

Historiography, Cultural Policy, and the Organization of Scholarship in Hungary in the 1920s

By
F. GLATZ

In the following paper we intend to outline briefly the connection of the political, "national mission" of historiography with the whole of contemporary politics in the first years of the history of counter-revolutionary Hungary, the time of political consolidation; what influence the emerging cultural policy of the age of counter-revolution exercised on its historiography, and to what extent historiography despite this political function benefitted from it. This theme forms part of a work the further object of which is the examination of the relation between historiography and current policy, and the revelation of the mechanisms at work in this area in various periods.

Before turning to our subject, some preliminary remarks have to be made by way of the historical background.

The reason for raising this problem is that it was clear even at the beginning of our research into historiography that its political function is the most obvious characteristic of the history of Hungarian historiography. Historiography has a prominent place in the ideology of the regime in any society, and that holds true of modern Hungarian history even more. Western-style politics and western-style "political science" in ideological life did not grow up in Hungarian bourgeois-society, owing to the fact that it never attained the stage of proper bourgeois democracy. In Hungary this function was taken over by other spheres of intellectual life: partly by literature and partly by historiography or jurisprudence. Since during the Horthy era historiography was politically loaded more than ever before, the most expedient way of getting at the truth in the case of the connection between history and politics seems to be the examination of historiography.

Here our researches into the historical discipline called for making a thorough survey of the developing cultural policy of the period. It became evident that we could hardly follow up our subject in the modern state without sketching the cultural policy that established the connection between scholarship and politics.

Another preliminary remark relates to the history of Hungarian cultural policy. One may speak of it virtually from the 1920s on, when on the basis of Kunó Klebelsberg's plans and suggestions and under his leadership modern learned organization was begun.¹ This action was the first attempt to satisfy one of the basic demands of modern scholarly development: to establish institutionalized learning.²

Its character was basically determined by Hungary's situation after 1919, first of all by the economic conditions of the country. The conceptions prevailing between 1919–1922 were characterized by attempts to establish scholarly undertakings and institutions by social means, primarily under the auspices of patrons. But soon it proved a vain attempt for Hungarian capital to join forces in the cause of science with an aristocracy possessing less and less financial means. The decreasing spending capacity of the Hungarian middle classes could furnish no financial basis for science, on the one hand — and, this constituting the main point — the occasional grants lost their value overnight owing to the ceaseless fall of currency, on the other.

Under such conditions none but a fixed state grant could be of help to Hungarian learning. This was realized by Klebelsberg who was after all a centralist in methods of governing. As a Minister of Education (1922–1931) he drew the scholarly institutes — based up to then upon foundations — more and more into the orbit of the regular budget. At the same time — changing the structure of the Hungarian scholarly life — he merged museums, libraries, and archives into large centralized institutions. (*Országos Magyar Gyűjteményegyetem* — 1922.) He drew into the budget of the *Gyűjteményegyetem* the recently established research institutes founded under the auspices of learned societies (institutes of history, the observatory, research institute of biology, etc.) too. Only the Academy of Sciences held partly aloof from this reorganization — its character of a foundation being left untouched — although it was given a considerable grant of money by the Ministry of Education year by year. Thus in the 1920s the Academy of Sciences lost its leading role in Hun-

¹ Count Kunó Klebelsberg (1875–1932). His father was an official and aristocrat, his mother came from a family belonging to the lesser nobility. He studied law, and attended university in Berlin for a year. He worked as official at the Prime Minister's office. From 1903 to 1917 he was under-secretary of the Prime Minister, then educational under-secretary. He was a follower and close colleague of the Prime Minister István Tisza. At the time of the revolutions he was in hiding; from February, 1919 he was involved in counter-revolutionary organizations. A representative of the moderate conservative, right-wing of the Hungarian ruling classes, he was in a key position in the consolidation of the counter-revolutionary system. In 1921–22 he was Minister for Home Affairs, and subsequently from June 1922 till August 1931 he was Minister of Education.

² In detail see: F. GLATZ: *A Magyar Tudományos Akadémia két világháború közötti történetéhez* (To the History of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences between the two World Wars). Magyar Tudomány, 1970. No. 12. — By the same author: *Klebelsberg tudománypolitikai programja és a magyar történettudomány* (Klebelsberg's Programme of Cultural Policy and Hungarian Historiography). Századok, 1969. No. 5–6.

garian scientific life; which was taken over by the Gyűjteményegyetem controlled by the Ministry of Education.³

Finally a few words have to be said about the leader of Hungarian cultural policy in the 1920s, Kunó Klebelsberg, because we shall be obliged to refer to his speeches, articles, and correspondence in the course of developing our subject, and also because in every field of Hungarian cultural policy — research organization, establishing institutions, financial grants, etc., — the traces of his influence can be detected. This is especially valid for historiography.

The Count who from his youth intended to become a politician was deeply interested in history. His comments made on his handwritten notes and on his readings prove that he followed with attention and expertness the activity of the outstanding figures of bourgeois historiography (Ranke, Burckhardt, etc.) and the problems of the development of historiography. Later, too, as a Minister he showed a thorough knowledge of the history of primarily modern Hungary, as testified by his letters.⁴ Still, in these notes the most remarkable feature is the way he worked his historical knowledge into his comments on current politics or rather the way he began to study each political question by drawing up a broad outline of its historical antecedents.⁵ This historical approach towards political questions characterized his way of thinking later, too. It made him the social-political function of history and of history-writing after 1919, when historicism gained wider ground in Hungarian political thinking than ever before.

Another outstanding property of the future Minister of Education was with relevance to our subject his exceptional organizing ability. It is only through this property that the politician was capable of controlling the enormous range of affairs and of realizing in practice any political conception in the age of modern political mechanisms embracing the whole of state life.

³ The data relating to the formation of organized scholarship in the 1920s were assembled in the volume: *A magyar tudománypolitika alapvetése* (The Foundation of Hungarian Cultural Policy — compiled by Z. MAGYARY) Budapest, 1927. By the same author: *A magyar tudományos nagyüzem megszervezése* (The Organization of Institutionalized Learning in Hungary). Budapest, 1931.

⁴ We are familiar with these notes only from the description of Klebelsberg's colleague Professor J. HUSZTI. He used these notes and quoted them abundantly in his book about Klebelsberg: *Gróf Klebelsberg Kunó életműve* (The Life-work of Count Kunó Klebelsberg). Budapest, 1942. — We could verify a part of his data and we found his use of sources, his quotations very correct, and reliable. The minister's thorough knowledge of history is attested especially well by the letters of Klebelsberg addressed to Sándor Domanovszky (The Archive of Manuscripts of the Library of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences — Magyar Tudományos Akadémia Könyvtára, Kézirattár — Hereafter: (MTAKK) and the letters of Árpád Károlyi addressed to Kunó Klebelsberg. (Archive of Manuscripts and Letters, Széchényi National Library — Országos Széchényi Könyvtár Kézirattára, Levelestár — hereafter: OSZKK).

