

INTRODUCTION



In 1917, as World War I (hereafter, WWI), continued to wreak enormous loss of life across Europe, there appeared in Zürich a work entitled *Menschen im Krieg* (*People in War*) by the Hungarian-Austrian writer and journalist Andreas Latzko (1876–1943).¹ Initially published anonymously, the work comprised six short novellas. Reprinted at least three times within the year, it was soon translated into other languages, notably French, English and Swedish.² The last of Latzko's stories, *Heimkehr* (*Homecoming*), depicts the travails of Johann Bogdán on the return to his village on the Hungarian plain. A coachman by trade, Johann has suffered horrific facial injuries from a grenade, including the loss of an eye and severe disfigurement of his jaw. As the train meanders slowly towards his destination, Johann becomes increasingly anxious about the reception he will receive at home and he nervously brings out a pocket-mirror, repeatedly examining his features, which had been operated on seventeen times. Resentment resurfaces about being treated as experimental material by the patronizing 'big city mob' of doctors and nurses, and Johann dreads that he is now a 'lost man'.³

His fears appear confirmed when the stationmaster's wife, who had grown up next door to him, fails to recognize him on arrival. Resting on a bench, he reaches again for the mirror, now worrying how his betrothed, Marcsa, will react to his appearance. A chance meeting with the local hunchback, Mihály, confronts Johann with someone who both recognizes him and accepts that he is not in a 'rosy mood'. Mihály is not surprised: 'Yes, that's how it goes! The poor folk have to sacrifice their healthy bones, so that the enemy does not deprive the rich of all their abundance!'⁴ However, Johann had always looked down on Mihály and – proud of his civilian profession – had never had time for the socialist talk of the 'rogue, who knew no God and no fatherland'.⁵ Hence, Johann's gradual irritation only swells when Mihály hints that Marcsa has been attracting the attention of the lord of the manor, Johann's employer. Arriving at the latter's castle to reclaim his former post, Johann first shudders with shame and hurt as Marcsa recoils

from what has become of her once handsome lover and says that they cannot marry if Johann has no job. The lord of the manor gets involved, telling Johann to leave Marcsa in peace and offering him only a job in his factory, which used to make bricks, but now turns a great profit making munitions. Humiliated, Johann confronts the landowner, exploding with rage: ‘Whoever loiters around at home, shouldn’t tell others to go to the devil when they’ve already been through hell for them!’⁶ Johann grabs a hunting knife and runs it through his master, just as he had used his bayonet on the battlefield. Yet, as the latter sinks to the ground, Johann receives a fatal blow on the head, which he just glimpses had come from an axe wielded by Marcsa, before he too collapses in a heap.

In a plain style that mixes social realism, expressionism and the internal monologues characteristic of fin-de-siècle prose, Latzko’s best-selling work articulated not just a searing critique of war, but also provided one of the earliest fictional treatments of coming home and the potential difficulties surrounding soldiers’ reintegration into civilian life. While his initial success and contacts with other writers noted for their pacifist stance, such as Romain Rolland and Stefan Zweig, ensured a respectable literary career, Latzko struggled for the remainder of his life with depression and hallucinations resulting from his wartime service on the Isonzo front. In December 1917, Latzko had disobeyed orders to return to the front, staying on in Switzerland where he had been recuperating. He was stripped of his reserve officer’s rank and his book was banned in Austria-Hungary and Germany, though copies circulated illegally.⁷ Having been highly acclaimed by contemporaries such as Karl Kraus, Latzko’s reputation soon faded and he is nowadays ‘an author whose name is barely remembered’.⁸ Nevertheless, Latzko’s tales address a range of themes of great interest to historical scholarship on interwar Europe: the psychological damage caused by the war; the potential for violence; altered authority relationships; the distance between those who had experienced combat and civilians at home; political tensions and conflicts over the war’s meaning.⁹

The question of what became of former soldiers in Central Europe after 1918 lies at the centre of this book, which investigates the history of WWI veterans in the republics of Austria and Czechoslovakia in the period up until 1938.¹⁰ Both these countries emerged from the break-up of the Habsburg Monarchy in late 1918, the latter comprising the territories of what before 1918 were the historical Bohemian lands (Bohemia, Moravia and Austrian Silesia) and the northern counties of Hungary (Slovakia and Subcarpathian Rus). Austria consisted mainly of the ‘hereditary lands’ of the former Habsburg Monarchy. Alongside the alpine provinces, it came to include – from 1921 – the province of Burgenland, formerly in western Hungary (see maps 0.1–0.3). Starting from a similar basis of parliamentary democracy, Austria and Czechoslovakia followed different political trajectories in the interwar period, but the two states had a common inheritance from Austria-Hungary and both met a similar fate in 1938/39. The aggressive

expansion of Nazi Germany ended their existence as sovereign states, even if the respective paths that led to these outcomes differed substantially, as did the public reactions to them. The complex, entangled histories of Austria and Czechoslovakia thus have much to say about inter-war central Europe and the wider question of how these societies dealt with the aftermath of war and the end of empire.¹¹

This comparative study of war veterans in Austria and Czechoslovakia explores key issues regarding political and social developments in post-1918 Europe. Aside from the specific history of the veterans themselves, we aim to shed new light on the debate surrounding cultures of ‘defeat’ and ‘victory’ in the aftermath of WWI and on the emergence of political instability (including paramilitarism, political violence and ideological polarization). While soldiers participated in the various revolutions and coup d’états accompanying the collapse of the old regime in Europe from 1917 onwards, historians have recently highlighted the ongoing importance of armies and/or ex-soldiers in the attempts to claim national territory and define borders in the contested landscape of Central and East-Central Europe. Here, the war certainly did not stop in the autumn of 1918, but rolled on in the shape of border conflicts and civil wars for several years.¹² Recent studies have added to earlier research, which was particularly concerned with the political fall-out from WWI and the roots of right-wing extremism, above all in Germany, Italy and Hungary.¹³ The ability – or inability – of post-war societies to deal with the consequences of defeat has been a significant issue in explaining the crisis of democracy in interwar Europe.¹⁴

We return to this debate below, but it is important to emphasize at the outset that this book seeks to make a significant contribution to the existing historiography in two main ways. Firstly, it takes an explicitly comparative approach to the topic, looking at two countries that have been under-represented in the discussion to date. Our transnational investigation of Austria and Czechoslovakia interweaves developments in neighbouring states that showed distinctive patterns of post-war reconstruction, while dealing with the institutional legacy of the Habsburg past (in terms of administration, legal framework, medical practices and so on). Secondly, our study builds on research that has questioned the validity of the dichotomy between cultures of ‘victory’ and ‘defeat’, given that most of the ‘successor states’ of the Habsburg Monarchy contained a mix of both. In other words, despite a *prima facie* hegemonic ‘culture of victory’ in Czechoslovakia and the seemingly long shadow of defeat over Austria, closer analysis shows that both societies contained those who were ‘vanquished’ as well as ‘victorious’.¹⁵

To begin with, this introduction first expands on the rationale for our research, reviewing the relevant scholarly literature. A second section moves on to theoretical and methodological issues. After elaborating our approach to the subject and sources used, we address the question of defining veterans in interwar Europe, taking account of the conjoined history of military veterans in the region before 1918. Finally, we detail the book’s structure.

Military Veterans in Interwar Europe

To understand the role of WWI veterans in Czechoslovakia and Austria as distinct social actors, as well as the object of state policies and broader public discourse, it is necessary to consider briefly the development of veterans as a social type in European history.

Returning soldiers were known from the ancient era onwards, but the veteran as a cultural and political phenomenon is comparatively recent. Important developments occurred in the early modern period, owing to the expansion in the size of armies. As the reach of royal administrations expanded, so too did expectations about the monarch's obligation to provide for former soldiers, primarily those invalidated out of service. From the late seventeenth century, monarchs began to found charitable institutions to this end, such as Louis XIV's *Hôtel des Invalides* in Paris (1678), which stood out for its grandeur. Soon after, Charles II established the Royal Hospital Chelsea in London (1682), and similar institutions were established in the Habsburg Monarchy from the 1720s.¹⁶ However, it was primarily due to the emergence of standing armies based on conscription that the place of the male veteran began to assume a new position in European society from the late eighteenth century onwards.

