

89. See E. Balázs, "Les interprétations hongroises d'Anatole France: de l'écrivain politique à l'écrivain apolitique et sceptique", *En tête des intellectuels*, *op. cit.*, pp. 194–200.
90. E. Ady, "Levelek Madame Prétéríte-höz [Letters to Ms. Prétéríte]", *Nyugat*, No. 22, 16 November 1914, pp. 461–462. Ms. Prétéríte is a character in Ady's fictive "dialogues."
91. A. Schöpfung, "A szavak háborúja" [Words War], *Nyugat*, No. 20, 16 October 1914, pp. 362–365.
92. In his writing entitled "Berlin" (1910), Ignotus had already emphasized the important role attributed to culture in Germany: "Culture nowhere else is as important as in Berlin, neither in Budapest, nor in Paris. Here, the culture is not an issue of snobism, it is not a toy either, not obligatory and superficial. It isn't a light breeze touching the fronts, but, in the case of cultivated men, this is an air to be breathed in, or a vital necessity, such as the bath of the English." He also noted that the inverse of this profound interest in culture would be disinterest toward politics. (Ignotus. *Feljegyzések* [Notes]. Budapest: Grill, 1909. pp. 158–159.)
93. "Too bad. The Germans would deserve to be talented, their talents would deserve geniuses, their geniuses creators. But it's all posture and *routine* ... and gesture instead of action ... Renaissances nevertheless don't look like this." Ignotus, "Reinhardtjárás" [Reinhardt's Coming and Going], *Nyugat*, 1 June 1914, No. 11, p. 800.
94. M. Lengyel, "Olvasmányok" [Readings], *Nyugat*, No. 20, 16 October 1914, pp. 367–369.
95. M. Lengyel, "Egyszerű gondolatok" [Simple Thoughts], *Nyugat*, No. 24, 16 December 1914, pp. 613–618.
96. Z. Ambrus, "Háborús jegyzetek: 'Sales boches!'" [War Notes: 'Sales boches!']", *Nyugat*, No. 3, 1 February 1915, pp. 113–115.
97. Z. Ambrus, "Háborús jegyzetek: Írók a háborúról" [War Notes: Writers on War], *Nyugat*, No. 3, 1 February 1915, pp. 115–119.
98. In countries occupied by German troops (such as Romania and Belgium) the theme of the "treason of intellectuals" soon came out. (See C. Prochasson, *1914–1918, Retour d'expérience*, *op. cit.*, p. 280.)
99. Z. Ambrus, "Háborús jegyzetek: A háború magasztalói" [War Notes: The Praise Singers of War], *Nyugat*, No. 5, 1 March 1914, pp. 229–232.
100. A. Schöpfung, "A háború lelke" [The Soul of War], *Nyugat*, No. 6, 16 March 1915, pp. 317–319.
101. Letter of Aladár Schöpfung to Lajos Hatvany, 23 April 1915, T. Balogh, ed., *Schöpfung Aladár összegyűjtött levelei* [Collected Letters of Aladár Schöpfung], Budapest: Pannónia könyvek, 2005, p. 156.
102. D. Kosztolányi, "Panaszkönyv. Levél Ignotushoz" (Book of Complaints. Letter to Ignotus), *Nyugat*, 1 March 1915, No. 5, pp. 272–274.
103. M. Lengyel, "Egyszerű gondolatok" [Simple Thoughts]. *Nyugat*, No. 6, 16 March 1915, pp. 291–294. He emphasized that those "who are bragging with their pen and mouth" are different from those who really encourage soldiers.
104. F. Karinthy, "Hazám és 'Hazám!'" [Fatherland and "Fatherland!"], *Nyugat*, No. 9, 1 May 1915, pp. 479–482.
105. M. Babits, "Itália", *Nyugat*, No. 12, 16 June 1915, pp. 639–646. From August 1914 he had remained in silence (until that he had published only a couple of poems in *Nyugat*).
106. Before 1914, futurism in *Nyugat* was treated with reserve. (See E. Balázs, *«En tête des intellectuels»*. *op. cit.*, pp. 210–212.) Babits, who had been a distant observer before the war, by 1914 radicalized his opinion due to the exaltation of the war by the Futurists.
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.)
108. Rasmussen and Prochasson, *Au nom de la patrie. Les intellectuels et la Première Guerre mondiale (1910–1919)*, *op. cit.*, pp. 145–147.
109. *Ibid.*, pp. 142–144.
110. C. Prochasson, *1914–1918, Retour d'expérience*, *op. cit.*, pp. 287–288. Új Idők.

