischen Konfiskationen von 1945*, pp. 9–139, here pp. 54–56, 61 ff

managed by the National Land Fund. On 30 June 1948 – after the Communist coup – the central National Administration was dissolved.

The prince's castles were also confiscated, based on decree no. 12. With the exception of specifically designated cases, this property was passed on to be administered by the Central directorate of State Forests and Farms. The exceptions were the castles at Lednice (Eisgrub), Valtice (Feldsberg), Šternberk (Sternberg) and Úsov/Aussee. Along with the adjacent parks and gardens, these buildings were transferred to National Administration or to the National Land Fund. From 1946 until 1948 nearly all of the castles were overseen by the National Cultural Commission of the Ministry of Education.

The part of the prince's property that consisted of mines and industrial and craft enterprises, was confiscated in October 1945 on the basis of decree no. 100 from 24 October 1945. In August and September 1945, still based on decree no. 5, the Ministry of Industry decided to impose National Administration on wood-processing enterprises, coal mines and quarries. In November 1945, all of these enterprises were nationalised and integrated into the newly created large state enterprises.

Finally, the confiscation of the prince's personal property was concluded, which was valued at a total of 31.1 million crowns, with bank and insurance assets worth 12.1 million crowns and other property worth 19 million crowns.

(6) Confiscation affecting Liechtenstein citizens

The confiscation in Czechoslovakia did not only affect the property of the reigning prince, Franz Josef II, but also the entire property of seven members of the princely house and at least 31 other Liechtenstein nationals.

Therefore, as a result of the decrees from 1945, the prince along with at least 39 Liechtenstein people had their property placed under National Administration and then confiscated. Their names are listed below in alphabetical order together with some brief information on the property that was subject to confiscation ²²⁶

²²⁶ Material from the Office of Foreign Affairs (AAA), Vaduz, esp. “*List of the Families affected by the confiscation of the then Czechoslovakian Government, Updated by the Office of Foreign Affairs of the Principality of Liechtenstein as of November 2002*”. – Geiger, Peter: *Alle enteigneten liechtensteinischen Staatsangehörigen: Wer, was, wo? Was wurde aus dem enteigneten Besitz?* In: Liechtensteinisch-Tschechische Historikerkommission (ed.): *Das Fürstenthaus, der Staat Liechtenstein und die Tschechoslowakei im 20. Jahrhundert*. Vaduz 2013, pp. 185–198. – Horčíčka, Václav: *Die Enteignungen von liechtensteinischem Vermögen in der Tschechoslowakei 1945 bis 1948*. In: Horčíčka, Václav – Marxer, Roland: *Liechtenstein und die*

In regard to certain among the above mentioned persons it seems of interest to carry out further study of sources for example on how they obtained Liechtenstein citizenship in order to clarify their attitudes during the 1930s and the course of the war and the path of life they took afterwards.

1. Baroness Hedwig von Berg und Wurmbrand-Stuppach, née Thyssen (landed property in Šahy and Drienov, Krupinsko, altogether 2,990 ha, together with no. 38, see below).
2. Dr. Albert Bloch (bank assets).
3. Ida Brändle, née Kraus (stake in the “Golden Lion” hotel in Karlovy Vary/Karlsbad).
4. Marie de Charmant (20% stake in the Šurany sugar refinery in Velké Šurany, together with no. 5)
5. Pierre de Charmant (together with no. 4).
6. Baroness Antonia von Falz-Fein (jewellery, bank deposit in Nové Mesto nad Váhom).
7. Maria von Frankl (50% property interest in her father’s castle with a park and fields in Velké Šarovce)
8. Gertrud Hartmann, née Hilpert (50% property interest in her father’s business “Josef Hilpert Glasperlenfabrik” with fields around Nová Ves nad Nisou/Neudorf an der Neisse,).
9. Dorothea von Janotta (castle and estate in Štěmplevec, Opavsko, bank assets, government bonds, silver, a Baroque organ).
10. Baron Johann Alexander von Königswarter (Šebetov/Schebetau estate, ca. 4,000 ha, loans, bank assets, jewellery)
11. Prince Alois von Liechtenstein (castle and Velké Losiny (Gross-Ullersdorf estate, Šumpersko, ca. 5,800 ha, securities, property interest in nine companies).
12. Prince Franz Josef II von Liechtenstein (ca. 69,000 ha of landed property, castles and other buildings, 10 of his own businesses, property interest in 26 firms, securities, bank assets, works of art).
13. Prince Friedrich von Liechtenstein (securities).
14. Princess Irma von Liechtenstein (securities).
15. Prince Emanuel von Liechtenstein (together with Prince Hans, no. 16: Nové Zámky/Neuschloss and other land of ca. 2,000 ha in Zahrádky/Neugarten near České Lípy/Böhmisch Leipa).

tschechoslowakischen Konfiskationen von 1945. Vom Zweiten Weltkrieg bis zur Gegenwart. Vaduz 2013, pp. 9–139, here pp. 62 ff. – Varying numbers of persons concerned are due to different methods of compiling lists.

16. Prince Hans von Liechtenstein (together with no. 15).
17. Princess Ludmila von Liechtenstein, née von Lobkowitz (various landed property in Mělník-Pšovka, Hoštejn u Zábřehu/Hochstein bei Hohenstadt and Zabreh and Čížová u Písku, totalling ca. 5,300 ha).
18. Princess Olga von Liechtenstein (forestry and land with buildings in Vamberk/Wamberg, Bohemia, securities, bank assets).
19. Franziska Näscher, née Bartsch (inherited property in Opava/Troppau).
20. Dr. Hans Nissl (together with no. 21: apartment house in České Budějovice/Budweis, securities).
21. Renate Nissl (together with no. 20).
22. Alfred Nietzsche (together with nos. 23 and 24: property in Karlovy Vary/Karlsbad, agricultural holdings in Horní Slavkov, residential house and razor factory “Rasierklingenfabrik Diu A. Nietzsche”).
23. Melanie Nietzsche (together with nos. 22. and 24).
24. Günther Nietzsche (also together with nos. 22 and 23).
25. Harriet Nottebohm (securities, together with no. 26).
26. Hermann Nottebohm (together with no. 25).
27. Baroness Maria von Reitzes-Marienwert (8.4 % share in a sugar refinery in Nitra/Neutra).
28. Adolf Risch (coal and wood shop in Piešťany/Pistyan).
29. Gertrud Schädler (securities).
30. Stefanie Marianne Schädler (securities).
31. Albin Seemann (property in Bratislava/Pressburg, deposit book).
32. Peter Seemann (also with no. 31).
33. Minka Strauss (property interest in the estate at Štrkovec, Šoporňa/Sokorno, 828 ha).
34. Olga Tomala (bonds, stocks).
35. Anton Wanger (securities, Škoda car).
36. Antonie Weiss (bank assets in Jablonec nad Nisou/Gablonz a. d. Neisse).
37. Count Ferdinand von Wilczek (property interest in coal enterprises in Ostrava/Troppau, securities).
38. Countess Mignon Wurmbrand-Stuppach (together with no. 1).
39. Max Egon zu Hohenlohe-Langenburg. (Not featured on the list of nos. 1–38, which was updated in 2002 by the Office of Foreign Affairs in aduz.)

(7) Arguments and counter-arguments

The mutual exchange of arguments started as early as June 1945. This exchange took a tough character while the Czechoslovak authorities created facts on the ground by the measures they took at the same time. These were typified by the intransigence of the Czechoslovak government bodies throughout the implementation of their laws. The Liechtenstein party put forward different objections and complaints concerning this approach, while the Czechoslovak side rejected them as being unjustified and justified the measures that they undertook. The arguments from both parties, which were repeatedly put forward on various occasions and in various contexts, are presented in the following table (without commentary).²²⁷

²²⁷ Horčička, Václav: *Die Enteignungen*. – Roland Marxer: *Die Beziehungen Liechtensteins*. – Horčička, Václav: *Die Konfiskation des Eigentums des Fürsten von Liechtenstein*, pp. 81–91. – Merki/Löffler: *Das Haus Liechtenstein in den böhmischen Ländern*. – Materials from the Office of Foreign Affairs (AAA), aduz..

<i>Czechoslovak arguments</i>	<i>Liechtenstein arguments</i>
1. Sequestration argument	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Sequestration is necessary to maintain the economic running of the estates, since all the leading administrators of the Liechtenstein’s holdings and enterprises were Germans who had either been imprisoned after the war or who had escaped. – The large Liechtenstein estates in all three bohemian regions are very important for the Czechoslovak economy. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – The employees on the Liechtenstein estates were and are mostly Czech, and they are still there. – The Liechtenstein properties are of existential importance for the Principality of Liechtenstein.
2. The “German” argument	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – The prince is ethnically “German” and therefore “an unreliable person of the state” according to decree Nr. 5. – The Prince is of German “nationality” according to his statement given at the national census of December 1930. He thus subjectively admitted his German “nationality”. The fact that he is German has been “generally known and supported by History”. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – The prince never declared being of German nationality. He was never a member of any German organisation or party. Therefore, no measures can be taken against him which are meant for the population of “German nationality”.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Decree no. 12 relates to all people of German nationality regardless of citizenship. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Decree no. 12/1945 relates only to nationals of the German Reich and (former) Czechoslovak citizens of German nationality (mother tongue) and not to German-speaking foreigners. – Liechtenstein citizens have to be treated in the same way as Swiss citizens.

<p>– The Principality of Liechtenstein is populated by “Germans”, it formed part of the German Confederation (Deutscher Bund), “Liechtenstein nationality“ does not exist.</p>	<p>– The Nazis were the ones who had used the argument that the Principality of Liechtenstein was populated by “Germans”, in order to deny the existence of Liechtenstein nationality and connect the Principality of Liechtenstein to the Third Reich. The people of Liechtenstein are of “Liechtenstein nationality”, thus the condition of confiscation set by Decree no. 12 is not applicable.</p>
<p><i>3. The National Socialism argument</i></p>	
<p>– The leading German employees and further staff in the administration of the Liechtenstein estates were “mainly organised Nazis”, they organised persecution of partisans and gave information to the Wehrmacht. War material was supplied to German organisations.</p>	<p>– During the war the Princely House of Liechtenstein behaved correctly towards Czechs. Of the 211 employees on the estates in Czechoslovakia, by 1 April 1945 only 24 were ethnic Germans. Czechs were also in the majority in the Central Directorate in Olomouc/Olmütz.</p> <p>– On several occasions during the war the prince and his representatives stood up for his Czech employees against the Nazi occupiers.</p>
<p>– The prince has no legal right to exemption (according to decree no. 12, § 1, para. 3) from confiscation.</p>	<p>– According to decree no. 12 (§ 1, para. 3) and decree no. 108 (§ 1, para. 1.2) the Liechtensteins are exempt from the confiscation of enemy property because they “never committed an offence against the Czech and Slovak peoples”.</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – The Liechtensteins were National Socialists. – During the whole of the Second World War their Principality displayed “a friendly attitude towards Germany”. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – During the war the prince never behaved like a “traitor and enemy” of the Czechoslovak Republic. He is not “an unreliable person of the state”. – The Prince was able to prevent Liechtenstein’s annexation by the Third Reich.
<p>4. The “White Mountain” argument</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – The Liechtenstein family acquired its property after White Mountain by “robbery of Czech owners” and “has remained an enemy of this nation to this day”.²²⁸ 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – The Liechtenstein family acquired its first property in Moravia as early as the 13th century. – Only one-sixth of the prince’s property confiscated in 1945 came from the post-White Mountain settlement (12,000 ha). – According to valid Czechoslovak laws, Prince Franz Josef II is not responsible for the acts of Karl I von Liechtenstein in the 17th century. In addition, Karl asked the emperor to reduce the punishments for the insurgents.²²⁹
<p>5. The penal argument</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Decree no. 12 is not a rule of criminal law, it serves the land reform. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – The confiscation decrees are inadmissible rules of punitive character. – The Prince is the head of a sovereign and neutral state.

²²⁸ Horčíčka: *Die Konfiskation des Eigentums des Fürsten von Liechtenstein*, pp. 81-91, citation p. 88. – Löffler: *Die Verwaltung der Herrschaften und Güter*, p. 196 f. – Detailed esp. Horčíčka, Václav: *Die Enteignungen von liechtensteinischem Vermögen in der Tschechoslowakei 1945 bis 1948*, pp. 9–139, there pp. 122–139 also excerpts of the decisive decrees no. 5, no. 12, no. 100 and no. 108.

²²⁹ Horčíčka, Václav: *Die Enteignungen*, pp. 66, 70 f.

<i>6. The argument of national and international law</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – The national administration and confiscation of Liechtenstein property are legally permissible. They were undertaken in accordance with Czechoslovak law. – They can be seen as disputed in terms of international law.²³⁰ 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – The confiscation decisions of the District National Committee in Olomouc/Olmütz and the District National Committee in Česká Lípa/Böhmisch Leipa were not issued in accordance with the law. – The confiscation of the property of foreign nationals is contrary to international law. – If interference in property rights is not compensated with appropriate damages, then according to the interwar decision of the International Court, it is not recognised.²³¹ – Confiscation runs counter to the Charter of the United Nations, signed by Czechoslovakia, which in Chapter I declares as its goal “the promotion and strengthening of respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language or religion”.²³²
<i>7. Argument of the crown and family estates</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – The princely estates are not crown estates. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – The princely estates are partly crown estates.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – The Prince is the sole owner, fide - commissum was abolished in 1924. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – The family property does not belong only to the prince, but to the whole Liechtenstein family.

²³⁰ Horčíčka, Václav: *Die Enteignungen*, p. 96, 100–102, 10‘9.

²³¹ Horčíčka, Václav: *Die Enteignungen*, p. 96.

²³² Horčíčka: *Die Enteignungen*, p. 83.

<p>– Revenues from the princely estates are not part of the state revenue of the Principality of Liechtenstein. The documents for the state budget from 1943-1945 prove this.</p>	<p>– The Principality of Liechtenstein depends for public expenses of the state on the revenues from the princely estates.</p>
<p>8. Argument concerning recognition</p>	
<p>– Diplomatic relations between Czechoslovakia and the Principality of Liechtenstein, which were established in July 1938, were discontinued in March 1939 along with relations with Switzerland. After the war, unlike with Switzerland, they were not re-established.</p>	<p>– In 1938 Czechoslovakia recognised the sovereignty of the Principality of Liechtenstein. Since that time, Liechtenstein has never discontinued its diplomatic relations with Czechoslovakia, because it never acknowledged the Protectorate of Bohemia and Moravia.</p>

It would also be interesting to carry out research into sources showing further evidence whether, apart from the prince, any of the other aforementioned Liechtenstein nationals tried to protect their property from confiscation in any way. If they did, what legal measures did they use and what were the results?

(8) Liechtenstein demands, complaints and testimonials

The prince hired Dr Emil Sobička, an experienced Prague lawyer, who formulated the petitions, demands and complaints submitted to the Supreme Administrative Court (SAC). Their objective was to halt or repeal National Administration and the confiscation measures. He also intervened with the highest Czechoslovak officials on this matter. On 18 September 1945, Sobička even wrote to President Beneš directly. His letter remained unanswered. In an advisory opinion from 7 November 1945, however, the lawyer Dr Jindřich Procházka, who worked in the legal department of the Presidential Office, wrote that the confiscation of the prince's property was in accordance with Czech laws, and that decrees no. 5 and 12 could in fact be interpreted as the rule of punitive character, but that from the point of view of international law. In the preamble to decree no. 12, the president proclaimed that, *“once and for all the Czech and Slovak soil is to be taken away from the hands of foreign German and Hungarian land owners and traitors to the Repub-*

lic”. If it would not concern punitive measures, but another step in the land reform, then expropriation with compensation would be adequate. On the basis of Procházka’s analysis, the head of the department at the Ministry of Agriculture, Kot’átko, also came to the conclusion that, “*in case of a possible arbitration financial compensation would have to be considered*”.²³³

In the summer of 1945, the prince and his brother, Karl Alfred, tried to persuade Switzerland also to intervene in Prague. The federal counsellor, Max Petitpierre, who was head of Switzerland’s Office of Foreign Affairs (OFA), promised them support. In December 1945, Switzerland was dealing with its own citizens. Following the model of the western great powers, they claimed compensation for property of Swiss citizens which had been confiscated in Czechoslovakia. At the end of December 1945, the Swiss ambassador in Prague suggested that the principle concerning compensation for Swiss nationals should also be applied to Liechtenstein nationals.²³⁴

Prince Karl Alfred was in contact with Laurence A. Steinhardt, the American ambassador in Prague, who was striving for compensation for nationalised American property. However, the American ambassador was unable to do anything for Liechtenstein.

Georges Sauser-Hall, a professor of international and comparative law at the University of Geneva, issued two advisory opinions in 1945 and 1946 on the Liechtenstein question in Czechoslovakia. At the start of 1947, another advisory opinion was elaborated by the lawyer Erwin H. Loewenfeld, lecturing at Cambridge University.

The various institutions which were involved with the National Administration and confiscation of Liechtenstein property – various district national committees, the Provincial National Committee in Brno (Brünn), the Provincial National Committee in Prague, the Supreme Administrative Court, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Ministry of Agriculture, the Ministry of the Interior, the Ministry of Justice – successively rejected all the petitions, claims and complaints. Some of the Czechoslovak authorities, however, were unsure of whether the Liechtenstein confiscation was sustainable, whether they would have to be partially revoked, and whether the authorities would have to pay compensation. From August 1947, a special commission was assigned to the Liechtenstein question made up of representatives from the Ministry of Agriculture, the Ministry of Justice, the Ministry of the Interior and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. The chairman of this

²³³ Horčíčka: *Die Enteignungen von liechtensteinischem Vermögen in der Tschechoslowakei 1945 bis 1948*, p. 67 f.

²³⁴ Horčíčka: *Die Enteignungen*, p. 74.

commission, Dr Michl from the Ministry of Agriculture, held the view that, from the perspective of Czechoslovak law, it would “perhaps be possible” to defend the confiscation of Liechtenstein property before the Supreme Administrative Court, a wording that shows significant uncertainty. The representatives from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs added doubts from the perspective of international law and foreign policy, according to which “*the confiscation of property without compensation*” from an international viewpoint would be “*seen as the application of a punitive regulation*”.²³⁵

Following a proposal from a special commission, the ministries commissioned the drafting of expert opinions. The advisory opinion of Josef Budník, issued in November 1947 for the Ministry of Justice, defended various positions from the Czechoslovak side. Nevertheless, he came to the conclusion that “*the confiscation of property ownership of foreigners without compensation does not correspond with the so far existing usual interpretation of general principles of law as recognised in civilised countries*”.²³⁶ Officials from the Supreme Administrative Court also noticed various procedural problems. In a conversation with Loewenfeld, an unnamed high-up source from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs said that failure to recognize diplomatic relations with Liechtenstein – as was expressed by foreign minister Jan Masaryk in a diplomatic note dated 25 June 1946 to the Swiss Office of Foreign Affairs – was apparently “unsustainable”²³⁷

In his detailed research based on documents from Czechoslovak archives, Václav Horčíčka concludes that: “*In the autumn of 1947, the state authorities including the Supreme Administrative Court were aware of the legal shortcomings in the confiscation of Liechtenstei property.*”²³⁸

At the end of 1947, based on expert opinion and recommendations regarding compensation, the Liechtenstein side considered the possibility of seizing the United Nations (the Security Council or the General Assembly) or the International Court of Justice in The Hague (based on a Czechoslovak-Swiss agreement on arbitration from 1930).

Close to resolving compensation in January 1948

Although everything had been factually confiscated, in legal terms it was not a matter which had been closed. There were still to be final negotiations at the Supreme Administrative Court, though these did not yet take place in 1947.

²³⁵ Horčíčka: *Die Enteignungen*, p. 100.

²³⁶ Horčíčka: *Die Enteignungen*, p.102.

²³⁷ Horčíčka: *Die Enteignungen*, p.102 ff., citation p. 105.

²³⁸ Horčíčka: *Die Enteignungen*, p. 103.

In January 1948 – shortly before Communist coup in 1948 – the internal doubts on the Czechoslovak side about the legitimacy of the Liechtenstein confiscation combined with pressure from Liechtenstein and Switzerland based on international legal arguments brought the situation close to a solution involving compensation. Two Czechoslovak officials examined the Swiss proposals for compensation payment and on 22 February 1948 stated vis-à-vis the representative of Liechtenstein that the Ministry of the Interior estimated the amount of financial compensation to be between 20 and 30 million Swiss francs. In return, they noted that Liechtenstein could provide a “special service” for Czechoslovakia by helping to build a steel plant.²³⁹

However, the prince and his representatives had somewhat higher expectations. In the spring of 1949, they were still hopeful that compensation could amount to a quarter or a third of the value of the property of the prince, i.e. between 85 and 114 million Swiss francs, as well as 25 million Swiss francs for other members of the Princely House who had been affected. During Summer 1949, the Prince and Bern were considering the possibility of, for the moment, concentrating on compensation for the Liechtensteins’ industrial property and leaving the negotiations on the landed property until later. Prague, however, was determined not to compromise. It was not possible to include Liechtenstein citizens into the Swiss-Czechoslovakian negotiations on compensation. In December 1949, Switzerland and Czechoslovakia reached an agreement whereby Swiss citizens would be paid compensation totalling 71 million Swiss francs.

Czechoslovakia’s firm rejection of Liechtenstein’s claims continued after the Communists seized power in February 1948, though there were still some lingering legal doubts. In 1950, the legal department of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs released an internal document stating that Czechoslovakia’s position against Liechtenstein was “*materially very weak, procedurally very strong*”.²⁴⁰

The negative ruling of the Administrative Court in 1951

The negotiations with the Czechoslovak Supreme Administrative Court had been delayed. With the establishment of the new Communist constitution in May 1948, the court was now called the “Administrative Court”. Its non-Communist judges were pensioned off in June 1948 and the court was moved to Bratislava in the autumn of 1949.

²³⁹ Horčíčka, *Die Enteignungen*, p. 107.

²⁴⁰ Horčíčka, *Die Enteignungen*, p. 109.

The Supreme Administrative Court did not rule only on the Prince's complaints but also on the complaints by other members of the Princely House. Prince Alois, the father of Franz Josef II, issued a complaint against the national administration imposed on his estates. In December 1948, the Supreme Administrative Court rejected this complaint, referring to the "German nationality" of the prince. In April 1948 at the Supreme Administrative Court, Olga von Liechtenstein presented a complaint against the confiscation of her property. The court dismissed her complaint, again referring to her "German nationality" by saying this matter had to be dealt with in a normal court "on an ethnic basis". The Supreme Administrative Court used the same argument on 21 November in rejecting the confiscation complaints by Prince Emanuel and Prince Hans.

On the same day the Administrative Court also ruled on the prince's complaint. At an oral hearing at the Supreme Administrative Court in December 1948, the prince's lawyer emphasised the prince's special rights (privileges and immunities) as a sovereign ruler, of the damages caused to the Liechtenstein state and the "character of confiscation as a punishment". The prince did not demand the return of his property, but damages, and that the confiscation declaration by the District National Council in Olomouc, confirmed by the Provincial National Council in Brno (Brünn), be annulled. At a meeting of the court senate of the Supreme Administrative Court on 8 June 1948, the complainant's petition was found to be unsubstantiated. The court passed his final ruling only nearly two years later on 21 November 1951. All of the prince's objections were rejected. The land registers showed that the court found that the prince was not only the user, but the sole owner, in addition he was of "German nationality" as was "generally known".

With this ruling by the Administrative Court "*for Czechoslovakia, the Liechtenstein case was closed*", at least on domestic level.²⁴¹ As the Czechoslovak government viewed diplomatic relations as having been discontinued with the Principality of Liechtenstein, which was amount to a nonrecognition of the sovereignty of Liechtenstein as a state, it was also impossible to appeal to international jurisdiction – the United Nations, the International Court of Justice or the International Court of Arbitration.

²⁴¹ Horčíčka: *Die Enteignungen*, p. 111–114.

(9) *No waiver of Liechtenstein claims*

In the period since the implementation of the confiscation measures based on the presidential decrees from 1945 and the subsequent rulings by ministries, national councils and the Supreme Administrative Court, the situation has remained unchanged. The prince, the Princely House, other former owners, and the Liechtenstein state representing all of its citizens, have in no way given up their claims from the Czechoslovak state, instead they have used various opportunities to uphold them. This still remains the case today. Meanwhile, the Czech side continues to stress the validity of the laws that historically justified intervention in property relationships.

No normal relations until 2009

For several decades until 2009 it had proven to be impossible to untangle the Gordian knot consisting in the blocking nexus between re-establishing diplomatic relations and solving the still open property issue. Both parties were interested in re-establishing diplomatic ties, but both sides set out procedural conditions: Liechtenstein wanted to normalize relations only once the dispute over property had been clarified. Czechoslovakia, and subsequently the Czech Republic and the Slovak Republic wanted instead to normalize relations before settling the disputed property issue.

Cutting the Gordian knot

In 2009, the aforementioned Gordian knot was cut. Diplomatic relations between Liechtenstein and the Czech Republic were established (in parallel with the Slovak Republic). The first measure was to establish together a commission of historians with parity of representation, whose objective was to study their joint history, to promote mutual understanding and to lay the foundation for a fruitful cooperation and for resolving open issues.²⁴²

²⁴² Marxer, Roland: *Die Beziehungen zwischen dem Fürstentum Liechtenstein und der Tschechoslowakei bzw. Tschechischen Republik seit dem Zweiten Weltkrieg*. In: Liechtensteinisch-Tschechische Historikerkommission (ed.): *Das Fürstenhaus, der Staat Liechtenstein und die Tschechoslowakei im 20. Jahrhundert*. Vaduz 2013, s. 213–235. – Detailed Marxer, Roland: *Die Beziehungen Liechtensteins zur Tschechoslowakei und zu deren Nachfolgestaaten seit dem Zweiten Weltkrieg. Nachwirkungen und Entwicklungen bis heute*. In: Horčíčka, Václav – Marxer, Roland: *Liechtenstein und die tschechoslowakischen Konfiskationen von 1945. Vom Zweiten Weltkrieg bis zur Gegenwart*. Vaduz 2013, pp. 141–247.

