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107. See, for instance, a volume gathering 20 offensive writings by French elites against German scientists, established at Alcan by Gabriel Petit and Maurice Leudet at the invitation of a survey launched by *Le Figaro* in April 1915. The title was “Les Allemands et la science.” (See Rasmussen and Prochasson, *Au nom de la patrie*. op. cit., pp. 208–209.)
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Turning and turning in the widening gyre  
The falcon cannot hear the falconer;  
Things fall apart; the centre cannot hold;  
Mere anarchy is loosed upon the world,  
The blood-dimmed tide is loosed, and everywhere  
The ceremony of innocence is drowned;  
The best lack all conviction, while the worst  
Are full of passionate intensity.

Surely some revelation is at hand;  
Surely the Second Coming is at hand.  
The Second Coming! Hardly are those words out  
When a vast image out of Spiritus Mundi  
Troubles my sight: somewhere in the sands of the desert.  
A shape with lion body and the head of a man,  
A gaze blank and pitiless as the sun,  
Is moving its slow thighs, while all about it  
Reel shadows of the indignant desert birds.  
The darkness drops again; but now I know  
That twenty centuries of stony sleep  
were vexed to nightmare by a rocking cradle,  
And what rough beast, its hour come round at last,  
Slouches towards Bethlehem to be born?

W.B. Yeats  
The Second Coming  
1919
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"War Stares at Us like an Ominous Sphynx":¹ Hungarian Intellectuals, Literature and the Image of the Other (1914–1915)

Eszter Balázs

Until the last decades of the nineteenth century various forms of coexistence between liberal and nationalist value-systems existed in Europe.² During the decades preceding the First World War, the compatibility of the two ideologies began to be challenged in different ways and with different intensities across Europe. In the Hungarian context, the opposition between “national” and “antinational” (“international”) had already emerged around 1900. Some intellectuals and politicians began to question the compatibility of the cause of liberty with the cause of community. By the end of the first decade of the twentieth century, this opposition among Hungarian intellectuals had translated to antagonism between “national-essentialist” (“particularist”) and “anti-essentialist” (“individualist”) intellectuals. The former were characterized by a complex of “national,” or cultural superiority, in particular toward the ethnic minorities under Magyar rule.³ The latter opposed this essentialist approach to culture, defining Hungarian culture as one of the many specific interpretations of world culture. These two sets of intellectuals were characterized by different meanings of liberty, autonomy and nation. They centered around reviews and described themselves either as part of the national intelligentsia (nemzeti intelligencia) or as individual intellectuals – using or refusing the adjective “national” (nemzeti) highlighted the difference between them.

This chapter focuses on Hungary’s new nationalism that culminated in the years 1914–1915. Like other First World War historians, we agree
with the idea that the Great War was not a chronological block but a fragmented epoch composed of several phases. In the Hungarian case, the years 1914 and 1915 were the mobilization years. An important paradigm in those years was the polarity between friend and foe, with the latter still being found mainly outside the country. Only from 1916 on would the foe be found within, as the hunt for scapegoats began. Anti-Semitism would gain ground.

The first years of the Great War saw Hungarian intellectuals' resistance to political and economic powers diminish. As in other European countries, Hungarian modernism and its avant-gardes came under the fire of a nationalist backlash. The press and periodicals overtly supporting the Great War trumpeted their moral victory over the “intellectuals” (a term borrowed from the French vocabulary). In periodicals that until then had defended literary autonomy, writers abstained from portraying themselves any longer as autonomous intellectuals. These periodicals devoted many columns to analysis of the Great War. During the years 1914–1915, even Nyugat (West) and Huszadik Század (Twentieth Century), the two most important platforms for the prewar figure of the autonomous intellectual, took part in supporting the war effort. Even as skepticism grew later, these reviews adhered, for a certain degree, to a “minimum program” that supported the war (expressing empathy for soldiers etc.).

The literary sphere was dormant during the first months of the war. Theaters and exhibition venues were shut down (subsidized theaters would only open again in January 1915). The publishing industry came to a halt and readers lacked money to buy books. Despite this quite challenging context, the relationship between war and literature, between war and culture, became a burning topic from the very first weeks of the war, not only in the literary periodicals but also in the daily press — pointing to the fact that intellectual activity became bound to war culture. For many writers, as well as for artists and scholars, the Great War gave way to a new field of experiences.

By the first months of the Great War, fronts had opened everywhere: not only literally, along the trenches, but also intellectually, within editorial boards and universities. When the war broke out, nothing better demonstrated the contiguity between the front and the intellectual home front than the call published in the literary daily Új Idők (Modern Times) for a holy union of all Hungarian intellectuals. Whether the intellectuals succeeded in “gathering within this loving family” that was expected from them remains to be seen.

