

INTRODUCTION



Czech Soldiers in the First World War

Anglophone histories of the First World War are not usually very balanced when it comes to covering the respective participants, fronts and battlefields. While the proverbial ‘Flanders Fields’ of the Western Front have been subjected to repeated analytical efforts, most other areas of operations, as well as many of the participating countries, have received substantially less attention. Barring specific moments such as the very beginning of the war in the case of Austria-Hungary and the Balkans, the Gallipoli Campaign in the case of Turkey, and the Bolshevik Revolution in Russia, even key powers are left on the fringes of the great drama that mostly plays out, both in terms of the general narrative as well as deeper analysis, in France, Germany and Great Britain.¹ East-Central Europe and its experience of the war is one of the many casualties of this discourse, which may be surprising given the importance Austria-Hungary and Central Europe had for the world events in the twentieth century.²

The western part of the future Czechoslovakia, known in 1914 as the Bohemian Crown Lands and comprising of the historical lands of Bohemia, Moravia and a small part of Silesia, is no exception to this treatment. Neither are the roughly 1,500,000 men from these lands who went to fight in some of the war’s bloodiest battles in the ranks of (initially) twenty-four k.u.k. infantry regiments,³ some of them with a tradition reaching back to the aftermath of the Thirty Years’ War, sixteen k.k. regiments of *Landwehr* infantry,⁴ sixteen k.k. *Landsturm* (militia), nine *jäger* (light infantry) battalions, fifteen cavalry regiments, numerous artillery units, as well as innumerable support and staff units, and most of the ships of the *Kaiserliche und Königliche Kriegsmarine*. There are no exact statistics on how many of them were Czech by identity, as nationality as a category did not exist in the official Austrian census, which only recorded the language of everyday use (*Umgangssprache*). As a consequence, particularly the population of multilingual areas often lacked a clear-cut identity based on the national idea.⁵ Also, the Austro-Hungarian military, as a consciously supranational dynastic institution,

did not have any separate categories for ethnic or even linguistic groups, and its administrative entities did not always conform to the land borders. Consequently, we may only estimate that from the above quoted number – itself an estimate – about two-thirds of the troops were predominantly Czech-speaking, as this conforms to the percentage of the population that defined itself as Czech-speaking in the supposedly ‘Czech’ Lands.⁶ This book is their story in the First World War of 1914–18.

The historiography of the Czech soldier during the First World War has so far usually suffered from a simplification often bordering on stereotyping, with the debate being framed by the lens of nationalism. According to the traditional consensus, Czech-speaking soldiers serving in the Austro-Hungarian military enlisted only because they were forced to do so, most of them supposedly thoroughly despised the war on the side of the Habsburgs, particularly one against their Serb and Russian Slavic brethren, and they spent their time in service either trying to desert or sabotaging the imperial war effort through decidedly lacklustre military performance. In general histories, they are often defined as ‘passive supporters of Russia’, always on the verge of ‘mutinies’ and ‘large-scale desertions’, or at least ‘popular demonstrations’.⁷ Two recent projects summarizing contemporary First World War scholarship, when mentioning Czechs outside of the developments leading towards an independent Czechoslovakia, similarly point to disputable loyalty, ‘mass surrenders’ and ‘national conflict’ as key topics regarding this particular minority in the ethno-linguistic patchwork of the monarchy.⁸ At best, the Czech subjects of Franz Joseph I were defined as ‘ambivalent patriots’, and even a respected expert in Central European history such as Mark Cornwall once wrote about the ‘underlying apathy or hostility towards the war effort’ among Czechs.⁹

While there is certainly some grain of truth in these qualifying judgements, it must be asked why it is that Czechs, out of all the minorities of Austria-Hungary, became a prime symbol both of disloyalty and passive national resistance to state power. As Mark Cornwall recently noted, ‘the evidence suggests some opportunism on the part of Czech politicians, but also some real Czech commitment to Austria which later accounts tried to conceal’.¹⁰ It is these ‘later accounts’ that need to be seen as the main source of the ‘disloyal Czechs’ paradigm, which closely reflected the need of the postwar societies and political entities of Central Europe. On the one hand, in its own variant of the *Dolchstoßlegende*, Austrian conservative historiography found it easy to continue the trend already established by Austrian-German politicians and partially by the Army High Command during the war, blaming not only the disintegration but also the very military defeat of the old empire on its national minorities. In this particular form of the ‘blame game’, Czechs were always popular as ‘usual suspects’ and there was little need to change this view after the war was over.¹¹

Even more important was the fact that this interpretation fitted very well into the national myth of the newly created Czechoslovak Republic. The country based its origins firmly in the ‘foreign action’ of its first president, Tomáš G. Masaryk, and other wartime exiles, as well as, in military terms, in the Czechoslovak Legion, a 90,000-strong army of expatriate Czechs (and Slovaks) and former Austrian prisoners of war (POWs), which fought successfully on the Eastern Front and saw some action in Italy and also in France, serving the exiles as a primary propagandistic tool in their push for independence.¹² After the establishment of Czechoslovakia, the dominant discourse of the war sought to legitimize the new statehood as a part of a worldwide ‘fight for liberty’, and the experience of the Legion, barring its radical elements, became the cornerstone of the official founding myth.¹³ However, the war experience of the majority of the Czech-speaking population (the large German and Magyar minorities of Czechoslovakia notwithstanding) differed starkly from this discourse, as 90 per cent of the Czechs who fought in the war did so in the Habsburg uniform on the battlefields of the Balkans, in Galicia, northern Italy, France, in the Mediterranean Sea and even in Palestine, and more than 160,000 men from Bohemia, Moravia and Austrian Silesia lost their lives in the process.¹⁴ Thus, an essential discontinuity between myth and reality had emerged, and the need to bridge it came to the fore. The image of Czechs as coerced malingerers, deserters and traitors, which the government in exile embraced for the purposes of political propaganda during the war, was a welcome solution that enabled the majority of the nation to reinterpret their past in nationally acceptable terms. In the early postwar years, this quickly became accepted as the mainstream – and thoroughly positive – version of the nation’s participation in the monarchy’s war effort, and the soldiers’ past became the subject of substantial reinterpretation.¹⁵ As a part of this process, several instances of mass surrenders of Czech-dominated units, such as the infamous ‘crossing of the lines’ by the k.u.k. Infantry Regiment 28, which supposedly went into Russian captivity ‘with the band playing’ in April 1915, became a legend that was inseparable from historical reality.¹⁶ Supported by the ever-increasing popularity of Jaroslav Hašek’s famous anti-war novel *The Good Soldier Švejk* (1921–23), which – again in a unified effort of Czech and German readership – soon became reinterpreted as a further self-evident example of Czech attitudes towards Austria and military service, the image of Czechs as anti-Austrian ‘Švejks’ became forever entrenched in the historical memory and spread worldwide.¹⁷ In the Czech historical writing, little changed over the years, as the historiography of the communist era resulted only in a shift regarding the motivation of the disloyal attitude of Czechs from nationalism towards class struggle, with the resulting image remaining the same.¹⁸ After 1989, the ‘nationalistic’ interpretation re-emerged and while it was, particularly in popular historiography, confronted with substantial efforts to ‘rehabilitate’ the image of Czechs as loyal soldiers of the monarchy and reject the ‘Švejk’ imagery, it

remained strong in the public discourse as well as in the historical writing.¹⁹ As a consequence, Czech historical writing on the military experience of the First World War was caught in an unproductive, analytically barren, never-ending discursive loop of debate that has hardly changed in the past one hundred years and has brought little in terms of an understanding that would go beyond the few competing images.

Fortunately, there are several exceptions to the rule in Central European historiography, which at least enable us to escape the limiting constraints of this eternal argument and to see the issue in a different light. It was Ivan Šedivý who, in his now classical synthesis of the history of the Bohemian Lands in 1914–18, concluded that the traditional discourse had all too often mistaken anti-war feelings, exhaustion and economic despair for nationally motivated resistance, ignoring the all-important process of change that occurred in this area over the course of the war.²⁰ Martin Zückert has identified the small but vocal group of political radicals around the prewar Czech National Socialist Party as the source of the popular image of the anti-war and anti-Austrian Czech.²¹ In an unpublished thesis that unfortunately still remains the most thorough analysis of the mobilization in Bohemia, David Pazdera has argued that while Czech soldiers did not go to war with much enthusiasm, they were steadfast in their determination to do their duty, hoping that the war would be over soon.²² Rudolf Kučera, in his short essay on the issue of loyalty of Czech soldiers in the war, has identified a gradual shift from class to national loyalties, brought about by increasingly desperate material conditions and other perceived injustices of the wartime service, as instrumental in the decline in the combat-worthiness of Czech-speaking troops.²³ And finally, Richard Lein thoroughly analysed the above-mentioned ‘affair’ of the 28th Infantry as well as a similar case of the 75th and 35th Infantry Regiments at Zborov in 1917, concluding that more than anything else, the spectacular failures of these Czech-dominated units were the result of botched command decisions on the part of the Austro-Hungarian command structure, as well as inexperience and general exhaustion, and showed that the subsequent interpretation was a result of immediate superiors trying to find a scapegoat for their own blunders. This led to some highly politicized and public decisions of the Army High Command that, rather ironically, gave ammunition both to Austrian-German nationalists and Czech politicians in exile to claim that all Czechs were traitors after all.²⁴

Goals and Methods

What most of these texts have in common, and what inspired the original idea behind this book, is that they, each in its own way, try to overcome the shortcoming that is common to most historical writing on the issue. The discourse

defined by the dual framework of loyalty and national identity seems to be so powerful as to overshadow all other considerations. As a consequence, the men who went to war speaking Czech have always been studied as *Czechs* first and foremost, only rarely as *soldiers* and never as *men*. The immodest goal of this text is to invert this logic and shed a completely new light through a lens never used before, one rarely used in military history in general. The core of our analysis will rest with the elementary identity of the Czech soldier, the fact that he defined himself as a *he* – a man. Only then will the focus shift on the way in which this *primary* identity influenced the way these men experienced their *soldiering*, i.e. their attitudes and motivations towards their participation in warfare. And as it is impossible to completely overlook the topic of national identity in a discussion of Czech soldiers' morale and motivation, we will ultimately try to find a link between these two analytical frameworks and the ever-present issue of *Czech* national self-identification and loyalty.