The New Nationalism and the First World War

Edited by

Lawrence Rosenthal

University of California, USA

Vesna Rodic

University of California, USA

palgrave
macmillan



Selection and editorial matter © Lawrence Rosenthal and Vesna Rodic 2015
Individual chapters © Respective authors 2015

All rights reserved. No reproduction, copy or transmission of this publication may be made without written permission.

No portion of this publication may be reproduced, copied or transmitted save with written permission or in accordance with the provisions of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988, or under the terms of any licence permitting limited copying issued by the Copyright Licensing Agency, Saffron House, 6–10 Kirby Street, London EC1N 8TS.

Any person who does any unauthorized act in relation to this publication may be liable to criminal prosecution and civil claims for damages.

The authors have asserted their rights to be identified as the authors of this work in accordance with the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988.

First published 2015 by
PALGRAVE MACMILLAN

Palgrave Macmillan in the UK is an imprint of Macmillan Publishers Limited, registered in England, company number 785998, of Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire RG21 6XS.

Palgrave Macmillan in the US is a division of St Martin's Press LLC, 175 Fifth Avenue, New York, NY 10010.

Palgrave Macmillan is the global academic imprint of the above companies and has companies and representatives throughout the world.

Palgrave® and Macmillan® are registered trademarks in the United States, the United Kingdom, Europe and other countries.

ISBN 978–1–137–46277–0

This book is printed on paper suitable for recycling and made from fully managed and sustained forest sources. Logging, pulping and manufacturing processes are expected to conform to the environmental regulations of the country of origin.

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

A catalog record for this book is available from the Library of Congress.

To Andrej and Filip

V. R.

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

Contents

<i>Acknowledgments</i>	ix
<i>Notes on Contributors</i>	x
1 A Storm before the Great Storm: New Faces of a Distinctly Twentieth-Century Nationalism <i>Lawrence Rosenthal and Vesna Rodic</i>	1
Part I The New Nationalism and the (Re)building of Nations	
2 Confecting a British Identity <i>Rod Beecham</i>	19
3 New Italian Nationalism <i>Andrea Ungari</i>	47
4 Eliminationist Anti-Semitism at Home and Abroad: Polish Nationalism, the Jewish Question and Eastern European Right-Wing Mass Politics <i>Grzegorz Krzywiak</i>	65
Part II The New Nationalism and Shifting Notions of Tradition	
5 "War Stares at Us like an Ominous Sphinx": Hungarian Intellectuals, Literature and the Image of the Other (1914–1915) <i>Eszter Balázs</i>	95
6 An Affair To Be Remembered: Integral Nationalism among Fin-de-Siècle France's Men of Letters <i>Vesna Rodic</i>	122
Part III The New Nationalism at the Crossroads between East and West	
7 Imagining the Homeland: A Late Ottoman Construction of National Identity <i>Güldeniz Kıbrıs</i>	141

8 The Great European War and the Rise of Radical Shintō Ultrnationalism in Japan <i>Walter A. Skya</i>	161
<i>Selected Bibliography</i>	182
<i>Name Index</i>	183
<i>Subject Index</i>	189

Acknowledgments

The following institutions have granted permission to quote from their materials:

The Hungarian Library and Information Centre of the Academy of Sciences, Budapest.

The Manuscript Collection of the National Széchényi Library, Budapest.
The British Library, London.

Manuscript and Archive Collections, National Library of Scotland,
Edinburgh.

Chapter 5 was supported by the János Bolyai Research Scholarship of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences.

5

"War Stares at Us like an Ominous Sphinx":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.⁴ 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, to 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.⁵ Theaters and exhibition venues were shut down (subsidized theaters would only open again in January 1915).⁶ The publishing industry came to a halt and readers lacked money to buy books.⁷ 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 press⁸ – 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.⁹ 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.¹⁰ 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.¹¹ 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),¹² 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.¹³

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.¹⁴ 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 year-books published by the bastion of Hungarian literary conservatism, the Kisfaludy Society.¹⁵ Specialized journals such as the *Földrajzi Közlemények* (Geographical Proceedings) and *Néptanítók 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 Rákosi, 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.¹⁶

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 Rákosi, 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.¹⁷

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 Rákosi, 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 Rákosi 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 Központi Segítő 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 (*Hadsegélyező 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.¹⁸

