

## THE RED NEWS-REEL OF THE TANÁCSKÖZTÁRSASÁG: HISTORY DREAM AND CINEMA IMAGINATION

BRUNO DE MARCHI  
Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore, Milano

In this essay, we shall try to present some practical considerations concerning the possibility of a concrete connection between cinema and history. Better, we shall present some considerations about the possibility by using a film document as a history source. Marc Ferro in his well-known *Cinéma et Histoire. Le cinéma agent et source de l'histoire* (Denoël-Gontier, Paris, 1977) has already explored this field with loose and rather fragmentary studies. Dedicated to Jacques Le Goff – hence owing very much to the 'Annales' school – Ferro's studies allow us to expound the question in a far more correct way.

### Diagram of the relations between cinema and historiography

Proceeding *per summa capita*, the *status questionis* of cinema/history relations can be seen in the following way:

1. A film document is not considered as a (reliable) source of history. Ferro remarks that, at the beginning of the century at least, "sources used by sanctioned historians form a *corpus* which is as hierarchical as the society to which they address their work. As in this society, documents are divided into classes where one could easily distinguish privileged ones, outcasts, tramps and *Lumpen*. Benedetto Croce wrote: "History is always contemporary". Now, at the beginning of the 20th century, this hierarchy reflects power games; in the first rank, we find the glamorous State Archives, manuscripts or printed papers, rare documents, all the expression of His Highness the Power, of the power of families, parliaments, chambers; then follows the group of the non-secret printed documents: juridical and legislative texts, first expressions of power; then newspapers and publications which do not come from the power only but from the whole of cultivated society. Biographies, sources of local history, travellers' reports all form the last rank; these documents occupy the lowest position in the making of the thesis. History is analysed from the point of view of those who arrogate the direction of society to themselves: statesmen, diplomats, magistrates and directors".<sup>1</sup>

2. A film "is part of the mental universe of a historian": partly because its language "proves to be unintelligible, because it is difficult to interpret it – just like dream language"<sup>2</sup>; partly because of "a blindness, an unconscious refusal, coming from more complex causes"<sup>3</sup>; paraphrasing Michel Foucault, Ferro gives as a proof of these more

complex causes the unexamined reasons which cause historians to transform some monuments of the past into 'documents' and some others not; and, on the other hand, to transform some documents of the present into 'monuments' and some others not.<sup>4</sup>

3. A film is not part of the mental universe of a historian, this being because of a prejudice which is not unreasonable. As Ferro says, for a man of culture, cinema is "a dulling machine, a pastime for illiterates, and for mean creatures degraded by needs". The bishop, the deputy, the general, the notary, the professor, the magistrate share this judgement by Georges Duhamel. They do not compromise themselves in this "show for helots". First jurisprudence verdicts perfectly show how film is accepted by ruling classes. Film is considered a sort of washout; Law does not recognise the author's existence. The images in movement are due to the special machine which produces them. For a long time, Law has considered the writer of the *subject* as the *film* author. As a rule, copyright was not recognised to the one who filmed. He was never considered a cultivated man, but he was called an image 'hunter'. Even today, as far as films on topical subjects are concerned, cameramen remain anonymous; images are signed by the producing house (...).<sup>5</sup>

4. A film is not accepted as a historical source even when it is a reportage and not fiction, because of its feeble truthfulness and the obvious possibility of it being manipulated. "How could you rely", Ferro goes on, "on films on topical subjects when everybody knows that these images, these pseudo-representations of reality are selected and can be transformed as they are arranged during an unchecked montage, a trick, a falsification. A historian would be unable to use documents of this kind. He works in a glass cage, »here are my reference points, here are my proofs«. He will never admit that his choice of documents, their assembly and the order of his argumentations are a montage, a trick, a falsification too. Studying the same historical sources, did different historians write the same history of French Revolution?"<sup>6</sup>

5. In comparison with the beginning of the century (and with cinema beginnings), the world has changed as well as the conception and the purposes of history.

— the Romantic mirage of an integral 'resurrection' of the past (as Michelet called it) has vanished; another project set off; it is the Marxist project of the individualization of the historical process in the analysis of the production *system* and class struggle; starting from other premises, this project confirms the hypothesis that history always has a meaning; it is a project that enacts a new kind of historic objectivity based on isonomy: the historian "exactly as subject — and a subject who cannot be reduced to a mere 'point', but as a subject really present in history, with his own interests, his own choices, his own decisions, a historic and partisan subject — (...) can tell the truth about history, exactly because his conscience is not outside history but it represents the historical moment of conclusion in history".<sup>7</sup>

— according to this point of view, the greatest historic objectivity corresponds to the greatest subjectivity: this is also one of the preliminary positions of the 'Annales' school, as Georges Duby has recently reaffirmed in his *Dialogues* with the philosopher Guy Lardreau: "I am quite positive of the subjectivity of the historical discourse. I am quite positive it is the product of a dream which is not totally free however, since the big

curtains of images that compose it must be fastened with hooks. These hooks are the tracks we spoke of before: concrete tracks printed on the landscape, material objects found by archeology, files, chronicles, reports, and theories on world order. However, desire creeps among these hooks".<sup>8</sup> Which desire? The desire to set up connections between these tracks: connections which will be easier if tracks are evident and which will be more difficult where tracks are wide apart. It is the imagination of the historian that will give form to this desire.<sup>9</sup>

— for Duby and for all those of the 'Annales' school, sources become "a sort of support, or, better, a spring-board used to make a dash, to build with the greatest skill a sound, well-grounded hypothesis about what events or structures could have been."<sup>10</sup>

6. So, history has become once again what it was in the Classic World, and this is due to two new methodologies: the marxist one and the 'Annales' one — no more explanation and doctrine but narration and discourse just as Quintilian said: *scribitur historia ad narrandum, non ad probandum* (Institutio oratoria, 10,1,31).

7. If history is the product of a dream — a dream "delimited, as Duby says, by the world uproar in which the historian lives" and "conditioned by the historian's environment"<sup>11</sup>: but anyway a dream — why should history dream ever refuse that rich mine of "dreamed material" coming from cinema — which is, after all also known as "the dream workshop"? In fact going back to Marc Ferro's opinion images have a great subversive and jurisdictional power. "A film, as Ferro says, bears witness. The reality which cinema presents appears as terribly true; one finds out that it does not necessarily correspond to the assertions of leaders, to the schemes of theorists, or to the analysis of the opposition. It may pour ridicule on their statements instead of illustrating them. We can understand why Churches, priests of all creeds, and every kind of teacher watch with scrupulous and almost maniacal attention over these images in movement which they are still unable to analyse, to control and to possess. A film can dismantle what has been built up with great skill by many generations of statesmen and thinkers. A film destroys the illusory image that every institution, and every individual has created of himself in front of society. The camera reveals the real mechanism of all that, and it can tell much more than one *would* tell about oneself. It reveals secrets, it shows the other side of society, its lapses. It pays attention to structures. All this is enough to understand why after a moment of surprise, there comes a moment of suspicion and dread. The image, the sound image, this product of Nature, will not find a language, as it is with the Savage. The idea that a gesture could be a sentence, and a look a long speech; is totally unbearable: this could mean that images, sounds, a shouting girl, a frightened crowd are the material for another story, different from history, could this be a sort of anti-analysis of society?