The traditional 'neverending debate about the Czech soldier in the Great War' will therefore be ultimately approached here, only this time through methods so far ignored or underused, in the firm belief that it will help to forge a new path in understanding men in war and those in Czech history in particular. It will be argued, over the course of this book, that masculinity, particularly the way in which ordinary men turned soldiers experienced it, indeed played an important role in the way in which these men experienced the war as such, and that in turn, war had profound effect on their understanding of their masculine self. It will be claimed that while specific understanding of masculine ideals led men to war, the same war had ultimately subverted the basic concepts of modern masculinity through its upsetting everyday realities and practices. As a result, a strong connection between the notions of masculinity and military morale will be established, and, using the specifics of the Czech case, it will be shown that the inherent instability of this connection may have had serious repercussions regarding the soldiers' motivation and even political loyalty, when a crisis of wartime masculine experience opened a path to alternative loyalties and notions of self-identification, based on refuting the war along with the state that made men to take part in it.

To fulfil this rather ambitious thesis, several intertwined questions will have to be answered first. In his summary of the recent historiography of the First World War, Alan Kramer noted that much recent writing is inspired by, among other factors, the following question: 'what enabled men to mobilise for war and endure it for so long?'²⁵ In this regard, historiography is traditionally torn between 'coercion' and 'consent', and while it needs to be acknowledged that the overall motivational framework incorporates both in a myriad of combinations, our focus here will be primarily on 'consent'. In his study of coercion and consent in the French army, Leonard Smith has rightly criticized the tendency to see consent as a creation of external pressures, as it relieves the men of any individual

will or agency, and removes the possibility for their position in the system to be negotiated.²⁶ However, in social analysis, the general assumption is that human beings primarily operate within the framework of pre-existing structures and meanings that define their position *before* it may be renegotiated through individual experience and agency, which may then lead to changes in the structures and meanings in question. For us, therefore, even active consent is contingent upon the underlying cultural and social framework, as even free will does not exist in a void. Our analysis will be concerned primarily with that framework, as it will focus on the very core of the question posed by Kramer – the fact that we are talking about *men* – and it will be asked whether the social experience and construction of *manhood* had any bearing on the way in which men understood their plight.

The key issue of our study will therefore be masculinity, which forms one part of the ‘constitutive element of social relationships based on perceived differences between the sexes’, as Joan W. Scott defined gender in her famous essay on its ‘usefulness for historical analysis’. She also added that gender is ‘a primary way of signifying relationships of power ... a primary field within which or by means of which power is articulated’.²⁷ While in Czech historiography this concept has long been sidelined in favour of the more traditionally oriented women’s history, only establishing itself firmly in the past decade and a half, historical writing elsewhere had a head start and, as early as the late 1980s, turned its attention not only to the limited ‘new men’s studies’, but also to the study of masculinity (or manliness) as a previously ‘hidden’ social category.²⁸ In other words, historians turned to what it *meant*, from the point of view of both society and the individual, to be a man. The Australian sociologist R.W. Connell’s theory of *hegemony* in gender relations, defining hegemonic masculinity as the pillar of patriarchal power, was soon adopted as a key analytical framework.²⁹ In this theory, inspired by Gramsci’s model of cultural hegemony in class relations, Connell assumes a whole series of ‘inherently historical’ masculinities to exist in any given human society, whose ‘making and remaking is a political process affecting the balance of interests in society and the direction of social change’. Of the manifold masculinities present in a given gender order, one is always seen as ‘hegemonic’, i.e. one that ‘is not a fixed character type ... rather, [one] that occupies the hegemonic position in a given pattern of gender relations, a position always contestable’. Masculinities therefore always form a hierarchy that is ‘inherently historical’. Their relations are ‘historically mobile’, but always based on the positions of hegemony, subordination, complicity or marginalization (‘deviance’). The primary purpose of this structure is the distribution of social power, with hegemonic masculinity ensuring the actors the best and most direct access to the ‘patriarchal dividend’, entailing symbolic power over other men and particularly over femininity, i.e. persons defined as women.³⁰ Even though the concept has been repeatedly

criticized and consequently re-adjusted, the basic thesis arguing for the existence of historical masculinities, one of them situated in a hegemonic but ever contested, challenged and dynamically changing position has remained.³¹ As such, it has inspired a new field of study that has spread successfully throughout the historical profession in the past two decades.³²

Surprisingly, however, this inspiring process all but bypassed the field of military history, particularly in the Czech Republic, where the historiography of warfare has mostly devolved into a methodological emptiness of descriptive positivism, with little reflection of contemporary trends.³³ While it is possible to agree with Rudolf Kučera, who, in his recent summary of the current state of research on masculinities and twentieth-century world wars, argues that ‘it is the phenomenon of modern total war in men and men in modern total wars ... which enables us to fulfil the potential’ offered by masculinity as an analytical category, his call remains unanswered by his colleagues.³⁴ Ironically, the only inspiring treatment of the issue when it comes to the First World War in Bohemia and Moravia – albeit not military history – comes from the same author, who devotes one chapter of his study of wartime industrial workers to the important issue of working-class masculine identity under the pressures of the changing economy and ensuing shifts in the gender order.³⁵

However, the discursive gap between the study of gender and the study of warfare is also apparent within the wider context of European historiography. Staying with the example of Central Europe in the First World War, we find plenty of studies dealing with the issue of gender. Yet, they generally tend to approach the issue from the point of view of either women or the gender order viewed through the home/front relationship, or its symbolic frontiers such as female nursing. At best, they address the temporality any re-alignment to the ‘double helix’ of gender relations, as in the famous essay by Margaret and Patrice Higonnet in 1987, where the authors argue that whatever radical shifts occur in wartime, subsequent social pressures will always ensure that masculinity will return to its hegemonic position.³⁶ The situation is not so different from the broader perspective either – the recently published collection of essays summarizing the current research on ‘gender and the Great War’ is rather exceptional in that it actually includes a chapter (albeit one in thirteen) on ‘gender and warfare’, where Susan Grayzel portrays men and their masculinity mostly as victims of modern military technologies.³⁷ Similarly, the vast majority of part II of volume 7 of the recent massive history of the First World War edited by Jay Winter deals with the issue of women and femininity in the war, while only one chapter by Joanna Bourke comes close to the essence of warfare when it deals with ‘gender roles in the killing zones’.³⁸ The tendency to conflate the study of gender in wartime with the issues relational to femininity or sexuality is nothing particularly new, as it has always been prevalent even in works dealing directly with the combatants’ experience.³⁹ As often happens in the social and cultural

study of warfare, it almost seems as if gender identities fall silent when the firing starts, the combatants almost being ungendered as a result.

The rather limited connection between military history and gender history is particularly surprising if one realizes how extremely gendered the social and cultural institution of warfare has always been.⁴⁰ As anthropologies of war have long been telling us, ‘war is not merely action ... It is a condition of and between societies, with innumerable correlates in virtually every dimension of culture’.⁴¹ As argued by John Lynn in his inspiring study of combat and culture, war is indeed a continuation of culture by other means.⁴² It is therefore obvious that an important cultural category such as masculinity is impossible to ignore when studying warfare. Studying war experience without reflecting masculinity is problematic because in most known cultures, war is seen as being closely related to the performance of qualities defined as masculine. The idea of organized armed conflict is often ‘gendered’ into the notion of ‘military masculinity’ – a system of values that defines manliness through legalized violence against other groups.⁴³ Among these values, specific character traits come to the fore – personal courage, self-sacrifice for the greater good, and internalized fear of social shame in the case of failure.⁴⁴ Many of the characteristics of military masculinity may also be culturally specific, changing over time and place – while some military masculinities extol violent aggression, pride and individual skill in killing, others may value blind obedience, discipline and collective spirit the most, while for some, trickery and a cloak-and-dagger approach is preferred; the number of combinations is perhaps infinite. Institutionalized through written or unwritten rules of militaries, mercenary bands or warrior classes, these values serve as a mirror against which manliness is measured by institutions, peer-groups or whole societies, particularly in wartime.