Supporting the national cause: The intellectuals close to power

In Hungary, intellectuals close to the inner circles of the power zealously committed to defend their homeland, an aim quite natural to writers who had always put the nation forward in their intellectual activities. They devised and executed strategies of persuasion for the benefit of the Hungarian state at a time when, contrary to what was going on in England for instance, war propaganda was not yet institutionalized. Although strong, intellectuals' mobilization was nevertheless not uniform. Similar to Germany and France, scholars and scientists committed themselves alongside writers. Like other European intellectuals who started to apply such strategies for their own countries, Hungarian intellectuals used the arsenal at their disposal: articles, leaflets, books and lectures, which had continuity with the previous decades, based on demonstration and logical connections. The strong rhetorical dimension of their writings was the consequence of a classical education that insisted on literary tradition and eloquence. Like Hungary's political and military leaders, intellectuals had been educated according to prewar positivist ideals and the belief in progress.

From December 1914 to the end of spring 1915, several cycles of conferences were organized in Budapest as well as in the countryside around a major topic: how does the war affect the cultural fields? In this first phase of the Great War, these lectures became the privileged platform of expression for the intellectuals close to power, whereas autonomist intellectual circles kept publishing, for want of a better solution, in periodicals more suitable for expressing doubt and dissent (and possibly, for launching debates). Military censorship was in force (decree 1912/LXIII), but less heavily than in Germany, France or Great Britain. Freedom of opinion was greater, especially at the beginning of the war, but the autonomist intellectuals fared worse than their lecturer-colleagues, who could directly disseminate their thoughts to a wide-ranging public without suffering from the dormant publishing business or the lessened volume of the periodicals.

These conference cycles were organized around one or two specific topics, and their proceedings were promptly published in an effort to improve the propagation of reflections on such topics as “war and literature,” “culture and war,” “sciences and war,” “school and war,” to name a few. They were targeted at a bourgeois public of Budapest and other major cities, which needed to be convinced of the necessity and the virtues of the war. According to many testimonies, such lectures were
very popular. Among the periodicals that published conference proceedings were the great conservative-liberal monthly Budapesti Szemle (The Budapest Review) and Magyar Figyelő (The Hungarian Observer), the periodical founded and edited by Ferenc Herczeg, a writer close to Prime Minister István Tisza. The publications also included the yearbooks published by the bastion of Hungarian literary conservatism, the Kisfaludy Society. Specialized journals such as the Földrajzi Közlemények (Geographical Proceedings) and Néptanító Lapja (The Schoolteacher's Journal) also printed these lectures when they touched upon a topic of particular interest. The general press published abstracts and excerpts from the lectures. Their goal was to disseminate pro-war ideas on a larger scale so as to touch a vast public. The daily Budapesti Hírlap, directed by writer Jenő Rékosi, frequently reported the ideas discussed in these lectures. The Catholic weekly Élet (Life) claimed such lectures were needed for Hungary to fight against war skepticism.

The first cycle of lectures took place at the Ritz hotel and included Bishop Ottokár Prohászka (who was to become one of the most voluble authors during the war), writer Jenő Rékosi, Count Gyula Andrássy (the younger), Count Albert Apponyi and writer Ferenc Herczeg, all of whom were close to power circles. These established writers, politicians and Church members all turned into war experts, partly due to the prewar debates around the new role devoted to intellectuals.

These prominent representatives of the Hungarian political and religious establishments had already been affected by different nationalist trends in the period before the First World War. The younger Andrássy, an important political rival to Prime Minister Tisza, represented the most liberal pole of national thought before the First World War. He incarnated the current of harmony between liberalism and nationalism that was dominant among Hungarian elites until the last years of the nineteenth century and which especially expressed itself with regard to new currents of arts and literature. Also, he owned the most liberal journal of prewar years, Magyar Hírlap, where many intellectuals devoted to modernism were already contributing before the First World War. However, Jenő Rékosi, Ferenc Herczeg and Count Albert Apponyi had already been moving toward antiliberalism regarding many cultural and social issues since the first years of the twentieth century. This move can be traced through their intolerance toward minorities. They repeatedly claimed the superiority of Hungarian “statehood” and culture over minorities in the Carpathian basin. Although Rékosi and Herczeg themselves had German origins, they embraced hyperassimilation, widely exploiting stereotypes of the other minorities. Meanwhile, the Minister of Education during 1906–1910, Count Apponyi, elaborated on outstandingly intolerant educational legislation toward minorities. Nevertheless, all remained advocates of the inclusivist model of nation statehood, and not of that of integrist nationalism which would become mainstream only after 1918–1919. In contrast, Bishop Prohászka had been a committed anti-Semite since the 1890s and had criticized the new modernist trends in cultural life since their emergence. Despite his efforts to modernize the Catholic Church in Hungary, he can be seen as an emblematic figure of the most antiliberal trend of Hungarian nationalism before the First World War.

Some of the lecturers who turned themselves into propaganda agents also worked within propaganda institutions. For instance, within the Central Aid Committee of (Budapesti Központhas Széti Bizottság), Count Gyula Andrássy headed the department of support to literature and arts. At the prime minister's request, the writer Ferenc Herczeg came to head the Office of the Army Aid (Hadszegélvezérlő Hivatal) between 1914 and 1916, and then became its Berlin contact. This office was tasked to gather donations, issue awards and organize exhibitions, including military ones.