Summary Report

The landed property of the ruling Prince of Liechtenstein in Czechoslovakia from 1919–1945											
Large estate	Country	1919		1929		1930		1939		1942/45	
		agric.	overall	overall	overall	agric.	forest.	forest.	overall	forest.	overall
Břeclav (Lundenburg), okr. Břeclav	Moravia	2884.10	9649.28	7339.28 (33)	12 034	12 252.82	0	10 047	12 359	9293	11 534
Valtice-Lednice (Feldsberg-Eisgrub), okr. Břeclav	Moravia	2544.25	7369.27	6963.27			2312	0			
Bučovice-Zdánice, okr. Vyškov, Hodonín (Butschowitz-Steinitz)	Moravia	3979.50	14 287	10611 (41)	0	10 247	0	10 247	10 247	10248	10248
Kostelec nad Cernými lesy, A, okr. Kolín (Schwarzkoletz), 1942/45 jako Úvaly (Auwal)	Bohemia	1958.50	11 894.50	10 304	13.50	6942.30	0	3261	3261		
Uhlíněves-Škvorec (Aurinnowes mit Skworetz), A, okr. Praha	Bohemia	4473.88	4845.89	91.33 (76.27)	14	N				3458	3458
Kounice (Kaunitz), A, okr. Nymburk	Bohemia	3340.50	3565.50	0	0	N	15	0	15	0	15
Křmov-Opava (Jägemdorf-Troppau), okr. Bruntál	Silesia	1440.30	9396.60	8131.10	8132	8124	121	8001	8122	8004	8060
Křtiny-Pozorňice-Adamov, okr. Brno-venkov, Blansko (Kirntein-Posorschtz-Adamsthal)	Moravia	606.02	14 694.11	7067.88	6835	6958.26	0	6945	6945	6943	6943
Lanškroun (Landskron), okr. Ústí nad Orlicí	Bohemia	1563.19	5962.60	62.11 (38.71)	17	N	20	0	20	0	17
Moravská Třebová (Mährisch Trübau), okr. Svitavy	Moravia	1221.50	6262	5258.50	3417	3414.91	200	3213	3413	3212	3412
Plumlov (Plumenuau), okr. Prostějov	Moravia	1846.19	12 956.27	11 164.27 (167.72)	0	N					
Radim (Radim), A, okr. Jičín	Bohemia	3177	3302.50	0	0	N					
Rataje nad Sázavou (Rattay), A, okr. Kutná Hora	Bohemia	343	2433	2120.5 (2)	0	N					
Ruda-Hanušovice-Koňštein (Branná), okr. Šumperk (Eisenberg-Hannsdorf-Goldenstein)	Moravia	723.50	14993	2 (1.50)	0	N					
Rumburk (Rumburg), okr. Děčín	Bohemia	88.81	2386.81	0.17 (0.17)	0	N					
Sternberk (Sternberg), okr. Olomouc											
Karlůvec (Karlsberg), okr. Bruntál	Moravia	2275.19	14 292.74	12 452.24 (13.25)	8631	6677.20	110	5 493	5 603	5 477	5 699
Uherský Ostroh (Ungarisch Ostra), okr. Uherské Hradiště, 1942/45 plus Lanžhot (Landshtut)	Moravia	2323.25	7135.50	5182 (223.50)	3338	4630	103	4 632	4 735	4 578	4 578
Úsov-Nové Zámky (Aussee-Neuschloss), okr. Šumperk	Moravia	1580.90	7720.53	6602.96	6044	6502.67	247	5890	6137	5908	6154
Zábřeh (Hohenstadt), okr. Šumperk	Moravia	1076.47	7234.21	6161.65	0	3629.79	0	3631	3631	3631	3631
Total		37446.05	160 381.31	99 514.26		73 834.95		65 457	68 585	65 917	69 006

Key: See next page

Land reform and confiscatio

Key

- Okř.** Districts according to law no. 36/1960 Coll., *O územním členění státu*. (5 large estates) 1903/14 (Kraetzl, Franz: *Das Fürstentum Liechtenstein und der gesamte Fürst Johann von und zu Liechtensteinsche Güterbesitz. Statistisch-geschichtlich dargestellt*. 8. Aufl. Brünn 1914): 28262,98 ha; 1919 (Voženilek, Jan /ed./: *Předběžné výsledky československé pozemkové reformy*. Země Česká a Moravsko-slezská. Praha 1930): 26041,39 ha. Until 1924 the other estates were fidei commissum.
- 1905** Size (in ha) according to: Tittel, Ignaz: *Schematismus und Statistik des Grossgrundbesitzes ... in der Markgrafschaft Mähren und im Herzogtume Schlesien*. Prag 1905; *Schematismus und Statistik des Grossgrundbesitzes ... im Königreiche Böhmen*. Prag 1906.
- 1919** Land register according to Voženilek, Jan (ed.): *Předběžné výsledky československé pozemkové reformy*. Země Česká a Moravsko-slezská. Prague 1930.
- 1929** According to Voženilek, Jan (ed.): *Předběžné výsledky československé pozemkové reformy*. Země Česká a Moravsko-slezská. Prague 1930, situation as of 1. 1. 1929 in Bohemia and 1. 7. 1929 in Moravia. Includes all land held (i.e. released and confiscated land), in brackets is the size of the land released from confiscation
- 1930** Proposed final position after the implementation of the so-called general agreement.
- 1932 / 35** According to Lustig, Rudolf – Světnička, František (eds.): *Schematismus velkostatků v Čechách*. Prague 1933, and Lustig, Rudolf (ed.): *Schematismus velkostatků v zemi moravskoslezské*. Prague 1935.
- 1939** According to Voldán, Vladimír et al.: *Státní archiv v Brně*. Guide to archival collections. Vol. 2. Prague 1964, p. 61.
- 1942/45** According to SLHA Vienna, FA, box 317, *Bericht zur Bewertung der Fürst Franz Josef v. u. z. Liechtenstein Liegenschaften: Bergbauunternehmungen, Industrien und Handelsunternehmungen in der Tschechoslowakei zum Zeitpunkt des Kriegsendes 1945*, position as of 31. 12. 1942.

IV. Conclusions

a. Summary theses

(1) Background

The establishment of diplomatic relations between the Czech Republic and the Principality of Liechtenstein in 2009 removed the remaining obstacles occurring so far in the debate on the common Czech-Liechtenstein history and paved the way for thorough, joint and collective historical research. The Czech-Liechtenstein Commission of Historians was set up by both sides with equal representation to provide a platform for an expert debate on such aspects of the relationship between the Czech Republic and the Principality of Liechtenstein / the reigning Princely House of Liechtenstein, which were considered so far as either unresolved or a matter of insufficient research. The selected researchers representing both sides were thus provided with the opportunity to bring together their different approaches, research traditions and archival resources. This enabled a fruitful debate on historical developments and their causes that had partly uniting, partly dramatically divisive effects.

The commission presents to its founders and to the general public the results of its activities carried out between 2009 and 2013, in the hope that they will contribute to an improved mutual understanding of their history and help develop dynamic mutual relations.

(2) The work of the Czech-Liechtenstein Commission of Historians

The commission studied the history of bilateral relations between the two States as well as the impact of the historical role of the Princely House of Liechtenstein in Central Europe, especially in the territory of today's Czech Republic. The commission also studied such issues that have been regarded as contentious in an objective manner (*sine ira et studio*). Its work thereby focussed on historical facts and their scientific interpretation.

One of the commission's basic working methods was to hold workshops on broader topics. This enabled the commission to focus on a historical problem, to call in numerous outside experts who had already done relevant primary or contextual research on relevant issues, and to involve them as speakers or as participants in the debate. During the three years, the commission held four international and interdisciplinary workshops. The first two were rather methodological

in character (in November 2011 in Vranov u Brna (Wranau) on Liechtenstein sites of memory; in June 2012 in Vienna on continuity and discontinuity over the centuries). The other two meetings focused on major historical aspects characteristic for the impact of the House of Liechtenstein in Central Europe (December 2012 in Brno/Brünn on the Liechtensteins and the arts; in April 2013 in Prague/Praha on the dramatic developments in the 20th century).

(3) *Historical problems and stereotypes, their origin and formation*

The Liechtensteins played a role in shaping Central European culture at many levels over a very long period of time, from the Middle Ages practically up to the present day. However, the history of the House and state of Liechtenstein in relation to the Czech lands is specific in many respects: on the one hand, it is a history of relations between the Czech Republic and the Principality of Liechtenstein as two sovereign modern states (and also a history of relations between their predecessors); on the other hand, it is a history of the impact that the Liechtensteins (the House of Liechtenstein) made in Central Europe. Over a long period of time, the Liechtensteins consolidated their estates in the Lands of the Bohemian Crown and Austria (mainly in the Moravia – Lower Austria border area) into a structure resembling today’s “Euroregions”, straddling the borders of lands and states as they existed at the time. This integration model had existed long before the Habsburgs began to integrate their Central European domains. This model developed throughout the early modern period in parallel with the Habsburg monarchy’s integration, and later also other families followed the example of the Liechtenstein model for the cross-border integration of feudal land holdings. Over the centuries, the Liechtensteins formed a component of larger administrative and territorial structures (Margraviate of Moravia, Kingdom of Bohemia, Holy Roman Empire, Habsburg Monarchy, Austrian Empire, Czechoslovak Republic). At the same time, they were also aiming at a statehood of their own.

The latter ambition complicated the history of the House of Liechtenstein and, at the same time, made it somewhat special. The progressive building of their own state that began as early as in the 17th century, was seen as a complication and a challenge to other state-building processes. This problem was evident in relation to the integrating Habsburg Monarchy, and even more in relation to its modern successor states built on the nation-state and republican principle, such as the Czechoslovak Republic.

The dramatic events of the 20th century put a strain on relations between the Liechtensteins / Principality of Liechtenstein on the one hand and Czechoslova-

cia / Czech Republic on the other. Problems began after the First World War as a result of the Treaty of Saint Germain. The territorial changes resulting from the demarcation of a new border between Czechoslovakia and Austria had a considerable impact on the Liechtenstein estates. Moreover, the Liechtensteins had to learn to live with a new system, governed by a constitution that denied a priori the core principles on which the existence and statehood of Liechtenstein were based. The Czechoslovak Republic, for its part, was struggling to come to terms with the heritage of the monarchy, of which the role and impact of Liechtenstein presence in Bohemia and Moravia formed part. The relationship was further marred by historical myths and stereotypes that influenced attitudes as well as concrete actions of both sides.

(4) *Property issues, their origin and formation*

Since the Middle Ages, the Liechtensteins had concentrated their land holdings in Central Europe. They gradually shifted their focus from Austria to the Lands of the Bohemian Crown, above all to Moravia but also to Bohemia and Silesia. Step by step the Liechtensteins acquired large tracts of land (by serving Czech kings in the medieval period, by marrying into leading Moravian noble houses in the late 16th century, by supporting certain members of the Habsburg dynasty during the crises in 1606–1609 and 1618–1620, by directly and indirectly benefiting from confiscations after the Battle of the White Mountain, by serving in the army of the nascent Habsburg and Austrian Empire).

What helped them was that, unlike competing noble families, they were not regarded as foreigners. The Liechtensteins enhanced this image through their ties with traditional Moravian and Bohemian noble houses. At the same time they continued to build their unique identity as a princely house unequalled in the Lands of the Bohemian Crown.

This long tradition not only set the Liechtensteins apart from other aristocrats who increasingly ventured into business and industry, but it survived all the changes in the modern era. Even after the reforms and confiscations that followed the First and Second World Wars, the Liechtensteins remained attached to their former landed property.

Future research may focus *inter alia* on the later fate of the possessions of the prince of Liechtenstein that became subject of sequestration during the land reform after 1918 as well as of the property of the prince and other nationals of Liechtenstein confiscated in 1945 on the basis of the decrees of the president of the Republic. Such research may lead to a detailed account on the fate and purpose of

any further use of these possessions and property during the 20th century up to the present.

(5) Mutual relations in the 20th century, their origin and formation

Another main area of interest for the commission of historians was the relations between the two subjects over the 20th century, which in Central Europe was marked by major upheavals and a whole series of dramatic events, historical processes, which in many respects differed from similar phenomena in the western part of Europe.

The events after 1918 gave rise to certain issues between the newly born Czechoslovakia and the Princely House of Liechtenstein, which in part still await resolution. These issues include the validity of the first Czechoslovak land reform that has been applied on a substantial part of the Liechtenstein land holdings in Bohemia, Moravia and Silesia and the closely related problem of Czechoslovakia's refusal to recognize the Principality of Liechtenstein situated along the river Rhine as a sovereign state in international law. The Liechtenstein side considered these acts (sequestration of land holdings against small compensation, forced sales) unjust, but *de facto* accepted them. From the Czechoslovak perspective, among factors burdening the relationship were the doubts about the loyalty of the Princely House of Liechtenstein to the new Czechoslovak Republic, and the questions of compatibility of the Liechtenstein *Fideicommissum* with the new republican system. Another factor was the question of extraterritoriality/immunity which the Liechtenstein immovable property might potentially enjoy in Czechoslovakia in the event of recognition of the Principality of Liechtenstein, and in case the private property of the Princely House was seen as closely tied to the state interests of the Principality of Liechtenstein. However, it should be added that in the post-1918 period, historical myths, stereotypes and historical or pseudohistorical arguments also played a part in the relationship between Czechoslovakia and Liechtenstein; during the land reform confiscation measures against the holdings of the princely family were justified by citing historical events and wrongs (Karl I., the battle on the White Mountain) suffered centuries ago. In July 1938, the Czechoslovak government, nevertheless, took steps towards the diplomatic recognition of the Principality of Liechtenstein, since it considered the land reform concluded in regard to Liechtenstein.

The Nazi occupation of Czechoslovakia between 1939 and 1945 and the following measures taken by Czechoslovakia opened further issues regarding the Czech-Liechtenstein relations. While the Czechoslovak side saw the Liechten-

steins (members of the princely house and other Liechtenstein citizens) as part of the German ethnic group (“Volksgruppe”) in Czechoslovak territory, the Liechtensteins in effect distanced themselves from Nazi Germany and insisted that they were part of the Liechtenstein nation and citizens of a neutral state. One much disputed question was whether the reigning Prince (in fact or allegedly) had described himself as belonging to the “German nationality” during the population census held in 1930; the census concerned simply the mother tongue not the nationality. However, this fruitless dispute again only reflected old stereotypes, furthermore it reflected efforts to regulate complicated matters in a simplified manner and finally also the new political system that had emerged in the countries of Central and Eastern Europe.

After the end of the Second World War, all Liechtenstein property in Czechoslovakia was subject to confiscation on the basis of the Decrees of the President of the Republic. While in Czechoslovakia the step was mostly regarded as justified, the Liechtensteins considered it unlawful both regarding the relations to the House of the reigning Prince and in relation to other Liechtenstein citizens who were also subject to confiscation.

Matters entered a new stage after the 1948 Communist coup in Czechoslovakia. In addition to the ethnic-national and constitutional arguments casting doubt on their case, the Liechtensteins were now presented as class enemies. Relations between Communist Czechoslovakia and the Principality of Liechtenstein / Princely House of Liechtenstein became part of the Cold War between the Eastern and Western blocs.

However, after the war, the reigning Prince was also faced with a new situation: he had to focus on the Rhineland state. Due to the political framework conditions even a partial restitution of the possessions in Czechoslovakia was not to be expected.

The changed political situation in Central Europe after 1948 gave rise to an unexpected historical phenomenon as regards the Liechtenstein image in Czechoslovakia. In contrast to the unfavourable stereotypes concerning the Liechtenstein of the past periods, in the second half of the 20th century the image of the Liechtensteins in Czechoslovakia became somewhat more differentiated. While the official image remained decidedly negative, people began to form an alternative “dissident” view. This became visible mainly in southern Moravia, where local memory, including positive recollections of the Princely House, showed their effects in connection with resistance against Communist rule. An important role in projecting this positive image was played by the Liechtenstein legacy in art and culture that could be traced through their former chateaus and in the cultural landscape.

(6) Issues related to culture and the arts

What defines the character of most sites of Liechtenstein memory is art and architecture, the passion for art collecting, and the cultural landscape. Activity in all these areas is the lasting hallmark of the Liechtensteins which can be traced far back into history. It seems fitting to describe it as a significant phenomenon shaping the Liechtenstein identity in *longue durée*. In history, aristocratic families used culture and the arts to demonstrate e.g. their political power and to project their hierarchical position and their image and prestige in society.

The traces of the long-term Liechtenstein presence in architecture, arts and culture in the territory of the Bohemian Crown Lands shaped the family's image even in times when it would otherwise have fallen prey to more recent clichés and ideological stereotyping. For example, even during the Communist era when the mass media, textbooks as well as specialised literature presented the historical role of the Liechtensteins from the perspective of class struggle, the family's architectural legacy e.g. in the Lednice–Valtice (Feldsberg–Eisgrub) Cultural Landscape was appreciated as an important part of national cultural heritage. This again positively reflected on the image of the Liechtensteins. In art-guides, for instance, negative stereotypes were restricted to introductory and rather formalistic remarks (e. g. highlighting the importance of artists and hard working dependent labourers) and went on to present in a positive light the role of the Liechtensteins as art patrons and buyers and as organisers of art and cultural events.

(7) Unresolved issues related to property

Despite the mutual understanding of the common history of the Lands of the Bohemian Crown, Czechoslovakia, the Czech Republic and the Principality of Liechtenstein and the perception of the role of the House of Liechtenstein, the issues relating to property existing since the confiscations in 1945 have remained unsolved. At least, this is how the Liechtenstein side perceives the situation. The differences in the perception of this issue and its legal basis runs like a thread through the modern history of mutual relations. The policy of the Czechoslovak government formed in 1945, of the Communist-era governments as well as of the governments formed since the fall of Communism in 1989 until today has always been to insist that the acts of confiscation were legitimate. On the other hand, the position of the Prince and the Principality of Liechtenstein is that these acts were illegitimate. Generally speaking, this remains unchanged even now.

Ownership is seen as something static. But history is dynamic, ever changing. Ownership relations from a certain date change with time, exposed as they are to modifications in law and politics, in the economic and social environment. Today, the properties seized in 1945 and subsequently confiscated are now in a different condition from that of almost seventy years ago. They are in new hands – either in the hands of the Czech state or of different private owners. Many of the properties are used for different purposes, well taken care of or not, and may have a different value than before. Such facts must be taken into account in the present debate on long-confiscated properties. It may seem that this perspective may further complicate the ownership problem. However, approaches taking due account of the dynamism of history, the flow of time and changing environment may in fact make the problem easier to unravel.

b. Desiderata and possible further steps

The endeavours of the Czech-Liechtenstein Historians Commission in the research conducted in 2010–2013 built on the many achievements of past analyses of the history of the House of Liechtenstein in Central Europe and in the Rhineland Principality of Liechtenstein, as well as into the history of bilateral Czech-Liechtenstein relations. The Commission's own research and cooperation with research institutions and colleagues in different countries has achieved a shift in focus regarding a number of research topics and their interpretation and the necessary understanding underlying it.

The shift in focus regarding the research into the history of the Liechtensteins and Czech-Liechtenstein relations in particular affected issues related to the sites of Liechtenstein memory and their role in the perception of the historical role of the Liechtensteins: also the shaping of the image of the House of Liechtenstein and the Principality of Liechtenstein in Czech eyes and, vice versa, the shaping of the image of Czechs / Czechoslovakia / Czech Republic in the eyes of the people of Liechtenstein, including the elites on both sides. A similarly important result achieved in three years of the Commission's work is the notable progress in understanding the continuity and long-term effects that helped the Liechtensteins create a remarkable entity existing practically throughout the history of Central Europe since the medieval times up to the present. But this applies also to the progress achieved in understanding and correctly interpreting the ruptures and discontinuities that have been an intrinsic part of the history of the Liechtensteins and at times dramatically affected the fate of their family as well as of Central Europe as a whole; this includes the establishment of independent Czechoslovakia in 1918 and the resulting legal, social and property-related upheavals, as well as the tragedy of World War II with all its consequences. Similarly important was the commission's research in the area of art and culture; these issues were consistently contextualized within the above categories of historical research.

However, now that the commission has completed this stage of its work, there are still many outstanding issues of expert as well as more general interest that, in the commission's opinion, require further research and clarification. On the other hand, the commission has produced results that might give the broader public in both countries a clearer insight into the complicated matter of Czech-Liechtenstein relations, and might also create the prerequisites supporting the commisi-

on's founders, both on the Czech and Liechtenstein sides, in taking specific steps towards even better relations and mutual understanding.

The commission has brought the research regarding the above mentioned issues to a stage that offers a good foundation for future study of many specific topics using historical as well as transdisciplinary methods and approaches. The commission considers it important to build on the results of its research concerning sites of Liechtenstein memory and their role in constructing and deconstructing historical images, myths and stereotypes. Time and again, images and stereotypes rooted in a specific historical context (e.g. the Revolt of the Bohemian Estates and Battle of White Mountain) affected events occurring much later (e.g. the Second World War and the immediate post-war period). In the context of this research, the commission considers it useful to work on biographies of some less known members of the House of Liechtenstein who played a role in some historical events and contributed to shaping the image of the House of Liechtenstein. Equally important, in the commission's opinion, would be contextual study of selected historical events, phenomena and processes, since the limited timescale of the research so far left little room to contextualize the issues (as done e.g. by Horel, Höbelt), which means that the issue of the role of the Liechtensteins is still presented more or less outside the broad historical context. Another important task for the future, in the commission's opinion, is to thoroughly study the issues related to the events of the 20th century that marked radical turning points in Czech-Liechtenstein relations as well as in the situation of the House of Liechtenstein in Central Europe.

The commission believes that in the coming period the publication of and publicity for the existing results of the research should be much more extensive than was possible in the past stage, when the Commission functioned as a closed team under time constraints. The results of the commission's work should be presented to the public in both countries through popular magazines, newspapers and other media, as well as at exhibitions and other cultural events organised jointly by Czech and Liechtenstein museums, national heritage institutes and other cultural institutions. An important aim of such events should be to make the general public, especially the young generation, aware of the positive but also problematic aspects of Czech-Liechtenstein relations and of some pending topics.

The commission believes that the governments of both countries, as founders of the commission, should take the results of its work into account and, in the light of its conclusions, support continued joint research and activities building on the positive trend in Czech-Liechtenstein relations.

As is apparent from the foregoing, the results of the research show that despite differences in the understanding and interpretation of certain events, namely those occurring in the 20th century, the history of the House of Liechtenstein is an integral part of the history of Central Europe and of the Lands of the Bohemian Crown over a long period of time. The Liechtensteins played a role in developing the cultural appearance of this region. Vice versa, without their estates in the Lands of the Bohemian Crown they would have hardly attained such a prominent position in Central Europe and translated this prominence into the present-day Principality of Liechtenstein, thanks to which Czech-Liechtenstein relations can develop as relations between two modern-day states and nations.

Czech-Liechtenstein relations have been profoundly affected by the complicated history of the 20th century, namely by the non-democratic regimes that dramatically influenced the relations between the two countries for more than fifty years. One of the aspects natural to the undemocratic regimes was the policy of emphasizing the negative aspects of Czech-Liechtenstein coexistence, bringing into play historical myths, images and stereotypes constructed across a long period of time. The commission believes that the present knowledge of the historical circumstances of the presence of the House of Liechtenstein in Czech lands and of the history of Czech-Liechtenstein relations enables the governments of both countries to build on the positive aspects of their long common history. The commission is aware that the role of the House of Liechtenstein in Central Europe is a unique and complicated historical phenomenon. Both sides will need to take specific and daring steps in order to overcome stereotypes, to fully utilize all positive aspects in mutual relations, and to build up hope for the future.

c. Prospects

At the end of 2013, the Czech-Liechtenstein Commission of Historians, established on the principle of parity, completed the task set by the governments of the two countries in 2010. It studied history, collected facts, discussed, evaluated and drew conclusions *sine ira et studio*.

The commission's work threw ample light on many issues affecting relations between the House of Liechtenstein / Principality of Liechtenstein and the Lands of the Bohemian Crown / Czechoslovak Republic / Czech Republic. It studied the phenomena that bound them together as well as the events that finally divided them, and the causes of these events.

History cannot be deleted from human memory. However, its study must be based on scientific criteria and on correct and friendly relations and objective assessment of facts, free of self-interest and emotional confrontation.

The presence and impact of the House of Liechtenstein – a princely house since the 17th century, a ruling house of the Rhineland principality since the early 18th century – was a significant factor in the Lands of the Bohemian Crown. The Liechtenstein presence has left deep marks in architecture and art, cultural institutions, agriculture and forestry, as well as in collective memory and national historical discourse from the 19th century onwards, despite the fact that as of 1920 and fully effective after 1945, the Liechtenstein-Czech-relations became interrupted.

Issues related to the confiscation of the Liechtenstein estates, especially of the Prince's own property, have never ceased to be a burden on mutual relations. The establishment of diplomatic relations between the Czech Republic and the Principality of Liechtenstein in 2009 has unlocked the situation and opened the door for discussion and objective historical study.

The commission hopes that its work and the results of its work will improve the understanding of common history and offer a basis for further efforts and finally a satisfactory solution of the still open problems in the mutual interest

To summarize once more: history must be taken into account. It must be studied impartially, without confrontation and emotion, on the basis of available facts and using proper methodological and interpretative approaches. This was the guiding principle of the commission's effort to jointly work for and contribute to a better understanding of relations between the two countries and the historical role of the House of Liechtenstein.

Czech-Liechtenstein history has always evolved in the context of “the big picture”. Stretching over centuries up to the present day, it is a history of exemplary deeds in cultural achievement as well as human dramas.

The results of the work of the commission and cooperating institutions show that Czech-Liechtenstein relations can be improved if we intensify cooperation in all areas, including joint research in the fields of history and art history. The commission proposes that the research activities should continue, intensify, deepen and focus on selected specific issues

Appendix

a. Archival sources

(1) *Sammlungen des Fürsten von Liechtenstein, Hausarchiv, Vaduz-Wien*

H Herrschaften
FA Familienarchiv
PK Plan- und Kartensammlung
Korrespondenz der Kabinettskanzlei

(2) *Liechtensteinisches Landesarchiv Vaduz (LLA)*

RA Oberamtsakten bis 1808
RB Oberamtsakten 1808–1827
RC Oberamtsakten 1827–1861
RD Regierung 1861–1862
LTA Landtagsprotokolle 1862–1921
LTA Landtagsprotokolle 1922–1949
Gesandtschaft Bern 1919–1933
Gesandtschaft Wien 1919–1923
Militärkontingent 1832–1868
Akten der Botschaft Bern

(3) *Amt für Auswärtige Angelegenheiten Vaduz*

Diverse Materialien zu Konfiskationen in der Tschechoslowakei
Zusammenstellung des Fürst Liechtenstein'schen Grundeigentumes im Raume der CSR nach der Bodenreform zum Stande vom Jahre 1945
List of the Families affected by the Confiscation of the then Czechoslovakian Government, Updated by the Office of Foreign Affairs of the Principality of Liechtenstein
Karten

(4) *Schweizerisches Bundesarchiv Bern*

Bestände E 2001
E 2001-07
E 2200-190

(5) *Politisches Archiv des Auswärtigen Amts Berlin*

Reg. 123 Büro des Reichsaussenministers, Akten betreffend Liechtenstein, 1938–39
Reg. 133 Büro des Staatssekretärs, Akten betreffend Liechtenstein, 1938–1944
Reg. 375 Politische Abteilung, Akten betreffend Liechtenstein, 1936–1939

(6) *Národní archiv Praha*

Česká dvorská kancelář Praha, Vídeň 1293–1791

Česká dvorská komora IV. Morava (ČDKM IV.)