In European culture, military masculinity has always had a complicated relationship with the hegemonic gender structures, and in the modern era it has usually been far from constituting their integral part. There are plenty of historical examples where military masculinity had been relegated to a marginalized or, at best, complicit status at the very edge of the social hierarchy, while the hegemonic image of manliness hardly included any of its traditional traits. However, because masculinity is by nature a fluid, dynamic construct, always contested and open to rapid change, events such as suddenly perceived danger to the group may cause the hegemonic masculinity to adopt some or all of the characteristics of military masculinity, therefore militarizing itself and pushing previously marginalized or even shunned values into the spotlight of social discourse, preference and adulation. Looking at the numerous cultural studies of manliness, it actually seems that for the most part, military masculine traits and behavioural patterns generally tend to exist ‘in the background’ of hegemonic structures, only being ‘activated’ from time to time, sometimes for years, sometimes for decades. We may well agree with Christopher Forth, who

once argued in favour of the idea that the man-warrior image was the most enduring and persistent ‘residual element’, occupying a position at the very roots of European hegemonic masculinities long after warfare ceased to be the *raison d’être* of European elite manhood.⁴⁵ Siniša Malešević too sees traits such as physical courage, endurance, strength and skill, and honour as cultural mainstays of masculinity with strong roots in the ‘warrior ethos’.⁴⁶ And, finally, John Tosh includes the concept of man as a ‘protector’ in his list of specific ‘numerous relatively constant and resilient gender structures’, one that he succinctly defines as ‘the gender *longue durée*’ of European culture.⁴⁷ Consequently, while early twentieth-century European society may have encompassed a number of ‘hegemonic masculinities’ depending on a divide of class, urban or rural origin, or cultural background, some of them radically rejecting the militarized notion of masculinity, the very individual characteristics that made up the core of this notion have always been in an ambivalent but close relationship to most of these hegemonic discourses. In a way, warfare has always been the ‘backstage’ of socially construed manhood.⁴⁸

The ‘discursive gap’ between the study of war and the study of *men at war* is so endemic and prominent that several noted historians have actually commented on the need for more reflection on the issue, often in connection with the already four-decades-old phenomenon of ‘new military history’. In 1997, John Lynn identified ‘the promise of gender history’ in his essay on ‘the embattled future of military history’, analysing the danger of it being forever sidelined by cultural and social studies. In particular, he argued that ‘there is much to be said about [masculinity in war], and it will come out most clearly in discussing combat’ and even went on to say that ‘in this sense, gender could be really sexy’.⁴⁹ Leo Braudy, in his sweeping study of the relationship between war and masculinity, argued the same, seeing warfare and masculine identity as fluid but tightly interconnected social constructs with a common history that goes back for millennia.⁵⁰ Joanna Bourke has acknowledged the importance of masculinity in studying war both in her own work on killing in combat and in her summary of ‘new military history’, where she has identified ‘the specifically masculine nature of war’ as a particularly important issue.⁵¹

When it comes to the First World War, it is particularly the analysis of gendered war remembrance that had entered the historical discourse with the works of authors such as Klaus Theweleit or George L. Mosse.⁵² It was Mosse who saw ‘the warrior image of masculinity’ as an elementary part of masculine identity ‘since the French revolution and the Napoleonic Wars’.⁵³ In her summary of German historiography of gender and war, Christa Hämmerle also identified the study of masculinity as an integral part of the ‘new debate’ on military institutions and practices, and actually used the discourse surrounding the notion of ‘war experience’ as an example.⁵⁴ However, it is her short essay on the possible uses of Connell’s concept of hegemonic masculinity that must

receive the most attention here, as it introduces this theorem to the study of the Austro-Hungarian military.

Subscribing to the notion of masculinity as a dynamic process reproducing social hierarchies and power, Hämmerle pinpoints several areas where Connell's theory might be particularly useful for historical analysis and where the notion of universal military service, introduced in 1868, connected with the discourse of manliness: first, she identifies the army in the prewar era as an institution deeply interested in producing 'full men', offering an 'education in manhood' through compulsory military service; second, she argues that while men were 'complicit' to an extent with this view, their civilian economic and social status still took precedence in their self-perception of their own position in the masculine hierarchy, and 'military masculinity', which included defining 'manly' bodily forms through the army's evaluation of the physical fitness of its recruits, was mostly confined to the social space of the military; third, she states that in the social space of 'active' service, which for most men meant a three- or later two-year training period upon reaching twenty-one years of age, masculinity constituted a key identity formed through the process of symbolic feminization and subsequent 'masculinization' of the recruits who were instilled (through body-reflexive practices ranging from drill to sexualization) with the notion of 'full manhood' they were supposed to represent in opposition to everything civilian; and, fourth, she concludes that in Austria-Hungary, the complicated nature of the state and the body politic prevented the process described as 'militarizing of hegemonic masculinity' typical of countries such as France or Germany in the prewar years, as military service carried many different meanings for different groups in the monarchy. Only with the beginning of the war in 1914, finally, did the moment come when hegemonic and military masculinities became aligned in the public discourse, rallying behind the idea of 'true men' fighting for 'God, the Emperor and the Fatherland'.⁵⁵

This is the moment when Christa Hämmerle concluded her outline and is also the moment when our application of Connell's theory falls in, hoping to analyse both the way in which the war changed the individual experience of manliness and the way in which 'the category of gender intertwined with other categories such as age, ethnicity, or religion'⁵⁶ to produce new social hierarchies specific for wartime and pertinent to the ultimate goal of all military institutions: fighting. What results is an analysis of the Czech military experience of the First World War through the lens of a history of masculinities, one that hopes to methodologically elevate the current debate on this particular issue, as well as to alleviate some of the criticism raised by Jeremy Black against the inability of gender analysis to 'offer more to the issue of military capability'.⁵⁷ In this context, the question posed above – what enabled men to mobilise for war and endure it for so long – will have to be supplemented by a set of supporting questions that also need to be answered – how did the Czech men in the uniforms of Austria-

Hungary experience their masculinity and the way it was influenced by the war? How did the war, mobilization and frontline service connect to their perception of themselves as men? What exactly did they imagine under the category of masculinity in relation to their military duties? How did they experience the interaction of various masculinities and femininities amidst the shockwaves of the wartime gender order? How did the war influence their perception of the gender order as a whole? And, last but not least, returning to the ‘neverending debate about the Czech soldier’, did this experience of one’s own masculine identity in war influence the men’s motivation to enlist and fight for the Habsburg Empire and, if so, how? Put simply, what did it mean *to be a man in war* for Czech soldiers, and how did it influence their attitudes, behaviour, feelings and morale?

Study along these lines would obviously not be possible without reflecting upon the broader issue of military morale and motivation, which has long been a subject of interest in the rather specific field of military history. It all started with Ardant du Picq, a colonel of the French infantry in the late 1860s who saw battle as a conflict of individuals, small groups, and their discipline and morale.⁵⁸ Later, in the twentieth century, the problem of individual morale and motivation became an important part of the military discourse. Shortly after the end of the Second World War, the British First World War military surgeon Lord Moran published an influential essay on courage, and J. Glenn Gray, himself a veteran of the U.S. Italian campaign of 1943 to 1945, soon added an insightful analysis of the psychology of the combat soldier.⁵⁹ In the late 1940s, a heavily researched sociological study by Samuel A. Stouffer and his team on the ‘hearts and minds’ of the GIs during the Second World War appeared,⁶⁰ as did the much shorter and more controversial work by S.L.A. Marshall on the same,⁶¹ both of which influenced similar later works such as the classical study of morale in the *Wehrmacht* by Edward Shils and Morris Janowitz.⁶² It took a few decades for this debate to trickle down into the field of military history, where it took a firm hold after Richard Holmes published his seminal work, offering a sweeping historical perspective on human behaviour not only in combat, but also in military service in general, with heavy emphasis on the First World War.⁶³

Turning our attention to this conflict, much has been said about the groundbreaking study of battle by John Keegan, which included a brief analysis of the motivational factors that caused British troops to walk slowly towards the German trenches on the Somme on 1 July 1916.⁶⁴ In parallel with Holmes, Tony Ashworth’s sociologically minded study analysed the ‘live and let live’ system of the Western Front, arguing – among other points – that the ‘masculine code of behaviour’ played a part in compelling men to ‘perform in combat roles’.⁶⁵ A decade later, Leonard Smith applied the Foucaultian theory of proportionality to the power relations in the French army in order to explain how the soldiers’ attitudes shifted on a scale ‘between mutiny and obedience’ in accordance with the pressure from above and the situation in the lines.⁶⁶ The same author also

took on the subject of the soldiers' narrative of the war experience, with emphasis placed on the notion that willing consent (i.e. positive internal motivation) indeed played an important role in soldiers' motivation.⁶⁷ His claim was part of a longstanding argument and went against the belief held by mostly German historians like Wilhelm Deist or Anne Lipp, who argued – at least with regard to the German experience – that men were more or less coerced into combat by the combination of harsh discipline, propaganda and symbolic concessions made by the army to alleviate their condition, with thousands of them ending up shirking their service by the end of the war.⁶⁸ In a similar vein, Benjamin Ziemann concluded that the ability to acquire additional supplies from home, the variability of frontline exposure, fear of punishment, regular furloughs and readily available escape in the form of strong Catholic faith were key factors in the cohesion of German troops originating from rural areas of southern Germany.⁶⁹

When Alexander Watson went on to add to this debate with his inspiring comparative study of British and German armies on the Western Front, he concluded that 'contrary to the impression given by some historiography, neither resilience nor collapse was the norm among men' of both armies, their motivation being fuelled by 'a combination of societal influences, military factors and human psychological defence mechanisms' and supported by propaganda, pre-existing beliefs and ideology, as well as primary group loyalty.⁷⁰ Watson actually comes close to admitting that masculinity and gender identity played an invisible role in motivating men as a part of the 'societal influences' underlining the overall consent with the military role, but like all the authors mentioned above, he does not dwell on the issue much more.⁷¹ And the same is true for Benjamin Ziemann's most recent addition to the debate, which analyses 'forms of violence and the willingness to perpetrate it' on the part of the German soldiers – while he identifies 'male fundamentalism' as a form of postwar masculine discourse celebrating military action and violence, he consciously eschews any effort at studying the 'gendering of violence' in the First World War, noting its 'infancy' in the context of research on the German army.⁷²

Listing important works on military morale and motivation, we have yet to mention one that is of key importance for this text. Its author is John Lynn and the work in question is his seminal study of the French revolutionary army between 1791 and 1794, where he presents us with a conveniently structured 'model of combat effectiveness'.⁷³ According to Lynn, this effectiveness is a product of numerous factors, both consensual and coercive, which ensure that the men ultimately reach the fighting area and engage in combat in the most effective way possible. As a part of this theory, Lynn postulates a structured model of soldiers' motivation itself, identifying three separate phases: initial (enlisting the men into the army), sustaining (keeping them in the ranks throughout training, unit movements and the long periods of waiting), and combat (making sure the men will actually fight when facing mortal danger). In our analysis of soldiers'

gender identity, this motivational structure will be used as a framework that will help us to bridge two methodological worlds: that of a gender analysis of Central European societies in wartime; and that of the ongoing debates over soldiers' experience of modern warfare and the First World War in particular. It will also enable us to cover the basic experiences Czech soldiers would have had.