"The strength of the cult around Shakespeare is a cultural test for the nations": War, national literature and world literature

On 5 March 1915, a specialist in English literature and a great figure of Hungarian teaching, Pr. Ágost Gyulai, who by then was the head of the Hungarian Pedagogical Society, gave a lecture that showed his intent to fully commit to the Great War. He talked about the link between war and literature as a part of the cycle on “War and School.” The cycle consisted of five conferences, which attested to the major role assigned to public schools as a vehicle of national mobilization in Hungary, similar to the French or the Italian cases. Gyulai’s lecture was published in the Budapesti Szemle, then in a separate publication organized by the periodical and later in a volume gathering the other lectures of the cycle, intended for teachers.

The cult around Shakespeare enables a closer look at the motivations behind intellectuals’ commitment during the war. Gyulai dismissed the idea of devaluing Shakespeare, Molière and Dante on the grounds that they represent “the intellectual life of rival nations.” As a Hungarian expert on Shakespeare’s works, of which he had published the first bibliography containing all the Hungarian translations up to 1908, and
as a translator of French writers such as Jules Lemaitre, Gyulai was inclined to save some writers of the adversary nations from the stigma of the foe. He mentioned the Berlin university professor Alois Brandl, who, as Gyulai claimed, defended the universal character of art. The reference was far from insignificant: Brandl was the head of the German Shakespeare Society. Shakespeare was therefore branded as a European intellectual reference, who belonged — as suggested by Gyulai — more to the Germans and their allies than to the Triple Entente. His intent was less to maintain an international culture than to dismiss the accusations of “barbarism” plaguing Germany and its war methods. Although Gyulai did not comment on this particular aspect, he was likely aware of the fact that Brandl had signed the Manifesto of the Ninety-Three, the famous October 1914 manifesto of 93 German intellectuals proclaiming their support of the defensive war in the aftermath of the blame that surrounded Germany for violating the neutrality of Belgium. He claimed moral ownership of Shakespeare as part of a strategy similar to that of certain French writers, who had claimed ownership of the greatest intellectual figures of their “enemy,” Kant and Goethe, admitting that such a claim coincided with the French theory of the existence of “two” Germanies.

For Gyulai, war was the opportunity to undertake revenge against the Entente cultures, whose domination, according to him, had for a long time been a source of distress for the Germans and Hungarians — hence their “military and spiritual alliance.” He portrayed Germany as eager to know the other great European cultures as well as humiliated by their indifference. According to him, Hungary was even more open to “foreign ideas” than Germany, as Hungary was able to assimilate and turn them into a “specific national content.” War would decide among other things which nation was the most intelligent — and Germany, in Gyulai’s view, already made a breakthrough in the spheres of culture and sciences.

The press that was committed to the war shared a similar emphasis on Shakespeare: the pro-war daily Budapesti Hírlap presented Shakespeare as a European writer requiring the support of Hungarian intellectuals. Writer Gyula Pekár, another connoisseur of French and English cultures and a former student at the Sorbonne who was to become the head of a propaganda institution (the Cultural Centre for Eastern Hungary), disparaged the English betrayal of Shakespeare, while engaging in the Hungarian habit of nationalizing great European writers:

Great Shakespeare, our idol, our master, king among poets, how painful it is for us to admit in front of you, in these times of utmost ordeal, how foul this national genius you blessed with your noble ideas became! Avon swan with enchanting words, could you have ever dreamed that this very language, in which you sang all human beauty and justice...would ever translate lies and abominations... From the top of our Hungarian mores, we watch with dismay how the English island sinks — and our only consolation, great Shakespeare, is that you remain as a rock and remain for us.

Budapesti Hírlap also published the summary of a lecture given at the Budapest university in the series “war lectures” (organized after the model of German universities) by famous literary historian Zsolt Beóthy, who used the same notion: “the most salient representative of Russian and English spirits, Tolstoi and Shakespeare are fighting on our side, they are our allies.” Beóthy, the head of the Kisfaludy Society and the author of a major essay from 1900 on national characterology (The Small Overview of Hungarian Literature), which was to influence several generations, affirmed in his lecture on “War and Culture” a compatibility between them:

[Culture] is not a light word such as it turned to be in so-called aesthetes’ language.... On the contrary, culture is life that wants to know, work, love, the people and the fatherland. It’s not only nerves open to pleasures, but also working muscles... it is not only comprised of intellectual elements but also of emotional and ethical ones.

Such an anti-intellectual exaltation of manhood shows that, for Beóthy, the war came to embody a moment of national reaction against modernity, and a return to order within the nation. It further shows the war as full of vitalism, as an endeavor of active moralization.

As the Kisfaludy Society gathered for its yearly assembly in the beginning of 1915, it was Beóthy who underscored the deep link between national Hungarian and universal values. A year later, at the next assembly, Zsolt Beóthy and Gyula Vargha announced the society’s celebration of the 300th anniversary of the death of “the greatest poet in the Christian world.” They proposed among other things new translations of Shakespeare’s works. Such a commemoration was all the more needed, Beóthy underscored, as “the poet’s nation and people got rid of his moral code and rose against us,” forcing Hungary to take arms in the name of “justice and culture.” After 1914, the long Hungarian cult of Shakespeare found itself in a new register dominated by the war: instead of speaking of a cult resisting the war hostilities and “having saved its
continuity and integrity,” an emerging conception of the cult developed, and the new cult became part of the strategy of answering to the charge of “barbarianism.”