It is necessary to start from images. We must not look merely for illustration, confirmation or denial of another kind of knowledge: namely the knowledge of written tradition. It is necessary to consider images for what they are, and to stop calling upon other forms of knowledge so as to grab them in a better way. Historians have already put sources of popular origin in their proper place first, the written ones, then the non-written ones: folklore, popular arts and traditions, etc. We still have to study the film with reference to the world that produced it. The hypothesis is that a film — image of

reality or not, document or fiction, genuine plot or pure invention — is history. The postulate is that what has never taken place and, even what did take place — beliefs, intentions and man's imaginary system are history as well as history itself".<sup>12</sup>

8. Hence it seems quite right to consider a film as a source for history. Its reliability depends on its genuineness: the more significant/signifying it is the more ingenuous it is, i.e. unaware of its use goal, not arranged for a thesis, not reticent but curious about the unusual and the usual as well. Paraphrasing Montale, we could say something fit for both the poet and the operator: no cameraman knows exactly what he is allowed to film. A cameraman does not catch — when he is filming — all the complex meanings of the reality he is 'printing' on the film.<sup>13</sup> The objective eye retains also what the biological eye cannot see.

### Homologation of the iconic source

After these premises, we are allowed "to start from images", as Ferro exhorts. In other words we should not look for confirmation of the assertions of written tradition, but build a new imagination — we mean a richer, more complex imagination — of a big event. In the Middle Ages, they used to say *fortis imaginatio generat casum*. We overturn this apophthegm when we assert that the Magyar Tanácsköztársaság *casus* provoked the *fortis imaginatio* of the cinema Directorate in service of the People's Commission for Education<sup>14</sup>; and even today, it can be the source of the same generous imagination among historians and students of cinema. By imagination we mean what DUBY means: a faculty which is able to establish connections between the different 'tracks' we possess about a certain event (i.e. the Tanácsköztársaság); a faculty which is able "to fill a gap, to serve as a bridge, to fill up the silence in a certain way, using what I already know".<sup>15</sup>

There are no doubts that the Magyar Tanácsköztársaság was a very important event. The historian Enzo Santarelli has remarked about it in a very clear and concise way: it is the only revolutionary event of the Baltic—Danubian—Balkan area preceding the establishment of the popular democracies of the second post-war period. The Tanácsköztársaság represented not only a strong wave of the revolutionary sea-storm crossing Europe from East to West at the end of the First World War. It was also a prototype of the socialist and internationalist evolution (just hinted at but unachieved) of the movements of identification and national independence which were a consequence of the dissolution of the Habsburg Empire.<sup>16</sup> Hence, it is a relevant, historical event. Added to that, the more exceptional and the more sudden an event is, the more it provokes — as DUBY remarks, a flowering of peculiar relations, a sort of swarm of discourses. In this superabundance of discourses, people say things that are usually left unsaid because they are banal. That is to say, they belong to everyday life and that nobody is interested in when everything is all right.<sup>17</sup>

The film documents that the *Magyar Filmintézet* (the Cinema Institute of Budapest) now possesses — that is twenty-five news-reels which are three to six minutes long — are extraordinary examples of this kind of unusual document. These documents are not shown because they "belong to everyday life", for they have a meaning simply because

they are inserted in a very special event. *Fortis casus generat imaginationem*. We will try to exert our imagination over this *fortis casus*: Duby's historical imagination and the symbolic imagination which allows us to see what is implicit and thus to go further, and to see what is said so to catch what is unsaid. We will exert that right/duty which Duby considers as peculiar to the historians who are always "compelled to insinuate their invention".<sup>18</sup>

### Vörös film: A revolution report

We will call *Vörös film* ("Red Film") this homogeneous *corpus* (*macrotext*). It is made up of twenty revolutionary news-reels which, as a whole last about eighty minutes. These news-reels were filmed during the 133 days of the Tanácsköztársaság and beyond it too; the last news-reel sequences were filmed on Balaton, one or two days after the official end of the republican experience.

Some leading ideas, some recurrent messages go across the *corpus* (*macrotext*): the *corpus* carries out the deliberation of the decree of April 12th 1919, according to which the Magyar Tanácsköztársaság nationalized the cinema industry. It was the first time that such a thing had happened in the whole world.

The *Vörös film* author, in a juridical as well as in a semantic sense,<sup>19</sup> is the political commissar Béla Paulik. He was, at first, responsible of the cinema directorate; Júlia Komját is at his side; she is the artistic and dramatic director of production.<sup>20</sup>

But as modern literary criticism has pointed out, the real author is the implicit author, immanent in the text<sup>21</sup>. In this case, it corresponds to the collective spirit of cinematographers — a revolutionary spirit, although not always marxist, nevertheless has the dimension of an "intellectual proletariat" according to the correct hermeneutics of Nemeskürty.<sup>22</sup> The implicit author has many names. The first names which must be thought of are those of Károly Escher and of all the other operators and technicians who worked for four and a half months to give life to the news-reels of the Tanácsköztársaság.

We can recognise two moments in its history: the period of the pacific expansion of the republic (March 21st — April 15th); and the period of the defensive contraction and of the internal disagreement, which started with the Romanian attacks (April 16th — August 1st).<sup>23</sup>

The *Vörös film* has positive reactions to those different situations: its *Leitmotiven* are the exaltation of its country and of revolution<sup>24</sup> during the period of pacific expansion. They are the defence of the republic against Romanian and Czech 'revanchismes', against the Entente that supported them; and against reactionaries menacing the internal order.<sup>25</sup> The armed wings of the Tanácsköztársaság are the Red Army and the Red Guard<sup>26</sup>, who were active during the period of defensive contraction and internal disagreement.

Both periods have another common *Leitmotiv*: care was taken to show how the republic was providential for the proletariat and especially for the weakest part of it: the young.<sup>27</sup> The microevents that the 'aulic' history usually records from other sources are practically missing in the *Vörös film*; they are present only by reflection and never

through protocol ceremonies, as was to happen in the news-reels of Fascist Italy and Nazi Germany. Not one event mentioned hereafter is recorded as "a conquest of revolution": the nationalization of industry (only for industries with more than twenty workers — that is, one hundred people), the nationalization of vast estates (48% of cultivated land), and the elections of the Soviets involving men and women over 18. The same thing happens for other important Government actions, such as the split between Church and State, the self-government of factories, the house reform, work Acts, and the laicization of schools (two thirds of which were under ecclesiastic direction).<sup>28</sup>

These are very important measures and they have a big revolutionary significance. The Executive passed these measures with great promptness, as if it was anxious to hurry up to win a challenge with history.