"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.¹⁹ 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.²⁰ 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.²¹

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 Lemaître,²² 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.²³ 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.²⁴

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.²⁵

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 Beöthy, 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.”²⁶ Beöthy, 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.²⁷

Such an anti-intellectual exaltation of manhood shows that, for Beöthy, 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 Beöthy who underscored the deep link between national Hungarian and universal values.²⁸ A year later, at the next assembly, Zsolt Beöthy and Gyula Vargha announced the society’s celebration of the 300th anniversary of the death of “the greatest poet in the Christian world.”²⁹ They proposed among other things new translations of Shakespeare’s works.³⁰ Such a commemoration was all the more needed, Beöthy 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,"³¹ 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."³² The first professor of history of philosophy at the university of Budapest, during the war, Alexander became the chief-editor of *Atheneum*, 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 Weimar.³³

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.³⁴ 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 Berzeviczy, the president of the Academy of Sciences since 1905 and a world-renowned Shakespeare specialist,³⁵ 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."³⁶

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.³⁷ 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.³⁸ *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.³⁹ 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.⁴⁰ 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,⁴¹ and the increasingly pejorative-sounding term *West* was used to refer to France.⁴² "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 Staël'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."⁵⁸ An anonymous article compared France to "an aging, washed-out lady, whose silken dress is covered with mud."⁵⁹ 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 human⁶⁰: "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."⁶¹

Élet also examined German singularity, which it defined as the will toward reintegration within the collectivity.⁶² 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."⁶³ 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."⁶⁴

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."⁶⁵ 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.⁶⁶

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.⁶⁷ 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 pitiable nation became ... a resolute and heroic champion of this culture.⁶⁸

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-Semitic discourses: "When the war broke out, we foresaw the obvious victory of the pure Hungarian current. We fanatically believed that the Gallic perverse spirit, semitic cosmopolitanism, Moscovite Saninism as well as all pornographic eroticism could not but perish...."⁶⁹ 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.⁷⁰

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,⁷¹ but also against assimilated Jewish Hungarian writers such as Sándor Bródy⁷² 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 acerbic 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 Ignóty, 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 Francophilia. His words echoed those of Ignóty 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 bellicose 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 Germanophilia, 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.⁹⁰ 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 Schöpfung was the first to comment:⁹¹ European intellectuals, he argued, burning with the desire to explain an inexplicable war, made slanderous accusations against Germany – though Schöpfung 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.⁹² 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.⁹³ 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.⁹⁴ 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,"⁹⁵ 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.⁹⁶ 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.⁹⁷ The theme of the "treason of the intellectuals" (*la trahison des clercs*) was already coming to the surface well before the war ended.⁹⁸ In March 1915, Ambrus rejected the war and castigated all the "platonic war lovers" writers.⁹⁹

In March 1915, Aladár Schöpfung 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 symbolical figure of Catholic mobilization, who had played a very important part as such from the outbreak of the war.¹⁰⁰ Still, in a letter of April 1915, Schöpfung brands Hungarian bellicose feelings as "erroneous opinions."¹⁰¹

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.¹⁰² 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."¹⁰³ Much like Lengyel, Frigyes Karinthy denounced the "betrayal literary merchants" and, speaking to the simple soldiers, warns them against the fake patriotism they are to be fed with like "tin boxes."¹⁰⁴

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.¹⁰⁵ According to Babits, anti-intellectualism reigned, as proved by the futurist trend,¹⁰⁶ and the "intellectual war suppliers" (as he quotes from Lengyel) such as Gabriele d'Annunzio 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.¹⁰⁷ 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).¹⁰⁸ 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."¹⁰⁹

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.¹¹⁰

Notes

1. B. Alexander, *Világirodalom és világháború* [War Literature and World War], 7 February 1915, LXIX. ünnepélyes közgyűlés. *A Kisfaludy Társaság Évtárája* [Annual of Society Kisfaludy], Vol. 49, pp. 1914–1916, Franklin: Budapest, 1916, p. 34.
2. For a full account, B. Trencsényi, "Searching for common grounds: National identity and intercultural research in an East-Central European context", T. Balázs et al., ed., *Nation-building and Contested Identities. Romanian and Hungarian Case Studies*, Budapest: Regio Books, 2001, pp. 11–12.
3. See E. Balázs, "*En tête des intellectuels*". *Les écrivains hongrois et la question de la liberté et de l'autonomie littéraires (1908–1914)*, Paris: EHESS, 2008, pp. 40–41; B. Trencsényi, "National essentialism in Romania and Hungary after 1945". In A. Blomquist, C. Iordachi and B. Trencsényi, eds, *Hungary and Romania Beyond National Narratives. Comparisons and Entanglements*,