Ministerstvo financ

Ministerstvo spravedlnosti

Ministerstvo vnitra – nová registratura

Ministerstvo zemědělství

Německé státní ministerstvo pro Čechy a Moravu

Nejvyšší správní soud

Stará manipulace, Praha 1526–1838

Státní památková správa

Státní pozemkový úřad

Ústřední ředitelství státních lesů a statků

Zemský národní výbor v Praze

(7) *Archiv bezpečnostních složek Praha*

325 Stíhání nacistických válečných zločinců

M 2 Odbor politického zpravodajství MV

A 31 Statisticko-evidenční odbor FMV

(8) *Vojenský ústřední archiv Praha*

Sb. 37 Vojenský historický archiv

(9) *Archiv ministerstva zahraničních věcí Praha*

GS-A Kabinet, r. 1945–1948

TO-O Lichtenštejnsko, 1945–1959

TO-O Švýcarsko, 1945–1959

TO-T Švýcarsko, 1945–1954

TO-T Švýcarsko, 1970–1974

Právní sekce VI., 1918–1945

Zprávy ZÚ Bern, 1918–1945

Zprávy ZÚ Bern, 1945–1946

Zprávy ZÚ Bern, 1947–1951

(10) *Archiv Kanceláře prezidenta republiky Praha*

Kancelář prezidenta republiky (KPR)

(11) *Moravský zemský archiv v Brně*

Fondy A – Fondy stavovské a samosprávné zemské správy a zemských úřadů a institucí:

- A 1 Stavovské listiny
- A 3 Stavovské rukopisy
- A 4 Sněmovní akta
- A 12 Akta šlechtická

Fondy B – Politické fondy:

- B 1 Gubernium
- B 6 Napoleonské války
- B 28 Okresní ředitelství Hustopeče
- B 29 Okresní ředitelství Moravský Krumlov
- B 124 Krajský národní výbor Brno
- B 180 Státní úřad pro válečné poškozence Brno

Fondy C – Justiční fondy:

- C 2 Tribunál – pozůstalosti
- C 8 Moravské zemské právo
- C 14 Odhady moravských panství
- C 22 Okresní soud Břeclav
- C 23 Okresní soud Bučovice
- C 25 Okresní soud Hustopeče
- C 27 Okresní soud Moravský Krumlov
- C 28 Okresní soud Moravská Třebová

Fondy F – Velkostatky:

- F 9 Ruda nad Moravou
- F 28 Lichtenštejnské ústřední ředitelství Olomouc 1924–1945
- F 29 Lichtenštejnské ústřední ředitelství statků Koloděje 1901–1925
- F 30 Lichtenštejnská ústřední účtárna Bučovice 1580–1924
- F 31 Lichtenštejnská lesní zařizovací kancelář Břeclav 1734–1947
- F 32 Lichtenštejnský inspektorát Moravská Třebová 1785–1844
- F 34 Lichtenštejnský inspektorát Břeclav 1745–1815
- F 35 Lichtenštejnský inspektorát Wilfersdorf 1764–1813
- F 43 Velkostatek Břeclav 1520–1946
- F 44 Velkostatek Bučovice 1571–1947
- F 63 Velkostatek Lednice 1578–1924
- F 75 Velkostatek Moravská Třebová 1614–1945

- F 93 Velkostatek Uherský Ostroh 1693–1947
- F 94 Velkostatek Valtice 1391–1945
- F 115 Lichtenštejnský stavební úřad Lednice 1752–1945
- F 116 Velkostatek Rabensburg 1644–1914
- F 126 Lichtenštejnské lesní ředitelství Olomouc 1869–1945
- F 128 Lichtenštejnské cirkuláře, normálie a instrukce 1722–1945
- F 130 Lichtenštejnská dvorní kancelář Vídeň 1514–1926
- F 132 Lichtenštejnská katastrální správa Olomouc 1775–1941
- F 177 Velkostatek Moravský Krumlov
- F 261 Lichtenštejnská administrace velkostatků Veselí nad Moravou 1763–1786
- F 264 Velkostatek Plumlov 1571–1934
- F 271 Lichtenštejnský revizní úřad Břeclav 1878–1882
- F 275 Lichtenštejnský inspektorát Šternberk 1781–1810
- F 410 Lichtenštejnská továrna na hliněné zboží a cihelna Poštorná 1888–1920
- F 479 Lichtenštejnské uhelné a hliněné doly, s.r.o. Mladějov 1866–1950
- Penzijní fond lichtenštejnských zaměstnanců Olomouc 1867–1951
- Fondy G – Sbírký a rodinné archivy:
 - G 1 Bočkova sbírka
 - G 2 Nová sbírka
 - G 4 Listiny Františkova musea
 - G 11 Sbírka rukopisů Františkova musea
 - G 145 Rodinný archiv Ditrichštejnů

(12) *Moravský zemský archiv v Brně, Státní okresní archiv Břeclav se sídlem v Mikulově*

Farní archivy

- Archiv města Břeclav 1625–1945
- Archiv města Hustopeče 1362–1945
- Archiv města Podivín 1637–1945
- Archiv města Valtice 1295–1944
- Archiv obce Hlohovec 1802–1845
- Archiv obce Charvátská Nová Ves 1781–1945
- Archiv obce Ladná 1848–1945
- Archiv obce Lanžhot 1870–1845
- Archiv obce Lednice 1567–1945
- Archiv obce židovské Lednice 1865–1919

(13) *Zemský archiv Opava*

Archiv žerotínsko-vrbenský 1497–1744

Královský úřad Opava 1742–1782

Sbírka map a plánů 1561–2000

Sbírka rukopisů 1550–2009

Velkostatek knížecí Opava 1564–1852

Velkostatek Šternberk 1381–1945

Velkostatek Úsov – Nové Zámky 1564–1945

Velkostatek Velké Losiny 1568–1945

Zemské muzeum Opava 1882–1938

Zemské právo opavsko-krnovské 1501–1850

(14) *Zemský archiv Opava, Státní okresní archiv Prostějov*

Archiv města Prostějov 1392–1945

Archiv městečka Plumlov 1600–1945

Obecní archivy

(15) *Zemský archiv Opava, Státní okresní archiv Šumperk*

Archiv obce Velké Losiny 1755–1945

(16) *Zemský archiv Opava, pobočka Olomouc*

Správa státních lesů Velké Losiny 1945–1948

Velkostatek Velké Losiny 1568–1945

(17) *Státní oblastní archiv Litoměřice, pobočka Děčín*

Rodinný archiv Kouniců, Česká Lípa 1623–1947

Velkostatek Česká Lípa – Nový Zámek 1535–1947

Velkostatek Rumburk 1570–1936

(18) *Archiv Masarykovy univerzity Brno (AMU)*

B 63 František Weyr

B 76 Jaromír Sedláček

b. Source editions

Allgäuer, Robert – Jansen, Norbert – Ospelt, Alois (eds.): *Liechtenstein 1938–1978*. Bilder und Dokumente. Vaduz 1978. Registerband 1988.

Allgäuer, Robert – Norbert Jansen (eds.): *Liechtenstein 1978–1988*. Bilder, Texte und Dokumente. Vaduz 1988.

Batliner, Alexander (ed.): *Liechtenstein 1988–1998*. Vaduz 2008.

Bistrický, Jan – Spurný, František – Václavek, Ludvík – Zemek, Metoděj: *Moravské a slezské listiny liechtenštejnského archívu ve Vaduzu*. 1173–1380. I. díl. Mikulov – Rajhrad – Hodonín – Znojmo – Brno 1991.

Bretholz, Bertold: *Das Urbar der Liechtensteinischen Herrschaften Nikolsburg, Dürnholz, Lundenburg, Falkenstein, Feldsberg, Rabensburg, Mistelbach, Hagenberg und Gnadendorf aus dem Jahre 1414*. Reichenberg und Chomutau 1930.

Documents Diplomatiques Suisses 1848–1945. Vol. 13 (1939–1940). Bern 1991.

Drtina, Prokop: *Československo můj osud*. Praha 1992.

Elvert, Christian de (ed.): *Die Bestrafung der böhmischen Rebellion, insbesondere die Correspondenz Ferdinand II. mit dem Fürsten Liechtenstein*. Brünn 1868.

Fleischer, Victor: *Fürst Karl Eusebius von Liechtenstein als Bauherr und Kunstsammler (1611–1684)*. Leipzig 1910.

Haupt, Herbert (ed.): *“Ein Liebhaber der Gemähl und virtuosen...” Fürst Johann Adam I. Andreas von Liechtenstein (1657–1712)*. Quellenband mit beigelegter CD-Rom. Wien – Köln – Weimar 2012.

Hrubý, František (ed.): *Moravská korespondence a akta I*. Brno 1934.

Jech, Karel (ed.): *Němci a Maďari v dekretch prezidenta republiky. Studie a dokumenty 1940–1945. Die Deutschen und Magyaren in den Dekreten des Präsidenten der Republik. Studien und Dokumente 1940–1945*. Praha – Brno 2003.

Jenne, Rudolph (ed.): *Documenta Liechtensteiniana*. 2. Bde. (s. 1., s. d.).

Liechtensteinisches Landesgesetzblatt (LGBL). Since 1863.

Rechenschaftsbericht der Regierung. Vaduz. Annually since 1922.

Sbírka zákonů a nařízení republiky Československé. Praha 1945–1948.

Sbírka zákonů a nařízení státu Československého. Praha 1945.

Vařeka, Marek (ed.): *Urbář plumlovského panství z roku 1624*. (Documenta Liechtensteina. Series Nova I). Prostějov 2009.

Wilhelm, Franz: *Neue Quellen zur Geschichte des fürstlich Liechtensteinischen Kunstbesitzes*. Jahrbuch des kunsthistorischen Institutes 5, 1911, Beiblatt, pp. 88–142.

Winkelbauer, Thomas: *Gundaker von Liechtenstein als Grundherr in Niederösterreich und Mähren. Normative Quellen zur Verwaltung und Bewirtschaftung eines Herrschaftskomplexes und zur Reglementierung des Lebens der Untertanen durch einen adeligen Grundherrn sowie zur Organisation des Hofstaates und der Kanzlei eines „Neufürsten“ in der ersten Hälfte des 17. Jahrhunderts*. Wien – Köln – Weimar 2008.

Wirtschaftskrise, Nationalsozialismus und Krieg. Dokumente zur liechtensteinischen Geschichte 1928 bis 1950. Bearbeitet von Stefan Frey und Lukas Ospelt. Vaduz – Zürich 2011.

c. Literature

Arranged according to (1) General works, (2) Karl I von Liechtenstein and the battle of the White Mountain, (3) Other members of the Liechtenstein family, (4) Land reform, Second World War, confiscation of property, (5) Culture and art, (6) History of the Principality of Liechtenstein, (7) Regional literature.

(1) General works

Austensen, Roy A.: *Count Buol and the Metternich Tradition*. Austrian History Yearbook 9–10, 1973–1974, pp. 173–193.

Balcárek, Pavel: *Karel z Lichtenštejna, konvertita a gubernátor v Čechách*. In: Balcárek, Pavel: *Ve víru třicetileté války. Politikové, kondotieri, rebelové a mučedníci v zemích Koruny české*. České Budějovice 2011, pp. 11–41, 430–432.

Boček, Antonín: *Přehled knížat a markrabat i jiných nejvyšších úředníků zemských v Markrabství moravském*. Brno 1850.

Buben, Milan: *Liechtensteinové I, II*. Střední Evropa. Revue pro středoevropskou kulturu a politiku 11, 1995, č. 49, s. 108–120, č. 50, pp. 99–111.

Cibulka, Pavel: *Eine Herrschaft in Mähren* [sc. Lundenburg (Břeclav)]. In: Heindl, Waltraud – Saurer, Edith (edd.): *Grenze und Staat. Paßwesen, Staatsbürgerschaft, Heimatrecht und Fremden gesetzgebung in der österreichischen Monarchie 1750–1867*. Wien – Köln – Weimar 2000, pp. 719–787.

Dopsch, Heinz: *Liechtenstein – Herkunft und Aufstieg eines Fürstenhauses*. In: Brunhart, Arthur (ed.): *Bausteine zur liechtensteinischen Geschichte, Studien und studentische Forschungsbeiträge*. Zürich 1999.

Dopsch, Heinz: *Kleinstaat und Kaiserreich. Das „staatsrechtliche Verhältnis“ des Fürstentums Liechtenstein zum Römisch-Deutschen Reich und zur Habsburgermonarchie*. In: *Von Stadtstaaten und Imperien. Kleinterritorien und Großreiche im historischen Vergleich*. Innsbruck 2006, pp. 154–171.

Dopsch, Heinz – Stögmann, Arthur: *Liechtenstein*. In: Historisches Lexikon des Fürstentums Liechtenstein, Bd. 1. Vaduz 2013, pp. 518–525.

Dostál, Vít: *Víceúrovňové vládnutí v zahraniční politice? Urovnání česko-liechtenštejnských vztahů a role Jihomoravského kraje*. Diplomová magisterská práce. Masarykova univerzita, Fakulta sociálních studií. Rukopis. Brno 2011.

Dotson, Samuel C.: *Genealogie des fürstlichen Liechtenstein seit Hartmann II. (1544–1585)*. Falköping 2003.

Drašnar, Vojtěch – Hoření, Kateřina – Kohoutková, Kamila – Steinerová, Alžběta (edd.): *Die Darstellung der Liechtensteiner: der aktuelle Diskurs der Erinnerung an die Liechtensteiner in Tschechien*. In: Liechtensteinisch-Tschechische Historikerkommission (ed.): *Das Fürstenhaus, der Staat Liechtenstein und die Tschechoslowakei im 20. Jahrhundert*. Vaduz 2013, pp. 237–256.

Elbel, Petr: *Das Bild der Liechtenstein in der tschechischen Historiographie*. In: Liechtensteinisch-Tschechische Historikerkommission (ed.): *Liechtensteinische Erinnerungsorte in den böhmischen Ländern*. Vaduz 2012, pp. 173–181. Česká verze: Elbel, Petr: *Obraz Lichtenštejnů v české historiografii*. In: Geiger, Peter – Knoz, Tomáš (edd.): *Místa Lichtenštejnské paměti*. (Časopis Matice moravské 131, 2012 – Supplementum 3). Brno 2012, pp. 165–172.

Falke, Jacob: *Geschichte des fürstlichen Hauses Liechtenstein*. Bd. 1. Wien 1868.

Falke, Jacob: *Geschichte des fürstlichen Hauses Liechtenstein*. Bd. 2. Wien 1877.

Falke, Jacob: *Geschichte des fürstlichen Hauses Liechtenstein*. Bd. 3. Wien 1882.

Fukala, Radek: *Liechtenstein*. In: Dokoupil, Lumír (ed.): *Biografický slovník Slezska a severní Moravy*. Sešit 10. Ostrava 1998, pp. 90–108.

Gracová, Blažena: *Das Bild der Liechtenstein in tschechischen Geschichtsbüchern*. In: Liechtensteinisch-Tschechische Historikerkommission (ed.): *Liechtensteinische Erinnerungsorte in den böhmischen Ländern*. Vaduz 2012, pp. 183–194. Česká verze: Gracová, Blažena: *Obraz Lichtenštejnů v českých učebnicích dějepisu*. In: Geiger, Peter – Knoz, Tomáš (edd.): *Místa Lichtenštejnské paměti*. (Časopis Matice moravské 131, 2012 – Supplementum 3). Brno 2012, pp. 173–182.

Halada, Jan: *Lexikon české šlechty*. Praha 1992, heslo Liechtensteinové, s. 88–89.

Hofmeister, Herbert: *Pro conservanda familiae et agnationis dignitate. Das liechtensteinische Familien-Fideikommiß als Rechtsgrundlage der Familien- und Vermögenseinheit*. In: Oberhammer, Evelin (ed.): *Der ganzen Welt ein Lob und Spiegel*. Das Fürstenhaus Liechtenstein in der frühen Neuzeit. Wien – München, pp. 46–63.

Horel, Catherine: *Die Habsburgermonarchie. Ein transnationaler Erinnerungsort?* In: Liechtensteinisch-Tschechische Historikerkommission (ed.): *Liechtensteinische Erinnerungsorte in den böhmischen Ländern*. Vaduz 2012, pp. 33–48. Česká verze: Horel, Catherine: *Habsburská monarchie: transnacionální místo paměti?* In: Geiger, Peter – Knoz, Tomáš (edd.): *Místa Lichtenštejnské paměti*. (Časopis Matice moravské 131, 2012 – Supplementum 3). Brno 2012, pp. 7–22.

Horel, Catherine: *La restitution des biens juifs et le renouveau juif en Europe centrale (Hongrie, Slovaquie, République Tchèque)*. In: Wiener Osteuropa Studien. Bern 2002.

Horel, Catherine: *Cette Europe qu'on dit centrale. Des Habsbourg à l'intégration européenne (1815–2004)*. Paris 2009.

Jan, Libor: *Die Anfänge der liechtensteinischen Kontinuität auf dem Gebiet des Rechts und des Grundbesitzes in Südmähren*. In: Liechtensteinisch-Tschechische Historikerkommission (ed.): *Die Liechtenstein: Kontinuitäten – Diskontinuitäten*. Vaduz 2013, pp. 45–54.

Juřík, Pavel: *Moravská dominia Liechtensteinů a Dietrichsteinů*. Praha 2009.

Knoz, Tomáš: *Erinnerungsorte der Liechtenstein: Einleitende Thesen*. In: Liechtensteinisch-Tschechische Historikerkommission (ed.): *Liechtensteinische Erinnerungsorte in den böhmischen Ländern*. Vaduz 2012, s. 11–32. Česká verze: Knoz, Tomáš: *Místa lichtenštejnské paměti. Úvodní teze*. In: Geiger, Peter – Knoz, Tomáš (edd.): *Místa Lichtenštejnské paměti*. (Časopis Matice moravské 131, 2012 – Supplementum 3). Brno 2012, pp. 23–47.

Komlosy, Andrea – Bůžek, Václav – Svátek, František (edd.): *Kultury na hranici*. Waidhofen 1995.

Konfliktgemeinschaft, Katastrophe, Entspannung. Skizze einer Darstellung der deutsch-tschechischen Geschichte seit dem 19. Jahrhundert. Herausgegeben von der Gemeinsamen Deutsch-tschechischen Historikerkommission. Oldenbourg 1996.

Lackner, Christian: *Hof und Herrschaft. Rat, Kanzlei und Regierung der österreichischen Herzoge (1365–1406).* Wien 2002.

Lackner, Christian: *Aufstieg und Fall des Hans von Liechtenstein zu Nikolsburg im 14. Jahrhundert.* In: Hirschiegel, Jan – Paravicini, Werner (edd.): *Der Fall des Günstlings. Hofparteien in Europa vom 13. bis zum 17. Jahrhundert.* Ostfildern 2004, pp. 251–262.

Löffle , Josef: *Die Verwaltung der Herrschaften und Güter der Fürsten von Liechtenstein in den böhmischen Ländern von der Mitte des 18. Jahrhunderts bis 1948.* In: Merki, Christoph Maria – Löffle , Josef: *Das Haus Liechtenstein in den böhmischen Ländern vom Mittelalter bis ins 20. Jahrhundert – Güter, Rechte, Verwaltung.* Vaduz 2013, pp. 169–208.

Löffle , Josef: *Die liechtensteinische Herrschafts- und Güterverwaltung – Ein Überblick.* In: Liechtensteinisch-Tschechische Historikerkommission (ed.): *Das Fürstenhaus, der Staat Liechtenstein und die Tschechoslowakei im 20. Jahrhundert.* Vaduz 2013, pp. 115–158.

Maťa, Petr: *Svět české aristokracie (1500–1700).* Praha 2004.

Merki, Christoph Maria – Löffle , Josef: *Das Haus Liechtenstein in den böhmischen Ländern vom Mittelalter bis ins 20. Jahrhundert – Güter, Rechte, Verwaltung.* Vaduz 2013.

Merki, Christoph Maria: *Liechtensteinische Güter und Rechte in Böhmen, Mähren und Schlesien vom Spätmittelalter bis ins 20. Jahrhundert. Zur Besitzgeschichte der grenzüberschreitenden Dynastie Liechtenstein.* In: Merki, Christoph Maria – Löffler, Josef: *Das Haus Liechtenstein in den böhmischen Ländern vom Mittelalter bis ins 20. Jahrhundert – Güter, Rechte, Verwaltung.* Vaduz 2013, pp. 9–167.

Merki, Christoph Maria: *Besitzverschiebungen: Vom Grundherr zum Bankier.* In: Liechtensteinisch-Tschechische Historikerkommission (ed.): *Das Fürstenhaus, der Staat Liechtenstein und die Tschechoslowakei im 20. Jahrhundert.* Vaduz 2013, pp. 13–23.

Möhl, Christoph: *Die Herren von Liechtenstein und die Wiedertäufer in Mähren*. In: Jahrbuch des historischen Vereins für das Fürstentum Liechtenstein 77, 1977, pp. 119–171.

Nebeský, Jiří: *Liechtenstein nebo Lichtenštejn? Poznámka k psaní jmen české šlechty*. Genealogické a heraldické listy 22, 2002, č. 2, s. 2–6.

Oberhammer, Evelin: *Das Hausarchiv der Regierenden Fürsten von Liechtenstein*. Scrinium 24, 1981, pp. 165–184.

Oberhammer, Evelin (ed.): *Der ganzen Welt ein Lob und Spiegel*. Das Fürstenhaus Liechtenstein in der frühen Neuzeit. Wien – München 1990.

Oberhammer, Evelin: „*Viel ansehnliche Stuck und Güeter*“. *Die Entwicklung des fürstlichen Herrschaftsbesitzes*. In: Oberhammer, Evelin (ed.): *Der ganzen Welt ein Lob und Spiegel*. Das Fürstenhaus Liechtenstein in der frühen Neuzeit. Wien – München 1990, pp. 33–45.

Oberhammer, Evelin: *Das Hausarchiv der Regierenden Fürsten von Liechtenstein*. In: Veröffentlichungen des Liechtensteinischen Landesarchivs I. Vaduz 2001, pp. 15–38.

Obršlík, Jindřich et al.: *F 43 Velkostatek Břeclav*. Inventář archivního fondu. Brno 1958.

Obršlík, Jindřich – Zřídka Veselý, František – Bräuner, Vilém – Krška, Ivan – Zemek, Metoděj: *F 115 – Lichtenštejnský stavební úřad Lednice 1752–1945*. Strojopis inventáře. Brno 1959.

Obršlík, Jindřich – Voldán, Vladimír: *Inventář lichtenštejnské dvorní kanceláře*. Brno 1960.

Pánek, Jaroslav: *Kontinuitäten und Diskontinuitäten in der Geschichte Mitteleuropas*. In: Liechtensteinisch-Tschechische Historikerkommission (ed.): *Die Liechtenstein: Kontinuitäten – Diskontinuitäten*. Vaduz 2013, pp. 13–29.

Pfeifer, Wilhelm: *Das Fürstenhaus Liechtenstein in Nordböhmen*. Backnang 1984.

Pircher, Wolfgang: *Verwüstung und Verschwendung. Adeliges Bauen nach der Zweiten Türkenbelagerung*. Wien 1984.

Pokluda, Zdeněk: *O našich biskupech a také o neposedných písmenkách aneb Lichtenštejn nebo Liechtenstein?* Vlastivědný věstník moravský 61, 2009, č. 2, pp. 190–191.

Polišenský, Josef: *Tricetiletá válka a evropské krize 17. století*. Praha 1970.

Press, Volker – Willoweit, Dietmar (edd.): *Liechtenstein – Fürstliches Haus und staatliche Ordnung*. Wien – München 1988.

Press, Volker: *Das Haus Liechtenstein in der europäischen Geschichte*. In: Press, Volker – Willoweit, Dietmar (edd.): *Liechtenstein – Fürstliches Haus und staatliche Ordnung*. Geschichtliche Grundlagen und moderne Perspektiven. ²Vaduz – München – Wien 1988, pp. 15–85.

Press, Volker: *Denn der Adel bildet die Grundlage und die Säulen des States. Adel im Reich 1650–1750*. In: Oberhammer, Evelin (ed.): *Der ganzen Welt ein Lob und Spiegel*. Wien – München 1990, pp. 11–32.

Press, Volker: *Adel in der österreichisch-böhmischen Erblanden und im Reich zwischen dem 15. und 17. Jahrhundert*. In: Knittler, Herbert (ed.): *Adel im Wandel*. Politik – Kultur – Konfession 1500–1700. Rosenberg 1990, pp. 19–31.

Radimský, Jiří: *C 2 Tribunál – pozůstalosti*. Inventář MZA. Brno 1958.

Reichert, Folker: *Landesherrschaft, Adel und Vogtei. Zur Vorgeschichte des spätmittelalterlichen Ständestaates im Herzogtum Österreich*. Köln – Wien 1985.

Rudersdorf, Manfred: *Josef Wenzel von Liechtenstein (1696–1772): Diplomat, Feldmarschall und Heeresreformer im kaiserlichen Dienst*. In: Press, Volker – Willoweit, Dietmar (edd.): *Liechtenstein – Fürstliches Haus und staatliche Ordnung*. ²Vaduz – München – Wien 1988, pp. 347–381.

Schmid, Georg M.: *Das Hausrecht der Fürsten von Liechtenstein*. In: *Jahrbuch des Historischen Vereins für das Fürstentum Liechtenstein* 78, 1978, pp. 1–181.

Skutil, Jan: *Lichtenštejni*. In: *Katalog moravských a slezských zemskodeskovních držitelů. Část IV*. In: *Vlastivědná ročenka okresního archivu Blansko*. Blansko 1979.

Skutil, Jan: *Rod Liechtensteinů*. In: Ludvíková, Miroslava (ed.): *Poutní místo Vranov*. Vranov u Brna 1996, pp. 43–49.

Schöpfer, Gerald: *Klar und Fest. Geschichte des Hauses Liechtenstein*. Riegensburg 1996.

Schwoy, Franz Josef: *Genealogie des Hoch fürstlichen Hauses Liechtenstein*. Patriotisches Tageblatt oder öffentliches Correspondenz und Anzeige Blat für sämtliche Bewohner aller kais. kön. Erblände über wichtige, interresirende, lehrreiche oder vergnügende Gegenstände zur Beförderung des Patriotismus. Brünn 1804, Nr. 25 (28. 3.); pp. 321–324, Nr. 26 (31. 3.), pp. 335–338; Nr. 27 (4. 4.), pp. 351–354.

Šembera, Alois Vojtěch: *Páni z Boskovic a potomní držitelé bradu Boskovického na Moravě*. Vídeň 1870.