One of the reasons for this hurry was the great number, in fact, the thousands of war prisoners, farmers, workers and intellectuals who had come back from Russia as eye-witnesses of revolution. It is useless to underline the power of their persuasion. Plautus has already said: *Pluris est oculatus testis unus quam auriti decem* (Truculentus, 490).

The Executive was anxious on one hand, to underline its substantial difference from the legal government which had taken the power after the democratic-bourgeois revolution on October 30th of the previous year<sup>29</sup>; on the other hand, it wanted to validate the alternative that took place without a formal power transition, but without shedding blood either.<sup>30</sup>

So the *Vörös film* is not at all a catalogue of ceremonials. On the contrary, it is a radiography: the radiography of the reaction of a group of 'real' men facing a real situation which is as short as it is rich in political, ideological, and artistic provocations.

The *Vörös film* not only witnesses but 'expresses' a concrete historical situation too. Expressing it, the *Vörös film* makes it free from the incoherence of its presentation and transforms it in an order of interhuman relations of great perspective: an order which includes every progressive movement of a people looking for greater freedom, a more effectual justice, and a real increase in the promotion of Man.

On one side, there is a political 'event' of big historical dimensions and, on the other side, there is a documentary and expressive 'result', such as the *Vörös film*. These two realities are connected by the cause/effect relation described by Duby: "the event is like a stone thrown into a pond: it makes some slime from the bottom come to the surface and this shows what is happening in the lowest strata of life".<sup>31</sup> We can ever risk saying: the document is just like the event. The events of the Tanácsköztársaság were exciting and tumultuous, so the productive moment of the *Vörös film* is exciting and conflictual too.

### Conflict in production

The big problem was to conciliate two poles: on one hand, the ideological impetuosity of the men of the Party (that is the commissars who directed the business) who had a great revolutionary faith, but no competence at all concerning film production; on the

other hand, the competence of the experts of this sector who were considered unreliable and reluctant (and such a suspicion was not always wrong) by the top.

The ritual mistake of revolutions was made: the roles of faithful incompetents and unreliable experts were overthrown. Pindar had already tried to warn about the fatal danger of this mistake: "horses for the quadriga and oxen for the plough". It was useless.

Béla Paulik was the first to be responsible for national cinema production as a political commissar. He had a very complicated personality and was rarely able to use his wide powers properly.

His April whim to enlist 'all those whose job is cinema'<sup>32</sup> in the autonomous 32nd regiment of the Red Army (proving that cinema was an important weapon) provoked the inevitable intervention of the Government's Revolutionary Council.<sup>33</sup> The order was cancelled, Paulik was relieved of his command, and he was appointed to coordinate filming at the front.<sup>34</sup> The office of 'political commissar of cinema activities' was abolished. Two other people were appointed as substitutes: István Radó, an excellent cinema expert, was appointed by the People's Commission for social production as Commissar of production; and László Márkus, writer, critic and stage-director, was appointed by the People's Commission for Education as artistic Commissar.<sup>35</sup>

The experiment of centralized and autocratic direction had been a big failure with Paulik. The gradual decentralization of national cinema gave better results. Vilmos Tarján, accredited reporter of the 'Sera', was appointed to coordinate the *Vörös film*.<sup>36</sup> Many others worked on it. Among all these, the most famous was Michael Curtiz (1888–1962), who eventually became a great author of sophisticated comedies in Hollywood in the 1930's and the 1940's. At the time of the Tanácsköztársaság his name was still Magyar: Mihály Kertész was even appointed as supervisor for the *Vörös film 5* that had to celebrate the manifestations of the 1st May 'freely'.<sup>37</sup> When he realised that things were going extremely badly, Kertész left for Vienna and never came back. This meant a deterioration of the production team. Those who were ideologically engaged kept on supporting the situation *unguibus et rostris*. Those who were doubtful and recalcitrant became more and more devoted to obstructionism.

Revolutionary tension had undergone some acceleration of its radicalism thanks to some active thinkers who, as Júlia Komját did, spread new passionate manifestos to fix the new nature of cinema. This provoked the excitement of those who were intransigent on both sides. Júlia Komját firmly proclaimed the ostracism of "the romantic, sentimental, mystical and deceptive themes, which belonged to the bourgeois ideology"; she claimed the necessity of an authentic art based on social ethics, and on a dynamic, oriented by the 'natural sciences' conception of the world.<sup>38</sup> She wrote that "every surreptitious insinuation of old ideas which were useful for the purposes of capitalism, is an act of stupidity. An act of stupidity is a counter-revolutionary act".<sup>39</sup>

After a few weeks, Júlia Komját pressed ahead again with stronger arguments, in her article *Film Problems*. She said a final 'no' to fiction stereotypes composed on the love-hate axis – an always gratuitous axis – and she said 'no' to the film-makers' habit of simply satisfying their public appetites and to their being rewarded by cheers of approval

when the public was driven to a fairy world where "everybody is happy" and where all the villains are punished.<sup>40</sup>

In spite of controversies, there was a big production.<sup>41</sup> As far as fiction films are concerned, there were remarkable results with over three or four films each month. There were nearly thirty fiction films (not all feature films). They were short works, such as *The Red Question*, *The Prodigal Son*, *Love Remedies*, *Good-for-Nothing*, *Whims*, *The Burglar*, and *The Rape of the Luck*.<sup>42</sup> However there were even more engaging films like *God's Son*, *Devil's Son*, taken from a progressive novel by Terka Lux; or like *Money*, from one of Gorki's tales; like *Miss Julia* by Strindberg; or like *Yesterday*, a revolutionary comedy which mixes syndicalism and adulteries. The latter was branded as a "mess of bad taste, disingenuous and lacking culture" by the Central Council of Cinema.<sup>43</sup> As far as documentaries are concerned, twenty parts of the *Vörös film* were joined under the banner of revolutionary optimism. The morals, which are the implicit author of the *Vörös film*, are totally positive. The optimistic level can be measured by the project prepared after May 1st 1919: it is the project of a city of cinema — at Szentendre and Leányfalu or at Kamaraerdő — which should have been built following the "modern methods of English and American architecture", i.e. with giant settings — a street in Nuremberg style, a copy of the Palazzo Ducale in Venice, a rococo mansion with a garden, a Greek temple, and Turkish thermal baths.<sup>44</sup>

