Hungarian Studies Review, Vol. XLII, Nos. 1-2 (Spring-Fall 2015)

Including a Special Section:

Hungary and International Relations in the Interwar Years

With essays by:

Éva Mathey
Zsolt Nagy
András Becker

Papers on other subjects by:

Virginia L. Lewis
Agatha Schwartz
Katherine Magyarody
Nándor Dreisziger

Also: book and conference reviews and an obituary

Hungarian Studies Review, Vol. XLII, Nos. 1-2 (Spring-Fall, 2015)

Contents

Special section:

Hungary and International Relations in the Interwar Years

Articles:

Other themes:

(Contents, continued)

Book and Conference Reviews

Hungarian Studies Review, Vol. XLII, Nos. 1-2 (Spring-Fall, 2015)

Special Section:

Hungary and International Relations in the Interwar Years, 1919-1940

Introduction

In many respects the interwar decades constitute a unique period in the evolution of Hungary. What distinguishes this age from the previous four centuries above all is the fact that from the end of the First World War in November of 1918 to Hungary's involvement in the Second World War in the spring of 1941 the country was an independent entity and conducted its own foreign affairs. Such a situation did not exist, except for certain brief periods during some of the wars of independence against foreign rule, during the four centuries that separate the time of Hungary's Jagiellonian kings of the early sixteenth century and the conclusion of World War I. It should be added here that for Hungary the period between 1867 and 1918 was one in which the country — in respect to external affairs — was not ruled by the Habsburg Court but shared responsibility for foreign policy (including a diplomatic service) with the Austrian half of the dual-monarchy of Austria-Hungary. For the purposes of understanding some of the papers in this special section we should also add that for Hungary the interwar era lasted almost two years longer than it did for many countries in Europe as the country did not get involved in World War II for some twenty-two months after September of 1939.

The predominant theme of Hungarian foreign policy in the period that separates the end of the First World War and the spread of fighting to the Balkans and Russia in the Second, was determined by the peace settlement that concluded World War I. As is well known, in the aftermath of that war the peacemakers, the victorious Western Allies, imposed onerous terms on the vanquished Central Powers, terms which included territorial losses — and that no country lost more of its lands than Hungary. Revising the territorial provisions of the post-war peace settlement became the cornerstone of interwar Hungarian diplomacy and heavily influenced Budapest's dealings with the outside world not only concerning diplomatic

matters but, as we'll see in one of the papers in this section, in cultural contacts as well.

The studies featured here make it clear that in interwar Hungary both public opinion and scholarly judgement blamed the ill-fate that befell the country — above all the dismemberment of the historic Hungarian kingdom — on the decisions of the victorious Allied powers. In doing so Hungarians largely ignored the fact that in the years and decades leading up to 1920 their country's leadership, and even its Magyar-speaking general public, regularly ignored the political and cultural sensitivities of the numerous nationalities living within the Kingdom — or managed to annoy these groups — or at least their intellectual elites. The dismemberment of Hungary was not so much the deed of vengeful or ignorant western leaders — even if some of them had grudges against Hungary's elite and were less than well-informed about the affairs of East Central Europe — but more of the consequence of long-term historical processes that had been taking place in the Middle Danube Basin of Central Europe for many generations. Perhaps the most important cause of these developments stemmed from early modern times when during the Ottoman occupation of southern and central Hungary many regions became depopulated — and after Christian armies, mainly under Habsburg leadership, drove out the Turks from there the Imperial Court in Vienna decided to replace the missing inhabitants predominantly by newcomers from the Balkans and from the Habsburgs' German possessions. Hungarians were not welcome in these ancient Magyar lands, neither as landlords nor as settlers.

Hungarian preoccupation with the revision of the post-World War I territorial peace settlement on the whole didn't serve the Hungarian nation well. As illustrated by the three studies in this special section of this volume, this preoccupation diverted attention from the nation's myriad socio-economic problems and often hindered in the establishment of good relations — or the keeping of such relations in the few instances that they had been achieved — with certain countries that sometimes exercised at least some influence in international affairs in the interwar period, among them the United States, Turkey, and Great Britain. The interplay between Hungary and these three countries during all or a part of the interwar era is the main theme of the three studies in this special section and we hope that what they say contributes to a better understanding of this critical period of Hungarian history.

Nándor Dreisziger

Hungarian Studies Review, Vol. XLII, Nos. 1-2 (Spring-Fall, 2015)

Revisionist Expectations toward the USA and Hungarian History Writing: A Case Study of Jenő Horváth (1881-1950)

Éva Mathey

Signed on June 4, 1920 in the Grand Trianon Palace in Versailles, the Treaty of Trianon dismembered historic Hungary. The Austro-Hungarian Monarchy became a bygone idea. The terms of the treaty fundamentally affected the geo-political status of the new Hungarian state and defined the foreign policy of Hungary inasmuch as it limited the government's scope of action. Contemporary Hungarian public opinion understandably reacted to the Trianon Peace Treaty with great despair and refused to accept its terms which were considered to be unfairly punitive. Regardless of class and status, interwar Hungarian society viewed the revision of the Treaty of Trianon as the only possible solution for Hungary's future. Trianon came as a "shock on Hungary's collective psyche,"[1] and created a serious emotional "dislocation" in the Hungarian mind. The trauma which the postwar settlement inflicted was unparalleled within living memory.

Hungarian history writing between the wars assumed a significant role in helping the Hungarian nation come to terms with the trauma of Trianon.[2] Seeking answers for the ill-fate of the Monarchy, offering explanation for what had happened, Hungarian historians between the wars made an attempt to furnish the process of 'healing' from the shock of defeat: they wanted to prove wrongs done to Hungary, provide evidence and justification for revision.[3] Trianon, and therefore revisionism, served as major focuses of their inquiry. One of the most prominent figures in this field between the wars was Jenő Horváth.

Jenő Horváth produced an extensive and voluminous body of scholarship on the problems of Trianon in particular, and on Hungarian and world history in general. At the same time he held several high-standing offices in various professional as well as social circles. His academic significance demonstrably makes him one of *the* "official" historians of Trianon in the interwar period.[4] Before we look at his *oeuvre*, we must introduce the man and his background for the sake of English audiences. Horváth received his doctorate in history and Latin from Buda-

pest University in 1905. Having an excellent command of English, French and German, first he wished to become a career diplomat. When such ambitions failed, he opted for his second love, history, which he began to teach at various Hungarian secondary schools. His academic interest in and commitment to the profession of the historian manifested themselves at a very early stage of his career. Two substantial and voluminous pieces of his early scholarship demonstrate this: *A történelem bölcselete. Tanulmányok a történettudomány alapelveiről és az emberi művelődés irányeszméiről* [The Wisdom of History. Essays on the Basic Principles of Historiography and the Guiding Concepts of Human Culture] (1907) and A *XIX. század alapvetése. A nagyhatalmak megalakulása 1648-1715. Köztörténeti tanulmány* [The Core Principles of the 19th Century. The Formation of the Great Powers 1648-1715. A Study in Public History] (1910). Both attracted the attention and acknowledgment of professional circles. Appointed Professor of History at the Nagyvárad Law Academy in 1912, Horváth turned his attention to world and diplomatic history. The end of World War I and the crisis which set in from the fall of 1918 forced Hungarian historians to react to the events of the war. Amidst the turmoil caused by the defeat and the military collapse of the Central Powers, and in response to the Hungarian fears of the prospective unfavorable peace settlement, Horváth published his first Trianon work, *Magyarország függetlensége és területi épsége. A nagyváradi jogakadémia felhívása a nyugati egyetemekhez* [The Independence and Territorial Integrity of Hungary. The Appeal of the Nagyvárad Law Academy to the Western Universities]. Published both in Hungarian and English, the pamphlet aimed at informing the learned public about Hungarian policies toward her nationalities and Hungary's claim to her territorial integrity on the basis of the Wilsonian principle of national self-determination.[5]

The end of the war and the dismemberment of historic Hungary affected Horváth's career both directly and indirectly. Since Nagyvárad (Oradea) became part of Romania, he had to give up his professorship there. Like everybody else, he was devastated by the Treaty of Trianon, which came to serve as a formative impact on his professional life after 1920. As a result, he devoted his career to the study of Hungarian history during and after the war in order to reveal the causes of the Hungarian tragedy, to answer yet unanswered questions, to set right and challenge "the apparent […] myths, legends, […], and lies" about Hungary's role in and responsibility for the war.[6] Horváth could serve these ends as managing director of the Magyar Külügyi Társaság (Hungarian Society for Foreign Affairs). First as editor, later as editor-in-chief of the society's

scholarly journal, *Külügyi Szemle* [Foreign Policy Review], he took active part in the organization and the promotion of Hungarian science, politics and culture at home and abroad. As professor of modern world and Hungarian history at several Hungarian universities (i.e. Pázmány University, József Nádor Technical University, the University of Economics and the Ludovika Academy) he published major essays and books on the causes and consequences of Trianon. His works drew on mainstream histories of World War I and the Paris Peace Conference of 1919–20, and on the memoirs, diaries and statements of contemporary Hungarian and foreign politicians. He also relied on the contemporary press and capitalized on his professional contacts and personal relations with several mainstream Hungarian politicians, including Count Albert Apponyi.

One of his first works, *Magyarország és a nemzetiségi kérdés 1815- 1920* [Hungary and the Question of Nationalities 1815-1920],[7] dealt with the problems of nationalities in Hungary, while *A trianoni béke megalkotása 1915-1920. Diplomáciai történelmi tanulmány* [The Making of the Treaty of Trianon 1915-1920. A Diplomatic Historical Essay] offered a thorough analysis of the circumstances under which the peace treaty was made and presented to Hungary for signature. The book articulated the belief that the Monarchy did not fall by "her own weight,"[8] but rather due to the propaganda of the nationalities abroad.[9]

Horváth's more inclusive and more voluminous Trianon works included the almost hundred-page long historical analysis "Diplomatic History of the Treaty of Trianon" in *Justice for Hungary*, a prestigious collection of scholarly essays written by contemporary intellectuals advocating the revision of the Trianon Treaty published by the Külügyi Társaság. His Trianon monographs: *A Milleniumtól Trianonig. Huszontöt év Magyarország történetéből, 1896-1920* [From the Millennium to Trianon. Twenty-Five Years of Hungarian History, 1896-1920]; and the two-volume *A magyar kérdés a XX. században* [The Hungarian Question in the 20th Century] were comprehensive analyses of Hungarian history before, during and after World War I.[10]

These works, which form the basis of the present survey, presented a comprehensive account of Hungarian history during and after the war, and offered answers to the question 'why Trianon happened?' Horváth's Trianon synthesis paid special attention to America's role in and responsebility for the peace treaty. Within this context, Horváth's works focused on several significant issues and events in Hungarian history in relation to American war and peace policies. These tenets served as the major thematic cores and building blocks of the revisionist arguments and

expectations toward the United States. Horváth's interpretation and synthesis of these helped create and keep alive the popular myth of the US as a possible ally of Hungary in frontier revision. The historical narrative he generated served as reference points for semi-official and popular accounts and lent authority to the revisionist narrative(s) in general.[11]

With respect to the role of the US, Horváth focused on six major themes: (1) the United States of America did not wish to dismember the Habsburg Monarchy (negotiations for separate peace, the original Fourteen Points and the Four Principles, the Inquiry's recommendations to Wilson); (2) Wilson changed his policy toward the Monarchy because he had fallen victim to the propaganda of the representatives of the would-be successor states, mainly to the influence of Thomas G. Masaryk; (3) Austria-Hungary and the US wished to end the war on the basis of the Fourteen Points of January 8, 1918; (4) American proposals for peace at the peace conference in Paris were more favorable than those of the Allies; (5) the US did not accept and approve the Trianon peace treaty (the US Congress refused to sign the post-war treaties); and (6) the separate US-Hungarian peace treaty did not mention the Trianon boundaries.

The belief that the United States of America did not wish to dismember the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy was one of the major tenets in Horváth's works. He systematically tried to support his case by the citation and the interpretation of numerous statements and political manifestos by influential American politicians, above all, President Wilson.

In the context of the peace proposed by the Central Powers on December 12, 1916 and the Allied reply of January 10, 1917 demanding the dismemberment of the states of the Central Powers, [12] Horváth discussed President Wilson's "Peace Without Victory Address" to Congress of January 22, 1917. He emphasized Wilson's idea of the free development of nations, the idea of nationality as the guiding principles of the "peace without victory" proposed in the president's message.[13] With this Horváth wished to demonstrate the American standpoint concerning the future of the Monarchy. He even cited Secretary of State Robert Lansing's statement that

> [President Wilson] is trying to avoid breaking with Austria in order to keep the channels of official intercourse with her open so that he may use her for peace. […] It is the President's view that the large measures of autonomy already secured for these older units is [sic] a sufficient guaranty of peace and stability in that part of Europe so far as national and racial influences are concerned […]."[14]

Horváth emphasized that even before the US had officially entered the war she stated that she did not want to dismember the Monarchy. Furthermore, he pointed out that the US "held out the prospect of keeping the empire of Chares IV intact."[15] (The fact that the US was not a belligerent at that time, and therefore could not officially influence such decisions of the Allies was ignored by Horváth.)

In reference to Wilson's Message to Congress on January 22, 1917, Horváth noted that the USA was willing to enter the war provided that both groups of belligerents accepted the American principles of national self-determination as the basis for the peace settlement.[16] Colonel Edward Mandel House, Wilson's closest friend and adviser, was also quoted as recommending the preservation of the Monarchy if it were willing to break with Germany.[17] Horváth cited Wilson's December 4, 1917 address (US President's call for the declaration of war on the Habsburg Monarchy) to buttress this point:

> We owe it, however, to ourselves to say that we do not wish in any way to impair or to rearrange the Austro-Hungarian Empire. It is no affair of ours what they do with their own life, either industrially or politically. We do not purpose or desire to dictate to them in any way. We only desire to see that their affairs are left in their hands in all matters, great and small.[18]

President Wilson's January 8, 1918 message to Congress, in which the Fourteen Points were stated as America's official war aims for the first time, became a key element in Horváth's argument. Point Ten provided the most significant building block of the revisionist expectations toward the US. By declaring that "[t]he peoples of Austria-Hungary, whose place among the nations we wish to see safeguarded and assured, should be accorded the freest opportunity of autonomous development,"[19] Wilson, in Horváth's words, "saved" the Monarchy from dismemberment.[20] Thus, Wilson's doctrine of national self-determination and the principles declared in the Fourteen Points turned out to be the alpha and the omega of the reasoning in Horváth's analysis and were presented as the ultimate guarantees by the USA for keeping the Monarchy intact. Even more so, Horváth said, because the USA was not bound by the secret treaties made during the war.[21]

As Horváth emphasized, in Point Ten of the Fourteen Points Wilson clearly stated that the US did not wish to dismember Austria-Hungary. Horváth failed to point out, however, that the principle of national self-determination came to be considered and interpreted by the

peoples and states of Central Europe as the key to their independence and freedom of action. Wilson's principle of national self-determination lent itself to various interpretations, and even the president did not formulate its exact and explicit meaning.[22] Horváth, on the other hand, did not mention important circumstances which made the first official declaration of US war aims necessary. Soviet Russia abandoned the war, preparations for the Brest-Litovsk agreement started, while negotiations for a separate peace between the Allies and the Monarchy failed again. All these development contributed to Wilson's declaration of the Fourteen Points.

American wartime policies toward the Monarchy were not motivated by altruism, but by shrewd calculation and political strategy.[23] Consequently, the image of the US as the benevolent savior of the Monarchy, so strongly supported by Horváth, lacks evidence. Horváth did not indicate that the Fourteen Points was not an idealistic program of war aims, but a pragmatic and tactical move. The way how Point Ten, the most important point with respect to the future of the Monarchy, was drafted illuminates this properly.

President Wilson's private task force, the Inquiry, prepared the policy proposals and comprehensive plans for the president concerning certain geographic units, among them the Monarchy.[24] Its memorandum, **"**War Aims and Peace Terms," threatened the Monarchy with dismemberment yet at the same time also implied that the Inquiry did not consider such action necessary.[25] The Inquiry's recommendation that "[t]owards Austria-Hungary the approach should consist of references to the subjection of the various nationalities, in order to keep that agitation alive, but coupled with it should go repeated assurances that no dismemberment of the Empire is intended"[26] eventually served as the basis for Wilson to draft Point Ten.[27] This reveals that the consideration behind Point Ten was to increase the willingness of the Monarchy to negotiate a separate peace and win her away from Germany.

Horváth's belief that with the Fourteen Points Wilson "saved" the Monarchy, therefore, was one-sided. He knew about the Inquiry's report and should have been aware of the American strategy toward the Monarchy. Still, he misrepresented this important issue. Concerning the work of the Inquiry, Horváth used Ray Stannard Baker's *Woodrow Wilson and the World Settlement* as his primary source in which Baker published the reports of the Inquiry. Horváth's quoting the Inquiry's document that "[o]ur policy must consist in refusing to accept the dismemberment of Austria-Hungary"[28] was presented to demonstrate America's insistence on keeping the Monarchy intact. The comparison of the quotation in Horváth

with the original source, however, reveals that Horváth was bent on adapting history to theory. Once the respective quotation in Baker had been checked and compared with the one in Horváth and it turned out that Horváth omitted certain and very substantial parts of the document as written in Baker's book. The original reads as follows:

> *Our policy must* therefore *consist* first *in* a stirring up of nationalist discontent, and then *in refusing to accept* the extreme logic of this discontent which would be *the dismemberment of Austria-Hungary*. By threatening the present German-Magyar combination with nationalist uprisings on the one side, and by showing it a mode of safety on the other, its resistance would be reduced to a minimum, and the motive to an independence from Berlin in foreign affairs would be enormously accelerated.[29]

Questions emerge. What explains such treatment of historical sources on Horváth's part? What explains Horváth's selectively presented quotation? Since Ray Stannard Baker's three-volume book was listed as a primary source in Horváth's works, the Hungarian scholar clearly had direct access to it, if not in Hungary, then abroad. It is therefore highly unlikely that he used another source that misquoted Baker. It is more likely that the "unconditional" stand of the United States on the side of the Monarchy was so important to him that he deliberately manipulated the statement. The attempt to separate the Monarchy from the German alliance just did not really fit Horváth's image of the US. Moreover, Horváth's treatment of the Baker quotation relating to the Inquiry's recommendation is not the only indication that he tended to ignore some facts and overemphasize others.

By the summer of 1918 President Wilson abandoned his policy of non-dismemberment. In his works Horváth dealt with Wilson's change of policy toward the Monarchy, and offered a unique interpretation. He contended that Wilson's change of attitude and policy toward the Monarchy in the spring of 1918 was the result of foreign pressure from British (mainly the New Europe group and Crewe House), French and associated political circles, and the propaganda against the Monarchy conducted by the representatives of the future successor states. Horváth said that Wilson was misled and made to believe that the annexation of territories of the Monarchy was the legitimate actions of the aspiring small states longing for independence on the basis of the Wilsonian logic of self-determination.[30] Horváth even accused President Wilson of misjudging the Central European situation and accepting the "fictitious" secret treaties

made by Masaryk during the war. Wilson's "careless mistake," Horváth asserted, contributed to the tragedy of Hungary.[31] He thus created the myth of Wilson the victim, wistfully manipulated and influenced by external forces. Masaryk was presented as the arch enemy, who won "over Wilson from self-determination to annexation."[32] "He induced the President to abandon his Fourteen Points, and entangled him in the secret stipulations of the Russian Slav plans, thus inaugurating the Wilson tragedy."[33]

War expediency, military and political reasons explained Wilson's new policy toward Austria-Hungary. These included the successful Bolshevik revolution; the Brest-Litovsk agreement between the Central Powers and Russia on March 3, 1918 which meant the collapse of the Eastern front, giving the Germans access to Russian supplies and allowing them to focus entirely on the Western front; the dander to American interests in the Far East by Japan. These factors made international cooperation in the Far East, thus, US intervention in Siberia, in the name of collective security, necessary. Added to this the Sixtus Affair[34] in April 1918 meant the breakdown of the secret peace talks with Vienna. At the same time, in the spring of 1918, the propaganda of the nationalities was also set into motion. In April the Congress of Oppressed Austro-Hungarian Nationalities met in Rome where the representatives of the nationalities called for self-determination.

Despite these events, however, until May 29 Wilson did not give any sign of sympathy toward the subject peoples of the Monarchy. Finally, military events in Siberia helped Wilson resolve the dilemma inherent in the conflict between his former policy toward the Monarchy and political-military necessities.[35] Aiding the Czechoslovak Legion[36] in Siberia provided grounds both for US military intervention in the Far East, and, as a consequence, "rewarding" the Czechoslovaks with independence. On the very day, May 29, when news about the Legion's first decisive battle reached the State Department, Wilson also indicated that he had decided to reverse his Austro-Hungarian policy as there was no further hope of a separate peace.[37] That notwithstanding, it was only in September that the US recognized the Czechoslovak National Council as the *de facto* belligerent government. This led to the American sanctioning of the dismemberment of the Habsburg Empire, and the recognition of the rights of its subject peoples to political independence.[38]

What follows from the above is that the influence of nationality propaganda and especially that of Thomas Masaryk on Wilson's change of policy was greatly exaggerated in Horváth's works. At the same time this interpretation was a very convenient one inasmuch as such a conviction

also served as an important ground on which Hungary could expect the US to right the wrongs resulting from dismemberment.

Horváth's assumption that the Monarchy ended the war on the basis of the Fourteen Points of January 8, 1918 which, in his view, applied even after November 3 and 13, the armistice of Padua and the military convention of Belgrade, constituted another major element of the expectations toward America relative to the revision of the Treaty of Trianon.[39] He based his argument on the diplomatic exchanges between the Foreign Office of the Monarchy and the State Department between the middle of September and the middle of October 1918. Foreign Minister Count István Burián, Horváth said, approached Wilson and initiated peace on September 14, 1918 on the basis of the Fourteen Points.[40] Washington rejected Burián's note even before it was officially delivered by Swedish Minister W. A. F. Ekengren on September 16.[41] Wilson's reply of September 16, according to which the US had "stated the terms upon which [she] would consider peace,"[42] was misinterpreted by Horváth. Horváth stated that Count Burián accepted Wilson's reply on October 5 and argued that Austria-Hungary ended the war on the basis of Wilson's principles.[43] The documents of the State Department collectively published as *Papers Relating to the Foreign Relations of the United States,* to which Horváth had access and used as a major primary source, proved that Burián's letter, which arrived in Washington on October 7, did not include any acceptance of Wilson's note. It was the Monarchy's actual (or second) peace proposal addressed to the President.[44]

Horváth carried his argument further by drawing the surprising conclusion that by this diplomatic exchange a binding international agreement was endorsed between the Monarchy and the US. By blending these events, Horváth also claimed that thereby Austria-Hungary and the US mutually agreed to end the war on the basis of the principles as expressed in the Fourteen Points of January 1918[45] and Austria-Hungary ended the war without any territorial losses.[46] These beliefs were mistaken. As a professor of international law and diplomacy Horváth should have known better, especially in light of the documents in the *Papers Relating to the Foreign Relations of the United States*. The claim that the original Fourteen Points still stood and that they provided the basis for the peace negotiations by no means was true in the fall of 1918. Wilson' official reply to the Austrian peace note on October 18 explained the American position.[47] Horváth had to be aware of Wilson's October 18 reply to Burián's second peace note as the document was also included in the very

same volume of the *Papers Relating to the Foreign Relations of the United States*. Still, he ignored this important detail.[48]

Horváth's interpretation of the events clearly reflected wishful thinking. As the official historian of the world war, someone who was close to government circles and the political elite, Horváth should have known that in late October Hungarian Foreign Minister Gyula Andrássy was officially informed that Point Ten was no longer valid, and no longer formed the basis of the armistice and the peace. Moreover, Horváth had to know about the Official American Commentary on the Fourteen Points prepared by Walter Lippmann and Frank I. Cobb.[49] The commentary put American plans for peace on a new basis and explicitly contained the information regarding the readjustment of US policies toward the Monarchy, including its effect on Point Ten. The Germans knew about the specific interpretations of the Lippmann–Cobb commentary, as the German news service had intercepted the coded wireless message that communicated the commentary to Wilson.[50] And this information must have been communicated to the Ballhauzplatz. If not through the German channel, then from David Hunter Miller's book, *My Diary at the Conference of Paris* Horváth could get the information that the Fourteen Points had been modified. Horváth quoted Miller saying in connection with the Monarchy's peace proposal that its "[o]nly basis is President Wilson's Fourteen Points, *as modified*."[51] But Horváth apparently gave no consideration to Miller's comment at all.

Horváth's misrepresentation of Burián's peace proposal and of Wilson's October 18 reply has another noteworthy feature. Horváth emphasized that the anti-Hungarian propagandists and "annexationist agents" in general and Thomas Masaryk in particular persuaded Wilson to break his previous promise and reject the Hungarian peace initiatives.[52] This helped underline the conviction that Wilson acted contrary to his personal wishes and that the US originally wished to treat Austria-Hungary in a more favorable way.

Horváth also dealt with America's role at the Paris Peace Conference and the American recommendations for peace with regard to Hungary.[53] He pointed out that Wilson and the American Delegation to Negotiate Peace insisted on the peace settlement being made on Wilson's terms, and Wilson refused to endorse Allied war aims, thus, their (harsh and punitive) conditions for peace.[54] American conduct at the peace conference in Paris favorable to Hungary, therefore, created another building block of Hungarian revisionist expectations toward the US.

Relying on Miller's *My Diary*, but without going into detail concerning American recommendations, Horváth presented only a few selected aspects of the American peace plan for Hungary. For example, he mentioned that the American proposals recommended a plebiscite in Transylvania for the non-Romanians and free access for Hungary to the Adriatic and the Black Sea.[55] Horváth correctly emphasized that the American Delegation at Paris put forth more favorable plans regarding the future boundaries of Hungary than the Allies. President Wilson proposed for an umbrella treaty for the Central Powers to end the war. He believed that with the help of experts the League of Nations should have the responsibility to settle the territorial questions and draw the final boundaries in the future. Wilson's idealistic program, however, was not realized and the Allies made separate peace treaties with the defeated powers.[56]

The eventual territorial recommendations for Hungary prepared by the members of the American delegation reflected a less biased, and a somewhat more objective approach than those of the Allies.[57] This notwithstanding, the final boundaries of Hungary set in the Treaty of Trianon and the ones proposed by the Americans showed only slight differences. In any case, the future boundaries of Hungary were decided by default by the territorial committees of the peace conference in which the Americans were also represented,[58] and the American proposals were not taken into consideration and failed to affect Hungary's final borders. President Wilson and the American Delegation had a lesser significance in the territorial negotiations and they went along the major line proposed by the Allies and successor states.

In connection with the defeat of the American recommendations Horváth does not fail to mention one important issue: Wilson's pet project, the League of Nations. Horváth pointed out that despite Wilson's defeat at Paris, the League of Nations, as stipulated in Article 19 of its Covenant, made provisions for possible future frontier readjustment.[59] Given the political-diplomatic power relations in Europe after the war, it was not likely that the League would assist any changes in the *status quo* created by the peace treaties. That the United States would have any say in the changes was even less likely, because the US Senate, which favored isolationism, refused to ratify the peace treaties drawn up in Paris including the Covenant of the League of Nations clauses. Consequently, the US never became a member of the League.

The fact that the US did not approve the treaties made in Paris was yet another tenet of the belief that the US may support revision. America's

rejection of the postwar settlement was interpreted by Horváth as America's refusal to become a party to the peace whose correction the US considered necessary.[60] This Hungarian belief was an illusion and was anything but well-founded. As is well-known, a Republican turn in American politics resulted in the Senate decision concerning the peace treaties. This political change ultimately also drove the whole Wilsonian project overboard.

"The importance of the American connection" in treaty revision was founded on yet another popular misconception which Horváth kept emphasizing in his works, namely, that the separate peace the US made with Hungary (signed on August 29, 1921) did not mention the boundaries of the Treaty of Trianon because the US did not approve the frontiers of Hungary. Not mentioning the frontiers of Hungary in the US-Hungarian separate peace, Horváth said, created an important precedent inasmuch as it made the readjustment of the Hungarian frontiers possible in the future in which, as is implied by Horváth, the US may undertake an important role. [61] This belief was another tenet of the revisionist expectations toward the US. Nevertheless, this notion lacked validity. Horváth's interpretation that the separate peace represented the amicable relations between the two countries and opened the way for the revision of the Treaty of Trianon was nothing short of delusional.

In the separate peace with Hungary the US insisted on keeping the economic privileges and rights under the Treaty of Trianon. So, in connection with them the Treaty of Trianon was specifically mentioned. At the same time the US explicitly renounced all the responsibilities contained therein regarding the Hungarian treaty (mainly responsibilities accruing from Article 19 of the League of Nations Covenant holding out the prospect of frontier adjustment). Consequently, even the slightest reference to diplomatic, military and political commitments regarding the Treaty of Trianon in general, and the frontiers of Hungary in particular was left out of the text.[62] The tone of the negotiations clearly demonstrated that Hungary was in a "take-it-or-leave-it"[63] position. The specific stipulations of the treaty, setting the framework for the relations of Hungary and the United States, reflect the uneven nature of the relationship between the two countries, with the US dictating the conditions.[64]

In conclusion, during the interwar years Hungarians sought answers for the tragedy of Trianon, and the desire for its revision provided a common ground for the whole nation. Horváth's works offered answers to the question, 'why Trianon happened.' His stated aim was to refute myths, legends and lies right in connection with Hungarian history during

and after the war.[65] At the same time he created new myths and misconceptions. America's role in negotiating the secret peace with the Monarchy, the US policy of non-dismemberment, the Fourteen Points and Point Ten, Wilson's righteous peace based on them, the idea that Wilson had fallen victim to the propaganda of the future successor states, American peace plans in Paris, America's refusal to sign the Paris peace treaties and the US-Hungarian separate peace all served to establish an otherwise unfounded belief relating to the role the United States may play in treaty revision. There is reason to believe that the creation of such myths by Horváth was intentional. His treatment of historical sources seems to support that. The question may arise whether Horváth's often selective treatment of historical facts can be explained by the lack of information. As the 'official' historian of the period he had access to important primary sources relating to the history of the war and the peace, in Hungary and abroad alike. The contemporary accounts by David Hunter Miller, Charles Seymour, Colonel Edward M. House, Ray Stannard Baker, Harold A. Temperley, James T. Shotwell, Harold Nicholson, etc. were, indeed, all available to him. The bibliographies of his works clearly testify to this. Although not indicated in his references, Horváth had to have access to James Brown Scott's *The Official War Aims and Peace Proposals, December 1916 to November 1918* as well.[66] This publication of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace provides clear and specific information about US policies during the war and in Paris. For Horváth who was a close associate of key mainstream politicians, such as Albert Apponyi and Pál Teleki, who were both closely related to the Carnegie Endowment, access to the book would not have been difficult. Even though he had the major primary sources available, Horváth's history writing did lack objectivity: he often adapted historical facts to preconceived theory, reinterpreted and rearranged them. Clearly, he was a historian with an agenda. He thus put "official" history writing to the services of Hungarian revisionist policies. Horváth's fairly biased accounts were the works of a man whose generation directly suffered the experience of defeat and the trauma caused by Trianon. Under this psychological and emotional burden, objectivity was apparently too much to expect from him.

NOTES

I wish to express my sincere appreciation to Professor Tibor Glant (University of Debrecen), Professor Peter Pastor (Montclair State University), and Professor

Tibor Frank (Eötvös Lóránt University, Budapest) for their generous professional support and advice they continued to offer me during my research and writing this article. My work has also been assisted by scholarships and research grants I had the priviledge to receive, among them the invaluable Fulbright Scholarship, and the grant to the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Institute, Free University, Berlin.

---

[1] Peter Pastor, "The Ups and Downs in the Historiography of the Peace Treaty of Trianon," in Dennis P. Hupchick and R. William Weisberg eds., *Hungary's Historical Legacies. Studies in Honor of Steven Béla Várdy* (Boulder: East Central European Monographs, 2000), 106.

[2] Among the representatives of mainstream Hungarian history writing between the wars were Sándor Domanovszky, Gyula Szekfű, Elemér Mályusz, István Hajnal, Bálint Hóman, Jenő Horváth, etc. Nearly all of them wrote their Trianon works dealing with the treaty's political, social and economic effects.

[3] On the psychology of trauma and defeat see Wolfgang Schivelbusch, *The Culture of Defeat. On National Trauma, Mourning, and Recovery* (New York: Henry Holt and Company, 2003).

[4] Horváth Jenő was considered to be *the* diplomatic historian of the inter-war period.

[5] Jenő Horváth, *Magyarország függetlensége és területi épsége. A nagyváradi jogakadémia felhívása a nyugati egyetemekhez* (Nagyvárad: n.p., 1918).

[6] Zoltán Major, "A trianoni vádlott megszólal. Tudományos pálya és történeti kor Horváth Jenő magyar diplomáciatörténész munkásságában," in Jenő Horváth, *A Milleniumtól Trianonig. Huszonöt év Magyarország történetéből 1896-1920* [From the Millenium to Trianon. Tweny-Five Years of Hungarian History] (Budapest: Nyitott Könyv Kiadó, 2004), XLVIII. Translation mine. Hereafter cited as Major, "A trianoni vádlott megszólal."

[7] Jenő Horváth, *Magyarország és a nemzetiségi kérdés 1815- 1920* (Budapest: n.p., 1920).

[8] Robert W. Seton-Watson, "The Problem of Treaty Revision and the Hungarian Frontiers," in *International Affairs* (July 1933): 18.

[9] Jenő Horváth, *A trianoni béke megalkotása 1915-1920. Diplomáciai történelmi tanulmány* (Budapest: Magyar Külpolitika, 1924), 37, 10.