The same proceedings from 1915 included an essay by the philosopher Bernát Alexander under the provocative title: “World Literature and World War.” The first professor of history of philosophy at the university of Budapest, during the war, Alexander became the chief-editor of *Athenaeum*, the periodical of the Hungarian Philosophical Society. He too was already involved in the Hungarian cult of Shakespeare: as a member of the Hungarian Shakespeare Society, he was its representative at the spring 1914 assembly of the German Shakespeare Society in Welmar.

Alexander’s essay sheds light on efforts to maintain a world culture at a time when, unlike the sciences whose universal features were easily retained, literatures had to “fight like armies.” This remark leads Alexander to question the historical accuracy of the terms *universal literature*. If Shakespeare was such a popular figure, it was because of national literatures: the English poet “belongs to the intellectual property” of all European nations, along with Dante, Victor Hugo and Molière. Alexander refused to denigrate the foreign enemy through the great cultural geniuses as the French did with the Germans. In his eyes, the patriotic fever shown by the Entente intellectuals (and especially the French) threatened world literature with a greater danger than Germany and its allies. The philosopher also criticized those among the Germans who accused Frenchmen of barbarism, and called war and literature essentially incompatible. Alexander concluded: “regardless of the winner [of the war], culture is indestructible.”

In early 1916, in a lecture delivered at the Kisfaludy Society, Albert Berzesczy, the president of the Academy of Sciences since 1905 and a world-renowned Shakespeare specialist, also stressed the difference between France and Hungary in their attitudes toward the goods of universal culture. According to him, Hungary “does not want nor can it follow the sorrowful path traced by the nations which pretended to lead civilization and hurried to throw away their former aesthetic, poetic and artistic creed in the ravenous fire of sacrifice that burns from political hatred.”

**Inner circles close to power: The “1914 ideas”**

Cultural and literary periodicals close to the government claimed legitimacy for the war while holding the opponent nations accountable for it. They insisted on fighting in the name of civilization against the other’s barbarism. In the very first stages of the conflict, they endorsed the idea of a “regenerative war” that would soon cure a Hungary plagued by decadence and bring it back to the moral path. *Magyar Figyelő* called it a “holy war” to defend the nation and European civilization, humanism and freedom against despotism, as embodied by Russia, and moral corruption or betrayal, as embodied by France. *Magyar Figyelő* praised war’s curative properties, for war was to put an end to the wrongdoings of the parliamentary system and the political antagonisms that had weakened the state. It was hoped that war would put an end to any cultural, political or social cleavages and see the formation of a national unity. By choosing the German side, Hungary was embracing the “1914 ideas,” the new nationalism and its values of manhood and strength, as carried by young German culture, as opposed to the old ideas derived from the French Revolution.

In 1914–1915 these periodicals reviewed the values of German and French cultures (as well as Russian and, to a lesser degree, English) and recycled old stereotypes. The assessment of the positive and negative influences of these two cultures on Hungarian life was based on a tradition rooted in the beginning of the nineteenth century: its theoretical foundations had been laid by the German Romantics, who had based their cultural antagonism with France on Herder’s theory opposing German “modernity” to French “classicism.” French republicanism came to be criticized in *Új Idők* as the ally of (Russian) despotism, and the increasingly pejorative-sounding term West was used to refer to France. “Materialistic civilization” was branded as inferior to “Kultur.” France “showed itself as a Central African savage only listening to his instincts” – a hint to colonial barbaric France. Nonetheless, despite their patriotic stance, the periodicals kept publishing translations from French literature to its (mostly female) readers, such as Georges Ohnet’s works.

In late 1914 and early 1915, Zoltán Szász, a liberal journalist from *Pesti Hírlap* and an occasional contributor to *Új Idők*, published several essays on Germany. In the first one he praised the complementarity between Germans and Hungarians, who could find benefits in such a relationship:

Hungarians make headway where the Germans are less strong: the average Hungarian is more brilliant, more gifted, even maybe more artistic and has a more refined taste than the average German, but in the field of organization, he remains inferior. Our industry, our
business, our political and social sciences remain quite poor next to the Germans'. Let us dare to learn from them, for we have no reason to fear for our national character, which is stronger than the German one on several fronts. Luckily enough, everything that a nation can learn from another, any type of organization, exists in an exemplary way among the Germans, but everything it cannot learn, such as the physical and spiritual maturity, exists in large parts at home. The Hungarian spirit and the German spirit can blend in a very happy way. Our alliance with the Germans is not only political, but more deeply: it is a happy alliance in a cultural meaning.43

Szász's words were very close to those of French intellectuals on German Kultur. According to a widespread generalization in France, German Kultur was "fertile in the material realm [but] fruitless in the intellectual order."44 Szász, who, as a prewar Francophile, commended the French language, returned to French clichés on Kultur dating back to Mme de Stael's famous writings on "Northern culture" and on Germany. She presented the "North" and, most particularly, German intellectual life as offering the prospect of French cultural renewal.45 Szász inserted this thinking into the "1914 ideas,"46 focusing on German social integration as a model for Hungarians. Interestingly, as he summed up the differences between the Germans and the Hungarians, he actually reunited the latter with the French – a gesture that betrayed his own ties with France.