Optimism and reticence are the two lines concerning the *Vörös film*, and they are applied with perfect coherence to the logic of the precarious period of the Tanácsköztársaság. This is due to the fact that optimism is the faith of revolution and reticence is a logical-strategic figure that must attest the reliability and the firmness of the so called 'internal front': even though, as Eco insinuates, reticence "helps in suggesting in a more persuasive way, what could seem banal once it is said".<sup>45</sup> The presentation of the troubles and failures of the republic proved the eagerness of self-punishing sincerity and it was not an omission of truth. It was not censorship. By László Márkus's order, the author (the director) had the ultimate responsibility for the film — hence its censor. It is true that someone abused this privilege and produced a film "against the spirit of the age".<sup>46</sup> That is why, on May 10th, a decree stated the principle that "films should be revised before their projection".<sup>47</sup> The *Vörös film* was also subject to this law. But as far as the *Vörös film* is concerned, we propose the hypothesis of self-censorship. Its film makers did not want to displease the Power, and they did not want to present themselves as defeatists. Besides, circulation is always a virtue in a situation which is not a status of right. Silence (that is to say the omission of unhappy ideas) was already regarded as supreme wisdom in Pindar's age<sup>48</sup> and it is a rule of propaganda. The *Vörös film* is inspired by *metanoia*. Propaganda is the best way to advertise revolutions. Who could ever advertise a stale product? Beyond optimism and the golden rule of reticence what else can be said about the *Vörös film*? We can comment on the little, arhythmic, discontinuous beat which is nearly puzzled in front of the non-ceremonial everyday life; we notice in each film the great attention to details, to the ephemeral and to casual facts; we can distinguish a refusal to catalogue the official character of anything but a few,



malicious exceptions. This is a disposition which refuses, as Jacques Le Goff says, seduction of history and which defines itself in comparison with the story lived by men.

Not one of the 226 events or fragments of events of the *Vörös film* maxireport on the revolution possesses something exciting or something glorious. We can read each of the twenty short chapters of the *Vörös film* as a confirmation of the crisis of historicism, namely a confirmation of the 'mise en question' of the possibility of finding an exact meaning of history in each single event. This is what Paul Veine is thinking when he says that in the final analysis, history is not driven by profound causes like 'the rise of bourgeoisie' or the 'redemption of proletariat'. We are not very far from the problematic attitude of a marxist like Eric Hobsbawm who – in his recent *Work, Culture and Ideas in Industrial Society* – destroys the vain convictions of 'historiographic' historians. He claims that we run the risk of forgetting that the objects and the subjects of our research are human beings. Historians must remember that men – not the 'working class', but working men and women, who are real people and often ignorant, narrow-minded and full of prejudices – are the objects of their studies. "For many of us", he says at the end, "the final goal of our research is to create a world where workers can live their own life and their own history, instead of receiving it as ready-made from someone else, even from professors". To sum up, if history has a meaning, we must look for it in history itself and not in men.<sup>49</sup>

The *Vörös film*, considered as a macrotext, and having the 'esprit de révolution' as implicit author as well as a various patchwork composed by many, insignificant, curious or even dull microtexts, is everything and nothing at the same time. It is a *corpus* and a magma at the time, something that no historian (a cinema historian or even a pure historian) could ever master by his professional technique alone. He could master it only by using a wide point of view, a perspective which is philosophical and aesthetical at the same time. It is philosophical because it concerns the large number of questions about existence which are still present in our century. It is aesthetical because the historian needs more and more to take a new possession of the events and characters which are the objects of his study. We think that this need is the product of the historian's never ending swing between philology and imagination. Philology certifies acritically the 'historicity' of an event; imagination fills the blank existing between a sure event, the previous and the following one (which is also DUBY's idea).

Working on the *Vörös film*, we ourselves try to proceed following the rhythm of this swing between the philological confirmation of facts belonging to the historical experience of the Tanácsköztársaság and the effort of imagination (and we mean also symbolic imagination) we want to make from now on. Both tensions contribute to a reaffirmation of the utility of the *Vörös film* as a historical document which strengthens the historicity of the Republic of councils. For us, today, historicity colours the 133 days of the Tanácsköztársaság as well as the twenty numbers (that is, the 266 episodes) of the *Vörös film*. If by history we mean everything that produces a considerable quantity of social, political and aesthetic effects, the 133 days and the 266 episodes of the *Vörös film* (chance wants that the 266 episodes of the *Vörös film* are exactly the double of the days of the Republic) 'make', that is to say 'are', history with great dignity. We mean by this

that the 133 days and the 266 episodes still reproduce and amplify passions, feelings, ideas and culture in the individual conscience and in collective consciences.

### The most dangerous tracks

We must now give substance to the historical discernment. We must follow the tracks and establish continuity where there appears to be none, from the fragmentary information supplied by the *Vörös film*. We can create this global vision – with the contribution of imagination – by cross reading the *Vörös film* as a macrotext. This cross reading of the macrotext allows us to define some themes which comprise the founding elements of the complex Tanácsköztársaság diorama. These themes are grouped in ‘narrative units’. By ‘narrative unit’ we mean a short film sequence lasting about thirty seconds, documenting a situation or an event and illustrated by a subtitle.

The themes are presented following in order of intensity:

- The Red Army, sword of the Republic (126 narrative units; hereafter n.u.)
- Proletariat and its leaders, *omphalos* of the new society (109 n.u.);
- Liturgies deepening the communication inside the Army and the proletariat, i.e. allocutions (33 n.u.) and march pasts (33 n.u.).

The significant clause of the *Vörös film* is the sequence showing the happy proletarian boys, at the holiday camps on the banks of Balaton, running towards the waters of the ‘Hungarian sea’ and diving in – surely ignoring the end of the 133 day Republic. This clause-sequence and the other four information groups of the *Vörös film* can have – like every other text – a double meaning: a denotative and a connotative reading.

### The red army tracks

On the denotative level, the theme ‘Red Army-sword of the republic’ is present in the whole arch of its function. Just like a big organism which needs invention and consolidation, the *Vörös film*, without following a logical progression (which is the result of spreading our observation over all the macrotext) but following an iterative order instead, shows all the main moments of the creation of the Army. So we can see: the enlistment and the training (7 n.u.); the moments concerning the quarters in Budapest and in other towns (8 n.u.); surveillance of the Danube and the junctions of many roads, surveillance of many river banks, the patrol of the river with the light ‘monitors’, and war units used during the resistance against the sedition organized in Szeged (8 n.u.).

The *Vörös film* then shows moments of war outside the capital: from the happy departures of troops by train (7 n.u.) – there was an armoured train for quick displacements and a defensive fortress (1 n.u.) – to the description of places near the front (2 n.u.).