Sloschek, Erich: *Lichtenstein*. Zeitschrift des Vereines für Geschichte Mährens und Schlesiens 37, 1935, pp. 111–113.

Spurný, František: *Liechtensteinové*. Cour d'honneur. Hrady, zámky, paláce 1, 1998, pp. 60–61.

Stekl, Hannes: *Österreichs Aristokratie im Vormärz. Herrschaftsstil und Lebensformen des Fürstenhauses Liechtenstein und Schwarzenberg*. München 1973.

Stögmann, Arthur: *Das Hausarchiv der der regierenden Fürsten von und zu Liechtenstein*. Mitteilungen des Österreichischen Staatsarchivs (Archivpfleg und Archivalienschutz. Beispiel der Familienarchive und Nachlässe) 56, 2011, pp. 503–518.

Stögmann, Arthur: *Einblick in den zwischen 1945 und 1997 im "Sonderarchiv Moskau" verwahrten Teilbestand des fürstlich liechtensteinischen Hausarchivs*. In: Liechtensteinisch-Tschechische Historikerkommission (ed.): *Das Fürstenhaus, der Staat Liechtenstein und die Tschechoslowakei im 20. Jahrhundert*. Vaduz 2013, pp. 175–184.

Stögmann, Arthur: *Kontinuitäten und Diskontinuitäten in der Religiosität und Religionspolitik der Fürsten von Liechtenstein im 16. und 17. Jahrhundert*. In: Liechtensteinisch-Tschechische Historikerkommission (ed.): *Die Liechtenstein: Kontinuitäten – Diskontinuitäten*. Vaduz 2013, pp. 71–90.

Svoboda, Miroslav – Svobodová, Kamila: *Das Leben an der Grenze. Die Liechtensteinischen Herrschaften vom Anfang des 15. Jahrhunderts im Spiegel ihres Urbars*. In: Knoz, Tomáš (ed.): *Tschechen und Österreicher. Gemeinsame Geschichte, gemeinsame Zukunft*. Wien – Brno 2006, pp. 253–260.

Šebek, Jaroslav: *Katholisches Leben und Frömmigkeit in den liechtensteinischen Herrschaftsgebieten in Südmähren*. In: Liechtensteinisch-Tschechische Historikerkommission (ed.): *Die Liechtenstein: Kontinuitäten – Diskontinuitäten*. Vaduz 2013, pp. 109–120.

Ther, Philipp: *Die dunkle Seite der Nationalstaaten. "Ethnische Säuberungen" im modernen Europa*. Göttingen – Oakville CT 2011.

Válka, Josef: *Dějiny Moravy 1. Středověká Morava*. Brno 1991.

Válka, Josef: *Dějiny Moravy 2. Morava reformace, renesance a baroka*. Brno 1995.

Vařeka, Marek: *Působení pánů z Lichtenštejna na Moravě v letech 1249–1350*. Královéhradecko. Historický sborník pro poučenou veřejnost 4, 2007, pp. 465–483.

Weltin, Max: *Die "Laaer Briefsammlung". Eine Quelle zur inneren Geschichte Österreichs unter Ottokar II. Přemysl*. Wien – Köln – Graz 1975.

Weltin, Max: *Landesherr und Landherren. Zur Herrschaft Ottokars II. Přemysl in Österreich*. Jahrbuch für Landeskunde von Niederösterreich NF 44/45, 1978–1979, pp. 159–225.

Weltin, Max: *Ascherichsbrugge. Das Werden einer Stadt an der Grenze*. NÖLA, Mitteilungen aus dem Niederösterreichischen Landesarchiv 10, 1986–1987, pp. 1–42.

Voldán, Vladimír: *Velkostatek Valtice 1391–1945*. Brno 1960.

Voldán, Vladimír a kol.: *Státní archiv v Brně. Průvodce po archivních fondech*. Sv. 2. Praha 1964.

Wilhelm, Gustav: *Zur ältesten Geschichte des Hauses Liechtenstein*. Neues Jahrbuch der Heraldisch-Genealogischen Gesellschaft Adler 3, 1951–1954, pp. 12–19.

Wilhelm, Gustav: *Stammtafel des fürstlichen Hauses von und zu Liechtenstein*. Vaduz s. d. [1980].

Winkelbauer, Thomas: *Haklich und der Korruption unterworfen. Die Verwaltung der liechtensteinischen Herrschaften und Güter im 17. und 18. Jahrhundert*. In: Oberhammer, E. (ed.): *Der ganzen Welt ein Lob und Spiegel*. Wien – München 1990, pp. 86–114.

Winkelbauer, Thomas: *Krise der Aristokratie? Zum Strukturwandel des Adels in den böhmischen und niederösterreichischen Ländern im 16. und 17. Jahrhundert*. Mitteilungen des Instituts für österreichische Geschichtsforschung 100, 1992, pp. 328–353.

Winkelbauer, Thomas (ed.): *Kontakte und Konflikte, Böhmen, Mähren und Österreich: Aspekte eines Jahrtausends gemeinsamer Geschichte*. Horn – Waidhofen an der Thaya 1993.

Winkelbauer, Thomas: *Die Liechtenstein als "grenzüberschreitendes Adelsgeschlecht". Eine Skizze der Entwicklung des Besitzes der Herren und Fürsten von Liechtenstein in Niederösterreich und Mähren im Rahmen der politischen Geschichte*. In: Komlosy, Andrea – Bůžek, Václav – Svátek, František (edd.): *Kulturen an der Grenze. Waldviertel – Weinviertel – Südböhmen – Südmähren*. Wien 1995, pp. 219–226.

Winkelbauer, Thomas: *Lichtenštejnové jako "šlechta neznající hranice". Náčrt majetkového vývoje pánů a knížat lichtenštejnských v Dolních Rakousích a na Moravě v rámci politických dějin*. In: Komlosyová, Andrea – Bůžek, Václav – Svátek, František (edd.): *Kultury na hranici – Jižní Čechy, Jižní Morava*, Waldviertel, Weinviertel. Wien 1995, pp. 215–218.

Winkelbauer, Thomas: *Les Liechtenstein, gentilshommes gestionnaires aux XVIIe et XVIIIe siècles. De l'économie théorique à la pratique économique*. In: Boehler, Jean-Michel – Lebeau, Christine – Vogler, Bernard (edd.): *Les élites régionales (XVIIe–XXe siècle). Construction de soi-même et service de l'autre*. Strasbourg 2002, pp. 121–149.

Winkelbauer, Thomas: *Österreichische Geschichte 1522–1699. Ständefreiheit und Fürstenmacht. Länder und Untertanen des Hauses Habsburg im konfessionellen Zeitalter*. Wien 2003.

Zemek, Metoděj – Obršlík, Jindřich – Voldán, Vladimír a kolektiv: *F 30 – Lichtenštejnská ústřední účtárna Bučovice 1580–1924*. Strojopis inventáře. Brno 1957.

Zemek, Metoděj: *Jižní Morava v lichtenštejnských listinách Vadúzu*. Jižní Morava 14, 1978, pp. 80–86.

Zemek, Metoděj: *Bohemika v lichtenštejnských archivech ve Vaduzu a ve Vídni*. Archivní časopis 19, 1979, pp. 211–229.

Zemek, Metoděj: *Listiny jižní Moravy v lichtenštejnském archívu ve Vaduzu*. Jižní Morava 15, 1979, pp. 207–230.

Zemek, Metoděj – Turek, Adolf: *Regesta listin z lichtenštejnského archívu ve Vaduzu z let 1173 až 1526*. Sborník archivních prací 33, 1983, pp. 149–296, 483–527.

Županič, Jan: *Das Haus Liechtenstein in Österreich-Ungarn. Zur Frage der souveränen Stellung eines aristokratischen Geschlechts*. In: Liechtensteinisch-Tschechische Historikerkommission (ed.): *Liechtensteinische Erinnerungsorte in den böhmischen Ländern*. Vaduz 2012, pp. 72–82. Česká verze: Županič, Jan: *Lichtenštejnský rod v Rakousko-Uhersku. K otázce suverénního postavení dynastie*. In: Geiger, Peter – Knoz, Tomáš (edd.): *Místa Lichtenštejnské paměti*. (Časopis Matice moravské 131, 2012 – Supplementum 3). Brno 2012, pp. 63–72.

(2) *Karl I von Liechtenstein and the battle of the White Mountain*

Balcárek, Pavel: *Ve víru třicetileté války*. České Budějovice 2012, především kap. 1, Karel z Lichtenštejna, pp. 11–41.

Bílek, Tomáš V.: *Dějiny konfiskací v Čechách po . 1618*. Praha 1882–1883.

Elvert, Christian de: *Die Bestrafung der böhmischen Rebellion, insbesondere die Correspondenz Ferdinand II. mit dem Fürsten Liechtenstein*. Brünn 1868.

Fukala, Radek: *Protilychtenštejnská opozice na Opavsku v letech 1613–1617*. Časopis Matice moravské 120, 2001, pp. 67–90.

Hrubý, František: *Moravská šlechta roku 1619, její jmění a náboženské vyznání*. Časopis Matice moravské 46, 1922, pp. 107–169.

Kippes, Erich: *Feldsberg und das Haus Liechtenstein im 17. Jahrhundert. Die Gegenreformation im Bereich der Fürstlichen Herrschaft*. Wien – Köln – Weimar 1996.

Knoz, Tomáš: *Liechtensteinové, Morava a Valtice v 1. polovině 17. století*. In: Kordiovský, Emil (ed.): *Město Valtice*. Valtice 2001, pp. 301–315.

Knoz, Tomáš: *Pobělohorské konfiskace Moravský průběh, středoevropské souvislosti, obecné aspekty*. Brno 2001.

Kostlán, Antonín: *Finanční zbrocení ve střední Evropě na počátku třicetileté války*. *Folia Historica Bohemica* 8, 1985, pp. 265–316.

Matějek, František: *Bílá hora a moravská feudální společnost*. *Československý časopis historický* 22, 1974, pp. 81–104.

Matějek, František: *Morava za třicetileté války*. Praha 1992.

Petráň, Josef: *Staroměstská exekuce*. Praha 1971.

Polišenský, Josef: *Třicetiletá válka a český národ*. Praha 1960.

Polišenský, Josef – Snider, Frederick: *Změny ve složení české šlechty v 16. a 17. století*. *Československý časopis historický* 20, 1972, pp. 515–526.

Stloukal, Karel: *Karel z Lichtenštejna a jeho účast ve vládě Rudolfa II. (1596–1607)*. *Český časopis historický* 18, 1912, pp. 21–37, 153–169, 380–434.

Stloukal-Zlinský, Karel: *Karel z Lichtenštejna a jeho účast na vládě Rudolfa II. (1569–1607)*. Praha 1912.

Stögmänn, Arthur: *Karel z Lichtenštejna, Albrecht z Valdštejna a převratné změny v Čechách po bitvě na Bílé hoře (1620–1627)*. In: Fučíková, Eliška – Čepička, Ladislav (edd.): *Albrecht z Valdštejna*. *Inter arma silent musae*. Praha 2007, pp. 295–303.

Vařeka, Marek: *Mocenské aktivity knížete Karla I. z Lichtenštejna a jeho bratrů v Horním Slezsku*. In: Brňovják, Jiří – Gojniczek, Waclaw – Zářícký, Aleš (edd.): *Šlechtic v Horním Slezsku*. Katowice – Ostrava 2011, pp. 177–196.

Vondra, Roman: *Karel z Lichtenštejna (1569–1627)*. Historický obzor 18, 2007, č. 11/12, pp. 273–277.

Wilhelm, Gustav: *Fürst Karl von Liechtenstein und seine genealogischen und heraldischen Bestrebungen. Die Entwicklung des Wappens der Fürsten von Liechtenstein*. Neues Jahrbuch der Heraldisch-Genalogischen Gesellschaft Adler 2, 1947–1950, pp. 5–14.

Winkelbauer, Thomas: *Karrieristen oder fromme Männer? Adelige Konvertiten in den böhmischen und österreichischen Ländern um 1600*. In: Chocholáč, Bronislav – Jan, Libor – Knoz, Tomáš (edd.): *Nový Mars Moravicus*. Brno 1999, pp. 431–452.

Winkelbauer, Thomas: *Karl von Liechtenstein und das "Prager Blutgericht" vom 21. Juni 1621 als tschechischer Erinnerungsort im Spiegel der Historiographie*. In: Liechtensteinisch-Tschechische Historikerkommission (ed.): *Liechtensteinische Erinnerungsorte in den böhmischen Ländern*. Vaduz 2012, pp. 51–71. Česká verze: Winkelbauer, Thomas: *Karel z Lichtenštejna a staroměstská exekuce 21. června 1621 jako české místo paměti v zrcadle historiografie*. In: Geiger, Peter – Knoz, Tomáš (edd.): *Místa Lichtenštejnské paměti*. (Časopis Matice moravské 131, 2012 – Supplementum 3). Brno 2012, pp. 49–62.

Zukal, Josef: *Die Liechtensteinische Inquisition in den Herzogtümern Troppau und Jägerndorf aus Anlass der Manzfeldischen Rebellion 1626–1627*. Zeitschrift für Geschichte und Kulturgeschichte Österreichisch-Schlesiens 7, 1912, Heft 1/3, pp. 4–260.

Zukal, Josef: *Slezské konfiskace 1620–1630. Pokutování provinilé šlechty v Krnovsku, Opavsku a Osoblažsku po bitvě bělohorské a po vpádu Mansfeldově*. Praha 1916.

Županič, Jan – Stellner, František – Fiala, Michal: *Encyklopedie knížecích rodů zemí Koruny české*. Praha 2001.

(3) *Other members of the Liechtenstein family*

Baumstark, Reinhold (ed.): *Joseph Wenzel von Liechtenstein. Fürst und Diplomat des 18. Jahrhunderts*. Ausstellungskatalog. Vaduz 1990.

Haupt, Herbert: „*Der Namen und Stammen der Herren von Liechtenstein*“. *Biographische Skizzen*. In: Oberhammer, Evelin (ed.): *Der ganzen Welt ein Lob und Spiegel. Das Fürstenhaus Liechtenstein in der frühen Neuzeit*. Wien – München 1990, pp. 213–221.

Haupt, Herbert (ed.): *Von der Leidenschaft zum Schönen. Fürst Karl Eusebius von Liechtenstein (1611–1684)*. Bd. 1–2. Wien – Graz 1998.

Haupt, Herbert: *Fürst Karl Eusebius von Liechtenstein 1611–1684. Erbe und Bewahrer in schwerer Zeit*. München – Berlin – London – New York 2007.

Höbelt, Lothar: *Fürst Johann Liechtenstein als finanzieller Schutzpatron der „Chabrus-Grafen“*. In: Liechtensteinisch-Tschechische Historikerkommission (ed.): *Die Liechtenstein: Kontinuitäten – Diskontinuitäten*. Vaduz 2013, pp. 247–261.

Hörmann, Michael: *Fürst Anton Florian von Liechtenstein (1656–1721)*. In: Press, Volker – Willoweit, Dietmar (edd.): *Liechtenstein – Fürstliches Haus und staatliche Ordnung*. Wien – München 1988, pp. 189–209.

Kürenberg, Joachim von: *Johann II. Fürst von u. zu Liechtenstein. Sein Leben und Wirken*. Eisgrub 1932.

Mitis, Oskar v.: *Gundacker's von Liechtensteins Anteil an der Kaiserlichen Zentralverwaltung (1606–1654)*. Beiträge zur neueren Geschichte Österreichs 4, 1908, pp. 35–118.

Schmidt, Georg: *Fürst Johann I. (1760–1836). „Souverenität und Modernisierung“ Liechtensteins*. In: Press, Volker – Willoweit, Dietmar (edd.): *Liechtenstein – Fürstliches Haus und staatliche Ordnung. Geschichtliche Grundlagen und Perspektiven*. Vaduz – München – Wien 1988, pp. 383–418.

Seger, Otto: *Gundaker von Liechtenstein und Albrecht von Wallenstein*. In: *Jahrbuch des Historischen Vereins für das Fürstentum Liechtenstein* 80, 1980, pp. 77–111.

Vařeka, Marek: *Jan Adam z Lichtenštejna a jeho role při budování knížectví Lichtenštejn (sonda do ekonomiky schellenberského panství)*. Sborník filozofické fakulty – Ostrava 2008, č. 15, pp. 139–153.

Vařeka, Marek: *Jan I. z Lichtenštejna a mocenský vzestup rodu*. Sborník prací Pedagogické fakulty Masarykovy univerzity, řada společenských věd, č. 23, 2009, pp. 33–48.

Vařeka, Marek et al.: *Jan Adam I. z Liechtensteina. Ekonom, politik a mecenáš. Johann Adam I. von Liechtenstein. Ökonom, Politiker und Mäzen*. (Katalog výstavy). Ostrava 2013.

Vařeka, Marek: *Die wirtschaftlichen Aktivitäten Hartmanns II. und seines Sohnes Karl I. von Liechtenstein*. In: Liechtensteinisch-Tschechische Historikerkommission (ed.): *Die Liechtenstein: Kontinuitäten – Diskontinuitäten*. Vaduz 2013, pp. 233–246.

Wakounig, Marija: *Franz de Paula Prinz von und zu Liechtenstein*. In: *Prague Papers on the History of International Relations*. Prague 2007, pp. 135–162.

Wilhelm, Gustav: *Die Reise des Fürsten Joseph Wenzel von Liechtenstein nach Parma im Jahre 1760*. In: *Jahrbuch des Historischen Vereins für das Fürstentum Liechtenstein* 75, 1975, pp. 37–48.

Winkelbauer, Thomas: *Das "Fürstentum Liechtenstein" in Südmähren und Mährisch Kromau (bzw. Liechtenstein) als Residenzstadt Gundakers von Liechtenstein und seines Sohns Ferdinand*. In: Bůžek, Václav (ed.): *Život na dvorech barokní šlechty*. Opera historica 5. České Budějovice 1996, pp. 309–334.

Winkelbauer, Thomas: *Fürst und Fürstendiener. Gundaker von Liechtenstein, ein österreichischer Aristokrat des konfessionellen Zeitalters*. Wien – München 1999.

Wolf, Adam: *Fürstin Eleonore Liechtenstein 1745–1812*. Nach Briefen und Memoiren ihrer Zeit. Wien 1875.

(4) *Land reform, Second World War, confiscation of property*

Brandes, Detlef: *Češi pod německým protektorátem. Okupační politika, kolaborace a odboj 1939–1945*. Praha 1999.

Case Concerning Certain Property (Liechtenstein V. Germany). Vol. I–II. Hague 2009.

Dallabona, Lucia: *Die Bodenreform in der Tschechoslowakei nach dem I. Weltkrieg unter besonderer Berücksichtigung des fürstlich-liechtensteinische Besitzes*. Wien 1978. (Nepublikovaná diplomová práce.)

Dvořák, Tomáš: *Grenzverschiebungen und Bevölkerungstransfers auf den ehemaligen liechtensteinischen Herrschaften in Südmähren und die Frage ihrer regionalen Identität*. In: Liechtensteinisch-Tschechische Historikerkommission (ed.): *Die Liechtenstein: Kontinuitäten – Diskontinuitäten*. Vaduz 2013.

Geiger, Peter: *Vom Rand zum Zentrum – Fürstentum und Fürstenhaus seit drei Jahrhunderten*. In: Liechtensteinisch-Tschechische Historikerkommission (ed.): *Die Liechtenstein: Kontinuitäten – Diskontinuitäten*. Vaduz 2013, pp. 209–233.

Geiger, Peter: *Das Bild der böhmischen Länder, der Tschechoslowakei und Tschechiens in den liechtensteinischen Medien*. In: Liechtensteinisch-Tschechische Historikerkommission (ed.): *Liechtensteinische Erinnerungsorte in den böhmischen Ländern*. Vaduz 2012, pp. 215–242. Česká verze: Geiger, Peter: *Obraz českých zemí, Československa a České republiky v lichtenštejnských médiích*. In: Geiger, Peter – Knoz, Tomáš (edd.): *Místa Lichtenštejnské paměti*. (Časopis Matice moravské 131, 2012 – Supplementum 3). Brno 2012, pp. 203–228.

Geiger, Peter: *Bemühungen um Rückgewinnung und Rettung fürstlicher Güter 1938 bis 1945*. In: Liechtensteinisch-Tschechische Historikerkommission (ed.): *Das Fürstenhaus, der Staat Liechtenstein und die Tschechoslowakei im 20. Jahrhundert*. Vaduz 2013, pp. 63–80.

Geiger, Peter: *Alle enteigneten liechtensteinischen Staatsangehörigen: Wer, was, wo? Was wurde aus dem enteigneten Besitz?* In: Liechtensteinisch-Tschechische Historikerkommission (ed.): *Das Fürstenhaus, der Staat Liechtenstein und die Tschechoslowakei im 20. Jahrhundert*. Vaduz 2013, pp. 185–198.

Glassheim, Eagle: *Noble Nationalists. The Transformation of the Bohemian Aristocracy*. Cambridge, Mass. 2005.

Horák, Ondřej: *Meziválečná pozemková reforma a lichtenštejnský dvůr v Pozořicích*. Jižní Morava 41, sv. 44, 2005, pp. 327–333.

Horák, Ondřej: *Liechtensteinové mezi konfiskací a vyvlastněním. Příspěvek k poválečným zásahům do pozemkového vlastnictví v Československu v první polovině dvacátého století*. Praha 2010.

Horák, Ondřej: *Die rechtlichen Aspekte der Eingriffe des Staates in Vermögen des Fürstenhauses Liechtenstein*. In: Liechtensteinisch-Tschechische Historikerkommission (ed.): *Das Fürstenhaus, der Staat Liechtenstein und die Tschechoslowakei im 20. Jahrhundert*. Vaduz 2013, pp. 93–104.

Horák, Ondřej: *Kontinuitäten und Diskontinuitäten bei den Eingriffen in den Grundbesitz in der Nachkriegs-Tschechoslowakei und das Fürstenhaus Liechtenstein*. In: Liechtensteinisch-Tschechische Historikerkommission (ed.): *Die Liechtenstein: Kontinuitäten – Diskontinuitäten*. Vaduz 2013, pp. 55–69.

Horčička, Václav – Marxer, Roland: *Liechtenstein und die tschechoslowakischen Konfiskationen von 1945. Vom Zweiten Weltkrieg bis zur Gegenwart*. Vaduz 2013.

Horčička, Václav: *Die Enteignungen von liechtensteinischem Vermögen in der Tschechoslowakei 1945 bis 1948*. In: Horčička, Václav – Marxer, Roland: *Liechtenstein und die tschechoslowakischen Konfiskationen von 1945. Vom Zweiten Weltkrieg bis zur Gegenwart*. Vaduz 2013.

Horčička, Václav: *Tváří v tvář katastrofě*. Lichtenštejnové a konec druhé světové války v Československu. *Genealogické a heraldické informace* 12 (27), 2007, pp. 65–72.

Horčička, Václav: *Die Tschechoslowakei und die Enteignungen nach dem Zweitem Weltkrieg. Der Fall Liechtenstein*. *Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaft* 5, 2010, pp. 413–431.

Horčička, Václav: *Konfiskace majetku knížat von und zu Liechtenstein v Československu po druhé světové válce, 1945–1946*. In: *Okupace, kolaborace, retribuice*. Praha 2010, pp. 166–180.

Horčička, Václav: *Vyvlastnění majetku knížete Františka Josefa II. von und zu Liechtenstein v Československu v roce 1945 a jeho dopad na československo-lichtenštejnské vztahy v poválečném období*. In: Brňovják, Jiří – Gojniczek, Waclaw – Zářický, Aleš (edd.): *Šlechtic v Horním Slezsku*. Katowice – Ostrava 2011, pp. 401–420.

Horčíčka, Václav: *Státní památková péče a konfiskace majetku rodu Liechtensteinů po druhé světové válce*. Zprávy památkové péče 71, 2011, pp. 121–125.

Horčíčka, Václav: *Czechoslovak – Liechtenstein relations in the shadow of the Communist coup in Czechoslovakia, February 1948*. European Review of History – Revue européenne d'histoire, Vol. 19, No. 4, August 2012, pp. 601–620.

Horčíčka, Václav: *Die Konfiskation des Eigentums des Fürsten von Liechtenstein in der Tschechoslowakei*. In: Liechtensteinisch-Tschechische Historikerkommission (ed.): *Das Fürstenhaus, der Staat Liechtenstein und die Tschechoslowakei im 20. Jahrhundert*. Vaduz 2013, pp. 81–92.

Horčíčka, Václav: *Einige grundlegende Probleme des Wirkens der Familie Liechtenstein in den böhmischen Ländern während des Zweiten Weltkrieges*. In: Liechtensteinisch-Tschechische Historikerkommission (ed.): *Liechtensteinische Erinnerungsorte in den böhmischen Ländern*. Vaduz 2012, pp. 123–137. Česká verze: Horčíčka, Václav: *Nástin problematiky působení rodu Lichtenštejnů v českých zemích v období druhé světové války*. In: Geiger, Peter – Knoz, Tomáš (edd.): *Místa Lichtenštejnské paměti*. (Časopis Matice moravské 131, 2012 – Supplementum 3). Brno 2012, pp. 107–121.

Hořejš, Miloš: *Šlechta a nacistická pozemková politika v českých zemích (Der Adel und die Nazi-Bodenpolitik in den böhmischen Ländern)*. In: *Šlechta střední Evropy v konfrontaci s totalitními režimy 20. století*. Praha 2011, pp. 235–258.

Hrubant, Jaroslav: *Liechtensteinové. K dějinám páté kolony u nás*. Praha 1945.

Keller-Giger, Susanne: *Bodenreform vor Souveränität*. In: Liechtensteinisch-Tschechische Historikerkommission (ed.): *Das Fürstenhaus, der Staat Liechtenstein und die Tschechoslowakei im 20. Jahrhundert*. Vaduz 2013, pp. 43–52.

Keller-Giger, Susanne – Quaderer, Rupert: *Das Fürstentum Liechtenstein, die böhmischen Länder und die Tschechoslowakei*. Geschichte der zwischenstaatlichen Beziehungen. Vaduz 2013.

Keller-Giger, Susanne: *Zwei Länder – ein Fürstenhaus. Ein Beitrag zur wechselvollen Geschichte der Beziehungen zwischen dem Fürstentum Liechtenstein und den böhmischen Ländern, der Tschechoslowakei und der Tschechischen Republik*. In: Keller-Giger, Susanne – Quaderer, Rupert: *Das Fürstentum Liechtenstein, die böhmischen Länder und die Tschechoslowakei. Geschichte der zwischenstaatlichen Beziehungen*. Vaduz 2013, pp. 17–182.

Knapp, Viktor: *Osídlovací právo hmotné*. Praha 1949.

Kuklík, Jan: *Mýty a realita tzv. "Benešových dekretů". Dekrety prezidenta republiky 1940–1945*. Praha 2002.