To follow this intent, Chapter 1 is devoted to the initial motivation of the men upon entering their wartime service, be it in 1914 or later. Attention is given here to the issue of the gender 'remapping' of the monarchy's social space and the synthesis of hegemonic and previously compliant/marginalized military masculinities, all in an effort to explain the surprising ease with which Czech men were mobilized for the Habsburg war effort. The accompanying shifts in the social hierarchy, interpreted within the context of the theory of patriarchal dividend, are what gives the chapter its title, as the process is seen as a collective *tournament of manliness*.

While the analysis of soldiers' initial motivation fits into one chapter, the sustaining motivation as defined by Lynn covers not just most of any soldier's time in service, but also most of the book, spanning four chapters in the process. As a result, Chapter 2 deals primarily with the most elementary factors of a soldier's material and physical existence, such as weather, fatigue, shelter, supply or sexuality, defining the resulting issues as endless *compromises of manliness* that slowly but gradually took away the sense of power and control from the men. Chapter 3 then takes inspiration from the study of military comradeship, which Thomas Kühne has defined as a highly gendered social concept requiring a *transformation of manliness* for the men to be able to accommodate their close homosocial coexistence and emotionality into the framework of military primary groups, therefore maintaining control over their experience of masculinity.⁷⁴ The analysis as presented in Chapter 4 focuses on the process of gradual *degradation of manliness*, caused mostly by the dysfunctional power relations Czech soldiers had with the Austro-Hungarian authorities, particularly on the symbolic level. As we will see, the individual experience of relative loss of power and status, as well as the restructuring of masculine hierarchies, all came into play here, eventually conspiring against both Czech soldiers' sustaining motivation, consent and, consequently, combat-effectiveness. Finally, Chapter 5 follows the various *venues of manliness* in which masculinity had to be performed in order to achieve or maintain hegemonic status. Taking inspiration for this framework from John Tosh, the chapter analyses both the importance of home for the men's 'emotional survival' and their gradual inability to perform their masculine roles both there and at the front, with the accompanying sense of losing power and control in both of those arenas, efforts to restore at least a semblance of normalcy notwithstanding.

The final chapter, Chapter 6, takes the reader, along with our subjects the soldiers, out of the liminal space of sustaining motivation into the symbolic

space that gives meaning to the whole war experience – to battle. Here, combat motivation as defined by Lynn takes over, rooted mostly in emotions such as fear in group dynamics, but even here gendered undertones are identifiable. Combat itself is analysed from the standpoint of masculine identity, and the various fears it brings about are connected to the soldiers' perceptions of manliness. The issue of bodily deformation or outright catastrophic destruction through the actions of modern weaponry is also analysed here, as it is not just the soldier who comes *under fire*, but also his masculinity, both in the socially psychological meaning and in the way in which the body is experienced in terms of losing control of its limits and shape.

Looking at the structure of the book, a unifying theme runs through it like a red line connecting all the angles chosen to analyse Czech soldiers' war experience – namely the process of losing power and control over various aspects of existence. As we have noted above, power projected into control is the key to understanding both the gender order in general and the hegemonic masculinity concept in particular. Thomas Kühne further argues that masculine identity is not just a system of cultural patterns and discourses; it is also their reproduction in social practice as well as a subjective process, an experience that produces power. If the ability to exercise power, or the perception of thereof, is seriously breached, the whole symbolic system that forms the primary basis for this power starts to fall apart.⁷⁵ Moreover, within the social context, power means the ability to control affairs and events in one's surroundings in terms of social relations, physical conditions and the fulfilment of one's real or perceived needs. When it comes to soldiers, it may be a process similar to the one described by Rudolf Kučera in his analysis of the politics and practices of the wartime working class in Bohemia. Kučera repeatedly points out the close connection between the militarization of wartime society and the gradual loss of control and power experienced by men in all spheres of life, including economic, social and family relations. In his view, this was one of several processes that were responsible for wartime shifts in the nature of the Central European working class. In this text, we see the same process as essential in defining, through an endless series of compromises, transformations and gendered performances, the motivation of Czech soldiers to die willingly (i.e. with at least a passive consent) for the Austro-Hungarian monarchy. Alon Rachamimov once noted in a thought-provoking analysis of German-speaking officer POWs in Russia that they had experienced 'an acute sense of masculine disempowerment' because of their captivity.⁷⁶ Our argument here is that this sense may have been actually close to what many of the men, particularly in the ranks, experienced even without being captured.

Any reader versed in the historiography of the Czech soldier of the First World War may be wary of the fact that our analysis takes us only as far as combat and its direct consequences, leaving out other key experiences of many soldiers, such as capture, medical discharge or even desertion. Obviously, these themes

are closely connected to the problem of masculinity, potentially representing moments of radical restructuring of values and attitudes, along with changing social frameworks that define masculine identity from the outside. Capture or desertion often presents us with breaking points in motivation that may have had a particular bearing on the actor's masculine identity, as is obvious from the very limited number of sources originating in captivity (primarily correspondence) used mainly in Chapter 5. However, after consideration, an analysis of these issues has been left out of this text for several reasons. First, it would lead to a greater level of generalization than should be allowed even in a work based mostly on personal accounts. Second, including the highly complicated issues of capture and desertion would mean asking manifold questions regarding the very *practice* of these, as well as the following issues of the POW experience, revolution and repatriation, as well as the Czechoslovak Legion. Following this path would threaten to take the text far beyond its intended scope. Also, many of these issues, including some relating to masculine identity, have already been successfully covered by Alon Rachamimov in her seminal study on POWs on the Eastern Front, and by other authors dealing with the issue of Austro-Hungarian soldiers in captivity during the First World War.⁷⁷ Any effort to push analysis beyond the limits given by the structure of Lynn's theory of military motivation would also mean that it would enter a realm beyond the universality of the common experience Czech soldiers went through. If we disregard the vast number of men in army support services, then after the first experience with fighting, even the combat soldiers' patterns of experience have the tendency to diverge – some are dead, some are wounded and invalided, some wounded and returned to their units later, some are captured, some desert and some go on to another battle. Combat situation is therefore a sort of a breaking point in the (decidedly relative) universality of men's experience of warfare. And, finally, the way in which the argument is structured here enables us to keep the analysis of the *men's* motivation to *stay* in service logically coherent, without embarking on issues that would threaten to tear it apart.

Note on the Sources

The key sources subjected to our analysis include mostly diaries, letters and memoirs, i.e. personal accounts written by Czech-speaking (or, in several cases, obviously multilingual) soldiers during or after the First World War.⁷⁸ Of course, the reliability of 'testimonies' with regard to the experience of war has been a subject of discussion ever since the publication of Jean Norton-Cru's massive and celebrated 'critical essay and analysis of recollections of French combatants published in France from 1915 to 1928' in 1929, a comparative study of several hundred autobiographical accounts meticulously judged by the author

according to their documentary value.⁷⁹ As this book is not interested so much in the objective nature of the war as in its subjective understanding by individual participants, applying a decidedly ‘cultural’ approach to the analysis in search of personal convictions, emotions and feelings men harboured about issues that pertain to our subject matter, it is partially ‘cleared’ on the minute detail of real events skipped in the search for meaning. For similar reasons, while it is obvious that the wider use of other kinds of sources (official documents, legal records, police reports or the contemporary press, for example) may help further our analysis and potentially support much of the presented argument, a conscious decision, guided by the same considerations, was made to fully focus the attention on a critical analysis of the available personal accounts – of the ways masculinity was felt and understood by those who aspired to it at the time – and leave the above-mentioned to future research. There are, of course, several exceptions to the rule, particularly a number of civilians’ personal accounts, as well as a sample of contemporary propaganda material produced to support the war effort in Bohemia, Moravia and Austrian Silesia.

The available body of sources brought up several issues that had to be addressed in the process of analysis. First, there is no way to pretend that it is more than a *sample* of all the possibly available personal accounts of the war that were ever produced in Czech, selected primarily on the basis of their authors’ eloquence (or conspicuous silence) vis-à-vis the topics presented here. Also, while innumerable diaries, letter collections and memoir manuscripts were lost to the vagaries of the twentieth-century history of Central Europe, it is also a fact that in the Czech Republic, there is no single institution collecting and making available personal accounts of the war that were not produced by the members of the Czechoslovak Legion. While some archives, including the Military History Archives in Prague, have subsections in their collections dedicated to these, the most valuable sources are often to be found either in local archives’ personal collections or in the family estates of the authors’ descendants, which makes searching for these sources a true challenge. On the other hand, over the past hundred years, numerous accounts have been published (although in numbers nowhere near those of the accounts by the members of the Czechoslovak Legion). Following the various agendas of their authors or editors, these publications came in several waves – in the 1920s, one particularly strong in the 1930s, then in a trickle until the late 1980s, with a resurgence around the turn of the twenty-first century. In the mixture of these publications, one finds texts made famous by the celebrity status of their authors, such as the diary by the Bohemian-Jewish journalist Egon Erwin Kisch (who, while technically a German-speaking cosmopolitan intellectual, served in a regiment with a Czech-speaking majority, and whose keen eye provides us with an unparalleled insight into the experience of the first few months of the war on the Serbian front), the correspondence of the impressionist poet and writer Fráňa Šrámek with his wife, or the memoirs of the radical leftist writer S.K. Neumann

and the painter and mystic Josef Váchal. There are also both scholarly and popular collections of letters, postcards and fragmentary diary entries published on the basis of territoriality, i.e. by men from the same region or village, who probably never aspired to literary fame, or by local historians. A number of memoirs and diaries was edited (often heavily) and published by the authors, often at their own expense, who did not want their plight to be forgotten, or who wanted to prove a point with regard to their war record; there are also manuscripts of these that never made it to the printing presses. There are also those that were published only by a scholarly or private effort in recent decades, these editions being of particularly variable, sometimes very poor quality in terms of their faithfulness to the original source (with some particularly egregious examples being basically rewritten by the editors, turning diaries into memoirs by proxy). There are also sources dug out from the archives in an effort to overcome some inherent limits of the published or retrospective sources, and to offer some comparison in point. And, finally, there is some supporting evidence taken from the narratives of fictionalized accounts by authors both known and unknown; however, these are limited to those instances that help make a particular point, illustrating a tendency or pattern present throughout the sample, with the full knowledge that artistic licence may be present.