[10] Eugene Horváth, "Diplomatic History of the Treaty of Trianon," in *Justice for Hungary* (London, Bombay, Calcutta and Madras: Longmans, Green and Co. Ltd., 1928), 23-121. Hereafter cited as Horváth, "Diplomatic History of the Treaty of Trianon." Jenő Horváth, *A Milleniumtól Trianonig. Huszontöt év Magyarország történetéből, 1896-1920* [From the Millennium to Trianon. Twenty-Five Years of Hungarian History, 1896-1920] (Budapest: Szent István Társulat, 1938). Hereafter cited as Horváth, *A Milleniumtól Trianonig*. Jenő Horváth, *A magyar kérdés a XX. században: Felelősség a világháborúért és a békeszerződésért* Vol. 1 [The Hungarian Question in the 20th Century: Responsibility for the World War and the Peace Treaty]; *A trianoni békeszerződés megalkotása és a revízió útja* Vol. 2. [The Creation of the Peace Treaty and the Road

to Revision] (Budapest: Magyar Tudományos Akadémia, 1939). Hereafter respectively cited as Horváth, *Felelősség* and Horváth, *A békeszerződés.* Translation of these sources are all mine.

[11] See for example Dr. Elemér Halmay, *A revíziós gondolat a világ-politikában* [The Revisionist Thought in World Politics] (Budapest: Kelet népe, 1927).

[12] Horváth, *A Milleniumtól Trianonig*, 183; Horváth, *Felelősség*, 387.

[13] Horváth, *A Milleniumtól Trianonig*, 189; Horváth, *Felelősség*, 393. See also Frederick C. Penfield to Robert Lansing, January 25, 1917 in *Papers Relating to the Foreign Relations of the United States. 1917. Supplement. I. The World War* (Washington: the Government Printing Office, 1931), 31. Quoted in Horváth, *Felelősség*, 394. Hereafter cited as *FRUS. 1917. Supplement I.*

[14] Robert Lansing to Walter H. Page February 8, 1917. *FRUS. 1917. Supplement I.*, 40. Quoted in Horváth, *Felelősség*, 395.

[15] Horváth, *A Milleniumtól Trianonig*, 189-190.

[16] *Ibid*., 191; Horváth, *Felelősség*, 401.

[17] Colonel Edward M. House, *The Intimate Papers of Colonel House* (London, 1928), 157. Cited in Horváth, *A Milleniumtól Trianonig*, 191 and Horváth, *Felelősség*, 401.

[18] Horváth, *A Milleniumtól Trianonig*, 191; Horváth, *Felelősség*, 401. In *Felelősség*, Horváth translated Wilson speech: "Mi semmiképen nem akarjuk Ausztria-Magyarország átalakítását. Nem a mi dolgunk annak belső életét gazdaságilag és politikailag elrendezni. Mi semmiképpen nem akarunk diktálni a monarchia népeinek csupán azt akarjuk, hogy kis és nagy dolgokban maguk intézzék saját ügyeiket." Horváth adds that the same decision was confirmed by Lloyd George on December 20, which, in Horváth's view, demonstrates that the USA and Britain shared their policies concerning the Monarchy and rejected the dismemberment of Austria-Hungary, 401. See also Ray Stannard Baker and William E. Dodd, eds., *The Public Papers of Woodrow Wilson: War and Peace*, 2 vols. (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1927). Hereafter cited as Baker and Dodd, eds., *War and Peace.*

[19] Horváth, *Felelősség*, 402-403.

[20] Horváth, *A Milleniumtól Trianonig*, 202. Wilson's *Four Principles* also constitute another important core of the argument to reinforce America' favorable Habsburg policy. Horváth quotes the *Four Principles* in *Felelősség*, 423-424.

[21] Horváth, *Felelősség*, 424. See also Robert Lansing to Allied Ambassadors to Washington, February 19, 1918. Quoted in Colonel Edward Mandel House, *The Intimate Papers of Colonel House* Vol. 3 (London, 1928), 370-371.

[22] Tibor Glant, *Throught the Prism of the Habsburg Monarchy: Hungary in American Diplomacy and Public Opinion during World War I* (Boulder: East European Monographs, 1998), 258. Hereafter cited as Glant, *Through the Prism*.

[23] Tibor Glant, „A 14 pont története és mítosza" [The 14 points' history and mythology] *Külügyi Szemle* (2009/4): 84-99.

[24] Glant, *Through the Prism*, 257. The Inquiry's Austro-Hungarian Division was headed by historian Charles Seymour, who worked with his associates Clive Day and Robert J. Kerner. In the fall of 1918 the staff was extended to include Richard B. Barrett, Florance A. Hague, Charles Sweeney and Thomas Burk. Between September and January the Inquiry prepared various plans concerning the future of Austria-Hungary. Trialism, federalism, reform dualism and even dismemberment were among its recommendations. The work of the Inquiry regarding Austria-Hungary falls into two periods, July and August of 1918, Wilson's change of policy toward the Monarchy, being the division line. While during the first period all kinds of materials and data were collected and general policy proposals were made, the second period is marked by actual preparations for the peace negotiations and recommendations for the peace terms. For more details see "Chapter Nine: The Inquiry: Preparations for Scientific Peace," in Glant, *Through the Prism*, 205-225.

[25] Victor S. Mamatey, *The United States and East Central Europe 1914-1918. A Study of Wilsonian Diplomacy and Propaganda* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1957), 178. Hereafter cited as Mamatey, *Wilsonian Diplomacy*.

[26] "War Aims and Peace Terms," Report of the Inquiry in *Papers Relating to the Foreign Relations of the United States. 1919. The Paris Peace Conference*, Vol.1 (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1942), 48; Ray Stannard Baker, *Woodrow Wilson and the World Settlement* Vol. 3 (New York: Doubleday, Page and Co., 1922), 32. Hereafter cited as Baker, *Woodrow Wilson*. See also Sándor Taraszovics, "American Peace Preparations during World War I," in Ignác Romsics, ed., *20th Century Hungary and the Great Powers* (Boulder: East European Monographs, 1995), 79. Hereafter respectively cited as Romsics, ed., *Hungary and the Great Powers* and Taraszovics, "American Peace Preparations."

[27] See Ray Stannard Baker, *Woodrow Wilson and the World Settlement* (New York: Doubleday, Page and Co., 1922), 38. Hereafter cited as Baker, *Woodrow Wilson*.

[28] Baker, *Woodrow Wilson* 28. Quoted in Horváth, *Felelősség*, 402.

[29] Baker, *Woodrow Wilson*, 28. Part of the report made in early January 1918 by the Inquiry to President Wilson regarding "War Aims and Peace Terms" was prepared by Dr. Sidney E. Mezes, David Hunter Miller, and Walter Lippmann. Italics mine.

[30] Horváth, *Felelősség*, 404-405; Horváth, "Diplomatic History of the Treaty of Trianon," 71-79.

[31] Horváth, *Felelősség*, 411.

[32] Horváth, "Diplomatic History," 77.

[33] Horváth, "Diplomatic History," 74-75. On Masaryk's recollections of his relations to President Wilson see Thomas Masaryk, *The Making of a State,*

Memories and Observations, 1914-1918 (London: H. Frowde, Hodder & Stoughton Co., 1927).

[34] Austrian Foreign Minister Count Ottokar Czernin indiscreetly disclosed information relative to the secret peace talks of the preceding few months between French and Austrian government circles. In response French Premier Georges Clemenceau published the facsimile of the so-called Sixtus Letter written by the Emperor Charles to former French President Raymond Poincaré proposing peace and offering Charles' support for the return of Alsace-Lorraine to France. As the immediate consequence of the incident, the emperor discontinued all further negotiations with the Allied and Associated powers. Furthermore, the German-Austrian alliance was strengthened by the Treaty of Spa on May 15, 1918. Austria was forced to pledge loyalty to Berlin and accept the joint military command of the Austrian and German armies.

[35] Glant, *Through the Prism*, 262.

[36] The Czechoslovak Legion was the military force of 50,000 fully armed former POWs who were willing to fight against the Central Powers. In February 1918, they set out for Vladivostok to be shipped to the Western front, and on their way to the Far East they clashed with Bolshevik forces, among them the Hungarian Red Guard in Chelyabinsk, on May 25, 1918 for the first time. This incident provided the excuse for Wilson to intervene in Russia by aiding the Legion against German and Austrian POWs armed by the Bolshevik forces.

[37] President Wilson to Sir William Wiseman, May 29, 1918 in Sir Arthur Willert, *The Road to Safety* (London, 1952), 158.

[38] Mamatey, *Wilsonian Diplomacy*, 265. In a memorandum to Lansing on June 26 Wilson wrote: "we can no longer respect or regard the integrity of the artificial Austrian Empire. I doubt that Hungary is any more an integral part of it than Bohemia."

[39] Horváth, *A békeszerződés*, 5.

[40] Horváth, *A Milleniumtól Trianonig*, 203-204.

[41] Mamatey, *Wilsonian Diplomacy*, 319.

[42] President Wilson to Count Burián, September 16, 1918 in Harold W. V. Temperley, ed. *A History of the Peace Conference of Paris*, Vol. 1 (London: n.p.: 1920-24), 448. Hereafter cited as Temperley, *Peace Conference of Paris* Vol.1. Horváth, *A Milleniumtól Trianonig*, 204.

[43] Horváth, *A Milleniumtól Trianonig*, 204; Horváth, *Felelősség*, 433. Horváth dates the Monarchy's reply to October 5, which was actually delivered on October 7.

[44] Count Burián to President Wilson, October 5, 1918 in Temperley, *Peace Conference of Paris,* Vol. 1, 448. Also see W. A. F. Ekengren to the Secretary of State, October 7, 1918 in *Papers Relating to the Foreign Relations of the United States, 1918, The World War, Vol. 1. Supplement I*, 341. Hereafter cited as *FRUS. 1918. Vol.1, Supplement I.*

[45] Horváth, *A Milleniumtól Trianonig*, 204; Horváth, *Felelősség*, 433; Horváth, *A békeszerződés*, 241.

[46] Horváth, *A békeszerződés*, 5.

[47] "The President deems it his duty to say to the Austro-Hungarian Government that he cannot entertain the present suggestion of the Government because of certain events of utmost importance which, occurring since the delivery of his Address of January 8th last, have necessarily altered the attitude and the responsibility of the Government of the United States." For the full length of the message see President Wilson to Count Burián, October 18, 1918 in Temperley, *Peace Conference of Paris,* Vol. 1, 449-450; Secretary of State to W. A. F. Ekengren, October 19, 1918, in *FRUS. 1918. Vol.1, Supplement I*, 368.

[48] In *Felelősség* at one place Horváth states that Wilson did not even reply to Count Burián's second, that is the October 5, note while few pages later in the same work he mentions Wilson's October 18 "telegram" to Burián. Horváth, *Felelősség*, 433, 436.

[49] See the full text of the commentary in Arthur Walworth, *America's Moment: 1918. American Diplomacy at the End of World War I* (New York: W. W. Norton and Co. Inc., 1977), 280-281. Hereafter cited as Walworth, *America's Moment*.

[50] Walworth, *America's Moment*, 73.

[51] David Hunter Miller, *My Diary at the Conference of Paris* Vol. 2 (New York: n.p., 1928), 54. Cited in Horváth, *A békeszerződés*, 88. Italics mine.

[52] Horváth, *A békeszerződés*, 121*;* Horváth, *Felelősség*, 436*;* Horváth, *A Milleniumtól Trianonig*, 205, 228, 288.

[53] Horváth, *A békeszerződés*, 87-137.

[54] Horváth, *A békeszerződés*, 88.

[55] Horváth, *A békeszerződés*, 92.

[56] Tibor Glant, "Wilson Párizsban: Trianon Amerikai háttere," in Zoltán Kovács and Levente Püski. eds. *Emlékkönyv L. Nagy Zsuzsa 80. születésnapjára* (Debreceni Egyetem Történelmi Intézet: Debrecen, 2010), 77-79. Hereafter cited as Glant, "Wilson Párizsban."

[57] "Outline of Tentative Report and Recommendations Prepared by the Intelligence Section in Accordance with Instructions, for the President and the Plenipotentiaries," January 21, 1919, popularly known as the Black Book, was prepared by the Inquiry in Paris. See David Hunter Miller, *My Diary at the Conference of Paris* (New York: Appeal Printing Company, 1924) Vol. 4. Quoted in Sándor Taraszovics, "American Peace Preparations during World War I," in Ignác Romsics, ed., *20th Century Hungary and the Great Powers* (Boulder: East European Monographs, 1995), 87. Also see Francis Deák, *Hungary at the Paris Peace Conference. The Diplomatic History of the Treaty of Trianon* (New York: Howard Fertig, 1972). Hereafter cited as Deák, *Hungary at the Paris Peace Conference*.

[58] Glant, "Wilson Párizsban," 81. Allen Welsh Dulles was seated on the Committee on the Czechoslovak Question, while Clive Day was a member of the Committee on the Yugoslav Question. Charles Seymour was a member of both.

[59] Horváth, *A békeszerződés*, 106-107; Horváth, "Diplomatic History," 89-90, 100.

[60] Horváth, *A békeszerződés*, 153-154.

[61] Horváth, *A békeszerződés*, 154; 230, 241; Horváth, *A Milleniumtól Trianonig*, 284.

[62] Secretary of State to Grant-Smith August 17, 1921 in *Papers Relating to the Foreign Relations of the United States. 1921. Vol. 2* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1936), 254. Hereafter cited as *FRUS. 1921*.

[63] William R. Castle, chief of the Western European Division in the State Department, when meeting with Count Pál Teleki at the Harvard Club said that the peace treaty was a take-it-or-leave-it proposition, and that Hungary should accept it without reservation. Castle to Hughes, August 9, 1921. Quoted in Peter Buckingham, *International Normalcy. The Open Door Peace with the Former Central Powers, 1921-1929* (Wilmington, Delaware: Scholarly Resources, Inc., 1983), 32.

[64] See Charles Evans Hughes to Ulysses Grant-Smith, July 9, 1921: "[…] the peace resolution is a clear expression of the Congress that more rights, advantages, and interests must be secured to the USA, and that our Government will not conclude any treaty that does not secure those rights, etc." In *FRUS. 1921. Vol. 2*, 250. For more on the subject see Éva Mathey, "Official America and Hungarian Revisionism between the Wars," in Lehel Vadon. ed. *Special Issue in Honor of Professor Zoltán Adádi-Nagy*. *Eger Journal of American Studies*. Vol. XII/1-2: 427-445.

[65] Zoltán Major, "A trianoni vádlott megszólal," in Horváth, *A Milleniumtól Trianonig*, xlviii.

[66] See the relevant parts of James Brown Scott, *The Official War Aims and Peace Proposals, December 1916 to November 1918* (Washington, D.C.: The Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 1921), 386-441.

Hungarian Studies Review, Vol. XLII, Nos. 1-2 (Spring-Fall, 2015).

In Search of a Usable Past: The Legacy of the Ottoman Occupation in Interwar Hungarian Cultural Diplomacy

Zsolt Nagy

On September 2, 1936 Budapest celebrated the 250th anniversary of the Battle of Buda. The celebration was to commemorate the victory of the Holy League over its Ottoman counterpart whereby the European Christian mercenary army under the leadership of Charles V, the Duke of Lorraine captured the Castle of Buda and ended its 145 years of Ottoman occupation. Contemporary newspapers reported that at 9:00 a.m. Hungarian and foreign dignitaries and invited international guests — among them descendants of those who fought at the siege in 1686 — gathered at the Coronation Church of Our Lady (simultaneous events took place at the city's main Protestant and Jewish places of worship). The male audience was seated inside the church's nave and, because of lack of space, the female audience was seated just inside the main entrance. The mass conducted by Jusztinián Serédi, the Prince Primate of Hungary, included the choral and orchestral performance of Matteo Simonelli's *Missa Buda Expugnata* (a piece written in 1686) and Zoltán Kodály's *Te Deum* (a piece composed for this specific occasion).[1] After the service, the elegant crowd of secular and religious leaders, led by Regent Miklós Horthy, strolled from the Square of Holy Trinity to the Viennese Gate Square. They were to officially unveil the female statuette of a winged protective spirit /angel with the Apostolic Cross, signifying the triumph and virtue of Christianity (Figure 1, see p. 50). However, before they could reach the Viennese Gate Square there was a halt in the procession. Horthy stopped to lay a wreath on the memorial of Abdurrahman Abdi Arnavut Pasha, the last Ottoman vizier of Buda who fell while fighting against the troops of the Holy League (Figure 2, see p. 51).[2] Was this anything but a gesture of respect toward a fallen enemy? Or perhaps does the very fact that in the midst of the jubilee that was to celebrate Christian Europe's victory over its Ottoman foe, Hungary's leader paused to pay his respects to the vizier

tell us something about the complexity of the legacy of Ottoman occupation? In this short paper — which by no means could or is even designed to address the subject matter as a whole — I will argue that interwar Hungarian cultural diplomacy's representation of the country's Ottoman past was not without challenges, nor was it one-dimensional. Why? On the one hand Hungarians, just as many of their neighbors, aimed to emphasize their central role in the struggle against the "Ottoman menace" in service of Western Civilization.[3] On the other hand, there was the mythical idea and influence of Turanism, which promoted the idea of a Hungarian-Turkish brotherhood. Finally, the practitioners of cultural diplomacy were also keenly aware of the very real geopolitical significance of Turkey, and Hungarian diplomacy aimed to thwart the establishment of regional cooperation between Turkey and Hungary's neighbours — most importantly Yugoslavia and Romania. To sum it up, in the interwar Hungarian imagination the Ottoman Empire/Turkey was simultaneously viewed as a historical enemy, brotherly nation, and potential ally.

Let me start with a brief explanation of the *raison d'être* of interwar Hungarian cultural diplomacy. The Treaty of Trianon — whereby Hungary lost 71.5% of its territory and 63.6% of its population — profoundly altered the way Hungarian leadership viewed the significance of culture and cultural projects. As the First World War and the accompanying propaganda offensive was raging on, the image of Hungary abroad was becoming a frustrating subject. For example, Count Albert Apponyi pointed out rather bitterly the role that Lord Northcliffe's media empire and the Reuters' monopoly played in Hungary's negative image abroad. However, he also emphasized that one should not be surprised that the country had such a negative image, for the Hungarians themselves had failed to provide information about the nation's achievements, just as they had failed to combat the negative depiction of the country in the foreign press and public opinion.[4] After 1920 the country's foreign image was seen as an issue with very grave consequences. Count Kuno Klebelsberg, Minister of Education and Culture, argued that the negative image of the country was responsible for the severity of the Trianon Treaty and the country's international isolation. Klebelsberg, and the majority of the country's political elite, believed that the restoration of the country's geographic integrity and international status — because of the lack of other factors, such as military and economic power — required the reconstruction of Hungary's image abroad.[5] The Ministry of Culture and the newly established diplomatic corps of the Foreign Ministry aspired to

deploy the country's cultural capital — real and imagined — as their primary instrument in influencing Western public opinion.

The planners of the campaign believed that the country's alleged "cultural superiority" [*kultúrfölény*] and assumed Western roots were matters that needed propagation abroad, for they saw these qualities as something that could justify Hungarian designs for revision of the postwar political and geographical reality. The goals of Hungarian cultural diplomacy were to maintain and expand the country's role as the *primus inter pares*, that is, "first among equals" in the field of cultural achievements among the nations of the region, and to portray its alleged superiority in the West, Klebelsberg argued. [6] Of course, Hungarians were not alone in their efforts. As Andrea Orzoff's recent study illustrates, the entire practice of interwar East Central European cultural diplomacy was built upon the discussion of Europe and Europeanness, as each state "cited its adherence to European cultural norms as proof of its moral worthiness," its historical achievements, and its role in defending and creating Western civilization.[7] Their "stories," as historian Holly Case refers to them, were "stories of always having belonged to, protected and defended, preserved, and represented European culture and values."[8] The legacy of Hungary's Ottoman past was indeed one of these "stories" and intended to show the Hungarian nation's contribution to European and universal culture.

In order to appreciate the complexity of Hungarian-Ottoman/ Turkish relations a brief overview of the two nations' entangled history might be useful. According to Pál Fodor, in 1389, when the Ottomans first crossed into Hungarian territory, the Hungarians did not realize that they were facing a new kind of enemy. However, after the Battle of Nicopolis (1396) when the Christian army under the leadership of King Sigismund of Hungary was defeated, in the Hungarian imagination the Ottomans were transformed into the "wild, pagan, godless" main enemy of king, country, and faith.[9] Under the rule of Matthias Corvinus (Mátyás Hunyadi) and later the Jagiellonians, as Hungary continued to face the Ottoman danger, the Turks became the eternal enemy of Hungary. The struggle against the "enemy of the faith" elevated the Kingdom of Hungary to "the shield and bastion of Christendom which, through great loss of its own blood [was] constantly guarding Europe."[10] Historian Domokos Kosáry argued that during King Matthias' reign a significant departure in Hungarian self-identity and national construction occurred: "Hungary continued to paint itself as a defender of universal Christianity, but the universal notion of Christianity was by now colored by national pride."[11]

The defeat at the Battle of Mohács (1526) and the subsequent fall of Buda (1541) not only led to the partition of the medieval Hungarian Kingdom, but also ended the prestige that the country hitherto enjoyed on the international stage. Self-assurance and national pride, argues historian Ignác Romsics, gave way to "despair and hopelessness," and in the sermons of Protestant pastors the Turks were seen as "the scourge of the living God and the wrath He unleashed" upon Hungarians for their sins.[12] Others believed that Hungary was predestined to find its way between the Ottoman Empire and the Habsburg Empire and called for unity.[13] Finding their way also meant relinquishing their status as the shield of Christendom and building relationships with the Ottomans. After the Battle of Mohács, Hungary faced three choices: maintain its independence, ally itself with the Habsburgs against the Ottomans, or ally itself with the Ottomans against the Habsburgs. King John Zápolya (János Szapolyai), on the Hungarian throne simultaneously with Ferdinand of Habsburg, chose the latter option and Hungary became an Ottoman vassal state in 1528.[14] The Ottoman orientation and, consequently, the anti-Habsburg orientation was especially pronounced in the politics of the Principality of Transylvania. Under the leadership of Gábor Bethlen, István Báthori, and István Bocskai the goal of the Transylvanian princes was to maneuver the principality between the Ottomans and the Habsburgs in ways that would allow for the reunification of the Hungarian kingdom.[15] Imre Thököly went so far in opposing the Habsburg rule that some even referred to Hungary as the "enemy of Christendom" — a label that, according to Béla Köpeczi's study on the subject, failed to gain currency in European public opinion.[16]

The 1699 Treaty of Karlowitz brought the end of more than a century and a half of Ottoman subjugation of Hungary. While small pockets of Hungarian territories — such as the Banat of Temesvár (today's Timişoara in Romania) — remained in Ottoman hands until 1718, conflict between the Ottomans and the Hungarians ended. With this the image of the Turks as the main enemy of Hungary was diminished. In many ways it was replaced by the Habsburgs, thus the Austrians became the main obstacles to the Hungarian aspirations that sought to resurrect the medieval prestige and power of the Hungarian nation (even though the nation as understood in the 19th century was yet to be). The Ottoman Empire actually became a safe haven for anti-Habsburg leaders in the aftermath of the Rákóczi Uprising (1703-1711). The small city of Tekirdağ — known by Hungarians as Rodostó — on the shores of the Sea of Marmara provided sanctuary to some of the leaders of the failed rebellion, including Ferenc Rákóczi himself. After the failed revolution of 1848, the Ottoman

city of Kütahya gave refuge to Lajos Kossuth. By the mid-19th century the image of the Turks, as the eternal enemy, was transformed into an image that celebrated Turkish-Hungarian kinship and friendship.

During the second half of the 19th century Turkish-Hungarian relations continued to improve, because of the common fear of pan-Slavism and an aversion toward the Russian Empire. In the fall of 1855, during the Crimean War, two former Hungarian revolutionary officers — György Kmety and Richárd Guyon — directed the successful Ottoman defense of Kars against the Russian forces.[17] During the 1877-78 Russo-Turkish war there were anti-Russian demonstrations in Budapest and elsewhere in Hungary. Gatherings, events, and publications celebrated the shared history and heritage of the Hungarians and Turks — with emphasis on reconciliation and friendship. For example, the 1877 publication of the song *Török-Magyar Bucsuzó* [Turkish-Hungarian parting or goodbye] commemorated the visit of a Turkish delegation. Both Hungarians and Turks proclaimed their respective admiration of one another and their common dislike of the Russians [*muszka*].[18] Another publication, *Rokon-dalok* [Songs of Kinship], tells the story of a commemorative occasion in April 1877 when Hungary's famed actress Lujza Blaha (billed as Mrs. Lujza Soldos) performed a welcoming song while recalling the "bitter fights" of the past, made it clear that nowadays the two nations shall embrace one another and see only brothers.[19] Symbolic gestures at the highest level furthered reconciliation efforts. In 1877 a Hungarian delegation visited Constantinople and presented Abdul Kerim Pasha with an ornamental sword.[20] The visiting Ottoman delegation reciprocated with a gesture of its own by returning some of the items that belonged to the Bibliotheca Corviniana and were taken after the sacking of Buda.[21] Historians and the political elite rediscovered the house of Rákóczi in Tekirdağ / Rodostó and transformed it into one of the most poignant and revered sites of Hungarian history outside of the country's borders.[22] By the turn of the century plays and operas celebrated Rodostó and the Ottoman-Hungarian shared past.[23]

Yet, despite the celebratory notes, the ambivalence to the view of Hungary's Ottoman past was already visible by the mid to late 1800s and continued to divide the ways Hungarians reconstructed and remembered their history. In many ways this was a historiographical development that was rooted in the *kuruc* versus *labanc* dichotomy. While it is a rather complex issue, for now suffice it to say that the *kuruc* mentality was mainly represented by its anti-Habsburg stand and was most popular within the Protestant and gentry strata, while the *labanc* character with its

more pro-Habsburg position and a generally-speaking anti-Turkish stance was rather representative among the country's Catholic nobility. On the one hand the works of historian Sándor Takáts' romanticized account of the 16th and 17th century, argues Pál Fodor, openly celebrated the chivalry and courage of both Hungarians and Turks.[24] In his account — which can be seen as an extreme version of *kuruc* history — the Habsburgs were responsible for the country's suffering, while the Turkish-Hungarian past was idealized.[25] The short-lived Hungarian Scientific Institute of Constantinople [*Magyar Tudományos Intézet*] was to be the crowning achievement of the cultural cooperation that was rooted in a mutual and entangled historical past. Klebelsberg, the then head of the Hungarian Historical Society [*Magyar Történelmi Társulat*], argued in 1917 for the necessity of a government-organized and funded scholarship system that would enable young students to further their education abroad and consequently provide for the future intellectual reserves of the country.[26] This institute was the first realization of his dreams and as director between January of 1917 and September of 1918 he organized a number of lectures and other events to foster cooperation among Hungarian, German, Austrian, and Turkish scholars.[27]

Perhaps it is not an exaggeration to say that no historian had greater influence on interwar Hungarian historiography — and consequently on the image of Hungary's Ottoman past in cultural diplomacy — than Gyula Szekfű. Klebelsberg understood the significance of finding usable episodes in the country's history. In his letter to Szekfű he pointed out his wish that Hungarian historians would examine and write the history of "Turkish peril."[28] Bálint Hóman's and Gyula Szekfű's multi-volume work, *Magyar történet* [Hungarian History] in part answered the call. In their works the Ottoman foe was once again vilified. As Steven Béla Vardy notes, Szekfű "blamed the Turks not only for the economic plight and personal harassment of the population, not only for the country's depopulation and for the general dislocation of Hungary's historical evolution, but also for the destruction of the Hungarian soil, for the pollution of the Hungarian waters, and for the putrefaction of the Hungarian air."[29] Szekfű indeed did not mince words; he proclaimed that Hungary's struggle against the Turks was simply "unprecedented in the history of mankind."[30] The Hungarians — argued Szekfű — unlike the Romanians, Serbs, and Bulgarians, did not shrink from their Christian duties. Consequently, continues the author, the Hungarians' fight for the "cause of Europe" was characterized by an unyielding attitude, constant preparedness, strong discipline, and deadly self-sacrifice — just as Rome's struggle against the

barbaric hordes.[31] To be sure, in his narrative of the Ottoman occupation of Hungary, one can clearly identify the story of victimization coupled with the notions of Hungarian exceptionalism — two of the pillars of interwar Hungarian self-identity. Cultural diplomacy's task was to propagate these and other perceived qualities abroad.

International recognition of Hungary's historical deeds was vital to legitimatizing revisionist claims, and as such representation and dissemination of the legacy of the country's Ottoman past was an essential component of cultural diplomacy. Interestingly enough it was not necessarily the Hungarian victories, but rather their defeats and suffering that validated Hungarian claims of Europeanness. All publications and lectures were designed to convince educated foreign elites of Hungary's credentials as a European country, moreover one whose contributions were crucial to the development of Western civilization. The basic idea was to represent Hungary as the architect and guardian of, and the future key to European culture in the Carpathian Basin. Apponyi — one of the Hungarian delegates at Trianon — summed up this idea in this way:

> The Hungarian nation had and has a lofty world-historic mission, determined by the achievement and tendencies of a thousand years, in the fulfillment of which it has been obstructed and weakened by the catastrophe of Trianon. The mission was, and still is the defence and the peaceful extension of the higher standards of Western life, by political and military, as well as by cultural efforts, according to the requirements of the age.[32]

Julius (Gyula) Kornis — state secretary of culture and member of the Parliament — made a similar argument on the pages of the *Hungarian Quarterly*, a government sponsored English language journal. According to his understanding it was Hungary's "historical mission" to be the "defender of the West," "the bulwark against tides of Orientals," and "to fight the Saracens for three centuries under the sign of the Cross."[33] Kornis and others, such as János Pelényi (Hungarian ambassador to the United States), offered the words of historians to illustrate their point about Hungary's status as the "shield of Christendom." For example, in his speech at Columbia University, Pelényi quoted French historian Jules Michelet: "Europe can never repay Hungary for the service she rendered when she protected Europe against the Turks and Mongols. While Hungary erected dams against the barbarian invasions, arts could live and prosper in the West." In the same speech he also made reference to British

historian Thomas Babington Macaulay, who supposedly said that "had it not been for Hungary's valiant defense of the cross against the Crescent it might well be that the Koran [Quran] and not the Bible would be taught in Oxford."[34]

Hungary's role in safeguarding and promoting Western Christianity was and remained a dominant argument in proving the country's European character.[35] The Hungarian Foreign Ministry ensured that all of Hungary's diplomats could act as historians abroad. Among the topics that they were trained to discuss was Hungary's role as the true "*scutum fidei*" (Shield of Trinity or Shield of Faith). According to this view Hungary's role as the Eastern bastion of Western Christianity against the Mongols and Turks exemplified the Europeanness of the country.[36] A memorandum entitled "Guidelines for contact with Americans" ("Irányelvek az amerikaikkal való érinkezésre") deemed the subject of "Hungary's historical role as the protector of Western culture and Christianity" an "effective" topic. The instruction cautioned would-be diplomats to make audiences aware that "the reason Western European culture could develop in peace" was the "five centuries long" sacrifice of the Hungarian nation.[37] Paul Hanebrink's recent article illustrated that the Hungarian understanding of the country's status as a shield of Europe continued into the twentieth century, for religious and secular leaders and intellectuals promoted the "ideological link" between Hungary's struggle against the Ottomans in the past and the Communist menace of the present.[38]

The country's Ottoman legacy was also employed as an explanation for the issue of demographics and ethnic composition of pre-Trianon Hungary. Prime ministers Pál Teleki and István Bethlen both made arguments to audiences in Great Britain and the United States in which they argued that a consequence of the "inconceivable hardship and misery" was that Hungary became "depopulated and devastated."[39] However, Hungary's victimization story was not yet over, for both Teleki and Bethlen argued that with the end of Ottoman occupation came not liberty, but yet another conquest, this time in the hands of the Habsburgs who resettled the depopulated parts of Hungary with foreigners. This "racial expropriation of Hungary by the Austrian Empire" — argued Teleki — forever changed the ethnic makeup of Hungary and led to the "modern claims of nationalities."[40] In this narrative of double-victimization one can find an interesting historiographical adjustment. By the 1920s in certain circles — especially those connected with the foreign representation of Hungary's past — the *kuruc-labanc* dichotomy diminished and gave way to a histori-

cal image in which the country was a martyr-like, underappreciated, and misunderstood nation.[41]

Of course, Hungarians were not the only ones claiming their Europeanness on the bases of historical deeds in service of the continent. Austrians, Poles, Romanians, Ukrainians, Serbs, and Croats — diplomats, historians, and artists — all argued for their role in safeguarding and saving the achievements of western civilization. The Croatian narrative went even further and proclaimed a "triple victimization," in which Hungarians joined the Ottomans and the Habsburgs as oppressors.[42] Romanians used their opportunity to illustrate their heroic deeds in the face of the Ottoman menace and in their representation there was nobody more faithful to Christianity (albeit Orthodoxy) than the Wallachian prince, Constantin Brâncoveanu. The prince was memorialized in the Romanian section of the Nationality Rooms at the University of Pittsburgh's Cathedral of Learning. As the inscription in the room's spectacular mosaic states: "Prince Constantin Brâncoveanu and his family laid down their lives so that faith in God and nation may live forever in Romanian hearts." His sacrifice became the symbol of Romania's devotion to Christianity and of Romania's loyalty to Europe.[43] Yet, perhaps no nation had more credibility as the shield of Christendom against the Ottomans as Poland and its king, Jan Sobieski. Even foreign newspapers celebrated this historical figure as the savior of Christendom.[44] Hungarians often felt frustrated by the West's perceived ignorance of Hungarian deeds and Hungarian heroes. On one occasion the Hungarian consul general in Washington D.C., György Ghika, addressed the lack of recognition of Hungary's hero János Hunyadi on the pages of *The New York Times* arguing that historical inaccuracies were obfuscating Hungary's "centuries-long struggle."[45] Yet, perhaps the most bitter examination of the foreign image and understanding of Hungarianness came from literary historian Sándor Eckhardt. He argued that the negative image of Hungarians abroad originated in the contemporary West's reaction to the Magyars' sacking and pillaging in ninth and tenth century Europe. He acrimoniously proclaimed that the West only appreciated Hungarian deeds when it was in desperate need, otherwise what he saw as Hungarian bravery and courage tended to be only referred to in negatives, as characteristics of a barbarian horde that was and remained a "*corps étranger a l'Europe*."[46] While Eckhardt was certainly not alone in his grievances, the general tone of the representation of the country's historical and cultural deeds abroad remained respectful, one might say politely informative, for Hungarians — just as their neighboring counter-

parts — understood that they were not alone in their campaign to win western acceptance and support.