The idea that Hungarian culture needed to rely on foreign intellectual sources had been haunting intellectual debates for more than a century. By the end of the nineteenth century, German culture had been considered a threat for many decades. Yet the idea started to fade before the war: at the turn of the century, the cultural relationship with Germany was reappraised, as seen in the interest for modern German literature in the modernist semimonthly Nyugat, launched in 1908.47 War was only the next step, if not a logical one. Szász's interpretation was one among many; others reassessed the value of the alliance with Germany in the frame of a several-centuries old struggle between the "Latin" and the "German" cultures.48

It is in this context that Bernát Alexander's 1915 lecture on "War Philosophy," published in Magyar Figyelő, can be understood. In it, he praised war for placing German and Hungarian relationships on an equal footing.49 He included Vienna – a rare inclusion at the time – and noted that the war alliance was based on higher aspects such as culture, thought, feeling, justice and law, and was sealed in sacrifice. As for the British, Magyar Figyelő remained tight-lipped: only in the beginning of 1915 did a contributor mention Rudyard Kipling's novel Many Inventions, which he read as a "confession" on the "English nature."50

Although strongly mobilized, the Budapesti Hírlap never crossed the line either. The accusation of barbarism against German culture was merely rejected as the outcome of French nationalist propaganda, carried out by thinkers who elaborated their ideas from their readings of German philosophy – the case in point being Henri Bergson.51 Bergson was attacked for being the first to call for war against Germany as civilization's fight against barbarism.52 Jenő Rákosi and his circle put forward the "1914 ideas" – Germany's mission to spiritually change Europe: "French thought, which had died with Mirabeau, Rousseau and Napoleon, will be replaced by German thought."53 A turning point would follow: European people would be able to benefit from the universal spreading of German culture. The Hungarian–German alliance was thus a source of rejoicing. The poet Gábor Oláh, who broke off with the literary modernism embodied by Nyugat as early as 1910 and became faithful to Rákosi's ideas, wrote a poem about the union between "two brothers" becoming "one force," "two Caesars to change every lie into justice."54

**Literary and cultural magazines close to the Church: Élet and Magyar Kultúra**

These two Catholic periodicals greeted the First World War along the same lines as those discussed above, but with the exception that they included verbal abuse and they more strongly expressed the new values brought about by the war. In the weekly Élet, writer Kálmán Harsányi wrote in Nietzschean style: "[the] nation is as one man: majestic, strong, its fists firmly raised"; in his view, "the first battle has already been won against defeatism of those poisoning society."55 In the monthly Magyar Kultúra, Count Albert Apponyi56 and Ernő Margitay, one of the sharpest pens of the periodical, wrote about a "crusade" of modern times, where Germany and its allies must fight in the West and the East against "the spirit of religion turned into superstition" and the "godlessness that diverts from Christianity."57

Both periodicals devoted many pages to describing the cultural dichotomy between the two enemy camps, and regularly cast aspersions on French "low morals." A grid of anti-values was ascribed to France: promiscuity, immorality, pornography, frivolity and so forth. This verbal abuse was tied to antimodernist (and antifeminist) discourses. According
to Ernő Margitay, war was a struggle between cultural mores: German unstained religious morals were opposing Russian barbarism, embracing the “hysteric on the banks of the Seine.” An anonymous article compared France to “an aging, washed-out lady, whose silken dress is covered with mud.” The aesthetics of violence were expressed even more strongly in Élet – in a manner similar to the ideas of the sociologist Werner Sombart, who defined German imperialism as deeply human: “Any moral and beauty begotten by the war are on our side. The charge of our lieutenants on the enemy in the Balkans, on Russian or on French soils, is a beautiful rhapsody.”

Élet also examined German singularity, which it defined as the will toward reintegration within the collectivity. In Magyar Kultúra, Ernő Margitay stressed that culture and work are deeply connected in Germany: “their meticulous work in the field of culture bears splendid fruits, which stir both hatred and admiration, and already point to their eventual victory.” German influence in Hungary was extolled: “Our friendship and our understanding rivalry with the Germans are a rejoicing for us: we have suffered enough, fought with ourselves and with the Germans long enough to get to this rejoicing. The strong German culture will stimulate the elaboration of a strong and deep Magyarhood.”