⁵ In the draft of the work, for instance, discussing the problem of nationalities, the first four chapters deal with the historical aspect of the subject: Chapter I.: from the fall of György Rákóczi II to the failure of the attempt at the foundation of an empire; Chapter II.: from the reign of Lipót II to 1848; Chapter III.: from the capitulation at Világos until the compromise of 1867; Chapter IV.: from 1867 to his age.

While unfolding his capabilities of this kind Klebelsberg was encouraged by two factors: partly by the undoubtedly talented exponents of German scholarly organization — primarily by A. Harnack — and partly by the policies of a Hungarian government becoming ever more bureaucratic and centralized since the end of the 19th century.⁶ (Especially the influence of István Tisza has to be mentioned here.)

These methods of government — as regards their purport — were at the time not utterly reactionary at all. After 1919 they were made, however, a tool of the conservative counter-revolutionary dictatorship by the politicizing “new” ruling classes that had risen to power in the counter-revolution.

Attachment to history and historical science, together with splendid organizing energy, account for the fact, that as early as during World War I (1916), when Klebelsberg was elected the president of the Historical Society,⁷ the first major actions were launched to establish the institutions of Hungarian historiography. He personally took part in planning and executing these actions as under-Secretary of State and later — during the Horthy era — as Minister of Education. Not only the idea editing the modern Sources of Hungary originated with him but also the rules of source-publication of the series in their final form; he fought as Minister for Home Affairs in 1921–22 not only for strengthening the scientific character of the National Archives, but he took a hand in the planning of the new building, in the progress of the frescoes, too, — and with competence. He not only procured large sums of money to meet the costs of publishing the domestic historical journals and acquired a separate non-commercial press, but visited the editorial office of “Századok” weekly to get information from his friend, Sándor Domanovszky, about the latest articles. And the researcher of the present day almost shakes his head in disapproval while reading in the correspondence material that the Minister of Home Affairs of Hungary, one of the key-figures of the counter-revolution-

⁶ Having a German education, characteristic of the contemporary civil servants (state officials), he considered A. Harnack as his ideal. *Gróf Klebelsberg Kunó beszédei, cikkei és törvényjavaslatai* (Speeches, articles and bills of Count Kunó Klebelsberg). Budapest, 1927. (hereafter: Klebelsberg) p. 213–232. — His letter addressed to A. Harnack is, in this respect, also of interest: Kunó Klebelsberg to A. Harnack 1925. XI. 10. (Draft) OSZKK. Archive of Letters.

⁷ Hungarian Historical Society (1867—), the most important forum of Hungarian historical life. Whereas the Academy was meant for the organization of meetings and discussions exclusively of the special discipline, the Society intended to appeal to the broader strata of society. Its presidents from the very beginning were high-ranking state-officials; ministers, under-secretaries of state, aristocrats. After 1919 — when the Academy was neglected — nearly all the major endeavours of historiography were carried out under auspices of the Society. Among its presidents were Kunó Klebelsberg from 1916 to 1932 and the historian Minister of Education Bálint Hóman between 1932–1944.

⁸ Kunó Klebelsberg to Sándor Domanovszky. 1921. VII. 16. MTAKK; cf.: S. DOMANOVSKY: *Emlékezések gróf Klebelsberg Kunó elnökségére* (Recollection of the Presidency of Count Kunó Klebelsberg). Századok, 1942. p. 39 Huszti: op. cit. p. 75.

⁹ Count Imre Mikó's speech at the committee meeting of the Historical Society July 2, Századok, July 1867. p. 16.

ary regime was browsing in the proofs of the Széchenyi Döbling papers suggesting to the editor what picture should be printed on the cover-page of the book, and all this in 1921 at the time of the inner debates on the political mechanism of consolidation.

This all has to be mentioned in advance for certain reasons of historical criticism. In the following we will frequently refer to Klebelsberg's declarations as, the president of the Historical Society, the minister holding the highest position in Hungarian historians' public life, will seemingly be quoted too often. At the same time we mention only institutions and the publication of important works, and those who are familiar with the facts may think that we conceal the fact that Klebelsberg left his mark upon many of them. But this is not the occasion to analyse the activity of a politician displayed to promote historiography, but to explain the formation of historiographic institutions and organizations in the Horthy era and the coexistence of the mechanism of counter-revolutionary cultural policy with scholarly development in the history of the 1920s.

On the "national" role of history

Let us turn back for a moment to the connection between history and politics and to the function of historical elements in Hungarian political thought, mentioned above. References to Hungarian history were given prominence in the political ideology of the Horthy era. Dealing with history was often equal to actually being engaged in politics. The authors of the best political studies were historians, politicians again and again resorted to history and to the millennial traditions of Hungarian history in their propaganda speeches. Historicism and the prominence given to history derived primarily from the situation of Hungary after 1920. The main aspirations of the ruling classes of the regime, to regain the annexed territories and to protest against the arrangements of the system emerging from the Peace Treaty, almost suggested a historical starting-point. The arguments against the Trianon decisions could not be welded together on a merely ethnic or geographical basis in spite of the large number of Hungarians living in the annexed territories. The restoration of Great-Hungary supreme over the nationalities and independent of the Hapsburgs -- but previously maintained with the help of the empire -- could be justified primarily by referring to historicity, historical right. If we go through the programme speeches delivered mainly from the presidential chair of the Historical Society -- an organization to maintain the connection between the public and specialized science -- during the decades preceding World War I, we can come across every now and then statements referring to the political, national role of historiography, wishes that the writing of

history should be the political guide of the citizens and should raise the whole nation to a high level of political maturity by making into public property all the conclusions that can be drawn from the past of the nation. The Historical Society and national historiography in general supplied naturally the "historical arguments" to Magyarize different place names, to restore the ancient national monuments in the 1880s and to popularize the "millennial idea".¹⁰ But we could go on quoting from the speeches of the World War when from the highest place of historians' public life the belief in a quick restoration was given a historical basis by arguing that Hungarian history — from the 13th century to the end of the 19th century — demonstrated that historical disasters were followed by recovery and that this historical law would repeat itself again.