With regard to the social history of soldiers, the large-scale battles of the French Revolutionary and Napoleonic Wars were significant for two reasons. Firstly, as Alan Forrest has shown for France, the quarter-century of conflict contributed to a substantial change in the cultural reception of ordinary soldiers: 'soldiering was no longer seen as being reserved for the poor and disadvantaged, and much of the social stigma attached to the military in the eighteenth century was removed. The representation of soldiers in popular imagery became more positive'.¹⁷ Deriving from the spread of conscription in European states and the ensuing link between military service and male citizenship, this shift coincided with the emergence of romanticism and helped pave the way for the public glorification of warfare and patriotic sacrifice in national discourses in nineteenth-century Europe.¹⁸ Secondly, notwithstanding this cultural change, the large number of ex-soldiers after 1815 formed part of the social question in Europe, because public provision for their well-being varied from rudimentary to non-existent. In practice, institutions for invalids located in national or imperial capitals catered only to a limited few, leaving the majority to fend for themselves. Thus, the first veterans associations arose in Great Britain, France, the German states and the Habsburg Monarchy in the decades after 1815, as a means of providing support for poor and needy veterans, especially those who had been incapacitated during combat.¹⁹ Nevertheless, only in the second half of the nineteenth century did veterans associations develop into large-scale organizations within civil society, mainly on a self-help, mutual insurance basis. As such, they formed important lobby groups in a period of mass politicization, growing nationalism and societal

militarization. Consequently, state governments became increasingly concerned to channel and control their activities.²⁰

If the 'military veteran' was thus a recognizable figure at the start of the twentieth century, WWI massively changed the scale and nature of the 'veterans question'. The enormous impact of mass deaths and destruction resulting from total war, the demise of old empires, and the rise of new nation states made the fate of ex-soldiers a key issue throughout interwar Europe. The unprecedented number of combatants, together with the severity and frequency of injuries incurred in industrialized warfare, meant that the relationship between ex-soldiers and the state became a crucial concern for all governments. In short, every belligerent state, as well as the new states emerging from the fallen empires, had to come to terms with hundreds of thousands of war veterans. With most states having become more interventionist during the course of the war, as well as raising popular expectations or offering incentives through propaganda, war veterans and their dependents posed major questions for welfare provision, social policy, party politics and national memory cultures. European societies faced practical challenges to nascent welfare systems and existing medical infrastructure for the treatment of injuries and illnesses, as well as dealing at the discursive level with redefinitions of war heroism and masculinity.²¹

Accordingly, the political and social functions of WWI veterans have been a popular topic of research on interwar Europe, pursued from various methodological standpoints. As indicated, early work concentrated on war returnees as major actors in interwar politics, with a particular focus on Germany. American historian George Mosse played a pioneering role through his influential thesis on the 'brutalization' of the public sphere following the widespread experience of combat.²² Historians of right-wing movements have subsequently viewed veterans as important transmitters of the 'mass killing culture' of the war into European societies after 1918.²³ Gender historical approaches have further enriched this perspective by emphasizing the role of 'militarized masculinity' in WWI and its impact in shaping violent activities by former combatants.²⁴

Overall, much of the research on WWI veterans in Central Europe has been framed by the concept of the 'culture of defeat', as originally formulated by Wolfgang Schivelbusch.²⁵ According to this narrative, post-1918 political, social and cultural circumstances in defeated states such as Germany, Austria and Hungary prevented certain groups of war returnees from coming to terms with the result of the war. This impeded their internal demobilization and enabled the rise of the paramilitary culture characteristic of the 1920s and 1930s.²⁶ Only more recently has research focused on Central or South-Eastern European states that were formally characterized by a 'culture of victory'. Respective studies by Julia Eichenberg and John Paul Newman have shown how veterans in countries such as Poland and the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes (from 1929, Yugoslavia) tended to be future-oriented, participating in the building of the

post-war order and readying themselves to defend it.²⁷ Moreover, other findings have pointed to the propensity of substantial numbers of veterans to distance themselves from nationalistic agendas, and instead to embrace the unfolding internationalism in interwar Europe.²⁸ From a different direction, emerging research on escalating political violence in pre-1914 Europe has demonstrated more forcefully than before that explanations for political conflict after 1918 cannot just be reduced to the traumatic impact of the war.²⁹

At the same time, new work has challenged previous interpretations by re-assessing the role of victory or defeat in the stability of interwar regimes in Europe. Veterans' attitudes to the post-war order were determined not just by wartime and early post-war experiences, but also by social, national and ideological cleavages within their movements. For example, the literature on French veterans, who prominently represented a 'culture of victory', shows an interpretative shift from seeing ex-soldiers as a bulwark of interwar democracy and peace to a more nuanced view, in which the internal polarization of veterans organizations paved the way for the destabilization of interwar democracies and the rise of fascism.³⁰ Equally, detailed analysis of countries with a 'culture of defeat' suggests that there were also significant groups of war veterans who had a pacifistic and liberal-democratic orientation, as Benjamin Ziemann has shown for Weimar Germany.³¹

In addition, scholarship on post-1918 Central and East-Central Europe has examined the contested nature of memory cultures of WWI among the Habsburg Monarchy's 'successor states'.³² Historians have identified 'mixed cases', such as Yugoslavia, where 'victorious' Serbia joined with the territories of Croatia and newly formed Slovenia, whose inhabitants had been on the 'losing' side during the war.³³ Hence, even in the victorious states, it was hard for many veterans to come to terms with the post-war order, meaning that ex-soldiers helped shape the public arena not only during the setting up of a parliamentary, democratic order in the early 1920s, but also during its shattering in the late 1920s and 1930s.³⁴ More recently, Ángel Alcalde has returned to the relationship between WWI veterans and fascism from a transnational perspective. Beginning in Italy, fascist groups came to monopolize the image and rhetoric around war combatants, linking this to Italy's 'mutilated victory' and the anti-communist cause. This pushed alternative readings of the war experience to the side, especially as Mussolini's dictatorship became consolidated and exerted growing influence on right-wing movements and authoritarian regimes in Europe. Alcalde thus argues that the fascist myth of war veterans spread from Italy to other European countries and the fascist veterans movement tried to dominate international veterans politics.³⁵

In turning to the Czech, Slovak and Austrian historiography of the interwar period, close examination shows how little these scholarly debates have penetrated research to date. Our transnational study seeks to make its mark within

this gap in the existing literature. Regarding Czechoslovakia, much of the literature still focuses on political and military resistance against the Habsburg regime during the war as being the main precondition for subsequent state independence, as well as on the political history leading to the establishment of the new state. Current narratives interpret the war and immediate post-war years in terms of a struggle to fulfil the national-political goal of independence, establish a parliamentary democracy in the face of opposing minorities, and create economic prosperity and a welfare state.³⁶ For example, Zdeněk Kárník's highly regarded synthesis on interwar Czechoslovakia constitutes a unique attempt to embrace broader social, economic and cultural aspects of the new state, but pays scant attention to the intricate problems of demobilizing soldiers post-1918.³⁷

In short, while communist historiography prior to 1989 only displayed interest in WWI veterans who disseminated revolutionary ideas from Bolshevik Russia,³⁸ historiography since 1989 has tended to subsume war veterans within the distinguished place reserved for those soldiers who joined the 'Czechoslovak legions fighting on the side of the Entente and became part of the 'Czechoslovak resistance' abroad. Both Czech and international historiography have successfully described various aspects of former legionnaires' history in the interwar period, notably the establishment of the 'official memory' of the legionnaires as one of the foundational myths of the new state and its 'culture of victory'.³⁹ Scholars have also emphasized the special status that legionnaires enjoyed in interwar Czechoslovakia, as well as the enormous political influence their organizations wielded during the 1920s and 1930s.⁴⁰