Élet devoted commentary to the decline of the enemy cultures, mostly French and Russian. Its scale of values was drawn from prewar stereotypes. In the face of the superior German culture, French cultural life was in decline for the Élet intellectuals: “Neither life nor wit fizz any longer, champagne has lost its foam and wit its sparkle.” The same article, however, took note of the existence of a French group “clever but not devoted to the ‘intelligentsia,’” swimming against the current, that is the “disciples” of Paul Bourget, Maurice Barrès and Henry Bordeaux, three anti-Dreyfus writers who embodied literary conservatism. (See Chapter 6 in this volume.) Regarding the Russians, the periodical was less loquacious: when speaking of “Slavic culture” (the term has a long tradition in Hungary and colludes with the German anti-Slavic discourse), it singled out the behavior of the ethnic minorities living in the Kingdom of Hungary. “Russian orthodoxy” was also blamed as the reason for the state of Russian culture.

Although less prominently than in the periodicals connected to civil power, these Catholic periodicals also spread the idea that Hungary’s mission was to defend the cultural values of mankind. Élet quoted Bishop Ottokár Prohászka’s speech of February 1915 at the yearly assembly of the Pázmány Association. The bishop stressed Hungarian distinctiveness and dismissed any accusation of barbarism:

…our press, regardless of the differences between the parties, defends the cultural values of mankind. Since the outbreak of the war I can’t remember ever reading any anathema against our enemies’ scientists, artists or writers. Our Academy did not exclude anyone from its ranks… It may be so because our isolated Magyar people has felt more immensely the obligation of paying tribute to those who tied our Turanian nature to Western culture. In this bloody tempest, in this cataclysm between East and West, our almost forgotten and pitiful nation became… a resolute and heroic champion of this culture.

The initial enthusiasm regarding the new values brought up by the war nevertheless faded around spring 1915, partly after Hungarian troops suffered great losses in Galicia. Intellectual commitment came to be branded as an illusion, and the rejection of sensuality became associated with anti-Semtic discourses: “When the war broke out, we foresaw the obvious victory of the pure Hungarian current. We fanatically believed that the Gallic perverse spirit, semiotic cosmopolitism, Moscovite Saninism as well as all pornographic eroticism could not but perish…” From August 1915 on, after the modernist Nyugat started to change its opinion regarding the war toward more pacifist discourses, Élet's prewar dichotomy between “Magyar” and “Jewish” was reactivated.

The other Catholic review, Magyar Kultúra, took it upon itself to behave as the thought police of the Hungarian periodicals through its “review of reviews.” Anti-Semitism emerged in this periodical in autumn, 1914, when Jewish refugees from Galicia arrived in the Hungarian capital. Many of Magyar Kultúra's contributors gave way to anti-Jewish comments against them, but also against assimilated Jewish Hungarian writers such as Sándor Bródy and József Kiss, the editor-in-chief of the first modernist weekly launched in the 1890s, A Hét (The Week), even though the latter had become conservative before the war. While Élet attacked the modernist review Nyugat's pacifism and its Jewish contributors in August 1915, Magyar Kultúra had already launched a conflict with the journal as early as September 1914, arguing Nyugat had showed an ungodly mercantile attitude. When the Reims cathedral was destroyed, Károly Burján, another acerb pen of Magyar
Kultúra, accused Nyugat of hypocrisy for shedding crocodile tears for Reims:

Shedding tears for the destruction of the Reims cathedral is appropriate to anyone but Nyugat, which tasked itself with driving out the spirit that made it possible to create the dome of Reims, that of Saint Peter, the Milan cathedral and so forth. If the trend that created the dome of Reims had reigned in this world, there would never have been a war, nor Nyugat for that matter.73

Autonomous periodicals: The case of Nyugat

Until 1916, relatively weak censorship in Hungary enabled autonomous periodicals like Nyugat or Huszadik Század to continue publishing. During the first years of the conflict, the press was still distributed without any prior control, even though self-censorship – including silence – played an important role.

Fervor stirred by the war was from the start blended with doubts and fears.74 For Ignotus, the editor-in-chief of Nyugat since 1912, the intellectual's war role should combine “patriotism” and “world citizenship.”75 Nevertheless, many first responses published in the review extolled the revitalizing force of the war on artistic activity. More than one of its contributors was thirsty for action.76

Among these, writer Béla Balázs, a close friend of philosopher György Lukács,77 stood out. To him, the war was “holy,” its “greatness” transcending the mind and the senses, perception and judgment. Driven by the “search for the body action in the war,”78 Balázs enlisted and became a “soldier-intellectual.”79 (His military career was short-lived and he demobilized in January 1915.) An early piece by Balázs (August 1914) was instrumental in initiating a polarization between “Weimar” and “Paris” akin to an intellectual “culture war.”80 In Balázs’s view, Weimar stood for “German culture” whereas Paris epitomized “Latin culture.” According to Balázs, “Paris was the first great [war] dead” in Hungary, where war had destroyed political and cultural Francophilism. His words echoed those of Ignotus in the radical daily Világ (The World).81

Balázs’s article was in line with his prewar passion for German culture, in which he saw a rejuvenating force for Hungarian culture. He did not reject French culture as a whole, but only its “Latin” part. He commended French writers, like those around the NRF (see Chapter 6) who accentuated the German part of French culture. As for Hungarian writers, he advised them to realize that the “German book fair became the stock exchange of world literature,” since only German culture was open to other cultures.