The Army was fighting on two fronts: the Transylvanian front at the Tisza against the Romanians, which from April 16th was commanded by Vilmos Böhm and the Czech

front. In spite of General Fauchet's efforts, there was no front with the new Serbo-Croat-Slovenian State.<sup>50</sup> However, the Republic also had to face the Counter-Revolutionary Committee of Vienna. This acted on the orders of Count István Bethlen and Szeged's Anti-Bolshevik Committee where Rear-Admiral Miklós Horthy was entrusted with responsibility for military affairs.<sup>51</sup> This committee inspired an insurrection in Budapest on June 24th, but this was immediately crushed by the Red Guard.<sup>52</sup>

That is the reason why the richest narrative section of the *Vörös film* is the section that exposes different moments of military life near the front. There are approach marches, transfers using motor vehicles, the happy crossing of towns and villages, barracks, training and manoeuvres (even with heavy weapons), the changing of the guard, the frequent inspections by officers, and officers reviewing troops which are spurred, incited or reproached. There are moments of relaxation spent for personal hygiene, mess-time and showing mascots. Then, almost on the sly, scenes of battle (7 n.u.), war destruction (2 n.u.), and the care of injured soldiers, are shown as if it was unusual and dangerous due to the lack of expertise of operators; last come the obsequies of those soldiers and citizens who died for the Tanácsköztársaság (6 n.u.).

The whole military span, from enlistment to death, is fully reported in the *Vörös film*. The fact that 47% of the macrotext is occupied by the Red Army – that is to say by the military part of the republic, the armed wing of the Tanácsköztársaság – is not a mere coincidence. It signifies the fact that film-makers, and operators considered freedom, national independence, and defence of the revolution to be primary values.

*Ubi libertas, ibi patria.* The Latin motto is good for 1919 Magyars during the 133 days of the Tanácsköztársaság. Alfred de Vigny's idea (in *Servitude et grandeur militaires*) of the army as a "nation inside the nation" proves to be absolutely appropriate for the *Vörös film*<sup>53</sup>. However, as history teaches, the so-called "War God" is always on the side of the biggest and best equipped army. The *Gott mit uns* is not a shield but simply the commemoration of a wicked relativity.

### Proletariat and infancy tracks

The second great theme of the *Vörös film* is the internal front, to which the proletariat gives life with its peculiar quality: its untiring activity (12 n.u.). To this untiring activity corresponds – almost to underline a cause and effect relation or a right and duty correspondence (*qui iure suo utitur neminem laedit!*) – the idea of the republic as the supplier (12 n.u.) – a lavish and thankful mother. Feudal times are not so distant a memory. Meanwhile, the proletariat is fighting for the right to have its primary needs defended (house, health, food).

Even the bourgeois intellectuals are shown as "fit for manual works" (2 n.u.). This points out that all the citizens found, in their work, equality and their right of citizenship – that is the right to belong to the republic.

The most evident and the most edifying sign (a persuasive sign for the public too) is that the greatest care of the republic is towards children, proletarian children, towards the

weak and the helpless ones. In fact, they are the *omphalos* of the new society. They deserve prompt care, starting from primary needs: it is necessary to chase from their sight the ghost of hunger (the long war has just finished and post-war period was not much better); their bodily health must be granted (here come tidy houses, play gardens, country excursions, summer holiday camps) and so must their mental health (and here come amusements, entertainments and a cinema specially for them).

The pedagogical cares of the Tanácsköztársaság are quite evident. Films produced for adults are not intended for "the intellectual enjoyment of children who are sensitive, innocent and impressionable". By a decree of May 8th, children under 10 were not admitted into cinemas, except for those cinemas showing films for children. By another decree five cinemas in Budapest were reserved for children. They were prepared and opened on May 31st. They showed documentaries, fairy tales and cartoons. There was even a film specially made for children: *Oliver Twist* by Márton Garas.

It was the first time in the world that a government had worried about planning the education around and through images for the young (and in July, a similar type of planning was prepared for the popularization of science among adults). Horthy's regime retained this supremacy — at least as far as concerns children's access to the cinema.<sup>54</sup>

The internal front is not formed only by proletarians and their children. It is a rich weft of interrelations, of comparisons, of information, of correspondence.

There is the anonymous town crowd (5 n.u.); everyday life moments in the streets and in the quarters of the capital, and a crowd queuing up to buy scarce commodities (2 n.u.).

The press did not hide the growing difficulties caused by the "economic block" of the Entente. People were advised to spare food for two reasons: the greatest part of the agricultural territories was in the hands of the enemy and farmers — because of their instinctive self-interest — were not convinced of the justice of sending foodstuffs to their "proletarian brothers".<sup>55</sup>

### The rites of confirmation of the tracks of consent

Private life was hard, at least for proletarians. On the other hand political life was brisk.

According to the visual documents — or better, the historic material — of the *Vörös film*, political life was the scaffolding of the internal front. For the first time ever in Hungary, the leaders — soldiers or civilians — of this political life (who are also the soul of this life) tried to establish a direct relation with great masses. They did that in the only possible way: they appeared in the big mass assemblies (9 n.u.). Béla Kun appears in 7 n.u.; other leaders in 15 n.u. appearing 6 times in the provinces.

In ancient times (and it is enough to think of Thucydides) speeches were considered the face of the spirit.<sup>56</sup> In fact, leaders' speeches to the crowd — to civilians in Budapest and to soldiers at the front — provide a wide gallery of the faces of the revolutionary spirit of the republic. The tone is invariably peremptory, their gestures are invariably

emphatic, their power of persuasion was strong (and nothing seemed able to weaken it). It is important to measure the stress laid on the speeches shown in the *Vörös film*: they are presented in 33 narrative units (and Béla Kun speaks three times only) which have short subtitles explaining just one of the many subjects exposed by the particular speaker.

Speeches, as Thucydides teaches, give many kinds of information. They describe the speaker as well as his audience. They offer the co-ordinates of a situation, of a project, of an opportunity. They are the final balance or the prelude of an action. Their purport depends on these human "variables" that situate and justify them. In a revolutionary context, more than ever, speeches are shadows. Only actions give credibility to speeches.<sup>57</sup> The speeches of the *Vörös film* must be read as a reflection of revolutionary actions; albeit a pale reflection, because they are voiceless speeches. Yet they have their own consistency.