However, the almost completely one-sided focus on the legionnaires has led to a paradoxical situation, albeit one that is not untypical for the historiography of former regions of the Habsburg Monarchy. Thus, the story of the almost 60,000 ordinary soldiers from Trentino (Italian-speaking Tyrol) in the Habsburg army's ranks was long obscured by a *Risorgimento*-inspired focus on the comparatively small number of volunteers – just under 700 – who fled to fight on the Italian side (including the 'national martyrs' Cesare Battisti, Damiano Chiesa and Fabio Filzi).⁴¹ In similar fashion, the large majority of war veterans in Czechoslovakia long appeared as a group 'without history'. Yet, in 1934, official statistics listed only about 89,000 people deemed 'legionnaires by law' and almost 21,000 further legionnaires without official legal status who had fought on the French, Italian and, most frequently, Russian side.⁴² By comparison, a total of some 1,400,000 Czechs and Slovaks and several hundred thousands of Germans, Hungarians and others who became citizens of Czechoslovakia after 1918 served in the Habsburg armed forces from 1914 to 1918.⁴³ Historians have begun to pay more attention to Czech and Slovak soldiers in the Habsburg military,⁴⁴ but only recently has the 'veterans question' in interwar Czechoslovakia become a subject of academic research. In addition to Natali Stegmann's pioneering work on disabled veterans and social policy, followed by two as yet unpublished dissertations, some other

recent articles have dealt with collective memory, gender, or physical violence among various veterans groups in interwar Czechoslovakia.⁴⁵

In sum, the on-going debate on the allegiance of Czech and Slovak soldiers in WWI has only slowly transferred into wider and systematic interest in war veterans in Czechoslovakia after 1918.⁴⁶ There is still insufficient research on the political leanings of the non-legionnaire veterans groups, their attitudes to the Czechoslovak state, lobbying for their collective interests, or associational activities. This limited attention to demobilized imperial soldiers from different social and national backgrounds illuminates the interpretative, teleological limits of national historiography on the period. In short, the master-narrative of the collapse of Austria-Hungary and the establishment of an independent Czechoslovakia is typically viewed in isolation from other Central European territories, with virtually no comparisons made to test basic propositions.⁴⁷

In several respects, the latter point is equally true for Austria. The relevant literature long operated within a closed geographical and interpretative framework, whereby the main narrative thread saw the 'failed' interwar First Republic as a kind of negative foil for the Second Republic's 'success story' after 1945.⁴⁸ Despite some historians' arguments for the need to take fuller account of the national, cultural and spatial pluralisms deriving from the Habsburg past, both 'Czechoslovak' and Austrian historiographies have focused largely on their own territories, proving fairly resistant to calls for a transnational approach.⁴⁹ In the Austrian case, this is especially true for the war's aftermath and the specific issue of the return home of former combatants. Current knowledge of the question is fragmentary, particularly in view of the size of the problem. As Verena Pawlowsky and Harald Wendelin's groundbreaking study of the legal framework for treating the disabled and the authorities' attempts to deal with victims of the four-year bloodshed shows, the nascent Alpine republic was confronted with roughly one million home-comers and at least 100,000 former prisoners-of-war (POWs) out of an approximate population of 6.5 million. Austria (within the boundaries of 1919) counted 495,000 war dead, more than 140,000 disabled men and 100,000 widows and orphans, meaning that 4 percent of the population was dependent on support.⁵⁰ Despite the recent appearance of studies on war invalids by Ke-Chin Hisa and Thomas Süssler-Rohringer, a broadening of perspective is still urgently needed.⁵¹

While general texts summarize the ruptures and upheavals of 1918/19, there is little detailed analysis of former soldiers, their various veterans or POW associations, and the general development of the 'veterans question' down to the so-called *Anschluss* of 1938.⁵² Certainly, earlier publications looked at paramilitary units and 'private armies' within the context of political and ideological developments, but without focusing on war veterans as a specific phenomenon.⁵³ Moreover, the recent wave of literature on Austro-Fascism generally underplays these issues, with the partial exception of the efforts by the 'corporate state' to

revive Habsburg military traditions between 1933/34 and 1938.⁵⁴ Despite interest in returning POWs' impact on the first years of the Alpine republic, historians have yet to explore fully the social, political and cultural role of veterans as a social group in interwar Austria.⁵⁵

Even more problematic is the general neglect of the topic from a cultural historical perspective, aside from work by Oswald Überegger and Werner Suppanz.⁵⁶ For Tyrol, Überegger has argued that the analysis of former combatants, with their extensive associational activities, rituals, and commemorative events cannot be separated from the history of 'regular troops' in the interwar Republic. Überegger highlights the 'functionalization' of the 'Habsburg heritage', as represented in museums and countless publications on the regiments of the 'old army'. This 'military-folkloristic practice' reached a climax in the 1930s, when the 'corporate state' promulgated reconciliation with the Habsburg past through celebration of the imperial armed forces.⁵⁷ Nevertheless, such studies remain a rarity for Austria when compared to the plethora of publications elsewhere.⁵⁸

As a consequence, histories of twentieth-century Austria and studies of right-wing and/or militia movements have tended to assume the involvement of war veterans in political extremism, but only comparatively recently have detailed studies of National Socialist cadres in Austria begun to uncover more precisely the role of the non-combatant generation in the movement.⁵⁹ There is still much to discover with regard to war veterans' political engagement, whether right-wing, leftist or more centrist, their support for internationalist and/or pacifist agendas, and their potential rejection of active political involvement. Hence, this book aims to survey this too-little-known terrain.

Approaching and Defining War Veterans in Austria and Czechoslovakia

In taking Austria and Czechoslovakia as case studies, we acknowledge the specific circumstances at play in the post-Habsburg arena, yet without viewing these as part of a 'Central European path' somehow containing its own essence. Rather, our aim is to investigate individual and group perceptions and experiences as part of a transnational continuum across Europe – indeed, the globe – in which the adjustments to post-war society produced variants and commonalities both within and across the new state boundaries.⁶⁰ From this point of view, historical comparison comprises the basic methodological starting-point, enriched by the analysis of cultural transfers and entanglements.⁶¹

As countries that shared a common constitutional, legal and administrative framework until 1918, but took different trajectories in the autumn of that year, Czechoslovakia and Austria form a suitable basis for comparative analysis.⁶² The war experience of the majority of former Austro-Hungarian soldiers provides

the required common denominator for mutual comparison, while the respective paths taken by the 'successor states' thereafter enable us to observe the phenomena under investigation in differing national and state environments. In both countries, war veterans constituted important and influential groups not only in terms of numbers, but also in terms of their symbolic meaning for the establishment and legitimacy of the post-war order. The question of successful or unsuccessful integration of war veterans into the new republics constituted a key aspect of social and cultural demobilization post-1918.⁶³ The study of WWI veterans can reveal much about the nodes of legitimacy, moral norms and mentalities that shaped the interwar order and eventually played a decisive role in its stability or instability.

With regard to systematic comparison between the different social and discursive environments formed by cultures of 'victory' and 'defeat', our study contributes to a rethinking of assumptions behind this paradigm in two ways. Firstly, we contend that, in practice, most of the 'successor states' in Central and East-Central Europe contained a mix of both 'victory' and 'defeat', above all when seen from the perspective of different ethnic, social and political groups. For example, Czechoslovakia was marked by a hegemonic 'culture of victory' at the state level, but there was also a hidden or suppressed 'culture of defeat' among those who were not granted the privileged status of legionnaires.⁶⁴ Whether Czech, Slovak or German, most former soldiers did not fall into this 'triumphant' category. From a different direction, it is likewise necessary to differentiate the situation in the First Austrian Republic and not to see its entire history through the prism of 1938.⁶⁵ While numerous prominent individuals with personal or professional ties to the old regime were vocal in lamenting the monarchy's fall,⁶⁶ many viewed the lost war and the dissolution of the empire as a political victory. This made possible the attainment of long-held goals and offered the opportunity to forge a new vision of society, such as occurred among Social Democrats involved in the myriad projects emanating from 'Red Vienna' between 1918 and 1934.⁶⁷

Secondly, we argue that the reception of cultures of 'victory' and/or 'defeat' was structured not only around ethnicity, class and political affiliations, but also varied according to different spatial environments. On the one hand, our analysis pays attention to regional perspectives, including disputed border areas where battles were fought over territory in the years following the armistices of November 1918. Local disparities in relation to state policies and narratives occurred in regions affected by divided or 'lost' territories (e.g. Cieszyn Silesia / Těšínské Slezsko, South Tyrol, Lower Styria), as well as in newly 'gained' territories (e.g. Slovakia, Burgenland). In other words, the social reintegration of veterans into post-war society was related to national-territorial consolidation. On the other hand, we strive to counterbalance the nation-centred perspectives of Austrian and Czech / Slovak historiography by incorporating the transnational sphere of veterans' activities in interwar Europe. International veterans associ-

ations such as the Interallied Federation of Veterans (*Fédération Interalliée des Anciens Combattants* (FIDAC) and the International Conference of Associations of Disabled Servicemen and Veterans (*Conférence Internationale des Associations de Mutilés de Guerre et Anciens Combattants*, CIAMAC) also played a role in Austria and Czechoslovakia, as did interactions with other international organizations, such as the League of Nations.