- "Nationalisms across the globe", Vol. 10, New York: Peter Lang, 2013, pp. 515–517.
4. P. Bihari, *Lövészárkok a hátszágban. Középosztály, zsidókérdés, antiszemitizmus az első világháború Magyarországon*, [Trenches in the home-front. middle-class, "Jewish Question" and Anti-Semitism in Hungary During WWI], Budapest: Napvilág, 2008, pp. 7–8, 15.
 5. Á. Gyulai, *A háború és az irodalom*, [War and Literature], Budapest: Franklin, 1915, p. 8.
 6. See for instance Szén [Coal] J. Andor, "Színházi beszámoló" [Theatrical Account], *Élet*, No. 6, 7 February 1915, p. 139.
 7. I. Bárczy, "Irodalom és főváros" [Literature and Capital], *Magyar Figyelő*, 1915, Vol. I, January–March, p. 275. Morning conference of the Central Aid Committee of Budapest [Budapesti Központi Segítő Bizottság], 24 January 1915.
 8. According to Ágost Gyulai, the general press started to dominate public life in this regard as well, *A háború és az irodalom*, op. cit., p. 26.
 9. [Editorial Board], "Szózat azokhoz, akik itthon maradtak" [A Call to Those Who Stayed Home], *Új Idők*, 9 August 1914, No. 33, p. 165.
 10. For the French and German cases see C. Prochasson, 1914–1918, *Retour d'expérience*, op. cit., p. 294. In my opinion, Hungarian historians and philosophers did not commit with more fervor than representatives of other intellectual spheres, in contrast to what happened in Germany and in France.
 11. G. S. Messinger, *The Battle for the Mind. War and Peace in the Era of Mass Communication*, Amherst-Boston: University of Massachusetts, 2011, pp. 32–33.
 12. This law, called the "exceptional law," gave exceptional power in the case of an important crisis such as, for instance, war. However, it remained in use during the postwar Horthy era. See more in S. Balázs, *Sajtó és hatalom a Horthy-korszakban. Politika – és társadalomtörténeti vázlat*, [Press and power in the Horthy era. A political and social history], Budapest: Argumentum, 2011, p. 118.
 13. I. Bárczy, "Irodalom és főváros", op. cit., p. 275.
 14. See among others G. Lampérth, "Háború és költészet" [War and Poetry], *Élet*, 28 February 1915, No. 9, p. 196.
 15. *Új Idők* also claimed it would provide literary and illustrated comments on the events on a weekly basis. ([Editorial Board], "Mozgósítás" [Mobilization], 2 August 1914, No. 32, p. 141).
 16. Radó, "Háborús délutánok" [War Afternoons], *Élet*, 20 December 1914, No. 51, p. 1393.
 17. E. Balázs, «En tête des intellectuels». op. cit., pp. 284–333. Also published as "Az intellektualitás vezérei". *Viták az irodalmi autonómiáról a Nyugatban és a Nyugatról, 1908–1914*. Budapest: Napvilág, 2009, p. 364.
 18. The office was created on 19 August 1914 to organize and direct aid work for the army (social aid to widows and orphans, aid to soldiers, through propaganda and commercial means). See O. Tóth, "Hadsegélyező hivatal tevékenysége a Hadtörténeti Múzeumban őrzött plakátok tükrében", *Acta Musei Militaris in Hungaria*, No. 12, Budapest: Hadtörténeti Múzeum, 2011. http://militaria.hu/uploads/files/82849700_1337252289.pdf