Thus there is hardly anything new in the words of the president of the society when he declared at the first important meeting of historians after 1919: "History is actually not retrospective, it is not curiosity going back to the past, but an enormous moral force, and if spirits cease to know and love, the nation resembles a man who has lost his memory, who does not learn but rushes unwisely into danger, into his ruin. Thus society defends itself and its order by patronizing its historiography."¹¹

In this statement, too, the central idea is the social function of history in general, but these lines written in 1920 express more concretely that history was considered as a moral force, as a factor preventing society from rushing into disaster.

Without going into a detailed description of the post-revolutionary situation of intellectual life in Hungary we have to mention that after 1919 each counter-revolutionary thinker, publicist, and politician took up a position on the events of 1918/1919. Those who had taken part in the revolution sought to prove they had not belonged to the true revolutionists; those who had been persecuted or who had quietly hidden for the few months had the conviction that counter-revolution composed of different orientations and intentions justified their behaviour, too. The reactions — mixed and of different value — of the right-wing intelligentsia to the revolutions contained one common thought: the claim that the Autumn Revolution in 1918 and the Soviet Republic were only blunders and not a direct continuation of Hungary's millennial history.

Thus contrasting national history with proletarian revolution produced the other basic group of historico-political questions raised in the political ideological forums of the 1920s beside the protests against the unjust territoria

¹⁰ With reference to this: *Pesty Frigyes Vegyes Iratai* II. k. (Miscellaneous Documents of Frigyes Pesti — the administrator of the Society. Volume II). OSZKK Fol. Hung. 1115. Cf. I. LUKINICH: *A Magyar Történelmi Társulat története 1867–1917* (The History of the Hungarian Historical Society 1867–1917). Budapest, 1918. pp. 59–60.

¹¹ Klebelsberg, p. 37.

arrangements of the Peace Treaty. Perhaps it is worth following the sequence of ideas of the speech quoted above in connection with the revolutions. The example of the 1848/49 Revolution is picked out of the history of Hungary and contrasted with the proletarian revolution. The War of Independence (1848) "defending the most sacred rights of the nation" had been an organic part of Hungarian history, whereas the radical spirit of 1918/19 constituted a "foreign material in the body of the nation", and had to be removed from there. The latter was opposed to everything that had taken place in Hungarian history for a thousand years and that was linked with the grand continuity of national life: the proletarian revolution — because of its internationalism — was considered to be antinational and by being "one sided" and "partisan" it neglected the greatest interests of the nation, and degenerated into an "anti-national" "rebellion" "leading the country to ruin." The earlier uprising of 1848/49 — in the personality of the most revolutionary poet, Petőfi — was considered to be a part of national history. For although Petőfi was a revolutionist, he was a "national" one who drew his national lyricism from the "beauty and greatness of the past of the nation", and who could perform his mission owing to his "sense for history and his patriotism". This national revolutionary spirit of 1848/49 associated with Petőfi was totally contrasted to the one which "spent its fury after our collapse in 1918–19" and was "antihistoric and antinational radicalism".¹²

The contrast of the two revolutions was achieved — as is evident from the above — on the basis of the category: national. And in the argumentation the word national meant belonging to national history; national feeling was equal to attachment to the millennial development of Hungarian history. The democratic and proletarian revolutions have no traditions in the history of Hungary, according to this view, their roots cannot be traced back to an earlier stage than the radicalism of the beginning of the century and thus, naturally, they are opposed not only to the development of Hungary but to everything historical. The ahistoric character of the proletarian revolutions showed itself not only in Hungary. The case was the same with the Commune of Paris in 1871, and in Russia where "it brought about the total decay of the nation". The French, too, acknowledged 1789, the Great Revolution — in spite of its failings and bloodshed — and 1848, their national revolutions, as their own, but they kept quiet about the Commune of Paris or "rather they cast it out from their national history as a foreign body". The Hungarians should treat Károlyi's and Kunfi's revolution in the same way "as alien from the soul of the nation, consuming and destroying the most sacred goods of the nation", being able to gain victory of a few months only owing to the decay of the "sense of history".

¹² *Ib.*, pp. 37, 52.

Here we have to halt for a moment to speak about the category of "sense of history". All the more so, because in the speeches delivered after 1919 it frequently occurs in the comments on the social function of history and of historical science.¹³ This characteristic expression of the romanticism of the 19th century, condensing in itself everything that philosophers, poets, and writers had asserted about events as being historically determined, meant in this usage -- applying a modern expression -- the historical consciousness of society and the interest of the society in history. That is to say: that society and that generation has a sense of history which takes interest in its own history, is familiar with it, and accepts the "normal" lessons that can be drawn from it, too. If society cherishes its sense of history -- according to the Hungarian counter-revolution, -- it will not be liable to adopt the revolutionary spirit. Bourgeois radicals could make society susceptible to seditious ideas, because society had lost its sense of history. "Everything national is lost", the historical way of seeing things, "the awareness of the past as a storehouse of morality and law in the life of nations". Oszkár Jászi had realized how much his doctrine and the society's sense of history contradicted each other -- Klebersberg says -- and this is the reason why he attacked "the traditionally noble spirit of Hungarian historiography"; he guessed that "only a generation unmindful of its glorious past, might turn its attention to his superficial doctrine". For -- and the above ideas on the sense of history of society get their truest interpretation here -- "he who sticks to our millennial constitution, he who is capable of grasping the moral and practical importance of legal continuity and political tradition, like the English, the first constitutional nation of the world, can never join the red banner of social disturbance and general subversion."¹⁴

Thus what we cited above becomes comprehensible, history is not "retrospective, it is not merely curiosity looking back into the past, but an enormous moral force" and if society forsakes its devotion to its past, to its national history "it surely rushes into danger and disaster" i.e. into revolution, "like a man who has lost his memory". That is why he ends his comments

¹³ The question is rightly raised in every analysis of the history of ideas how much the ideas quoted were common in that age. The instances show that most of the unsound generalizations are the consequence of failing to do so. The initial "horizontal" survey indicates that the views spread by Klebersberg on "the sense of history" and "historical consciousness" were rather general. In the first days of the revolution we come across the contrast of revolution and "sense of history" in intellectual circles, and after 1919 the realization of the contradiction between the unjustness of the Peace Treaty of Trianon and Hungarian history is given voice at the political meeting in the countryside and at the meetings of the counter-revolutionary associations urging revision. (Cf. the minutes of the Faculty of Arts of the University of Debrecen. 30. X. 1918, -- Archive of Hajdú-Bihar county. Presidential documents of the Lord-Lieutenant. 1919--1922; -- Archive I of Pest county, documents of the Lord-Lieutenant. 1919--1921; -- Archive of Fejér county, documents of the Lord-Lieutenant 1919--22. Programme documents of the revisionist associations: Old Archive of the Academy. Secretary General's Documents, 1919--1922. MTA KK.)