On this basis, we draw on a wide range of material from archives and libraries not only in the Czech Republic and Austria, but also in Slovakia, Germany, Switzerland, the Netherlands, Great Britain and Hungary. Alongside the respective national archives, documents from regional and municipal archives have been used, although these proved to be more numerous in the Austrian case. Official sources naturally provide much information on state policy towards veterans, as well as on the external dimensions of their activity. While sources from regional and municipal administrations provide alternative political and institutional perspectives, the records, reports and periodicals of veterans associations themselves provide insight into the concerns and actions of former soldiers (even if these are usually refracted through the association leadership). Where available, memoirs and other ego-documents have been used to add personal testimony to the record. Finally, we make substantial use of newspapers in order to ascertain detailed information on local events, such as meetings or public ceremonies. This multi-perspectival approach allows us not only to analyse the interplay between state agencies, regional contexts and key actors in civil society, but also to capture the different forms and permutations of war veterans' activities in Austria and Czechoslovakia.

The latter point is particularly important because the question as to who constituted a veteran varied according to time, place and context. In this respect, the historical evolution of the term in the Habsburg territories is instructive. For example, as a standing army gradually developed in the Habsburg Monarchy after 1649, the notion of 'veteran' remained limited in meaning, given that, in one sense, there was no such thing as an 'ex-soldier' when service was for life. 'Veteran' might therefore refer to someone who had fought in a particular campaign or battle (e.g. a 'veteran' of the 1683 siege of Vienna), but in the early modern period, the key distinction was between serving soldiers and 'invalids'. Disabled veterans were discharged once it was confirmed that they were no longer fit for regular service and formed an identifiable social group, subject to poverty and uncertainty, and often living as beggars.

Only with the expansion of the armed forces during the eighteenth century did Empress Maria Theresia accept the need to provide for disabled former soldiers, meaning that status as an 'invalid' was more important than 'veteran'.⁶⁸ As enlightened ideas took hold in the mid-eighteenth-century, a modern medical system began to develop in all of the empire's provinces. This resulted in medical teams being attached to each regiment, who identified war invalids in the immediate

vicinity of military lines. A turning point in the development of a welfare system for war invalids and disabled soldiers came with the creation of the Court Commission for Invalids (*Invalidenhofkommission*) in 1750/51. This was complemented by an institutional structure in the monarchy's larger cities, including Prague and Vienna, where Houses for Military Invalids (*Militärinvalidenhäuser*) provided basic care, but also functioned as workhouses. After 1759, disabled soldiers who were not sent to the workhouse received an allowance. However, invalids still remained an ostracized social group; begging in public was banned and they were only allowed to marry by special permission of the authorities.⁶⁹

This development highlighted a key issue for government policy well into the twentieth century, namely the relationship between wounded soldiers and the state. While the introduction of fixed terms of military service in the early nineteenth century gave more meaning to the distinction between 'soldiers' and 'veterans', understood simply as 'former soldiers', in practice only invalidated soldiers came within the remit of government charitable policy. As the scale of warfare escalated in the second half of the eighteenth century and the Napoleonic period, the number of ex-soldiers proliferated enormously and it was in this context that the first military veterans association (MVA) was founded in the Habsburg Monarchy. The start came in the north Bohemian town of Reichenberg / Liberec in 1821, where cloth-worker Josef Müller and companions founded an association to give former soldiers some protection against illness and hardship in old age. The mutual insurance function formed the main rationale for all subsequent MVAs. The provinces of Bohemia, Moravia, Upper Austria, Lower Austria and Salzburg saw foundations in the next decades, with an estimated 250 in existence by 1870, following a surge after the wars in 1859 (against Piedmont and France), 1864 (against Denmark) and 1866 (against Prussia and Italy).

In other words, these conflicts laid bare the limitations of the state-run Invalids Fund in covering the needs of all but the most desperate former soldiers, even if they saw important developments in other respects. Influenced by the growing humanitarian movement, the International Committee of the Red Cross was established in 1863 and the war wounded became subject to international law. After its defeat in the 1866 war, the Austrian Empire acceded to the first-ever Geneva Convention of 1864, which mandated care for the sick and wounded on the battlefield from all of its signatories. However, this did not impact directly upon domestic provision for war invalids. Nor did the Habsburg Monarchy have to contend with nearly as high a number of casualties and wounded men as the United States did after the contemporaneous Civil War (1861–1865).⁷⁰ In short, despite some slight alterations to the system in the second half of the century, substantial legislation to provide for ex-serviceman in the Habsburg Monarchy only arose during WWI (see Chapter 2).⁷¹

After the Compromise of 1867, which created the Dual Monarchy of Austria-Hungary, a comprehensive system of universal military conscription for male

citizens between the ages of 19 and 42 came into being, through the Army Laws passed by the respective parliaments in December 1868.⁷² This change, together with the right to freedom of association under the Fundamental Laws of 1867, led to the rapid expansion of MVAs in imperial Austria, as part of the politicization of the petty bourgeoisie and peasantry.⁷³ Primarily a rank-and-file movement, there were around 2,750 MVAs in imperial Austria in 1913, according to official figures. Significantly, MVAs were concentrated in the alpine hereditary lands and the lands of the Bohemian crown, with Bohemia, Moravia and Silesia accounting for 1,757 of this total, as against 961 in the provinces that later formed the Austrian Republic (i.e. excluding Burgenland, but comprising the pre-1918 boundaries of the other provinces). Aside from the provision of mutual insurance, the popularity of MVAs derived from their function as a forum for male sociability in towns and villages across imperial Austria and from the claim by peasant and lower-middle class groups for status recognition in civil society.⁷⁴ As a result, the meaning of 'military veteran' expanded in line with the MVAs becoming a mass movement, with the term in effect including all men who had completed their military service and were organized in associations, irrespective of age or whether they had participated in combat or not.

For the purposes of our study, three points are relevant when considering this legacy for the post-1918 period. Firstly, the growth of MVAs in the Bohemian and Austrian lands reflected the fact that these territories constituted the 'fiscal military core state' in which the financial resources, administration and recruitment for the Habsburg army had developed since the mid-seventeenth century.⁷⁵ By contrast, there was only a weak veterans movement in Hungary, partly due to national-political factors resulting from the 1848/49 revolutions, and partly due to socio-economic conditions in regions that were less prosperous than the more developed Austro-Bohemian provinces. Equally, this derived from a less well-established military tradition in Hungary, which had only been integrated into the Habsburg recruitment system at a later stage. In the northern Hungarian counties, therefore, a veterans movement was barely established in what became the eastern part of Czechoslovakia after the war.⁷⁶ Partly for this reason, the discussion here tends to focus mainly on the Czech territories after 1918.