 19. See for instance: Ágost Gyulai's letter to the poet Árpád Zemplényi 18 March 1916. National Széchényi Library. Center of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, Department of Manuscripts and Rare Books; Ágost Gyulai's letter to anonyom 19 October 1915. Hungarian Academy of Sciences. Department of Manuscripts. Ms 4190/267. Published with the permission of the library.
 20. For the French and Italian cases, see C. Prochasson, 1914–1918, *Retour d'expérience*, op. cit., p. 61.
 21. Á. Gyulai, *A háború és az iskola. Háborús előadások* [War and School. War Lectures], Budapest: Franklin, 1915.
 22. Playwright, theater critic, essayist, historian, member of the French Academy and known for his conservative theater and literature reviews. One of the founders of the ultraconservative Ligue de la Patrie française (founded 1899) that he headed for a considerable stretch.
 23. Y. Lowin, *Les Intellectuels français et allemands face à la Première Guerre mondiale: entre nationalisme et pacifisme. Une étude comparée*, Université de Nancy 2, Grin, 2011, p. 10.
 24. A. Rasmussen and C. Prochasson, *Au nom de la patrie. Les intellectuels et la Première Guerre mondiale (1910–1919)*, Paris: La Découverte, 1996, p. 132.
 25. G. Pekár, "Az angolok" [The English], *Budapesti Hírlap*, 20 September 1914, No. 231, pp. 8–9.
 26. "Az egyetem háborús előadásai" [University War Lectures], *Budapesti Hírlap*, 19 December 1914, No. 321, p. 8.
 27. Z. Beöthy, "Háború és cultura" [War and Culture], *Budapesti Szemle*, 1915, Vol. 161, No. 457, pp. 26–33.
 28. "Beöthy Zolt elnöki megnyitó beszéde (Zrínyi Miklós emléke)" [Presidency Speech of Zolt Beöthy (The memory of Miklós Zrínyi)], 7 February 1915. LXIX. ünnepélyes közgyűlés. *A Kisfaludy Társaság Évlapjai* [Annual of the Society Kisfaludy], Vol. 49, 1914–1916, Budapest: Franklin, 1916, p. 7.
 29. "Beöthy Zolt elnöki megnyitó beszéde (Shakespeare és Arany) és Vargha Gyula titkári beszámolója" [Presidency Speech of Zolt Beöthy and Report of Gyula Vargha, Secretary of the Society], 6 February 1916, LXX. ünnepélyes közgyűlés. *A Kisfaludy Társaság Évlapjai* [Annual of the Society Kisfaludy], Vol. 49, op. cit., pp. 61–71, 72.
 30. "Beöthy Zolt elnöki megnyitó beszéde (Shakespeare és Arany) és Vargha Gyula titkári beszámolója" [Presidency Speech of Zolt Beöthy and Report of Gyula Vargha, Secretary of the Society], 6 February 1916, LXX. ünnepélyes közgyűlés. *A Kisfaludy Társaság Évlapjai* [Annual of the Society Kisfaludy], Vol. 49, op. cit., pp. 61–71, 72.
 31. See P. Dávidházi, "Isten másodszüллőtte. A magyar Shakespeare-kultusz természetrájza" ["God's second sun". The Hungarian Cult of Shakespeare], Budapest: Gondolat, 1989, pp. 206–207.
 32. B. Alexander, *Világirodalom és világháború* [World Literature and World War], 7 February 1915. LXIX. ünnepélyes közgyűlés. *A Kisfaludy Társaság Évlapjai* [Annual of the Society Kisfaludy], Vol. 49, op. cit., pp. 18–38.
 33. Vargha Gyula titkári jelentése [Report of Gyula Vargha, Secretary of the Society]. 7 February 1915. LXIX. ünnepélyes közgyűlés. *A Kisfaludy Társaság Évlapjai* [Annual of the Society Kisfaludy], Vol. 49, 1914–1916. Budapest: Franklin, 1916, p. 13.