Oral communication is the great vehicle of transmission of revolutionary passion, and passion, or conviction, is the only persuasive "orator". Films do not allow us to find out something about the persuasiveness of those speeches. Their number is really impressive. Almost 13% of the narrative units of the *Vörös film* are occupied by speeches. It is even more strange that in the *Vörös film*, the answer, the logical correlation of leaders' speeches, and the collective reply to their ideological exhortations, have the same frequency as those speeches. There are 33 narrative units containing speeches, and 33 containing march pasts, parades, demonstrations — always with a remarkable presence of the crowd, which becomes a multitude on May 1st, the official Republic Day<sup>58</sup>. Six are funeral cortèges. The dead — as Thucydides had already remarked<sup>59</sup> — are always praised. Each revolution needs its dead. They are its martyrs, its witnesses. They are useful because they teach us to despise death, which is considered as something insignificant in comparison with a great cause. The living find consolation in staying together. They think that even though they have many reasons to despise their actual life, they have no reason to be afraid of death, which will find them in any case.

Even funeral cortèges are an assertion of life: a life that must go on, if only to find time enough to change it. This seems to be the meaning of every kind of cortège in the *Vörös film*. They have something fabulous about their nature. Their regular and measured steps — which seem almost clumsy — give the impression of surprise, emotion, enthusiasm for something new, and something pleasant — something that people are afraid to lose immediately. The cortèges convey a sort of 'dismay'. It is a kind of dress rehearsal which is too far from any reasonable, possible expectation to be considered real. Here, the imagination of the historian goes beyond any plausible induction. He is probably looking for the symbolic meaning that every cortège possesses in Western symbolic "imaginaire".

What we have said till now is the result of reading the *Vörös film* as a denotative macrotext. In the case of such a reading it is conveyed as a discontinuous macrotext with peculiar narrative fragments, which can be grouped, as we have seen before (main themes). We can also express some orderly reflections, as we have so far tried to do.

### Symbolic tasks of the imagination

Empty and unknown spaces are extremely wider than those "reported" episodically and in a fragmentary way by the *Vörös film*. That is why, following the connotative tracks, we must prepare for a great increase of the imagination. We do that to give a hint of some possible connections in the *abruptum*, i.e. in the intermittent discourse of the *Vörös film*. So we have a second possibility to strengthen the historical hermeneutics of the *Vörös film*; in hermeneutics we can find in the four big narrative groups of the *Vörös film*: the Red Army, the proletariat-*omphalos* of the new society, speeches and cortèges. We will add a note on the clause of the *Vörös film*, namely, the boys in the waters of lake Balaton.

#### 1. The Red Army, Sword of Revolution

What is a weapon in a symbolic respect? It is the anti-monster which can yet become a monster in its turn. A weapon is created as an instrument to fight an enemy, but it can be withdrawn from its original purpose and it can be used against a friend or simply against someone else. There is a fundamental amphibology in a weapon: it can be simultaneously an instrument of justice and oppression, of rescue and suppression, an instrument of defence and conquest. What ever, a weapon, with its positive or negative nature, materializes the idea of a will firmly oriented towards an aim.

From a moral and spiritual point of view, in the Western world, weapons stand for interior powers: virtues are nothing but functions finally balanced by the spirit supervision.

The Red Army (or better, its incessant presentation in the *Vörös film*) stands for the primary solicitude of the republic and for the ratification of its potentiality of bearing comparison with internal (the Red Guard) or external opposing forces. It is not to be outclassed and it must be able to stand any challenge with equal force. The red colour, which distinguishes this army from any other, is a sort of support for the symbology of the weapon defending the Tanácsköztársaság. In fact, red is the fundamental symbol of origin of life in all its power, force and exuberance. Red is the colour of fire and blood, with all their ambivalences. If red is a dim, dark, dull red, it is a nocturnal, feminine, secret, funeral colour. If red is bright as fire, it is a solar, male, stimulating, spurring colour. It is the symbol of ardour, of impulsive and generous force, of youth, of a free and sound eros, a bellicose and triumphant eros. The Red Army has a definite and predominant presence in the *Vörös film*. It underlines the affirmative tension of revolution — which appeals to all the exuberance of the male — to impose itself in an international context and to prove its authority in front of recalcitrant and hostile forces at home.

## 2. *The Proletariat – the Omphalos of a New Society*

For the proletarian revolution, which followed the bourgeois revolution led by Count Károlyi's, it is normal for the proletariat to be the *omphalos* of the society which must be built. The *omphalos* is the universal symbol of centrality. Many cosmologies say that the world has its origin in a navel and from this the epiphany of life spreads with great force in the four fundamental directions. Let's remember the Delphic oracle, centre of the Apollo cult. The tradition says that the Delphic *omphalos* was placed exactly where the god had killed the Python serpent and near the cleft which swallowed the waters from the Deucalion flood. Apollo placed himself at the centre (in the navel) of the earth so he could direct the human genre from there. Delphos (world *omphalos*) and proletariat (*omphalos* of the new society) stand for the living power prevailing over the blind and monstrous forces which generate chaos. We could say in modern language that it is the centre of life's rational order. This order is not obtained through an overwhelming imperiousness, but with no external help, through an inner control, through reinforcement of personality, and through self-discipline. The stress of the *Vörös film* on the proletariat-*omphalos* is like an order: an order to do one's founding duty without compromise, and without the support of other classes. The proletariat must succeed by the force of its compactness and innovative centrality.

## 3. *Speeches and Cortèges: a Double Modality to Consolidate Proletarian Centrality*

The *Vörös film* indicates the two ways of consolidating proletarian compactness and centrality: its leaders' speeches and the choral answer of mass cortèges.

Which is the symbolic charge of the word-tool used in the leaders' speeches? It is the human word: an audible sound and a penetrating form. The word is the *alter ego* of the male semen. It penetrates the ear – which is almost another female sex – and it goes down towards the deep conscience to fecundate the seed of action and create a new embryo. This is the embryo of a brand new reality. In this case, it is the embryo of a new, egalitarian and progressive society.

The ideas of a fecundating word, of the fertility of a speech, of a *Verbum* bringing the seed of creation, (origin of the whole creation and intended as the first and essential manifestation of the divinity) can be found in the cosmogonic conception of many peoples. The word is the initial act which establishes the profound sense of existence: it is the Greek *Logos* – that is to say word, sentence and speech at the same time – and also reason and intelligence, even divine thought. Each word, each speech symbolizes the manifestation of intelligence through language; and intelligence is a modality of existence: the self-thinking existence which expresses itself “in persona” or the existence which is known and communicated by someone else.

So, the recurrence of perorations in the *Vörös film* is the unconscious affirmation of the rationality of revolutionary discourse, and of its possibility to penetrate the con-

science of the proletarian masses with fertile results. Where the revolutionary word is accepted, it activates the embryo of the new society which is due to spring from the proletariat. The receptivity of these proletarian masses is proved by cortèges, mass meetings and demonstrations. What is the symbolic range? What is the connotative value of these "human chains" running in the streets of the capital to celebrate a day (May 1st) or to show a common will? The chain, the series, the sequel are the symbol of the communicative and solidary ties of a community (a big or a small one) and of each action that affects it. Hands and arms can be joined to form a chain. It is a human chain: it is the sign of the will to adapt oneself to a certain kind of collective life, namely to conform to a group. This exalts personal will and destroys every compulsion: it is a free, spontaneous acceptance. It ratifies a pact of collaboration, a unanimous and assertive reply to the call of the revolutionary message conveyed by the leaders' word.