Kuklík, Jan: *Dekrety prezidenta republiky – výraz kontinuity československého právního řádu nebo jeho revoluční změny?* In: Malý, Karel – Soukup, Ladislav: *Vývoj práva v Československu v letech 1945–1989*. Praha 2004.

Lančík, Jindřich: *Vysvětlivky k dekretu o konfiskaci zemědělského majetku*. *Právní praxe* 9, 1945, pp. 272–274.

Marxer, Roland: *Die Beziehungen zwischen dem Fürstentum Liechtenstein und der Tschechoslowakei bzw. Tschechischen Republik seit dem Zweiten Weltkrieg*. In: Liechtensteinisch-Tschechische Historikerkommission (ed.): *Das Fürstenhaus, der Staat Liechtenstein und die Tschechoslowakei im 20. Jahrhundert*. Vaduz 2013, pp. 213–236.

Marxer, Roland: *Die Beziehungen Liechtensteins zur Tschechoslowakei und zu deren Nachfolgestaaten seit dem Zweiten Weltkrieg. Nachwirkungen und Entwicklungen bis heute*. In: Horčíčka, Václav – Marxer, Roland: *Liechtenstein und die tschechoslowakischen Konfiskationen von 1945. Vom Zweiten Weltkrieg bis zur Gegenwart*. Vaduz 2013.

Michna, Pavel: *Kdo navštívil Johanna z Lichtenštejna na Nových Zámcích u Litovle v říjnu 1938?* *Vlastivědný věstník moravský* 3, 2007, pp. 279–302.

Mikule, Vladimír: *Dekrety prezidenta republiky o postavení Němců a jejich dnešní právní význam*. In: Jech, Karel (ed.): *Němci a Maďaři v dekretch prezidenta republiky. Studie a dokumenty 1940–1945*. Praha – Brno 2003, pp. 76–99 (Czech), 186–215 (German)

Mittermair, Veronika: *Die Neutralität Liechtensteins zwischen öffentlichem und fürstlichem Interesse*. In: Brunhart, Arthur (ed.): *Bausteine zur liechtensteini-schen Geschichte*, Band 3, 19. Jahrhundert: Modellfall Liechtenstein. Zürich 1999, pp. 43–97.

Mrázek, Josef: *Obraz Velká vápenka a majetkoprávní nároky Lichtenštejnů vůči ČR*. Právní rádce 9, 2001, č. 9, pp. I–XII.

Nováček, Silvestr: *Osudný rok 1938 v břeclavském regionu*. Břeclav 1989.

Novotný, Gustav: *Konfiskace a uvalování vnucených správ na pozemkový majetek velkostatků v českých zemích v době nesvobody 1938–1945*. In: Rašticová, Blanka (ed.): *České a slovenské zemědělství v letech 2. světové války*. Sborník příspěvků z mezinárodní konference konané ve dnech 17. a 18. 4. 1996. Studie Slováckého muzea 1 (1996). Uherské Hradiště 1996, pp. 51–60.

Obršlík, Jindřich: *První pozemková reforma na jižní Moravě*. Pohledy 1963.

Ouřadová, Zora: *Sudetoněmečtí statkáři a jejich styky s chamberlainskou Anglií 1934–1938*. Diplomová práce FF UK. Praha 1974.

Pekař, Josef: *Omyly a nebezpečí pozemkové reformy*. 2. vydání. Praha 1923.

Pinterová, Jana: *Knížectví Lichtenštejnsko a jeho vztahy s Českou republikou: od roku 1918 do současnosti se stručným historickým přehledem*. Diplomová práce FSV UK v Praze. Praha 2000.

Quaderer, Rupert: *Liechtenstein und die Tschechoslowakei nach dem Ersten Weltkrieg*. In: Keller-Giger, Susanne – Quaderer, Rupert: *Das Fürstentum Liechtenstein, die böhmischen Länder und die Tschechoslowakei*. Geschichte der zwischenstaatlichen Beziehungen. Vaduz 2013.

Quaderer, Rupert: *Liechtensteins Bemühungen um die Errichtung einer diplomatischen Vertretung in Prag nach dem Ersten Weltkrieg*. In: Ročenka textů zahraničních profesorů / *The Annual of Texts by Foreign Guest Professors*. Univerzita Karlova v Praze, Filozofická fakulta. Praha 2008, pp. 177–206

Quaderer, Rupert: *Liechtenstein und die Bodenreform in der Tschechoslowakei nach dem Ersten Weltkrieg*. In: Prague Papers on the History of International Relations. Prague – Vienna 2008, pp. 265–290.

Quaderer, Rupert: *Das Haus Liechtenstein und seine Beziehungen zur Tschechoslowakei nach dem Ersten Weltkrieg*. In: Hazdra, Zdeněk – Horčíčka, Václav – Županič, Jan (edd.): *Šlechta střední Evropy v konfrontaci s totalitními režimy 20. století*. Praha 2011, pp. 21–34.

Quaderer, Rupert: *Beneš vertrete "einen unserer Aufnahme feindlichen Standpunkt"*. In: Liechtensteinisch-Tschechische Historikerkommission (ed.): *Liechtensteinische Erinnerungsorte in den böhmischen Ländern*. Vaduz 2012, pp. 83–122. Česká verze: Quaderer, Rupert: *Beneš zastává "našemu přijetí nepřátelské stanovisko"*. Lichtenštejnsko, Společnost národů a Československo. In: Geiger, Peter – Knoz, Tomáš (edd.): *Místa Lichtenštejnské paměti*. (Časopis Matice moravské 131, 2012 – Supplementum 3). Brno 2012, pp. 73–106.

Pártl, Jan: *Dekret č. 12/45 Sb. o konfiskaci zemědělského majetku Němců, Maďarů a zrádců a judikatura Nejvyššího správního soudu*. Časopis pro právní a státní vědu 28, 1947, pp. 281–284.

Rychlík, Jan: *Pozemková reforma v Československu 1919–1938*. Vědecké práce zemědělského muzea 27, 1987–1988, pp. 127–148.

Schallenbergerová, Veronika: *Vztahy Čechů a Němců v obci Lednice v letech 1918–1938*. Nepublikovaná magisterská oborová práce. Masarykova univerzita. Brno 2008.

Schidberger, František: *Nejsme Rakušané ani Němci*. Rozhovor s knížetem Janem Adamem II. Lidové noviny 6, 1993, č. 37, 15. února, p. 4.

Slezák, Lubomír: *Tvůrci, kritikové a odpůrci pozemkové reformy*. Moderní dějiny 1, 1993, pp. 197–217.

Sedláček, Jaromír: *Právní pozice rodu knížat z Liechtensteinu a na Liechtenstejně podle práva československého*. Praha 1928.

Smola, Franz: *Die Fürstlich Liechtenstein'sche Kunstsammlung. Rechtsfragen zur Verbringung der Sammlungen von Wien nach Vaduz in den Jahren 1944–1945.* Frankfurt am Main – Berlin – Bern – New York – Paris – Wien 1999, pp. 25–26.

Späti, Christoph: *Die Schweiz und die Tschechoslowakei 1945–1953. Wirtschaftliche, politische und kulturelle Beziehungen im Polarisationsfeld des Ost-West-Konflikts* Zürich 2000.

Školl, Jaroslav: *Osvobození Břeclavska Rudou armádou.* Pohledy 1963.

Šípek, Zdeněk: *Spory Československa s Rakouskem o vedení státních hranic na jižní Moravě v letech 1918–1923.* Jižní Morava 3, 1967, pp. 93–94.

Vaculík, Pavel: *Komunistická perzekuce šlechty.* Praha 2004.

Županič, Jan: *Der Erbe des Barons von Hirsch: Maurice Arnold Freiherr von Deforest-Bischoffsheim. Das vergessene Schicksal des Grafen von Bendern.* In: Jahrbuch des Historischen Vereins für das Fürstentum Liechtenstein 110, 2011, pp. 47–61.

Županič, Jan: “*Candide secure*” – *Der liechtensteinische Bürger Johann Alexander von Königswarter.* In: Liechtensteinisch-Tschechische Historikerkommission (ed.): *Das Fürstenhaus, der Staat Liechtenstein und die Tschechoslowakei im 20. Jahrhundert.* Vaduz 2013, pp. 199–212.

(5) *Culture and art*

Bauer, František: *Krypta na Vranově.* Brno 1882.

Braun, Edmund Wilhelm: *Ein Epitaph des Fürsten Karl Liechtenstein in der Troppauer Pfarrkirche und sein Meister, Bildhauer Johannes Georg Lehnert.* Zeitschrift für Geschichte und Kulturgeschichte Österreich-Schlesiens 5, 1909–1910, č. 1, pp. 25–39.

Braun, Edmund Wilhelm: *Die Restaurierung des Epitaphs des Fürsten Karl Liechtenstein in der Troppauer Pfarrkirche und sein Meister, Bildhauer Johann Georg Lehnert.* Mitteilungen der k. k. Zentralkommission für Denkmalpflege, III. Folge, Band 14, 1915, pp. 162–164.

Egger, Gerhart: *Das Palais Liechtenstein in der Rossau*. Wien 1970.

Falke, Jacob von: *Katalog der Fürstlich Liechtensteinischen Bildergalerie im Gartenpalais der Rossau zu Wien*. Wien 1871.

Fidler, Petr: *Kostel Nanebevzetí Panny Marie ve Valticích*. In: Kordiovský, Emil (ed.): Město Valtice. Valtice 2001, pp. 155–196.

Fleischer, Victor: *Fürst Karl Eusebius von Liechtenstein als Bauherr und Kunstsammler (1611–1684)*. Leipzig 1910.

Haupt, Herbert: *Fürst Karl I. von Liechtenstein, Obersthofmeister Kaiser Rudolfs II. und Vizekönig von Böhmen. Hofstaat und Sammeltätigkeit*. Edition der Quellen aus dem liechtensteinischen Hausarchiv. Textband. Quellen und Studien zur Geschichte des Fürstenhanes Liechtenstein. 1/1. Wien – Köln – Graz 1983.

Haupt, Herbert: *Rara sunt cara. Kulturelle Schwerpunkte fürstlichen Lebensstils*. In: Oberhammer, E. (ed.): *Der ganzen Welt ein Lob und Spiegel*. Wien – München 1990, pp. 115–137.

Haupt, Herbert: *Diplomatie und Repräsentation im Dienst des Kaiserhauses. Die öffentlichen Einzüge des Fürsten Joseph Wenzel von Liechtenstein*. In: Baumstark, Reinhold (ed.): *Joseph Wenzel von Liechtenstein. Fürst und Diplomat des 18. Jahrhunderts*. Ausstellungskatalog. Vaduz 1990, pp. 24–54.

Höss, Karl: *Fürst Johann II. von Liechtenstein und die bildende Kunst*. Wien 1908.

Jeřábek, Tomáš: *Dějiny valtického zámku v 19. a 20. století*. In: Kordiovský, Emil (ed.): Město Valtice. Valtice 2001, pp. 197–208.

Konečný, Michal: *Die Landschaft zwischen Eisgrub (Lednice) und Feldsberg (Valtice)*. In: Liechtensteinisch-Tschechische Historikerkommission (ed.): *Liechtensteinische Erinnerungsorte in den böhmischen Ländern*. Vaduz 2012, pp. 141–148.
Česká verze: Konečný, Michal: *Krajina mezi Lednicí a Valticemi jako místo paměti*. In: Geiger, Peter – Knoz, Tomáš (edd.): *Místa Lichtenštejnské paměti*. (Časopis Matice moravské 131, 2012 – Supplementum 3). Brno 2012, pp. 123–130.

Kudělka, Zdeněk: *Valtice*. Brno 1964.

Král, Adolf Bunny: *Vranov u Brna*. Brno 1968.

Král, Adolf Bunny: *Liechtensteinská hrobka na Vranově u Brna*. Vlastivědný věstník moravský 21, 1969, pp. 121–131.

Král, Adolf Bunny: *Liechtensteinská hrobka na Vranově u Brna*. Brno 1970.

Král, Adolf Bunny: *Objev původního vstupu do liechtensteinské hrobky na Vranově u Brna*. Vlastivědný věstník moravský 36, 1984, pp. 69–73.

Král, Adolf Bunny: *Hrobka na Vranově u Brna*. Vranov u Brna 1989.

Král, Adolf Bunny: *Kostel narození Panny Marie s paulánským klášteřem*. In: Ludvíková, Miroslava (ed.): *Poutní místo Vranov*. Vranov u Brna 1996, pp. 27–37.

Kräftner, Johann: *Zur Geschichte der Fürstlichen Sammlungen*. In: Liechtenstein Museum. *Die Fürstlichen Sammlungen*. München – Berlin – London – New York 2004.

Kräftner, Johann: *Liechtenstein Museum Wien. Biedermeier im Haus Liechtenstein. Die Epoche im Licht der Fürstlichen Sammlungen*. München 2005, pp. 126–127.

Kräftner, Johann: *Die Familie Liechtenstein als Kunstsammler und Mäzene*. In: Liechtensteinisch-Tschechische Historikerkommission (ed.): *Die Liechtenstein: Kontinuitäten – Diskontinuitäten*. Vaduz 2013, pp. 263–274.

Kräftner, Johann: *Das Liechtenstein Museum im 20. Jahrhundert*. In: Liechtensteinisch-Tschechische Historikerkommission (ed.): *Das Fürstenhaus, der Staat Liechtenstein und die Tschechoslowakei im 20. Jahrhundert*. Vaduz 2013, pp. 159–174.

Kroupa, Jiří: *Zámek Valtice v 17. a 18. století*. In: Kordiovský, Emil (ed.): *Město Valtice*. Valtice 2001, pp. 155–196.

Kroupa, Jiří: *Proměny moravskokrumlovského zámku v době renesance a baroka*. In: Fišer, Zdeněk (ed.): *Moravský Krumlov ve svých osudech*. Brno – Moravský Krumlov 2009, pp. 265–276.

Krsek, Ivo – Kudělka, Zdeněk – Stehlík, Miloš – Válka, Josef: *Umění baroka na Moravě a ve Slezsku*. Praha 1996.

Kühndel, Jan – Mathon, Jaroslav: *Plumlovský zámek a jeho knížecí architekt*. Prostějov 1937.

Lauche, Wilhelm: *Die Bedeutung des dahingeschiedenen regierenden Fürsten Johann II. von und zu Liechtenstein für die Kunst, die Wissenschaften, die Landwirtschaft und den Gartenbau*. Brünn 1929.

Lorenz, Hellmut: *Liechtenstein Palace in Vienna from the Age of baroque*. New York 1985.

Lorenz, Hellmut: *Ein "exemplum" fürstlichen Mäzenatentums der Barockzeit. Bau und Ausstattung des Gartenpalais Liechtenstein in Wien*. Zeitschrift des deutschen Vereins für Kunstwissenschaft 43, 1989, pp. 7–24.

Lorenz, Hellmut: *Zu Rottmayers Treppenhausfresken im Wiener Gartenpalais Liechtenstein*. Acta Historiae Artium Hungariae 34, 1989, pp. 137–144.

Lorenz, Hellmut: *"Nichts Brachtigeres kan gemacht werden als die vornehmen Gebeude". Bemerkungen zur Bautätigkeit der Fürsten von Liechtenstein in der Barockzeit*. In: Oberhammer, E. (ed.): *Der ganzen Welt ein Lob und Spiegel*. Wien – München 1990, pp. 138–154.

Ludvíková, Miroslava (ed.): *Poutní místo Vranov*. Vranov u Brna 1996.

Matyášová-Lejsková, Milada: *Zámek v Kostelci nad Černými lesy ve světle urbáře z roku 1677*. Umění 4, 1956, pp. 269–278.

Miltová, Radka: *Mytologická tematika v moravských rezidencích Lichtenštejnů jako součást rodové paměti*. In: Geiger, Peter – Knoz, Tomáš (edd.): *Místa Lichtenštejnské paměti*. (Časopis Matice moravské 131, 2012 – Supplementum 3). Brno 2012, pp. 131–142.

Miller, Dwight C.: *Marcantonio Franceschini and the Liechtensteins. Prince Johann Adam Andreas and the decoration of the Liechtensteins garden palace at Rossau-Vienna*. Cambridge 1991.

Novák, Zdeněk: *Das Erbe des Einflusses der Fürsten von Liechtenstein auf die Garten- und Landschaftskultur der böhmischen Länder*. In: Liechtensteinisch-Tschechische Historikerkommission (ed.): *Die Liechtenstein: Kontinuitäten – Diskontinuitäten*. Vaduz 2013, pp. 123–173.

Měřínský, Zdeněk – Plaček, Miroslav: *Vývoj hradu, města a jeho opevnění do poloviny 17. století*. In: Kordiovský, Emil (ed.): *Město Valtice*. Valtice 2001, pp. 133–154.

Mihola, Jiří: *K počátkům paulánského řádu v českých zemích*. Sborník prací Pedagogické fakulty MU v Brně. Řada společenských věd 18, 2001, pp. 26–36.

Mihola, Jiří: *Vranov u Brna. Mariánské poutní místo, paulánský klášter, hrobka Lichtenštejnů*. Vranov u Brna 2010.

Novák, Zdeněk: *Zámecká zahrada*. In: Kordiovský, Emil (ed.): *Město Valtice*. Valtice 2001, pp. 104–113.

Novák, Zdeněk: *Jak byl Lednicko-valtický areál zapsán do Seznamu světového dědictví*. In: Kordiovský, Emil (ed.): *Město Valtice*. Valtice 2001, pp. 127–132.

Pavlicová, Martina: *Die Volkskultur in Südmähren aus Sicht der ethnischen Problematik*. In: Liechtensteinisch-Tschechische Historikerkommission (ed.): *Die Liechtenstein: Kontinuitäten – Diskontinuitäten*. Vaduz 2013, pp. 187–200.

Plaček, Miroslav: *Valtice – nový pohled na stavební vývoj zámku a města*. Jižní Morava 32, sv. 35, 1996, pp. 103–123.

Polleross, Friedrich: *Utilita, Virtu e Belleza. Fürst Johann Adam Andreas von Liechtenstein und sein Wiener Palast in der Rossau*. Zeitschrift für Kunst und Denkmalpflege 47, 1993, pp. 36–52

Richter, Václav – Kudělka, Zdeněk: *Die Architektur des 17. und 18. Jahrhunderts in Mähren*. Sborník prací Filozofické fakulty brněnské univerzity F 16, 21, 1972, pp. 91–129.

Rizzi, Georg Wilhelm: *Josef Kornhäusel*. In: *Bürgersinn und Aufbegehren. Biedermeier und Vormärz in Wien 1815–1848*. Wien 1988, pp. 505–513.

Slavíček, Lubomír: *Die Schlossgemäldergalerie in Frischau bei Znaim, ein weiterer Ort der liechtensteinischen Sammeltätigkeit*. In: Liechtensteinisch-Tschechische Historikerkommission (ed.): *Liechtensteinische Erinnerungsorte in den böhmischen Ländern*. Vaduz 2012, pp. 149–169. Česká verze: Slavíček, Lubomír: *Zámecká obrazárna ve Fryšavě (Břežanech) u Znojma*. In: Geiger, Peter – Knoz, Tomáš (edd.): *Místa Lichtenštejnské paměti*. (Časopis Matice moravské 131, 2012 – Supplementum 3). Brno 2012, pp. 143–162.

Straková, Martina: *Mecenáš Moravského průmyslového muzea Jan II. z Lichtenštejna*. Bulletin Moravské galerie v Brně 62, 2006, pp. 141–148.

Vácha, Zdeněk: *Das Bild der Liechtenstein und die mährischen Denkmäler*. In: Liechtensteinisch-Tschechische Historikerkommission (ed.): *Liechtensteinische Erinnerungsorte in den böhmischen Ländern*. Vaduz 2012, pp. 195–214. Česká verze: Vácha, Zdeněk: *Obraz Lichtenštejnů a moravské lichtenštejnské památky*. In: Geiger, Peter – Knoz, Tomáš (edd.): *Místa Lichtenštejnské paměti*. (Časopis Matice moravské 131, 2012 – Supplementum 3). Brno 2012, pp. 183–202.

Weinbrenner, Karl: *Die Veste Rabensburg*. Monatsblatt des Vereines für Landeskunde für Niederösterreich 7, 1908, Nr. 1, pp. 1–7.

Wilhelm, Franz: *Bericht über kunstgeschichtliche Funde im Hausarchiv der regierenden Fürsten von Liechtenstein*. Jahrbuch des kunsthistorischen Institutes 8, 1914, Beiblatt, 35–50.

Wilhelm, Franz: *Ein Plan zur Errichtung eines fürstlichen Residenzschlosses in Troppau*. Zeitschrift für Geschichte und Kulturgeschichte Österreichische-Schlesien 9, 1914.

Wilhelm, Gustav: *Der historische liechtensteinische Herzogshut*. In: Jahrbuch des Historischen Vereins für das Fürstentum Liechtenstein 60, 1960, pp. 5–20.

Wilhelm, Gustav: *Baugeschichte des Schlosses Feldsberg*. Brünn – München – Wien 1944.

Wilhelm, Gustav: *Die Fürsten von Liechtenstein und ihre Beziehung zur Kunst und Wissenschaft*. Jahrbuch der liechtensteinischen Kunstgesellschaft. Schaan 1976.

Wilhelm, Gustav: *Joseph Hartmuth 1758–1816. Architekt und Erfinde*. Wien – Köln 1990.

Wilhelm, Gustav: *Der Weg der Liechtenstein-Galerie von Wien nach Vaduz*. In: Jahrbuch des Historischen Vereins für das Fürstentum Liechtenstein 95, 1998, pp. 1–48.

Winkelbauer, Thomas: *Repräsentationsleben, Hofstaat und Hofzeremoniell der Herren bzw. Fürsten von Liechtenstein in der ersten Hälfte des 17. Jahrhunderts*. In: Bůžek, Václav (ed.): *Život na dvorech a v rezidenčních městech posledních Rožmberků*. Opera historica 3. České Budějovice 1993, pp. 179–198.

Winkelbauer, Thomas – Knoz, Tomáš: *Geschlecht und Geschichte. Grablegen, Grabdenkmäler und Wappenzyklen als Quellen für das historisch-genealogische Denken des österreichischen Adels in 16. und 17. Jahrhunderts*. In: Bahlcke, Joachim – Strohmeyer, Arno (edd.): *Konstruktion der Vergangenheit*. Zeitschrift für historische Forschung, Beiheft 29. Berlin 2002, pp. 129–178.

Voldán, Vladimír: *Valtické vinařství v 18. století*. Jižní Morava 1, 1965, pp. 45–52.

(6) *History of the Principality of Liechtenstein*

Beattie, David: *Liechtenstein. A modern History*. London – New York 2004.

Biedermann, Klaus: *Das Dekanat Liechtenstein 1970 bis 1997. Eine Chronik des kirchlichen Lebens*. Vaduz 2000.

Brunhart, Arthur (ed.): *Historiographie im Fürstentum Liechtenstein. Grundlagen und Stand der Forschung im Überblick*. Zürich 1996.

Brunhart, Arthur (ed.): *Bausteine zur liechtensteinischen Geschichte*. I–III. Zürich 1999.

Čapek, Otakar: *Poslední německá monarchie, knížectví Liechtensteinské*. Praha 1939.

Dopsch, Heinz: *Das Fürstentum Liechtenstein im Heiligen Römischen Reich Deutscher Nation (1719–1806)*. In: Vollkommer, Rainer – Büchel, Donat (edd.): 1712 Das Werden des Landes 2012. Vaduz 2012, pp. 151–166.

Fiala, Petr – Matušinová, Anna: *Religion und Politik in Liechtenstein*. In: Liechtensteinisch-Tschechische Historikerkommission (ed.): Die Liechtenstein: Kontinuitäten – Diskontinuitäten. Vaduz 2013, pp. 91–108.

Geiger, Peter: *Krisenzeit. Liechtenstein in den Dreissigerjahren 1928–1939*. 2 vol. Vaduz – Zürich 1997 2000².

Geiger, Peter: *Kriegszeit. Liechtenstein 1939 bis 1945*. Vaduz – Zürich 2010, 2 vol.

Geiger, Peter: *Geschichte des Fürstentums Liechtenstein 1848 bis 1866*. In: Jahrbuch des Historischen Vereins des Fürstentums Liechtenstein 70, 1970, pp. 5–418 (Sonderdruck 1971).

Geiger, Peter – Brunhart, Arthur – Bankier, David – Michman, Dan – Moos, Carlo – Weinzierl, Erika: *Questions concerning Liechtenstein during the National Socialist period and the Second World War. Refugees, financial assets, works of art, production of armaments*. Final report of the Independent Commission of Historians Liechtenstein / Second World War (ICH). Vaduz – Zürich 2009.

Geiger, Peter: *Vom Rand zum Zentrum – Fürstentum und Fürstenhaus seit drei Jahrhunderten*. In: Liechtensteinisch-Tschechische Historikerkommission (ed.): Die Liechtenstein: Kontinuitäten – Diskontinuitäten. Vaduz 2013, pp. 31–44.

Geiger, Peter: “*Ein Völklein vorstellen...*” In: Bosshart-Pfluge, Catherine – Jung, Joseph – Metzger, Franziska (edd.): Nation und Nationalismus in Europa. Kulturelle Konstruktion von Identitäten. Stuttgart – Wien 2002, pp. 225–250.

Geiger, Peter (ed.): *Peter Kaiser als Politiker, Historiker und Erzieher (1793–1864)*. Vaduz 1993.

Geiger, Peter: *Liechtensteinische Aussenpolitik in der zweiten Hälfte des 19. Jahrhunderts*. In: Liechtenstein Politische Schriften (LPS) 1. Vaduz 1972, pp. 71–77.

Haupt, Herbert: *Das Haus Liechtenstein bis 1712*. In: Vollkommer, Rainer – Büchel, Donat (edd.): 1712 Das Werden des Landes 2012. Vaduz 2012, pp. 109–116.

Historisches Lexikon für das Fürstentum Liechtenstein (HLFL). 2 vol., Vaduz 2013.

Historisches Lexikon der Schweiz (HLS). vol. 1–9, 2002–2010. (Vol. 10–14, from 2011 on).

Hofmann, Ladislav K.: *Lichtenštejsko*. In: *Ottův slovník naučný*, sv. 15. Praha 1900, pp. 1054–1058.

Horčíčka, Václav – Suchánek, Drahomír – Županič, Jan: *Dějiny Lichtenštejska*. Praha 2011.

Kaiser, Peter: *Geschichte des Fürstentums Liechtenstein. Nebst Schilderungen aus Churrätien's Vorzeit*. Chur 1847. Neu hg. von Arthur Brunhart. Vaduz 1989.

Kraetzl, Georg: *Das Fürstentum Liechtenstein und der gesamte Fürst Johann von und zu Liechtenstein'sche Güterbesitz*. Brünn 1914.