Secondly, the public, patriotic role of MVAs became a vital, and increasingly prominent, part of their activities from the 1880s onwards, as they participated in dynastic celebrations, public holidays and local commemorations. Nevertheless, in common with civil society as a whole, MVAs became increasingly 'nationalized' by the turn of the century, in the sense that separate 'national' groups of veterans came into being (while not necessarily being 'nationalist' in political terms), such as the Central Committee of Military Veterans Associations in the Kingdom of Bohemia (*Ústřední sbor spolků vojenských vysloužilců v království Českém*), established in 1886.⁷⁷ This development also constituted a rejection of attempts led by German-speaking MVAs and ex-army officers to centralize the veterans

movement in late imperial Austria, which culminated in a 1907 parliamentary bill to create an Imperial-Royal Austrian Soldiers Corps. The bill failed to gain a majority, but the legislation was eventually enacted by decree, on 4 July 1914.⁷⁸

Thirdly, this drive towards centralization meant that the question of military veterans already became highly politicized before 1914 across the Bohemian and Austrian lands, with the Austrian Social Democrats and the Czech Nationalist Socialist party frequently criticizing the government's 'militarism'. As a result, the military hierarchy viewed 'anti-militarists' with deepening suspicion, as potentially 'disloyal elements'.⁷⁹ At the same time, the existence of veterans groups already established a discourse around the rights and duties of former soldiers. MVAs constituted a large interest group in civil society, which increasingly became an object of state policy, if not yet of extensive welfare provision.

In summary, nineteenth-century developments decisively influenced the relationship between ex-soldiers and the state, thus demonstrating the importance of continuities across the dividing line of WWI, something that work on veterans in other European countries has tended to underplay. Despite attempts to distance themselves from the previous regime, the successor states were bequeathed a substantial administrative, legal and economic infrastructure, as (among others) Pieter Judson has cogently argued.⁸⁰

Undoubtedly, the mass warfare of WWI transformed the scale and intensity of this relationship between former soldiers and the state. Still somewhat malleable as a concept, a catch-all definition of 'veteran' might encompass all former soldiers who participated in WWI. In practice, however, there are two forms of 'being a veteran' that are most relevant for our analysis. In the first place, being a veteran was a matter of external attribution, primarily by the state. With wartime governments having assumed obligations to provide for soldiers and their families, the state stipulated who was entitled to benefits, pensions and so on.⁸¹ Accordingly, different categories of veteran existed, depending on the type and length of service, and above all, deriving from medical classification of the wounded and disabled (whether physical or psychological). Moreover, this implied a hierarchy of veterans, depending on which political and national groups fitted into master-narratives of the war's meaning, or how specific status groups viewed themselves (e.g. ex-officers or members of 'elite' regiments). Secondly, veterans were defined by their conscious self-identification as such and their active participation in an organization that recognized them in this way. Most obviously, this comprised MVAs or other associations bringing together former soldiers, such as POW associations, ex-officers clubs and so on.⁸² However, it also included militias or political parties who recognized veterans and accorded them status within their social and cultural practices.⁸³

In this sense, we understand WWI veterans primarily as a construct of state-centred discourses of national belonging, citizenship and welfare benefits, and as conscious social and political actors making claims for recognition and accept-

ance vis-à-vis the state and civil society. Identifying as a veteran was not based solely on past experience, but on the way in which this experience was communicated, interpreted and instrumentalized as a 'valuable sacrifice'. At the same time, however, it is important to recognize the existence of non-organized veterans, those former soldiers who left only sporadic traces in the sources, but still formed an important part of post-1918 society. Some of these men simply merged back into their families and local surroundings, perhaps being indifferent to much of national politics. Others did not embrace the role of 'veteran', but nevertheless engaged in the public sphere and carried the experience of war with them.

Structure of the Book

Taking account of this 'pre-history', our analysis of WWI veterans in Czechoslovakia and Austria follows a chronological approach. Within this framework, we examine key political, social and cultural themes, with some topics ranging outside the general chronological parameters. The first chapter focuses on the period immediately following the armistice of November 1918, which brought an end to conflict between the major belligerents. In practice, this was a period of demobilization *and* re-mobilization, characterized by substantial political change, the establishment of the new states and border disputes. The chapter analyses the interweaving processes of demobilization and the returning home of soldiers from different fronts and of POWs from Russia on the one hand, and the re-mobilization of soldiers for regional border conflicts on the other hand. As well as looking at the differences between coming home to Czechoslovakia or Austria, we describe the initial engagement of war veterans themselves in shaping the new political arenas and the start of their reintegration into society.

The successful demobilization of soldiers required a quick and effective path to integration for soldiers returning home from the war, as well as immediate provision for the needs of those harmed by the war, and for their families. Accordingly, Chapter 2 explores developments in the realm of welfare policy, where governments potentially had considerable leverage to shape the return to peacetime society. In comparing welfare provision between Czechoslovakia and Austria, the chapter explores the respective handling of the legislative framework left by the Habsburg Monarchy, as well as the claims and reactions of welfare recipients, particularly associations of war invalids. Closely related to welfare provisioning, the chapter also discusses medical discourse, conceptions of masculinity, treatment of disabled soldiers and employment measures, which were areas where similarities between government policies and social attitudes are discernible. We discuss how veterans were constructed as a group under law, and how state policy began to differentiate among them, above all regarding entitlements for privileged groups such as the Czechoslovak legionnaires.

If welfare policy and official war narratives constituted areas where the state categorized former soldiers, it was the latter's own definition and representation of their war experiences that defined what being a veteran meant in everyday life. The third chapter thus examines more closely the organization of veterans at a number of levels. Our analysis proceeds from the assumption that positive collective action and the cultivation of a shared memory are fundamental ways of turning wartime experience into a common identity as 'veterans'. Collective self-identification requires not only organizational work, but also a social and political context in which this work can take root. The chapter provides an overview of the different kinds of veterans associations existing in the period after 1918. Adding to the 'traditional' MVAs mentioned above, a plethora of new associations emerged, specifically naming themselves in relation to the war, such as war victims or ex-POW groups. We consider growing lines of tension in the respective countries, e.g. between the federal and provincial governments in Austria, which was reflected in the activities of veterans groups, and between the 'victorious' ethos of the Czechoslovak state and the majority of veterans, who had served in the 'defeated' Austro-Hungarian army. While both republics became consolidated by the mid-1920s, political and economic uncertainties continued to permeate society, so we consider too the nature and extent of veterans' involvement in paramilitary and homeland defence organizations.

Within a post-war order defined by the Paris peace conferences and international agreements, veterans' activities possessed numerous transnational dimensions, which are explored in Chapter 4. One obvious aspect was the cross-border 'veterans question', due to the complex legacy of the Habsburg Monarchy, with – for example – many Czechoslovak former soldiers resident in Austria. Equally, the process of 'civilizing the warriors' constituted not just a crucial challenge for interwar Central European societies, but also for international governance and the maintenance of peace. The chapter thus discusses Austrian and Czechoslovak ex-soldiers' participation in the international veterans movement and various efforts to shape the international order.

Nevertheless, the year 1933 marked an important turning point for both countries, in view of the dismantling of parliamentary democracy in Austria and the shift in government policy towards German nationalist parties in Czechoslovakia, following the advent to power of the National Socialists in neighbouring Germany. The final chapter thus traces the remobilization and instrumentalization of veterans in this period. Although veterans groups in both Austria and Czechoslovakia often displayed clear political sympathies, most of their activities had focused on securing their *raison d'être* via welfare activities. However, the global economic crisis and altered geopolitical circumstances motivated veterans groups to play a more active role, just as state governments sought to increase their influence and control over organizational structures, particularly in Austria under the dictatorial regimes of Dollfuß and Schuschnigg from 1933 onwards. Bound up with all

these issues were state efforts to impose itself upon veterans associations and their memory narratives. In Czechoslovakia, the situation was still more complex, and we explore why many veterans associations in German majority areas moved in a more radical nationalist direction, while others did not. We also discuss how and why ideological polarization occurred among Czechoslovak veterans. The chapter considers external influences on the landscape of veterans in Austria and Czechoslovakia before the international crises provoked by Nazi Germany that overturned the existing state order in the years 1938/39.

Lastly, the conclusion returns to the discussion of WWI veterans in Austria and Czechoslovakia in a wider European context and summarizes our key findings.