The issue of the time and place of origin of a source is of particular importance in the Czech historiography of the First World War, as there is often a vast difference between the texts that originated during the conflict and those that were written or rewritten, and sometimes also those published after the war. Of course, a historian needs to be constantly aware that there is no text without an agenda, and even the most authentic diary entry or letter is not just an outpouring of feelings and thoughts, but a construction of meaning addressed not only to the writer and his or her consciousness, but also to numerous potential readers (the recipient, other people with whom he or she may share the text, future generations, censors and other unintended readers, etc.), which has severe consequences for the nature of the information and forces us to dig deep in search of slips of the tongue and often unconscious references to the subject of our study. However, the closer to the events described the text is created, the less time there is to insert hindsight and further agendas. With Czech soldiers, these agendas come to the fore after 1918, as many memoirs and some later editions of diaries tend to reinterpret the war experience in a way that better fits its outcome, primarily the dissolution of the monarchy and the establishment of Czechoslovakia. While there is no hard rule that would be of much help here (indeed, there are anti-war and anti-Austrian as well as Czech nationalist accounts written by soldiers during the war), every text written in the interwar period in particular needs to be viewed especially critically, as there were many important reasons for the authors to put a different spin on their war record in the Imperial and Royal uniform. Perhaps the best example, and also by far the most problematic source used in

this book, is the well-known anthology of recollections and edited fragments of diaries published in the late 1920s and early 1930s under the editorship of Alois Žipek. Its admitted purpose was to testify ‘to an age ... of horrible deprivation and enormous sacrifice’, thus building a monument that will forever be ‘a source of encouragement for all people Czech and Slovak to value their newly acquired freedom and hold it in high esteem’.⁸⁰ The First World War is interpreted here as a Czech and Slovak struggle for freedom from its very beginning, and the selection of texts follows this logic. Most of them reflect on the conflict through the lens of nationalism, often to an extent all but unknown in texts written during the war, particularly in its early phases. This distortion, while often very obvious, is one of the reasons why Žipek’s collection is a chronically unreliable source in many aspects, and is used here only in those cases that are aligned with the information in other sources, or when there is no other, more reliable alternative.

The rather limited sample of sources used here – in total, thirty-five diaries in various stages of edition, five correspondence collections (three unedited but incomplete), twenty-five memoirs, two collections of fragments of diaries and correspondence, two collections of diary entries and memoirs, and five novels or novellas – immediately raises another problem: that of representativeness and the dangers of overt generalizations. Indeed, a sample of testimonies, however accurate, can never tell us what *all* soldiers did, thought or felt, and the spectre of overgeneralization will always be around the corner of the endless diversity and complexity of human experience. However, the highly analytical nature of the text has shown that even from the rather limited number of sources available, general patterns, repetitions, themes and points conspicuously left out quickly emerged and tended to repeat themselves throughout the course of the research, confirming the emerging hypotheses. Over time, the repetitive tendency of most subjects of interest became evident, and broadening the sample further only resulted in simply accumulating further evidence. As a result, further search for source material seemed pointless and unnecessary.

Besides various agendas, the very personalities of the authors also influence the kind of information we are able to extract from the sources. While gender identity is an ever-present issue that concerns all the members of a society, it is also true that men with a higher level of education tend to be more reflective of their predicament, and their texts may therefore offer potentially deeper thoughts. Educated men are also more prone to produce substantial amounts of writings, even though, as will be seen, this is far from being a rule, particularly in the case of the First World War. However, there is higher probability of them summarizing their experience in memoirs. While Bohemia and Moravia during the 1910s offered a comparably high standard of education within the European context, with Bohemia being arguably the most industrialized and modernized region of the monarchy outside of Lower Austria, the prevalence of educated men, often ranking as noncommissioned officers (NCOs) or officers, is still obvious.

Out of sixty-five diaries, memoirs and correspondence collections, where it is possible to obtain some biographical data, we see that: fourteen men had only elementary school (eight years of *Volksschule* and then went straight to work, or trained as craftsmen) education, and five were college educated (for twenty-two, their educational level is unknown), which clearly shows an overrepresentation of the better educated (64% of the known sample reaching the level of secondary education).⁸¹

All the accounts in this sample were written in Czech (Egon Erwin Kisch's diary being the only exception). This, of course, does not mean that their authors necessarily identified as 'Czechs' by nationality – put strictly, it only implies their language preference. Several of the men were obviously bilingual thanks to their higher-level education or environment they lived in (for example, two lived in Vienna in 1914). On the other hand, those authors who thought it necessary to identify themselves nationally already in 1914 are defining themselves as Czech in this regard as well. Here, the general overrepresentation of the better-educated has the apparent effect of influencing the very sense of national identification the men show – the group of those who, in some way, identify themselves as being Czech at the beginning of the war strongly correlates with higher education levels, urban background and sometimes even membership in Czech nationalist organizations such as the Sokol gymnastic association (two men) or the Czech National Socialist Party (three men). Closer to the notion of initial national indifference, as presented by authors such as Tara Zahra or Jeremy King, are the men with lower levels of education or from a farming background who, while mostly aware of the basics of national discourse, seem to place much less emphasis on the issue at the beginning of the war. The same is true for some of the men coming from large urban areas like Vienna or Prague, where matters were often complicated by bilingual realities or class self-identification.⁸² However, even they, almost invariably, seem to find some sort of identification with the national idea by 1918 at the latest – or at least so they claim in their accounts. But the majority of the sources used here were only being edited or published after the war, when national optics was already hard to avoid even if the authors tried – and they had little inclination or motivation to do so, which complicates any deeper analysis of the issue.

Interestingly, the level of education did not translate into rank, as only nine authors served as officers (including cadets and one-year-volunteers, i.e. officer candidates), fifteen as noncommissioned officers (rank of corporal and above), while twenty-four spent the war as enlisted men (the rest are unknown). All of these men were conscripts in one form or another, and none of the officers (with one exception) can be considered a career, or regular officer. As a consequence, almost none of them were directly subject to the specific conceptualizations of masculine honour prevalent in the regular army, particularly in the extremely class-conscious Austro-Hungarian officer corps.⁸³ In terms of age, the age group of young men between twenty-six and thirty-five years is represented the most,

with twenty-one authors, while another eighteen are from the group of seventeen to twenty-five years, with nine men older than thirty-five (the rest, again, is unknown). A majority of men in our sample were single (thirty-one), while fifteen are known to have families. Most also came from the countryside (twenty-seven), while only seventeen are known to have lived in cities with a population of over 20,000 inhabitants before the war. As for religious affiliation, it is very difficult to identify precisely; however, none of the men was deeply religious in any sense and while some tended to invoke God or other supreme being at a time of stress or elation, these are used mostly as a figure of speech.

As for the nature of the service, the vast majority of the men served in the infantry (thirty-nine), only six with the artillery and six in support units (four medical assistants and two with the staff). Probably because of this, the great majority of the men (thirty-eight) could claim to have seen and participated in combat (at least in a passive way of being bombarded repeatedly by artillery), while another six served in the frontlines, but came into danger only occasionally, though they regularly witnessed the direct consequences of combat. Only three men served in the rear, with only secondhand knowledge of combat experience.

While it is always problematic to extrapolate from individual experience, a critical analysis still makes it possible to penetrate into the minds of the actors, analyse those areas of their existence that are pressured the most by modern warfare and try to judge overall patterns from highly subjective accounts. For example, it is clear that young men without families experienced the war, as well as their masculinity, differently from older men with dependents. Similarly, men who felt marginalized in their peacetime life tended to see war as a potential social elevator more often than those who had already possessed hegemonic social status previously. It is also obvious that the experience of wartime masculinity differed for officers and for the other ranks, as these groups were differentiated by their access to the key hallmarks of masculine status: power, resources and women. Social background as well as education often played its role in the way in which men expressed themselves, and it also influenced the specific notion of masculinity to which the individual actors subscribed, which had bearings on a whole range of issues from communication with home, through attitudes towards the army authorities all the way to the perception of sexuality.

Whatever the nature of the personal accounts used in the forthcoming analysis, there is one feature that is common to all of them – they were all written by *men*. This feature is easy to overlook and that is why it is actually so often ignored in most of the historical writing on the experience of warfare. The diaries, letters and memoirs used here all reflect the thoughts of biologically male individuals, who saw themselves socially defined as *men*, a category defined through *masculinity*. For them, *manliness* was an implicit state of being. In many of the writings, it is obvious that the word a ‘man’ (in Czech ‘člověk’, which, while masculine, denotes a ‘person’ or, more literally, a ‘human’) in their text automatically denotes

‘man’ (a person of masculine social status), as women are always specifically identified. For the most part, a ‘man’ means a ‘soldier’ in these wartime texts (again, nonmilitary persons tend to be defined specifically). Everything and everyone not fitting into these simple categories of ‘textual normality’ is then often relegated to their own different space, where men-soldiers are not present, or only as exceptions. It is as if the personal accounts of the First World War experience, written by Czech soldiers of the Austro-Hungarian army, perfected – through the intensive socialization of the authors in all-male groups – the ‘invisibility’ of masculinity as a social category. As noted by one American sociologist, when a man ‘wakes up in the morning and looks in the mirror, [he does not see a man] he sees a human being. A generic person’.⁸⁴ When soldiers write about war, they see beings around them who just *are* men as a matter of fact. And their accounts, by this very nature, tell us how it feels to be a *man* in war.