¹⁴ Klebersberg, pp. 36--37.

on the connection between history and the present by saying that society defends itself, its own order, if it patronizes historiography. According to this view, the social function of the writing of history is to promote the development of the sense of history which alone is capable of stopping the spread of revolutionary ideas, to keep alive the love of national history and to draw its lessons. He was encouraged by this conviction of his on this social function of history -- said Klebelsberg in 1920, with the benefit of hindsight -- to reorganise the Historical Society immediately after the fall of Bolshevism, one of whose main objectives was precisely to nurture historical sense of the Hungarian nation. This is how historiography, called to foster historical thinking in order to protect against the danger of revolution, becomes in the lectures an organic part of the counter-revolutionary world of thought.

If one of the most essential features of setting up a programme for cultural policy in the 20s was to attribute a very important, "national" role to history in political thought, so its other, no less important characteristic was to keep constantly in view the development of historiography as a specialised branch of science. Although it approached historiography from the side of policy it never intended to give up scientific pretensions. It is true that the establishment of an outstanding Hungarian scholarship and its hegemony in Eastern and Central Europe fits the well-known conception about the cultural superiority of Hungary, and even in the development of individual disciplines contemporary publicists saw great national force. They maintained that through increasing the reputation of the Hungarian world of science, through a closer attachment to European culture and by producing well-trained experts the Hungarians were to demonstrate their vitality. Still, the fact is that this way of playing politics through science entailed everything that could help the development of scholarship according to the counter-revolutionary objectives: creating research posts, starting the publication of big series of scholarly works, building up the system of foreign scholarships.

Let us take only one example out of the numerous facts illustrating the concurrence of this conception of cultural policy with the programme of an individual discipline. We saw in the preceding how definitely the social function of historiography had been determined in the intellectual life of the Horthy era at an early phase. It followed almost as a natural consequence that when it came to outlining the actual programme for history the *relation between historical work and public* came into prominence, especially the question how the historical work can exercise an influence on the reading public, primarily on the middle classes constituting the basis of the system. From this angle Klebelsberg sets the objectives for the historiography of the 20s -- not only in propagandistic speeches and articles but in private correspondence, too: the essential questions have to be dealt with and one must not get lost in details like the scholars of the earlier decades; who puffed away at third-rate ques-

tions, unable to attract and captivate public interest.¹⁵ And that was why historiography could not perform its national mission. Now if we compare all this with the programmes set by historians of the age we will almost always notice the same criticism of the historiography of the earlier decades, rebuking it for having dealt with minor details, neglected to give a comprehensive description of the development of the history of Hungary, and for having failed to be readable. Especially the leading personalities of the history of ideas, first following in Ranke's footsteps and becoming independent afterward (Bálint Hóman, Gyula Szekfű) accused the prerevolutionary historians of an exaggerated specializing attitude and of getting lost in trivia.

The argumentation is, naturally, professional, and let us add that it contained a lot of real elements: it referred either to the international development of historiography, to the trend against data collecting and attributing too much attention to technics, or to the notion that detailed studies are necessarily followed by an age of synthesis and that earlier results have to be surpassed. Thus cultural policy connects the demand of exercising an influence on the public with the criticism of the writing of history of the earlier decades. It urged the revelation of essential problems but at the same time it coincided with the modern efforts of the pure historical science of the age, which reached the same result by approaching the problem from the angle of the specialised discipline.

The extensive consideration for the demands of the discipline and for its professional endeavours is demonstrated by the fact too that this policy by no means demanded propagandistic writing but well-written historical works, not popular brochure-literature, but vast source-books supplied with thorough analyses, and monographs.

Just as the policy of system often gives proof of its adequacy by being able to form a leading team of qualified persons, so a key question of cultural policy is to what extent it is able to make the best scholars of the age side with its programme and whether it is capable of activating them in organizing the science. The cultural policy of the 1920s did its best to draw the best historians into working out conceptions and to enable each likely talented historian to develop. Klebelsberg, for example, from his very first appearance in scholarly life (1916) sought the company of the best historians of the age. This is how a narrow circle of advisors formed from among the best historians and archivists around the Minister of Education by the middle of the 1920s. We have to place among them Dezső Csánki, director of the National Archives, distinguished primarily by his expertness in administrative problems (disliked yet supported by the Minister), and Bálint Hóman, the famous mediaevalist of the age, who soon became director of the National Museum. In the questions of organization he took part in setting the programme and in realizing Klebels-

¹⁵ *Ib.* p. 53.

berg's ideas, and his suggestions were relied on by the Minister more than once.¹⁶ Árpád Károlyi who was personally on most intimate terms with the Minister has to be mentioned among them too. He was one of the most respected archivists of contemporary Europe, former director of the Haus-, Hof- und Staatsarchiv in Vienna and in the 20s considered to be the greatest Hungarian historian¹⁷ of the age; and last but not least, Sándor Domanovszky, the founder of the school of the history of Hungarian agriculture who invested most of his energy in administering the science (as he used to say) of the period between the two World Wars. (He edited the central historical journal, *Századok*, managed the affairs of the big series of publications of sources, handled financial affairs, was coordinator between the different research institutes, and president of the Council of Scholarships established to award foreign scholarships.)

The demand for a high standard of historical science is obvious not only in the persons charged with the organization of learning. The contemporary cultural policy also strove to support any historian who accepted the platform of the system. Hóman, Ferenc Eckhardt, Gyula Szekfű, Domanovszky, the young generation of the 20s, and the younger ones, Elemér Mályusz and István Hajnal¹⁸ and the old, even those who refused to follow the history of

¹⁶ Csánki, *Dezso* (1857–1933). His work in five volumes on 15th century historical geography is still one of the important basic works of the age. In the 20s he was the managing vice-president of the Gyűjteményegyetem, the leading scholarly organization of the age.

Hóman, *Bálint* (1885–1951). A well-known expert of early medieval history: his most important work is the Hungarian History written in joint authorship with Gyula Szekfű. After 1919 he held different high positions in scholarly life: director of library, museum, the vice president of the Gyűjteményegyetem, University professor. Between 1932–42 — with a short break — he was Minister of Education. He was sentenced to life imprisonment as a right-wing politician and war-criminal by the people's court.