The movement of this human chain, the so called "circumambulation" (that is to say, the way of moving of the cortège), recreates in a modern manner, the very ancient habit of "reproducing" the sun's vital movement. A march past has this cosmic value in that it conforms to an ordered and universal rhythm where everybody wants to be inserted so as to be in complete harmony with it. Imitation of the star cycles is the same as expressing a desire to take part in and "guarantee", world harmony — thus adopting the rhythm of every personal microcosm to the rhythm of the macrocosm.

One of the first solemn assertions of the Tanácsköztársaság was to qualify itself as an integral part (microcosm) of the big, international proletarian movement (macrocosm).<sup>60</sup> This feeling of being a part of a wider, European movement finds its correlative part in the great "motion" of the masses reproducing, by "circumambulation", the concrete act of insertion into the great circuit of the world proletarian revolution.

### The Lustral Bath Clause

Just a short note on the closing sequence of the *Vörös film*: the bathing boys at the proletarian holiday camps by the side of Balaton. They are bathing in the little "Magyar sea" while the republic is dying. The symbolic meaning is obvious. It is difficult to say whether the *Vörös film* operators and set-dressers were conscious of the end or not; but even though it is an involuntary clause and its meaning is still intact.

The *Vörös film*, a documentary macrotext of the republic, closes with a lustral bath in the lake waters: and the lake is the eye of the earth through which infernal gods — the gods of origin — watch the life of human beings. In doing so, they judge it. Nobody ignores the purifying and regenerating virtues of water. These virtues are always active, in every place and in every time, in sacred and profane domains. Bathing is the first rite which sanctions the great moments of life: birth, puberty and death. Immersion stands for uterine regression: it answers to a call for safety, to a need for relaxation, for *ressourcement*, as the French would say, and for a return to the matrix. At the same time, immersion stands for the acceptance of a moment of oblivion and it hints at the abandon of quarrels, fights and disagreements. Immersion breaks life as a hiatus. It is an interrup-



tion, to which it necessarily gives an initiation value. In this case, water occurs as a purifying, regenerating and fecundating value. The young proletarians bathe in Balaton and this acquires a pregnant and clear sign, a prophetic sign. It says: there will be a break in the continuity of revolution and history will define its length; it will be a necessary and useful break, an intermission which prepares a new life for a regenerated society – a society which is definitely fecund.

In conclusion we want to remark, that the convergence of the symbolic signs of the *Vörös film* are evoked by a connotative reading; the proletariat-*omphalos* idea, the fecundating discourse idea, the cortège/repetition of an idea of solar vitality, the regenerating idea of the bathing they all give strength to the “revolution = life” equation. This equation certifies the motive which is present throughout the *Vörös film*. Life and revolution are synonyms of victory. This is a lasting victory, a victory which remains in spite of little defeats, personal deaths, and precarious counterrevolutions.

Now, the study of the hermeneutics of the *Vörös film* macrotext seem to be complete – at least partially. It is an uncertain, crooked, irregular macrotext, but its imperfections and defects make it lively and vital. We could even say that for the *Vörös film* imperfection is its “raison d’être”. The incompleteness is a challenge, an injunction, an entreaty to action to lose no time in self-satisfaction.

One of the main ideas of Chateaubriand’s *Histoire de France* is that all the revolutions which are not achieved in customs and in ideas are destined to failure. The *Vörös film* is a sketch of the new society. Every sketch must be achieved, integrated and finished off. Completing is living, having completed is dying.

### Provisional conclusion

The conclusion we can draw from the attempt to follow some tracks or, to use DUBY’s words, to find a new representation of the Tanácsköztársaság (“starting from images” as FERRO remarked) the *Vörös film* images analysis made by us is partial and provisional.

We began from images because we recognized that those animated signs – the first real name of cinema is “animated photography” – have the dignity of a historical source beside other traditional sources. This dignity should be verified philologically by further studies on the film material kept at the *Magyar Filmintézet*, by comparing these studies with the result of studies made on other written sources and by looking for further testimonies if not of contemporary people (we have been told that no author of the *Vörös film* is still alive) then of those people who, in one way or another, got in touch with the different authors – real or implicit – of the *Vörös film*.

The result of a further study, developed in that way, could be definitive. It should keep in mind the following factors:

– the news-reel covers a well-determined and rather short period: the shorter the chronological scissors are, the better are the results of studies. The main worry of those who follow the “Annales” can be respected from this point of view: chronology for history is absolutely decisive.

— this research gives freedom of action to imaginative hermeneutics and to symbolic imagination (we think of Duby's 'dream of history'). The results of this provisional research should be compared with the results of other research made by traditional historians who follow traditional sources and traditional methods. It is right to think that from the comparison, the different results could either cancel each other out or melt in a wider and convincing synthesis without expecting Michelet's "total resurrection of history". We do not want to give any absolute value to the comparative method. We would just like to assert the right rules of interdisciplinary study.

These rules allow us to get over the barriers established for single disciplines without expecting to get over medieval prudence: *omnis comparatio claudicat*. Even though our results are provisional — and we insist on this judgement — they still are evident (at least as far as the *Vörös film* is concerned: a news-reel which was born in exceptional conditions, with no apologetic pretensions, with no celebratory purposes and with little propaganda). The result is that with the unwitting eye of the cameraman, the *innocent eye* (and we use *innocent* in its etymological meaning: an eye that does not damage, that does not spoil anything) of the camera is able to keep a catalogue of images which can be frequently examined; this is a catalogue which brings back the passion and the tension of an exceptional event, lived by the minority of a people who already are a minority in Europe, but who are able to find inside themselves the will to create new measures for a good government.

Lamartine had already pointed out that time only can teach men to govern by themselves and that their education takes place through revolutions.<sup>61</sup> This rule fits the Magyar people who, in the short time of little more than a century, have seen the birth of many revolutions.

Besides, the *Vörös film* seems to regain at least one of the morals of history against the common tendency to go over the old saying *historia est magistra vitae*. That is morals that are still suggested by Duby.

To know history — and above all, the history of revolutions — and to try to recover its thickness, fervour and tone through contemporary and documentary images, allows people to have a freer judgement. If it is not useful to teach progress, history can be at least a lesson for citizens. History can help to form people who are able "to act and to operate with full knowledge of the facts, and who are less entangled in the net of an ideology. History also teaches the complexity of reality. It teaches us to read the present in a less naïve way, to grasp how the different factors of a culture and of a social moulding interact reciprocally".<sup>62</sup> So, is it really worth nothing to have the possibility to count on more conscious and aware people for society?