34. A few months later, in April 1915, the weekly *Új Idők* of Ferenc Herczeg, a friend of the prime minister, would publish the news that the Austrian and German members of all the French literary and scientific societies had been expelled (which also included the Hungarians). The author of the article found it ironic that French dramas kept on being performed in Berlin, Vienna and Budapest: "It would appear that in the interpretation of culture there is quite a gap between the educated West and the so-called 'barbarians.'" ([Editorial board], "A művelt Nyugat és a barbárok" [The Educated West and the Barbarians], *Új Idők*, 18 April 1915, No. 17, p. 428). On the foreign correspondent's dismissal, M. Chagnon, *Manifeste des 93. La nature de la mobilisation intellectuelle allemande au déclenchement de la Grande guerre (1914–1915)*, MA dissertation, University of Québec in Montréal, 2007. <http://www.archipel.uqam.ca/3314/1/M9652.pdf>
35. A. Berzeviczy, *A természetfeletti elem Shakespeare színműveiben* [Supernatural in Shakespeare's Plays], Budapest: Franklin, 1910; A. Berzeviczy, *Michelangelo és Shakespeare sonnetjei* [Michelangelo and Shakespeare's Sonnets], Budapest: Athenaeum, 1914. Both essays were translated into French before the war.
36. A. Berzeviczy, "Shakespeare és a magyar nemzeti lélek" [Shakespeare and the National Hungarian Soul], 6 February 1916, LXX. ünnepélyes közgyűlés, *A Kisfaludy Társaság Évlapjai* [Annual of the Society Kisfaludy], Vol. 49, *op. cit.*, pp. 76–84.
37. J. Becker, *Dictionnaire de la Grande Guerre*, Paris: André Versaille, 2008, p. 111.
38. Anonym, "Mozgósítás" [Mobilization], *art. cit.*
39. Such a hope is similar to the Kaiser's *Burgfrieden* (see Y. Lowin, *Les Intellectuels français et allemands face à la Première Guerre mondiale*, *op. cit.*, p. 4 and C. Prochasson, 1914–1918, *Retour d'expérience*, *op. cit.*, p. 335).
40. On the use of stereotypes, Rasmussen and Prochasson, *Au nom de la patrie*, *op. cit.*, p. 145.
41. Horkayné [Herczeg, Ferenc], "Ellesett párbeszéd" [Borrowed Dialogues], *Új Idők*, 16 August 1914, No. 34, p. 194.
42. Sz. J. [Lyka, Károly], "A művelt Nyugat" [The Educated West], *Új Idők*, 23 August 1914, No. 35, pp. 215–216.
43. Z. Szász, "Németség és magyarság" [The Germans and the Hungarians], *Új Idők*, 11 October 1914, No. 42, pp. 384–385.
44. Rasmussen and Prochasson, *Au nom de la patrie*, *op. cit.*, p. 207.
45. Mme de Staël: *De la littérature considérée dans ses rapports avec les institutions sociales* (1800), *De l'Allemagne* (1813). See also D. Rosenberg: *Towards a Cosmopolitanism of Self-difference: Heinrich Heine and Mme de Staël between France and Germany*, Santa Barbara: University of California, 2007, pp. 39–44.
46. The ideas of 1914 were conceptualized by the social scientist Johann Plenge who claimed that German political structure and culture (Kultur) were superior to other countries. He also set the German version of liberty against the French which dated back to 1789 by proposing that German liberty proved to be a balance between freedom and obedience and could provide a better response to the problems of the twentieth century. These ideas were put into a concrete thesis by Werner Sombart in his work entitled *Händler und Helden*. The ideas of 1914 also helped to conceptualize Germany's missionary role in Central Europe. See on this W. Mommsen, "German artists, writers and intellectuals and the meaning of war, 1914–1918", J. Horne, *State, Society and Mobilization in Europe During the First World War*, Cambridge: CUP, 2004, pp. 21–38.