Even though the overriding consensus among the political elite pointed toward a European, that is Western leaning policy, there was a significant portion of intellectuals and politicians who thought that Hungary's past and future rested in the East. This understanding was characteristic of the Turanist movement.[47] According to its followers, Hungarians belonged to the Orient, as they shared the common Ural-Altaic origins with Turkish, Bulgar, Finnish, Estonian, and Mongolian people. Some even included Koreans and Japanese in this grouping and dreamed of a pan-Turanian conglomeration that would counter-balance Western hegemony. Others saw it as a way to find equilibrium vis-à-vis pan-German and pan-Slav ideologies. Turanist Society originated in the last third of the nineteenth century as a real scientific — linguistic — project which sought to prove or disprove the Hungarian language's Finno-Ugric origin. Interest in the movement was further amplified by political and economic motivations, as the Hungarian half of the Dual Monarchy sought to carve out its own area of influence. The Turanist Society [*Turáni Társaság*], established in 1910, aimed to bring together the various interests in order to promote further research. Hungarian orientalist and linguist, Ármin Vámbéry's 1914 book, *A magyarság bölcsőjénél: A magyar-török rokonság kezdete és fejlődése* [At the Cradle of the Hungarians: The beginning and development of Hungarian-Turkish kinship] provided new theories about the origins of the Hungarian language and ethno-genesis of the Hungarian people as a whole.[48] Membership in the society was a surprisingly diverse mixture of politicians and intellectuals from Mihály Károlyi through István Tisza to Pál Teleki.[49] In his 1914 speech to the general assembly of the Turanist Society, Pál Teleki argued for the need of continued scientific and economic cooperation that would bring together all Turan nations, but these expansions — exhorted Teleki — must be in harmony with the foreign policy parameters put forward by the joint Foreign Ministry of the Dual Empire.[50] In 1925 the vice-president of the society, Alajos Paikert, explained that the goal of the group was to foster a cultural, economic, and political cooperation between the related nations. In his speech to the assembly he emphasized that while the society believes and adheres to the ideas of the League of Nations, in its current form — without Germany, the United States, Russia, and the Republic of Turkey — it does not believe in its effectiveness. Instead, proposed Paikert, Hungary should build stronger relationships with the likes of Turkey (who successfully overturned the Treaty of Sèvres), Japan (one of

the strongest naval powers), China (a nation with great potential), Finland and Estonia.[51] In many ways, I would argue, the Turanist Society was representative of the same circumstance that characterized Hungarian foreign policy as a whole, it was seeking to break out from isolation and create new connections. Some of their efforts materialized by creating Finnish and Estonian cultural institutes and Hungarian cultural institutions and representations in places like Tokyo and Tartu.

There was a schism in the ideology and in 1920 a splinter group, the Hungarian Turanist Union [Magyarországi Turáni Szövetség], began to advocate an anti-Western orientation and became closely connected with right-wing and racist groups with "pipedreams" about the decline of Western Civilization and the subsequent ascendancy of the Orient. In this new empire, which was to be the realization of Genghis Khan's dream, Hungary once again was to be a border fortress, this time in the service of the Orient against the Occident.[52] It was in this spirit that a group of Turanists gathered at the shrine of Gül Baba on September 2, 1936 to commemorate the liberation of Buda in their own way. In their interpretation the battle was not between the two Turan brothers — Hungarians and Turks — but between East and West. If the two great people would have worked together, continued the argument, than there would not have been "narrow-minded" Paris Treaties and instead there would be two powerful empires: the Hungarians and the Ottomans standing as barriers against injustice, anarchy, and the red flood [of Bolshevism].[53]

There were certain aspects of Turanism that the Hungarian political leadership accepted, such as the Hungarian-Turkish friendship, but for the most part the Christian Nationalist political elite refused to deviate from its Western orientation. Klebelsberg, for example, readily acknowledged that Hungary's roots were in Asia. He also went as far as to agree that some of the racial characteristics remained intact. However, argued Klebelsberg, for millennia Hungarians had been living in the heart of Europe. He did not question the notion that Europe showed its "ungrateful" side to Hungary at the Trianon treaty, which to him was clearly "unjust and brutal," yet he disagreed with those propagating a break with the West. Breaking relations with the West would be the rejection of a traditional European outlook that was exemplified by St. Stephen, King Matthias, and István Széchenyi and would have amounted to the rejection of the very essence of Hungarianness, argued Klebelsberg. To refuse modern reforms in the center of Europe, concluded the minister, would be "absurd," and the nation would vanish.[54] It is safe to say that Turanism, especially the radical ideologies presented by the Hungarian

Turanist Union, had little impact on the country's diplomatic and cultural diplomatic efforts.

Nevertheless, the main reason why Hungarians were careful about their representation of the country's Ottoman past was geopolitics. During the mid-nineteenth century Hungarian-Ottoman relations were improving significantly, not at least because of a common dislike of Russia. During the First World War, as allies, the improvement of relations continued and in 1923 Hungary and Turkey signed a Treaty of Friendship. During the 1926 commemoration of the 500 years anniversary of the Battle of Mohács — which greatly weakened the Hungarian Kingdom — Horthy declared that the "one time foe became a friend" and the "two nations bound by common kinship" overcame their differences and replaced them with friendship and sympathy."[55] The Hungarian ambassador's (László Tahy) report from Ankara testifies to the jealousy-mixed admiration the Hungarian political elite felt about a country that was able to revoke the Treaty of Sevres, and gain international recognition for the new Republic of Turkey through the Treaty of Lausanne.[56]

Different foreign policy aspirations however placed strain on Turkish-Hungarian relations. Mustafa Kemal Atatürk's Turkey sought to have friendly relations with all of its neighbors and aimed to avoid entanglements with Great Power politics. Atatürk's principle "Peace at Home, Peace Abroad" was based on Turkey's strategically important geopolitical location — which was advantageous and disadvantageous at the same time — and the need to keep an independent / neutral stance in international relations (this is why Turkey actually had treaties of friendship and pacts of non-aggression signed with the Soviet Union, Germany and Great Britain at the same time).[57] On the other hand, Hungary refused a relationship with the Soviet Union, a country whose support was immensely important to Turkey's leaders. Even more significantly, as Hungary sought to break out from its international isolation and aimed to secure the necessary foreign support for its revisionist goals, the Bethlen government turned toward Mussolini's Italy. It was a move that was not welcomed by the Turkish government.

Contemporary documents indicate that Turkey's political elite was deeply concerned about growing Italian political influence on the Balkans and as such was apprehensive about the closeness of Hungarian-Italian relations.[58] Hungarians sought to alleviate the growing tension by explaining the usefulness of Hungary's Italian orientation to various Turkish leaders. For example Prime Minister Bethlen, during his visit to Turkey told his Turkish counterpart, İsmet İnönü, about the practical side

of Italian support, such as its support to the plebiscite in Sopron, its support for a League of Nations' loan, and general Italian support for Hungary on the international stage.[59] In the same visit Bethlen met with Atatürk who surprised him with the idea of a Balkan Pact. Bethlen argued against the idea and painted the threatening picture of a pan-Slav union (led by the Soviet Union) and positioned Hungarian revisionist aims as way to counter such aspirations.[60]

This cautious approach to relations with Turkey continued under Prime Minister Gyula Gömbös. The new Prime Minister, accompanied by his Foreign Minister Kálmán Kánya, visited Ankara in October 1933. The two met with Prime Minister İsmet Pasha and Foreign Minister Tevfik Rüştü and discussed the European political situation in their two-day meeting. Among the issues discussed was the Four-Power Pact between Great Britain, France, Germany, and Italy that had been signed in June 1933. The Turkish hosts viewed the pact with a level of apprehension for fears of the growing hegemony of Great Power politics vis-à-vis the League, while the Hungarian leadership believed that such a coalition would be beneficial as far as possible revisions of Trianon were concerned. Balkan politics was another key theme of the meeting, for a proposed Turkish-Romanian rapprochement was certainly against Hungarian wishes. Hungary's anti-Soviet stance — just as discussed during Bethlen's visit — once again proved to be a problematic issue, because Turkey was looking to build and strengthen its relationship with the Soviet Union.[61]

Despite all its efforts, Hungarian leadership was unable to influence Turkish foreign policy. Turkey mended its relationship with Greece and, to the dismay of the architects of Hungarian foreign policy, signed treaties of non-aggression, friendship, and cooperation with Romania and Yugoslavia, culminating in the signing of the Balkan Pact in February 1934.[62] The Hungarian political elite looked at the Balkan Pact as the definite sign of a break in the "traditional" Turkish-Hungarian friendship. The very existence of the Balkan Pact and the subsequent language of Turkish support of the status quo (and consequently the support of anti-revisionism) made Hungarian politicians uneasy about Turkey.[63] Nevertheless the political leadership also realized that Hungary could not afford to alienate its former ally and, for the remainder of the interwar period, sought to maintain cordial relations with Turkey.

This cautious approach clearly manifested itself in the 1936 commemorative celebration of the 1686 liberation of Buda. From the beginning the Hungarian Foreign Ministry advised that any and all celebrations must pay due attention to the Turkish sensibilities and thus

retained the right to check programs and speeches related to the events.[64] Their restraints were justified, for the Turkish embassy sent word that its government was growing more and more dissatisfied with tendencies to place Hungary's Ottoman past in the darkest light.[65] I am using and have been using the phrase "Ottoman past" not simply to differentiate between the Ottoman Empire and the Republic of Turkey, but because this distinction — albeit not always adhered to — was seen as a very important one to both Hungarians and Turks of the time. The Foreign Ministry, for example, asked Endre Liber (vice-mayor of Budapest) in his radio address celebrating the anniversary, to please refrain from using the words "Turkish" and use instead "Ottoman," avoid "captivity" and use "occupation," and instead of "heathens" employ the word "Islam" when addressing the historical issue.[66]

The episode involving József Damkón's and Gyula Walde's statue of Pope Innocent XI — the main architect behind the 1684 creation of the Holy League — provides a telling example of the sensibilities surrounding this celebration (Figure 3, see p. 52). On the one hand the papal statue suggested a clear connection between the Hungarian past and the universal themes of Christendom. The bronze statue erected by the "grateful nation" was commemorating the pope — "the saviour of Hungary." The foundation was honouring the great figures of the struggle against the Ottomans: Pope Innocent XI, Holy Roman Emperor Leopold I, Jan Sobieski, and Marcantonio Giustinian, the 107th doge of Venice. It is safe to say that at no other time was Hungary so significant to its Western neighbours than during its Ottoman occupation and no other major or minor Hungarian battle was part of the Western historical memory to the degree than the liberation of Buda was. The Hungarians understood this and when the Turkish ambassador to Hungary complained about the anti-Turkish rhetoric, the answer was a polite rejection of any charges and an argument that stated that this was a celebration to signify and represent Hungary's historical traditions that — according to the Hungarian reply — were steeped in the Western and Christian orientation. The ambassador's questions about the planned statue of Pope Innocent XI were not so easily retorted. He argued that the fallen flag with the crescent at the foot of the statue suggested disrespect and offered an analogy to his Hungarian host about what his reaction would be to a statue celebrating the Ottoman victory at Mohács with trampled Hungarian colors. Here, paying due attention to Turkish sensibilities, a compromise was seemingly reached whereby the dedication of the statue was not part of the official program, but rather it was delayed a month.[67]

The official ceremony did not only memorialize the recapturing of Buda, but also offered parallels to the contemporary situation of the country. Archduke József (Ágost) in his speech at the Hungarian Academy of Sciences argued that just as Hungarians were able to break the Turkish yoke so will Hungarians overcome the dark times of Trianon and the day of commemoration should celebrate the future resurrection of Hungary.[68] The Lord Mayor of Budapest, Jenő Sipőcz, in his radio speech emphasized that with the victory at Buda Western civilization got back its eastern bastion and just as before, once again — according to its historical mission, continued the Lord Mayor — Budapest and Hungary served as dam against new barbarism threatening Europe.[69] Bálint Hóman, Minister of Culture, offered similar symbolism and message in his speech focusing on the example of the past as a model for "today's struggle" for "Hungarian resurrection."[70]

What role did Hungary's Ottoman past play in the country's cultural diplomacy? Interwar Hungary was a small and largely powerless country with a proud past, and future dreams of grandeur. At one time Hungary was significant to Europe as a whole. For example, when Thomas More penned his famed spiritual work, *A Dialogue of Comfort against Tribulation*, he placed his narrative in 16th century Hungary. More explained that if Hungary was lost — "which up till now has always been a very sure stronghold of Christendom" — it would open up an Ottoman conquest of the rest of Christendom.[71] Of course, More's *Dialogue* is not about Hungary, but the fact that he chose to set his story in Hungary, I think, is representative of the universally recognized value of Hungary's struggle — as universal as far back as 16th century Europe's fear of the Ottoman was concerned. The decision to spotlight Hungary's Ottoman past in interwar cultural diplomacy was certainly not without logic. After all, with perhaps the exception of the Hungarian Revolution of 1848-1849, there was very little in the country's otherwise long history that mattered to the rest of the world. Hungarians sought to suggest — albeit indirectly — that the West owed them for their suffering and deeds. Intellectuals, artists, and diplomats worked together to gently remind their foreign audiences of the victimhood, one could say martyrdom, of Hungary as the bastion of western culture and civilization. While Christendom was definitely a universal concept in the 16th century when More was awaiting for his execution, the problem for the architects of cultural diplomacy was that in the 1920s and 1930s — amidst Great Power politics concerned with nationalism, Communism, Fascism, Nazism and so on — the concept lost its universal significance. Hungarian musicians were able to compose

music, painters and sculptors depicted heroic deeds, and scholars wrote historical studies all showcasing Hungarian deeds in service of Christendom, but cultural diplomacy only works if there is interest on the side of the target audience. To the Western European and American public, the main targets of Hungarian cultural diplomacy, the value of past deeds mattered very little. One does not necessarily have to subscribe to the realist school of international relations to see that during the interwar years military and economic considerations decided where the Great Powers' interest lied.

While highlighting the country's Ottoman past might not have successfully influenced the international situation, it did have an impact on the ways Hungarians understood their Ottoman past and viewed themselves vis-à-vis the rest of the continent. The story of Hungarian heroism continues to be disseminated even nowadays. Six-graders still struggle to read Géza Gárdonyi's 1899 romantic novel *Egri csillagok*. Known in the English-speaking world as *Eclipse of the Crescent Moon,* it tells the story of the 1552 siege of Eger and paints an epic picture of the small Hungarian garrison's victory against overwhelming Ottoman forces. To be sure, Hungarians continue to see their heroic struggle against the Ottoman foe as their badge of honor and validation of their European credentials, but the Turks are no longer the enemy. On the contrary, most Hungarians have favorable views of the Turks. The focus on the shared past is celebrated in exhibitions and gatherings.[72] In Szigetvár, the site of Hungary's first epic poem *Szigeti veszedelem* (The Peril of Sziget), there is now a memorial park commemorating both Miklós Zrínyi and Suleiman the Magnificent. Talking about Suleiman, I cannot help but mention that currently on Hungarian television one of the most successful programs is the Turkish soap opera *Muhteşem Yüzyıl* (titled *Szulejmán* in Hungarian, *Magnificent Century* in English).[73] The issue of Hungary's Ottoman past continues to resurface even in Hungarian political discourse. Its latest manifestation is the Jobbik program — Hungary's ultra-right party — which calls for closer ties with Turkey (and the East in general) and even seeks to create a commemorative day to celebrate common ancestry of the Turanian people.[74]

In this light Miklós Horthy's gesture toward a fallen enemy might be no more than a gesture of respect for a valiant foe. However, the story of interwar Hungarian cultural diplomacy's search for a useable past could also tell us that no nation has total ownership of its own history. History was and remains a political tool, but there has to be an understanding that one nation's history is always intimately linked with the history of others.

Presenting it in a biased and ahistorical way will not bring benefits — it actually diminishes the possibility of constructing and developing a true understanding of a nation's history.

NOTES

My research was first presented at the 2013 ASEEES annual convention in Boston. I would like to thank the panelists and audience for their comments and questions. I would also like to thank the University of St. Thomas History Department, the Dean's Office, the Center for Faculty Development, Cathy Cory, and Terry Langan for the financial support that made the research possible.

[1] *Pesti Hirlap*, 3 September 1936, 5-6.

[2] The memorial was erected in 1932 based on the artistic design of Kálmán Zsille. It was commissioned and paid for by the late descendants of a fallen Hungarian soldier, György Szabó of Veszprém County.

[3] Maria Todorova and Larry Wolff offered useful commentary on the concept of "Ottoman menace." See, Maria Todorova, "The Ottoman Menace in Post-Habsburg Historiography," *Austrian History Yearbook* 40 (2009): 141-147 and Larry Wolff, "Menace as Metaphor: The Traumatic Memory of Ottoman Encounters," *Austrian History Yearbook* 40 (2009): 148-153.

[4] Gróf Apponyi Albert, "Előszó" [Preface] in Gyula Gesztesi, *A magyarság a világsajtóban: magyar sajtópolitika* [Hungary in the World's Press: Hungarian Press Politics] (Budapest: Dick Manó, 1918), 1-12. This collection of studies first appeared in 1916 and 1917 on the pages of the *Új Nemzedék.*

[5] Kuno Klebelsberg, *Neonacionalizmus* (Budapest: Athenaeum, 1928), 107. The document was first published in the *Nemzeti Újság* in November 1927.

[6] Klebelsberg, *Neonacionalizmus*, 247.

[7] Andrea Orzoff, *Battle for the Castle: The Myth of Czechoslovakia in Europe, 1914-1948* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), 9.

[8] Holly Case, "Being European: East and West," in Jeffrey T. Checkel and Peter J. Katzenstein, eds., *European Identity* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 115.

[9] Pál Fodor, "A törökök magyar szemmel" [The Turks through Hungarian Eyes] in *Magyar Tudomány* [Hungarian Science] 172, no. 4 (2011): 400-1.

[10] The qualifier (shield and bastion of Christendom) was a proclamation by the Hungarian Diet of Rákos (1505). Quoted in Ignác Romsics, "From Christian Shield to EU Member" in *The Hungarian Quarterly* 118 (2007): 6.

[11] Domokos Kosáry, *Magyarország története* [History of Hungary] (Budapest: Országos Közoktatási Tanács, 1943), 69-70. Quoted and translated in Romsics, "From Christian Shield to EU Member," 8.

[12] Ibid. Romsics quoted Gáspár Károlyi, who was responsible for the first complete Hungarian translation of the Bible.

[13] Fodor, "A törökök magyar szemmel," 404-405.

[14] The theory that Hungary's vassal status was a result of the country's lack of opportunities and John Zápolya's decision was but a result of limited choices between "two evils" and not necessarily some sort of an inner-Hungarian schism was first put forward by Gábor Barta in the 1970s. For more on this and a selection of Barta's writings on the topic see, Gábor Barta, "A Sztambulba vezető út, 1526-1528. A török-magyar szövetség és előzményei" [The Road to Istanbul, 1526-1528. The Turkish-Hungarian Alliance and its Preceding Events], in *Rubicon* (2013/2. különszám): 30-34.

[15] Romsics, "From Christian Shield to EU Member," 11-12.

[16] Köpeczi's 1976 study referred to in Romsics, "From Christian Shield to EU Member," 13.

[17]"Emlékezés a krími háború magyar honvédtábornokaira" [Remembrance for the Hungarian Honved Generals of the Crimean War] in *Történelem portál*. http://tortenelemportal.hu/2014/05/krimi-haboru-kmety-guyon/ (accessed: 8 November 2014).

[18] *Török-Magyar Bucsuzó: török testvéreink látogatásának örök emlékére* [Turkish-Hungarian Goodbye: for an Eternal Memento of Our Turkish Brothers' Visit] (Budapest: Rózsa Kálmán és neje, 1877).

The song in Hungarian was as follows: A törökember, / A magyarember/ Keserü harczban volt sokat; / De a veretlen / A közös ellen / Most kimutatta útjokat. / Egymást megértve, / Szent ölelésbe / Ime a testvérnépet lásd / Hogy viszonozta a török szofta / Ime! A magyar látogatást. / Eszerint aki itt van szofta /Az Isten hozta és Allah hozta. / Ime most tudja s meg is érti tán, / Ha kimondom tiszta magyarán.

[19] *Rokondalok: a magyar-török testvériség emlékére* [Songs of Kinship: for the Memory of the Hungarian-Turkish Brotherhood] (Budapest: Rózsa Kálmán és neje, 1877), 3.

[20] Bey Hasem, *A magyar ifjúság Konstantinápolyban* [The Hungarian Youth in Constantinople] (Budapest: Bantalits Imre, 1877), 6.

[21] Árpád Mikó, "A Corvina-könyvtár történetei" [Stories of the Corvina Library] http://www.corvina.oszk.hu/studies/miko2002-1-hun.htm (accessed: 10 December 2014).

[22] For example, see: Kálmán Thaly, *Rodostó és a bujdosók sirjai* [Rodostó and the Graves of the Outlaws] (Budapest: Atheaeum Rt., 1889). For a

modern account of the site, see János Hóvári, *Rodostói emlékek és tanulságok* [Memories and Lessons of Rodostó] (Budapest: Magyar-Török Baráti Társaság, 2009).

[23] For example see, *István Géczy and Géza Lampérth, Rodostó — történelmi szinmű három felvonásban epilogussal* [Rodostó — Historical Play in Three Acts with an Epilogue] (Budapest: Lampel R., 1902) and Count Géza Zichy, *Rodostó — történelmi dalmű három felvonásban* [Rodostó — Historical Opera in Three Acts] (Budapest: Globus, 1912).

[24]Fodor, "A törökök magyar szemmel,"406. Essentially, the debate over the real and imagined consequences of the defeat at Mohács generated Hungary's own *Historikerstreit.* For a summary of the debate see, Vilmos Erős, "A Mohács-vita" [The Mohacs Debate] in *Magyar Szemle* New Volume 23, no. 5-6 (2014). Available online: *http://www.magyarszemle.hu/cikk/a_mohacs_vita* (accessed: 11 December 2014). See also, Steven Bela Vardy, "The Changing Image of the Turks in Twentieth Century Hungarian Historiography" in *Clio's Art in Hungary and Hungarian America* (Boulder, CO: East European Monographs, Distributed by Columbia University Press, 1985), 147-171. For a recent evaluation of the consequences of Mohács and the following Ottoman rule, see: Géza Pállfy, "The Impact of the Ottoman Rule in Hungary" in *Hungarian Studies Review* 28, no. 1-2 (2001): 109-132.

[25] Vardy, *Clio's Art in Hungary and Hungarian America*, 148.

[26] József Deér, "A külföldi collégiumok" [The Hungarian Colleges] in *Magyar Szemle* (October, 1931): 112.

[27] Gábor Ujváry, *Tudományszervezés – Történetkutatás – Forráskritika* [Scientific Organization—Historical Research—Source Criticism] (Győr, Hungary: Győr-Sopron Megye Levéltára, 1996), 68.

[28] Klebelsberg's letter to Szekfű, 23 February 1921. G 628, Eötvös Loránd Tudományegyetem Egyetemi Könyvtár. [ELTE University Library]

[29] Vardy, *Clio's Art in Hungary and Hungarian America*, 150.

[30] Bálint Hóman and Gyula Szekfű, *Magyar történet* IV. [Hungarian History Vol.4] (Budapest: Királyi Magyar Egyetemi Nyomda, 1928), Available Online: http://www.elib.hu/00900/00940/html/ (accessed: 15 December 2014).

[31] *Ibid.*

[32] Count Albert Apponyi, "The Historic Mission of Hungary and of the States Aggrandised to her Detriment" in *Justice for Hungary: Review and Criticism of the Effect of the Treaty of Trianon*, (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1928), 19-20.

[33] Julius Kornis, "Hungary's Place in History" *The Hungarian Quarterly* 2, no.1 (Autumn 1936): 47.

[34] Pelényi's speech was given at Columbia University's St. Stephen's Day celebration on 18 November 1938. K 66, 376. csomó, II-6 (2), Magyar Országos Levéltár [Hungarian National Archive] (hereafter MOL). I must point out that I have been unable to locate the corresponding quotes in their original, but that has not stop Hungarians from reproducing them in one way or another, even as recently as 2011. See, Andrew L. Simon, *Made in Hungary: Hungarian Contributions to Universal Culture* (Simon Publications: 1999), 17 and the 2011 publication of the Hungarian Ministry of Defense: Lajos Gubcsi ed., *1000-1100 years ago… Hungary in the Carpathian Basin* (Budapest: MoD Zrínyi Média Ltd, 2011). http://mek.oszk.hu/09100/09132/09132.pdf (accessed: 20 October 2013).

[35] For example see articles published on the pages of *The Oxford Hungarian Review*, *The Hungarian Quarterly*, and the *Nouvelle revue de Hongrie*.

[36] Undated Document. K 67, 9. csomó, 3.tétel, 68. dosszié, MOL

[37] Undated Document. K 67, 1.csomó, 1.tétel, MOL.

[38] Paul Hanebrink, "Islam, Anti-Communism, and Christian Civilization: the Ottoman Menace in Interwar Hungary" *Austrian History Yearbook* 40 (2009): 114-124.

[39] Count Paul Teleki, *The Evolution of Hungary and its Place in European History* (New York: The MacMillan Company, 1923), 54-87 and Count Stephen Bethlen, *The Treaty of Trianon and European Peace* (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1934), 19-56.

[40]Teleki, 84. For a triple victimization story (Croatians in the hands of Ottomans, Austrians, and Hungarians) see, Patrick Hyder Patterson, "The Futile Crescent? Judging the Legacies of Ottoman Rule in Croatian History" *Austrian History Yearbook* 40 (2009): 125-140.

[41] For a recent study on the new perspectives of the *kuruc-labanc* debate, see: Gergely Romsics, *Nép, nemzet, birodalom: A Habsburg Birodalom emlékezete a német, osztrák és magyar történetpolitikai gondolkodásban, 1918-1941* [People, Nation, Empire: The Memory of the Habsburg Empire in the German, Austrian, and Hungarian Historical Thinking, 1918-1941] (Budapest: Ú.M.K., 2010), especially chapter 4.

[42] Patrick Hyder Patterson, "The Futile Crescent? Judging the Legacies of Ottoman Rule in Croatian History" in *Austrian History Yearbook* 40 (2009): 128-129.

[43] For more on the Romanian, Hungarian, and Czechoslovak Nationality Rooms at University of Pittsburgh's Cathedral of Learning, see: Zsolt Nagy, "National Identities for Export: East European Cultural Diplomacy in Inter-War Pittsburgh," in *Contemporary European History* 20, no.4 (2011): 435-453.

[44] See, for example, the article written by Stephen P. Mizwa, founder and president of the Kosciuszko Foundation in New York. Stephen P. Mizwa, "A Pole

who Fought for Christendom: Sobieski Beat the Turks at Vienna 250 Years Ago" *The New York Times*, 10 September 1933, XX5.

[45] George de Ghika, "How John Hunyadi Fought the Turks" *The New York Times*, 13 January 1935, E5.

[46] Sándor Eckhardt, "A magyarság külfödi arcképe" [Hungary's Portrait Abroad] in *Mi a magyar?* Ed. Gyula Szekfű (Budapest: Magyar Szemle Társaság, 1939), 87-136. Available online: mtdaportal.extra.hu/books/szekfu_gyula_mi_a_magyar.pdf (accessed: 10 November 2013).

[47] There is a difference between the Turanist Society [Turáni Társaság] and the Hungarian Turanist Union [Magyarországi Turáni Szövetség]. The former was European oriented. The above mentioned ideology was representative of the latter.

[48] The theory was and remains rather controversial. The Hungarian academic establishment at large rejects Vámbéry's notions. For a review and modern assessment of Vámbéry's theory, see Nándor Dreisziger, "Ármin Vámbéry (1832-1913) as a Historian of Early Hungarian Settlement in the Carpathian Basin," in *AHEA: E-Journal of the American Hungarian Educators Association* 6 (2013). The hard copy of the article was provided by Professor Dreisziger, for which I would like to thank him.

[49] Balázs Ablonczy, "'Lándzsahegy,' néprokonság, small talk: turanizmus és keleti gondolat a két világháború közötti magyar külpolitikai gondolakodásban" [Spearhead, National Kinship, Small Talk: Turanism and Eastern Thought in Interwar Hungarian Foreign Policy Thinking] in *Magyar külpolitikai gondolkodás a 20. Században* [Twentieth Century Hungarian Foreign Policy Thinking], ed. Pál Pritz (Budapest: Magyar Történelmi Társulat, 2006), 88-89. On Turanism in general, see Joseph A. Kessler, "Turanism and pan-Turanism in Hungary: 1890-1945" (PhD diss., University of California, Berkeley, 1967).

[50] Pál Teleki, *A Turáni Társaság eddigi és jövedő működése* [The Hitherto and Future Works of the Turanist Society] (Budapest: Fritz Ármin, 1914).

[51] Alajos Paikert, *A turáni gondolat politikai vonatkozásai* [Turanist Idea in Regards to Politics] (Pécs: Dunántúl Rt. Egyetemi Nyomdája, 1926), 4-5.

[52] Éva Kincses Nagy, "A turáni gondolat" [The Turanist Idea] in *Őstörténet és nemzettudat, 1919-1931*[Prehistory and National Consciousness], ed. Éva Kincses Nagy (Szeged: Balassi Kiadó, 1991), http://www.tankonyvtar.hu/en/tartalom/tkt/ostortenet-nemzettudat/ch07.html (accessed: 25 October 2013).

[53] Pesti Hirlap, 3 September 1936, 8.

[54] Kuno Klebelsberg, *Jöjjetek harmincas évek!* [Come Forth Thirties!] (Budapest: Athenaeum Rt., 1930), 49-50.

[55] *Magyarság*, 31 August 1926, 3. See also, János Szabó B. ed., *Mohács* (Budapest: Osiris, 2006), 527-535.

[56] 3 November 1928. K 63, 287.csomó, 32.tétel, MOL.

[57] Selim Deringil, *Turkish Foreign Policy during the Second World War: an Active Neutrality* (New York: Cambridge UP, 1989), 1-11.

[58] See for example, László Tahy's 19 March 1927 report to Foreign Minister Lajos Walko. Reproduced in Elek Karsai ed., *Iratok a ellenforadalom történetéhez, 1919-1945*. IV. Kötet [Documents to the History of the Counter-Revolution. Vol. 4] (Budapest: Kossuth, 1967), 35.

[59] 7 November 1930. K 64, 41.csomó, 32. Tétel, MOL.

[60] *Ibid*.

[61] 9 November 1933. K 64, 56.csomó, 32. Tétel, MOL.

[62] Andrew Mango, *Atatürk: the Biography of the Founder of Modern Turkey* (New York: The Overlook Press, 2002), 485-487.

[63] K 63, 290.csomó, 32/1. Tétel, MOL.

[64] 9 January 1934. K 66, 294.csomó III-6 (1.) tétel, MOL.

[65] 14 July 1936. K 66, 294.csomó III-6 (1.) tétel, MOL.

[66] 12 September 1936. K 66, 294.csomó III-6 (1.) tétel, MOL.

[67] 14 July 1936. K 66, 294.csomó III-6 (1.) tétel, MOL.

[68] József Kir. Herceg, *A magyar-török harcok és Budavár visszavétele: elnöki beszéd a Magyar Tud. Akadémiának 1936. szeptember 2-án tartott rendkívüli ülésén* [Hungarian-Turkish Fights and the Retaking of the Buda Castle: Presidential Speech at the Special Session of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences on September 2, 1936] (Budapest: Magyar Szemle különnyomat, 1936).

[69] "Budavár visszafoglalásának emlékünnepe főpolgármester előadása," [The Memorial Commemoration of the Recapturing of the Buda Castle: Presentation by Lord Mayor Jenő Sipőcz] *Pesti Hirlap*, 3 September 1936, 5.

[70] *Pesti Hirlap*, 2 September 1936, 5.

[71] Saint Thomas More, *A Dialogue of Comfort against Tribulation*. Rendered in modern English by Mary Gottschalk (Princeton: Scepter Publishers, 1998), Book Three, Preface, 191.

[72] See for example, the 1988 exhibition in the National Széchényi Library titled: "Hungarian-Turkish Shared Past."

[73] The soap opera actually enjoys worldwide popularity and is shown in 47 countries. Even the American Historical Association blog site noticed the overwhelming popularity of the show. See: Nathan Williams, "The Rise of Turkish Soap Power" in BBC News. http://www.bbc.com/news/magazine-22282563 (accessed 21 December 2014) and "Magnificent Century: Historical

Turkish Soap Opera Finds a Global Audience" in *AHA Today* http://blog.historians.org/2014/07/magnificent-century-historical-turkish-soap-opera-finds-global-audience/#sthash.RziBJCk2.dpuf (accessed 21 Dec. 2014).