Liechtenstein, Eduard von: *Liechtensteins Weg von Österreich zur Schweiz. Eine Rückschau auf meine Arbeit in der Nachkriegszeit 198–1921*. Vaduz s. d. [1946].

Liechtenstein, Hans-Adam von: *Stát ve třetím tisíciletí*. Praha 2011.

LieLex – ein Nachschlagewerk zu Liechtenstein, von Ausländer bis Zeitläufte. Red. Pio Schurti. Vaduz 1996.

Lussy, Hanspeter – López, Rodrigo: *Finanzbeziehungen Liechtensteins zur Zeit des Nationalsozialismus*. Studie im Auftrag der Unabhängigen Historikerkommission Liechtenstein Zweiter Weltkrieg, Bd. 1. Vaduz – Zürich 2005.

Malin, Georg: *Die politische Geschichte des Fürstentums Liechtenstein in den Jahren 1800–1815*. In: *Jahrbuch des Historischen Vereins für das Fürstentum Liechtenstein* 53, 1954, pp. 5–178.

Marxer, Wilfried: *Das Hausgesetz des Fürstenhauses von Liechtenstein und dessen Verhältnis zur staatlichen Ordnung Liechtensteins*. Beiträge Liechtenstein-Institut Nr. 17/2003.

Marxer, Wilfried: *Medien in Liechtenstein. Strukturanalyse der Medienlandschaft in einem Kleinstaat*. Schaan 2004.

Marxer, Roland: *Liechtensteins Beziehungen zur Tschechoslowakei und zu deren Nachfolgestaaten*. In: Jahrbuch des Historischen Vereins für das Fürstentum Liechtenstein 105, 2006, pp. 131–152.

Merki, Christoph Maria: *Wirtschaftswunder Liechtenstein. Die rasche Modernisierung einer kleinen Volkswirtschaft im 20. Jahrhundert*. Zürich 2007.

Ospelt, Alois: *Wirtschaftsgeschichte des Fürstentums Liechtenstein im 19. Jahrhundert. Von den napoleonischen Kriegen bis zum Ausbruch des Ersten Weltkrieges*. In: Jahrbuch des Historischen Vereins für das Fürstentum Liechtenstein 72, 1972, pp. 5–244.

Politische Schriften Liechtenstein (LPS, Verlag der Akademischen Gesellschaft). Vaduz. (Since 1972).

Press, Volker: *Die Entstehung des Fürstentums Liechtenstein*. In: Müller, Wolfgang (ed.): *Das Fürstentum Liechtenstein. Ein landeskundliches Portrait*. (Veröffentlichungen des alemannischen Instituts Freiberg in Breisgau 50). Bühl – Baden 1981, pp. 63–91.

Press, Volker – Willoweit, Dietmar (edd.): *Liechtenstein – Fürstliches Haus und staatliche Ordnung. Geschichtliche Grundlagen und moderne Perspektiven*. Vaduz 1987.

Quaderer, Rupert: *Neutralitäts- und Souveränitätsprobleme Liechtensteins im Umfeld des Ersten Weltkrieges*. In: *Kleinstaat und Menschenrechte*. Festgabe für Gerard Batliner. Basel – Frankfurt am Main 1993, pp. 43–61.

Quaderer, Rupert: *“Die Sehnsucht nach Deinem Geld ist unermesslich”. Das Fürstenhaus als finanzieller Nothelfer Liechtensteins in den Jahren nach dem Ersten Weltkrieg*. In: *Liechtensteinisch-Tschechische Historikerkommission* (ed.): *Das Fürstenhaus, der Staat Liechtenstein und die Tschechoslowakei im 20. Jahrhundert*. Vaduz 2013, pp. 25–42.

Quaderer, Rupert: *Liechtensteins Bemühungen um die Errichtung einer diplomatischen Vertretung in Prag nach dem Ersten Weltkrieg*. In: *Ročenka textů zahra-*

ničních profesorů / The Annual Texts by Foreign Guest Professors 2 (Filozofická Fakulta Univerzity Karlovy v Praze), 2008, pp. 177–206.

Quaderer, Rupert: *Das Haus Liechtenstein und die Bodenreform in der Tschechoslowakei nach dem Ersten Weltkrieg*. In: Prague Papers on the History of International Relations 2008. Red. Václav Drška, Richard Lein, Lukáš Novotný. (Institute of World History, Faculty of Arts and Philosophy, Charles University Prague, and Institute of East European History, Faculty of Historical and Cultural Sciences, University of Vienna). Prag 2008, pp. 265–290.

Quaderer-Vogt, Rupert: *Bewegte Zeiten: Liechtenstein 1914 bis 1926*. vol. 1–3. Vaduz 2013.

Raton, Pierre: *Les Institutions de la Principauté de Liechtenstein*. Paris 1949.

Raton, Pierre: *Liechtenstein. Staat und Geschichte*. Vaduz 1969.

Schneider, Tim: *Domizil Liechtenstein: Land, Gesellschaftswesen, Steuern*. Vaduz 1991.

Válka, Josef: *Lichtenštejnové a Lichtenštejnsko*. Jižní Morava 25, sv. 28, 1989, pp. 289–293.

Vogt, Paul: *Brücken zur Vergangenheit. Ein Text- und Arbeitsbuch zur liechtensteinischen Geschichte*. 17. bis 19. Jahrhundert. Vaduz 1990.

Vogt, Paul: *Mit urkundt diesses brieffs. Der Kaufvertrag der Grafschaft Vaduz vom 22. Februar 1712, ratifiziert von Kaiser Karl VI. am 7. März 1712 in Wien*. In: Vollkommer, Rainer – Büchel, Donat (edd.): *1712 Das Werden des Landes 2012*. Vaduz 2012, pp. 19–28.

Vollkommer, Rainer – Büchel, Donat (edd.): *1712 Das Werden des Landes 2012*. Vaduz 2012.

Wanger, Harald: *Die regierenden Fürsten von Liechtenstein*. Triesen 1995.

Vařeka, Marek: *Lichtenštejnsko*. Praha 2010.

Vařeka, Marek: *Hrabství Vaduz za vlády hrabat z Montfortu a Werdenbergu (1180–1416)*. Sborník prací Pedagogické fakulty Masarykovy univerzity, řada společenských věd, č. 23, 2010, pp. 117–121.

Županič, Jan: *Na cestě k samostatnosti. Lichtenštejnsko mezi Německým spolkem a Rakouskem (1848–1871)*. Historický obzor 5–6, 2010, pp. 38–42.

Županič, Jan: *Vznik Lichtenštejnského knížectví*. Časopis Národního muzea A 179, 2010, č. 3–4, pp. 3–12.

(7) Regional literature

Beránek, Vladimír: *Vranov u Brna*. Historie a památky. Vranov 1940.

Biermann, Gotlieb: *Geschichte der Herzogthümer Troppau und Jägerndorf. Teschen* 1874.

Březina, Jan: *Vlastivěda moravská. Šumperský, staroměstský a vízmberský okres*. Brno 1932.

Březina, Jan: *Zábřežsko v období feudalismu do roku 1848*. Ostrava 1963.

Dubowy, Anastasius: *Der Wallfahrtsort Wranau*. Wranau 1929.

Fišer, Zdeněk (ed.): *Moravský Krumlov ve svých osudech*. Brno – Moravský Krumlov 2009.

Hornstein, A.: *Geschichte des Wallfahrortes Maria Wranau in Mähren*. Brünn 1831.

Hosák, Ladislav: *Historický místopis země moravskoslezské*. Praha 1938.

Hosák, Ladislav: *Vlastivěda moravská. Hustopečský okres*. Brno 1924.

Janák, M.: *Moravský Krumlov. 700 let města nad Rokytinou*. Brno 1968.

Janoušek, Vojtěch: *Vlastivěda moravská. Prostějovský okres*. Brno 1938.

Klam, Arnošt: *Lichtenštejnova chata na Sněžníku*. Králíky 1995.

Kordiovský, Emil: *Valtice*. Valtice 1992.

Kordiovský, Emil: *Jihomoravská lichtenštejnská panství v lánových rejstřících a tereziánském katastru*. Jižní Morava 29, sv. 32, 1993, pp. 207–241.

Kordiovský, Emil (ed.): *Městečko Lednice*. Lednice 2004.

Kroupa, Jiří: *Lednický zámek doby barokní a klasicistní*. In: Kordiovský, Emil et al.: *Městečko Lednice*. Lednice 2004.

Kubíček, Alois (ed.): *Průvodce knížecími Liechtensteinskými Adamovskými lesy*. Brno 1922.

Láznička, Zdeněk (ed.): *Hustopeče*. Dějiny města. Brno – Hustopeče 1972.

Markel, Martin: *Lichtenštejnská privilegia pro Dyjákovice po třicetileté válce*. Ročenka státního okresního archivu ve Znojmě 1997. Znojmo 1998, pp. 55–75.

Matějek, František: *Účinky třicetileté války na Břeclavsku*. Jižní Morava 3, 1967, pp. 46–56.

Nekuda, Vladimír (ed.): *Břeclavsko*. Brno – Mikulov 1989.

Nováček, Silvestr: *Břeclavsko 1918–1921*. I. Třídní, ekonomický, sociální, národnostní a náboženský obraz břeclavského regionu v letech 1918–1921 s přihlédnutím k situaci před první světovou válkou. Brno 1973.

Paukert, Jiří: *Lednice*. Brno 1967.

Petrin, Silvia: *Der Verkauf der Herrschaft Nikolsburg im Jahre 1560 und die Stände von Niederösterreich*. Unsere Heimat 44, 1973, pp. 129–137.

Polišenský, Josef: *Valtice a rozmach lichtenštejnské moci*. In: Zemek, Metoděj (ed.): *Valtice*. Brno – Valtice 1970, pp. 151–155.

Richter, Václav – Zemek, Metoděj – Krsek, Ivo: *Mikulov*. Brno 1971.

Řezníček, Jan: *Dva mikulovské urbáře z roku 1560*. Jižní Morava 2, 1966, pp. 7–25.

Stehlík, Miloš: *Valtice*. Brno 1966.

Strnischtie, Heinrich: *Plumenau*. Notizenblatt der historisch-statistischen Sektion der kais. königl. mährisch-schlesischen Gesellschaft zur Beförderung des Ackerbaues, der Natur- und Landeskunde 1862.

Švábenský, Mojmír: *Listina Karla z Lichtenštejna z roku 1625 pro Valtice*. Jižní Morava 29, sv. 32, 1993, pp. 199–205.

Svoboda, Miroslav: *Valtice ve válkách na přelomu 18. a 19. století*. In: Kordiovský, Emil (ed.): *Město Valtice*. Valtice 2001, pp. 321–336.

Trávníček, Jan: *Poustka in der Herrschaft Posoritz (Pozořice) als liechtensteinischer Erinnerungsort*. In: Liechtensteinisch-Tschechische Historikerkommission (ed.): *Die Liechtenstein: Kontinuitäten – Diskontinuitäten*. Vaduz 2013, pp. 175–186.

Vařeka, Marek: *Rybníkářství na plumlovském panství v předbělohorské době*. In: *Mezi Hradcem Králové a Plzní. Východočech na českých univerzitách*. Sborník in memoriam prof. PhDr. Zdeňku Mackovi, CSc. Ústí nad Orlicí 2007, pp. 210–213.

Vařeka, Marek: *Prameny k dějinám knížectví Krnov v Lichtenštejnském rodovém archivu ve Vídni a Vaduzu*. Sborník bruntálského muzea 2008, pp. 28–39.

Vetterl, Karel: *Písňe a tance Slováků z Ranšpurku před 150 lety*. Národopisné aktuality 9, 1972, pp. 271–284.

Volný, Tomáš Řehoř: *Die königliche Hauptstadt Brünn und die Herrschaft Eisgrub, sammt der Umgebung der Letztern topographisch, statistisch und historisch geschildert*. Brünn 1836.

Weinlich Antonín: *Mariánské poutní místo Vranov*. Brno 1892.

Witzany, Michael: *Die Marktgemeinde Eisgrub*. I–III. Eisgrub 1898–1907.

Zemek, Metoděj: *Břeclav*. Dějiny města. Brno 1968.

Zimáková, Alena: *Územní vývoj břevclavského okresu po roce 1850*. Jižní Morava 3, 1967, pp. 83–89.

Workshops and publications

a. Workshops

(1) *Liechtenstein sites of memory*

11.–12. November 2011, Vranov u Brna

Catherine Horel (Paris, Université de Paris I Sorbonne): Transnationale Erinnerungsorte in der Habsburgermonarchie. Eine Anwendung des Modells von Pierre Nora / Transnacionální místa paměti v habsburské monarchii. Aplikace modelu Pierra Nory

Tomáš Knoz (Brno, Masarykova univerzita, Filozofická fakulta, Historický ústav): Liechtensteinische Erinnerungsorte – Einführungsreferat / Místa liechtensteinské paměti – úvodní referát

Thomas Winkelbauer (Wien, Universität Wien, Institut für österreichische Geschichtsforschung): Karl von Liechtenstein und das “Prager Blutgericht” vom 21. Juni 1621 als tschechischer Erinnerungsort / Karel z Lichtenštejna a staroměstská exekuce z 21. června 1621 jako české místo paměti

Jan Županič (Praha, Univerzita Karlova, Filozofická fakulta, Ústav světových dějin): Die Liechtenstein in Österreich-Ungarn. Souveräne Stellung eines aristokratischen Geschlechts / Lichtenštejnové v Rakousko-Uhersku. Suverénní postavení aristokratické rodiny

Rupert Quaderer (Bendern, Liechtenstein-Institut): Beneš vertrete “einen unserer Aufnahme feindlichen Standpunkt”. Liechtenstein, der Völkerbund und die Tschechoslowakei / Beneš zastává “stanovisko nepřátelské našemu přijetí”. Lichtenštejnsko, Společnost národů a Československo

Václav Horčíčka (Praha, Univerzita Karlova, Filozofická fakulta, Ústav světových dějin): Die Liechtenstein und der Zweite Weltkrieg – Erinnerungsort / Lichtenštejnové a druhá světová válka – místo paměti

Michal Konečný (Brno, Masarykova univerzita, Filozofická fakulta, Seminář dějin umění / Národní památkový ústav): Lednicko-valtický areál. Krajina paměti nebo odraz vzorníkové literatury? / Areal von Eisgrub–Feldsberg. Erinnerungslandschaft oder Widerspiegelung der Vorlagen-Bücher?

Vladimír Herber – Jan Trávníček – Zuzana Fialová (Brno, Masarykova univerzita, Přírodovědecká fakulta): The Memory of the South Moravian Liechtenstein’s Landscape / Paměť jihomoravské “liechtensteinské” krajiny

Radka Miltová (Brno, Masarykova univerzita, Filozofická fakulta, Seminář dějin umění): Mythological Themes in the Liechtenstein Residences in Moravia as Part

of the Ancestral Memory / Mytologická tematika v moravských rezidencích Liechtensteinů jako součást rodové paměti

Lubomír Slavíček (Brno, Masarykova univerzita, Filozofická fakulta, Seminář dějin umění): Liechtensteinische Sammeltätigkeit als Erinnerungsort / Liechtensteinské sběratelství jako místo paměti

Petr Elbel (Brno, Masarykova univerzita, Filozofická fakulta, Historický ústav / Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften): Bild der Liechtenstein in der tschechischen Historiographie / Obraz Liechtensteinů v české historiografii

Blažena Gracová (Ostrava, Ostravská univerzita v Ostravě, Filozofická fakulta, Katedra historie): Bild der Liechtenstein in den tschechischen Geschichtslehrbüchern / Obraz Liechtensteinů v českých učebnicích dějepisu

Zdeněk Vácha (Brno, Národní památkový ústav): Bild der Liechtenstein und mährische Denkmale der Liechtenstein / Obraz Liechtensteinů a moravské liechtensteinské památky

Peter Geiger (Bendern, Liechtenstein-Institut): Bild der böhmischen Länder und der Tschechoslowakei in den liechtensteinischen Medien / Obraz českých zemí a Československa v lichtenštejnských médiích

Guests

Eliška Fučíková (Praha)

Lothar Höbelt (Wien, Universität Wien, Institut für Geschichte)

Jiří Kroupa (Brno, Masarykova univerzita, Filozofická fakulta
Seminář dějin umění)

Alena Salašová (Brno, Mendelova zemědělská a lesnická univerzita v Brně /
Lednice)

Ondřej Horák (Olomouc, Univerzita Palackého, Právnická fakulta, Katedra
teorie práva a právních dějin)

Johann Kräftner (Wien, Liechtenstein. The Princely Collections, Vaduz – Vienna)

Miroslav Svoboda (Moravský zemský archiv, Státní okresní archiv Břeclav se
sídlem v Mikulově)

Arthur Stögmänn (Wien, Liechtenstein. The Princely Collections, Vaduz – Vienna)

Marek Vařeka (Hodonín, Masarykovo muzeum)

(2) *The Liechtensteins: continuities – discontinuities*

18.–19. June 2012, Vienna

Jaroslav Pánek (Praha, Akademie věd ČR, Historický ústav, v.v.i.): Kontinuitäten und Diskontinuitäten in der mitteleuropäischen Geschichte / Kontinuity a diskontinuity ve středoevropských dějinách

Peter Geiger (Bendern, Liechtenstein-Institut): Vom Rand zum Zentrum – Fürstentum und Fürstenhaus Liechtenstein seit drei Jahrhunderten / Od periferie k centru – Knížectví Lichtenštejnsko v průběhu tří století

Libor Jan (Brno, Masarykova univerzita, Filozofická fakulta, Historický ústav): Anfänge der liechtensteinischen Kontinuität auf dem Gebiet des Rechtes und Besitzes / Počátky lichtenštejnské kontinuity v oblasti práva a majetkové držby

Ondřej Horák (Olomouc, Univerzita Palackého, Právnická fakulta, Katedra teorie práva a právních dějin): Kontinuitäten und Diskontinuitäten in den Eingriffen in das Bodeneigentum in der Tschechoslowakei der Nachkriegszeit und die Liechtenstein / Kontinuity a diskontinuity v poválečných zásazích do pozemkového vlastnictví v Československu a Liechtensteinové

Arthur Stögmann (Wien, Liechtenstein. The Princely Collections, Vaduz – Vienna): Glaube und Religion – Kontinuitäten und Diskontinuitäten in der Geschichte des Fürstenhauses / Víra a náboženství – kontinuity a diskontinuity v dějinách knížecího domu

Anna Matušinová – Petr Fiala (Brno, Masarykova univerzita, Fakulta sociálních studií, Katedra mezinárodních vztahů a evropských studií): Katholischer Glaube als Identifikationsymbol im heutigen Europa / Katolická víra jako identifikační symbol v dnešní Evropě

Jaroslav Šebek (Praha, Akademie věd ČR, Historický ústav, v.v.i.): Katholisches Leben und Frömmigkeit in den südmährischen liechtensteinischen Regionen / Katolický život a zbožnost na jižní Moravě – regionu Lichtenštejnů

Zdeněk Novák (Praha, Národní zemědělské muzeum): Das Erbe der jahrhundertelangen Einflüsse des Hauses Liechtenstein auf die Gartenkultur in den böhmischen Ländern / Dědictví staletých vlivů knížecího domu Lichtenštejnského na zahradní kulturu v českých zemích

Martina Pavlicová (Brno, Masarykova univerzita, Filozofická fakulta, Etnologický ústav): Volkskultur in Südmähren aus dem Standpunkt der ethnischen Problematik / Lidová kultura na jižní Moravě z pohledu etnické problematiky

Martin Markel (Brno, Masarykova univerzita, Filozofická fakulta, Historický ústav): Der Einfluss der Untertanenordnung auf die Gestaltung der bürgerlichen Gesellschaft. Die Verhältnisse auf dem Dominium der Liechtenstein Mährisch Krumau im 18.–20. Jahrhundert / Vliv poddanských řádů na utváření měšťanské

společnosti. Poměry na lichtenštejnském panství Moravský Krumlov v 18.–20. století

Tomáš Dvořák – Adrian von Arburg (Brno, Masarykova univerzita, Filozofická fakulta, Historický ústav): Grenzveränderungen und Migration auf dem Gebiet der einstigen Ländereien der Liechtensteiner in Südmähren im kurzen 20. Jahrhundert / Přesuny hranic a obyvatel na bývalých lichtenštejnských panstvích na jižní Moravě v krátkém 20. století

Marek Vařeka (Hodonín, Masarykovo muzeum): Wirtschaftsaktivitäten Hartmanns II. und seines Sohnes Fürst Karls I. von Liechtenstein / Hospodářské aktivity Hartmana II. a jeho syna knížete Karla I. z Lichtenštejna

Lothar Höbelt (Wien, Universität Wien, Institut für Geschichte): Die Liechtenstein als (finanzielle) Schutzpatrone des Adels in den böhmischen Ländern. Rettung der Chabrus-Grafen vor dem Bankrott in den 1870er-Jahren / Lichtenštejnové jako (finanční) patroni české šlechty. Záchrana chabrusových hrabat před bankrotem v 70. letech 19. století

Johann Kräftner (Wien, Liechtenstein. The Princely Collections, Vaduz – Vienna): Zielgerichtetes Sammeln. Stereotype und Brüche in einer Familie von Mäzenen und Sammlern / Cílené sběratelství. Stereotypy a zvraty v rodě mecenášů a sběratelů umění

Jiří Kroupa (Brno, Masarykova univerzita, Filozofická fakulta, Seminář dějin umění): Vom Barock bis zum Neobarock: Motive der Kontinuität in der liechtensteinischen Architektur / Od baroku k neobaroku: Motivy kontinuity v lichtenštejnské architektuře

Robert Stalla (Wien, Technische Universität, Institut für Kunstgeschichte): Stil als Mittel der Kontinuität bei den Liechtenstein / Styl jako prostředek lichtenštejnské kontinuity

Guests

Petr Elbel (Brno, Masarykova univerzita, Filozofická fakulta, Historický ústav)
Eliška Fučíková (Praha)

Václav Horčíčka (Praha, Univerzita Karlova, Filozofická fakulta, Ústav světových dějin)

Catherine Horel (Paris, Université de Paris I Sorbonne)

Susanne Keller-Giger (Buchs)

Tomáš Knoz (Brno, Masarykova univerzita, Filozofická fakulta, Historický ústav)

Josef Löffler (Wien, Universität Wien, Institut für Geschichte)

Roland Marxer (Balzers)

Christoph Merki (Triesen)

Thomas Winkelbauer (Wien, Universität Wien, Institut für österreichische Geschichtsforschung)

Jan Županič (Praha, Univerzita Karlova, Filozofická fakulta, Ústav světových dějin)

(3) *The Liechtensteins and the Arts*

2.–4. December 2012, Brno

Herbert Haupt (Wien): Umění ve službách reprezentace. Knížata z Lichtenštejna jako objednavatelé a sběratelé v období baroka / Die Kunst im Dienste der Repräsentation. Die Fürsten von Liechtenstein als Auftraggeber und Sammler im Zeitalter des Barocks

Jiří Kroupa (Brno, Masarykova univerzita, Filozofická fakulta, Seminář dějin umění): Repräsentace Lichtenštejnů a Ditrichštejnů – symbolické formy / Repräsentation der Liechtenstein und Dietrichstein – Symbolische Formen

Hellmut Lorenz (Wien, Universität Wien, Institut für Kunstgeschichte): Příklady “representatio magnificentiae” lichtenštejnského domu v barokní grafice / Beispiele der “representatio magnificentiae” des Hauses Liechtenstein in der barocken Graphik

Eliška Fučíková (Praha): Karel I. z Lichtenštejna a jeho pražský palác / Karl I. von Liechtenstein und sein Prager Palais

Friedrich Poleross (Wien, Universität Wien, Institut für Kunstgeschichte): *Della virtù e della grandezza Romana*. Lichtenštejnský palác v Rossau – Poznámky k architektuře, programu a autorovi / Della virtù e della grandezza Romana. Das Palais Liechtenstein in der Rossau – Bemerkungen zu Architektur, Ikonographie und Konzept

Tomáš Knoz (Brno, Masarykova univerzita, Filozofická fakulta, Historický ústav): Lichtenštejnská zámecká sídla v kontextu moravsko-rakouské renesance a manýrismu. Zámek Rabensburg / Die liechtensteinischen Schlossbesitze im Kontext mährisch-österreichischer Renaissance und Manierismus. Schloss Rabensburg

Vladimír Mañas (Brno, Masarykova univerzita, Filozofická fakulta, Ústav hudební vědy): Hudba na dvoře Karla I. z Lichtenštejna / Musik am Hofe Karls I. von Liechtenstein

Martin Krumholz (Praha, Akademie věd ČR, Ústav dějin umění, v.v.i.): Anton Florian z Lichtenštejna – Umění ve službách habsburské propagandy / Anton Florian von Liechtenstein – Kunst im Dienste der habsburgischen Propaganda

Miroslav Kindl (Olomouc, Univerzita Palackého, Filozofická fakulta, Katedra dějin umění): Nizozemští umělci ve službě knížat Lichtenštejnů ve druhé polovině

17. století (Jan van Hoy, Franciscus van der Steen, Jan van Ossenbeeck and Hans de Jode) / Netherlandish Artists in the Service of the Princes of Liechtenstein in the 2nd Half of the 17th Century (Jan van Hoy, Franciscus van der Steen, Jan van Ossenbeeck and Hans de Jode)

Štěpán Vácha (Praha, Akademie věd ČR, Ústav dějin umění, v.v.i.): Pražský malíř Anton Stevens ve službách knížete Gundakara z Lichtenštejna / Der Prager Maler Anton Stevens im Dienste des Fürsten Gundaker von Liechtenstein

Gernot Mayer (Wien, Universität Wien, Institut für Kunstgeschichte / Kunsthistorisches Museum): Umění jako dobročinnost. K obdivuhodnému uměleckému patronátu Marie Terezie Savojské z Lichtenštejna (1694–1772) / Die Kunst der Wohltätigkeit. Zur erstaunlichen Kunstpatronage von Maria Theresia von Savoyen-Liechtenstein (1694–1772)

Martina Lehmannová (Praha / Brno, Muzeum hlavního města Prahy / Moravská galerie): Lichtenštejnský mecenát Moravskému průmyslovému muzeu. Podíl Jana II. z Lichtenštejna na utváření místa paměti / Liechtensteinisches Mäzenatentum gegenüber dem Mährischen Industriemuseum. Anteil von Johannes II. von Liechtenstein an der Gestaltung des Erinnerungsortes

Pavel Šopák – Markéta Kouřilová (Opava, Slezská univerzita / Slezské muzeum): Pátrání po identitě. Lichtenštejnové ve Slezském zemském muzeu / Die Suche nach der Identität. Die Liechtenstein im Schlesischen Landesmuseum in Troppau