After January 1915, Nyugat refused to continue releasing Balázs’s belliscose war notes, which were pervaded with a “patriotic mysticism.”82 His promotion of a new aestheticism grounded on the rejection of rationality, bourgeoisie values and liberalism, his quest for an identity as an assimilated poet (with the desire to resolve the paradox of being a Jew) and his Nietzschean voluntarism – all of which were present in his prewar essays83 – had taken another step with the war and they ended up separating him from Nyugat.

Still, the periodical published a series of articles praising German culture. Zoltán Felvinczi Takács, a civil servant at the Fine Arts Museum and a regular contributor to Nyugat, justified the war in a November 1914 article, entitled “Germans and Hungarians” with the idea that Germans took up arms in the name of culture.84 Like Balázs, he sang the praises of Germany’s support for Hungarian culture in its effort to establish itself in the European arena.

In a January 1915 article in Nyugat, Géza Laczkó, a former Francophile, condemned the French in a quite offensive tone.85 Although his discourse was not a sort of Germanophobia, it was quite similar to points made by some German patriots railing against French and English individualism.86 Laczkó portrayed the French as being selfish in essence, placing single interests above the (national) community. Unlike Balázs, he did not seek to distinguish a “Latin” part from a “German” one that could be saved – expressing a radical repudiation of the culture that once used to feed his thoughts.

Despite the lack of a rigorous censorship, it became increasingly difficult to express one’s disapproval for conformist views. Nevertheless, some voices came to the defense of French culture. The first to reject pro-war feelings among Intellectuals, though in a moderate tone, was Miksa Fenyő, who was known for the sharpness of his articles in Nyugat before 1914. In September 1914, he called for solidarity across national, cultural and civilizational borders.87 In the same issue, poet Endre Ady, a Francophile whose name epitomized poetic modernism, warned against condemning France unconditionally in the whirlwind of the conflict.88 Fed by the “Dreyfusard” tradition, he contrasted the “ugliness and idiocy” of France to the “French genius” embodied in his eyes by Anatole France, the very writer most quoted by Nyugat before the war.89 In December 1914, he stressed again this dichotomy as he contrasted the French capital, Paris, a reappraised “female” city and the “New Athens,” embodying universalism, to a France that had resigned
its universal purpose. As early as November 1914, he declared his "horror for the war"; in January 1915, he praised "internationalism" in a universalist meaning and published a poem dedicated to Jean Jaurès, the symbolic victim of unleashed nationalist passions.

From November 1914 Nyugat published articles related to the mobilization of intellectuals in wartime. These articles were intended to justify war commitment alongside the Germans. Aladár Schöpflin was the first to comment: European intellectuals, he argued, burned with the desire to explain an inexplicable war, made slanderous accusations against Germany – though Schöpflin only mentioned writers from enemy countries such as Romain Rolland and Rudyard Kipling.

Ignotus shared the criticism of France's intellectual mobilization. From the outbreak of the war, he called for the acknowledgement of German culture as a young culture able to show the path to a younger Hungarian culture, which remained in its dependency. His reevaluation of German culture inspired by the war is all the more poignant when one considers that just before the outbreak of the war, Ignotus had confessed to his disappointment that German culture had failed to achieve its true potential. This change of heart was significant of a more general skepticism of liberal and social values, which Ignotus had until then associated with French intellectual culture.

As an observer of the home front, playwright Menyhért Lengyel, who had known significant successes on German stages before the war, alluded in October 1914 to a "psychic defeat" and quoted Jonathan Swift and Voltaire (two writers of the enemy camp) to unfold a skeptical analysis of the war. He was the very first among Hungarian intellectuals to adopt a pacifist stance, when in December 1914 he published a discourse on demobilization: war, Lengyel asserted, was absurd and anachronistic, representing only "mourning and abhorrence," whose only explanation can be found in mankind's limited nature.

In February 1915, Francophile Zoltán Ambrus, a novelist who had been famous for his novels since the 1890s, published his war notes, which dealt in great part with intellectual mobilization. He also aimed at a national justification through the dismissal of the accusation of barbarism against the Germans. Ambrus further drew a line between French and German writers: to him, warmonger attitudes were mainly shared by "average" French writers, not by the German ones. France complained without proof of the brutalities of the German army while inflicting some upon Germany. But Ambrus was already more measured in his second series of notes and assessed intellectual life in a more subdued tone: for the first time in the review, the idea of European intellectual collaboration was rejected. The theme of the "treason of the intellectuals" (la trahison des clercs) was already coming to the surface well before the war ended. In March 1915, Ambrus rejected the war and castigated all the "platonic war lovers" writers.

In March 1915, Aladár Schöpflin also wondered about the bellicose turn of European – and German – intellectuals, yet without questioning his own commitment: he even highlighted the activities of Bishop Ottokár Prohászka, the symbolic figure of Catholic mobilization, who had played a very important part as such from the outbreak of the war. Still, in a letter of April 1915, Schöpflin brands Hungarian bellicose feelings as "erroneous opinions." March 1915 was actually a turning point in Nyugat: Dezső Kosztolányi was the first to question openly the Hungarian intellectual mobilization and contrasted the "new literature" to the "literature of the reaction," inclined to mobilize and calling for a return to order. Playwright Menyhért Lengyel declared himself to be "a friend of the peace," insisting on the gap between warmonger states and civil societies seeking peace; to him, commitment to the war turned writers into "intellectual war suppliers." Much like Lengyel, Frigyes Karinthy denounced the "betrayed literary merchants" and, speaking to the simple soldiers, warns them against the fake patriotism they are to be fed with like "tin boxes.