Notes

1. János Szabó, 'Ein Österreicher aus Ungarn oder ein Ungar aus Österreich? Zum Lebenswerk von Andreas Latzko', in *KAKANIEN: Aufsätze zur österreichischen und ungarischen Literatur, Kunst und Kultur um die Jahrhundertwende*, eds Eugen Thurner et al. (Budapest-Vienna, 1991), 357–66.
2. Andreas Latzko, *Menschen im Krieg* (3rd reprint, Zürich, 1918). The first French edition had already appeared in 1917, the Swedish and English translations in 1918 (the latter with the title, *Men in War*).
3. *Ibid.*, 172.
4. *Ibid.*, 184.
5. *Ibid.*, 185.
6. *Ibid.*, 199.
7. Andrew Barker, *Fictions from an Orphan State: Literary Reflections of Austria between Habsburg and Hitler* (Rochester, NY, 2012), 23–24.
8. *Ibid.*, 33. See also: Jacques Lajarrige and Kerstin Terler, eds, *Andreas Latzko (1876–1943): Ein vergessener Klassiker der Kriegsliteratur? / Andreas Latzko (1876–1943): Un classique de la littérature du guerre oublié?* (Berlin, 2021).
9. Robert Gerwarth, ed., *Twisted Paths: Europe 1914–1945* (Oxford, 2007).
10. On the need for precisely such a comparative study, see Martin Crotty, Neil J. Diamant and Mark Edele, *The Politics of Veteran Benefits in the Twentieth Century: A Comparative History* (Ithaca-London, 2020), 167.
11. For a jointly produced general history of both countries in the modern era, see Niklas Perzi, Hildegard Schmoller, Ota Konrád and Václav Šmidrkal, eds, *Nachbarn: Ein österreichisch-tschechisches Geschichtsbuch* (Weitra, 2019).
12. Robert Gerwarth, *The Vanquished: Why the First World War Failed to End, 1917–1923* (London, 2016); see also Rudolf Kučera and Ota Konrád, *Paths Out of the Apocalypse: Physical Violence in the Fall and Renewal of Central Europe, 1914–1922* (Cambridge, 2022).
13. Paul A. Hanebrink, *In Defense of Christian Hungary: Religion, Nationalism, and Antisemitism, 1890–1944* (Ithaca, NY, 2009); Béla Bodó, *The White Terror: Antisemitic and Political Violence in Hungary, 1919–1921* (London-New York, 2021).
14. Mark Mazower, *Dark Continent: Europe's Twentieth Century* (London-New York, 1998), 1–39.
15. Mark Cornwall and John Paul Newman, eds, *Sacrifice and Rebirth: The Legacy of the Last Habsburg War* (Oxford-New York, 2016).
16. Laurence Cole, *Military Culture and Popular Patriotism in Late Imperial Austria* (Oxford, 2014), 122.

17. Alan Forrest, 'Napoleonic Veterans and the Challenge of Peace', in *A History of the European Restorations. Vol. 2, Culture, Society and Religion*, eds Michael Broers, Ambrogio Caiani and Stephen Bann (London, 2020), 168–76, here 168.
18. Karen Hagemann, 'Venus and Mars: Reflexionen zu einer Geschlechtergeschichte von Militär und Krieg', in *Landsknechte, Soldatenfrauen und Nationalkrieger: Militär, Krieg und Geschlechterordnung im historischen Wandel*, eds Karen Hagemann and Ralf Pröve (Frankfurt am Main-New York, 1998), 13–48; Alberto Banti, *The Nation of the Risorgimento: Kinship, Sanctity and Honour in the Origins of Unified Italy* (London, 2020), 50–100.
19. Alan Forrest, Karen Hagemann and Jane Rendall, eds, *Soldiers, Citizens and Civilians: Experiences and Perceptions of the Revolutionary and Napoleonic Wars, 1790–1820* (Basingstoke, 2009).
20. Harm-Peer Zimmermann, 'Der feste Wall gegen die rote Flut': *Kriegervereine in Schleswig-Holstein 1864–1914* (Neumünster, 1989); Thomas Rohkrämer, *Der Militarismus der 'kleinen Leute': Die Kriegervereine im Deutschen Kaiserreich 1871–1914* (Munich, 1990).
21. Deborah Cohen, *The War Come Home: Disabled Veterans in Britain and Germany, 1914–1939* (Berkeley, 2001); Sabine Kienitz, *Beschädigte Helden: Kriegsinvalidität und Körperbilder 1914–1923* (Paderborn, 2008); Barbara Bracco, *La patria ferita: I corpi dei soldati italiani e la Grande Guerra* (Florence, 2012); Nils Löffelbein, *Ehrenbürger der Nation: Die Kriegsbeschädigten des Ersten Weltkriegs in Politik und Propaganda des Nationalsozialismus* (Essen, 2013); Jason Crouthamel and Peter Leese, eds, *Psychological Trauma and the Legacies of the First World War* (Basingstoke, 2016).
22. George Mosse, *Fallen Soldiers: Reshaping the Memory of the World Wars* (New York-Oxford, 1990).
23. Alan Kramer, *Dynamic of Destruction: Culture and Mass Killing in the First World War* (Oxford, 2007).
24. Klaus Theweleit, *Männerphantasien*, 2 vols (Frankfurt a.M.-Basel, 1977–1978); Sven Reichardt, *Faschistische Kampfbünde: Gewalt und Gemeinschaft im italienischen Squadrismus und in der deutschen SA* (Cologne, 2002).
25. Wolfgang Schivelbusch, *The Culture of Defeat: On National Trauma, Mourning, and Recovery* (New York, 2003).
26. Béla Bodó, *Pál Prónay: Paramilitary Violence and Anti-Semitism in Hungary, 1919–1922* (Pittsburgh, 2010); Robert Gerwarth and John Horne, 'Vectors of Violence: Paramilitarism in Europe after the Great War, 1917–1923', *Journal of Modern History* 83 (2011): 489–512; Robert Gerwarth and John Horne, eds, *War in Peace: Paramilitary Violence in Europe after the Great War* (New York-Oxford, 2012).
27. Julia Eichenberg, *Kämpfen für Frieden und Fürsorge: Polnische Veteranen des Ersten Weltkriegs und ihre internationalen Kontakte, 1918–1939* (Munich, 2011); John Paul Newman, *Yugoslavia in the Shadow of War: Veterans and the Limits of State Building, 1903–1945* (Cambridge, 2015).
28. Julia Eichenberg and John Paul Newman, eds, *The Great War and Veterans' Internationalism* (Basingstoke, 2013).
29. Amerigo Caruso and Claire Morelon, 'The Threat from Within across Empires: Strikes, Labor Migration, and Violence in Central Europe, 1900–1914', *Central European History* 54 (2021): 86–111; Matteo Millan and Alessandro Saluppo, eds, *Corporate Policing, Yellow Unionism, and Strikebreaking, 1890–1930: In Defence of Freedom* (London-New York, 2021).
30. Compare: Antoine Prost, *Les Anciens combattants et la société française, 1914–1939*, 3 vols (Paris, 1977); Chris Millington, *From Victory to Vichy: Veterans in Inter-War France* (Manchester, 2012).
31. Benjamin Ziemann, *Contested Commemorations: Republican War Veterans and Weimar Political Culture* (Cambridge, 2013). By contrast, Gerd Krumeich has since sought to reiterate the idea