Zuzana Všetěčková (Praha, Akademie věd ČR, Ústav dějin umění, v.v.i.): Jiří z Lichtenštejna a na Mikulově a výtvarné umění přelomu 14. a 15. století / Georg von Liechtenstein und die Kunst an der Wende des 14. und 15. Jahrhunderts

Petr Fidler (České Budějovice, Jihočeská univerzita, Filozofická fakulta, Ústav dějin umění): Římské echo. Vývojový význam valtického zámeckého kostela / Rom in Feldsberg. Entwicklungsgeschichtliche Bedeutung der Feldsberger Schlosskirche

Johann Kräftner (Wien, Liechtenstein. The Princely Collections, Vaduz – Vienna): Venkovské kostely Lichtenštejnů / Landkirchen der Liechtenstein

Vít Vlnas (Praha, Národní galerie): Korespondence Karla Eusebia z Lichtenštejna jako pramen poznání uměleckého obchodu v Čechách v 17. století / Die Korrespondenz Karl Eusebius von Liechtenstein als Quelle zur Kenntniss des Kunsthandels in Böhmen

Bohumír Smutný (Brno, Moravský zemský archiv): Lichtenštejnské hospodářské snahy / Die liechtensteinischen Wirtschaftsbemühungen

Tomáš Krejčík (Ostrava, Ostravská univerzita v Ostravě, Filozofická fakulta, Katedra historie): Lichtenštejní ve svých mincích, medailích a pečetích. Mezi uměním a ekonomikou / Die Liechtenstein in ihren Münzen, Medaillen und Siegeln. Zwischen Kunst und Ökonomik

Guests

Catherine Horel (Paris, Université de Paris I Sorbonne)

Peter Geiger (Schaan)

Ivana Holásková (Brno / Lednice, Národní památkový ústav)

Ondřej Horák (Olomouc, Univerzita Palackého, Právnická fakulta, Katedra teorie práva a právních dějin)

Michal Konečný (Brno, Národní památkový ústav)

Radka Miltová (Brno, Masarykova univerzita, Seminář dějin umění)

Michal Tlusták (Brno / Valtice, Národní památkový ústav)

Petr Tomášek (Brno, Moravská galerie)

Zdeněk Vácha (Brno, Národní památkový ústav)

Thomas Winkelbauer (Wien, Universität Wien, Institut für österreichische Geschichtsforschung)

Jan Županič (Praha, Univerzita Karlova, Filozofická fakulta, Ústav světových dějin)

(4) *The Princely House of Liechtenstein, the state of Liechtenstein and Czechoslovakia in the 20th century*

26.–27. April 2013, Prague

Jan Županič (Praha, Univerzita Karlova, Filozofická fakulta, Ústav světových dějin): Einführung: Umbrüche / Úvod: Přelomy

Christoph Merki (Triesen, ehem. Universität Bern und Liechtenstein-Institut): Besitzverschiebungen: Vom Grundherrn zum Bankier / Proměny pozemkové držby: Od pozemkového vlastníka k bankéři

Rupert Quaderer (Bendern, Liechtenstein-Institut): Fürstenhaus und Bodenreform / Knížecí dům a pozemková reforma

Susanne Keller (Buchs, Universität Zürich): Fürstentum und Bodenreform / Knížectví a pozemková reforma

Lothar Höbelt (Wien, Universität Wien, Institut für Geschichte): Adel in Österreich und die Brüche von 1918–1933–1938–1945 / Šlechta v Rakousku a zlomy 1918–1933–1938–1945

Peter Geiger (Schaan – Bendern, ehem. Liechtenstein-Institut): Bemühungen um Rückgewinnung und Rettung fürstlicher Güter 1938 bis 1945 / Snahy o znovuzískání a záchranu knížecích statků

Václav Horčíčka (Praha, Univerzita Karlova, Filozofická fakulta, Ústav světových dějin): Enteignungen 1945 bis 1948 / Vyvlastnění 1945–1948

Ondřej Horák (Olomouc, Univerzita Palackého, Právnická fakulta, Katedra teorie práva a právních dějin): Die rechtlichen Aspekte der Staatseingriffe in das Vermögen des Fürstenhauses Liechtenstein / Právní aspekty státních zásahů do vlastnictví knížecího domu Lichtenštejnů

Catherine Horel (Paris, Université de Paris I Sorbonne): Enteignung des Adels in Ungarn nach 1945 – eine vergleichende Perspektive / Vyvlastnění uherské šlechty po roce 1945 – srovnávací perspektiva

Josef Löffle (Wien, Universität Wien, Institut für Geschichte): Fürstliche Verwaltung (bis 1948) / Knížecí správa (do roku 1948)

Johann Kräftner (Wien, Liechtenstein. The Princely Collections, Vaduz – Vienna): Die Fürstlichen Sammlungen im 20. Jahrhundert / Knížecí sbírky ve 20. století

Arthur Stögmann (Wien, Liechtenstein. The Princely Collections, Vaduz – Vienna): Einblick in den zwischen 1945 und 1997 im “Sonderarchiv Moskau” verwahrten Teilbestand des Hausarchivs / Pohled na fondy Domáciho archivu umístěné v letech 1945–1997 ve “Zvláštním archivu v Moskvě”

Peter Geiger (Schaan – Bendern, ehem. Liechtenstein-Institut): Alle enteigneten liechtensteinischen Staatsangehörigen: Wer, was, wo? Was wurde aus dem enteigneten Besitz? / Vyvlastnění lichtenštejnští občané: Kdo, co, kde? Co se stalo z vyvlastněných majetků?

Roland Marxer (ehem. Amt für Auswärtige Angelegenheiten, Vaduz): Die Beziehungen zwischen dem Fürstentum Liechtenstein und der Tschechoslowakei – Tschechischen Republik seit dem Zweiten Weltkrieg / Vztahy mezi Knížectvím Lichtenštejnsko a Československem – Českou republikou od druhé světové války

Karina Hoření – Alžběta Steinerová – Vojtěch Drašnar – Kamila Kohoutková (Brno, Masarykova univerzita, Fakulta sociálních studií, Katedra sociologie)

“Die Gestaltung der Liechtenstein”. Gegenwärtiger soziologischer Diskurs zur liechtensteinischen Frage in Tschechien / “Vytváření Lichtenštejnů”. Současný sociologický diskurz o lichtenštejnské otázce v Česku

Jan Županič (Praha, Univerzita Karlova, Filozofická fakulta, Ústav světových dějin): Schlussdiskussion: Einsichten, Folgerungen / Závěrečná diskuse: Náhledy, závěry

Guests

Tomáš Dvořák (Brno, Masarykova univerzita, Filozofická fakulta, Historický ústav)

Eliška Fučíková (Praha)

Tomáš Knoz (Brno, Masarykova univerzita, Filozofická fakulta, Historický ústav)

Robert Kvaček (Praha, Univerzita Karlova, Filozofická fakulta, Ústav českých dějin)

Václav Ledvinka (Praha, Archiv hlavního města Prahy)

Martin Markel (Brno, Masarykova univerzita, Filozofická fakulta, Historický ústav)

Michal Stehlík (Praha, Univerzita Karlova, Filozofická fakulta)

Jaroslav Šebek (Praha, Akademie věd ČR, Historický ústav, v.v.i.)

Thomas Winkelbauer (Wien, Universität Wien, Institut für österreichische Geschichtsforschung)

b. Publications by the Czech-Liechtenstein Commission of Historians

Volume 1

Liechtensteinisch-Tschechische Historikerkommission (ed.): *Liechtensteinische Erinnerungsorte in den böhmischen Ländern*. Vaduz 2012.

Czech edition:

Geiger, Peter – Knoz, Tomáš (edd.): *Místa Lichtenštejnské paměti*. (Časopis Matice moravské 131, 2012 – Supplementum 3). Brno 2012.

Volume 2

Liechtensteinisch-Tschechische Historikerkommission (ed.): *Die Liechtenstein: Kontinuitäten – Diskontinuitäten*. Vaduz 2013.

Czech edition:

Geiger, Peter – Knoz, Tomáš (edd.): *Lichtenštejnové: kontinuity – diskontinuity*. (Časopis Matice moravské 132, 2013 – Supplementum 4). Brno 2013.

Volume 3

Liechtensteinisch-Tschechische Historikerkommission (ed.): *Die Liechtenstein und die Kunst*. Vaduz 2013.

Czech edition:

Geiger, Peter – Knoz, Tomáš (edd.): *Lichtenštejnové a umění*. (Časopis Matice moravské 132, 2013 – Supplementum 5). Brno 2013.

Volume 4

Liechtensteinisch-Tschechische Historikerkommission (ed.): *Das Fürstenhaus, der Staat Liechtenstein und die Tschechoslowakei im 20. Jahrhundert*. Vaduz 2013.

Czech edition:

Peter Geiger – Tomáš Knoz (edd.): *Lichtenštejnové, Lichtenštejnsko a Československo ve 20. století*. (Časopis Matice moravské 132, 2013 – Supplementum 6). Brno 2013.

Volume 5

Merki, Christoph Maria – Löffle, Josef: *Das Haus Liechtenstein in den böhmischen Ländern vom Mittelalter bis ins 20. Jahrhundert – Güter, Rechte, Verwaltung*. Vaduz 2013.

Czech edition:

Merki, Christoph Maria / Löffle, Josef: *Lichtenštejnové v českých zemích od středověku do 20. století. Majetky, práva, správa*. Vaduz 2016.

Volume 6

Keller-Giger, Susanne – Quaderer, Rupert: *Das Fürstentum Liechtenstein, die böhmischen Länder und die Tschechoslowakei, Geschichte der zwischenstaatlichen Beziehungen*. Vaduz 2013.

Czech edition:

Keller-Giger, Susanne / Quaderer, Rupert: *Lichtenštejnsko, české země a Československo. Historie mezinárodních vztahů*. Vaduz 2015.

Volume 7

Horčička, Václav – Marxer, Roland: *Liechtenstein und die tschechoslowakischen Konfiskationen von 1945. Vom Zweiten Weltkrieg bis zur Gegenwart*. Vaduz 2013.

Czech edition:

Horčička, Václav / Marxer, Roland: *Lichtenštejnsko a československé konfiskace z roku 1945. Od druhé světové války po současnost*. Vaduz 2015.

Volume 8

Geiger, Peter – Knoz, Tomáš – Fučíková, Eliška – Horák, Ondřej – Horel, Catherine – Kräftner, Johann – Winkelbauer, Thomas – Županič, Jan: *Liechtensteinisch-tschechische Beziehungen in Geschichte und Gegenwart*. Synthesebericht der Liechtensteinisch-Tschechischen Historikerkommission. Vaduz 2014.

Czech edition:

Geiger, Peter – Knoz, Tomáš – Fučíková, Eliška – Horák, Ondřej – Horel, Catherine – Kräftner, Johann – Winkelbauer, Thomas – Županič, Jan: *Česko-lichtenštejnské vztahy v dějinách a v současnosti*. Souhrnná zpráva Česko-lichtenštejnské komise historiků. (Disputationes Moraviae, sv. 5). Brno, Matice moravská 2014.

Index

Index of Names

- Albert I**, of Habsburg, King of the Romans, Duke of Austria and Styria, 1255–1308, 31
- Albert II**, of Habsburg, Duke of Austria and Styria, 1298–1358, 31
- Albert III**, of Habsburg, Duke of Austria, 1349–1395, 32, 33, 93
- Albert IV**, of Austria, Duke of Austria, 1377–1404
- Albert V**, of Bavaria, Duke of Bavaria, 1528–1579
- Albert V (Albert II)**, of Austria, King of the Romans, King of Bohemia Margrave of Moravia, 1397–1439
- Albert VI**, of Austria, Duke of Austria, 1418–1463, 34
- Aldegreven Heinrich**, German Engraver and Painter, 1502–1555/1561
- Alt Jakob**, German Painter, 1789–1872, 127
- Altdorfer Albrecht**, German Engraver and Painter, c. 1480–1538
- Anna of Boskovice and Černá Hora**, wife of Karl I, 38
- Anna of Šternberk**, wife of Hartneid III, 93
- Anna Maria**, Countness of Ortenburg, wife of Hartmann II, 1547–1601, 36, 37
- Anning Bell Robert**, British Painter, 1863–1933, 126
- Antonia von Falz-Fein**, Baroness, 156
- Arnulf Prinz von Bayern**, husband of Theresia von Liechtenstein, 1852–1907, 52
- Artner Gustav**, Professor at the University of Agriculture in Brünn, 1890–1967, 153
- Auerspergs**, Family, 45
- Babenbergs**, Family, 29
- Bardini Stefano**, Italian Art Dealer, 1836–1922, 125
- Barvitijs Johannes**, 39, 95
- Bauer Friedrich**, Knight, 119, 120, 125
- Bauer Josef Anton**, German Lithographer, 1820–1904, 119, 120
- Beduzzi Antonio Maria Nicolao**, Austrian–Italian Architect and Theater Engineer, 1675–1735, 107
- Beham Barthel**, German Painter, 1502–1540, 128
- Bellucci Antonio**, Italian Painter, 1654–1726, 118
- Beneš Edvard**, President of Czechoslovakia, 1884–1948, 24, 59, 62, 63, 67, 83, 140, 141, 144, 163, 213, 231
- Binck Jacob**, German Engraver and Painter, 1485–1568/9, 128
- Bloch Albert**, 156
- Bloch Marc**, French Historian, 1886–1944, 73
- Bock Franz**, German Archeologist and Art Historian, 1823–1899, 125
- Bockasai Stephen**, Prince of Transylvania and Hungary, 1557–1606, 40
- Bourbon**, Family, 51
- Braganza**, Family, 51, 53, 246
- Brändle Ida**, 156
- Braun Edmund Wilhelm**, German Art Historian, 1870–1957, 125, 128, 214
- Brunner Otto**, 36
- Budník Josef**, Czechoslovakian Lawyer, 1903–1963, 165
- Bürgi Jost**, Swiss Clockmaker, 1552–1632, 97
- Canevalle Marco Antonio**, Italian Architect, 1652–1711
- Canova Antonio**, Italian Sculptor, 1757–1822, 118, 119
- Carlone Giovanni Battista**, Italian Architect, † 1645, 96, 98
- Carratti Francesco**, Italian Architect, 1620–1677, 110
- Castrucci**, Gemcutter Family, 97
- Cerisola Antonio**, Builder, 109
- Charles I**, 53
- Charles X**, 51
- Charles**, Illegitimate Son of the Emperor Rudolph II, 95
- Conrad III**, King of Germany, 1093–1152, 29
- Cranach Lucas the Elder**, German Painter, 1472–1553, 128
- Cumberland**, Family, 51
- Černý Jan**, Governor of Moravia–Silesia, Prime Minister of Czechoslovakia, 1874–1959, 63
- Dallinger Johann**, Austrian Painter, 1741–1806, 119, 120
- de Brahe Tycho**, Danish Astronomer, 1546–160, 95
- de Gabrieli Gabriel**, Swiss Architect, 1671–1747, 106
- de Charmant Marie**, 156
- de Charmant Pierre**, 156
- de Talleyrand-Périgord Charles-Maurice**, French Foreign Minister, 1754–1838, 49
- de Vries Adrian**, Dutch Sculptor, c. 1556–1626, 91, 96
- degli Embriachi Baldassare**, Italian Carver, 25

- Delsenbach Johann Adam**, German Copperplate Engraver and Painter, 1687–1765, 105, 106, 107
- Dieckhoff Albrecht**, German Lawyer, 64, 65
- Ditrichstein**, Family, 45
- Donner Georg Raffael**, Austrian Sculptor, 1693–1741, 117, 118
- Dopsch Heinz**, 29, 30, 33, 194, 195, 221
- Dorothea von Janotta**, 156
- Dou Gerrit**, Dutch Painter, 1613–1675, 129
- Dubček Alexander**, First Secretary of the Presidium of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, 1921–1992, 83
- Dukes of Northumberland**, Family, 36
- Duquesnoy François**, Flemish Sculptor, 1597–1643, 117
- Dürer Albrecht**, German Painter, 1471–1528, 128
- Đuriš Julius**, Czechoslovakian Statesman, Ministry of Agriculture, 1904–1986, 145, 153
- Durkheim Émile**, French Sociologist, 1858–1917, 73
- Eggenberg**, Family, 45
- Ehrenhaft Ludwig**, Bohemian Painter, 1872–1955, 126
- Elbel Petr**, Czech Historian, 77, 79, 195, 232, 234
- Elisabeth von Gutmann**, wife of Franz I, 1875–1947, 63
- Elisabeth Amalie**, of Austria, Archduchess, niece of Franz Joseph I, Emperor of Austria, 1878–1960, 53, 64
- Elliott John H.**, 36
- Engel Joseph Franz**, Austrian Architect, 1776–1827, 114
- Erna Giovanni Baptista**, Architect, 1622–1698, 109
- Esterházys**, Family, 37, 51
- Eugene of Savoy**, Prince, 1663–1736, 44
- Falke Jakob von**, German–Austrian Art Historian, 1825–1897, 121, 122, 195, 215
- Fantio Vincenzo**, 117
- Ferdinand I**, Holy Roman Emperor, 1503–1564, 36
- Ferdinand II**, Holy Roman Emperor, King of Bohemia, King of Hungary, 1578–1637, 39, 41, 42, 85, 192, 203
- Ferdinand III**, Holy Roman Emperor, King of Bohemia, King of Hungary, 1608–1657, 41
- Fidler Petr**, Art Historian, 98, 99, 108, 109, 110, 111, 215, 236
- Fierlinger Zdeněk**, Czechoslovakian Statesman, Prime Minister of Czechoslovakia, 1891–1976, 154
- Filippi Giovanni Maria**, Italian Architect, 1565–p. 1630, 96, 98
- Fischer Ludwig Hans**, Austrian Engraver and Painter, 1848–1915, 128
- Fontana Carlo**, Italian Architect, 1638–1714, 105
- Francis II (I)**, Holy Roman Emperor, Emperor of Austria, 1768–1835, 48
- Franz von Dietrichstein**, Archbishop of Olmütz, 1570–1636, 40, 108
- Franz Ferdinand d'Este**, Heir to the Austrian throne, 1863–1914, 53
- Franz Joseph I**, Emperor of Austria, 1830–1916, 124
- Frick Aurelia**, Liechtenstein Foreign Minister, 15
- Friedrich II**, “the Quarrelsome”, Duke of Austria and Styria, 1211–1246, 29, 30
- Friedrich III**, Holy Roman Emperor, 1415–1493, 34, 35
- Frühwein Martin**, Prague Burgher, † 1621, 84
- Garrigue Masaryk Tomáš**, President of Czechoslovakia, 1850–1937, 83, 134
- Geiger Peter**, Historian, 16, 20, 21, 24, 64, 65, 66, 67, 74, 75, 77, 79, 81, 82, 83, 84, 86, 87, 88, 93, 94, 97, 98, 100, 101, 102, 105, 108, 109, 110, 111, 124, 126, 141, 155, 195, 196, 203, 205, 208, 210, 213, 215, 217, 219, 221, 232, 233, 237, 238, 240, 241, 242
- George of Poděbrady**, King of Bohemia, 1420–1471, 34
- Gindely Anton**, Bohemian Historian, 1829–1892, 78
- Gisela Josef**, Austrian Painter, 1851–1899, 128
- Giuliani Giovanni**, Italian–Austrian Sculptor, 1664–1744, 111
- Gonzaga**, Family, 95
- Gorbachev Mikhail**, President of the Soviet Union, 90
- Gottwald Klement**, President of Czechoslovakia, 1896–1953, 83
- Greiner Johann Georg**, Austrian Fresco Artist, 1663–1723, 105
- Gyulai Ignaz**, Hungarian Military Office, 1763–1831, 49
- Habermel Erasmus**, Mechanic, maker of astronomical instruments, 1538–1606, 97
- Habsburg-Lorraine**, Family, 51, 53, 56, 64, 132, 135, 136
- Hals Franz**, Dutch Painter, c. 1582–1666, 129
- Hardtmuth Joseph**, Austrian Architect, 1758–1816, 47, 86, 113, 114, 120
- Hartmann Gertrud**, 156
- Haupt Herbert**, Austrian Historian, 24, 47, 91, 92, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 101, 102, 108, 192, 206, 215, 221, 235

- Havel Václav**, President of Czechoslovakia, President of the Czech Republic, 1936–2011, 83
- Hedwig von Berg und Wurmbrand-Stuppach**, Baroness, 1878–1960, 156
- Heidrich Johann**, Architect, 116
- Heinrich II**, “Jasomirgott”, Duke of Austria, Margrave of Austria, 1112–1177, 29, 31
- Heinrich IV**, Holy Roman Emperor, 1050–1106, 29
- Hirschvogel Augustin**, German Glass Painter, 1503–1553, 128
- Hitler Adolf**, 1889–1945, 59, 60, 64, 66
- Höbelt Lothar**, Austrian Historian, 181, 206, 232, 234, 237
- Hoefnagel Joris**, Flemish Painter, 1542–1601, 96
- Hohenems**, Family, 44
- Holstein**, Family, 36
- Horčíčka Václav**, Czech Historian, 15, 19, 21, 24, 65, 67, 68, 70, 138, 153, 154, 155, 158, 161, 162, 164, 165, 166, 167, 168, 209, 210, 211, 213, 222, 231, 234, 237, 241
- Horel Catherine**, French Historian, 16, 21, 50, 51, 74, 82, 181, 196, 231, 234, 237, 238, 241, 2425
- Höss Karl**, Moravian Historian, 114, 115, 117, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 215
- Hubmaier Balthasar**, Anabaptist theologian, c. 1480–1528, 36
- Hus Jan**, Bohemian theologian, c. 1369–1415, 85
- Husák Gustav**, President of Czechoslovakia, 1913–1991, 83
- Cham-Vohburg**, Family, 29
- Charles I**, Emperor of Austria, 1887–1922, 53
- Charles X**, French King, 1757–1836, 51
- Jettel Eugen**, Moravian Painter, 1845–1901, 126, 128
- Joachim of Ortenburg**, Count of Ortenburg, 1530–1600, 36
- Jobst of Moravia**, of Luxemboug, Margrave of Moravia, King of the Romans, c. 1354–1411, 32, 34, 93
- Johann of Luxemboug**, King of Bohemia, 1296–1346, 31, 32
- Jörger von Tollet Bernhard**, husband of Judith von Liechtenstein, 37
- Jörger von Tollet Helmhart**, Freiherr, 37
- Jörger von Tollet Wolfgang**, Freiherr, 37
- Joseph I**, Holy Roman Emperor, 1678–1711, 45, 124
- Joseph II**, Holy Roman Emperor, 1741–1790, 114
- Kálnoky Gustav**, Count, Austro–Hungarian Foreign Minister, 1832–1898, 53
- Karl Ludwig**, of Austria, Archduke, 1833–1896, 53
- Karl VI**, Holy Roman Emperor, 1685–1740, 45, 224
- Katharina of Boskovice and Černá Hora**, wife of Maximilian I, 99
- Kaufmann Adolf**, Austrian Painter, 1848–1916, 128
- Kepler Johannes**, German Astronomer and Astrologer, 1571–1630, 95
- Kinzel Josef**, Austrian Painter, 1852–1925, 128
- Kleiner Salomon**, German Engraver and Painter, 1700–1761, 106
- Knapp Viktor**, Czechoslovakian Lawyer and Statesman, 1913–1996, 144, 147, 149, 151, 211
- Kohout Jan**, Czech Foreign Minister, 15
- Konečný Michal**, Czech Historian, 20, 86, 110, 215, 231, 237
- Kornhäusel Josef**, Austrian Architekt, 1782–1860, 111, 218
- Koshar Rudy**, American Historian, 73
- Kräftner Johann**, Austrian Art Historian and Architect, 16, 21, 91, 92, 96, 99, 100, 104, 113, 216, 232, 234, 236, 238, 241, 242
- Krammer**, Garden Inspector, 111
- Kuklík Jan**, Czech Legal Historian, 133, 150, 151, 211
- Lauch Wilhelm**, First Director of the Higher Fruit and Horticultural School in Lednice, 114, 115
- Laušman Bohumil**, Czechoslovakian Statesman, 1903–1963, 150
- Lehmannová Martina**, Historian, 124, 126, 127, 236
- Leopold I**, Holy Roman Emperor, 1640–1705, 42
- Leopold IV**, of Austria, Duke of Further Austria, 1371–1411, 33
- Liechtenstein**, siehe von Liechtenstein
- Lhota Václav**, Czechoslovakian Historian, 149, 151
- Lobkowicz**, Family, 38, 45, 97, 129, 157
- Loewenfeld Erwin H.**, British Lawyer, 164, 165
- Louis II**, of Hungary, King of Bohemia, King of Hungary, 1506–1526, 36
- Maderno Carlo**, Italian Architect, 1556–1629, 96
- Maria von Frankl**, 156
- Maria von Reitzes-Marienwert**, Baroness, 157
- Maria Theresa**, Holy Roman Empress, 1717–1780, 107
- Maria Theresia of Braganza**, wife of Karl Ludwig of Austria, 1855–1944, 53