Italy's entry into war on the side of the Entente in May 1915, perceived by Vienna and Budapest as a "treason," moved poet Mihály Babits to break his silence on war and on intellectual mobilization. According to Babits, anti-intellectualism reigned, as proved by the futurist trend, and the "intellectual war suppliers" (as he quotes from Lengyel) such as Gabriele d'Annuzio and pugnacious second-rate Hungarian poets who prevailed in intellectual milieus. Like Kosztolányi, this major voice of Nyugat was really criticizing the mobilization of the intellectuals in Hungary, even though his target was Italian intellectuals, members of a new enemy country.

Conclusion

The coexistence of nationalism and liberalism that marked Hungarian history during the entire nineteenth century was not challenged at first by the First World War. The years before this conflict had already seen the growth of a national essentialism which was linked to the overall crisis of modernity at the turn of the twentieth century. War mobilization of many of the Hungarian elites was only the next step in the process of
the collapse of this relative harmony. Intellectuals’ mobilization relied on a system of self-restraint and self-persuasion even though the range of such mobilizations was from the start wider than in the West. Since Nyugat’s initial conformism was quickly questioned by its contributors, one cannot speak of a “holy union” among Hungarian intellectuals as found in France, Germany or England.

Paradoxically, if Nyugat first published articles more or less critical of the war as well as harsh indictments of French culture, the literary circles close to power, which by definition were more committed, did not vilify the cultures of the enemies. They resisted the uncouth clichés of French and English cultures, even though these countries were branded as Hungary’s enemies, along with Russia. A full cultural protectionism was not attempted, as was the case in France. The intellectuals at the service of the state – as was the case with the German intellectuals – represented Hungarian culture as a warrant of European culture, worthy of keeping it alive, as their commitment around Shakespeare’s cult shows. Shakespeare became the symbol of choice for opposing the accusation of barbarism.

For their part, the intellectuals in the periodicals close to the Church did not refrain from unleashing their hatred and contempt for France, which they saw as the incarnation of immorality. They used the war opportunity to get even with Hungarian literary modernism: their condemnation of France as the source of harmful modernity was therefore a perfect vector.

Those few who condemned French culture in Nyugat were particularly aggressive. Béla Balázs, who was very keen on German culture, felt choked by the legacy of French culture in Hungary and by a Hungarian culture he deemed outdated. Géza Laczkó, who had been a champion of French culture, expressed his bitterness toward France. Others opted to sing praises of German culture. Those who resisted patriotism from the start were not numerous: Miksa Fenyő, Endre Ady and Menyhért Lengyel were among the most vocal voices. Nevertheless, despite a certain loss of its autonomy and liberty of speech, Nyugat did not turn into an intellectual platform of the national cause.

Everything changed by the end of summer 1915, when one of the founders and patrons of Nyugat, writer Lajos Hatvany, and the poet Mihály Babits fiercely spoke out against the war. Hatvany questioned the spirit of European intellectuals (and, this time, of Hungarian ones too) committed to the war, whereas Babits published a pacifist poem. Romain Rolland published a series of texts – first in the Journal de Genève between August and December 1914 – under the title Au dessus de la mêlée (Above the Fray). The dissident voices among Hungarian intellectuals – which emerged as a new form of social intervention – were to erect new borders among the intellectuals. They criticized the war without yet overtly demanding its end. Nevertheless, they stirred a wave of venomous attacks from within the circles committed to the national cause. The Hungarian state – as the other belligerent states in Europe – felt threatened by those who disputed the legitimacy of the war; because of another pacifist poem of his (“Fortissimo,” 1917), Mihály Babits became marginalized. Everywhere in a Europe that had lost its innocence, “the intellectual became a dissident.” As with Romain Rolland, Babits needed “the atrocities of a world war to convince him of his duty not to remain in the solitude specific to the artistic ethos.”

The prewar great divide between the “old” and the “new” literatures persisted during the war between Nyugat and its “opponents,” though with unheard-of hues. Polemics within the “new” literature between “social art” and “art pour l’art” (commitment vs. the ivory tower) moved to the background during the first years of the war. But, as was true for other belligerent nations’ intellectual life, the First World War did not bring a rupture as much as it was an event revealing deeply buried forces and behaviors. Social art would become the pet topic of avant-gardes to come. The aesthetic avant-gardes, born in Hungary around 1915–1916 on a German model and its expressionist Die Aktion, rejected the war. Similarly, terseness, irony and understatement – as renewed literary forms – emerged in some Hungarian periodicals. Even though Hungarian dissidence covered a full spectrum, its structured networks showed the great difference between Hungarian and German or Austrian intellectuals, who for the most part were barely touched by pacifism.
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