- of the war's outcome amounting to a 'collective trauma', which decisively shaped the Weimar Republic and created strong feelings of hatred and anger in the political sphere, including on the moderate left. See Gerd Krumeich, *Die unbewältigte Niederlage: Das Trauma des Ersten Weltkriegs und die Weimarer Republik* (Freiburg i.B., 2018).
32. Maria Bucur, *Heroes and Victims: Remembering War in Twentieth-Century Romania* (Bloomington, 2009), 49–143.
 33. Newman, *Yugoslavia*.
 34. Jörn Leonhard, *Der überforderte Frieden: Versailles und die Welt 1918–1923* (Munich, 2018), 566–67.
 35. Ángel Alcalde, *War Veterans and Fascism in Interwar Europe* (Cambridge, 2017).
 36. For example, see Jaroslav Pánek, Oldřich Tůma et al., *A History of the Czech Lands*, 2nd ed. (Prague, 2018); Jindřich Dejmek et al., *Československo: Dějiny státu* (Prague, 2018). For a nuanced, panoramic view of interwar Czechoslovakia, see Dagmar Hájková and Pavel Horák, eds, *Republika Československá, 1918–1939* (Prague, 2018).
 37. Zdeněk Kárník, *České země v éře První republiky (1918–1938)*, 3 vols (Prague, 2000–2003).
 38. Jan Fiala, *Rumburská vzpoura* (Prague, 1953); Karel Pichlík, *Vzpoury navrátilců z ruského zajetí na jaře 1918* (Prague, 1964); Vlastimil Vávra, *S hvězdou na čepici: Vzpomínky československých rudoarmějců* (Prague, 1977); Jan Galandauer, *Oblas Velké říjnové socialistické revoluce v české společnosti* (Prague, 1977).
 39. Compare: Dagmar Hájková, Pavel Horák, Vojtěch Kessler and Miroslav Michela, eds, *Sláva republiče! Oficiální svátky a oslavy v meziválečném Československu* (Prague, 2018); Nancy M. Wingfield, 'National Sacrifice and Regeneration: Commemoration of the Battle of Zborov in Multinational Czechoslovakia', in *Sacrifice and Rebirth*, eds Cornwall and Newman, 129–50; Nancy M. Wingfield and Dagmar Hájková, 'Czech-(oslovak) National Commemorations during the Interwar Period: Tomáš G. Masaryk and the Battle of White Mountain Avenged', *Acta Histriae* 18 (2010): 425–52; Andrea Talabér, 'Commemorative Conundrum: The Creation of National Day Calendars in Interwar Czechoslovakia and Hungary', *Bohemia* 56 (2016): 406–36.
 40. Natali Stegmann, 'Soldaten und Bürger: Selbstbilder Tschechoslowakischer Legionäre in der Ersten Republik', *Militär-geschichtliche Zeitschrift* 61 (2002): 25–48; Ivan Šedivý, 'Legionářská republika? K systému legionářského zákonodárství a sociální péče v meziválečné ČSR', *Historie a vojenství* 51, no. 1 (2002): 58–184; Ivan Šedivý, 'Legionáři a mocenské poměry v počátcích ČSR', in *Moc, vliv a autorita v procesu vzniku a utváření meziválečné ČSR (1918–1921)*, eds Jan Hájek et al. (Prague, 2008), 16–28; Jan Michl, *Legionáři a Československo* (Prague, 2009); Katya Kocourek, *Čechoslovakista Rudolf Medek: Politický životopis* (Prague, 2011).
 41. Quinto Antonelli, *I dimenticati della Grande Guerra: La memoria dei combattenti trentini (1914–1920)* (Trento, 2008).
 42. Michl, *Legionáři*, 285.
 43. Martin Zückert, 'Memory of War and National State Integration: Czech and German Veterans in Czechoslovakia after 1918', *Central Europe* 4 (2006): 111–21, here 111.
 44. Libor Nedorost, *Češi v I. světové válce*, 3 vols (Prague, 2006–2007); Vojtěch Dangl, *Pod zástavou císaře a krále (kapitoly z vojenských dějin Slovenska 1848–1914)* (Bratislava, 2009); Josef Fučík, *Generál Podhajský* (Prague-Litomyšl, 2009); Rudolf Kučera, 'Entbehrung und Nationalismus: Die Erfahrung der tschechischen Soldaten der österreichisch-ungarischen Armee 1914–1918', in *Jenseits des Schützengrabens: Der Erste Weltkrieg im Osten: Erfahrung – Wahrnehmung – Kontext*, eds Bernhard Bachinger and Wolfram Dornik (Vienna, 2013), 121–37; Jiří Hutečka, *Men under Fire: Motivation, Morale and Masculinity among Czech Soldiers in the Great War, 1914–1918* (New York-Oxford, 2019).

45. Natali Stegmann, 'Deutsche Kriegsgeschädigte in der Tschechoslowakei', *Bohemia* 48 (2008): 440–63; idem, *Kriegsdeutungen – Staatsgründungen – Sozialpolitik: Der Helden- und Opferdiskurs in der Tschechoslowakei 1918–1948* (Munich, 2009); idem, 'Sozialpolitik und Kriegsdeutungen: Kriegsinvaliden im Spiegel tschechoslowakischer Vorbilder, 1918–1920', in *1918: Model komplexního transformačního procesu?*, eds Lucie Kostrbová and Jana Malínská (Prague, 2010), 203–18; idem, 'Veteran Status and War Victims' Policy in Czechoslovakia from the End of the First World War until the Nineteen-Fifties', *Comparativ* 20, no. 5 (2010): 63–74; idem, 'Social Benefits and the Rhetoric of Peace in Czechoslovak Veteran Organisations', in *The Great War and Veterans' Internationalism*, eds Eichenberg and Newman, 118–35; idem, 'Die Teilhabe des Bundes der Kriegsverletzten, Witwen und Waisen in der Tschechoslowakei an CIAMAC (Conférence Internationale des Associations de Mutilés de Guerre et Anciens Combattants)', in *Politische Strategien nationaler Minderheiten in der Zwischenkriegszeit*, eds Mathias Beer and Stefan Dyroff (Munich, 2013), 241–67; Marek Růžička, *Péče o válečné invalidy v Československu v letech 1918–1938*, PhD thesis, Charles University Prague 2011; Adam Luptak, *Veterans of the Great War in Interbellum Czechoslovakia*, PhD thesis, Oxford University 2020; Jiří Hutečka, 'Kamarádi frontovníci: Maskulinita a paměť první světové války v textech československých c. a k. Veteránů', *Dějiny – Teorie – Kritika*, no. 2 (2014): 231–65; Adam Luptak and John Paul Newman, 'Victory, Defeat, Gender, and Disability: Blind War Veterans in Interwar Czechoslovakia', *Journal of Social History* 53 (2020): 604–19; Jiří Hutečka, "Completely Forgotten and Totally Ignored": Czechoslovak Veterans of the Austro-Hungarian Army and the Transitions of 1918–1919', *Nationalities Papers* 49 (2021): 629–45; Kevin J. Hoepfer, 'Nationalizing Habsburg Regimental Tradition in Interwar Czechoslovakia', *The Hungarian Historical Review* 11 (2022): 169–204. See also the special issue, Laurence Cole, Rudolf Kučera, Hannes Leidinger and Ina Markova, eds, 'World War I Veterans in Austria and Czechoslovakia', *Zeitgeschichte* 47 no. 1 (2020), which presents preliminary results from our research project.
46. Josef Fučík, *Osmadvacátníci: Spor o českého vojáka Velké války 1914–1918* (Prague, 2006); Richard Lein, *Pflichterfüllung oder Hochverrat? Die tschechischen Soldaten Österreich-Ungarns im Ersten Weltkrieg* (Münster, 2011).
47. For transnational approaches to Czechoslovakia's war veterans, see Marcin Jarząbek, *Legioniści i inni: Pamięć zbiorowa weteranów I wojny światowej w Polsce i Czechosłowacji okresu międzywojennego* (Cracow, 2017); John Paul Newman, 'Volunteer Veterans and Entangled Cultures of Victory in Interwar Yugoslavia and Czechoslovakia', *Journal of Contemporary History* 54 (2019): 716–36; Julia Eichenberg and Natali Stegmann, 'Divided by War, United by Welfare: The International Labour Organization Promoting War Invalids' Internationalism', *European Review of History / Revue européenne d'histoire* 29 (2022): 590–613.
48. Barbara Jelavich, *Modern Austria: Empire and Republic, 1815–1986* (Cambridge, 1987), 328–29.
49. Compare: Moritz Csáky and Elena Mannová, *Collective Identities in Central Europe in Modern Times* (Bratislava, 1999); Joachim von Puttkamer, *Ostmitteleuropa im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert* (Munich, 2010).
50. Verena Pawlowsky and Harald Wendelin, *Die Wunden des Staates: Kriegsoffer und Sozialstaat in Österreich 1914–1938* (Vienna, 2015), 13.
51. Newly published works on social policy towards war invalids in Austria only cover the period up to 1925 and 1918, respectively; see Ke-Chin Hsia, *Victims' State: War and Welfare in Austria, 1868–1925* (New York, 2022); Thomas Süssler-Rohringer, *Kriseninduzierte Kontinuität: Soziale Sicherung und die Re-Integration Kriegsversehrter im Habsburgerreich 1880–1918* (Göttingen, 2023). The latter study appeared too late for its findings to be incorporated into this volume.
52. For example, Manfred Rauchensteiner, *Unter Beobachtung: Österreich seit 1918* (Vienna, 2017), 59–63 and 79–84, only briefly touches on these issues in relation to the struggle