- Martinelli Domenico**, Italian Architect, 1650–1718, 105, 106, 107
- Martinitz Maxmilian Guidobald**, Bohemian Nobleman, 1664–1733, 105
- Matthias Corvinus**, King of Bohemia, King of Hungary, 1443–1490, 35
- Matthias**, Illegitimate Son of the Emperor Rudolph II, 95
- Matthias II**, Holy Roman Emperor, King of Bohemia, King of Hungary, 1557–1619, 39, 40, 41, 77, 91, 96
- Maximilian I**, of Bavaria, Duke, 1573–1651, 41
- Maximilian II**, Holy Roman Emperor, 1527–1576, 36, 99
- Melchior Klesl**, Bishop of Vienna, 1552–1630, 40
- Merki Christoph Maria** Historian, 19, 21, 35, 45, 46, 47, 66, 68, 138, 139, 158, 197, 223, 234, 237, 241
- Mignon von Wurmbbrand-Stuppach**, Countess, 1917–1958, 157
- Michl**, 164
- Miseroni Dionysio**, Bohemian Jeweler and Stone-cutter, 1607–1661, 91, 97
- Miseroni Ottavio**, Bohemian Jeweler and Stone-cutter, 97
- Murman (Wurman) Lorenz**, Flemish Sculptor, 96
- Napoleon I**, Bonaparte, French Emperor, 1769–1821, 48, 49, 50
- Näscher Franziska**, 157
- Nick Gottfried**, Jeweller, 96
- Nissl Hans**, 157
- Nissl Renate**, 157
- Nitzsche Alfred**, 157
- Nitzsche Günther**, 157
- Nitzsche Melanie**, 157
- Nora Pierre**, French Historian, 73, 75, 231
- Nosek Václav**, Czechoslovakian Statesman, Ministry of the Interior, 1892–1955, 145
- Nottebohm, Harriet**, 157
- Nottebohm Hermann**, 157
- Novotný Antonín**, President of Czechoslovakia, 1904–1975, 83
- of Boskovice and Černá Hora, Jan Šembera**, † 1597 38, 94, 95, 99, 200
- of Breuner Seyfried Christopher**, 1569–1651, 41
- of Brunswick Henry Julius**, Duke of Brunswick–Lüneburg, 1564–1613, 95
- of Fürstenstenberg Friedrich**, Count, 1576–1646, 39
- of Harrach Charles**, 1560–1628, 41, 85
- of Cham and Vohlbürg Diepold III**, Margrave of Vohlbürg, 29
- of Kounice Charles**, 42
- of Krausenegg Paul**, Guardian of the illegitimate sons of the Emperor Rudolph II, 95
- of Lobkowitz Zdeněk Vojtěch Popel**, 1568–1628, 38
- of Salm Weikhard**, 40
- of Savoy-Carignano Thomas**, nephew of Prince Eugene of Savoy, † 1729, 44
- of Saxony-Teschen Albert**, 1738–1822, 128
- of Valdštejn Albrecht**, 1583–1634, 41, 204
- of Žerotín Charles**, 1564–1636, 38, 40, 41
- of Žerotín Charles the Elder**, 1564–1636, 80, 94
- of Žerotín Ladislav Velen**, 1579–1638, 41
- Oldenburg, Family**, 36
- Ospel Anton Johann**, Austrian Architect, 1677–1756, 107
- Otto of Habsburg**, Duke of Austria and Styria, 1301–1339, 31
- Otto IV**, von Maissau, Marshal of Austria, † 1440, 34
- Ottokar II**, King of Bohemia, Margrave of Moravia, † 1278, 30, 31, 201
- Palladio Andrea**, Italian Architect, 1508–1580, 103, 104
- Passini Ludwig**, Austrian Painter, 1832–1903, 128
- Pekař Josef**, Czechoslovakian Historian, 1870–1937, 76, 85, 212
- Percy, Family**, 36
- Petitpierre Max**, Swiss Federal Councillor 1899–1994, 164s
- Petri**, Estate Manager of Johann I, 112
- Polišenský Josef**, Czech Historian, 1915–2001, 79, 199, 204, 226
- Poppelak Franz**, Builder, 114
- Pozzo Andrea**, Italian Painter, 1642–1709, 118
- Press Volker**, Historian, 31, 33, 34, 35, 36, 38, 46, 77, 199, 206, 223
- Procházka Jindřich**, Czechoslovakian Lawyer, 163, 164
- Prokop of Luxembourg**, Magrave of Moravia, 1355–1405, 33
- Průcha Václav**, Czechoslovakian Historian, 134, 151
- Rainer Ferdinand**, of Austria, Archduke, Austrian Politician, 1827–1913, 124, 126
- Randa Antonín**, Professor of Civil Law at the Charles-Ferdinand University in Prague, 1834–1914, 152
- Raphael**, Italian Painter, 1483–1520, 120
- Rapotonen-Diepoldinger, Family**, 29
- Ricci Carl**, Banker, 119
- Risch Adolf**, 157
- Rubens Peter Paul**, Flemish Painter, 1577–1640, 101, 118, 120
- Rudolph of Habsburg**, King of the Romans, 1218–1291, 31
- Rudolph II**, Holy Roman Emperor, 1552–1612, 36, 39, 40, 77, 91, 95, 96, 97, 99, 100

- Rumpf Wolf**, 39
- Russ Robert**, Austrian Painter, 1847–1922, 126
- Russell John**, Lord, Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, 1792–1878, 57
- Sachsen-Weimar**, Family, 51
- Salm-Reifferscheidt-Raitz, Hugo Karl Franz**, Count, Austrian Nobleman, 1832–1890, 124
- Savery Roelant**, Dutch Painter, 1576–1639, 96
- Savoy**, Family, 35
- Sedlmayr Hans**, Austrian Art Historian, 1896–1984, 107, 114
- Seemann Albin**, 157
- Seemann Peter**, 157
- Serlio Sebastiano**, Italian Architect, 1475–c. 1554, 104
- Schädler Stefanie Marianne**, 157
- Schönborn**, Family, 65
- Schongauer Martin**, Alsatian Engraver and Painter, c. 1445–1491, 128
- Schönn Alois**, Austrian Painter, 1826–1897, 128
- Schwaiger Hans**, Bohemian Painter, 1854–1912, 126
- Schwarzenberg**, Family, 37, 45, 51, 112, 200
- Sigismund of Luxembourg**, Holy Roman Emperor, King of Bohemia, 1368–1437, 33, 34
- Smířický**, Family, 41
- Sobička Emil**, Czechoslovakian Lawyer, 1906–1990, 163
- Spranger Bartholomeus**, Flemish Painter, 1546–1611, 96
- Steihardt Laurence A.**, U.S. Ambassador in Prague, 1892–1950, 164
- Straka Josef**, Bohemian–Austrian Painter, 1864–1946, 126
- Strauss Minka**, 157
- Strecker Emil**, German Painter, 1841–1925, 128
- Svoboda František**, Central director of the Liechtenstein's property administration, 154
- Tencalla Giovanni Giacomo**, Italian–Swiss Architect, 1593–1653, 108, 109
- Tomala Olga**, 157
- Trautson Paul Sixt**, 39
- Tusar Vlastimil**, Czechoslovakian Statesman, Prime Minister of Czechoslovakia, 1880–1924, 137
- Vacková Jarmila**, Czech Art Historian, 1930–2011, 90
- van Laer Pieter**, Dutch Painter and Printmaker, 1599–1641/1642, 69
- van Meckenem Israhel**, German Printmaker, c. 1445–1503, 128
- van Westrum Jasper Schade**, Dutch representative to the States-General, 1623–1692, 129
- Victoria**, Queen of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, 1819–1901, 57
- Vignola Giacomo Barozzi**, Italian Architect, 1507–1573, 103
- Viškovský Karel**, Czechoslovakian Statesman, 1868–1932, 135
- Vladislav II**, of Hungary, King of Bohemia, King of Hungary, 1456–1516, 35
- Vohburg**, Family, 29
- von Aachen, Hans**, German Painter, 1552–1615, 96
- von Alt Rudolf**, Austrian Painter, 1812–1905, 126
- von Amerling Friedrich**, Austrian–Hungarian Portrait Painter, 1803–1887, 120
- von Apponyi Rudolph**, Count, Austrian Ambassador at British royal Court, 1812–1876, 57
- von Bode Wilhelm**, German Art Historian, 1845–1929, 115, 121, 129
- von Erlach Johann Bernhard Fischer**, Austrian Architekt, 1656–1723, 104, 107, 111, 114
- von Friedländer Friedrich**, Bohemian–Austrian Painter, 1825–1901, 126
- von Haymerle Heinrich Karl**, Baron, Austro–Hungarian Foreign Minister, 1828–1881, 52
- von Königswarter Johann Alexander**, Baron, 1890–p. 1960, 156, 214
- von Lanna Alfred**, 129
- von Liechtenstein Alfred**, 1842–1907, 56
- von Liechtenstein Alois**, Son of Hans–Adam II, 1968–, 68
- von Liechtenstein Alois**, Father of Franz Josef II, 1869–1955, 51, 63, 64, 156
- von Liechtenstein Alois I**, Son of Franz Josef I, 1759–1805, 46, 47, 107, 111, 113, 119
- von Liechtenstein Alois II**, Son of Johann I, 1796–1858, 52, 54
- von Liechtenstein Anton Florian**, Son of Hartmann, 1656–1721, 43, 45, 106, 107, 206, 235
- von Liechtenstein Christoph**, † c. 1412, 33, 34
- von Liechtenstein Christoph III**, Son of Johann IV, brother of Johann V and Heinrich VII, † post 1506, 35, 36
- von Liechtenstein Emanuel**, 1908–1987, 156, 167
- von Liechtenstein Erasmus**, Son of Heinrich VII, brother of Johann VI, † 1524, 36
- von Liechtenstein Ferdinand Johann**, Son of Gundaker, 42
- von Liechtenstein Franz**, Son of Johann I, 1802–1887, 49, 56
- von Liechtenstein Franz**, Son of Alfred, 1868–1929, 56
- von Liechtenstein Franz I**, Brother of Johann II, 1853–1938, 52, 61, 62, 63, 68, 122
- von Liechtenstein Franz Josef I**, Nephew of Joseph Wenzel, 1726–1781, 46, 111

- von Liechtenstein Franz Josef II**, 1906–1989, 51, 61, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 80, 141, 155, 156, 161, 167, 170
- von Liechtenstein Friedrich**, †1290, 31
- von Liechtenstein Friedrich**, 1871–1959, 156
- von Liechtenstein Georg Erasmus**, Brother of Hartmann II, 1547–1585, 94
- von Liechtenstein Georg I**, Son of Hartneid II, brother of Johann I and Hartneid IV, †1398, 32, 34
- von Liechtenstein Georg III**, Son of Hartneid III, †1444, 93, 236
- von Liechtenstein Georg VI**, Son of Heinrich VII, brother of Erasmus, 1480–1548, 36
- von Liechtenstein Gundaker**, Son of Hartmann II, brother of Maximilian I and Karl I, 1580–1658, 35, 37, 38, 39, 42, 43, 45, 54, 86, 94, 193, 206, 207, 236
- von Liechtenstein Hans-Adam**, Son of Franz Josef II, 1945–, 61, 68, 102, 222
- von Liechtenstein Hartmann I**, Son of Johann V, †1542, 36
- von Liechtenstein Hartmann II**, 1544–1585, 36, 37, 94, 195
- von Liechtenstein Hartmann**, 1613–1686, 54
- von Liechtenstein Heinrich II**, †1314, 31
- von Liechtenstein Hartneid II**, Son of Heinrich II, c. 1310–1351, 31
- von Liechtenstein Hartneid III**, Son of Hartneid II, †1376/1377, 93
- von Liechtenstein Hartneid IV**, Son of Hartneid II, brother of Johann I, †1395, 32, 33
- von Liechtenstein Hartneid V**, Son of Hartneid IV, †1426/1427, 33, 34
- von Liechtenstein Heinrich**, Brother of Franz Josef II, 1920–1993, 67
- von Liechtenstein Heinrich I**, ca. 1211–1266, 29, 30, 31
- von Liechtenstein Heinrich V**, Son of Hartneid III, †c. 1418, 33, 34
- von Liechtenstein Heinrich VII**, Son of Johann IV, brother of Johann V and Christoph III, †1483, 34
- von Liechtenstein Heinrich IX** “the Younger”, Brother of Hartmann II, 1554–1585, 94
- von Liechtenstein Johann Adam Andreas**, Son of Karl Eusebius, 1657/1662–1712, 44, 45, 85, 92, 102, 104, 105, 106, 107, 117, 217, 218
- von Liechtenstein Johann I**, Son of Hartneid II, brother of Hartneid IV, †1397, 32, 33, 48, 49, 50, 53, 55, 93, 99, 111, 112, 113, 119, 120, 206
- von Liechtenstein Johann I**, 1760–1836, 48, 49, 50, 53, 55, 99, 111, 112, 113, 117, 119, 120, 206
- von Liechtenstein Johann II**, Son of Alois Josef II, 1840–1929, 52, 56, 57, 61, 62, 63, 68, 88, 92, 93, 107, 110, 114, 115, 116, 117, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 139, 206, 215, 217
- von Liechtenstein Johann II**, †c. 1411, 33, 34, 93
- von Liechtenstein Johann Nepomuk Karl**, Grandson of Anton Florian, 1724–1748, 45
- von Liechtenstein Johann Septimus**, Brother of Hartmann II, 1558–1595/1596, 94
- von Liechtenstein Johann V**, Son of Johann IV, brother of Christoph III, †1473, 34
- von Liechtenstein Johann VI**, Son of Wolfgang I, 1500–1552, 36
- von Liechtenstein Joseph Wenzel**, Nephew of Anton Florian, 1696–1772, 45, 46, 99, 107, 117, 205, 207, 215
- von Liechtenstein Judith**, Daughter of Hartmann II, sister of Karl I, Maximilian I and Gundakar, wife of Bernhard Jörger, 1557–1581, 37
- von Liechtenstein Karl**, Son of Johann I, 1803–1871, 49, 50
- von Liechtenstein Karl Alfred**, Brother of Franz Josef II, 1910–1985, 64, 67, 164
- von Liechtenstein Karl Eusebius**, Son of Karl I, 1611–1684, 42, 43, 44, 85, 91, 98, 101, 102, 103, 104, 106, 107, 108, 109, 192, 206, 215, 236
- von Liechtenstein Karl I**, Son of Hartmann II, brother of Maximilian I and Gundakar, 1569–1627, 20, 81, 85, 91, 92, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 108, 161, 176, 194, 203, 207, 215, 235
- von Liechtenstein Katharina**, Daughter of Hartmann II, sister of Karl I, Maximilian I and Gundakar, 1572–1643, 37, 38, 42, 95
- von Liechtenstein Leonhard I**, Son of Christoph III, 1482–1534, 36
- von Liechtenstein Ludmila**, Wife of Alfred, 1908–1974, 157
- von Liechtenstein Maria (Irma)**, Wife of Friedrich, 1877–1956, 156
- von Liechtenstein Maria Theresia**, Daughter of Johann Adam Andreas, wife of Thomas of Savoy-Carignano, 1694–1772, 44, 236
- von Liechtenstein Maximilian I**, son of Hartmann II, brother of Karl I and Gundakar, 1578–1643, 35, 37, 38, 39, 42, 43, 45, 54, 94, 95, 99, 108
- von Liechtenstein Olga**, Wife of Eduard, 1873–1966, 157, 167
- von Liechtenstein Rudolph**, 1838–1908, 51
- von Liechtenstein Theresia**, Sister of Johann II, wife of Arnulf, Bavarian prince, 1850–1938, 52
- von Liechtenstein Ulrich**, 34
- von Liechtenstein Wolfgang II**, 1536–1585, 37
- von Liechtenstein and Falkenstein Friedrich**, Son of Heinrich I, brother of Heinrich II, †1290, 31
- von Liechtenstein and Mikulov Heinrich II**, Son of Heinrich I, †1314, 31

- von Liechtenstein-Petronell Hugo (I)**, 29
- von Offermann Theodor Rotter**, Austria
Industrialist, 1822–1892, 124
- von Pückler-Muskau Hermann**, German Noble-
man, 1785–1871, 112
- von Senftenau Jacob Kurz**, Imperial pro-chancellor
for the Emperor Rudolph II, 1553–1594,
95
- von Schmidt Friedrich**, German Architect,
1825–1891, 116
- von Schrötter Alfred**, Austrian Painter, 1856–1935,
128
- von Silva-Tarouca Friedrich**, Count, Roman
Catholic Clergyman, 1816–1881, 124
- von Stillfried-Rathenitz Raimund**, Austrian
Photographer, 1839–1911, 120, 121, 126
- von Wallenstein Albrecht**, 41, 206
- von Wilczek Ferdinand**, Count, 1893–1977, 157
- von Wilczek Georgina**, Countess, wife of Franz
Josef II, 1921–1989, 65
- Vondra Roman**, Czech Historian, 80
- Voženilek Jan**, Czechoslovakian Statesman, 135, 170
- Waagen Gustav Friedrich**, German Art Historian,
1794–1868, 120
- Waldstein**, Family, 129
- Wanger Anton**, 157
- Wannieck Friedrich**, Austrian Industrialist,
1838–1919, 124
- Weinbrenner Karl**, Austrian–Bohemian Architect,
1856–1942, 116, 219
- Weiss Antonie**, 157
- Wenceslas I**, King of Bohemia, 30
- Wenceslas IV**, King of the Romans, King of Bohemia,
1361–1419, 32, 33, 93
- William the Courteous**, Duke of Austria,
1370–1406, 33
- Winkelbauer Thomas**, Austrian Historian, 16, 21,
24, 38, 47, 78, 80, 193, 202, 205, 207, 220, 231, 235,
237, 239, 241, 242
- Wurzelbauer Benedikt**, German Bronze Caster,
1548–1620, 129
- Zahálka Otakar**, Czechoslovakian General,
1891–1942, 65
- Zdrasila Adolf**, German Painter, 1868–1942,
128
- Zschille-Grossenhain Richard**, Manufacturer, Art
Collector, 1847–1903, 125
- zu Hohenlohe-Langenburg Max Egon**, 1897–1968,
157

Index of Places

- Adamstahl (Adamov) 115
 Alps 103
 Altlichtenwarth 30, 123
 Altvatergebirge (Jeseník mountains) 88
 Ancona 119
 Augsburg 96
 Austria 23, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 39, 43, 44,
 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 56, 57, 60, 61, 62,
 64, 66, 77, 82, 87, 94, 108, 109, 112, 122, 130, 141,
 174, 175
 Auwal (Úvaly) 154
 Balzers 88, 234
 Basel 94, 223
 Beijing 92
 Berlin 23, 45, 64, 67, 101, 107, 108, 110, 123, 129, 133,
 187, 206, 214, 216, 220
 Bern 23, 62, 66, 67, 141, 166, 187, 188, 192, 196, 214,
 237
 Bischofswarth (Hlohovec) 75, 190
 Blansko 169, 199
 Bohemia 15, 19, 30, 31, 33, 35, 41, 43, 44, 46, 51, 54,
 59, 61, 65, 77, 78, 81, 83, 87, 93, 117, 124, 130, 140,
 141, 154, 157, 163, 169, 170, 174, 175, 176, 243,
 244, 245, 246, 247, 248
 Boskovice 38, 42, 94, 99, 243, 245, 246, 250
 Bozen 123
 Branitz 112
 Branná 41, 169
 Bruntál 169
 Butchowitz-Steinitz 42, 169
 Cham 29
 Cologne 70, 92, 98, 134
 Croatia 82
 Czechoslovakia (Czechoslovakia Republic) 18, 19,
 20, 21, 24, 32, 59, 60, 61, 62, 64, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70,
 82, 83, 85, 92, 130, 132, 133, 134, 135, 137, 139,
 141, 142, 143, 146, 149, 153, 155, 160, 162, 163,
 164, 166, 167, 168, 169, 174, 175, 176, 177, 178,
 180, 210, 237
 Czech Republic 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 23, 24, 59, 69, 70,
 80, 82, 83, 85, 92, 168, 173, 174, 175, 178, 180, 183,
 Danube 29, 51, 53, 57, 59, 109
 Drienov 156
 Dürnhholz (Drnholec) 35, 192
 Dürnkrot 31
 Eggenburg 123
 Eisenberg (Ruda nad Moravou) 41, 65, 169
 Eisgrub (Lednice) 37, 86, 215
 Elbe 133
 England 36
 Enns 37, 39, 43
 Estonia 133
 Faenza 125
 Falkenstein 31, 33, 35, 192
 Feldsberg (Valtice) 33, 34, 36, 37, 38, 52, 57, 61, 63,
 65, 66, 69, 86, 98, 106, 108, 110, 215
 France 38, 48, 49, 50, 73, 133
 Frankfurt am Main 214, 223
 Gablonz an der Neisse (Jablonec nad Nisou) 157
 Geneva 94, 136, 164
 Germany 23, 36, 59, 64, 70, 103, 132, 133, 141, 161,
 177, 207
 Gnadendorf 35, 192
 Göding (Hodonín) 44
 Graz 92, 123, 201, 206, 215
 Great Britain 133
 Gross-Ullersdorf (Velké Losiny) 51, 53
 Győr 42
 Hagenberg 35, 192
 Hague 70, 136, 165, 207
 Herrnbaumgarten 37, 94
 Hlohovice 114
 Hohenau 37, 94
 Horní Slavkov 157
 Hungary 40, 44, 51, 53, 60, 82, 130
 Illyrian Provinces 48
 Innsbruck 98, 99, 108, 109, 123, 194
 Italy 133
 Jägerndorf (Krnov) 41, 44, 51, 66, 123, 169, 205, 225
 Japan 92
 Jewan (Jevany) 139
 Johnsdorf (Janovka) 126
 Judenau 44
 Judenburg 29
 Karlsbad (Karlovy Vary) 123, 156
 Karlsberg (Karlovec) 44, 55, 66, 169
 Kaunitz (Kounice) 42, 44, 46, 169
 Klosterneuburg 29
 Kolín 169
 Krupinsko 156
 Kutná Hora 169
 Latvia 133
 Leipzig 50, 98, 101, 102, 103, 104, 109, 133, 192, 215
 Leitha 29, 30
 Lesser Town of Prague (Malá Strana) 32
 Liechtenstein 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25,
 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42,
 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56,
 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70,
 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86,
 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100,
 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110,
 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 121,

Summary Report

- 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 130, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 147, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 173, 174, 175, 176, 177, 178, 180, 181, 182, 183, 184, 187, 192, 193, 194, 195, 196, 197, 198, 199, 200, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 227, 231, 232, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237, 238, 240, 241, 242
- Linz 123
- London 68, 101, 107, 108, 125, 141, 142, 206, 216, 220
- Loosdorf 112
- Lower Austria 32, 33, 34, 35, 37, 39, 43, 44, 47, 52, 61, 82, 94, 108, 112, 174
- Mährisch Aussee (Úsov) 38, 55, 95, 155, 169, 191
- Mantua 95
- Meran 123
- Mistelbach 32, 35, 123, 192
- Mödling 29
- Mohács 36
- Moravia 15, 19, 23, 24, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 47, 52, 54, 58, 59, 61, 63, 64, 65, 77, 79, 81, 86, 87, 91, 94, 96, 112, 115, 117, 126, 130, 140, 141, 154, 161, 163, 169, 170, 174, 175, 176, 177, 231
- Moscow 92, 142
- München 123, 196, 198, 199, 200, 202, 206, 207, 215, 216, 217, 219
- Muskau 112
- Netherlands 103
- Neudorf an der Neisse (Nová Ves nad Nisou) 156
- Neugarten (Zahrádky) 156
- Neugebäude 99
- Neuhof 113
- Neuilly 136
- Neulichtenwarth 30
- Neuschloss (Nové Zámky) 156, 169, 191
- Neutra (Nitra)
- New York 73, 97, 101, 107, 108, 118, 128, 206, 214, 216, 217, 220
- Nikolsburg (Mikulov) 30, 33, 35, 45, 76, 86, 93, 192, 197, 226
- Nuremberg (Nürnberg) 96, 123, 129
- Old Town Square (Prague) 41, 75, 77, 84, 85
- Paris 16, 45, 48, 50, 62, 75, 129, 133, 140, 196, 214, 224, 231, 234, 237, 238
- Petronell 29
- Plumenu (Plumlov) 38, 75, 96, 102, 104, 169, 227
- Podivín 34, 190
- Poland 82, 133, 134
- Pottendorf 35
- Pressburg (Bratislava) 49, 144, 148, 157, 166
- Prussia 50, 51, 112
- Raab 42
- Rabensburg 32, 35, 37, 88, 94, 102, 190, 192, 219, 235
- Radim 46, 169
- Rattay (Rataje nad Sázavou) 44, 46, 169
- Regensburg 45
- Reichenberg (Liberec) 123, 192
- Rhine 48, 49, 50, 60, 61, 92, 176
- Rhineland 177, 180, 183
- Ringelsdorf 37, 94
- Rohrau 29
- Romania 133
- Rome 45, 105, 117, 118, 119, 126
- Rossau 57, 99, 104, 111, 115, 118, 119, 121, 215, 217, 218, 235
- Rumburg (Rumburk) 43, 45, 51, 65, 169, 191
- Russia 63, 92, 133
- Saint-Germain 32, 61, 136
- Salzburg 123
- Saxony 51, 128, 247
- Schellenberg 44, 45, 54
- Schrattenberg 114
- Scotland 36
- Shanghai 92
- Siena 38
- Singapore 92
- Slovakia (Slovak Republic) 59, 69, 82, 83, 144, 149, 150, 168
- Soviet Union 133, 245
- Spalato 123
- Steyregg 33, 34, 36, 37
- St Gallen 68
- Stockholm 129, 252
- St Petersburg 63
- Sudetenland 64, 65, 66
- Svitavy 169, 252
- Switzerland 23, 60, 61, 62, 66, 67, 70, 92, 133, 140, 163, 164, 166
- Thaya 32, 202
- Tracht (Strachotín) 31
- Trent 93
- Trianon 136
- Troppau (Opava)
- Tulln 44
- Unterwindthorst 123
- Upper Austria 33, 37
- Ústí nad Orlicí 169, 227
- Vaduz 15, 16, 18, 21, 23, 35, 44, 45, 47, 51, 54, 57, 58, 61, 62, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 70, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 81, 82, 84, 86, 87, 88, 92, 98, 99, 100, 106, 113, 115, 137, 138, 139, 140, 153, 155, 156, 157, 158, 168, 187, 192, 193, 195, 196, 197, 198, 200, 201, 202, 203, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 227, 232, 233, 234, 236, 238, 240, 241

Index

Versailles 136
Vohburg 29
Walschlandt (Vlachy) 104
Wamberg (Vamberk) 157
Waterloo 50
Weimar 51, 98, 132, 192, 193, 194, 204
Weinviertel 31, 43, 112, 202
White Mountain (Bílá Hora) 41, 42, 43, 75, 77, 78, 79,
80, 81, 85, 91, 97, 132, 161, 175, 176, 181, 194, 203
Wilfersdorf 33, 37, 42, 88, 94, 189
Winterthur 125
Wranau (Vranov u Brna) 17, 42, 57, 63, 75, 83, 87, 88,
174, 200, 216, 217, 218, 225, 231
Zabreh 157
Znaim (Znojmo) 34, 123, 192, 219, 226
Zuož 68

In 2009 the Czech Republic and the Principality of Liechtenstein established diplomatic ties, thus ameliorating a situation which had lasted since 1945 because of the post-war period of confiscations in the Czech lands. In 2010 the governments of both countries established a joint commission of historians in order to examine the development of relations within the context of their rich history to the present day, and to explain it not only to the two peoples but also to an international public.

This Summary Report by the Czech-Liechtenstein Commission of Historians contains the results of common research of more than three years, published at first in German and in Czech. This English Edition now opens the results to a worldwide public of interested readers and researchers.

The Summary Report sheds light on the history of the Princely House of Liechtenstein, deeply rooted in the Bohemian Lands since the Middle Ages, als well as on the difficult relations between the Principality and the Czech Republic during the 20th century. It explains why the diplomatic ties remained interrupted for more than half a century, and it names questions which are still waiting for solution.

Contents:

- The Liechtenstein-Czech Commission of Historians
- The Liechtensteins: Middle Ages, Early Modern Age, 19th Century, 20th Century
- Sites of memory, historical images
- The Liechtensteins and art
- Land reform after 1918
- Confiscations 194
- Conclusions, desiderata, prospects
- Appendix: Sources and bibliography, workshops and publications by the Czech-Liechtenstein Commission of Historians, Index