¹⁷ Károlyi, *Árpád* (1853–1936). He studied at the Institut für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung, later he became the librarian of the Haus-, Hof- und Staatsarchiv. The application of the theory of "provenance" in the Staatsarchiv is associated with his name. He introduced primarily the history of the independence movements in his numerous studies. His publications of sources are considered to be the first modern editions of sources. His works — naturally with reservations — can still be very useful for their rich material and correct critique of sources. After 1919 he was the director of the Hungarian Historical Institute in Vienna, and the chief-administrator of the Collegium Hungaricum.

¹⁸ Eckhardt, *Ferenc* (1885–1957). Attended the Institut in Vienna, too, and became the archivist of the Hofkammerarchiv in Vienna (1914–1919). Later he became the deputy director, for a short time the director of the Historical Institute in Vienna. After 1928 he was University professor of the University at Budapest. His work on the history of economics of the 18th century is of abiding value.

Szekfű, *Gyula* (1883–1955) the best-known figure of Hungarian historiography between the two World Wars. Archivist at the Staatsarchiv between 1908–1919, subsequently worked at the Institute of Vienna. His work entitled "Három nemzedék" (Three Generations) is almost a summary of the ideology of the regime. From the 1930s he joined the left-wing movements, after 1945 he was the first envoy of Hungary in Moscow. In spite of the tendentiousness his works are characterized by the author's thorough knowledge of the sources and his unparalleled skill in writing.

Hajnal, *István* (1892–1956) an outstanding scholar of "primary sciences" and of modern history. His activity was unfortunately interrupted but his works on the history of paleography, technics and politics are lasting. Several works of both Szekfű and Hajnal were published in foreign languages.

ideas, the best supported trend of the age (Dávid Angyal, Antal Áldássy, etc.) were all financially aided in some way or other, awarded foreign research-tours and given publishing possibilities even in the hard post-war economic situation.¹⁹ This was a primary condition for a high standard of historical literature in spite of the conservative and counter-revolutionary attitude and objectives of the regime.

On the organization of research

The cultural policy of the 20s, however, aimed not only at transforming the social function of historical science in agreement with the policy of the counter-revolutionary system, but also at maintaining research in spite of the post-war economic difficulties. Let us see the setting of the programmes and briefly some of the results in this sphere.

The starting point of this conception of cultural policy was that in the modern age any form of social activity can be controlled only with the help of extensive organizations built on a large scale. Research has to be adjusted accordingly "Many of the jobs that required earlier only the individual enterprise of enthusiastic and talented people now demand the activity of organizations", said Klebelsberg in a speech as early as 1917. It was in this spirit that the president of the Historical Society wanted to reorganize Hungarian historical scholarship in the last years of the war and all Hungarian scholarly life after 1919. This was an unprecedentedly vast project for the establishment of a modern Hungarian scholarship.

This conception considered the organization of research as the most important task, and the same thoughts can be read in several declarations: the time of individual undertakings is over, joint, co-ordinated research-work is the thing of the future. "In the field of the study of sources grand scientific collective undertakings meet the demands and requirements of the modern age, the results of which can be presented in big series of publications." That is why it is desirable to organize our "archivist researchers" "for major publications of historical sources". He did not contest the individual inspiration of scholarship because, as he said, great discoveries are made by individuals (1921), but the development of science as a whole is promoted not primarily by the thoughts and inventions of great personalities. "Apart from such necessarily unique but unfortunately rare, brilliant eruptions thousands of qualified persons contribute to the further development of science. Especially the preparatory works, collection of materials, the production of semi-finished scholarly goods requires numerous industrious hands, and they represent the

¹⁹ In detail see: F. GLATZ: *Klebelsberg tudománypolitikai programja és a magyar történettudomány* (The Programme of Cultural Policy of Klebelsberg and Hungarian Historical Science). Századok 1969. No. 5—6.

fresh, young energy not shying at the bulk of the work. The bulk of scientific work is not the product of geniuses but of industrious hands.²⁰

Even if not unprecedented, the plans of these developments for the organization of research and for institutions and institutes based on it together with the practical steps to realize them, sounded new in their age.

This conception was new for other reasons, too. In Hungarian historical life the demand for the establishment of modern research-organization had not arisen yet. It was surprising that an "earnest" politician (Klebensberg, State Secretary in 1918, Minister for Home Affairs in 1921) considered cultural policy so seriously as a "special field". The programme was new, too, because it laid down concrete tasks: to collect the modern sources of Hungary and to publish them in big series of source — publications, to compile a hand-book of history, to establish scientific institutes at home and abroad and a publishing house for scientific books, etc.

It is not our duty here to describe the large-scale organization of research institutes and institutions. In the following we wish to present some concrete cases of how the mechanism of the historical organization worked by the middle of the 1920s. This time, too, we are seeking answers to the question how research was connected with politics through the cultural policy of the regime, or rather how far the inner development of historical science can be traced apart from cultural policy.

Let us see first the greatest historical enterprise of the age, the publication of the modern sources of Hungary.

The idea of revealing the "ages closer to us" originated with Klebensberg. In the introductory part we mentioned that the hand-written notes (dated from the early 1900s) of the young politician indicate that he had a thorough knowledge of the modern history of Hungary, but they also show that — as he himself formulated it in his later speeches — he always searched in modern history for a guide to the policy of the present. He begins the analysis of each historical theme always by outlining the historical background of the problem. This historical approach preserves a lot of the dialectical relation of past and present in its method of thinking. Klebensberg himself was neither a scholar nor a historian; thus, of course, he did not think this relation over theoretically. In his way of thinking both types of historical approach can be detected. Sometimes he distorts history by projecting the problems of the present back into the past to events that took place centuries before, with help of primitive parallels; at other times he rightly reveals the real historical roots of the contemporary problems of nationality and administration, stressing that the problems of the present can be comprehended only by tracing them from the past. If we revealed the immediate antecedents of our political life not only

²⁰ Klebensberg, pp. 7, 44.

scholars, but even "our economists and politicians could profit by history" For — as he stated — "the beauty of a state document and of a political speech, too, lies in current events being connected with their historical antecedents and placed in the great continuity of national life".²¹ Thus, when the Historical Society included in its programme the edition of the sources of the modern history of Hungary (under the title of *Fontes historiae aevi recentioris*) in 1917, its political initiative was not denied. These objectives did not create a stir apart from professional circles — in the warlike atmosphere before 1918.²² After 1919 it was a different matter.