Notes

1. For an overview of recent research, see Alan Kramer, ‘Recent Historiography of the First World War (Part I)’, *Journal of Modern European History* 12, no. 1 (2014): 5–27; and Alan Kramer, ‘Recent Historiography of the First World War (Part II)’, *Journal of Modern European History* 12, no. 2 (2014): 155–74. For a perfect example of this discourse, see ‘Part I: A Narrative History’, in *The Cambridge History of the First World War*, ed. Jay Winter (3 vols, Cambridge, 2014), vol. 1, 15–199.
2. For an overview of recent research on Austria-Hungary, see the review essay by John Deak, ‘The Great War and the Forgotten Realm: The Habsburg Monarchy and the First World War’, *Journal of Modern History* 86, no. 2 (2014): 336–80.
3. The abbreviation ‘k.u.k.’ standing for *kaiserliche und königliche*, i.e. Imperial and Royal, denoting the regiments being part of the ‘common army’ of the Austro-Hungarian dual state.
4. ‘K.k.’ standing for *kaiserlich-königlich*, i.e. Imperial-Royal, putting the regiments into the organizational structure of the territorial army of the Cisleithanian (Austrian) half of the monarchy.
5. For the recent debates over ‘language frontiers’ and the attached forms of national identities as they formed in prewar Bohemia and Moravia, see, for example, Tara Zahra, *Kidnapped Souls. National Indifference and the Battle for Children in the Bohemian Lands, 1900–1948* (Ithaca, 2008); or Jeremy King, *Budweisers into Czechs and Germans* (Princeton, 2002). For perhaps the best summary of the topic on a broader spectrum, see Laurence Cole, ‘Differentiation or Indifference? Changing Perspectives on National Identification in the Austrian Half of the Habsburg Monarchy’, in *Nationhood from Below: Europe in the Long Nineteenth Century*, ed. Maarten van Ginderachter, Marnix Beyen (Basingstoke, 2012), 96–119; see also Laurence Cole and Daniel L. Unowsky, eds, *The Limits of Loyalty: Imperial Symbolism, Popular Allegiances, and State Patriotism in the Late Habsburg Monarchy* (Oxford, 2007). For further reading on the issue of nationalism and political identity in the Habsburg Empire, again with emphasis on both local and imperial identities as strong counterweights to the emerging modern mass nationalism,

- see Pieter M. Judson, *The Habsburg Empire: A New History* (Cambridge, 2016); for some of the ensuing criticism, see, for example, Deak, 'The Great War and the Forgotten Realm', 362.
6. For some basic statistics, see, for example, Ivan Šedivý, *Češi, české země a Velká válka 1914–1918* (Prague, 2001), 39–40.
 7. See Hew Strachan, *The First World War* (Oxford, 2001), vol. 1, 157. Similarly, Christopher Clark in his seminal study of the outbreak of the war repeatedly raises questions about 'the loyalty of Czech reservists'. See Christopher Clark, *The Sleepwalkers: How Europe Went to War in 1914* (London, 2012), 269.
 8. See Benjamin Ziemann, 'Soldiers', in *Brill's Encyclopedia of the First World War*, eds Gerhard Hirschfeld, Gerd Krumeich and Irina Renz (Leiden, 2014), vol. 1, 122; and Alexander Watson, 'Mutinies and Military Morale', in *The Oxford Illustrated History of the First World War*, ed. Hew Strachan (Oxford, 2014), 194.
 9. For 'ambivalent patriots', see Claire Nolte, 'Ambivalent Patriots: Czech Culture in the Great War', in *European Culture in the Great War: The Arts, Entertainment, and Propaganda, 1914–1918*, ed. Aviel Roshwald, Richard Stites (Cambridge, 1999), 162–75; for 'underlying apathy', see Mark Cornwall, 'Morale and Patriotism in the Austro-Hungarian Army', in *State, Society, and Mobilization in Europe during the First World War*, ed. John Horne (Cambridge, 1997), 176.
 10. Mark Cornwall, 'Austria-Hungary and "Yugoslavia"', in *A Companion to World War I*, ed. John Horne (Oxford, 2012), 374.
 11. For the tradition of suspecting Czechs of 'treason', one that emanated from the bitter politics of prewar Austria, see, for example, Mark Cornwall, *The Undermining of Austria-Hungary: The Battle for Hearts and Minds* (London, 2000), 32–33; Gunther E. Rothenberg, *The Army of Francis Joseph* (West Lafayette, 1976), 18–19, 121–30, 184–87; Richard Lein, *Pflichterfüllung oder Hochverrat? Die tschechischen Soldaten Österreich-Ungarns im Ersten Weltkrieg* (Vienna, 2011); see also Lein, 'The "Betrayal" of the k.u.k. Infantry Regiment 28: Truth or Legend?', in *Prague Papers on the History of International Relations* (Prague, 2009), 325–48.
 12. For more information on the Legion, see, for example, John F.N. Bradley, *The Czechoslovak Legion in Russia, 1914–1920* (Boulder, 1991).
 13. For the 'legionary myth' and the various groups competing over its meaning and purpose in the interwar period, see 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, Dagmar Hájková, František Kolář, Vlastislav Lacina, Zdenko Maršálek and Ivan Šedivý (Prague, 2008), 16–28. See also Jan Galandauer, 'Československé legie a jejich komemorace', in *Česká společnost za velkých válek 20. století: pokus o komparaci*, eds Jan Gebhart and Ivan Šedivý (Prague, 2003), 293–312; or Jan Galandauer, 'O struktuře české historické paměti', *Historie a vojenství* 45, no. 2 (1996): 132–36. On the very real consequences of these conflicts over memory in terms of access to government welfare programmes, see Natali Stegmann, *Kriegsdeutungen – Staatsgründungen – Sozialpolitik: Der Helden- und Opferdiskurs in der Tschechoslowakei, 1918–1948* (Munich, 2010), 63–80.
 14. Šedivý, *Češi, české země a Velká válka*, 65–71.
 15. See Martin Zückert, 'Memory of War and National State Integration: Czech and German Veterans in Czechoslovakia after 1918', *Central Europe* 4, no. 2 (2006): 121; see also Martin Zückert, 'Der Erste Weltkrieg in der tschechischen Geschichtsschreibung

- 1918–1945’, in *Geschichtsschreibung zu den böhmischen Länder im 20. Jahrhundert. Wissenschaftstraditionen, Institutionen, Diskurse*, eds Christiane Brenner, Erik K. Franzen, Peter Haslinger and Robert Luft (Munich, 2006), 61–75.
16. For a summary, see Lein, *Pflichterfüllung oder Hochverrat?*, 407–16; and Josef Fučík, *Osmadvacátníci: spor o českého vojáka Velké války* (Prague, 2006).
 17. See Jaroslav Hašek, *Osudy dobrého vojáka Švejka za světové války* (4 vols, Prague, 1921–23). For the most recent English translation, see *The Fateful Adventures of the Good Soldier Švejk during the World War*, trans. Zdeněk Sadloň and Emmitt Joyce (3 vols, London, 1997). For the interwar shifts in interpretation of the novel, see Radko Pytlík, *Osudy a cesty Josefa Švejka* (Prague, 2003).
 18. See, for example, Karel Pichlík, *Čeští vojáci proti válce, 1914–1918* (Prague, 1961); or, even better, Jaroslav Křížek, *Čeští a sovětsí rudoarmějci v sovětském Rusku 1917–1920* (Prague, 1955).
 19. For the revisionist approach, see the works of Josef Fučík: *Soča (Isonzo) 1917* (Prague, 1999); *Piava 1918* (Prague, 2001); or *Generál Podbajský* (Prague, 2009). For the latest defence of the nationalist view, see Jindřich Marek, ‘Beránci, lvi a malé děti: Nekonečný spor o českého vojáka v letech 1. světové války’, *Historie a vojensví* 63, no. 1 (2014): 94–113. For the same point from the similar author, see Jindřich Marek, *Pod císařskou šibeníci: čeští vojáci na křížovatkách roku 1918* (Cheb, 2005). There was actually some criticism of the nationalist discourse as early as the 1930s, particularly on the part of the veterans of Austro-Hungarian service. See, for example, Karel Wagner, *S českým plukem na ruské frontě* (Prague, 1936). For more on this topic, see Jiří Hutečka, ‘Kamarádi frontovní: maskulinita a paměť první světové války v textech československých c. a k. veteránů’, *Dějiny-teorie-kritika* 9, no. 2 (2014): 231–66.
 20. Šedivý, *Češi, české země a Velká válka 1914–1918*. For a more recent interpretation, see Etienne Boissérie, *Les Tchêques dans l’Autriche-Hongrie en guerre (1914–1918)* (Paris, 2017).
 21. Martin Zückert, ‘Antimilitarismus und soldatische Resistenz: Politischer Protest und armeefeindliches Verhalten in der tschechischen Gesellschaft bis 1918’, in *Glanz – Gewalt – Geborsam: Militär und Gesellschaft in der Habsburgermonarchie (1880 bis 1918)*, eds Laurence Cole, Christa Hämmerle and Martin Scheutz (Essen, 2011), 199–220.
 22. David Pazdera, ‘Češi v první světové válce (Pokus o vymezení válečného prožitku českých vojáků rakousko-uherské armády od mobilizace a nástupu k jednotce po příchod na frontu)’, Master’s thesis, České Budějovice: University of České Budějovice, 1997. For a more general approach to the topic of reactions to the outbreak of the war in Austria-Hungary, see Laurence Cole, ‘Questions of Nationalization in the Habsburg Monarchy’, in *Nations, Identities and the First World War*, ed. Nico Wouters and Laurence Van Ypersele (London, 2018), 191–221.
 23. Rudolf Kučera, ‘Entbehrung und Nationalismus: Die Erfahrung tschechischer Soldaten der österreichisch-ungarischen Armee 1914–1918’, in *Jenseits des Schützengrabens: Der Erste Weltkrieg im Osten: Erfahrung – Wahrnehmung – Kontext*, eds Bernard Bachinger and Wolfram Dornik (Innsbruck, 2013), 121–38.
 24. See Lein, *Pflichterfüllung oder Hochverrat?*; see also Lein, ‘The Military Conduct of the Austro-Hungarian Czechs in the First World War’, *The Historian: A Journal of History* 3, no. 2 (2014): 518–49. In his case study of a similar case of k.u.k. Infantry Regiment 36, another Czech dominated unit that was ingloriously disbanded after it failed in the face of a surprise Russian attack on the San River in late May 1915, Christian Reiter