[74] See, Áron Kovács, "Mi is Attila unokái vagyunk - mit keres a Jobbik Törökországban?" [We are too the Grandchildren of Attila — what is the Jobbik doing in Turkey?] in *Origo.* http://www.origo.hu/itthon/20120203-a-jobbik-kulpolitikai-tervei-kozeledes-torokorszag-fele.html (accessed Sept. 20, 2013) and "Pofon a turáni eszmének és a keleti nyitásnak" [A Slap in a Face to the Turanist Idea and to the Opening toward the East] in *Jobbik Magyarországért Mozgalom* http://jobbik.hu/hireink/pofon-turani-eszmenek-es-keleti-nyitasnak (accessed 20 September 2013).

Figure 1.
Béla Ohmann's bronze statuette signifying the liberation of Buda in 1686.
Author's Photo.

Figure 2.
Kálmán Zsille: Memorial of Abdurrahman Abdi Arnavut Pasha
Author's Photo

Figure 3.
József Damkón and Gyula Walder: Pope Innocent XI (Author's Photo)

Hungarian Studies Review, Vol. XLII, Nos. 1-2 (Spring-Fall, 2015)

A Step too Far? The Impact of German Military Passage to Romania through Hungary on the Anglo-Hungarian Relationship, April 1940

András Becker

A large and growing body of literature has investigated the German-Hungarian relationship in the 1930s and early 40s and the role Hitler and Mussolini played in the territorial aggrandisement of Hungary between 1938 and 1941. The historiography is overwhelmingly consensual on a number of points: firstly, as the direct result of the Second Vienna Award Hungary allowed the free passage (*droit de passage*) of the *Wehrmacht* to Romania.[1] Historians have been aware that the *Wehrmacht* had already requested the use of Hungarian territory in its contingency plan to occupy Romania much earlier than September 1940, in the spring of 1940 in fact, but because the German military passage did not occur at that time the problem in historical research seemed unimportant.[2] Instead, Hungarian historians have argued that the passage of German military trough Hungarian territory after the Second Vienna Award, and Hungary's adherence to the Tripartite Pact in November 1940 and allowing the *Wehrmacht* to use Hungarian territory in the invasion of Yugoslavia in April 1941 cumulatively caused a deterioration in the Anglo-Hungarian relationship and in the British opinion of Hungary.[3] This argument has a number of inherent flaws. Hungarian historiography has been primarily interested in the conclusions and outcomes of British policy towards Hungary, but the analysis of the complex interplay of influences, dynamics and the criteria of the British decision-making process, which provide a more nuanced picture of British perceptions and policy towards Hungary, have so far been largely neglected.

The problem of the prospect of a spring 1940 German military passage through Hungary has so far been the scarcely understood affair of the Anglo-Hungarian relationship. New and persuasive evidence, emerging from British archives, suggest that a decision to grant this free passage was reached in Budapest much earlier than has been previously suggested,

in April 1940. This fundamentally changes our understanding of German-Hungarian relations by providing a new perspective on the ways Hungarian Prime Minister Pál Teleki (1939-41) perceived Hungarian revisionism, neutrality and independence regarding the relationship with Berlin. Firstly, it suggests that Teleki's agreement to a German passage was not the result of gratitude for the Second Vienna Award, nor was it the sign of Hungarian subservience occurring as the consequence of the disappearance of Allied counterbalance to German hegemony in the continent after the fall of France, a notion steadfastly maintained by Hungarian historiography. The newly found evidence makes it necessary for us to rethink this argument and to disentangle the true motives behind the early Hungarian accord.

In this study, these misconceptions are contested, and it is argued that the Hungarian decision to grant a way-leave passage to Germany in April 1940 fundamentally changed British perceptions towards Hungary, and in particular the way London looked at the trustworthiness of the Hungarian elite, and its willingness and ability to confront Germany. This made a dramatic impact on British attitudes towards Hungary's future role, geographical shape and social and political structure in post-war Central Europe. This episode is effectively the long lost puzzle piece of the evolution of British opinion about Hungary: it finally explains the reasons behind the sharp deterioration of British official opinion during the course of the summer of 1940; a phenomenon which so far has been understood only superficially, and which have been explained with the generalisation that Hungary followed an increasingly pro-German policy.

With regards to the Hungarian perspective, the question inevitably arises why Budapest consented to a German request in April. So far, the Allied defeat in France in June 1940 went some way towards explaining Hungary's growing subservience. Historians have also argued that after Dunkirk Teleki's implicit faith in the ultimate British victory had been fundamentally shaken, and apprehension about losing the possibility to enlist German assistance for further territorial gains brought the realization that closer cooperation with Hitler would be vital.[4] The evidence brought forward here suggests that by the spring of 1940, due to the lack of open and immediate British support for Hungary's territorial claims, Teleki had been keen to bring the question of Transylvania to a head, in disregard of British disapproval. Balázs Ablonczy and Tibor Frank has pointed to the primacy of frontier revision in Teleki's foreign political aims,[5] but the unquenchable thirst for revision does not seem to explain the decision to value German support more than the British.

The answer ultimately lies in the dramatic shift on the international stage. The Hitler-Mussolini meetings at the Brenner Pass in March 1940 have been viewed as a crucial step in the materialization of an active German-Italian military alliance in the war, but historians have not recognised its implications for the future of Hungary. British sources indicate that at Brenner a secret deal was struck, and in return for greater influence in the Balkans Mussolini had given up its special relationship with Hungary.[6] These documents indicate that losing nominal Italian protection, Hungary was faced with the dilemma of resistance or collaboration in the face of German armed pressure. Here, we are arguing primarily that the arrangements of the Brenner meetings could potentially explain that out of fear of physical German occupation Teleki decided to provide a *carte blanche* to Berlin to pass through Hungarian territory.

The purpose of this study is to demonstrate the impact of the Hungarian decision to grant transit rights for the *Wehrmacht* in April 1940 on the Anglo-Hungarian relationship and British Central European and Balkan strategy until diplomatic relations were broken off between London and Budapest in April 1941. It is also interesting to disentangle how the question of the *droit de passage* affected British opinion of Hungary's recent territorial gains and how it shaped British post-war planning in Central Europe. At the same time our analysis aims to disentangle who and on what principles made policy on Hungary in Whitehall, and demonstrates the ways the various individual perceptions and political and strategic priorities in the region shaped British official policy towards Hungary.

Several studies have produced sketchy analyses on this problem, but until now no reliable evidence has been brought forward to suggest that Hungary granted military passage to Germany earlier than September 1940.[7] András Bán recognised that the question posed an impossible dilemma for Teleki, who so far successfully maintained a balance between Germany and the Allies, but neglected its impact on the Anglo-Hungarian relationship.[8] György Réti has also paid some attention to the problem, and stressed that the lack of Italian encouragement to resist a German request put Hungary in a difficult situation, but Réti's scope of analysis was limited to German, Italian and Hungarian sources.[9] Elizabeth Wiskemann claimed that the German demand for a passage through Hungary served as a cover for the invasion of Denmark and Norway, to direct attention away from Scandinavia. Wiskemann unfortunately did not disclose her source of information, but her argument was probably valid, as the Hungarian decision occurred simultaneously with the Scandinavian campaign.[10]

Until now, German, Italian, and Hungarian sources have provided the largest set of evidence, but all of these are very vague on the subject, particularly regarding the timing of the Hungarian decision. The question presented a delicate and highly confidential issue for all parties; therefore the problem is absent from official sources. The published diplomatic documents of the German Foreign Ministry and the German-Hungarian diplomatic correspondence do not mention that Berlin asked for a military passage from Budapest in the spring of 1940.[11] Italian sources are also very obscure on the question. *Talamo*, the Italian minister in Budapest, reported on several occasions in April that Berlin possibly requested a military passage through Hungarian territory, but remained silent on whether the Hungarians actually granted the passage.[12] The *I Documenti Diplomatici Italiani,* the published diplomatic sources of Italian foreign policy reveals nothing exact about a '*droit*' in the spring of 1940 either. The surviving Hungarian sources are similarly silent. Neither the *Diplomáciai iratok Magyarország külpolitikájához* (DIMK), nor the diplomatic correspondence between Berlin, Rome and Budapest mention anything specific about a German request and a Hungarian reply. The minutes of the Hungarian Cabinet meetings offer no further evidence either.[13] A memorandum handed by *Lipót Baranyai*, the anglophile president of the Hungarian National Bank and a close ally of Teleki, directly to Ciano on the 8 April is one of the rare documents clearly indicating that the Germans contacted Budapest about a military passage. In a questionnaire Baranyai enquired about whether Italy was willing to defend Hungary against German aggression.[14] Mussolini's answer to the Hungarian inquiry, after consultation with Berlin, was abrupt and laconic: I am Hitler's ally, and wish to remain so.[15]

Mussolini's evasive response prompted Budapest to look for alternatives elsewhere. A similarly worded memorandum and questionnaire was prepared for the Foreign Office by Teleki, which inquired about the British attitude towards the prospects of allowing a German military passage. The memorandum pointed out that the British response would significantly determine the Hungarian decision, but Foreign Minister István Csáky wrote on the bottom of the page that the memorandum was never sent to London.[16] A personal letter, written by Teleki on the 17 April to Hitler, also mentions the matter: Teleki assured the Germans that in return for supporting Hungary's bid for Transylvania, the passage of the *Wehrmacht* to Romania would be allowed.[17] It can thus be suggested that the reason for holding the memorandum back was either the fact that British opinion was not considered important anymore, or that Budapest

made the decision to allow the military movements of the *Wehrmacht* before the 17 April, or perhaps both.

So far only a fraction of the diplomatic reports of *Owen O'Malley* (British Minister in Hungary, 1939-41) have been analysed by historians. His reports convincingly prove that Hungary eventually granted a passage in early April, but the exact date of the decision and the actual form of the German request still remains very uncertain.

British priorities in Central and South East Europe until April 1940

In order to understand the impact of Hungary's yielding to any German transit request on the Anglo-Hungarian relationship we first need to ask a number of questions. Firstly, it is useful to dwell upon problems such as the British official attitude towards the role of small and neutral powers in Europe, and the implications of the violation of their territory for British strategy in time of war and peace. Also, sketching the interplay of Britain's political, military and economic priorities in Central Europe and the Balkans, and outlining the criteria which determined the British perspective of the Anglo-Hungarian relationship, with particular attention to the development of the German-Hungarian cooperation and the impact of Hungary's territorial claims on British policy prior to March 1940 will enable us to have a clearer understanding of the effects of the problem on British perceptions and policy.

The 1907 Hague Convention addressed the conduct of warfare and the rights and duties of neutral powers. It forbade belligerents to move troops or convoys of either munitions of war or supplies across the territory of neutral powers; at the same time it prohibited neutrals from allowing such actions.[18] Many of these carefully laid down rules were violated during the Great War. For instance, the German invasion of Belgium in 1914, essentially an attempt to enforce a military passage to France, was the violation of neutral territory. The inviolability of European neutrals occupied a decisive role in the British strategy of the *balance of power*, because it provided buffer zones for great power rivalry. In 1839, Britain guaranteed Belgian neutrality, which eventually caused London to declare war on Germany in 1914.[19] After the Great War neither the League of Nations nor other supranational bodies regulated the rights and duties of neutrals in war, thus the Hague Convention remained in place to regulate their role.

It is clear that the Belgian example cannot be used to illustrate British attitudes towards the role of neutrals and small powers in the interwar period, particularly in Central Europe.[20] Although Britain returned to the balance of power, Whitehall was traditionally less concerned with this part of the world. This period does not provide a suitable precedent through which the paradigm of British attitude towards a *droit de passage* through neutral territory in Central Europe could be examined. The only notable exception is the question of a Red Army transit through Poland and Romania, which would have been the fundamental element of a collective security system against Nazi Germany from the mid-1930s.[21] This example is useful in providing a rare glimpse of the British stance on the issue of great power military passage through the territories of small Central European states, but because the Soviet Union appeared as a friendly power in this equation and that the scheme was to be organised in peace-time, considering it provides inaccurate evidence for the British attitude towards such a problem in war. Besides, Poland and Romania would have played an integral part in the collective security system; hence they cannot be referred to as neutrals.

Underpinned by deep antipathy towards Communism, Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain and Foreign Secretary Lord Halifax proceeded with great reluctance in negotiating the encirclement of Germany with Soviet participation. Consequently, and as a result of extreme Polish reluctance, London rejected supporting the passage of the Red Army through Romania and Poland in 1938 in defence of Czechoslovakia.[22] Shrouded in the dense fog of appeasement, the principles of British strategy were unclear at the time, but the lukewarm enthusiasm to commit to collective security tells much about the inherent reluctance to conduct active power policy in a traditionally and practically second-tier region.

From the British perspective, the sweeping territorial changes of Czechoslovakia in 1938 were acceptable, because they were negotiated at the green table. Moreover, it perfectly befitted Chamberlain's notion that he would be able to cooperate with Berlin in resolving outstanding Central European issues, which he believed would bring long sought stability to international relations and to the region alike. For these reasons, the First Vienna Award, the German-Italian arbitration of the Hungarian-Czechoslovak territorial dispute in November 1938, was *de facto* accepted by London.[23]

In contrast, when in March 1939, simultaneously with German aggression against Bohemia and Moravia, Hungary occupied Ruthenia, Czechoslovakia's easternmost province, British perceptions towards

Hungary underwent a considerable change. From this kind of Hungarian behaviour, which appeared to be a covert German-Hungarian military cooperation, policy-makers in Whitehall were convinced that the 'Hungarian jackal' had taken the bait, and in return for further chunks of territory in Transylvania would actively assist the 'German lion', its master, in carving up the region. After the destruction of Czechoslovakia, the German aggression against the Romanian oil fields had become the permanent subject of British anxieties and the Foreign Office expected that the *Wehrmacht* would most likely use Hungary as the most obvious transit route. Whether Hungary would offer resistance to German aggression, or grant military passage to avoid occupation, was a constant subject of Foreign Office discussions.[24] The predictions of the British Embassy in Budapest that at best Hungary would only offer token resistance to such German designs had significantly determined the way the Foreign Office looked at the future of Hungarian foreign policy and the nature of the German-Hungarian relationship.[25] Consequently, Whitehall's conception of German-Hungarian military cooperation against Bucharest became central to its perception of the Hungarian-Romanian territorial dispute and became the underlying reason for discouraging Hungary's persistent claims in Transylvania.[26]

The Kassa-Velejte railway incident in September 1939 is an illustrative example, which vividly demonstrated the way Budapest perceived German-Hungarian cooperation against Romania. The German request to use the Hungarian section of this railway for the duration of the German-Polish war has received great prominence in the Hungarian historiography, although its implications for the future course of the German-Hungarian relationship and the British reaction have not been adequately stressed.

Teleki refused to grant passage for German military convoys against Poland on moral grounds, citing the century old friendship between Hungary and its northern neighbour. Historians have repeatedly overstated this aspect and used it to underpin the image of Hungary as a country steadfastly defiant to German pressure.[27] In this respect, András Bán also argued that the Hungarian noncompliance had a distinctive positive reaction in London.[28] Bán quoted Ralf Walford Selby's Foreign Office memorandum about Hungary, which emphasized that the Kassa example clarified that Britain could count on Hungarian resistance against Germany. The problem with this is that Selby was the lone voice in the Foreign Office stressing that suspicions towards Hungary were unfounded.

Moreover, he was a junior clerk, and his proposals were mostly sidelined by senior officials at an early stage.[29]

In reality, the Hungarian refusal triggered mixed feelings in the Foreign Office. Csáky's promise that the railroad tunnels near Kassa would be blown up if the *Wehrmacht* would have attempted enforcing the passage turned out to be lies, which repulsed British policy-makers.[30] C. A. Macartney and Gyula Juhász pointed out that officials in Whitehall believed that Hungary asked for a free hand in Transylvania for allowing the passage and only after the German rejection they make the decision to refuse allowing a military passage.[31] However, it would be a mistake to think that for these reasons British perceptions in relations to Hungary were always and consistently negative. Both junior and senior officials in Whitehall still displayed great trust in Horthy's and Teleki's ability to mount stiff resistance to German demands incompatible with Hungarian independence, such as a military passage.[32]

Historians have not pointed out that at the same time as refusing to open the Kassa railway Csáky declared that a similar request for a passage towards Romania would be granted without hesitation in return for supporting Hungarian claims for Transylvania.[33] The question had not been raised by Berlin at that time, but Csáky's statement amply demonstrates the Hungarian stance in the matter.

During the 'Phoney War' Britain found itself caught between Nazi-Soviet cooperation and its own military weakness in its Central European strategy. Military options had to be reconsidered; opening a Balkan front and defending Hungary, Romania and Yugoslavia against German aggression was ruled out and the strategic emphasis shifted to the defence of vital imperial lifelines in the Mediterranean.[34] This however did not mean that London would not do its utmost to limit German expansion in the region. The consequence, as we would see from the response to the Hungarian agreement to the prospect of a German military passage in April 1940, was a confusing vacillation between decisions taken in the short-term military interest, and decisions dictated by the interest in long-term political goals in the wider regions of East Central and South East Europe.

Hungary grants military passage to Germany

The first confirmation that Hungary might be willing to grant passage was reported to London by O'Malley in early March 1940. Taking advantage

of the opportunity of the 20th anniversary of Horthy's election as Regent, O'Malley requested a private audience to probe him on German-Hungarian relations. The meeting offered some deeply revealing insights into the recent dramatic development of Hungarian foreign policy. Horthy avoided O'Malley's direct questions about the possibility of Hungarian acquiescence to a German military passage. He remained very ambiguous and talked around the subject at great length. He extensively dwelt upon the disaster impending in Europe and the difficulties with which Hungary was confronted. Notably however, he referred to 'the sombre nature' of the decision he would have to take if Germany, determined to make a dash for the Romanian oilfields, offered him the choice between regaining Transylvania and armed German intervention. Regardless of O'Malley's persistence in demanding the declaration of a clear policy, Horthy only noted that Hungary's attitude depended on Mussolini's willingness to stand by Hungary. The meeting left O'Malley profoundly uneasy. Regardless of being sympathetic towards moderate frontier revision, he was evidently unable to comprehend why Horthy would place regaining Transylvania before Hungarian independence. Judging from Horthy's circumspect attitude O'Malley was convinced that the question of military passage had recently been brought up by Berlin again, and Hungarian policy-makers were now intensely debating their options.[35]

Ultimately Horthy's lack of political and diplomatic skill accounts for his surprising frankness. Previously, Teleki was careful not to reveal his card to the British. Horthy's comment on the 'sombre nature' of the decision about Transylvania seems to be a slip of the tongue, that later caused considerable headaches to Teleki. In an attempt to repair Hungary's reputation in Britain Teleki took matters in his own hands. When O'Malley requested clarification from Foreign Minister Csáky, keen to prevent the meeting, Teleki stormed out of an ongoing Cabinet meeting to confer with O'Malley personally.[36] During their interview, the British minister pressed the case of the importance of Hungarian resistance to any German requests for transit, but sounded very vague in his argument against such Hungarian actions. Since the outbreak of the war, quite strikingly, O'Malley did not receive detailed instructions about the official British attitude towards the question of Hungarian armed resistance; therefore in his reasoning he could only stress Britain's obvious strategic interest that blocking further German expansion in the region was vital both for Britain and Hungary.

Teleki appeared to be fully aware of the importance of Hungarian resistance for London, and as a result, by vaguely referring to the

possibility of a firm Hungarian protest, he attempted to take the wind out of O'Malley's complaints and to reassure British anxieties: "[…] it seems to me that if we are to be robbed of our independence we can either voluntarily submit ourselves […], or we can make it plain that we have been overridden by brute force, in which case we can at least preserve the hope of recovering our liberty later on." [37] Highly skilful in his tactics, he obviously aimed to probe O'Malley as to whether a mere diplomatic protest would suffice to retain British sympathy. Historians have often stressed that Teleki held great and genuine affection towards Britain and tried his utmost to win British support both for Hungarian independence and territorial aspirations. However, a deeper examination of the Anglo-Hungarian relationship, and the problem of the German military passage in particular, provide ample evidence that Teleki's political course and diplomatic moves were largely dictated by the determination that Hungary could not abandon revisionism, and his conduct in this context had little regard for British opinion.

Regardless of the obscurity of Horthy's and Teleki's words, the evidence suggests that Teleki tried to maintain a balance between the Allies and Germany with the unquestionable aim of preserving Hungarian independence and neutrality as far as possible. In the process, until late March, Teleki was able to resist German requests for a way-leave passage.[38]

Since the final destruction of Czechoslovakia in March 1939, German military passage through Hungary, or German-Hungarian military aggression against Romania had been expected in Whitehall. Hence, the response to O'Malley's reports, which merely reiterated the possibility of German military movements, was minimal. The probable Hungarian acquiescence nevertheless stirred up some crude emotions, which vividly demonstrated the mind-set of key policy-makers. For instance, Alexander Cadogan, the Permanent Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, the effective head of the Foreign Office, referred to Horthy's comments with sharp disapproval: "Disgusting!"[39] At the same time, the British were keen to forge the mutual cooperation of South East Europe against Germany. A clear sign of this increased British interest was the calling of the heads of British missions in the region to a conference in London. Before leaving for the conference, O'Malley requested to see Teleki once again to find out more about the recent meeting between Hitler and Mussolini at the Brenner Pass. Teleki was anxious to convey that neither the Axis nor Hungarian policy had changed as a result of the Brenner talks. The interview did not bring tangible results, but O'Malley described Teleki as

being unusually reticent, and was convinced that the Hungarian premier had something to hide.[40] O'Malley soon left for London, at a crucial turning point for Hungary and the Anglo-Hungarian relationship. While he was away, Teleki finally bowed to persistent German pressure and granted military passage to the *Wehrmacht*.[41] It is not beyond the bounds of possibility that the fact that O'Malley was away provided a pressure-free opportunity for Teleki to acquiesce to German demands; nevertheless, O'Malley was only informed about the Hungarian decision upon his return.[42]

The meetings of British representatives in London dedicated very limited attention to Hungary. The focus of the conference was to discuss Britain's vital strategic interests in the region. Debate centred on the Turkish attitude towards the war, and the possibilities of providing help to Romania, which at the time faced intense political and economic pressure from Germany and the Soviet Union. Because of its important strategic position in the vicinity of the Straits, special attention was also placed on bringing Bulgaria closer to the Allies. These questions overshadowed the problems surrounding Hungary, which clearly demonstrated its relative strategic insignificance. However, during the time of the conference, reports were received about the recent meetings between Hitler and Mussolini at the Brenner Pass and its possible implications for Central and South East Europe. These news once again set British strategic planning in motion.

Historians have underlined the Brenner conference as the decisive event in the completion of a German-Italian military alliance, an iconic encounter of the two dictators, where Hitler finally persuaded Mussolini to join the war on the side of Germany.[43] This view of Brenner has persisted in the writings of Hungarian historians, who have not recognized its far-reaching implications for Central and South East Europe, and Hungary in particular.[44] Sources about the Brenner meetings are limited, and the surviving accounts are deliberately ambiguous: German, Italian and Hungarian documents do not mention that the question of Hungary was ever brought up.[45] By comparison, British official sources strongly suggest that at the Brenner Pass Central and South East Europe had been carved up into a German and Italian sphere of influence, and in exchange for greater dominance in Greece and the Mediterranean, Mussolini had given up the protection of Hungary. Due to losing the protection of Italy, Budapest was left with limited room to manoeuvre against Germany, which, this study argues, became the primary reason for providing a *carte blanche* to the

Wehrmacht to pass through Hungarian territory if Berlin deemed it necessary at a future date.

London received the news through unspecified and highly confidential diplomatic sources that Hitler at the Brenner Pass bluntly broke the news of the imminent invasion of Romania to Mussolini, who realised that Hungary would serve as a transit route in the process.[46] More detailed information started to flow from mid-April. Then the French reported that members of the Italian Embassy in London openly declared that as a result of the Brenner Conference Italian policy was forced to make a dramatic turn in respect to Hungary. They admitted that Italy would now be unable to do anything in Hungary against German wishes, and the Duce was helpless to protect that country if Germany wanted to enforce a military transit.[47]

A little later, information from the highest Hungarian circles confirmed the connection between the Brenner meeting and Hungary's decision to allow German military movements. Ian Campbell, the British minister in Belgrade, conveyed Horthy's words to the Foreign Office. In a direct message to Campbell, Horthy readily explained in plain words that due to the change in Hungary's position after the Brenner meetings it had been decided in Budapest to allow the entry and passage of German troops to Romania.[48] At the same time, diplomatic and intelligence sources reported heavy German military concentrations along the frontiers of Hungary which underpinned the supposition in Whitehall that the subjugation of Romania (and Hungary) was planned. (The same sources however all described the German disappointment about the on-going operations in Norway, and how the sluggishness of the campaign was most likely to upset the original intention to occupy Romania before the summer campaign on the Western front).[49]

If the British had any doubts about the Hungarian attitude towards the question of any German military passage, they soon disappeared after O'Malley's return to Budapest. Disturbed by the rumours of the increased German pressure for a passage, O'Malley, evidently in possession of clearer instructions this time, pressed Teleki at their meeting on 20 April to declare Hungary's response to these German requests. Annoyed at being forced into a corner, Teleki firmly rejected giving an answer: "[In] this question […] I tolerate no intervention. What Hungary does […] is Hungary's business and it would be inconsistent with our dignity to give way to the pressure that now you put on us to declare ourselves."[50]An affirmative answer to a German request could be held responsible for the sudden dramatic change in Teleki's tone. At the same time, as Teleki later

admitted, the scant British attention to Hungary also played a crucial role in yielding to German demands. Henceforth, Teleki did not even try to prevent Csáky from trampling over the previously carefully protected relationship with London, and did not block him from meeting O'Malley. Keen to avoid these persistent interrogations, Teleki now sent Csáky to break the news to the British minister that Hungary would not in any way resist any German request and the railway line running through Kassa [*Košice*] and Ungvár [*Uzhhorod*] would be put at the disposal of the German army if it wanted to use it to invade Romania. However, it would be misleading to put Csáky unduly in the role of a staunch advocate of German orientation. According to O'Malley's account, the Hungarian Foreign Minister looked deeply shaken when he gloomily explained the reasons for the decision: "The other alternative would be forcible resistance to the German army. This could at best only last for a few days. […] Put yourself in my place and ask yourself what would you do?"[51]

O'Malley, compared to his predecessor Geoffrey Knox, was genuinely fond of Hungary. He evidently felt kinship with the problems of small nations in Central Europe, and to a certain degree he even sympathized with Hungarian revisionism.[52] He regarded the efforts Teleki and Horthy had made for maintaining Hungarian independence highly, but now felt bitter and disillusioned by the turn in Hungary's foreign policy. A little later, O'Malley learned from a close friend of Horthy that the Brenner Conference, the recent successes of the Germans in Norway and more precisely the British inability to protect Norway from a German invasion, had confirmed the Hungarians in their decision that a way-leave passage should be provided to Germany.[53] Hence, upon his return to Budapest realizing the shift in Hungarian foreign policy, O'Malley recommended the immediate and complete restriction of trading raw and war materials with Hungary, which he argued, would eventually fall into German hands.[54]

The reaction of the Foreign Office

O'Malley's reports brought deep-seated prejudices against Hungary in Whitehall to the surface. The Hungarian decision was viewed as a cohernt element of a tendentiously pro-German Hungarian policy, which left no doubt about Hungary's future attitude. Even though Hungary was considered militarily invaluable in British grand strategy after the collapse of Poland, a German military passage through Hungary touched on a nerve

and shifted British perceptions about Hungary and the Hungarian political elite in particular. The question of how London should react triggered intense soul-searching in the Foreign Office. The debate centred on the problem's immediate implications over the defence of Romania, war trade with Hungary and the future of the Anglo-Hungarian relationship. The question divided senior officials. 'Rab' Butler, the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs recommended that the situation should be ruthlessly exploited to cause trouble to Germany. His suggestion that inducing Hungary to armed resistance would be a gain for the British war effort, no matter how modest, proves that foreign affairs were now inextricably mingled with defense considerations.[55] Robert Vansittart, the former head of the Foreign Office, also known for his deep antipathy towards Hungary, also criticized the lack of active British support to neutrals. After being kicked upstairs to become Chief Diplomatic Advisor (a role with no direct influence on policy-making) Vansittart had now evidently taken the opportunity to blame Britain's diminishing reputation in the region both on the mismanagement of British foreign policy and Hungarian revisionism.[56]

As the debate reached the senior levels the tone became more pragmatic. Orme Sargent, the head of the Southern Department raised his voice against jumping into half-baked adventures and immediately sidetracked Butler's proposition. Sargent, who harbored feelings of resentment towards the Hungarian elite, mostly due to *Magyarization* in the late 19th century, did not seem surprised by the Hungarian decision and felt confirmed in his long-standing suspicions about a German-Hungarian conspiracy against Romania. His response on the other hand also reflected his broader understanding of the strategic implications of Hungary's '*volte face*'. Sargent was convinced that egging the Hungarian government to resist Germany was inadvisable, as the short-term advantage of a brief Hungarian resistance was outweighed by the long-term political disadvantage of being once more accused of failing to help a neutral state.[57] This statement corroborate Macartney's argument, which emphasized that an openly pro-British Hungarian foreign policy in early 1940 would have been an embarrassment for London, as Britain lacked the means to provide adequate help. Cadogan wholeheartedly agreed with Sargent, but made an interesting remark, which puts his earlier appalling opinion about Horthy into context. He now stressed that a country that was not keen to commit suicide cannot be treated harshly at the peace conference. Comments such as this contradict the picture often painted by historians about Cadogan, whose attitude towards Central Europe and the Balkans have so far been

judged largely in the light of his often derogatory diary entries.[58] From the outbreak of the war Cadogan was involved in post-war planning to a great extent and the evidence suggests that he advocated the creation of a peace settlement which would not have divided the region into victors and vanquished.[59]

We know very little about the opinion of Foreign Secretary Lord Halifax about Hungary in the spring of 1940.[60] He seldom minuted Foreign Office files, and the examination of his official memoranda on Central Europe and the Balkans do not bringing us closer to his mindset either. The accuracy of these official memoranda in projecting British official policy had also been widely questioned by historians. David Dilks has pointed out that memoranda initialed by Halifax were often compiled either by Oliver Stanley, Halifax's private secretary, or by senior officials in the Foreign Office.[61]

Indeed, British Cabinet memoranda on the Balkans and Central Europe in the spring of 1940 are very vague and exhibit a large amount of indifference. They do not mention the problem of German military passage at all, but dwell extensively on insignificant issues, such as strong anti-German feelings in the region and exuded ungrounded optimism about the temporality of the loss of British prestige.[62] Completely disregarding the implications of the Brenner meetings, these documents did not entirely exclude the possibility of the Italian protection of Hungary against German aggression. Considering the fate of Hungary to be an unusually high priority in Italian policy they expected, or perhaps wished for, a German-Italian quarrel over Hungary or other positions in the Balkans.[63] Another memorandum in late April similarly misjudged the Balkan status quo, and Halifax proudly declared that the Balkan Bloc, consisting of Romania, Yugoslavia, Hungary and Bulgaria, had been created and declared that British prospects in these countries, with the backing of the Anglo-French-Turkish alliance, were highly promising.[64] Due to the unreliability of these primary sources, in the analysis Halifax's opinion, we have to rely on the scarce number of minutes in Foreign Office files scribbled by Halifax personally.[65] The fact that he mostly only initialed the minutes written by Sargent and Cadogan, as a sign of concurrence, or simply minuted 'I agree', leave no doubt that on Hungarian matters the Foreign Secretary largely relied on their viewpoints. These observations attach added importance to Sargent's and Cadogan's opinion in analyzing the official British opinion of Hungary, all the more so, as in most cases, besides Halifax, they represented the Foreign Office's viewpoint at Cabinet meetings.

Hungary's persistent revisionist ambitions, and more crucially the notion that for its pro-German policy Hungary would be rewarded with territories at the expense of its neighbours, were now linked with the German military passage and consequently became the permanent feature in the British judgement of Hungary. Consequently, this did not only affect perceptions about Hungary's future attitude, but also questioned the viability of Hungary's earlier territorial acquisitions, the First Vienna Award and the occupation of Ruthenia, which were now seen as proof of a long-term German-Hungarian collaboration. Cadogan, Sargent and other senior policy-makers were convinced that for allowing a military transit through her territory Hungary would receive Eastern Slovakia as a reward.[66]

Even though the British foreign policy-making elite now seemed to have lost faith in Hungary, their reaction to a yet mostly unknown Hungarian proposition, from a very different quarter, suggests that the lack of trust was only felt towards the current Hungarian political elite. Historiography usually suggests that Count Mihály Károlyi, the controversial and left wing president of Hungary after the Great War (1918-19), had only taken up a political role in the Hungarian anti-fascist emigration in Britain from 1941.[67] New evidence however indicates that he was active as early as April 1940. Urievicz, an emissary of Károlyi, called on the Foreign Office in late April and requested British approval for Károlyi's plan to offer Ruthenia to the Soviet Union in return for a Soviet guarantee of Hungary's independence. Minutes suggest that Orchard and Robert in the Central Department approached Károlyi's group positively, and were keen to sound out Urievicz on the views of a Hungarian political group which opposed both Hitler and the current Hungarian regime, but because of the current Nazi-Soviet cooperation they were convinced that Moscow would not support such a scheme, thus Károlyi's emissary was not received.[68]

"Our fate is being decided now between Namur and Sedan."[69] The Anglo-Hungarian relationship in the first weeks of the Battle of France

The decisive moment on the Western front came on 10 May, when Germany launched a major offensive against the Allies. György Barcza in London, and the Hungarian elite in Budapest, anxiously waited for the outcome of the battle, praying for an Allied victory. The aim here is to

determine whether the outbreak of hostilities on the Western front brought about change in the Anglo-Hungarian relationship, and in what direction the war pushed the crippled image of Hungary in London.