#### Notes

1. M. Ferro, *Cinéma et Histoire. Le cinéma agent et source de l'histoire*, Paris, 1977. Italian translation: *Cinema e storia. Linee per una ricerca*, p. 95. Every quotation of this essay is translated into English by the author himself.

2. *Ibidem*, p. 92.

3. *Ibidem*, p. 93.
4. M. Foucault, *L'archéologie du savoir*, Paris, 1966, pp. 14–15.
5. M. Ferro, *op. cit.*, p. 96.
6. *Ibidem*, p. 97.
7. G. Lardreau in G. Duby, *Dialogues*, Paris, 1980. Italian translation: *Il sogno della storia*, Milano, 1986, p. 14.
8. G. Duby, *op. cit.*, p. 46; cfr. pp. 39–40.
9. *Ibidem*, p. 40.
10. *Ibidem*, p. 46.
11. *Ibidem*, p. 49.
12. M. Ferro, *op. cit.*, pp. 100–101.
13. Cfr. *Ibidem*, p. 29.
14. I. Nemeskürty, *A képpé varázsolt idő*, Budapest, 1983, p. 183.
15. G. Duby, *op. cit.*, p. 40.
16. E. Santarelli, "Tra storia e storiografia", in *Ungheria oggi*, no. 13/14, luglio – dicembre 1979, p. 68; cfr. also G. Borsányi, *Mosca guardava con grande speranza Béla Kun e la Repubblica dei Consigli*, *ibidem*, pp. 21–28.
17. G. Duby, *op. cit.*, pp. 63–64.
18. *Ibidem*, p. 42.
19. Etymologically, the word 'author' comes from a radical \*auc/aug (*augeo, auctoritas*) and a suffix -tor used to fix the *nomina agentium*. Originally it meant: the one who has the first idea of something and makes it grow.
20. "Socialized Cinematographic Firms" is the legal name of the directorate for cinematography. It had to organize the production, the distribution and cinemas in Budapest; it had to promote the trade of Hungaria films abroad, to form actors and to educate and inform its public. Cfr. Nemeskürty, *op. cit.*, pp. 183–184 and M. Bálint, *A magyar némafilm története 1918–1931*, Budapest, 1976, p. 31.
21. Cfr. M. Corti, *Principi della comunicazione letteraria*, Milano, 1976, p. 41.
22. I. Nemeskürty, *op. cit.*, pp. 180–181.
23. E. Santarelli, *op. cit.*, pp. 72–73. Cfr. M. Ormos, "L'intervento dell'Intesa" in *Ungheria oggi, op. cit.*, pp. 40–41.
24. Cfr. I. Barta, I. T. Berend, P. Hanák, M. Lackó, L. Makkai, Z. L. Nagy, G. Ránki, *Histoire de la Hongrie des origines à nos jours*, Budapest, 1974, 475; L. Barta, "Chauvinisme et communisme" in *La République des Conseils-Budapest 1919*, Paris, 1979, pp. 53–56.
25. M. Ormos, *op. cit.*, pp. 37–48.
26. G. Péteri, "Le radici della nuova egemonia", in *Ungheria d'oggi, op. cit.*, pp. 4–20. Cft. *Histoire de la Hongrie*, pp. 467–468.
27. *Histoire de la Hongrie*, p. 468.
28. E. Santarelli, *op. cit.*, p. 72.
29. H. Vass, "L'influence internationale de la République hongroise des Conseils," in *Nouvelles Études Hongroises*, no. 14, 1979, p. 42.
30. E. Santarelli, *op. cit.*, p. 70; and also T. Hajdú, "Mihály Károlyi il giorno della proclamazione della Repubblica dei Consigli", in *Ungheria d'oggi*, pp. 29–36.
31. G. Duby, *op. cit.*, p. 64.
32. M. Bálint, *op. cit.*, p. 34.
33. Cfr. *Histoire de la Hongrie*, p. 466.
34. M. Bálint, *op. cit.*, pp. 34–35.
35. *Ibidem*, p. 35.
36. *Ibidem*, p. 36.
37. *Ibidem*, pp. 61–62. Cfr. E. Santarelli, *op. cit.*, p. 73.
38. M. Bálint, *op. cit.*, p. 39.
39. *Ibidem*, p. 40.

40. *Ibidem*, p. 41.  
 41. *Ibidem*, p. 42.  
 42. *Ibidem*, p. 44.  
 43. *Ibidem*, pp. 44–48. Cfr. I. Nemeskürty, *op. cit.*, pp. 187–188.  
 44. M. Bálint, *op. cit.*, pp. 50–51.  
 45. Cfr. U. Eco, “La bustina di Minerva”, in *L'Espresso*, no. 21, 1 giugno, 1986, p. 242.  
 46. M. Bálint, *op. cit.*, p. 37.  
 47. *Ibidem*, p. 53.  
 48. *Odi nemeae*, 5, 18.  
 49. G. Duby denies the existence of a ‘vector’ for history, *op. cit.*, p. 134 and so he concludes his *Dialogues* saying: “I really think that (history) has no meaning at all” p. 184.  
 50. *Histoire de la Hongrie*, p. 473 sqq.  
 51. *Ibidem*, pp. 474–475.  
 52. *Ibidem*, pp. 478–479.  
 53. On the same subject, cfr. E. Santarelli’s study *Italia e Ungheria nella crisi postbellica*, Urbino, 1968. The beautiful image of André de Vigny considering the army as ‘a nation within a nation’ became real in a short time. From May 2nd (day of general mobilization) to May 24th (day of reconquest of Miskolc, taken by the Czechs on May 2nd) the Red Army – formed by trade-union workers – increased the number of its effective force: from 65,000 to 220,000. The interest of the *Vörös film* is quite comprehensible.  
 54. M. Bálint, *op. cit.*, pp. 53–55.  
 55. *Ibidem*, pp. 59–60.  
 56. Seneca, *Ep. ad Lucilium*, 115.  
 57. Terenzio, *Hecyra*, 857–860.  
     *Ba.* Bene factum et uolup est. *Pam.* Factis ut credam facis.  
     Antiquamque adeo tuam uenustatem obtines  
     Ut uoluptati obitus, sermo, aduentus tuos, quocumque adueneris  
     Semper siet.  
 58. E. Santarelli, *op. cit.*, p. 73. Cfr.  
 59. *Hist. Pell.*, 2, 45, 1.  
 60. Cfr. *Histoire de la Hongrie*, pp. 466–467.  
 61. A. de Lamartine, *Méditations poétiques. Cours familier de littérature*, Paris.  
 62. G. Duby, *op. cit.*, p. 182.