- came to a similar conclusion, pointing mostly towards mishandling of the troops and general demoralization. See Christian Reiter, 'Der Untergang des IR 36: Der "Verrat" der tschechischen Soldaten im Gefecht bei Siniewa 1915', Master's thesis, Vienna: University of Vienna, 2008.
25. Kramer, 'Recent Historiography of the First World War (Part I)', 5.
 26. Leonard V. Smith, *The Embattled Self: French Soldiers' Testimony of the Great War* (Ithaca, 2007), 107–8.
 27. Joan W. Scott, 'Gender: A Useful Category of Historical Analysis', *American Historical Review* 91, no. 5 (1986): 1067 and 1069.
 28. For a summary of the situation a decade ago, see Jana Ratajová, 'Gender history jako alternativní koncept dějin', in *Dějiny žen aneb Evropská žena od středověku do poloviny 20. století v zajetí historiografie*, eds Kateřina Čadková, Milena Lenderová and Jana Stráníková (Pardubice, 2006), 19–32; or Denisa Nečasová, 'Dějiny žen či gender history? Možnosti, limity, východiska', *Dějiny – teorie – kritika* 3, no. 1 (2008): 81–102. For a summary of the study of masculinities, see Jiří Hutečka and Radmila Švaříčková-Slabáková, 'Od genderu k maskulinitám', in *Konstrukce maskulinní identity v minulosti a současnosti: Koncepty, metody, perspektivy*, eds Radmila Švaříčková-Slabáková, Jitka Kohoutová, Radmila Pavlíčková and Jiří Hutečka (Prague, 2012), 9–20. For stylistic reasons, the terms 'masculinity' and 'manliness' are used as synonyms here, even though the author is aware of the possible repercussions for terminological purity.
 29. R.W. Connell, *Masculinities* (Berkeley, 1995, 2nd edition 2005).
 30. Connell, *Masculinities*, 44 and 76–77. On the topic of masculinity and patriarchy, see also Pierre Bourdieu, *La domination masculine* (Paris, 1998).
 31. See, for example, Demetrakis Z. Demetriou, 'Connell's Concept of Hegemonic Masculinity: A Critique', *Theory and Society* 30, no. 2 (2001): 337–61; or Tony Jefferson, 'Subordinating Hegemonic Masculinity', *Theoretical Criminology* 6, no. 1 (2002): 63–88. For a somewhat revised version of the theory, see R.W. Connell and James D. Messerschmidt, 'Hegemonic Masculinity: Rethinking the Concept', *Gender and Society* 19, no. 6 (2005): 829–59.
 32. For key works, see, for example, Michael Roper and John Tosh, eds., *Manful Assertions: Masculinities in Britain since 1800* (Oxford, 1991); John Tosh, 'What Should Historians Do with Masculinity? Reflections on Nineteenth-Century Britain', *History Workshop Journal* 38, no. 1 (1994): 179–202; Ute Frevert, *Mann und Weib, und Weib und Mann: Geschlechter-Differenzen in der Moderne* (Munich, 1995); John Tosh, 'The Old Adam and the New Man: Emerging Themes in the History of English Masculinities, 1750–1850', in *English Masculinities, 1660–1800*, eds Tim Hitchcock and Michele Cohen (London, 1999): 217–38; Wolfgang Schmale, *Geschichte des Männlichkeit in Europa (1450–2000)* (Vienna, 2003); John Tosh, 'Hegemonic Masculinity and the History of Gender', in *Masculinities in Politics and War: Gendering Modern History*, eds Stefan Dudink, Karen Hagemann and John Tosh (Manchester, 2004): 41–58; Martin Dinges, ed., *Männer – Macht – Körper: Hegemoniale Männlichkeiten vom Mittelalter bis heute* (Frankfurt am Main, 2005); Christopher E. Forth, *Masculinity in the Modern West: Gender, Civilization and the Body* (London, 2008).
 33. The best example of this issue is the scholarly journal *Historie a vojenství (History and Warfare)*, published by the Institute for Military History in Prague, which fails to depart from the traditional, somewhat antiquarian discourse typical of the state of the field in the Czech Republic. For a rather dated, but sadly still applicable critique of the situation, see

- Ivan Šedivý, 'Česká historiografie vojenství 1989–2002', *Český časopis historický* 100, no. 4 (2002): 900–1.
34. Rudolf Kučera, 'Muži ve válce, válka v mužích: Maskulinity a světové války 20. století v současné kulturní historiografii', *Soudobé dějiny* 19, no. 4 (2011): 550.
 35. Rudolf Kučera, *Rationed Life: Science, Everyday Life and Working-Class Politics in the Bohemian Lands 1914–1918* (New York, 2016; first published in Czech in 2014), 94–129. The historiography of the Slovak frontline experience is somewhat more infused with gender analysis, mostly because of the work conducted by Gabriela Dudeková. See, for example, Gabriela Dudeková, 'S Bohem za kráľa a vlast? Problém loajality a bojovej morálky radového vojaka vo Veľkej vojne', in *Vojak medzi civilmi, civil medzi vojakmi: Pocta Vojtechu Danglovi*, eds Gabriela Dudeková and Elena Mannová (Bratislava, 2017), 163–96; or Gabriela Dudeková Kováčová, 'The Silent Majority: Attitudes of Non-prominent Citizens at the Beginning of the Great War in the Territory of Today's Slovakia', *Revue des Études Slaves* 88, no. 4 (2017): 699–720.
 36. Margaret E. Higonnet and Patrice L.-R. Higonnet, 'The Double Helix', in *Behind the Lines: Gender and the Two World Wars*, eds Margaret R. Higonnet, Jane Jenson, Sonya Michel and Margaret Collins Weitz (New Haven, 1987), 31–50. For the most important works on gender identity in wartime Austria-Hungary, see Christa Hämmerle, *Heimat/Front: Geschlechtergeschichte des Ersten Weltkriegs in Österreich-Ungarn* (Vienna, 2014); Maureen Healy, *Vienna and the Fall of the Habsburg Empire: Total War and Everyday Life in World War I*, (Cambridge, 2004); or *Gender and War in Twentieth-Century Eastern Europe*, eds Nancy M. Wingfield and Maria Bucur (Bloomington, 2006).
 37. Susan R. Grayzel and Tammy M. Proctor, eds., *Gender and the Great War* (Oxford, 2017).
 38. *The Cambridge History of the First World War*, vol. 3, 153–78.
 39. For an example from the history of the First World War, see Frederic Rousseau, *La guerre censurée : Une histoire des combattants européens de 14–18* (Paris, 1999); for an example from a general study of war, see Richard Holmes, *Acts of War* (New York, 1985). Both works, while excellent in their own right, conflate the issue of gender into descriptions of soldiers' attitude towards women, sex, heterosexuality and connecting issues.
 40. For a sociological analysis, see Siniša Malešević, *The Sociology of War and Violence* (Cambridge, 2010), 275–307; for a general overview, see Joshua Goldstein, *War and Gender: How Gender Shapes the War System and Vice Versa* (Cambridge, 2001), particularly 10–21.
 41. R. Brian Ferguson, 'Explaining War', in *The Anthropology of War*, ed. Jonathan Haas (Cambridge, 1990), 26.
 42. John A. Lynn, *Battle: A History of Combat and Culture* (Boulder, 2003).
 43. For examples of various past and present cultures where war is socially construed around masculinity and vice versa, see Bryan Hanks, 'Constructing the Warrior: Death, Memory and the Art of Warfare', in *Archaeology and Memory*, ed. Dušan Boric (Oxford, 2010), 122–23; John Robb, 'Violence and Gender in Early Italy', in *Troubled Times. Violence and Warfare in the Past*, eds Debra L. Martin and David W. Frayer (Amsterdam, 1997), 111–44; Lawrence H. Keeley, *War before Civilization* (New York, 1996); Jean Guilaine and Jean Zammit, *The Origins of War: Violence in Prehistory* (Oxford, 2001), 158–94; R. Brian Ferguson, 'Violence and War in Prehistory', in *Troubled Times*, 321–55; R. Brian Ferguson, 'A Paradigm for the Study of War and Society', in *War and Society in Ancient and Medieval Worlds: Asia, the Mediterranean, Europe, and Mesoamerica*, eds Kurt