Immediately before the Battle of France O'Malley sounded out Teleki on Hungary's attitude towards the war and Germany, with the aim to find out whether the Hungarian position had changed towards a German military transit. The intense conversation highlighted the enormous contrast between Hungarian and British perceptions about the limits of acceptable cooperation between Budapest and Berlin. Frustrated over the lack of information Teleki was providing, O'Malley firmly indicated that opening Hungarian territory in return for frontier revision in Transylvania may have grave consequences for the Anglo-Hungarian relationship and could result in reducing British raw material export to Hungary. A seemingly very enervated Teleki, frustrated about the British threats, exclaimed that this would be the best way to push Hungary into Germany's arms.[70]

Teleki, guided by the vision of Hungary's messianic mission in the Carpathian basin, was convinced that the security of Hungary could only be guaranteed by the restoration of Greater Hungary.[71] O'Malley and key British policy-makers refused to accept the idea that the purpose of frontier revision was to build a geographically and militarily strong Hungary at the expanse of other nations. They were baffled by Teleki's policy, which seemingly was even prepared to collaborate with Germany to achieve this aim.[72]

The Teleki-O'Malley meeting on 11 May resonates with this notion. Teleki, once again showed considerable annoyance towards O'Malley and blamed British lack of support for allowing a German passage, if they asked. Teleki was particularly adamant, declaring that the current situation on the Western front was the result of the failure of Britain and France to check Hitler when it was still possible, and to address the territorial problems of Central Europe. He also indicated that he would not accept territory from either Britain or Germany, and hinted that Hungary now wished to take matters into its own hands.[73] The Hungarian anger and self-pity over Trianon, which earlier was rigorously projected towards Britain in an attempt to gather sympathy, now in the dilemma of collaboration or occupation, turned into intense irritation towards Britain. The argument that Hungary would not defend Romania, by refusing military passage to Germany, appeared during this meeting for the first time, and concurrently served as a justification for action towards London. The fact that the concept only appeared about a month after the

actual Hungarian decision occured questions whether it was genuine. Whether Teleki used this argument as a pretext cannot be decided conclusively, nevertheless it failed to deceive O'Malley and the Foreign Office, who considered this argument a fabrication.

Teleki, although irritated with British passivity, continued the policy of reassurance towards London. He sent Béla Randvánszky to London, with the message that Hungary would protest at a German military passage, but the regime and Horthy would stay in place to prevent the appointment of a Quisling government and any *Gleichschaltung* of the country.[74] The Hungarian born Lady Listowel, who had connections with the highest Foreign Office circles, was also sent to London to convey Teleki's message of continued neutrality in the war. However, as a result of Hungary's compliance to a German passage, the Foreign Office thereafter turned a deaf ear to these pledges and disregarded them as false promises.[75] These missions failed to influence British perceptions, as Hungarian assurances were intentionally left vague to avoid angering Berlin with any resemblence to a pro-British policy.[76] Also, these ambiguous promises were unable to outweigh the official pro-German rhethoric, the Axis friendly tone of the Hungarian press and the violent anti-Western invectives of Csáky.[77] These kind of diplomatic balancing acts were acceptable for London during the Czech crises of 1938, but since the outbreak of war it caused intense displeasure.[78]

The implications of the *droit de passage* on British Central and South East European policy and its impact on the Anglo-Hungarian relationship

The Hungarian decision carried profound implications for British Central and South East European policy. For one, militarily, Whitehall found the prospect of an effortless German military transit through Hungary particularly alarming, because it brought the *Wehrmacht* dangerously close to Britain's vital strategic interests in Greece, Turkey and the Eastern Mediterranean. Politically, Hungary's acquiescence, and Britain's inability to check German expansion in Hungary, could have sent the signal to Romania, Greece and Turkey that London could do nothing to prevent them from falling under the German yoke, which would only be avoidable if they followed the Hungarian example and yielded. Also, it potentially provided the German economy access to essential raw materials, such as Romanian petroleum and agricultural products and non-ferrous metals

from mines in Yugoslavia. The sharp contrast between the strong condemnation expressed behind closed doors in London, and the seemingly indifferent official reaction points to the curious conflict and interplay of short and long-term political, economic and military interests in the wider region, which evidently worked on a far broader scale than the Anglo-Hungarian relationship. British military strategy in the Balkans is beside the point here. The aim is to demonstrate the impact of the Hungarian decision on British policy towards Hungary and the wider Central and South East European region.

In London, the swift German occupation of South East Europe appeared to be inevitable as soon as hostilities broke out on the Western front in May. Based on O'Malley's alarming accounts and a fresh report by the British military attaché in Budapest, the possibility of any Hungarian resistance to a German passage was completely ruled out by late April.[79] One can immediately argue that the Hungarian decision had a minimal impact on British strategy, due to the fact that after the collapse of Poland, Hungary and Romania were already written off in military planning, and that by late 1939 the British also ruled out any possibility of opening a Balkan front. However, regardless of its military weaknesses, the British were far from ignoring the political and military possibilities the region had to offer in the war. The immediate primary concern was the probable discouraging effect of Hungary's decision on Romania's determination to resist German aggression. With the aim to increase the prospects of armed Romanian resistance, London went out of its way to assure Bucharest of British support. Moreover, to avoid disheartening the Romanians it was decided that all efforts should be made to prevent the news from reaching Bucharest.

The prospect of Hungarian yielding also had a significant impact on Anglo-Hungarian trade. Earlier, Hugh Dalton, the Minister of Economic Warfare, was convinced that by offering supplementary export and import quotas, Hungary, which was in desperate need of raw materials to modernise its industry and army, could be encouraged to resist German aggression. Now, reflecting on the new situation, Dalton reversed his viewpoint and proposed the complete suspension of all war material exports and that further import quotas should be refused.[80] By comparison, the Ministry of Supply was apparently still very interested in maintaining trade-relations unchanged, as it was keen to secure the import of mechanical parts and ammunition from Hungarian arms manufacturers. Thus, they recommended refraining from diplomatic protests or imposing an economic embargo in order not to compromise trade with Hungary.[81]

In the interwar period the Foreign Office was not in a position to influence British trade policies, which was a rather intriguing characteristic of the British foreign policy-making process, but on this occasion the direct intervention of Halifax provided an exception. The Foreign Office unanimously agreed to maintain a rigid set of criteria in trading with Hungary in the future; contraband-control remained tightly enforced and exceptions were not allowed.[82] War material exports to Hungary in excess of pre-war levels were also prohibited, but even though Halifax and the senior officials of the Foreign Office were convinced that strengthening the Hungarian Army with war-trade would eventually strengthen the *Wehrmacht*, which after the probable occupation of Hungary would disarm the Hungarians, war material trade remained largely unrestricted.[83] The top-secret scheme of importing Bofors air-defence guns and ammunition, manufactured in Hungary under Swedish licence, for the defence of Britain and Portugal seemed to have a critical role in the decision to maintain friendly diplomatic relations with Hungary and for keeping war-trade unrestricted.[84] Halifax was very interested in acquiring these guns from Hungary and believed that putting political and economic restrictions on the Anglo-Hungarian trade would cause resentment in Budapest, which could endanger the Bofors scheme.[85] In order to help the deal, Halifax and the War Office both expressed their willingness to satisfy future Hungarian requests for increased import quotas, if it would facilitate the manufacturing of the Bofors guns.[86]

Whitehall's disapproval of the constant flow of overtly anti-Hungarian newspaper articles in the British press, which kept reiterating the possibility of a German-Hungarian military alliance, also demonstrates the utmost determination to avoid compromising friendly relations with Budapest. For instance, in early May, the *Evening Standard* enthusiastically claimed that Hungary aimed to regain Transylvania with German assistance, and would allow a German military passage through its territory in return.[87] Barcza, being completely unaware that Hungary provided a military *carte blanche* to Germany, as standard procedure, vehemently protested against the publication of the article, which, he believed unduly put Hungary in a negative light.[88] Even though Cadogan grew more and more certain about a German-Hungarian military cooperation against Romania, to maintain cordiality between London and Budapest, he acceded to Barcza's request and took steps to prevent any recurrence.[89]

For all these reasons, O'Malley was instructed to maintain friendly relations with Budapest, and was advised that instead of issuing an official

diplomatic *démarche*, British reservations should only be raised in a personal letter to Csáky, which nevertheless should highlight the inconsistency of Hungary's move with the concept of neutrality. [90]

However, in the longrun, the matter proved to be a critical water-shed in the Anglo-Hungarian relationship and made a dramatic impact on British perceptions about Hungary and regional policy alike. Primarily, it raised doubts about the earnestness and trustworthiness of the Hungarian elite, which brought questions about Hungary's post-war social and political structure to the forefront. Furthermore, the earlier tacit consent to Hungary's recent territorial acquisitions now came under review in London. It is becoming increasingly important to review the enduring viewpoint of this era's historiography that Hungary's adherence to the Tripartite Pact in November 1940 and the participation in the invasion of Yugoslavia in 1941 were ultimately responsible for the deterioration of the British view of Hungary. The evidence set out here strongly suggests that allowing access to Hungarian territory had a more far-reaching impact on British opinion.

The Foreign Office blamed Hungary's increasing cooperation with Germany on Horthy's apparent reluctance to commit Hungary against its powerful neighbour, which was believed to be the result of the Regent's inherent admiration of German militarism and his continued inability to control the pro-German elements of the army's high command. Also, senior policy-makers viewed Horthy's subservient attitude as the natural continuation of the German-Austro-Hungarian military alliance in the Great War, a notion, which in British perceptions determined Hungary's place on Germany's side in a future conflict and became responsible for seeing Hungary as unreliable. Since Trianon, senior officials often referred to Hungary as one of the main culprit of the Great War, a country, which deserved dismemberment at Trianon due to the impatient *Magyarization* of its minorities in the dualist era. Hungary's current behaviour consolidated these deeply held perceptions. [91]

Teleki's positive image in London also crumbled. The Central Department, which oversaw Czechoslovak and Hungarian affairs, until now expressed its appreciation for all the work Teleki had done for Hungarian independence and neutrality. However, after this shift in Hungarian foreign policy Roberts and Orchard uttered their deepest disappointment and irritation over Teleki's dubious conduct.

These developments had a profound impact on the dwindling Anglo-Czechoslovak relationship, which since the outbreak of the war had been deeply troubled over the issue of the status of the Czecho-Slovak

émigrés in London. Edvard Beneš, the last Czechoslovak president and now head of the Czech émigrés, demanded the repudiation of the Munich Agreement and the recognition of the Czecho-Slovak National Committee as a legal government-in-exile. Suspicious about his political machinations and keen to avoid being drawn into political and territorial commitments, the British until then exhibited extreme reluctance to recognise this émigré group, but increasing German-Hungarian collaboration eventually broke the deadlock. Upon receiving news of the Hungarian decision about the passage of German troops through Hungary, Roberts and Orchard, guided by the strategic priority to find allies on the continent, now recommended that more support should be given to nations, such as the Czechs, which were ready to make sacrifices for the Allied cause. [92]

Hungary's "unreliability" as a potential partner in the struggle against Germany set British Central European policy in motion. Since the Munich Agreement, in order to keep its options open, in official communications London was careful to appear neither pro-Czech nor pro-Hungarian. Until March 1940 the same caution was recognisable towards the Hungarian-Czechoslovak territorial dispute, and its arbitrary settlement in November 1938, the First Vienna Award.[93] The new situation changed the way London perceived Prague's and Budapest's future role and weight in post-war Central Europe. Roberts, who previously exhibited strong reservations about Beneš, now insisted on abandoning impartiality in the Hungarian-Czechoslovak rivalry and recommended that soothing Hungarian anxieties regarding the developing Anglo-Czechoslovak friendship or the future Czechoslovak frontiers was now unnecessary as Hungary had committed itself on the side of the enemy.[94]

British Central European priorities shift: the changing significance of the German military passage through Hungary

Hungarian historiography did not recognise that until the '*droit*' affair the Czech émigré question in London had a Hungarian angle, and London was reluctant to decide between Prague and Budapest.[95] In early July however, at the recommendation of Halifax, the Cabinet decided to recognise the Czecho-Slovak National Committee as the provisional government of the Czecho-Slovak peoples.[96] The reasons for the decision were both strategic and political. As a result of the defeat of France and Hungary's openly pro-German policy, Halifax stressed that the opinions of Paris and Budapest could now be ignored.[97] Despite the recognition, London still explicitly

refused to commit to the future frontiers of the Czecho-Slovak state, but compared to 1939, when similar reservations were expressed, the question lost its Hungarian dimension. [98]

We have noted the disagreement between O'Malley and the Foreign Office about the direction of British policy should take over Hungary. Now, the recognition of the Czech émigrés brought the differences to the surface, which eventually clarified the impact of the *droit de passage* on British perceptions over the question of the future of Hungary's recent territorial gains. Earlier in February Sargent had noted his dissatisfaction over O`Malley's pro-Hungarian inclination and minuted with discontent that "[…] the Hungarians have an eloquent advocate in the person of His Majesty's representative".[99] Later in July Sargent was particularly annoyed over O'Malley's recommendation that in order to prevent Hungarian flirtations with Germany Hungary's territorial claims in Transylvania should be officially supported.[100] Due to O'Malley's pro-Hungarian views on frontier revision, and perhaps to avoid his unnecessary protests, the Foreign Office deliberately failed to inform him that the Czech émigrés would receive recognition. O'Malley, on receiving the news felt let down and deprived of any opportunities to sooth Hungarian anxieties or to influence Hungarian foreign policy.[101] One of the most significant results to emerge from this spat was that during the ensuing discussion, the Foreign Office categorically asserted that the Hungarian decision to grant military passage to Germany in April crucially influenced the decision to recognise the Czecho-Slovak Committee as a provisional government.[102]

Before the French defeat, while the British Expeditionary Force was standing and fighting on the continent, the Hungarian attitude in the matter of German military passage was of primary importance in British Central and South East European policy. However, after the Allied collapse the question seemed to be less pressing in terms of strategic planning. For this reason, and also due to the fact that the passage did not occur, British official criticism of Hungarian policy had somewhat softened by the autumn of 1940. Thus, when German troops passed through Hungary via Romania in October *en masse* the matter did not disturb the Foreign Office to the same degree as it did earlier in April. (By agreeing to the German-Italian arbitration of the Hungarian-Romanian territorial dispute, the Second Vienna Award, Hungary consented to allow the transfer of German troops to Romania).[103] By the turn of the year, the use of Hungarian territory lost most of its strategic implications, but as we would see, regardless of the evidently softened disapproval of Hungary's

foreign policy, resentment towards the Hungarian elite had not changed and for this the decision to allow a German passage remained responsible.

Hungarian historiography has shown considerable confusion about British policy towards Hungary in late 1940 and early 1941. András Bán and Ignác Romsics interpreted the prolonged debates within the Foreign Office, a common mechanism of policy-making in London, as the sign of intense fluctuation and inconsistency in official policy. Bán and Romsics percieved the formulation of British opinion as a series of balanced and meticulous debates, a series of consensus achieved by the painstaking and equal participation of the Cabinet, the Foreign Secretary and the Foreign Office, which considered every possible scenario to reach a wise and sensible decision. In effect, the process was largely the uncoordinated interaction of governmental departments and influential officials. Decisions, particularly on secondary issues such as Hungary, were often made hastily, based on limited information by the department heads of the Foriegn Office, without consulting higher authority. The Foreign Secretary and the Cabinet only dealt with Hungarian questions when they gathered primary importance in regional war strategy.

For these reasons, view-points of the military passage varied significantly depending on the participants of discussions and how it related to British grand strategy at the particular moment. For instance, nobody has taken the trouble to juxtopose the correspondence of the two departments responsible for the region, the Central and Southern, which long had been quarelling about the direction of policy towards Hungary. This debate became particularly prominent from late 1940. Such analysis would have revealed that the issue of a German military passage does not only serve as a barometer for the Anglo-Hungarian relationship but also as a the showpiece of the dynamics of British grand strategy in the region, and as a window to the workings of the British foreign policy-making process.

Neither Bán nor Romsics realised that the Southern and Central Departments were at odds over the policy Britain should follow towards Hungary. A comparison of the Central Department's policy in the Hungarian-Czechoslovak relationship with that of the Southern, which dealt with the Hungarian-Romanian dispute separately, indeed projects the distinct impression of confusion in British policy. In January 1941 Britain severed diplomatic relations with Bucharest claiming that Romania became the base of the German army. For this reason, the Central Department, although still critical about the the pro-German attitude of the Hungarian elite, recommended a friendly policy towards Hungary, which

in effect demonstrates the diminishing significance of Hungary's earlier stand on the military passage. Bán mistakenly interpreted the contrast between Cadogan's disapproval of the Second Vienna Award in September 1940 and Makins' positive tone towards Hungary in early 1941 in the Central Department as a positive shift in British opinion. During the course of the first three months of 1941, Makins and Roberts, the senior officials of the Central Department, articulated a surprisingly lenient and friendly tone towards Hungary.[104] They blocked the request of the Treasury to freeze Hungarian financial assets in London - moreover their tone occasionally suggested that they were toying with the idea of basing British post-war Central European strategy on a strong and territorially bigger Hungary.[105]

On the other hand, from 1941 Orme Sargent, the head of the Southern Department, strongly pressed for a pro-Romanian policy in the Hungarian-Romanian territorial dispute over Transylvania. He constantly used the Hungarian decisions made in April and October about a German passage as the basis of his anti-Hungarian tone. He was startled that London still maintained contacts with a country that allowed the easy passage of Nazis towards the Mediterranean.[106] Vansittart shared Sargent's view-point and also recommended that diplomatic relations with Hungary should be immediately severed, as the Hungarian elite was completely on the side of Nazi Germany and thus the country was under enemy control.[107] Roberts, who defended Hungary and explained that the country was only a corridor for Germany, not like Romania, immediately sidelined these arguments.[108]

It seems curious that Makins and Roberts, who arguably carried less influence in decision-making at Cabinet level than Sargent, managed to lead the formulation of policy towards Hungary in the early months of 1941. It is not our aim to enter into a prolonged analysis of the British foreign policy-making process but to point out that until the attitude of Hungary became a primary concern in the Yugoslav crisis in April 1941, the Foreign Office, particularly its Central Department, was allowed to direct the conduct of policy. When in April the German aggression in the Balkans seemed imminent, the defence of Yugoslavia and Greece became a primary British strategic interest, and thus Cadogan, Eden and the Cabinet overruled the recommendations of the Central Department and decided that attaining allies on the continent by supporting Yugoslavia was more important than securing the friendship of Budapest. Hence diplomatic relations with Budapest was broken off on 7 April for the reason that Budapest allowed Hungarian territory to become a German

base in the assault on Yugoslavia. In April 1941 the shift in the strategic situation in the Balkans necessitated the adjustment of British priorities. Consequently, the Anglo-Hungarian relationship became subordinated to these.

Conclusion

Many historians have criticised Britain because it expected second-ranking powers to make sacrifices on the altar of the Allied cause.[109] The evidence set out here suggest that these claims are unteanable in the case of Hungary, which during 1940-41 was never asked to follow an openly pro-British policy or to declare war on Germany. Both O'Malley and Barcza stressed on numerous occassions to the Foreign Office that with a British promise of the revision of the Trianon frontiers Hungary could have been instantly turned against Germany. This card however was never played by Whitehall. The evidence suggests that through diplomatic channels Budapest was strongly urged to resist German political, and economic pressure, and to deny the right of military passage, but direct threats or military and other promises were never used to influence the direction of Hungarian foreign policy.

This article has also re-examined some of the statements made by British and Hungarian historians and by scrutinising a large number of hitherto unused sources has concluded that Teleki did not decide to pursue a closer cooperation with Germany as the consequence of the Allied defeat in France, but he did so because Hungary had lost Italy's support after the Brenner Conference. This study has argued furthermore that providing transit right for the *Wehrmacht* in April 1940 became a turning-point in the British perceptions of Hungary, which consequently was viewed by senior decision-makers as a country that had been drawn into the German orbit by its own choice. One of the most significant findings to emerge from the analysis of the question of the '*droit*' is that the new evidence presented here now clearly explains the radical contrast between the positive British opinion of Hungary in early 1940 and the condemnation of the Second Vienna Award in August 1940. This, until now, has only been explained by the vague and generalizing argument that Hungary followed an increasingly pro-German policy.

This study does not trace the development of British policy after 1941, but it emphasizes that as a consequence of the '*droit*' affair, trust in the Hungarian political elite as a reliable partner had already been shaken

by mid-1940 and in British official circles the justification of Hungary's territorial acquisitions were already being debated and questioned. This attitude essentially prevailed until the Paris Peace Conference in 1947.

The analysis of the British reaction to the question of military passage has also provided a window through which the labyrinth of the British foreign policy-making process towards Central Europe and the Balkans could be better understood. It demonstrated the contrast in the workings of Whitehall between the day-to-day conduct of foreign policy towards second-tier regions, such as Central Europe, and crises, when imperial priorities were threatened, such as during Hitler's Balkan campaign of April 1941. The reaction to any German military transits through Hungary changed accordingly.[110]

NOTES

The research for this article was made possible partly through an award from the Royal Historical Society.

[1] On 30 August 1940, the Second Vienna Award, the German-Italian arbitrary decision of the Hungarian-Romanian territorial dispute, transferred Northern Transylvania from Romania to Hungary: György Réti, "A második bécsi döntés" *Külpolitika* 27, 1 (March, 2000): 1-2, 182-204; Zoltán Szász, "A második bécsi döntés" *Együttélés* 6, 2-4 (2000): 79-84; Béni L. Balogh, "A második bécsi döntés" *Limes* 4, 3 (2001): 61-88; Nándor Dreisziger, "Transylvania in International Power Politics during World War II" *Hungarian Studies Review*, 36, 1-2 (Spring-Fall, 2009): 85-114.

[2] Deborah S. Cornelius, *Hungary in World War II, caught in the cauldron* (New York: Fordham University Press, 2011), 120-125. The rapid collapse of the Allies on the Western front in June 1940 and Romania's subsequent reversal of its pro-Allied policy (Romania renounced the British – French guarantee of its independence in July 1940) made the German contingency plan, and using Hungarian territory in the process, unnecessary.

[3] Ignác Romsics, Béni L. Balogh and György Réti have argued that Britain condemned the Second Vienna Award, because it was forced on Romania by Germany and Italy, and as a consequence Hungary was simply viewed as a German puppet in London: Ignác Romsics, "A brit külpolitika és a 'magyar kérdés', 1914-1946" in *Helyünk és sorsunk a Duna-medencében* ed. Ignác Romsics (Budapest: Osiris, 2005), 106-108; Balogh, "A második bécsi döntés", 22-29; Béni L. Balogh, *A magyar-román kapcsolatok 1939-1940-ben és a második bécsi döntés* (Csíkszereda: Pro-Print, 2002), 304-309; Réti, "A második bécsi döntés", 1-2., 182-204; György Réti, *Budapest – Róma, Berlin árnyékában,*

magyar-olasz diplomáciai kapcsolatok 1932-1940 (Budapest: ELTE, 1998), 251-256.

[4] Between the 27 May and 4 June 1940 the Allies evacuated more than 300 000 soldiers from the continent from the harbor of Dunkirk. After the German breakthrough at Sedan in mid-May Teleki asked János Pelényi, the Hungarian minister in Washington, to send back the $5 million originally intended for establishing a Hungarian émigré government in America: János Pelényi, "The Secret Plan for a Hungarian Government in the West at the outbreak of World War II", *The Journal of Modern History* 36, 2 (June, 1964): 171. See also: Gyula Borbándi, "A Teleki-Pelényi terv nyugati Magyar ellenkormány létesítésére", *Új Látóhatár* 9, 2 (1966): 155-170; Nándor Dreisziger, "Mission Impossible: Secret Plans for a Hungarian Government in Exile in Canada During World War II," *Canadian Slavonic Papers* 30, 2 (June, 1988): 245-262.

[5] In his biography of Teleki, Ablonczy reviewed the heroic image of Teleki and pointed out that in order to achieve his priority, frontier revision, he was ready to cooperate extensively with Germany: Balázs Ablonczy, *Pál Teleki, The Life of a Controversial Hungarian Politician* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2006); Tibor Frank, 'Treaty revision and doublespeak: Hungarian neutrality, 1939-41' in *European Neutrals and Non-Belligerents during the Second World War,* ed. by Neville Wylie (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010): 150-173.

[6] Since the late 1920s Italy was the most important trade partner of Hungary, a crucial market for its agricultural product. Also, Mussolini openly supported Hungary's revisionist aims. Although the importance of Italian-Hungarian friendship and Italy's role as the vanguard of Hungarian revisionism was very much overplayed in Budapest, Rome indeed was the counterbalance to German penetration into the Danubian region in the 1930s. The disappearance of Poland, and Italy's growing reliance on Germany altered the situation, and German influence in Hungary became more explicit. The conclusions of the Hitler-Mussolini conversations at the Brenner Pass undoubtedly reflect this tendency and were the culmination of this process.

[7] Focus was on October-November 1940 when German troops indeed passed through Hungarian territory: Romsics, "A brit külpolitika és a 'magyar kérdés'", 153-155; András Bán, *Hungarian-British Diplomacy 1938-41: The Attempt to Maintain Relations* (Oxford: Routledge, 2004), 100-101.

[8] Bán, *Hungarian-British Diplomacy 1938-41*, 85-86.

[9] Réti, *Budapest-Róma Berlin árnyékában,* 220-224.

[10] Elizabeth Wiskemann, "Hungary" in *Survey of International Affairs 1936-46, The Initial Triumph of the Axis*, ed. Arnold Toynbee (London: Oxford University Press, 1958), 322.

[11] *Documents on German Foreign Policy* (DGFP), ser. D, vols. 7-12, ed. P. R. Sweet (H.M. Stationary Office: London, 1954); *A Wilhelmstrasse és*

Magyarország, Német diplomáciai iratok Magyarországról 1933-1944, ed. Gyula Juhász (Budapest: Akadémiai kiadó, 1968).

[12] *A Palazzo Chigi és Magyarország. Olasz Diplomáciai Dokumentumok Magyarországról. A Darányi-kormány megalakulásától a Szovjetunió elleni hadüzenetig (1936-1941)* ed. György Réti, 550-551, 554, 555: Talamo to Ciano, 15, 19, 24 April 1940 (Budapest: Hungarovox, 2007).

[13] Antall Czettler and Gyula Juhász claimed that the Hungarian Cabinet discussed the problem of a possible German request on 1 April and asked for Slovakia in return for allowing a passage. The minutes of the March and April cabinet meetings do not refer to any military passage in any form. Ironically, Teleki at the 1 April Cabinet meeting, which was April Fools' Day, mentioned that during his discussions in Rome, and similarly at the Brenner Pass, Hungary's relation to Germany was not touched, although, as we will see, the Brenner Pass meetings crucially determined Hungary's future: Antal Czettler, *Teleki Pál és a Magyar külpolitika 1939-1941* (Budapest: Kairosz, 2008); Gyula Juhász, *A Teleki kormány külpolitikája 1939-1941* (Budapest: Akadémiai kiadó, 1964); Gyula Juhász, *Magyarország külpolitikája, 1919-1945* (Budapest: Kossuth, 1988), 231-232; compare to: Magyar Országos Levéltár (MOL) K 27, Minisztertanácsi jegyzőkönyvek, (1940. 03. 04.; 03. 08; 03. 18; 03. 21; 03. 30; 04. 01; 04. 06; 04. 12; 04. 16). Based on information given by Barczy, the minute-taker at the Hungarian Crown and Ministerial Council's meetings, Macartney claims that the question of German military transit came up on 1 April. According to the same source, Teleki suggested to Hungary's military leaders on April 6 that if the Germans requested a passage, the government should propose a joint Hungarian-German attack on Romania. Although Macartney discusses the question at length, his account is unclear as to whether the request occurred at that time. C.A. Macartney, *October Fifteenth. A History of Modern Hungary 1929-1945* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1957), xi, 396-397.

[14] *A Palazzo Chigi és Magyarország*, 547: Baranyai to Ciano, 8 April 1940. Ciano also mentions that during Teleki's visit to Rome in March, the Hungarian Premier brought up the question of Italian assistance, which Mussolini refused: G. Ciano, *Diaries, 1937-1943. The Complete, Unabridged Diaries of Count Galeazzo Ciano, Italian Minister for Foreign Affairs, 1936-1943*, ed. Robert L. Miller (London: Phoenix, 2002), 25 March, 8 April 1940.

[15] Ciano, *Diaries*, 9 April 1940.

[16] *Diplomáciai Iratok Magyarország Külpolitikájához 1936-1945*, Vol. IV (DIMK IV), ed. Gyula Juhász (Budapest: Akadémiai kiadó, 1962), 584: 'Memorandumtervezet Őfelsége kormánya számára német átvonulásról Románia felé', 17 April 1940.

[17] Quoted by: Ablonczy, *Pál Teleki*, 206. This is the only document, which mentions the possibility of a Hungarian agreement to a German passage. On the other hand it does not prove in what circumstances and with what conditions the passage was requested.

[18] Hague Convention (1907): Laws of War: Rights and Duties of Neutral Powers and Persons in Case of War on Land, 18 October 1907, Chapter V, Art. 2, 4, 5: <http://avalon.law.yale.edu/20th_century/hague05.asp> (accessed: 11 December 2013).

[19] Historians have debated the underlying reasons of the British declaration of war. The consensus is that behind London's entry to the war in 1914 there was the goal to maintain the balance of power in Europe; see particularly: Kenneth J. Calder, *Britain and the Origins of the New Europe 1914-1918* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008).

[20] In early 1939, the Foreign Policy Committee of the Cabinet produced a curious memorandum. It stressed that in the event of another German aggression against a small state (Switzerland and The Nederlands in particular) Britain should not be fighting only for their security, but in defense of the freedom of all countries. It is very difficult to decide whether policy-makers contemplated similar treatment for Central European countries (especially compared to The Nederlands, which was a vital British partner): FO 371/ 22962, C 1099, The National Archives, Kew, UK (TNA).

[21] For the problem, see: Jonathan Haslam, *The Soviet Union and the Struggle for Collective Security in Europe, 1933-39* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 1984); Jiri Hochman, *Soviet Union and the Failure of Collective Security* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1984); Michael Jabara Carley, *1939: The Alliance That Never Was and the Coming of World War II* (Chicago: Ivan R Dee, 2009); Hugh Ragsdale, *The Soviets, the Munich Crisis, and the Coming of World War II* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009).

[22] Carley, *1939: The Alliance That Never Was*, 43, 46, 59.

[23] See also: István Janek, "Az első bécsi döntés és Nagy-Britannia álláspontja", *Új Szó*, 28 October 2005, 17-18; András Becker, "Britský Pohľad na Prvú viedenskú arbitráž [The British view of the First Vienna Award]", in *Juh Slovenska, po Viedenskej arbitráži 1938-1945* [South-Slovakia after the First Vienna Award, 1938-1945], ed. Jan Mitáč (Bratislava: National Memory Institute, 2011), 118-136.

[24] Minute by Orchard, 18 March 1940, minute by Roberts 19 March 1940, Foreign Office (FO) 371/24427, C 3916/529/21, TNA. Budapest was fully aware of the consequences of allowing the passage of German troops. After the Hungarian occupation of Ruthenia Sargent made it clear to Barcza that whether Hungary decided to resist German pressure or allowed the passage of the *Wehrmacht* would crucially affect the British views of Hungary: DIMK III., 500: Barcza to Csáky, 20 March 1939; The Diaries of György Barcza Nagyalásonyi (Barcza, Diaries), 18 March 1939, Box 0009, Hoover Institution: Archives (HIA).

[25] O'Malley to Halifax, 9 March 1940, FO 371/24427, C 3916/529/21, TNA.

[26] War Office (WO) 190/606; WO 190/681; WO 190/691; WO 691/694, TNA. In his memoirs Barcza also noted that because of the German-Austro-

Hungarian alliance in the Great War, the Hungarian diplomatic corps during the inter-war period was essentially viewed by the Foreign Office as the instrument of German diplomacy: György Barcza, *Diplomataemlékeim, Magyarország volt vatikáni és londoni követének emlékirataiból 1911-1945*, 2 vols, vol. 1 (Budapest: Európa, 1994), 423.

[27] Pál Pritz, without due reflection, has called the Kassa incident the Hungarian decision of the century. Pál Pritz, "Emlékirat és történelmi valóság. Barcza György emlékiratai fényében" in *Az objektivitás mítosza? Hazánk és a nagyvilág, 20. századi metszetek,* ed. Pál Pritz (Budapest: Magyar Történelmi Társulat, 2011), 200.

[28] Bán, *Hungarian-British Diplomacy 1938-41*, 77-79.

[29] Bán, *Hungarian-British Diplomacy 1938-41*, 77-78; compare to: minute by Selby, 5 September 1939, FO 371/23114, C 13487/350/21, TNA; minutes by Kirkpatrick, Nichols, Strang and Troutbeck, 5 September 1939, FO 371/23114, C 13487/350/21, TNA. It seems that his young age was not the only factor in disapproving his opinions. His father, Sir Walford Selby, minister in Vienna in the 1930s, accused Vansittart and the Foreign Office of condoning the Anschluss and of giving Germany a green light in the Danubian-region. The young Ralf evidently inherited his father's conviction that London should give more support to the Central European countries. Whether his pro-Hungarian views or the memory of the spat with his father made his propositions continuously overruled in the Foreign Office cannot be proved satisfactorily: Walford Selby, *Diplomatic twilight, 1930–1940* (London: J. Murray, 1953), 138; Phillip Neville, "Lord Vansittart, Sir Walford Selby and the Debate about Treasury Interference in the Conduct of British Foreign Policy in the 1930s", *Journal of Contemporary History* 36, 4 (October, 2001): 623-633.

[30] Foreign Office to O'Malley, 12 September 1939, FO 371/23114, C 13491/350/21, TNA.

[31] Juhász, *Magyarország külpolitikája*, 223; Macartney, *October Fifteenth*, 386.