47. E. Balázs, *En tête des intellectuels*, *op. cit.*, pp. 190–191.
48. See for instance [Editorial Board], "Az ízlés pólusai" [The Poles of Taste], *Új Idők*, 9 May 1915, No. 20, pp. 494–495.
49. B. Alexander, *A háború filozófiájáról*. Budapest: Pallas, 1915. Some German intellectuals, such as Friedrich Naumann, the author of *Mittleuropa* in 1915, would never have approved of such an idea. See also C. Prochasson, 1914–1918, *Retour d'expérience*, *op. cit.*, p. 286.
50. Anonym, "Rudyard Kipling az angolokról" [Rudyard Kipling on the English], *Magyar Figyelő*, January–March 1915, Vol. I., pp. 157–159.
51. Anonym [Rákosi, Jenő], "Germania barbara?", *Budapesti Hírlap*, 3 September 1914, No. 214, p. 1. See also Alfa [Alexander, Bernát], "Följegyzések" [Notes], *Budapesti Hírlap*, 3 September 1914, No. 214, p. 9.
52. C. Prochasson, 1914–1918, *Retour d'expérience*, *op. cit.*, p. 95.
53. Anonym [Rákosi Jenő], "Páris előtt" [In front of Paris], *Budapesti Hírlap*, 10 September 1914, No. 221, p. 1.
54. G. Oláh, "Németországához" [To Germany], *Budapesti Hírlap*, 10 September 1914, No. 221, p. 1.
55. K. Harsányi, "Energia" [Energy], *Élet*, 2 August 1914, No. 31, p. 963.
56. Apponyi elaborated the concept "*treuga Dei*," which meant that the political opposition should assist the war effort of the government – such a peaceful collaboration lasted until 1916.
57. A. Apponyi, "A mi háborunk" [Our War], *Magyar Kultúra*, 1914, Vol. II., pp. 4–8. Ernő Margitay also considers war as a crusade of modern times where the religious spirit fights that of skepticism and fake religion. (E. Margitay, "Válságok" [Crisis], *Élet*, No. 38, 20 September 1914, pp. 1–125.) The editor-in-chief of *Magyar Kultúra*, priest Béla Bangha also mentions a "sunset of national and religious thought." Another article sees the war as a "national catharsis." (f. [?], "A nemzeti katarzist..." [The national catharsis...], *Magyar Kultúra*, 1914, Vol. II, pp. 488–489.)
58. E. Margitay, "Háború" [War], *Élet*, No. 32, 9 August 1914, p. 993.
59. Anonym, "Francia erkölcs" [French Morals], *Élet*, No. 32, 9 August 1914, p. 1014.
60. See *Händler und Helden*, published in 1915, in which Sombart greets the "German war." The critic of *Magyar Kultúra* presented this book early in 1915. See K. Burján, "Werner Sombart: Händler und Helden", *Magyar Kultúra*, 1915, Vol. I., p. 470.
61. Szalay, "Németek. Háború-költészet-filozófia" [Germans. War-Poetry-Philosophy], *Élet*, No. 41, 11 October 1914, pp. 1199–1200.
62. M. Kovács, "A germán lélek" [The German Soul], *Élet*, No. 40, 4 October 1914, pp. 1173–1175.
63. E. Margitay, "A német munka" [The German Work], *Élet*, No. 49, 5 December 1915, pp. 1185–1186.
64. Anonym, "Fordításaink" [Our translations], *Élet*, No. 49, 5 December 1915, p. 1187.