For in Hungarian political thought the question arose — as early as during the World War at the first vision of the possible separation of the nationalities — what has led to it? The question was finally posed for the Hungarian ruling classes by the collapse of the Monarchy. — i.e. "Great-Hungary" — and by the revolutions. The most important ideological works after 1919 struggle with trying to answer this question. And it is not by chance either that the most impressive historico-political work of the Horthy era was Gyula Szekfű's "Three Generations"²³ which attempted to answer the question and to sketch out the "decay" leading to revolutions. The *Fontes* programme also belongs to this school of thought. The 1918 prospectus of the series of historical sources classifies the volumes to be edited into five classes: history of politics, of administration, of religion and intellectual life, history of economics, and history of settlements of the 18th century. Even if there is no possibility here to analyse the subject-matter in detail, we may observe that the central questions are the constitutional history of Hungary in the Monarchy, and the question of nationalities. Within the frame of religion and intellectual life the series sought to present the Serbian and "Wallachian" (i.e. Roumanian) Orthodox Churches and the history of the protestants of Transylvania; the volume on the settlements of the 18th century wished to document the history of the nationalities settled in Hungary at that time, i.e. to show what good patriots they became within the frontiers of Great Hungary.²⁴ After 1919 in the *Fontes* programme these groups of problems partly change and partly enlarge. The history of the nationalities is still relevant; indeed it is emphasized more. Yet it is no longer a problem of the 18th century but is associated with the history of the War of Independence in 1848–49, demonstrating how the nationalities turned against the Hungarian Nation in 1848 "at the time of its just fight" and in 1918 as well. The subject-matter of the history of the administration of the modern Hungarian state was modified after many

²¹ Klebelsberg, pp. 53–54.

²² Századok, 1917.

²³ GY. SZEKFŰ: *Három nemzedék* (Three Generations). Budapest, 1920.

²⁴ The project of Árpád Károlyi, Gyula Szekfű, Ferenc Eckhardt. February, 1918. OSzKK. Annalekta. A Magyar Történelmi Társulat iratai. (The documents of the Hungarian Historical Society.

discussions to anticipate the independent Hungarian governmental authorities formed after 1919. A new topic is the idea of conservative reform represented by the great historical personality, István Széchenyi, as an ideal opposed to the revolutionary spirit.²⁵

As seen above, one of the vast projects of Hungarian historiography was closely related to the most important political-ideological trends of the age: the enormous source-editions fitted in with the plans of cultural policy. This project was initiated by a politician exceptionally sensitive to the problems of the age, who discussed the shaping of the detailed plan with the scholars mentioned above. It was Árpád Károlyi, Gyula Szekfű, Ferenc Eckhardt who surveyed the source material of modern Hungarian history relevant to the above mentioned questions; they prepared the first major draft of the *Fontes* and Sándor Domanovszky, Dezső Csánki and Imre Lukinich participated in working out the further details of the project.

Nevertheless, after establishing the correlation between politics and this programme of research in history, we immediately have to examine it with relevance to the inner development of the historical science, too.

To begin with, the idea of publishing the sources of modern Hungarian history was of utmost importance. The 19th century's writing of history ended with research into the feudal period; from the 17th—18th century the only event considered as a subject of history was Rákóczi's war of independence, a historically projected and glorified image of the eternal issue of independence. Historians apart from writers of publicistic pretensions and one or two works (e.g. those of Henrik Marczali) — did not choose for subject matter the history of later centuries, because they did not consider the recent past worthy of scholarly treatment. Thus urging research into modern history also meant that a number of questions — only the subject of publicism before — were approached now by historical science too. The *Fontes* volumes of the 1920s

be it the edition of Széchenyi's unpublished works written in Döbling, his collected documents, sources on the activity of the most significant palatines of Hungary, or the material of the volumes on the history of politics and nationalities — indicate the commencement of large-scale researches into modern Hungarian history and to this very day, they are useful sources for historians dealing with the history of the 18th—19th centuries.

The *Fontes* programme enlarged not only the subject matter of Hungarian bourgeois historiography but it brought about the expansion of the source-basis of historical research to an unprecedented extent. The programme kept in view the fact that modern sources were very divergent. It intended

²⁵ On the establishment of the *Fontes* programme: Századok, 1920., 1921., 1922. Cf.: the letters of Árpád Károlyi, Gyula Szekfű, Ferenc Eckhardt, Sándor Domanovszky and Imre Lukinich addressed to Kunó Klebelsberg. OSZKK. Archive of Letters; and Letters of Kunó Klebelsberg to Sándor Domanovszky. MTAKK.

to employ the organization of research as a means of bringing to light the enormous quantity of data through the hip of systematic work of several researchers. Thus the programme envisaged the systematic revelation of the source-material to be found abroad relevant to Hungarian history. Historians working on the basis of a co-ordinated common programme should visit the archives of Europe in order to trace and to collect the sources relating to the modern history of Hungary. The exploration of foreign sources accelerated at the beginning of the 20s. Not only the material of the Archives of Vienna was made use of but Hungarian researchers visited and searched through local archives in Austria and the major German, French, English and Spanish archives as well.²⁶ These materials came into circulation not only through the *Fontes* volumes, but also through the major and minor publications of the specialized press (*Levéltári Közlemények*, *Századok*).

The novelty in content was accompanied by a considerable advance in the methodology of historical science as well. Our historians were compelled to think over innumerable questions of research into modern history, and its publication. In our opinion the most urgent problem of the investigation of the modern era is still in what respects and to what extent, the socio-political mechanisms of the modern age, and hence its documentation and the historical criticism of its sources, differ from research into feudalism, an entirely different socio-political system. Those bases of methodology which were established primarily by the comprehensive German schools of history in the 19th century, and still form the basis of the methodology of history, set out essentially from research into the Middle Ages. Bourgeois historiography -- even if it did not pose the question in this very form -- nevertheless was aware of the problems in many respects. Here we would like to refer only to the methodological questions -- interesting for us on account of our subject -- relating to the source editions. Just as G. Schmoller had to deal with some problems of source-editions due to the abundance of documents relating to the modern age when he worked on the first modern collections in the 1880s,²⁷ so Hungarian historiography had to face these problems in the early years of the 1920s. The research rules of the series of publications (the principles of the selection of materials, etc.) had to be laid down, and for the first time in Hungarian history-writing the rules of source-editions had to be published.²⁸ (We can really appreciate this latter achievement if we look through the enormous quantity of publications of documents prepared by amateurs, usually disre-

²⁶ Historians and archivists gave a regular account of their research tours abroad. OSZKK. Archive of Letters, Letters addressed to Kunó Klebelsberg.

²⁷ *Acta Borussica*. Vorrede. H. v. Sybel und G. Schmoller. Berlin. 1892. p. I—XIV.