[32] 'The Balkan Situation', 16 December 1939, CAB/66/4/15, TNA; Macartney, *October Fifteenth*, 376.

[33] *Ciano, Diaries,*6 September 1939; Macartney, *October Fifteenth,* 366.

[34] 'Situation in the Balkans', 16 December 1939, CAB/66/4/15, W. P. (39) 145, TNA; Nick Smart, *British Strategy and Politics During the Phoney War: Before the Balloon Went Up* (Westport: Greenwood Press, 2003), 29-30. Historians, such as Christopher Catherwood and Holy Case have pointed to the elusive nature of British strategy and sharply criticised Britain for abandoning Central Europe, but expecting Hungary, Romania, Yugoslavia and Bulgaria to resist German pressure: Christopher Catherwood, *The Balkans in World War Two: Britain's Balkan Dilemma* (Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan, 2003), 5; Holy Case, *Between States, The Transylvanian Question and the European Idea during World War II* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2009), 4. Elisabeth Barker and

David Kaiser have also criticised British political commitments undertaken without possessing the military means to fulfil them: Elisabeth Barker, *British policy towards South-East Europe in the Second World War* (London: MacMillan, 1976), 5; David Kaiser, *Economic Diplomacy and the Origins of the Second World War: Germany, Britain, France and Eastern Europe, 1930-1939* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1980), 250-254.

[35] O'Malley to Halifax, 9 March 1940, FO 371/24427, C 3766/529/21, TNA. See also: Barker, *British policy towards South-East Europe*, 63.

[36] In the eyes of the British, Csáky acquired a profoundly negative reputation. Precisely the previous day, Csáky delivered a violent anti-Allied rant in the Parliament, in which he held the Allies responsible for the outbreak of the war and for all of Hungary's problems. This speech became largely responsible for the British distrust in Csáky.

[37] O'Malley to Halifax, 9 March 1940, FO 371/24427, C 3916/529/21, TNA.

[38] In early March O'Malley reported that there was a story going about that the German government were pressing with increasing insistence for a way-leave for their troops through Hungary, but noted with evident confidence that leading figures, such as Teleki, Kálmán Kánya, former Foreign Minister and Lipót Baranyai, the governor of the Hungarian National Bank showed no sign of nervousness and were firmly standing behind Hungarian independence: O'Malley to Halifax, 8 March 1940, FO 371/24427, C 3915/529/21, TNA. Ivone Kirkpatrick, the head of the Central Department also referred to a private letter written by O`Malley, which stated that the Hungarians had recently refused once more to agree to the passage of German troops: minute by Kirkpatrick, 17 March 1940, FO 371/24427, C 3766/529/21, TNA.

[39] Minute by Cadogan, 17 March 1940, FO 371/24427, C 3766/529/21, TNA.

[40] O'Malley to Halifax: conversations with Teleki 2 April 1940, 30 April 1940, FO 371/24427, C 6324/529/21, TNA.

[41] Naturally, the British legation was not left without representation. In O'Malley's absence, first secretary Gascoigne headed the legation, but quite oddly, during the 2 week long absence of O'Malley, he sent only a very limited number of telegrams to London (or at least very little survived in the files of the Foreign Office).

[42] Perhaps the Germans had also taken the opportunity to take advantage of the absence of the British minister to push their demands with intense vigor. The possibility that in his absence O'Malley was unable to provide guidance to Teleki, which became the reason for granting the passage can however be excluded, because, as we have seen, the reluctance of the Hungarian policy-making elite to discuss the question with O'Malley proved that British opinion was considered less important.

[43] Santi Corvaja, *Hitler and Mussolini: The Secret Meetings* (London: Enigma, 2008), 95-116.

[44] Historians consulted German, Italian and Hungarian sources in their analyses, but this affair remained a best-kept secret in these quarters, due to its sensitivity for the parties involved. Analyses of German and Italian foreign policy also neglected this perspective: C. J. Lowe and F. Marzari, *Italian Foreign Policy 1870-1940* (London: Routledge, 1975), 365-366; Luigi Villari, *Italian Foreign Policy under Mussolini* (London: Devin-Adair, 1956); MacGregor Knox, *Mussolini Unleashed 1939-1941* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982), 87-88; Richard Lamb: *Mussolini as Diplomat: Il Duce's Italy on the World Stage* (New York: Fromm International, 1999), 273-276; see also: Elizabeth Wiskemann, *The Rome-Berlin Axis* (London: Collins, 1949); *Germany and the Second World War: Volume 3: The Mediterranean, South-East Europe, and North Africa 1939-1941* ed. Gerhard Schreiber (London: Clarendon, 1995).

[45] *I Documenti Diplomatici Italiani* (DDI), 9. ser. III. vol.; *Document of German Foreign Policy* (DGFP), ser. D. vol. 9.

[46] Minutes of the meeting of British representatives, 11 April 1940, FO 371/24902, R 4337/4156/67, TNA.

[47] Minute by Cadogan, 18 April 1940, minute from the French Embassy, 19 April 1940, FO 371/24950, C 6019/60/22, TNA. At first Cadogan did not realise the implications of this change on Italian policy. Grasping at straws he stressed that emphasizing to the Hungarians that the full power of the Balkan Entente was standing behind them could still encourage Hungarian resistance. Truly, the Balkan Entente conference, which was held simultaneously with the conference of British representatives, issued a declaration provisioning joint measures in the event of outside aggression. The declaration however, just like Cadogan, ignored deep-seated antagonisms, which kept Hungary and the Balkan states apart, namely Hungarian revisionism.

[48] Campbell to Foreign Office, 15 May 1940, FO 371/24427, C 6327/529/21, TNA. It is notable that Horthy sent this message on 11 May, a day after the Germans launched their offensive on the Western front. In the current calamities, Horthy evidently seemed less careful about revealing his cards to the British.

[49] W. M. 97 (40), 19 April 1940, CAB 65/6, TNA.

[50] O'Malley to Halifax, 30 April 1940, FO 371/24427, C 6324/529/21, TNA.

[51] O'Malley to Halifax, 26 April 1940, FO 371/24427, C 6495/521/21, TNA. For good measure we have to add that even though Hungary granted passage, German troops did not enter the country *en masse* and the military passage did not materialize in the spring of 1940. Not as the direct result of the *droit de passage*, but there is evidence that the covert infiltration of German 'engineers', 'teachers', 'interpreters' etc. to Hungary and Romania was already under way on a relatively large scale in the spring of 1940: *A Palazzo Chigi és*

Magyarország, 571: Talamo to Ciano, 13 May 1940; 587: Talamo to Ciano, 25 May 1940.

[52] Owen O'Malley was born English, but the family had Irish origins, thus looked sympathetically on the territorial and minority problems of small nations, such as the Hungarian. Later, in an interview with Macartney, he admitted that he found Hungarian claims somewhat exaggerated, but looked favorably upon them: O'Malley to Macartney, May 1952, MSS. ENG. c. 3311, Box 32, Papers of C. A. Macartney, Bodleian Library, Oxford (PCAM).

[53] O'Malley to Halifax, 6 May 1940, FO 371/24427, C 6495/521/21, TNA.

[54] O'Malley to Halifax, 26 April 1940, FO 371/24427, C 6495/529/21, TNA.

[55] Minute by Butler, 11 May 1940, FO 371/24427, C 6495/521/21, TNA.

[56] Minute by Vansittart, 7 May 1940, FO 371/24427, C 6495/521/21, TNA.

[57] Minutes by Sargent, 8, 9 May 1940, FO 371/24427, C 6495/521/21, TNA.

[58] *The Diaries of Sir Alexander Cadogan*, ed. David Dilks (London: Cassell, 1971), 17 September 1938; 17 October 1938.

[59] Minutes by Cadogan, 9 May 1940, FO 371/24427, C 6495/521/21, TNA.

[60] Andrew Roberts, the biographer of Halifax, has stressed the Foreign Secretary's fatalistic approach to the German penetration into Central Europe, but concentrated very little on Halifax's opinion about Hungary: Andrew Roberts, *Holy Fox: Biography of Lord Halifax* (London: Phoenix, 1997), 149-150, 156-157.

[61] David Dilks, "The British Foreign Office between the wars", in *Shadow and Substance in British Foreign Policy 1895-1939, Memorial Essays Honouring C. J. Lowe*, ed. B. J. C. McKercher and David J. Moss (Alberta: University of Alberta Press, 1984), 193-194.

[62] Halifax, 'South-Eastern Europe', 26 March 1940, FO 371/24887, R 3856/5/67, W. P. 110 (40), TNA.

[63] Halifax, 'Policy in the event of an Italian attack on Yugoslavia', 29 April 1940, CAB 66/7/21, TNA.

[64] Halifax, 'The Balkan Front', War Cabinet (40) 140, 29 April 1940, FO 371/24889, R 5565/5/67, TNA. The Anglo-French-Turkish Pact was concluded on 19 October 1939. It provided for British and French assistance to Turkey in the event of aggression against the latter, and also provided for Turkish aid in the event of an act of aggression committed by a European power and leading to war in the Mediterranean Sea involving France and the United Kingdom. Turkey was very reluctant to promise military aid to any of the Balkan countries in the name of common defense, which in effect rendered the pact defensive only, see: Catherwood, *The Balkans in World War Two*, 90-103.

[65] Halifax's memoirs do not provide any additional clues either: Lord Halifax, *Fullness of Days* (London: Dodd Mead, 1957).

[66] Minute by Nichols, Cadogan, Sargent, 18 May 1940, FO 371/24430, C 6327/529/21, TNA. Hungary receiving territory as a reward for her subservience was a recurrent notion of senior officials. Macartney labelled it as the 'Jackal-stigma' and considered it as the consequence of the Second Vienna Award: Macartney, *October Fifteen*, 424. It is evident that this stigma was present in the perceptions of the senior officials of the Foreign Office much earlier. After the allowing the German military passage it became a permanent pattern in the British judgment of further Hungarian territorial aggrandizements.

[67] György Kellner, *Magyar antifasiszták Angliában, 1940-1945* (Budapest: Magvető, 1983), 117; Tibor Hadjú and György Litván, "Count Michael Károlyi in Wartime England. From His Correspondence, 1941-1946", *The Hungarian Quarterly* 44, 2 (2003), 104-105, 108-109; Tibor Hajdú, *Ki volt Károlyi Mihály?* (Budapest: Napvilág, 2012).

[68] FO 371/24430, C 6206/6206/21, TNA. The Foreign Office claimed that even Barcza supported this scheme. Neither Barcza's memoirs, nor his diaries mention Károlyi's proposition. Later, from 1941 Károlyi's and other anti-fascist Hungarian political groups were not allowed to play any crucial political role in representing Hungary in Britain.

[69] Barcza, Diaries, 17 May 1940, Box 0010, HIA.

[70] O'Malley to Foreign Office, 23 April 1940, FO 371/24427, C 6323/529/21, TNA.

[71] Ablonczy, *Pál Teleki*, 96, 111, 106-107.

[72] Ablonczy, *Pál Teleki*, 106-107, 111.

[73] Teleki-O'Malley conversation, 11 May 1940, K 66 1940-I.-5. 436. cs., 2597/1940, MOL.

[74] Barcza, Diaries, Box 0010, 14 May 1940, HIA. Teleki's emissary was the son of Baron Béla Randvánszky, a well-known politician and historian of the dualist era.

[75] Sir N. Charles (Rome) to Foreign Office, 24 April 1940; minute by Orchard and Roberts 8 May 1940, FO 371/24427, C 6321/529/21, TNA; Barcza, Diaries, 17 May 1940, Box 0010, HIA.

[76] Nándor Dreisziger, "Bridges to the West, the Horthy regime's reinsurance policies in 1941", *War and Society* 7, 1 (May, 1989), 1-23.

[77] Csáky, on the 8 March addressed a sharp rant against the Allies for supporting a Czech-Polish confederation after the war. Barcza reported that the Foreign Office was surprised, but restricted the publication of the speech in the press. Barcza on the other hand was unaware that the speech caused resentment towards Hungary in the Foreign Office: Barcza to Csáky, 8 March 1940, K66 1940-I.-5. 436. cs., 86/biz., MOL.

[78] István Bibó, the Hungarian political theorist, who as early as the 1930s called Hungarian revisionism the major obstacle to regional rapproachment, also

pointed out later that Hungarian historical arguments for frontier revision were considered as naive and extreme in Whitehall: *Bibó István Összegyűjtött Munkái* vol. 4, ed. István Kemény és Mátyás Sárközi (Bern: Európai Protestáns Magyar Szabadegyetem, 1984), 1210.

[79] Barclay to Foreign Office, May 1940, FO 371/24427, C 6327/529/21, TNA; Joint Intelligence Sub-Committee, 'German Intentions in South East Europe', War Cabinet J. I. C. 42 (40), 29 April 1040, FO 371/24889, R 5540/5/67, TNA.

[80] Ministry of Economic Warfare to Cadogan, 16 May 1940, FO 371/24427, C 6495/529/21, TNA; minute by Dalton, June 1940, FO 371/ 24428, C 6882/529/21, TNA.

[81] Ministry of Supply to Foreign Office, 14 May 1940, FO 371/24427, C 6495/529/21, TNA.

[82] Foreign Office to O'Malley, 18 May 1940, FO 371/24427, C 6495/529/21, TNA.

[83] The Ministry of Economic Warfare admitted that even before Hungary granted military passage to Germany, the arming of Hungary was never considered, as it was believed that supplying adequate amount of armament could not have been facilitated: Ministry of Economic Warfare to Foreign Office, 18 May 1940, FO 837/509, TNA.

[84] The deal involved importing 6 guns to Britain and 6 for Portugal.

[85] Minute by Halifax, 23 May 1940, FO 371/24428, C 6882/529/21, TNA.

[86] War Office (MI3) to Makins, 17 May 1940, FO 371/24427, C 6327/529/21, TNA.

[87] "Hungary is Raising an Army in Secret", *Evening Standard*, 4 May 1940.

[88] Barcza to Csáky, 16 May 1940, K 66, 1940-I.-5. 436. cs., 2998/1940, MOL.

[89] Cadogan to Barcza, 8 May 1940, FO 371/24430, C 6618/2472/21, TNA.

[90] Foreign Office to O'Malley, 10 May 1940, FO 371/24427, C 6495/529/21, TNA; Makins to Ministry of Economic Warfare, 23 May 1940, FO 837/509, TNA.

[91] Lóránt Dombrády and Thomas Sakmyster have demonstrated Horthy's inability to retain his influence over the army and how the Hungarian general staff mingled into Hungarian foreign policy: Loránt Dombrády, *Hadsereg és politika Magyarországon 1938-1944* (Budapest: Kossuth, 1986); Thomas L. Sakmyster, "Army Officers and Foreign Policy in Interwar Hungary, 1918-41", *Journal of Contemporary History* 10, 1 (January, 1975), 19-40.

[92] Minute by Makins, 21 June 1940, FO 371/24288, C 7504/2/12, TNA; minute by Makins, 24 June 1940, FO 371/24289, C 7646/2/12, TNA; minute by Makins 8 January, minute by Roberts 10 January 1941, FO 371/26389, C

235/235/12, TNA. See also: Vít Smetana, *In the Shadow of Munich: British Policy towards Czechoslovakia from the Endorsement to the Renunciation of the Munich Agreement (1938-1942)* (Prague: Charles University, 2008), 192-193.

[93] Minutes by Orchard and Roberts, May 1940, FO 371/24427, C 6327/529/21, TNA.

[94] Sir N. Charles (Rome) to Foreign Office, 24 April 1940, minute by Orchard and Roberts 8 May 1940, FO 371/24427, C 6321/529/21, TNA; Barcza, Diaries, 17 May 1940, Box 0010, HIA.

[95] Bán, *British-Hungarian Diplomacy, 1938-41*, 105.

[96] 'The Recognition of the Czecho-Slovak National Committee', 1 July 1940, FO 417/42, C 7646/2/12, TNA; J. W. Brugel, "The recognition of the Czechoslovak government in London", *Journal of Czechoslovak and Central European Studies*, 11, 2 (1983), 1-15; Smetana, *In the Shadow of Munich*, 208-214.

[97] Smetana, *In the Shadow of Munich*, 179-183.

[98] 'Recognition of the Czecho-Slovak National Committee', 1 July 1940, CAB 67/7/18, TNA; Macartney, *October Fifteenth,* 424. It is important to point out that as a consequence of the recognition of the Czecho-Slovak Committee, Csáky had seriously contemplated demonstratively sending Barcza on a leave, or even breaking diplomatic relations with London; see: DIMK V, 214: Barcza to Csáky, 23 July 1940.

[99] Barker, *British policy towards South-East Europe*, 62.

[100] Minute by Sargent, 3 July 1940, FO 371/24890, R 6689/5/67, TNA. Barker, *British policy towards South-East Europe*, 64. The Cabinet ignored O'Malley's propositions.

[101] O'Malley to Halifax, 7 August 1940, FO 371/24428, C 8204/529/21, TNA.

[102] Minute by Roberts, 10 August 1940, FO 371/24428, C 8204/529/21, TNA.

[103] Barker, *British policy in South-East Europe*, 65; Keith Hitchins, *Rumania 1866-1947* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994), 436-455. It has to be mentioned that the Germans passed through Hungary in civilian clothes with tourist transit visas. Barcza to Csáky, 7 October 1940, K 63, 15. cs., 1940-2/31, I. tétel, 262/pol. 1940, MOL. Macartney also defended the Hungarian decision to grant passage to Germany in October as the only possible solution, saving German military occupation: Macartney, *October Fifteen*, 440-441. Juhász wrote very negatively about the Hungarian decision, and argued that as a result Hungary became a German base: Juhász, *Magyarország külpolitikája*, 239. As we will demonstrate, in effect until February 1941 Hungary was 'only' a corridor of the *Wehrmacht*.

[104] Bán, *Hungarian-British Diplomacy 1938-41*, 118-119; see also: Romsics, 'A brit külpolitika és a „magyar kérdés"', 109. From the start of 1941 Roger Makins became the head of the Central Department, and Frank Roberts was

promoted to deputy-head. Throughout the year, regardless of severing of diplomatic relations on 7 April and declaring war on Hungary on 7 December, the Central Department articulated exceptionally positive views towards Budapest, appreciating Hungarian reluctance to fully cooperate with Nazi Germany. The fact that their positive opinions failed to influence British official policy points to the fact that when it came to strategic decisions about the Anglo-Hungarian relationship, they were made by higher authority, such as Foreign Secretary Anthony Eden or the Cabinet.

[105] Roberts to S. D. Waley (Treasury), 21 January 1941, FO 371/26613, C 461/392/21, TNA; minute by Roberts, 17 March 1941, minute by Makins, 18 March 1941, FO 371/26603, C 1228/123/21, TNA.

[106] Barker, *British policy towards South-East Europe*, 65.

[107] Vansittart to Eden, February 1941, FO 371/26603, R 1101/80/37, TNA.

[108] Minutes by Makins and Roberts, 21 February 1941, FO 371/26603, C 1494/123/21, TNA; minutes by Nichols and Sargent, 18, 22 February 1941, FO 371/26603, C 1228/123/21, TNA. Barcza recounted very different British perceptions towards Teleki in his diaries. He noted that since Teleki's congratulatory message to Mussolini on the successful occupation of British Somaliland in the summer of 1940, Teleki was not trusted anymore by the Foreign Office. It is true however that Barcza did not mention the Central Department in this context, but Whitehall in general: Barcza, Diaries, 18 November 1940, Box 0010, HIA.

[109] Barker, *British policy towards South-East Europe*, 5.; Kaiser, *Economic Diplomacy and the Origins of the Second World War*, 250-254; Catherwood, *The Balkans in World War Two*, 5; Case, *Between two states, the Transylvania question*, 4.

[110] By considering the fierce debates between the Central and Southern Departments and the eventual independent decision of higher authority we have also contribute to the question of *debate* vs. *dictate*, which has long fascinated scholars of British foreign policy. Anthony Barker and Graham K. Wilson have examined the question of the disobedience of the Foreign Office, but their analysis concentrated on the post-1945 era: Anthony Barker and Graham K. Wilson, "Whitehall's Disobedient Servants? Senior Officials' Potential Resistance to Ministers in British Government Departments," *British Journal of Political Science* 27, 2 (April, 1997), 223-246.

Hungarian Studies Review, Vol. XLII, Nos. 1-2 (Spring-Fall, 2015)

Other themes:

Lockean "Gold" Versus *Ancien Régime* "Mud" in Zsigmond Móricz's *Sárarany*

Virginia L. Lewis

"… and again he swung the damned body, smashing it against the stone wall, as though the latter were the ancient adversary he had to destroy with this despicable object of carnage, this execrable, disintegrating pillar of flesh." Zsigmond Móricz's first novel *Sárarany* (1910) reaches its brutal climax in this moment toward the novel's end, when the proud Hungarian peasant protagonist, Dani Turi, takes out an anger accumulated over centuries on Count László Karay, reducing the aristocrat to "little more than a rag, a useless, formless heap."[1] The barbarity of this scene provokes a crucial question: what accounts for the boundless frustration that thus transforms a wealthy, successful peasant into a brutal, savage murderer? In broader terms, how is the reader to interpret Móricz's suggestion that an intelligent, capable man such as Turi, the "gold" or *arany* of his title, is compelled to wallow in the "mud" or *sár* of his milieu, and succumb to complete ethical degradation?[2] Does Móricz really mean, as the final words of his text indicate, to lay the blame at God's feet if nothing good has become of this human gold?

> Ki hát a bűnös, ha ebből az aranyból semmi sem lett?
> – Ki?
> Az Isten, aki nem csinált belőle semmit.[3]
>
> So who is at fault if nothing has become of this gold?
> "Who?"
> God, who has made nothing of it.[4]

The reader can certainly take Móricz at his word here. But the very fact that the author invested the effort necessary to write a full-length novel about Dani Turi's predicament intimates he wished for his readers to look more deeply, to take into account the social and economic forces laid bare in *Sárarany* in their effort to fathom the mechanisms implicated in Dani's fall from grace and descent to homicidal madness. In this essay, I suggest that Dani Turi's attempt to extricate himself from the "mud" of the ancien régime that holds him down, by realizing his golden potential via the Lockean dream of profitable land ownership, is doomed as a venture in light of what Móricz diagnoses as the feudal backwardness of turn-of-the-century Hungarian society.[5]

When the novel opens, Dani has already proven himself an unusually capable agricultural entrepreneur, whose profitable ventures are the envy of the entire peasant community. Móricz begins his account of Dani's economic success by emphasizing his status as a village peasant "[j]ust like the others,"[6] who completes the usual military service, followed by his marriage to a girl from his village; but his unique entrepreneurial talents are quickly unveiled. His wife's dowry having made a landowner of him, Dani creates a scandal by planting, instead of the traditional wheat grown by all his peers, rapeseed, and "when the harvest arrived and the richly blessed earth yielded Dani Turi eight hundred *forints* per acre of rape-field, boundless incredulity took hold of the people." The peasant's unheard-of success is the talk of the village: "it would never have entered their minds that this soil could produce anything other than what it was accustomed to producing. They would gladly have vented their anger on this earth, which up to now had failed to return all the nice money they'd invested …"[7] But this is just the beginning. In a move that can only be deemed revolutionary, Dani scraps his rapeseed venture for the production of cabbage, resulting in what strikes his fellows as earth-shaking success: "An earthquake could not have aroused the astonishment Dani Turi did when he earned the sum of three thousand *forints* from a plot planted with cabbage which previously, when planted with wheat, had brought in barely two hundred…. People fought over this Kiskara cabbage at the markets."[8] After the success of this enterprise, Dani acquires more land from his father-in-law, a wedding gift consisting of fallow fields deemed useless by their owner, and rents it out to others who want to follow his lead and grow cabbage, and thus, "without lifting a finger, he got more from the land than he would have if he'd worked himself to death."[9] Móricz's protagonist exhibits all the traits of a commercial agricultural producer, who assesses the market and plants what will

command the best price, while factoring in techniques of modern farm production: "the revitalizing of the old, used-up earth; fertilizer one could buy at the store and scatter from sacks; deep plowing of the soil, viticulture …"[10] Dani Turi thus mounts a full frontal attack on the traditional agrarian economy that was rooted in subsistence farming and relied for its persistence on a class of rural subalterns who lacked the agency necessary to embrace modernization.

Dani is in effect bucking the trend of a centuries' long feudal mentality in rural Hungary. Joseph Held sheds light on this mentality in his book *The Modernization of Agriculture: Rural Transformation in Hungary, 1848-1975*. Writing concerning the impact of the lifting of serfdom in 1848, Held states: "The journals of the 1850's and 1860's, especially those dealing with economics on a professional level, contained continuous complaints about the peasants' continuing to work their lands the same way as they had done in the age of the *robot* and the ninth of the harvest (*dézsma*)."[11] Further:

> … the reporters of county newspapers realized that, although 1848 ended feudalism in Hungary, the past proved much too strong a force in peasant life. … The feudal system in Hungary — as in the other societies of East Central Europe — actually impeded the development of rational thinking among the peasants, or, as contemporaries were fond of saying, "it retarded the development of work-ethics."[12]

In the same section, Held affirms: "Since 1848 lifted the burden of feudal obligations from athe [*sic*] peasants, eliminating the obstacles to diligence and initiative, improvements could soon be expected. But it took three decades before the existing system began to fall apart."[13] At the time of Móricz's writing, this process was still only haltingly underway, particularly in eastern Hungary, as Held observes: "For the most part, modernization left the eastern part of the country relatively untouched during the 1870's and 1880's."[14] By portraying Dani Turi as the only man in his village who embraces "the two motivating forces" which, as Held suggests, "existed for furthering progress: namely 'freedom and property,'"[15] Móricz presents a timely and honest critique of the society in which he grew up. Dani is admired by his fellow villagers, but he stands apart in his passionate devotion to the Lockean dream.

As Held explains, it was the liberal reformers responsible for the 1848-1849 Revolution who promoted freedom and capitalism among the peasantry. These reformers "lived under the illusion that the freeing of

peasants from feudal burdens would bring about a sudden improvement in agricultural practices. They hoped that production methods of primitive self-sufficiency would be quickly transformed into a system based on individual peasant smallholders of a capitalist kind."[16] Many of these reformers' ideas harked back to John Locke's *Second Treatise of Government*, first printed in 1690. The right to own property is asserted by Locke, in addition to other passages, in §45 of the *Treatise*: "Thus *Labour*, in the Beginning, *gave a Right of Property*, where-ever any one was pleased to employ it, upon what was common …."[17] The notion of land-as-commodity also finds early resonance in Locke: "'Tis *Labour* then which *puts the greatest part of Value upon Land*, without which it would scarcely be worth any thing …."[18] Man's capacity to produce things of value to others from land-as-property makes possible the exchange and accumulation of wealth through the use of money:

> 50. But since Gold and Silver, being little useful to the Life of Man in proportion to Food, Rayment, and Carriage, has its *value* only from consent of Men, whereof Labour yet makes, in great part, *the measure*, it is plain, that Men have agreed to disproportionate and unequal Possession of the Earth, they having by a tacit and voluntary consent, found out a way, how a man may fairly possess more land than he himself can use the product of, by receiving in exchange for the overplus, Gold and Silver, which may be hoarded up without injury to any one, these metalls not spoileing or decaying in the hands of the possessor.[19]

It is in the context of this private, commodity-based economy that Dani Turi seeks to realize his ambitions as an agricultural entrepreneur. Though writers on Locke often caution against deeming him an apologist of unrestrained capitalism,[20] his ethical outlook was, according to Charles Taylor, "plainly an endorsement of the serious, productive, pacific improver of any class and against the aristocratic, caste-conscious pursuit of honour and glory through self-display and the warrior virtues."[21] According to Taylor, Locke's arguments in the *Second Treatise* support the conclusion that men are intended to work hard for their own improvement as rational individuals. Held cites the Hungarian reformers he references in *The Modernization of Agriculture* to similar effect: "'there is a magic force in the idea of private property, a force that frightens away indolence, awakens all the slumbering powers of labor and sows the seeds of moral ennoblement.'"[22]

Improvement in the Lockean sense is certainly an apt term for what Dani Turi seeks for himself and his family. Early on in the novel, he dreams of his son becoming a student,[23] and even a count.[24] These noble aspirations are extended to his wife, of whom he seeks to make "a real lady": "– *Bizony még úri asszony lesz belőled!*" he exclaims to her.[25] He plans to fulfill her every material desire: "'There's not as much silk in all the shops of Szatmár as you'll be able to get for your dresses!'"[26] His children, too, should inherit "a proper fortune."[27] But Dani's goals are not limited to his immediate family circle. In a manner that reflects once again the goals of the Hungarian reformers cited by Held, Dani Turi seeks to right historical wrongs committed against the peasants of Kiskara by the Karay counts, whose treasonous actions had resulted in the forced departure of the local peasants from the land handed down to them by their Hungarian ancestors: "He wanted to gain land, to conquer it; not just for himself, but for his entire land-hungry village."[28] The *Nagyszeg*, one of the parcels of land he seeks, is thus destined for the village community as a whole.[29]

Móricz makes it clear that Dani's social status as a peasant frustrates him and suggests repeatedly that improving his social status is a key concern for him. He is bothered on more than one occasion by his coarse, rough peasant's hands[30] which must cause revulsion in any noble lady he might touch[31] ("His thick, coarse fingers lay there spread out, studded with jagged nails, and were so strong and so accustomed to hard gripping that they were incapable of holding anything gently. Held by such fingers, a tender white woman's body must melt like a sculpture made of butter"[32]); and he seeks to emulate the refined expressions of affection characteristic of the upper class.[33] He imagines his son Béla as a little gentleman whose hands must always be clean[34] and betrays his inner desire to enjoy others' respect.[35] Dani's striking physical resemblance to Count László[36] underscores the notion that he indeed merits a higher social status, that somehow his destiny includes access to the same privileges and respectability enjoyed by his aristocratic look-a-like. Improving his lot and reaching his ambitions means improving his standing in society, and Dani sees the accumulation of money as the best way to accomplish this. That it lies within the realm of possibility is hinted at by Móricz with the character of the *vén házalózsidó* or old peddler Jew from the first chapter of the second part of *Sárarany*, whose income from the sale of his modest wares has ensured that his sons became gentlemen, his daughters-in-law "fine ladies" (*úri fiai és nagyúri menyei*).[37] The selling of goods by a Jew, however, is fundamentally different from the development of land as a commodified

resource by a peasant — the first did not constitute the threat to the aristocracy's hold on social and economic power that the second did. And yet Dani has no other means at his disposal of improving his status than generating profit as a landowner from land-as-commodity. The central challenge he faces in realizing his ambitions is that suggested by a Hegelian notion of agency: he can only function as an economic agent given adequate status, and he cannot attain the necessary status without succeeding as an economic agent.[38] The plot of *Gold in the Mud* pivots on this very paradox.

Money, acquired through skill, intelligence, and hard work, those attributes that allowed individuals to prosper as members of the urban middle classes, does not by itself suffice in allowing Hungarian peasant Dani Turi to improve his social standing and access to agency in a meaningful way, in spite of his extraordinary feats in the area of agri-cultural commerce. Dani's keen intelligence is recognized not just by his peasant peers, but even by high-level administrators of the Karay estate: "'We have a certain peasant in Kiskara,'" the manorial administrator tells Count László, "'by the name of Dani Turi. If he had a bit of schooling, he could cut a nice figure in any gentlemen's society. He has more intelligence than the entire village put together.'"[39] Móricz devotes the better part of a chapter to describing Dani's fabled capacity to get things done as a field worker, extolling not only his speed and thoroughness as a wheat cutter, but also the superior quality of his tools.[40] Yet he can never increase his profits sufficiently to rise above his station without the acquisition of more land. As the author puts it: "He'd been married for barely four years when the boundaries of Kiskara grew too narrow for him. These boundaries were limited by the monstrous estates of the Count."[41] Legally there is very little land for even the wealthiest of peasants to acquire, due to the stranglehold of feudalism on land tenure as portrayed in the novel. Of all the land belonging to Count Miska's "monstrous estates," only two modest parcels are exempted from the entailment: "The first was the Nagyszeg, which at the time of the leasing had been under water; this section lay in a mighty enclave of the Tisza. The other was the Pallag, a nice piece of pasture extending for two hundred acres."[42] As modest as these two parcels are, they would in fact triple the size of Dani Turi's holdings,[43] thus opening the door to a substantial accumulation of wealth on his part if he could manage to acquire them.