65. Tövis [Thorn] [Mátrai, Rudolf], "Páris", *Élet*, No. 47, 22 November 1914, p. 1305.
66. I. Vodicska, "A szláv kultúra" [Slavic Culture], *Élet*, No. 51, 20 December 1914, pp. 1402–1405.
67. a. j. [Andor, József]. "A sajtó" [The Press], *Élet*, No. 6, 7 February 1915, p. 138.
68. *Ibid.*, p. 138.
69. J. Andor, "Irodalmi glosszák" [Literary Glosses], *Élet*, No. 14, 4 April 1915, pp. 337–338. The allusion is to the novel *Sanin* of Artsybashev, very popular and the object of scandals in Hungary before the war.
70. J. Andor, "Kultúránk válsága" [The Crisis of Our Culture], *Élet*, No. 34–35, 22 and 29 August 1915, pp. 802–804 and 826–829.
71. From the outbreak of the Great War onward, Catholic periodicals railed against the Jews, first against the refugees coming from Galicia, then against the Jews of Budapest. (Kópja, "Sodoma", *Élet*, No. 48, 29 November 1914, p. 1325; B. K. [Burján Károly], "Bródy Sándor", *Magyar Kultúra*, 1914, Vol. II, pp. 415–416.)
72. V. Deák, "Bródy Sándor drámái" [Bródy's Dramas], *Magyar Kultúra*, Vol. II, 1914, pp. 445–450.
73. B. K. [Burján, Károly], "Nyugatosok zavaros tépelődései" [The Confounding Hesitations of Writers of the *Nyugat*], *Magyar Kultúra*, 1915, Vol. I, pp. 414–415.
74. After the first weeks of enthusiasm, Hungarian writers became more aware of the fact that the war would last. Many different interpretations of the phenomenon called the "war of cultures," namely the cultural oppositions of the war, were published. The antithesis of French and German cultures was the most important opposition analyzed by them. The analyses published between January 1915 and July 1915 show various approaches to the mobilization of the intellect. All these publications, regardless of their topic, merged opinions with emotions.
75. He urged a new type of love of patriotism in the name of a "sober egoism," breaking with that of the old generation dominated by both pathos and self-pity. The "Hungarian interest," he remarked, corresponded to the "interest of the empire." (Ignotus, "Háború" [War]. *Nyugat*, No. 15, 1 August 1914, pp. 129–132.) A few days before the assassination of Franz Ferdinand (26 June 1914), he published a pessimistic article on the political situation in Europe by predicting a possible cataclysm of the Monarchy ("The house of glass"). The metaphor is an allusion to the fragility of the Monarchy, incapable of accepting reforms and recognizing the Balkan states. (See A. Gergely, "Egy kritikus politikai nézetei. Ignotus és az első világháború" [Political Opinions of a Literary Critic and the Great War]. *Beszélő*, 1996, No. 8, pp. 126–129.)
76. A. Schöpflin, "Katona öcsémnek" [For My Little Brother, the Soldier], *Nyugat*, No. 16–17, 16 August–1 September 1914, pp. 197–199. The poem of Kosztolányi, Dezső: "Öcsém" [My Little Brother], *Nyugat*, No. 16–17, 16 August–1 September 1914, p. 196; Elek, Artúr, "Mi, tollasok..." [We, Men of Letters...], *Nyugat*, No. 16–17, 16 August–1 September 1914, p. 267.
77. They shared a common passion for German culture, which they believed to be a regenerating force for Hungarian culture. In 1911 Lukács published an essay under the title "Gaulish Danger" in the German-written Hungarian weekly, *Pester Lloyd*: the young philosopher compared the fruitful German culture to the shallow and useless French culture – "A gall veszély", in *Ifjúkori művek (1902–1918). Lukács György összes művei* [Youth Works 1902–1918. The Complete Works of György Lukács], Budapest: Magvető, 1977, pp. 562–569.
78. C. Prochasson, 1914–1918, *Retour d'expérience*, op. cit., p. 277.
79. On this subject see S. Audoin-Rouzeau and A. Becker, 1914–1918, *az újraírt háború* [1914–1918. Understanding the Great War], Budapest: L'Harmattan, 2007, p. 114. In *Nyugat*, Béla Balázs wanted to embody this higher form of patriotism through personal sacrifice. Several other *Nyugat* writers were also on the front: István Kertész, Géza Lengyel, Józsi Jenő Tersánszky, Géza Csáth or Gyula Halász, the latter's letters being regularly published in *Nyugat* in the column *Letters from the Camp*, launched in October 1914.
80. B. Balázs, "Páris-e vagy Weimar?" [Paris or Weimar?], *Nyugat*, No. 16–17, 16 August–1 September 1914, pp. 200–203.
81. Ignotus, "A hazáról" [On Fatherland], *Világ*, 15 August 1914, pp. 5–6.
82. M. Ferro, "Cultural life in France, 1914–1918", A. Roshwald, and R. Stites, eds, *European Culture in the Great War: The Arts, Entertainment and Propaganda, 1914–1918*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999, p. 296. These interrupted war notes were published in January–February 1915 under the title "Go and suffer, you too!" B. Balázs, "Menj és szenvedj te is! I–II (Naplójegyzetek) [Diary notes]", *Nyugat*, No. 1–2–3, 1 and 16 January and 1 February 1915, pp. 40–44, 105–109, 154–158.
83. See for instance B. Balázs, "Párisi levél. Bravúr és fegyelem" [Letter from Paris. Bravery and discipline], *Világ*, 6 January 1912, pp. 7–8. Ignotus also stressed a regenerative war to come in line with the decline of French culture and the primacy of German culture because of its people's discipline. This instance shows how much the German–French dichotomy could become an important aspect of a new type of civility that showed in expectations about the war.
84. Z. Felvinczi Takács, "A magyarok és a németek" [The Hungarians and the Germans], *Nyugat*, No. 21, 1 November 1914, pp. 449–451. A few weeks earlier, he extolled German war paintings celebrating the war. Felvinczi Takács, Zoltán, "Új csataképek" [New Battle Scenes], *Nyugat*, No. 18–19, 16 September–1 October 1914, pp. 338–339.
85. G. Laczkó, "A francia lélek keresztmetszete" [The Profile of the French Soul], *Nyugat*, No. 1, 1 January 1915, pp. 24–27.
86. S. Audoin-Rouzeau and A. Becker, 1914–1918, *az újraírt háború*, op. cit., p. 115.
87. M. Fenyő, "1914", No. 18–19, 16 September – 1 October, pp. 321–324. A close study of the *Nyugat* writers during the first year of the war shows visible differences from the similarly autonomous German, French or English artistic and intellectual circles, who did not question the war for the most part. On the French case, see Y. Dagan, *La NRF entre guerre et paix 1914–1925*, Paris: Tallandier, 2008.
88. E. Ady, "Vígasztaló Anatole France" [The Comforter Anatole France], *Nyugat*, No. 16–17, 16 August–1 September 1914, pp. 267–268.