²⁸ *Szabályok Magyarország újkori története forrásainak kiadására* (Rules for the Publication of Sources on the Modern History of Hungary). *Századok*, 1920. *Részletes utasítás az újkori történeti források kiadására* (Detailed Directions to the Edition of Sources of Modern History.) *Ib.*

garding source criticism.) And if, more up-to-date rules of source-editions are formulated as a result of the labors still going on, they will find much methodologically exemplary in the publications of the 1920s: the Batthyány volume by Árpád Károlyi, the Documents of Palatine Joseph by Sándor Domanovszky and the Documents of Sándor Lipót by Elemér Mályusz.²⁹

Alongside the organization of research, the establishment of the system of institutes and other institutions was also given prominence in the setting of the programme of cultural policy. These were places of work for a new stratum of scholars; these institutes assured the survival of earlier scientific achievements and the perpetuation of the experience of the older scholars' generation in the youth working with them. Apart from the organized research work carried out in the institutions, the programme demanded coordination between the institutes and other institutions: in history it separated the work of the archivist from that of the historian doing research in the source-material (the subject matter of the journals was also divided among the journals—*Levéltári Közlemények*—*Századok*). The programme had among its objectives too, to co-ordinate the activity of the historian working in an institute doing only research with university education, the training of the new generation of researchers and the seminars at the university, etc.³⁰

The programme of the reorganization of Hungarian historiography and of all Hungarian scholarly life fitted into a conception striving to make research organized and to establish a system of learned institutions. The reorganization of library, museum and archive affairs and of publishing concerned historiography and historians, for most of the contemporary historians were officials of archives and museums, or teachers. But of the projects affecting historiography the most important one was the plan — partly realized — for a Historical Institute, because of the originality of the idea and its impact on the development of historiography.

The idea of establishing an institute of history was raised in Hungarian historical literature as early as the 1880s. The Institute, on the model of the Sickel Institute in Vienna (*Institut für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung*),³¹ was to help train scholars and archivists after their university studies. The plan of an institute was raised again after 1910 when the Historical Insti-

²⁹ *Gróf Széchenyi István döblingi irodalmi hagyatéka. I—II* (The Döbling Papers of Count Széchenyi. Vol. I—II.) Edited and preface by Á. KÁROLYI. Budapest, 1921. 22.; *József nádor iratai I—III.* (Papers of Palatine Joseph. Vol. I—III.) Edited with notes by S. DOMANOVSKY. Budapest, 1925., 1929., 1935.; *Sándor Lipót iratai I—II.* (Papers of Sándor Lipót. Vol. I—II.) Edited by E. MÁLYUSZ. Budapest, 1926.

³⁰ With reference to this see: Árpád Károlyi to Klebelsberg 14. VI. 1922. OSzKK. Archive of Letters; and Klebelsberg p. 53.

³¹ *A Magyar Történelmi Társulat 1885. július 3—6. napjain Budapesten tartott Kongresszusának irományai* (The Documents of the Congress of the Hungarian Historical Society held on 3—6. July, 1885 in Budapest). *Századok*. 1885, No. VIII.

tute of Constantinople was established for the investigation of the source material of Hungarian history to be found in Turkey. (1916. The organizational work was directed already -- although not publicly -- by Klebelsberg.³²) In 1917, in his capacity as president of the Historical Society and several times after 1919, Klebelsberg drafted the project of a network of scholarly institutes unique in Europe. The aim was to develop a cadre of full time researchers (by systematic training of young researchers and the establishment of permanent research-centres). Institutes at home and abroad were planned. The one *at home* was to be dedicated to the professional training of young researchers: "in a few laborious years" it was to "qualify them for working as researchers, publish their papers, keep track of their subsequent work, and help them to become situated in scholarly life". The primary aim of the institute was to make possible the acquisition and application of the methods of the subsidiary disciplines of history and historical research. Institutes in *foreign* countries would be established in cities where the local archives contained source-material relevant to Hungarian history.

The Institute of History in Rome, active before, was to be revived; the Institute in Constantinople, established at the time of World War I, was to be developed, and an independent institute of history was to be founded in Vienna. This way a network or research institutes unique in Europe, would have been built up.³³

Among the projects of the institutes, the establishment of the most important one, the institute at home was delayed the most (1942). Nevertheless the research stations abroad were established one after the other in the 1920s: in 1920 the Hungarian Historical Institute was founded in Vienna, in 1923 the Institute of Rome resumed work, and so-called Hungarian Institutes were established at major West-European and other universities: in Berlin, Paris, Stockholm, Madrid, Warsaw and Dorpat.³⁴ For example let us look at the most important Hungarian historical institute abroad, the one in Vienna, since it seems to be the most suitable to demonstrate the above-mentioned methods of research organization, and because its establishment was the culmination of the activity described earlier in connection with research organization and the *Fontes* series.

Like other European institutes in foreign countries in the 19th and 20th centuries the Institute of History in Vienna was founded in order to render

³² Archduke Francis Joseph to Kunó Klebelsberg. I. VII. 1916. OSZKK. Archive of Letters; and Századok 1917.

³³ Klebelsberg, pp. 10, 15—20., 38, 68—69.

³⁴ *A külföldi magyar intézetek működése és a magyar műveltség célját szolgáló külföldi ösztöndíjak az 1925/26. évben* (The Activity of the Hungarian Institutes Abroad and the Foreign scholarships Serving the Aims of Hungarian Culture in 1925/26). Budapest, 1927.

possible the continuous use of the sources relevant to Hungarian history in the archives of Vienna.³⁵

In 1920 work started under the leadership of the Hungarian archivists of the former Haus- Hof- und Staatsarchiv. The younger generation sent to work in Vienna began its activity under the guidance of Árpád Károlyi, Gyula Szekfű and Ferenc Eckhardt: Elemér Mályusz was engaged on the history of the Southern Slavs in 1848–49, István Hajnal researched Kossuth's exile. But soon the sphere of activity of the Institute broadened, the pupils of the professors working for the *Fontes* programme arrived to work here for 1–2 years; they helped to copy the documents and at the same time they worked on their own smaller theme. The reports of the Institute in 1922–23 mention that the young scholars were urged to take lessons in languages and to attend — according to their interest — the seminars of some of the celebrated professors in Vienna (the lectures of Alphons Dopsch, the famous professor of history of economics, were especially well attended). The researchers sent to Vienna had the opportunity to spend a few months in German and French archives, too, if required by their research, moreover, we know that some of them participated in the seminars of Meinecke, too.³⁶ In the 1920s new rooms were added to the Institute, and a library with a model selection of books containing nearly all the most recent West-European works on history and — as indicated by the catalogue of the library — a considerable number of books on economic and social history, on methodology and source-publications.³⁷

The enlargement of the Institute was of such an extent that by the end of the 20s it could receive several researchers arriving in Vienna only 1–2 weeks to study material in archives or museums. Moreover, by that time the Historical Institute often received art historians, men of letters and officials of the Ministry passing through Vienna.