Dani's land hunger (*földéhség*) is referenced by scholars such as Péter Nagy[44] and was symptomatic of peasants across Europe, as evidenced by narratives such as Emile Zola's *La terre* (1887) concerning a

peasant community in central France, or Liviu Rebreanu's *Ion* (1920) about an ambitious Romanian peasant, among numerous others. The hopes pinned by many an immigrant to the United States around the turn of the 20th century on access to land in the territories beyond the Mississippi River, as portrayed in narratives such as Ole Edvart Rølvaag's *Verdens Grøde* (*Giants in the Earth*, 1924-25), provide further evidence of the importance of land in the minds of many rural inhabitants in the modern era as a means of acquiring wealth, freedom, and improved social standing.[45] To gain a more complete understanding of what increased access to land-as-property meant to the peasant-cum-entrepreneur at an individual, human level, beyond outward expressions of status and position, it is useful to consider the inward aspirations of Móricz's protagonist. Dani Turi's own lust for land has a great deal to do with realizing the "gold" within himself; he seeks land as a means of accomplishing something, of acting in a meaningful way on the world around him. His efforts to acquire the *Pallag* and the *Nagyszeg* parcels are frustrated for many months, because Count Miska and his wife Count Helene are standing in the way of this acquisition by their refusal to act on Dani's request. During these months, Dani's frustration accumulates and the reader gains insight into the peasant's hopes in relation to the land he seeks:

> … what most oppressed him was that he couldn't accomplish anything great. He couldn't make a break from life as he knew it. … he yearned for another life, greater, busier, bolder …. *How deplorable are all these wasted days*, he thought to himself over and over, *God, what I could accomplish with them! If only I had the right opportunity!*
>
> …. If it weren't for the hope that the day must yet come that would lead him to a new burst of activity and make good this endless period of stagnation and uselessness, he would surely perish, consumed from within by maggots …[46]

Scholars on Móricz often refer to Dani as an example of the unused energies of the peasants, citing his lust for action and power and suggesting that society would be the ultimate beneficiary of any measures taken to alleviate the frustrated ambitions of the Dani Turis of the world.[47] But Dani's crisis is also of an individual nature, one that can trace its roots to a Lockean notion of natural rights. Móricz takes care to problematize the ambitious, egomaniacal dimensions of his protagonist, often betraying the threatening nature of his goals.[48] This perspective contributes to the critical side of the debate concerning the role of the "rational individual" in

the modern nation-state, described as follows by Michael Kearney: "This creature is a choice-making, self-gratifying, maximizing actor. The genealogy of this type runs from Locke and the other social contract theorists of the state through Adam Smith and Jeremy Bentham to its most elaborate and explicit conceptualization in the neoclassic economists."[49] The landowning, maximizing actor operating within the framework of capitalism conduces to a whole host of problems studied by Martin Heidegger, Val Plumwood, and Wendell Berry, to name just a few. Without venturing too far into the treacherous terrain of seeking justification for the eminently questionable motives guiding Dani Turi's actions, and in the spirit of the Lockean interpretation featured in this article, it is useful to assert that Dani Turi seeks what philosopher Alan Gewirth terms "aspiration fulfillment," which he explains as follows: "To fulfill oneself by reference to one's aspirations involves that the self is viewed as a center of desiderative force which strives to achieve intended outcomes. To fulfill oneself is to achieve these outcomes and thereby to bring oneself, as thus centered in one's aspirations, to fruition …."[50] Gewirth's definition can be constructively compared with Locke's understanding of the role of property in enabling the individual to achieve tangible realization of his capacities, as a means of interpreting Dani Turi's ambitions with regard to the land he seeks to acquire from Count Miska:

> … property to Locke seems to symbolize rights in their concrete form, or perhaps rather to provide the tangible subject of an individual's powers and attitudes. It is because they can be symbolized as property, something a man can conceive of as distinguishable from himself though a part of himself, that a man's attributes, such as his freedom, his equality, his power to execute the law of nature, can become the subject of his consent, the subject of any negotiation with his fellows. We cannot alienate any part of our personalities, but we can alienate that with which we have chosen to mix our personalities.[51]

This process of alienation in the legal sense relates to the "outcomes" that result from Gewirth's aspiration fulfillment to the extent that, by producing valuable crops from his land, Dani can engage in the sort of economic exchange with his community that will enhance his and his family's material welfare and, he hopes, also allow him to engage purposefully with the power structures that determine the political and social roles he, his wife, and children can play in society. In addition, Dani aspires to facilitate the empowerment of his entire village by restoring land

access withdrawn from the community as a result of the treasonous actions of the Karay family centuries before.

The problem, of course, is that Dani cannot assert any claim on the land he seeks without the assent of the Count.[52] His ambition of increased *in*dependence is *de*pendent on the feudal structures that place severe limits on his action radius. The "mud" of the ancien régime threatens to trap him. Móricz asserts the highly problematic nature of this dilemma by insisting that it is not so simple as an either/or proposition. There is not only the question of *whether* Dani Turi can gain access to the land parcels he seeks, there is also the question of *how*. These two questions play an equally critical role in the novel. Concerning the first, Móricz lends drama to the situation by showing how the nobles' lack of interest in lending serious attention to Dani Turi's request causes painful delays that, beyond resulting in doubt, stress, and misery for the peasant, also occur at precisely that point in his life when he feels his physical powers and energy dwindling. The reasons for these delays constitute a pointed critique of the nobles' failure to treat the peasants as human beings with valid needs and hopes:

> During the summer [Dani had] visited the town lawyer day in and day out without succeeding in taking over the dead tenant's land lease. The Count had journeyed to Africa, and the Countess would hear nothing concerning the governance of Kiskara. And Count László, her brother-in-law, had made it clear that he was the peasants' enemy. So nothing at all had happened. … a decision would not take place until the new year.[53]

The nobles are distant from their subjects both geographically and mentally. The welfare of the community is of no concern to them. At the collective level, they exhibit no interest in bringing about "improvement" in the sense noted above — they live in a world apart from that of the peasants, whose quality of life bears no connection with their own concerns. At the individual level, the problem is even more apparent: Dani Turi is the acknowledged head of the village, yet his eminently reasonable petition is simply ignored. In an era when nation-building is a crucial concern of modernity, such neglect on the part of those who hold the reins of social and economic power is intolerable. Móricz thus offers a strong indictment of the aristocracy for standing in the way of progress, and strengthens it by indicating how the nobles' neglect results in a waste of productive energy, given that a peasant like Dani can withstand the rigorous work required of a successful farmer for only a limited time. As

the second part of *Sárarany* gets underway, the author makes a point of emphasizing the waning of Dani's powers: "Not with anger, but with bitterness, with anguish he realized how much he'd aged."[54] This statement comes in the context of Dani's realization that he is no longer the attractive sexual male he once was. The author's repeated references to Dani's fatigue and lethargy[55] parallel his decline as a desirable object of sexual attention: "And now his playmates were the aged women with their crusty loins, who complained when hugged that everything aches, their sides, their backs, their bones? An unbearable bitterness, the great bitterness of his life, gathered in Dani's soul."[56] Móricz thus introduces a crisis in his narrative, suggesting that if his peasant protagonist does not soon reach his goal of assuming the *Pallag* and *Nagyszeg* land parcels, it will be too late for him to accomplish his entrepreneurial goals and make a meaningful contribution to progress in his community.

The pressure on Dani is intensified by the fact that the peasants themselves exert a negative influence on him with regard to achieving his aspirations. *Sárarany* is a valuable historical document in its portrait of the peasantry in eastern Hungary and the barriers to progress posed by their mentality and habits. Their reliance on tradition as a guide for their social and economic actions,[57] their apathy in the face of hardship and suffering,[58] and their high tolerance for disorderliness of both a physical and moral nature[59] all suggest a class of people unprepared for the kind of freedom posited by Locke, with its requirement of responsibility and mutual trust based on reason and virtue. The most revealing character in this regard is Dani's wife Erzsi, whose value system exhibits numerous contrasts with that of her ambitious husband. Two obvious reasons for these differences stand out: firstly her identity as a woman, and secondly her Catholicism. Erzsi's character merits an entire article devoted to what she reveals in regard to the place and role of women in turn-of-the-century rural Hungarian society. Without any intent of minimizing the importance of Erzsi's status as a wife, mother, and woman in her own right with aspirations unique to these identities, the focus here concerns her religious convictions and decision to pursue the path of martyrdom as opposed to prosperity. While Dani serves as a virtual poster child for Weber's notion of the Protestant work ethic, Erzsi uses her Catholic faith as a vehicle for projecting meaning onto, and thereby embracing, her suffering as the path to moral salvation. Although Erzsi's unblemished record of absolute faithfulness to her husband is a source of great pride to Dani on the one hand,[60] her rejection of his capitalist ambitions on the other hand causes him endless frustration.[61] This rejection has a dual foundation. Erzsi's

dreams of domestic bliss are at odds with Dani's ambitions and their dependence on work beyond the confines of their home and engagement with the community at large. At one point, she laments concerning her husband: "He needed everything … and amidst all this he also needed her. But she was only a small part of this everything! This embittered her fiercely …."[62] She has no need of wealth for its own sake, on the contrary, thrift has been a constant in her life and she struggles with the notion that that ought to change:

> The penny-pinching of Erzsi's parents had rescued for their descendants a small inheritance which, in the limited circumstances of village life, could not be enlarged. When Dani turned out to be such an incredibly talented money-maker, into whose lap forints dropped by the thousands, the two of them gradually shed their true nature. Dani demanded more and more impatiently the "good life," a home, a wife, a way of life fit for a lord …. Erzsi, for her part, felt that her old, miserly lifestyle was no longer appropriate, and if her husband had acted toward her as he should, she would have completed the transition to a new way of living. But as things stood, instead of adapting to a new approach to life, she had no idea what would come next. She was losing the ground beneath her feet. It was a constant source of aggravation to her that she hated her husband's money as much as she hated life itself …[63]

In time, Erzsi adopts suffering as the only way of life that will ensure her the peace of mind she requires in order to be content,[64] effectively closing the door on any aspirations related to prosperity or capitalism-induced wealth. This desire to achieve sinlessness finds its source in the second aspect of the dual foundation mentioned above, namely the sin*ful* dimension of Dani's quest for wealth and power, the fact that, in this narrative, he enacts his quest via an economic exchange reliant on sex as currency. Dani's repeated sexual transgressions in the name of increasing his wealth are unacceptable in view of the ethical code subscribed to by his wife, with its demand for marital fidelity as a vital aspect of domestic bliss. The issue of the sexual economy in *Sárarany* must be addressed in relation to the question posed above concerning *how* Dani can get the approval he needs from the Count to acquire the *Pallag* and *Nagyszeg* land parcels. *Whether* he succeeds in this being the issue at stake for the moment, it should be pointed out that, although Erzsi's objections to Dani's ambitions contribute to the stumbling blocks he must overcome in order to reach his goals, in the end her decision to pursue the path of

Catholic martyrdom and tolerate her husband's every transgression removes her misgivings as an obstacle.

This leaves the obstacle posed by the comital family itself. Dani forces their hand by having the schoolmaster write up a petition, which reaches Countess Helene's hands precisely when her boredom with her "empty, senseless and aimless life" causes her to dwell in excitement on the powerful impression made on her by Dani Turi, that "peasant Don Juan," during his initial encounter with her and Count László in his attempt to gain their permission to purchase the land he desires.[65] In the end, her family lawyer concludes that the fields sought by the peasant "were exempted from the estate property as a whole. So the Countess had a contract drawn up whereby the one parcel, the '*Pallag*,' would be granted to Dani Turi in exchange for cash, while the other would go to the village community conjointly …."[66] Once Dani has signed the two documents and the Countess marks the contract regarding the *Pallag* as paid in full, the transaction is effectively complete. Dani has reached the object of his aims. This victory is, however, hollow and pointless, as an examination of the *how* of the land transfer transaction will show.

The two social worlds portrayed in *Sárarany*, that of the peasants and that of the aristocrats, differ radically from one another in ways that render Dani's aspiration of significantly improving his social status doomed from the start. Arguably the most significant difference distinguishing the two spheres in the novel is the sexual economy of the local peasantry, which is so alien to Countess Helene that she requires a detailed explanation from Bora Kis, one of Dani Turi's admirers and the object of a destructive rivalry between Dani and his wife's cousin, Gyuri Takács. The explanation begins when Countess Helene asks Bora whether she has ever received a hug from Dani Turi, the *paraszt donjuán*:

> The girl looked at her innocently. "I wouldn't allow it."
> "Even so."
> "I'm a poor girl."
> "And?"
> "I can't be had for free …"
> The Countess was astonished; she didn't understand.
> "Uncle Dani pays no one. On the contrary, people pay him," she added as though boasting. "The women and girls go to work on his fields solely in order to get a kiss from him. 'Cause he doesn't give his kisses to just anyone."
> "So he hasn't hugged you, because you can't pay him?"

> The girl gave a peevish shrug of her shoulders. "I know how to wield a hoe, too! I could pay too … Him … But he wouldn't pay me! Obviously you don't know that when a poor girl like me is also beautiful, she can only sleep with a man who pays well. I have to make my fortune. …"[67]

Some scholarship on *Sárarany* suggests that Móricz's adoption of the themes of Naturalism in the novel, including the attention to sexual excesses, represents a response to literary fashion.[68] But his use of sexual references and themes throughout the text plays a crucial functional role in defining the sort of glass ceiling that bars the peasant Dani Turi from his objective of rising above his class. There is a clear dichotomy separating the role of sex in the peasant world, where it is closely connected to material gain, from its role in the world of the nobles, where it revolves solely around pleasure. Bora explains how Dani secures labor for his fields by granting sexual favors to village women. Without this, he would not be able to accomplish what he does in monetary terms with his land. Additional references to this economic state of affairs are strewn throughout the novel, such as the following:

> This year Dani planted cabbage along the Tisza, on the very fields where, in the first year, the rapeseed had done so well. He had to win over the women to this project – it was the only way to succeed where no one else would in cultivating these far-flung fields successfully. When it came to winning women over to harvest cabbage, Dani didn't even refrain from giving hugs to the Gypsy women dwelling near the village.[69]

Four paragraphs further down in the text, the author states: "All the women of the village were his vassals, his work slaves."[70] The Countess neatly sums up this unique labor market, with her "vague impression that an open trade was going on in the world, whereby girls and men freely generated profit from their beauty."[71] In a society where capital is painfully limited, as among land-starved peasants, physical attractiveness becomes a form of currency used in a manner very similar to money among the wealthier classes. But this currency market comes with a high ethical price, as the hurtful relationship between Dani and Erzsi reveals. Even Dani understands his wife's misery as she complains to him about the double standard affecting their love life:

> "In the five years of our marriage, have I as much as looked at anyone else? What would you do with me if I kept a lover?"
>
> *Strangle you!* the man thought to himself in his rage; but he said nothing, only clenching his fists.
>
> The woman sighed. "But you! What do you do to me? Why are you never with me? You can't stand us? And yet you're with all the women of the entire village! Shouldn't I cry over that from morning to night?"[72]

Erzsi expresses disgust over the "dirty money" Dani makes: "Money for which I have to fight over you with others."[73] She experiences acute inner torment over her unfaithful husband.[74] Yet even she seems to understand at some level the necessity of her husband's marital infidelity, as evidenced by her dogged rejection of the overtures of her cousin, Gyuri Takács, as he tries to convince her that Dani merits her hatred and does not deserve her the way he himself does:[75] "'Phooey,'" she exclaims to him, "'you come whining and crying to me, because my husband, who's married and has a family, is more appealing to the girls than an old bachelor.'"[76] In spite of everything, Erzsi feels a deep loving bond with Dani, in part because of his very success in his endeavors. This is part of the rationale behind her ability to adopt the role of the sacrificial lamb who allows her husband everything, while denying herself everything — except for him, whom in the end she cannot live without.[77]

For his part, Dani is able to live with himself as an unfaithful husband as long as he does not cross the one line of actually desiring another woman to the extent that he would do exactly what Bora expects, namely "pay" for her affections with a gift. This dividing line between acceptable infidelity and unacceptable infidelity is mentioned in the very first chapter of the novel, an indication of its important role in the plot: "I want to gather up the entire world and lay it at your feet," Dani exclaims to his wife. "To this day I haven't given a single other woman the tiniest of gifts. So what are you feeling sorry about? … What does it matter to you how I go about my business, as long as I succeed!"[78] Sexual favors as a means to further his business endeavors – that is what is at stake for Dani, who loves his wife just as deeply as she loves him,[79] in spite of how his material ambitions drive him to hurt her. This invisible line is crossed, however, when Dani purchases a silk kerchief for Bora, who refuses any and all overtures of affection on the part of the *paraszt donjuán* precisely for the reasons she explains to the Countess. Tormented over the thought that he is no longer the man he used to be, Dani is driven by desperation to give "the tiniest of gifts" to the young girl in order to win her over.[80] The

momentousness of this act as transgression is made plain by the author, who writes that Dani's "soul trembled with emotion. A storm of desires and sensations battled within him; he felt ashamed and was overcome with humility; he sensed the unmanliness of his actions and sought to make amends for it."[81] This, the first chapter of the second part of the novel, ends with the observation: "Dani Turi was a completely different man from the one who'd driven out to the fields that morning."[82] As readers familiar with *Sárarany* will recall, Dani only intensifies this transgression he so regrets, in the name of prevailing over rival Gyuri Takács, who would like nothing better than to depose Dani as what the Countess regards as "a proud cock," ruling "over the many hens atop the dung heap of life,"[83] by winning the entirety of Gyuri's landholdings in a card game and handing them over to Bora Kis's father. Yet in spite of the invisible line dividing Dani's use of sexual favors for strictly business purposes from deliberate acts of infidelity, the dirty (*piszkos*) continuity connecting the two is beyond doubt. The peasant reliance on sex-as-currency forms a material part of the *sár* or mud that composes Dani's peasant world, "the raunchy world of the little village" as the Countess imagines it, "surrounding her with the odor of the brutal and unrestrained mating of the animals, the horses, the chickens, the pigeon coops, the unbathed peasant women" and constituting "filth" (*szemét*).[84]

Dani Turi's quest to improve his social status means rising above the mud of his feudal existence. His determination to accumulate the socially accepted currency of the capitalist world: money,[85] is a gesture toward emancipating himself from the sexual economy that undermines his social acceptability. Dani's first direct encounter with gentility gives him a glimpse of the enormous gap separating peasant sexual relations from noble ones, as he observes the display of affection that takes place between the Count's lawyer and the latter's beautiful wife:

> … he regarded the lady and the gentleman as they hugged each other with gentle ease. The lady's white arm rested with such delicacy on her husband's shoulder, as though a rose had fallen there. And the man, with his plump face and red moustache, breathed such a soft kiss onto her hand, as though he hadn't touched it. And when they'd kissed each other in this same gentle manner, like the touching of butterflies' wings, Dani saw clearly that unattainable something that was missing from his women, his love affairs …[86]

This example of affectionate behavior in an upper-class married couple is a far cry from the tumbles in the hay that typify Dani's experience with sexual relations, as shown by his encounter with one of the cutters working for him during the wheat harvest: "Dani flung his arms around her, hugged her wildly and brutally, then cast her onto the sheaf of grain. He shattered her with his kisses, with horribly lustful kisses meant for the both of them," after which "the girl lay there in the grass." Dani then leaves her and heads for home: "He didn't once turn around, didn't even glance back at the girl, who lay in her disheveled clothes there among the grain like a crushed bit of life."[87] Amazingly, the peasant girl had craved this opportunity to enjoy Dani's affections to the point of stalking him as they worked at harvesting the wheat! Immediately after this scene, as Dani is on his way home, he imagines a very different scenario if the opportunity were to present itself for him to hug Countess Helene: "How softly, how gently, how very differently he would hug her than he was accustomed to hugging other women. So impalpably that he would barely graze her skin; so lightly that he would barely feel her weight."[88] Of course the only way such a scene could possibly take place would entail either that the peasant Dani Turi become the Countess's lover, an utter impossibility given her superior social standing, or that Dani himself enjoy genteel social standing, his ultimate, though unrealistic aim. And even if such an impossibility were to occur, it would have nothing to do with securing the Countess's labor for his fields, it would be strictly a question of pleasure similar to that enjoyed by Helene together with her paramour, Count László. That Dani even imagines such an unlikely scenario is necessary in part as a foil for what really does transpire when the Countess's gross need for titillation prompts her to engage in the peasant sexual economy dominated by Dani Turi,[89] an eventuality she had imagined when first learning of his fabled reputation among the peasants:

> For the first time in her life, the Countess felt the wild, sensuous, aimless drive well up within her that takes hold of one's body and jolts it, ripping one's soul from its hinges. And at times she shuddered at the thought of what would happen if she really fell into the hands of this stallion of a peasant, whom these rutting mares surrounded with their neighing and cavorting like a god risen to earth.[90]

Returning to the crucial question as to the *how* of Dani's securing the Countess's approval for his acquisition of the *Pallag* and *Nagyszeg* fields, Dani is fully aware that the only currency with which he can

legitimately gain access to this land to the full satisfaction of all parties involved is *money*. If he is to enjoy tenure of the land with the legal rights necessary to permit capitalist development and the building of wealth, he must *purchase* it. Thanks to his diligence and business acumen, Dani succeeds in amassing the money needed to reach his goal. Thus when he learns that "immediate cash payment was expected" to finalize his acquisition of the *Pallag*, he can react with the plan to "get the money to complete the purchase this very day!"[91] But by this point it is already evident that his plan is doomed, given the Countess's abysmal assessment of Dani's social worth. The first thing Dani hears upon entering the room where Helene has invited him to sign the documents pertaining to the land transfer is the insulting nickname that Gyuri Takács has circulated and that Bora Kis revealed to the Countess early in the novel, concerning where he is beautiful:[92] "laughing, her teeth pressed together, lustfully, disdainfully, she uttered the peasant Don Juan's insulting nickname, and saw in her mind the queer, shameless girl who'd likewise uttered the word, with an unmistakable snicker and boorish charm."[93] Dani is far too intelligent not to perceive the grave insult inflicted on him by her utterance, particularly given Bora's revelation when she breaks down and shares the nickname with Countess Helene: "whoever says it out loud, Dani Turi would kill without a thought."[94] This explains his cold, silent reaction as he stands now before the Countess. He has just hit the glass ceiling that blocks his ascent to higher social standing. Her "cold disdain" as he waits for her to acknowledge his presence does not escape him, nor the fact that his "very peasantness angered the Countess."[95] Dani's aspirations are further offended when he sees upon inspection of the documents he is to sign "that the selling price had been reduced to half his original offer, and instead of payment by installments, immediate cash payment was expected."[96] His capacity to pay for the land, his ability to engage successfully with an economy that relies on money as currency, is the object of serious doubt on the part of those financial leaders who, like Count Miska, "did not believe he could get any money out of" the peasants.[97] Faith means everything in an economy based on money, as the very word "credit" confirms, derived as it is from the Latin word for "believe." As long as Dani's would-be creditors assume he lacks the means to prove a good financial risk, his effort to participate successfully in the capitalist economy is doomed.

But the humiliation to which the Countess subjects him goes even farther than this financial suspicion.[98] Her fascination with the very sexual economy from which Dani seeks to extricate himself through the use of

money as payment provokes her into engaging with it herself: "It would never have occurred to her that she, too, would be paying this peasant Don Juan, who was accustomed to being paid by the women."[99] And this is exactly what she does: "She took the pen, dipped it in the ink, and hurriedly wrote at the bottom of the document, beneath Dániel Turi's miserable, laughable chicken scratches: 'Entire sum received in full,' followed by her name." Dani then "suspected what the woman had in mind for him, what she expected of him."[100] Dani is now confronted with the opportunity to realize the vision of gentle, delicate, noble exchange of affection he had imagined himself indulging in with Countess Helene. Yet the sexual act that takes place is instead so brutal and violent that it can only be characterized as an act of extreme vengeance. Móricz leaves the worst possible details to his readers' imagination, allowing the Countess only to languish in the subsequent chapter, broken and bleeding helplessly, passing in and out of consciousness, with no one to come to her aid.[101]

Thus we arrive at the scene referenced at the beginning of this article, which opens with a silent confrontation between Count László and the peasant who has just, for all intents and purposes and to indulge a vulgar term, screwed his lover to death. The few words that finally escape the Count's mouth: "What are you doing here?" and the stern command: "March!"[102] do little more than pound the nail in the coffin of Dani Turi's social and economic aspirations. This is then the point where Dani reduces Count László to little more than a bloody heap, which he thrashes violently against a stone wall, the symbol for the historical processes that have led to this moment of unquenchable rage and frustration on the part of a capable, intelligent, passionate, ambitious agricultural entrepreneur. In spite of his outstanding qualifications for realizing the Lockean dream of improved social standing by means of land-as-property, his proven ability to engage reason and hard work in the production of valuable commodities from his land, Dani's path to improvement and progress is barred by the mud of the *ancien* régime, in which he is condemned to wallow due to the grip of the aristocracy on the structures of power, and its refusal to share them with those groups they have oppressed for centuries. Zsigmond Móricz's first published novel thus offers an important and revealing portrait of the impact the oppressive social and economic forces of his age had in delaying the arrival of effective self-realization and prosperity among Hungary's peasant classes.

NOTES

[1] Zsigmond Móricz, *Gold in the Mud*, trans. by Virginia L. Lewis (Aberdeen, South Dakota: Library Cat, 2014), 313. The original text reads: "És újra kanyarintott a nyomorult tetemmel és paskolta vele a kőfalat, mintha az volna az ősi ellenség, amit egy hitvány húsostorral, nyavalyás szétfolyó hús-oszlappal kellett volna szétvernie.

És mikor már rongy volt, alaktalan, haszontalan tömeg volt csak a kezében …" Quoted from Zsigmond Móricz, *Sárarany* (Budapest: Athenaeum, 1939), 226.

[2] Mihály Czine quotes a parallel interpretation on the part of Zsigmond Móricz himself, whereby, in spite of the final words of the novel ("Mi az élet? Sár. És az ember benne? Arany a sárban" – Móricz, 240), the author suggests that the productive capacities lying within Hungary's peasant classes become as mud because of how they are wasted by society: "Ezt jelenti a szó: sárarany, az az arany, mely sárként használódik el az emberi élet útjain. A tehetség, mely elpang az emeberiségtől megfosztottságában" (quoted in Mihály Czine, *Móricz Zsigmond*, 4th ed., Debrecen: Csokonai Kiadóvállalat, 1992, p. 57). My own interpretation of the *sár* in the novel is inspired by the author's statement that "man" (*az ember*) is located within the "mud" (*a sárban*) as a symbol for society itself and an agent of the protagonist's ruin. Further confirmation of this approach is provided at the end of the first part of the novel, where Dani labels life in his village "*sár*" and proclaims that, if that is the sort of life he is stuck in, he at least intends to wallow around in it properly (Móricz, 124). See also Péter Nagy, "How Modern Was Zsigmond Móricz?" (in *The New Hungarian Quarterly*, 1980:77), where he states concerning *Sárarany*: "This is the story of a peasant stuck in the mud of village life" (p. 31).

[3] Móricz, 240.

[4] Móricz/Lewis, 334.

[5] Compare Péter Nagy's statement: "The Dani Turis, caught in the vice of feudalism, had no room for action, and this only intensified the destructive passions that raged in their breasts" ("How Modern Was Zsigmond Móricz?", 31).

[6] Móricz/Lewis, 31; original wording: "Mint a többi" (Móricz, 23).

[7] Móricz/Lewis, 32; original wording: "… s kivált mikor jött az aratás, a bőséges, áldott aratás, amely egy holdnyi földről nyolcszáz forintot eresztett a Dani zsebeibe, akkor szörnyű elképedés lepte meg az embereket."

"… sose nézték volna ki, hogy ez a föld egyebet is tud teremni, nemcsak amit szokott … Szerették volna kitölteni rajta a haragjukat, hogy eddig mind magának tartotta azt a sok jó pénzt …" (Móricz, 23).

[8] Móricz/Lewis, 33; original wording: "Ha földrengés ütött volna be, nem okoz olyan rémületet, mint az, hogy háromezer forintnál többet kapott Dani egy olyan darab föld terméseért, ahol százötven, kétszáz forint ára búzánál több nem terem meg. … Ahova vitte, kapkodták a kiskarai káposztát" (Móricz, 24).

[9] Móricz/Lewis, 34; original wording: "… olyan árért, hogy egy kapavágás nélkül több haszna volt belőle, mintha megszakítja magát" (Móricz, 24).

[10] Móricz/Lewis, 34; original wording: "A kiélt öreg föld megjavításán, boltban vett, zsákból szitált trágyázáson, földforgatáson, szőlőtelepítésen …" (Móricz, 24).

[11] Joseph Held, *The Modernization of Agriculture: Rural Transformation in Hungary, 1848-1975* (Boulder, Colorado: East European Monographs, 1980), p. 24.

[12] Held, 27.

[13] Held, 33.

[14] Held, 63-64.

[15] Held, 24.

[16] Held, 24.

[17] John Locke, *Two Treatises of Government*, student edition, ed. by Peter Laslett (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1988), p. 299.

[18] Locke, 298.

[19] Locke, 301-302.

[20] See for example Charles Taylor, *Sources of the Self: The Making of the Modern Identity* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard UP, 1989), who writes that Locke "doesn't seem to have had any particular brief for large-scale commerce and industry" (p. 240).

[21] Taylor, 240.

[22] Held, 24. He cites here the following: János Hetenyi, Pál Király, and Adolf Ploetz, *Robot és dézsma* (Pest, 1845), p. 357.

[23] Móricz, 29.

[24] Móricz, 27.

[25] Móricz, 11.

[26] Móricz/Lewis, 15; original wording: "– A szatmári bótosok nem győznek annyi selymet lemérni, amennyi viganóravalót vehetsz!" (Móricz, 11).

[27] Móricz/Lewis, 17; original wording: "– Ha tizenhat pulyád lesz, mindre maradhat elég" (Móricz, 13).

[28] Móricz/Lewis, 56; original wording: "Földet akar szerezni, hódítani; földet nemcsak magának, hanem földetlen éhes soknépű falujának" (Móricz, 40).

[29] Móricz, 214. Given Dani Turi's ambitions of noble status for his family and the restoration of land rights taken from the peasants of his village centuries before, Péter Nagy's claim that Dani seeks to pursue the "American path" in reaching his capitalist goals seems questionable (Péter Nagy, *Móricz Zsigmond*, Budapest: Szépirodalmi Könyvkiadó, 1975, p. 96). Dani as Móricz has drawn him clearly aspires to improve his status within the framework of existing Hungarian social structures, even inviting at one point comparison of himself with the Deputy County Chief: "… akkor osztán nem cserélek a vicispánnal se" (Móricz, 11).

[30] Móricz, 50.

[31] Móricz, 43.

[32] Móricz/Lewis, 38; original wording: "Kirugódtak az ujjai, e vaskos, bárdolatlan, csorba körmű ujjak, amelyek olyan erősek s úgy hozzászoktak a kemény fogásokhoz, hogy nem is bírnak puhán érinteni valamit. Az úri fehér hab asszonytest, ha nem vigyáz, úgy szétmálik ezek közt mint a vajkép" (Móricz, 27).

[33] Móricz, 46, 110.

[34] Móricz, 29.

[35] Móricz, 203.

[36] "A két férfi úgy hasonlít egymáshoz, mintha testvérek volnának" (Móricz, 94).

[37] Móricz, 135-136.

[38] See Robert B. Pippin, *Hegel's Practical Philosophy: Rational Agency as Ethical Life* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2008), chapter 6: "The Freedom of the Will: Social Dimensions," pp. 147-182.

[39] Móricz/Lewis, 129; original wording: "– Hát van odaát Kiskarán egy parasztgazda, Turi Dani, ha egy kis iskolája volna, beillene az akármilyen úri társaságba. Annyi esze van, egy egész falunak sok" (Móricz, 92).

[40] Móricz, 100-107.

[41] Móricz/Lewis, 34; original wording: "Alig négyesztendős házas volt, mikor egyszerre csak szűk lett neki a kiskarai határ. Ott terült el mellettük a rengeteg uradalom" (Móricz, 24).

[42] Móricz/Lewis, 35; original wording: "A Nagyszeg, amely a bérletkötéskor még víz alatt volt, a Tisza egy hatalmas szögelletében és a Pallag, egy szép darab kétszázholdas legelő" (Móricz, 25).

[43] Móricz, 25.

[44] E.g. Nagy, *Móricz Zsigmond*, 99.

[45] As Held states with regard to post-revolutionary Hungary, "the decisive factor in determining peasant status increasingly became the amount of land possessed" (p. 42).

[46] Móricz/Lewis, 207-208; original wording: "És a legnagyobb baja mégis az volt, hogy nem bírt keményen tenni valamit. Nem bírt szakítani. … más életet, magasabbat, merészebbet, tevékenyebbet óhajtott …. Hogy telnek ezek az útálatos napok, gondolta számtalanszor magában és istenem, mit tudnék én csinálni! csak alkalmam volna rá! … Ha még a reménység sem volna meg, hogy egyszer majd csak elhozza az idő magától a cselekvés idejét, amikor kipótolhatja a hosszú tespedést, akkor igazán tönkrement volna magától, megőrölte volna a szú belülről …" (Móricz, 147-148).

[47] See for example Tibor Klaniczay, ed., *Handbuch der ungarischen Literatur* (Budapest: Corvina, 1977), pp. 379-380; also Nagy, *Móricz Zsigmond*, 94-96; Czine, 56-63.

[48] Móricz, 223, 226.

[49] Michael Kearney, *Reconceptualizing the Peasantry: Anthropology in Global Perspective* (Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press, 1996), p. 48.

[50] Alan Gewirth, *Self-fulfillment* (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1998), p. 14.

[51] Peter Laslet, "Introduction," in Locke, 103.

[52] Móricz, 25.

[53] Móricz/Lewis, 180-181; original wording: "A nyáron minden nap bent volt az ügyvédnél, még se bírta megkapni a meghalt bérlő örökét. A gróf elutazott Afrikába, a grófné hallani sem akart többet a kiskarai uradalomról; László gróf meg nyiltan kijelentette, hogy ellene van a parasztoknak. Még sem történt semmi. … újévre kellett meglenni a döntésnek" (Móricz, 128).

[54] Móricz/Lewis, 202; original wording: "És nem haraggal, de elkeseredéssel, kétségbeeséssel érezte meg, hogy mennyire megvénült" (Móricz, 143).

[55] Móricz, 67, 73, 147, 155.

[56] Móricz/Lewis, 202; original wording: "Hát már csak ezek az ő párjai, a megvénült, kiszikkadt bordájúak, akik jajgatnak ölelés közben, hogy fáj az oldaluk, hátuk, csontjuk? Daninak iszonyú keserűség, az élet nagy keserűsége gyülemlett föl a lelkében" (Móricz, 144).

[57] Móricz, 21.

[58] Móricz, 37, 115-117, 162.

[59] Móricz, 72, 117-118, 127, 187.

[60] Móricz, 8-9.

[61] Móricz, 52, 57, 150-153.

[62] Móricz/Lewis, 104; original wording: "Szüksége van annak mindenre, mindenre s a sok minden közt ő reá is. De ő csak egy kis rész a nagy sokban! És ez rettenetesen elkeserítette …" (Móricz, 74).