- over war remembrance and paramilitarism; John W. Boyer, *Austria, 1867–1955* (Oxford, 2022) does not address them directly. On former officers, see Peter Melichar, 'Die Kämpfe merkwürdig Untoter: K.u.k Offiziere in der Ersten Republik', *Österreichische Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaften* 9, no. 1 (1998): 51–84.
53. Lajos Kerekes, 'Italien, Ungarn und die österreichische Heimwehrebewegung 1928–1931', *Österreich in Geschichte und Literatur mit Geographie* 1 (1965): 1–13; Ludger Rape, *Die österreichischen Heimwehren und die bayerische Rechte 1920–1923* (Vienna, 1977); Francis L. Carsten, *Faschismus in Österreich: Von Schönerer zu Hitler* (Munich, 1977); Clifton Earl Edmondson, *The Heimwehr and Austrian Politics, 1918–1936* (Athens/GA, 1978); Martin Kitchen, *The Coming of Austrian Fascism* (London-Montreal, 1980); Wilhelm Chraska, *Die Heimwehr und die Erste Republik Österreich* (Kiel, 1981); Walter Wiltschegg, *Die Heimwehr: Eine unwiderstehliche Volksbewegung?* (Vienna, 1985).
 54. See the comprehensive overview by Florian Wenninger, 'Dimensionen organisierter Gewalt: Zum militärhistorischen Forschungsstand über die österreichische Zwischenkriegszeit', in *Das Dollfuß-Schuschnigg-Regime 1933–1938: Vermessung eines Forschungsfeldes*, eds Florian Wenninger and Lucille Dreidemy (Vienna, 2013), 493–576. Compare also: Emmerich Tálos and Wolfgang Neugebauer, eds, *Austrofaschismus: Politik – Ökonomie – Kultur 1933–1938* (Vienna, 2005); Günter Bischof, Anton Pelinka and Alexander Lassner, eds, *The Dollfuß / Schuschnigg Era in Austria: A Reassessment* (New Brunswick, 2003).
 55. Hannes Leidinger and Verena Moritz, *Gefangenschaft, Revolution, Heimkehr: Die Bedeutung der Kriegsgefangenenproblematik für die Geschichte des Kommunismus in Mittel- und Osteuropa 1917–1920* (Vienna, 2003).
 56. Werner Suppanz, 'Die italienische Front im österreichischen kollektiven Gedächtnis', in *Österreich-Ungarn und Italien im Ersten Weltkrieg (1914–1918)*, eds Nicola Labanca and Oswald Überegger (Vienna, 2015), 307–30.
 57. Oswald Überegger, *Erinnerungskriege: Der Erste Weltkrieg, Österreich und die Tiroler Kriegserinnerung in der Zwischenkriegszeit* (Innsbruck, 2011), 105–9.
 58. For example Jay Winter, *Remembering War: The Great War between Memory and History in the Twentieth Century* (New Haven, 2006); Arndt Beck and Markus Euskirchen, *Die beerdigte Nation: 'Gefallenen'-Gedenken von 1813 bis heute* (Berlin, 2009).
 59. Hans Schafranek, *Söldner für den 'Anschluss': Die Österreichische Legion 1933–1938* (Vienna, 2011); idem, *Wer waren die niederösterreichischen Nationalsozialisten? Biografische Studien zu NSDAP-Kreisleitern, SA und SS* (St. Pölten, 2020).
 60. Compare: Oscar Halecki, *The Limits and Divisions of European History* (London 1950); Werner Conze, *Ostmitteleuropa: Von der Spätantike bis zum 18. Jahrhundert* (Munich, 1992); Jan Křien, *Dvě století střední Evropy* (Prague, 2005); Ivan T. Bérénd, *History Derailed: Central and Eastern Europe in the Long Nineteenth Century* (Berkeley, 2003); Philipp Ther, 'Deutsche Geschichte als transnationale Geschichte: Überlegungen zu einer Histoire Croisée Deutschlands und Ostmitteleuropas', *Comparativ* 13, no. 4 (2003): 156–81.
 61. Pierre-Yves Saunier, *Transnational History* (Basingstoke, 2013); Margrit Pernau, *Transnationale Geschichte* (Göttingen, 2011).
 62. Hartmut Kaelble, *Der historische Vergleich: Eine Einführung zum 19. und 20. Jahrhundert* (Frankfurt a.M., 1999); Michail M. Krom, *An Introduction to Historical Comparison* (London, 2021).
 63. John Horne, 'The Living', in *The Cambridge History of the First World War. Vol. III, Civil Society*, ed. Jay Winter (Cambridge, 2014), 592–617.
 64. Mark Cornwall, *The Devil's Wall: The Nationalist Youth Mission of Heinz Rutha* (Cambridge, Mass., 2012).

65. Hanns Haas, 'Ein verfehelter Start? Die Anfänge Österreichs 1918 bis 1920', *Zeitgeschichte* 41 (2014): 371–83.
66. Gergely Romsics, *Myth and Remembrance: The Dissolution of the Habsburg Empire in the Memoir Literature of the Austro-Hungarian Political Elite* (Boulder, Co., 2006), 13–49 and 101–38.
67. Helmut Gruber, *Red Vienna: Experiment in Working-Class Culture, 1919–1934* (New York, 1991).
68. Cole, *Military Culture*, 122–23.
69. Hsia, *Victims' State*, 17–27; Ivana Hrobec and Dubravko Habek, 'War Invalids and Disabled Soldiers in the Habsburg Army: The Case of the Đjurdjjevac Regiment in 1860/61', *RAD CASA – Medical Sciences* 540, no. 48–49 (2019): 86–91, here 88.
70. Stephen R. Ortiz, ed., *Veterans' Policies, Veterans' Politics: New Perspectives on Veterans in the Modern United States* (Gainesville, 2012).
71. Verena Pawlowsky and Harald Wendelin, 'Die normative Konstruktion des Opfers: Die Versorgung der Invaliden des Ersten Weltkrieges', in *Glanz – Gewalt – Gehorsam: Militär und Gesellschaft in der Habsburgermonarchie (1800 bis 1918)*, eds Laurence Cole, Christa Hämmerle and Martin Scheutz (Essen, 2011), 359–83.
72. Cole, *Military Culture*, 112–21.
73. *Ibid.*, 126–34.
74. *Ibid.*, 128–33.
75. See the contributions in: Peter Rauscher, ed., *Kriegführung und Staatsfinanzen: Die Habsburgermonarchie und das Heilige Römische Reich vom Dreißigjährigen Krieg bis zum Ende des habsburgischen Kaisertums 1740* (Münster, 2010).
76. Balázs Tangl, 'Military Veterans' Associations in the Kingdom of Hungary (1868–1914)', *The Hungarian Historical Review* 11 (2022): 71–104. More generally, see Carol Skalnik Leff, *National Conflict in Czechoslovakia: The Making and Remaking of a State, 1918–1987* (Princeton, 1988), 11–41.
77. Cole, *Military Culture*, 140–54.
78. *Ibid.*, 268–307.
79. *Ibid.*, 287–99.
80. Pieter M. Judson, *The Habsburg Empire: A New History* (Cambridge, Mass., 2016), 442–52.
81. Ke-Chin Hsia, 'Who Provided Care for Wounded and Disabled Soldiers? Conceptualizing State-Civil Society Relationship in WWI Austria', in *Other Fronts, Other Wars? First World War Studies on the Eve of the Centennial*, eds Joachim Bürgschwentner, Matthias Egger and Gunda Barth-Scalmani (Leiden, 2014), 303–28.
82. Julia Eichenberg, 'Veterans' Associations', in *1914–1918-Online. International Encyclopedia of the First World War*, eds Ute Daniel, Peter Gatrell, Oliver Janz, Heather Jones, Jennifer Keene, Alan Kramer and Bill Nasson, issued by Freie Universität Berlin, Berlin 2014-10-08. DOI: 10.15463/ie1418.10270.
83. Alcalde, *War Veterans*.