As demonstrated by the reports of the Institute and the director's correspondence, a minor workshop of Hungarian history-writing developed in Vienna, where the visiting researcher could acquire a thorough knowledge of the German language, could collect considerable material in the archives and libraries of Vienna and got an inside view of the methods of the senior scholars at the Institute. And — what might have meant the most to the young researchers — they could breathe the air of the West-European cultural life, of the exhibitions, of the intellectual life of Vienna, a metropolis compared

³⁵ As for the purpose of the Institute see the by-laws (Árpád Károlyi) National Archive (OL.) A Bécsi Magyar Történeti Intézet iratai I. (The Documents of the Hungarian Institute of History in Vienna T.). — BMTI.

³⁶ With reference to this, see the quarterly reports of the Institute OL. The documents of BMTI, Vol. III; and the reports of Árpád Károlyi and the letters of Sándor Domanovszky addressed to Klebelsberg. OSZKK. Archive of Letters.

³⁷ The catalogue of the Library. OL. BMTI. III.

to contemporary Budapest. They had the chance to make the personal and professional acquaintance of future professors and respected specialists.³⁸ Every Hungarian historian of the age visited the Institute in Vienna, and later even some talented graduate students, too. The historian who went there acquired a good knowledge of the language and sources and, above all, he obtained an international horizon.

Naturally, the cultural policy of the age placed the organization of institutes in an integrated conception in the same way as it had the organization of research and the series of source editions. An acknowledged objective of this policy was to develop an intellectual life of European level to demonstrate in this way, too, that not even the Peace Treaty of Trianon, forced on the country, could demolish the intellectual supremacy of the Hungarian nation among the peoples of the Danube basin.³⁹

The cultural policy of the 1920s made efforts to establish institutes in every West-European country (in England and in the United States unsuccessfully); nevertheless, due to a decisive orientation in foreign policy the best institutes were founded in Germany and in Italy, in the countries "afflicted by the peace treaties like us". Although the Hungarian historian, art historian or literary man working in Rome, in Vienna, in Berlin or in Paris was not conscious of it, the leadership in cultural policy ranged research abroad and intellectual relations with foreign countries — though indirectly — among the general political objectives of the country, as witness the minutes of the meeting of the Association of Hungarian Institutes Abroad held in 1925.⁴⁰

*

Finally a few sentences to sum up the subject of the article:

As historical elements gained more and more ground in the political ideology of the Horthy era, the political function of historiography increased. Historiography served in part the function of political science, too.

Although the historical approach was always characteristic of Hungarian political thought, the development of this political function of historical science and increasing effectiveness were greatly promoted by mechanisms of cultural policy created as part of the consolidation of the counter-revolutionary system.

³⁸ We are indebted to the former members of the Institute, to Oszkár Paulinyi, to Endre Varga and Miklós Komjáthy for this information. We learned about the everyday life of the Institute in the contemporary diary of János Sőregi, director of a museum, who spent three years in Vienna. Archive of Manuscripts of the Library of the University of Debrecen.

³⁹ Klebelsberg, p. 32.

⁴⁰ The minutes of the Association of the Hungarian Institutes Abroad, held on 12—16th May, 1925. Berlin, OSZKK. Archive of Letters Róbert Gragger to Kunó Klebelsberg, enclosure of the letter of 20th May, 1925.

This is a period of Hungarian bourgeois history-writing when the attachment of historiography to politics is very strong.

Examining the connection between history writing and politics from the viewpoint of the historical discipline we may state that in spite of being attached to politics — and what is more, to counter-revolutionary politics — the discipline developed considerably. As demonstrated by our short analysis, this was facilitated by the fact that bourgeois cultural policy in the 1920s — while using historical science for political purposes — avoided demanding cheap propaganda works from it, something not unknown in Hungarian history. Perhaps we can add without exaggeration: this shows, that for politics on history on high level, historical science itself must be on high level, too.

Историография, культуральная политика и организация научной жизни в Венгрии в 1920-е годы

Ф. ГЛАЦ

Резюме

Статья представляет собой фрагмент обширной работы, которая ставит своей целью выявить взаимосвязь всегдашней политики и исторической науки, раскрыть механизмы, определяющие различный характер этой взаимосвязи в различные эпохи.

Во введении автор статьи устанавливает, что в духовной жизни венгерского общества в капиталистический период по причине отсутствия буржуазной демократии не сложилось «political science», и ее функцию приняли на себя специальные науки (история, право), а также литература. Новая венгерская история — особенно в хортистский период — выполняла исключительно политическую функцию. Связь политики и науки в современном государственном механизме осуществляется прежде всего политикой в области науки. В Венгрии после 1919 года под руководством весьма одаренного политика этого периода Куно Клебельсберга создается структура буржуазной политики наук, которая в свое время считалась «современной».

В следующей главе представлена и проанализирована большая роль исторических элементов в контрреволюционной идеологии. Это проявляется и в агитации против трианонского мирного трактата и в тех концепциях, которые стремились доказать, что революция 1919 года была «антиисторическим» движением в венгерской истории. Согласно этим концепциям история доказывает, что правомерны лишь национальные движения, «национальные революции» (1848 года). Эта историзирующая позиция открыто провозглашала политическую роль исторической науки, и как показывает анализ, проведенный во второй главе исследования, цели контрреволюционной пропаганды отражаются и на важнейших специальных серийных изданиях и на создававшейся сети научных учреждений.

Если же все это рассмотреть в плане профессионального развития науки, то можно утверждать, что профессиональный уровень исторической науки, несмотря на ее политическую функцию, постоянно повышался. Ученые, хотя и стояли на позициях буржуазного мировоззрения, обладали основательной профессиональной подготовкой и в рамках программы политики в науке создавали труды на высоком уровне, с помощью исследовательских программ и созданных за границей институтов ввели в историографию богатый источниковедческий материал и выработали новые методические принципы. Таким образом, в исторической науке данного периода сосуществуют высокий профессиональный уровень и зависимость науки от буржуазной, консервативной политики. И, наконец, вывод, который следует из анализа относительно политики в науке: буржуазная политика в области науки в 1920-х гг. избегала того известного и в венгерском развитии пути, который требовал от специальной науки «дешевых пропагандистских брошюр». Это одновременно доказывает и то, что выполнение наукой политической функции на высоком уровне может быть осуществлено лишь при создании трудов на высоком профессиональном уровне.