- A. Raaflaub and Nathan Rosenstein (Cambridge, 2001), 389–437; or David D. Gilmore, *Manhood in the Making: Cultural Concepts of Masculinity* (New Haven, 1991). For a more essentialist approach, see Azar Gat, *War in Human Civilization* (Oxford, 2006), 77–86; and Maurice R. Davie, *The Evolution of War: A Study of its Role in Early Societies* (New Haven, 1929), 23–45; or Lionel Tiger, *Men in Groups* (London, 1969). For a feminist critique of the same, see, for example, Barbara Ehrenreich, *Blood Rites: Origins and History of the Passions of War* (London, 1997).
44. Robert A. Nye, 'Western Masculinities in War and Peace', *American Historical Review* 112, no. 2 (2007): 418; see also Paul R. Higate, ed., *Military Masculinities: Identity and the State* (Westport, 2003).
 45. Christopher E. Forth and Bertrand Taithe, eds., *French Masculinities: History, Culture, and Politics* (London, 2007), 5–6.
 46. Malešević, *The Sociology of War and Violence*, 302.
 47. John Tosh, 'Hegemonic Masculinity and the History of Gender', in *Masculinities in Politics and War: Gendering Modern History*, eds Stefan Dudink, Karen Hagemann, and John Tosh (Manchester, 2004), 45–48. A conclusion that goes even beyond the theorem of 'residual elements', that 'historically societies have valued military masculinity and the personal characteristics of manliness that it comprises more highly than civic virtue and its masculinities', is argued by Nye, 'Western Masculinities in War and Peace', 418.
 48. For the author's take on the issue of military masculinities in modern Europe, see Jiří Hutečka, 'Militární maskulinita jako koncept historického bádání', in *Konstrukce maskulinní identity v minulosti a současnosti*, 36–47.
 49. John A. Lynn, 'The Embattled Future of Academic Military History', *Journal of Military History* 61, no. 4 (1997): 784–85; for a more recent summary of the same issue, see Robert M. Citino, 'Military Histories Old and New: A Reintroduction', *American Historical Review* 112, no. 4 (2007): 1070–90.
 50. Leo Braudy, *From Chivalry to Terrorism: War and the Changing Nature of Masculinity* (New York, 2003).
 51. Joanna Bourke, 'New Military History', in *Palgrave Advances in Modern Military History*, eds Matthew Hughes and William J. Philpott (London, 2006), 271; see also Joanna Bourke, *An Intimate History of Killing: Face-to-Face Killing in Twentieth Century History* (London, 1999).
 52. Klaus Theweleit, *Male Fantasies* (2 vols, Cambridge, 1987–89); George L. Mosse, *Fallen Soldiers: Reshaping the Memory of the World Wars* (Oxford, 1990); George L. Mosse, *The Image of Man: The Creation of Modern Masculinity* (New York, 1996).
 53. Mosse, *The Image of Man*, 115.
 54. Christa Hämmerle, 'Von den Geschlechtern der Kriege und des Militärs: Forschungseinblicke und Bemerkungen zu einer neuen Debatte', in *Was ist Militärgeschichte?*, eds Thomas Kühne and Benjamin Ziemann (Paderborn, 2000), 229–30 and 252.
 55. Christa Hämmerle, 'Zur Relevanz des Connell'schen Konzepts hegemonialer Männlichkeit für "Militär und Männlichkeit/en in der Habsburgermonarchie (1868–1914/18)"', in *Männer – Macht – Körper*, 103–21.
 56. *Ibid.*, 114.
 57. Jeremy Black, *Rethinking Military History* (London, 2004), 51.
 58. Ardant du Picq, *Battle Studies: Ancient and Modern Battle*, trans. John N. Greely and Robert C. Cotton (New York, 1920). Most of the work was originally published (posthumously) as *Études sur le Combat* in 1880.

59. Lord Moran, *The Anatomy of Courage* (London, 1945); J. Glenn Gray, *The Warriors: Reflections on Men in Battle* (New York, 1959).
60. Samuel A. Stouffer, et al., *The American Soldier* (2 vols, Princeton, 1949).
61. S.L.A. Marshall, *Men against Fire: The Problem of Battle Command* (New York, 1947).
62. Edward Shils and Morris Janowitz, 'Cohesion and Disintegration in the Wehrmacht in World War II', in *Military Conflict: Essay in the Institutional Analysis of War and Peace*, ed. Morris Janowitz (Beverly Hills, 1975), 177–220.
63. Holmes, *Acts of War*.
64. John Keegan, *The Face of Battle* (London, 1976).
65. Tony Ashworth, *Trench Warfare 1914–1918: The Live and Let Live System* (Basingstoke, 1980).
66. Leonard V. Smith, *Between Mutiny and Obedience: The Case of the French Fifth Infantry Division during World War I* (Princeton, 1994), particularly 15–17.
67. Smith, *The Embattled Self*.
68. See Wilhelm Deist, 'The Military Collapse of the German Empire: The Reality behind the Stab-in-the-Back Myth', *War in History* 3, no. 2 (1996): 186–207; Anne Lipp, *Meinunglenkung im Krieg: Kriegserfahrungen deutscher Soldaten und ihre Deutung 1914–1918* (Göttingen, 2003).
69. Benjamin Ziemann, *War Experience in Rural Germany* (Oxford, 2007).
70. Alexander Watson, *Enduring the Great War: Combat, Morale and Collapse in the German and British Armies, 1914–1918* (Cambridge, 2008), 232–33.
71. *Ibid.*, 54.
72. Benjamin Ziemann, *Violence and the German Soldier in the Great War: Killing, Dying, Surviving* (London, 2017), 11–15, 64.
73. John A. Lynn, *The Bayonets of the Republic: Motivation and Tactics in the Army of Revolutionary France, 1791–94* (Urbana, 1984), 21–40.
74. Thomas Kühne, *The Rise and Fall of Comradeship: Hitler's Soldiers, Male Bonding and Mass Violence in the Twentieth Century* (Cambridge, 2017).
75. Thomas Kühne, 'Männergeschichte als Geschlechtergeschichte', in *Männergeschichte – Geschlechtergeschichte: Männlichkeiten im Wandel der Moderne*, ed. Thomas Kühne (Frankfurt am Main, 1996), 22–23.
76. Alon Rachamimov, 'The Disruptive Comforts of Drag: (Trans)Gender Performances among Prisoners of War in Russia, 1914–1920', *American Historical Review* 111, no. 2 (2006): 364.
77. Alon Rachamimov, *POWs and the Great War: Captivity on the Eastern Front* (London, 2002); see also Hannes Leidinger, Verena Moritz, *In russischer Gefangenschaft: Erlebnisse österreichischer Soldaten im Ersten Weltkrieg* (Vienna, 2008).
78. On the potential of so-called ego-documents, see, for example, Wilfred Schulze, 'Ego-Dokumente: Annäherung an den Menschen in der Geschichte? Vorüberlegungen für die Tagung "EGO-DOKUMENT"', in *Ego-Dokumente. Annäherung an den Menschen in der Geschichte*, ed. Wilfred Schulze (Berlin, 1996), 11–30. For their possible use in the field of military history, see the Introduction to Michael Epkenhans, Stig Förster and Karen Hagemann, eds., *Militärische Erinnerungskultur: Soldaten im Spiegel von Biographien, Memoiren und Selbstzeugnissen* (Paderborn, 2006), ix–xviii. For examples, see Helmut Berding, Klaus Heller and Winfried Speitkamp, eds., *Krieg und Erinnerung. Fallstudien zum 19. und 20. Jahrhundert* (Göttingen, 2000); Wolfram Wetze, ed., *Der Krieg des kleinen Mannes: Eine Militärgeschichte von unten* (Munich, 1992); Klaus Latzel,

- 'Vom Kriegserlebnis zu Kriegserfahrung: Theoretische und methodische Überlegungen zur erfahrungsgeschichtlichen Unterschung von Feldpostbriefen', *Militär-geschichtliche Mitteilungen* 56, no. 1 (1997): 1–30; Gerald Lamprecht, *Feldpost und Kriegserlebnis. Briefe als historisch-biographische Quelle* (Innsbruck, 2001); Péter Hanák, 'Die Volksmeinung während des letzten Kriegsjahres in Österreich-Ungarn', in *Die Auflösung des Habsburgerreiches: Zusammenbruch und Neuorientierung im Donauraum*, eds Richard G. Plaschka and Karl-Heinz Mack (Munich, 1970), 58–66; or Fritz Fellner, 'Der Krieg in Tagebüchern und Briefen: Überlegungen zu einer wenig genutzten Quellenart', in *Österreich und der Grosse Krieg 1914–1918: Die andere Seite der Geschichte*, eds Klaus Amann and Hubert Lengauer (Vienna, 1989), 205–13. In Czech, the only relevant effort is Vítězslav Prchal, ed., *Mezi Martem a Memorií: Prameny osobní povahy k vojenským dějinám 16. – 19. století* (Pardubice, 2011).
79. Jean Norton-Cru, *Témoins: Essai d'analyse et de critique des souvenirs de combattants édités en français de 1915 à 1928* (Paris, 1929).
 80. Alois Žipek, ed., *Domov za války: Svědectví účastníků* (5 vols, Prague, 1929–31), vol. 1, 8.
 81. Compare with educational statistics for Bohemia, Moravia, and Austrian Silesia from 1920, where only 1% of the adult population (2% of men) were college educated and 10% (13% of men, 6% of women) reached the level of secondary education. See Ludmila Fialová, Pavla Horská et al., *Dějiny obyvatelstva českých zemí* (Prague, 1998), 341.
 82. See Zahra, *Kidnapped Souls*; and King, *Budweisers into Czechs and Germans*. See also Tara Zahra, 'Imagined Noncommunities: National Indifference as a Category of Analysis', *Slavic Review* 69, no. 1 (2010): 93–119.
 83. On the Austro-Hungarian officer corps, its wartime experience and the values and attitudes that permeated its professional core of career men in particular, see Martin Schmitz, *'Als ob die Welt aus den Fugen ginge': Kriegserfahrungen österreichisch-ungarischer Offiziere 1914–18* (Paderborn, 2016); see also István Deák, *Beyond Nationalism: A Social and Political History of the Habsburg Officer Corps, 1848–1918* (Oxford, 1990). For the consequences these values carried into the officers' experience of wartime (and postwar) gender, see, for example, Hämmerle, *Heimat/Front*, 183–201. It is of note that the one exception to the rule, Major Karel Wagner of k.u.k. Infantry Regiment 88, led the way in the abortive postwar efforts of some of the Austro-Hungarian Czech-speaking veterans to save the memory of their service, strongly emphasizing the notion of honour in the process. See Wagner, *S českým plukem na ruské frontě*, 7–9.
 84. Michael S. Kimmel, *The History of Men: Essay on the History of American and British Masculinities* (New York, 2005), 5.