[63] Móricz/Lewis, 213-214; original wording: "Erzsiéknél a foghoz vert krajcárok mentették meg egyik nemzedékről a másikra a kis vagyont, amelyet a falusi élet szűkös viszonyai között gyarapítani nem lehetett. S mikor Dani oly hihetetlenül ügyes pénzkováccsá lett, akinek az ölébe csak úgy dűltek az ezrek, mind a ketten kifordultak magukból, a férfi még türelmetlenebbül követelte a 'jóélést', a házat, az asszonyt, az életet az urak módja szerint …. Erzsi viszont érezte, hogy tovább már nincs rendjén az ő régi krajcároskodó életmódja és ha az ura olyan lett volna hozzá, mint amilyennek lennie kellett volna, meg is tette vón az átmenetet. De így ahelyett, hogy új életfelfogásra rendezkedett volna be, nem tudta, mi lesz tovább. Elvesztette a lába alól a talajt. Folyvást azzal izgatta magát, hogy éppen úgy útálja az ura pénzét, mint az életet …" (Móricz, 152).

[64] Móricz, 122, 145, 192, 197, 236, 240.

[65] Móricz, 79, 213.

[66] Móricz/Lewis, 295-296; original wording: "Lassan mégis rájöttek, hogy éppen a Turi Dani esetében kivételt lehet tenni, mert ezek a földek ki vannak véve az egész vagyontömegből. A grófnő erre megcsináltatta a szerződést, amely

szerint egyik birtokát, a Pallagot Turi Dani veszi meg készpénzért, a másikat a község egyetemlegesen …" (Móricz, 214).

[67] Móricz/Lewis, 122; original wording: "– Hát, Borcsa, téged sohasem ölelgetett meg az a Turi?

A lány ártatlanul nézett rá.

– Én nem hagynám magam.

– Ugyan!

– Én szegény lány vagyok.

– És?

– Engem ingyen nem lehet …

A grófnő rábámult, nem értette.

– Dani bácsi pedig nem fizet senkinek. Inkább neki fizetnek, – tette hozzá dicsekedve. – Az asszonyok meg a lányok mind mennek neki kapálni, meg mindent csinálni, csak egy csókot kapjanak tőle. Mert ő tőle nem kap ingyen csókot akárki.

– Hát téged azért nem ölel meg, mert nem tudsz neki mit fizetni.

A lány kedvetlenül rántotta meg a vállát.

– Én is tudok kapálni! Én is tudnék fizetni … Neki … de ő nem fizetne nekem! Hát maga azt nem tudja, hogyha az ilyen szegény lány, szép lány, akkor nem hálhat emberrel, csak ha jól megfizetik. Nekem szerencsét kell csinálni." (Móricz, 87)

[68] In Klaniczay, for example, we find the following: "Der Naturalismus zeigt sich hier in der Überbetonung der rohen körperlichen Leidenschaften, …" (p. 380). See also Czine, 56-57.

[69] Móricz/Lewis, 33; original wording: "Káposztát ültetett Dani a Tiszaparton. Éppen abba a földbe, ahol első esztendőn olyan szép volt a repce. Kellett is, hogy olyan jól volt az asszonynéppel. Senki más azt a rengeteg földet meg nem bírta volna munkáltatni rajta kívül. De ő még a faluvégi cigányasszonyokat is sorra csókolta, csak menjen neki napszámba káposztakapálni" (Móricz, 24).

[70] Móricz/Lewis, 34; original wording: "Egy falu asszonynépe volt a vazallusa, a munkás-cselédje" (p. 24).

[71] Móricz/Lewis, 123; original wording: "Zavarosan érteni kezdte a nyilt vásárt, ahol a szép lányok is, a szép férfiak is tisztán és nyersen kamatoztatják a szépségüket" (Móricz, 88).

[72] Móricz/Lewis, 90; original wording: "Vetettem szemet valakire öt esztendő alatt? Mit csináltál te énvelem, ha más embert tartanék magamnak? …

– Megfojtanálak! – gondolta magában vad dühvel a férfi s nem szólt, csak ökölbe szorult a keze.

Az asszony sóhajtott.

– De te! Te mit teszel nekem?! Ugyi sose vagy velem? Nem állhatsz bennünket! Oszt hogy vagy te az egész világ asszonyával? Osztán ne sírjak én reggeltül estig?" (Móricz, 65).

[73] Móricz/Lewis, 17; original wording: "nekem nem kell piszkopénz.
– Milyen piszok?
– Bhhh, amiért osztoni kell – rajtad!" (Móricz, 13).

[74] Móricz, 36, 59-60.

[75] Móricz, 36-37, 195-198.

[76] Móricz/Lewis, 270; original wording: "Fí, sírni jössz a kötőm mellé, panaszkodni, hogy az uram, ember létére kedvesebb a jányoknál, mint egy ilyen vén legény" (Móricz, 195).

[77] Móricz, 135.

[78] Móricz/Lewis, 18; original wording: "Az egész világot ide akarom hordani a kötődbe; még a mai napig egy bokor kendőt se adtam más asszonyszemélynek rajtad kívül. Mit sajnálsz? … Mi közöd hozzá, hogy csinálom a magam seftyét, csak sikerüljön" (Móricz, 14).

[79] Móricz, 61.

[80] Móricz, 138.

[81] Móricz/Lewis, 196; original wording: "… a lelkében egész fölindulás reszketett. Nagy akarások és fölgerjedt érzések háborogtak benne; restellte magát s a szívét szorította valami megalázottság; érezte férfiatlánság s jóvá akarta tenni" (Móricz, 139-140).

[82] Móricz/Lewis, 197; original wording: "… hogy ez a Turi Dani egészen más ember, mint az, aki reggel kihajtott a mezőre" (Móricz, 140).

[83] Móricz/Lewis, 112; original wording: "… aki mint büszke kakas uralkodik az életnek e trágyás, soktyúkú szemétdombján" (Móricz, 79).

[84] Móricz/Lewis, 112; original wording: "Beleszédítették a hallgató asszonyt a kis falu bűzös világába. A lányon át szétsugárzott körülötte az állatok, a lovak, a tyúkok, a galambducok, a fürdetlen parasztasszonyok nyers és tartózkodás nélküli párzásainak szaga …" (Móricz, 79).

[85] Móricz, 128.

[86] Móricz/Lewis, 65; original wording: "… elnézte az asszonyt, meg az urát, amint puhán, könnyedén átöltelték egymást. Olyan könnyű mozdulattal pihent az asszony fehér keze az ura vállán, mintha egy fehér rózsa esett volna oda. S olyan lágyan lehelt rá a vöröses bajszú, húsos arcú férfi egy kis csókot arra a kézre, mintha nem is érintette volna. És mikor épp ilyen könnyedén, lepkeszárny módra csókolták meg egymást, Dani tisztán megérezte, mi az az elérhetetlen valami, ami hiányzik az ő asszonyaiból, az ő szeretkezéseiből …" (Móricz, 46).

[87] Móricz/Lewis, 151-152; original wording: "És Dani átkapta félkarral, vad kegyetlenül átölelte, levágta a kéve búzára. Csókkal, mindkettőjüknek irtózatosan kéjes csókkal törte agyon." "A lány ott hevert a földön." "Vissza sem nézett, oda sem pillantott a lányra, aki ott feküdt rendetlen ruhával a kévén, mint egy szétmállott élet" (Móricz, 107-108).

[88] Móricz/Lewis, 153; original wording: "Be lágyan, be puhán, be máskép tudná, mint ahogy asszonyt szokott ölelni. Olyan érezhetetlenül, alig birizgelné a színét, olyan könnyen, alig emelintené meg a súlyát" (Móricz, 108).

[89] Móricz, 215.

[90] Móricz/Lewis, 112; original wording: "Érezte, hogy életében most először forrt föl benne az a vad, érzéki, oktalan és céltalan buja gerjedelem, amely elfogja és megrázza az emberi testet és sarkaiból kiveti a lelket. És néha szinte megrémült már attól, mi lesz, ha csakugyan hatalma alá kerül a paraszt díszménnek, akikhez mint valami földön járó istenhez búgnak és nyihognak és táncolnak ezek a buja sárló kancá" (Móricz, 79).

[91] Móricz/Lewis, 301; original wording: "a részletek helyett rögtöni fizetésről szólt az írás." "Kap ő pénzt arra a birtokra még ma!" (Móricz, 218).

[92] Móricz, 89, 134.

[93] Móricz/Lewis, 297; original wording: "És nevetve, összeszorított foggal, buján, cudarul mondta ki a paraszt Don Juan gúnynevét és látja azt a különös becstelen lányt, aki maga is meredt nyihogással s durva bájjal mondta ki" (Móricz, 215).

[94] Móricz/Lewis, 124; original wording: "aki élő ember azt kimondja, azt megölné Turi Dani" (Móricz, 88).

[95] Móricz/Lewis, 300; original wording: "Hideg lett a pillantása s gúnyisan nézett az emberre …" (Móricz, 216); "A grófnőt bosszantotta a paraszt parasztsága" (p. 217).

[96] Móricz/Lewis, 301; original wording: "Azon hökkent meg, hogy a vételár felényire volt szabva, mint amit ő ajánlott, viszont a részletek helyett rögtöni fizetésről szólt az írás" (Móricz, 218).

[97] Móricz/Lewis, 35; original wording: "nem bízott benne, hogy ezektől pénzt kap" (Móricz, 25).

[98] In the following I take issue with Péter Nagy's statement in "How Modern Was Zsigmond Móricz" (p. 31) concerning Dani Turi: "Out to conquer the world, he thinks of seducing the countess and succeeds, only to be humiliated by the count whom he then kills." Count László's humiliation of Dani is nothing when compared with that to which he is subjected by Helene. The connection between Bora's statement that Dani Turi would kill anyone who calls him by his insulting nickname and the Countess's arousal-inducing use of this same nickname within earshot of him provides certain indication that the chain of events including Dani's murder of the Count, as well as of the man who made up the nickname in the first place, Gyuri Takács, begins when he first hears Helene's deeply insulting use of it.

[99] Móricz/Lewis, 296; original wording: "Sohasem gondolta volna, hogy ő is megfizesse a paraszt Don Juant, akit meg szoktak fizetni az asszonyok" (Móricz, 214).

[100] Móricz/Lewis, 302; original wording: "Fölvette a tollat, tintába mártotta és sietve odaírta a szerződés végére, a Turi Dániel gyatra, nevetséges betűi alá, hogy: 'Az egész összeget átvettem.' És a nevét." "… megértette, mit szánt neki, mit várt tőle a nőstény" (Móricz, 218).

[101] Móricz, 220-222.

[102] Móricz/Lewis, 311; original wording: "– Mit akarsz itt?" (Móricz, 224), "– Mars!" (p. 225).

Hungarian Studies Review, Vol. XLII, Nos. 1-2 (Spring-Fall, 2015)

Éva Heyman, the Hungarian Anne Frank: Writing Against Persecution and Trauma

Agatha Schwartz

2015 marks an important anniversary: 70 years since the end of World War II and its darkest chapter, the Holocaust. Numerous memoirs and other testimonies about the Holocaust have been published to date and continue to be published. However, as Louise Vasvári has pointed out, there is a "relative lack of Holocaust texts published in Central and Eastern Europe proper, including scholarship." Vasvári sees one major reason for this in the fact that "in postwar communist countries, anti-Semitism continues today."[1] Vasvári considers women's Holocaust writing a category in itself; and yet another category are adolescents some of whom survived the Holocaust and published their diaries or memoirs either immediately after World War II or much later.[2] Anne Frank and Éva Heyman belong to those adolescents whose diaries did survive but who themselves were victims of the Holocaust.[3] Their names became known posthumously for their testimonies that were published by a surviving parent — in Anne's case her father, in Éva's case her mother. The name of Anne Frank is familiar to most people; her diary has become a signature piece of Holocaust literature and translated into numerous languages. It is not only a testimony about life for persecuted Jews under the Nazi regime but also a symbol of a bright adolescent girl's refusal to succumb to despair and darkness. Fewer readers will be familiar with the diary of another teenage Holocaust victim who, like Anne Frank, began her diary on her thirteenth birthday and who also wrote about her observations, feelings and thoughts before being brutally pushed into a cattle wagon and transported to Auschwitz where she would be murdered a few months later. The Hungarian Éva Heyman has rightly been called the "Anne Frank from Northern Transylvania."[4] Yet unlike Anne Frank, whose diary encompasses the period between the summer of 1942 and 1944, Éva Heyman barely had a few months to fill the pages of her little notebook.

To date, Éva Heyman's diary has been published under different titles in several languages; first in 1948 in the Hungarian original under her

mother's, Ágnes Zsolt's name as *Éva lányom* (My daughter Éva) and re-published under the same title only recently, in 2011. The form of the published diary is that of an embedded narrative, introduced by Ágnes Zsolt's preface and followed by two letters addressed to the mother after the war, one by Mariska, the family's former cook, the other one by Juszti, the former nanny. These frame narratives explain the context in which Éva wrote her diary and also provide information about her, her family's and her diary's destiny following the deportation. The English translation bears the title *The Diary of Éva Heyman,* published initially in 1974 and based on the 1964 Hebrew translation *Yomanah shel Evah Hayman*. In Romanian, the title is *Jurnalul lui Éva Heyman* (1991), with the subtitle "*Am trăit atît de puțin*" (I have lived so little), which is a quote from the diary. The German version relied on one of the important episodes described in the diary by opting for the title *Das rote Fahrrad* (The red bicycle, 2012). Finally, in French it was rendered, using the same quote as the Romanian translation's subtitle, as *J'ai vécu si peu: Journal du ghetto d'Oradea* (I have lived so little: Diary from the Nagyvárad ghetto, 2013).

Éva's diary, written in Nagyvárad/Oradea/Großwardein[5] encompasses the period from February 13 (her thirteenth birthday) to May 30, 1944, thus about three and a half months. The last part of the diary was written in the Nagyvárad ghetto where Éva and her family were forced to move shortly before they were deported. According to the preface written by Ágnes Zsolt, it was the family's loyal former cook Mariska Szabó who had kept Éva's diary handed to her by Éva herself the night before the family's deportation. Mariska kept it only to give it to Éva's mother who, along with her husband Béla Zsolt, survived the war. Unlike Anne Frank, who had to live in hiding for two years and could thus experience the immediate effects of the war and the persecution of the Jewish people mostly indirectly before their hiding place would be betrayed, Éva Heyman reports on the day-to day changes that affect her, her family's and their friends' lives at a dramatic pace. Thus she describes several traumatizing events, most notably her best friend Márta's sudden deportation, back in 1941, in the middle of an afternoon tea party. This event marks Éva profoundly to the point that she mentions it twice already in her first diary entry. I will argue that writing becomes a coping strategy and a form of healing for Éva for the brief yet extremely daunting period that her diary encompasses, her way of dealing with the trauma and with the constant danger and fear around her. I agree with Cornelius Hell that "dealing with what is happening to her and the people around her becomes the motor of a fast-track path to adulthood which only allows for occasi-

onal remnants of a child's fantasy world."[6] Thus Éva, despite her young age, seems to be the one who handles the increasingly difficult situation, the ever-increasing narrowing down of her and her family's living space and the moving to the ghetto the best. Along with her unabated desire to live, writing the diary gives her the much needed support and hope. It offers the reader insights into an adolescent girl's "feelings, desires and experiences."[7] But most importantly, the diary gives the reader a sense of how this adolescent girl managed to create for herself the narrative tools to analyze what is happening around her and to take a critical stance not only toward the perpetrators who destroy her, her family's and other Jewish people's lives, but also toward members of her family.

The authenticity debate

It is important to address the authenticity debate surrounding this diary. The authenticity of Éva Heyman's diary has been contested to the point that Gergely Kunt proposes to read it as a text that was not only edited (a point on which most critics agree), but even authored by Éva's mother. According to Kunt, Ágnes Zsolt, unable not only to save her only child but even to offer her a proper funeral, "wrote this book as part of the mourning-process" by taking a "child's point of view in the narrative."[8] One major problem is that the original of the diary is missing.[9] It is not unlikely that Ágnes, who had a literary inclination, or even her writer husband Béla Zsolt himself may have altered or even omitted parts in the published version of Éva's diary.[10] It remains an open question to what degree Éva's mother may have "censored" her daughter's notes and thus given the reader only a shorter version of the original text. But, these possible editorial interventions notwithstanding, Judah Marton, author of the introduction to the English translation, has no doubts regarding the diary's authenticity. He bases this judgment, on the one hand, on the fact that "in 1940 Jewish children in Europe were mature beyond their years"; on the other hand, he met and spoke to some surviving members of the Rácz (Ágnes Zsolt's) family in Israel as well as to a former classmate of Éva's: "all of them said that Éva was an extraordinarily intelligent girl. All agreed that the image of Éva that emerges from the diary precisely reflects the Éva they had known and that they had no reason to question the authenticity of any part of the diary."[11] This image of Éva is further confirmed by her stepfather, Béla Zsolt who in his Holocaust memoir *Kilenc koffer* (*Nine Suitcases*) describes her as a "child, with her small fairy apple face, her eager curiosity, her ambition, her vanity, her starry

eyes full of energy."[12] More recently, following the publication of the German translation, Cornelius Hell also argued in support of the diary's authenticity: "the micro-scenes written from the perspective of an adolescent girl exude an authenticity making it improbable that the mother would have tried to overcome her feelings of guilt by producing a fake. Moreover, it is unlikely that the critical representation of the mother would have come from the mother herself."[13] Based on these strong points in support of the authenticity of Éva Heyman's diary, in the following I will approach it as a text authored first and foremost by Éva herself.

However, I would like to add a general comment regarding the so-called veracity of any diary, autobiography or any other form of life writing.[14] As Roger Woods argues quoting Dagmar Günther, life writing has to be analyzed beyond the simple binary of fact and fiction and seen, rather, within the larger frame of "biographical constructions of meaning."[15] I will therefore read Éva Heyman's diary along the same lines as neither fact nor fiction but as a testimony about an extreme existential situation that was the Holocaust and for the effects that this extreme situation left on the factual and fictional Éva Heyman.

Éva Heyman's family

Éva Heyman was born in Oradea/Nagyvárad on February 13 (a Friday, as per the first page of the diary), 1931. Her mother, Ágnes (Ági) Rácz, was the only child of a prominent Jewish-Hungarian family. Ágnes's father, Dr. Rezső Rácz, was a reputable pharmacist (the Rácz pharmacy was on Várad's main street), whose father Dr. Sándor Rosenberg was the first neolog rabbi of Nagyvárad between 1868-1876.[16] While a student of pharmacy, Rezső Rosenberg changed the family name to Rácz. He was connected to progressive Hungarian intellectual circles and writers in Nagyvárad. Ágnes herself was also very educated and studied pharmacology in Kolozsvár. Ágnes's mother, née Kaufmann, was the daughter of a prosperous Arad family who owned vineyards. Éva's father, Béla Heyman, an architect, came from the well-known Heyman-Weiszlovits family. Ági and Béla Heyman divorced in 1935 (when Éva was only 4 years old), leaving their only child in the care of her maternal grandparents and the family's Austrian governess, Juszti (whom Éva often mentions in her diary with great affection). Ágnes later married the well-known and prolific Hungarian writer and left-wing journalist Béla Zsolt, took on her new husband's name and followed him to Budapest. It is important to mention that Béla Zsolt is the author of "one of the very first — and most important

— memoirs of the Holocaust ever written,"[17] *Nine Suitcases* (2004; *Kilenc koffer*).[18] In fact, Éva Heyman's and Béla Zsolt's respective narratives can be read as complementary accounts of the Hungarian Holocaust, told from two different perspectives,[19] but each offering another angle of the same episode: the deportation of the Nagyvárad Jews. Whereas Béla Zsolt's memoir mainly encompasses his and his wife's as well as his wife's family's (including Éva's) days in the Nagyvárad ghetto,[20] Éva's diary tells mostly about her and her family's pre-ghetto life and its rapid disintegration following the German occupation of Hungary in March 1944. In this paper, I will make only occasional references to Béla Zsolt's text so as to offer additional information about some important moments from Éva's diary.

While Béla and Ágnes Zsolt were smuggled out of the ghetto with false papers and with the help of friends, Éva, her father and her grandparents were deported to Auschwitz and murdered there. According to Ágnes Zsolt's preface, and based on information she had obtained from survivors, it was Mengele himself who, on October 17, 1944, pushed Éva (who had by then contracted scabies and had feet covered in wounds) onto the truck that carried his victims to the gas chamber. Éva was not to live to celebrate her fourteenth birthday. Her mother and stepfather left Hungary on Rezső Kasztner's train and survived.[21] Béla Zsolt died in 1949 following an illness and Ágnes Zsolt committed suicide in 1951 by slashing her wrists in front of a picture of her daughter.[22] However, before her death she made sure that her daughter's diary that had survived the horrors of the Holocaust, saw the light of the day in 1948. Éva's diary can thus be considered, along with her stepfather's memoir, one of the earliest published accounts of the Hungarian Holocaust.

The diary

Éva's journal[23] contains 38 entries in total, written over a period of three and a half months. The entries up to March 19, when she mentions the German occupation of Hungary, are usually several pages long. The entries between March 19 and the family's moving to the Nagyvárad ghetto on May 5 become shorter, which may partly be explained by the air raids that at times made it difficult for Éva to write. The entries written in the ghetto are initially quite long, but become shorter between May 17 and 30, the day before the deportation. The first entry, written on Éva's thirteenth birthday, introduces all the important people around her: her mother, her stepfather, her father, her maternal grandparents, her paternal

grandmother, as well as the nanny Juszti and the cook Mariska. From the first page, Éva's main preoccupations become apparent: her mother's prolonged absences because of Uncle Béla (as she calls her stepfather) and his imprisonment in Budapest. The fact that she only refers to her mother as Ági, never as mom, in itself reflects her problematic relationship with her mother, one that is full of doubt regarding her mother's love and commitment toward her, a feeling that in later entries becomes mixed with jealousy. The reader is introduced to the world of a young upper-middle class girl full of hope for the future and her ambition to become a photo journalist. Yet despite the surface of a certain normalcy that she conveys from a teenager's perspective (e.g. describing an abundance of birthday presents, among them a little golden chain that she puts around her neck with the key to her diary, her studying French, doing lots of sports and having plans for the future), it is clear that abnormal things have been happening. Already her desire to be an Aryan and to marry an Aryan Englishman speaks to the persecution of the Jewish people as does her mentioning of Uncle Béla's earlier internment in the Ukraine. It also becomes evident that Éva had had her diary for a while, but that she did not write in it either because she was still too young or because some events were too difficult for her to write about, as it will transpire later. She treats her diary like her best friend, promising it to write more about certain difficult topics and personifying it to the degree of concluding her first entry with the words: "You're probably tired, too, dear diary."[24]

Writing about and against trauma

The most difficult things that become almost unsayable for Éva can be considered as traumatizing events.[25] Tim Cole sees two such events in the diary: one is the deportation of Éva's friend Márta to "Poland," in Éva's words, the other a certain *vitéz* Szepesváry's repeated attempts to confiscate her grandfather's pharmacy.[26] Unlike Cole, I would not regard the latter as traumatizing; although Éva does keep mentioning it — which reflects her deep annoyance, her feeling of injustice and a certain fear and loss of security — it does not lead to such a deep, obsessive and painful "acting out" as does Márta's deportation.

In its original meaning, as Cathy Caruth reminds us, trauma signified "wound," i.e. a bodily injury. With the development of medical and psychiatric literature in the 19th century, and particularly following Freud, trauma begins to signify a wound inflicted on a person's mind, one that becomes latent and acts itself out through the unconscious, in night-

mares or repetitive actions.[27] Indeed, repetition is one of the most prevalent signs of trauma, although not the only one. Dominick LaCapra calls this compulsive going back to and re-enacting of the repressed traumatizing event in the Freudian sense "acting out." It can result in repetition of traumatic scenes and situations that often appear in dreams. In order to heal trauma, the compulsive "acting out" ideally has to yield to "working through." In "working through" there is an attempt to gain critical distance to an event and to distinguish between past, present and future,[28] something trauma victims often lose.[29] For Éva, writing her diary becomes, at least temporarily, such an act of healing, of "working through" as it gives her a sense of agency, something her community is gradually being stripped of, and it allows her to keep a sense of the present and her hope in the future. However, there are also moments of what can be called "acting out."[30]

As per the above definition, Márta's sudden disappearance definitely constitutes a traumatizing event for Éva. She manages to write about it in detail in her second diary entry from February 14. This episode continues to haunt her, which is confirmed in her mother's foreword: "Ever since her friend, Márta Münzer, was taken away in 1941 [...], Éva had changed in a rather peculiar manner [...] the grief she felt at Márta's destiny left deep, indelible traces upon her."[31] The way in which Éva describes this episode from three years back reflects the intertwining of the child's and the adults' perspective that she re-formulates in her own words, something we can see throughout the entire diary. She refers to Márta as a friend who was two years her senior and whom she admired for her talent as a dancer. She even compares her with Josephine Baker. In the middle of a happy afternoon, following a bicycle ride (on Éva's new red bicycle that will become an important player in a later episode) and the savouring of a delicious afternoon snack at Éva's place (chocolate and strawberries with whipped cream), Márta suddenly has to leave as the police had come to their house to pick up her parents. The child's naive explanation from her point of view that it must be because of Márta's speeding on her bicycle quickly dissipates as Éva overhears a conversation between Ági and Grandma, a conversation that brutally brings in the reality of the adult world: "the government was preparing to do something terrible, and Jews who weren't born in Hungary would be taken to Poland where a horrible fate was in store for them."[32] As it turns out, it was only Márta's father who had not been born in Hungary, but both she and her mother followed him on his last journey. What Éva did not know at the time but would

gradually find out, was that Márta's family's fate was shared by many other Jews living in Hungary. Jacob Boas notes:

> The so-called alien Jews, of which there were some thirty to thirty-five thousand, were told that they would be sent to "Poland," where they would live in the homes of Jews who had fled east. They were taken instead to newly-occupied Ukraine, to a place called Kamenets-Podolsk. But there were no homes waiting — only machine guns — and some twenty-three thousand (including local Jews) were shot: the first five-figure massacre in the Nazi's Final Solution program.[33]

However, Éva admits that she wouldn't have done what Márta did, i.e. follow her father. She will mention later (entry from April 19) that she would go "to any place in the world," even if that meant not seeing her family, only not to be "taken to Poland like Márta was."[34] And in her entry from April 20, she admits that, if given the same choice as Márta, "I would stay even without Papa and without Ági and without anybody at all, because I want to stay alive!"[35] Thus the trauma Márta's deportation has caused her seems to be abating somewhat, due to the "working through" writing brings for Éva; her desire to live and her hope for a future prevails.

However, in one of the last entries, from May 14, written already in the ghetto, Éva's way of dealing with this trauma changes in that she no longer thinks about Márta as she did particularly since the German occupation. Instead, she begins to have dreams, nightmares about her lost friend. Thus she falls back into the "acting out" of the initial trauma as it seems to become cemented in her unconscious:

> For instance, yesterday I dreamt that I was Márta and I stood in a big field, bigger than any I had ever seen, and then I realized that that field was Poland. There wasn't a sign of a human being anywhere, or of a bird, or of any other creature, and it was still, like that time we were waiting to be taken to the Ghetto. In my dream I was very frightened by the silence and I started running. Suddenly, that cross-eyed gendarme, who returned the cigarettes to Ági, grabbed me from behind by the neck, and put his pistol against my nape. The pistol felt very cold. I wanted to scream, but not a sound came out of my throat. I woke up and woke up Marica and told her what an awful dream I had had. Suddenly it occurred to me that that is the way poor Márta must have felt at the moment the Germans shot her to death! Marica asked me not to tell her about any more dreams like that; she had not told me what the adults were discussing one

> night when they thought the children were asleep. I was really asleep, but Marica had been awake.[36]

The return of the "acting out" of the trauma that had begun to heal can be explained by further traumatization that the increasing pace of persecution, the stripping away of her family's, their friends' and her own (as few as they may be) possessions and basic human rights entails. Following the Germans' arrival in Nagyvárad on March 25, Éva notes the day-to-day worsening of the Jews' situation: "Every day they keep issuing new laws against the Jews."[37] She writes about, among other things, having to wear the yellow star, send away their "Aryan" personnel (Mariska and Juszti), their belongings being taken away — including her camera — as well as the panic that befalls her family, in particular her mother and grandmother, and the wall that becomes erected between Jews and "Aryans" who won't even greet the Jews on the street anymore. But she also notes the decency of some rare "Aryans," mostly from the lower classes, such as Mariska who keeps coming back to their house secretly, feels ashamed about what is happening and continues to help the Rácz family.

The event that has the deepest impact on Éva in this period of re-traumatization leading up to their moving to the ghetto, is the loss of her red bicycle. This bicycle was not only the sole remaining connection to her lost friend Márta (with whom they rode their red bicycles on their last afternoon together), but a friend whom she named Friday (after Robinson Crusoe). Éva liked riding around on Friday, thus it was both a symbol of freedom, adventure and loyalty for her. And this symbol will be taken away on April 7 when the police confiscate her bicycle. Éva is so outraged at this blatant injustice of being stripped of her lawful property that she throws herself on the ground, holding the back wheel of her bicycle and shouting: "Shame on you for taking away a bicycle from a girl! That's robbery!"[38] Éva thus positions herself in opposition not only to the authorities but to the adult world in general in displaying agency and courage to rebel against injustice, which the adults of her family seem to lack. Her rebellious act provokes a twofold reaction: while one of the policemen shouts all sorts of nasty anti-Semitic insults back at her, much to Éva's shock who had never been told such things to the face before, the other policeman speaks up in her defence: "You should be ashamed of yourself, colleague, he said, is your heart made of stone? How can you speak that way to such a beautiful girl? Then he stroked my hair and promised to take good care of my bicycle. He gave me a receipt and told

me not to cry, because when the war was over I would get my bicycle back."[39]

The loss of her bicycle carries the elements of re-traumatization for Éva. It will be soon followed by other "terrible things" that Éva refers to only fleetingly making her at times lose her motivation for writing. Nevertheless, her notes continue and her diary becomes the main support she can rely on. Thus the "writing through" of her by now permanent traumatization remains her main tool to cope with the situation and it helps her, despite moments of despair, keep her desire to live and her faith in the future.

The desire to live and failed attempts to save Éva's life

What runs through the diary like a leitmotif is Éva's continued affirmation of her desire to live, against all trauma, loss and persecution. Éva repeatedly mentions this strong desire to live, particularly in the days following the German occupation. On March 25, day of the German troops' arrival in Várad, she writes that she wants to see the end of the war and that she will hide.[40] On March 26, she cries out: "But I don't want them to kill me! I want to be a newspaper photographer, and when I'm twenty-four[41] I'll marry an Aryan Englishman, or maybe even Pista Vadas."[42] Pista Vadas is a Jewish boy who is her first love and a few years her senior. The fact that Éva comes to the point of considering marrying a Jewish man may be interpreted as an acceptance of her Jewishness and of the collective fate of her people. The most heartrending entry is from March 28, when Éva writes: "I always cry when I read about someone dying.[43] I don't want to die, because I've hardly lived!"[44] And on March 29, a rather unusual cry to God as Éva doesn't otherwise mention God: "God, sweet God, don't let us die [...]. I so much want to live!"[45]

What makes Éva's story particularly tragic is that there were several possibilities for her to be saved. Although as mentioned above, the factual information provided in any diary cannot be taken at face value, most details of this part of Éva's story are also rendered and corroborated by Béla Zsolt in *Nine Suitcases*. One option was that Juszti take Éva to a farm owned by the Poroszlay family. While Mrs. Poroszlay was very much in favour of this solution, and Éva writes that she would have been happy to live in a stable and keep the sheep, "just so the Germans should not kill me with a gun as they killed Márta,"[46] Mr. Poroszlay, an anti-Semite, rejects this proposal. The second possibility to save her was taking her to Budapest, along with Ági and Uncle Béla, with false papers that a

cousin of Ági's brings along. However, Grandma's psychological condition is so bad by that point that the cousin returns to Budapest leaving everybody, including Éva, to their fate in Várad. The third and last possibility to save Éva was the family seamstress's, Mrs. Jakobi's offer (entry from April 19) to take Éva with her. Here Éva describes Grandma's reaction in detail as follows: "But Grandma said that she wouldn't allow it, because Mrs. Jakobi was an evil woman and she would sell me to men and then I would also be an evil woman."[47] Ági apologizes to Mrs. Jakobi explaining that her mother's mental state is very bad, on which Éva comments: "It looks like Ági is ashamed that Grandma is out of her mind, even though nobody can be blamed for it except that damned Hitler."[48] Through such comments, Éva describes the toll the persecution of the Jews took not only on people's physical but also mental and emotional well-being. Ultimately, however, she becomes the sacrificial lamb for the sake of keeping the family together, come what may. The diary offers no lament on Éva's part regarding this tragic development; but it could well be that her mother may have edited some parts out. Béla Zsolt gives a much more critical view about these failed attempts to save Éva's life, and he blames it very much on his mother-in-law and her obsessive insistence that the child may be harmed, sold, or ending up on the street if she let her go with the people who offered to help. Zsolt describes his mother-in-law's rejection of letting Éva go, even against Ági's heated argument with her, as a blackmailing strategy: "if the child had gone, the old people would have taken cyanide."[49] Faced with this situation, Ági is unable to choose between her daughter and her parents' well-being. Zsolt concludes with a bitter comment: "My mother-in-law had won: the child stayed."[50]

Life in the ghetto and deportation

Éva refers to what follows soon after "as if it really is a dream," which one can interpret as a manifestation of trauma, and she admits that she has "never been so afraid."[51] The family is forced to leave their home and move to the Nagyvárad ghetto on May 5. The policemen who come for them take away all jewellery, including Éva's little golden chain on which the key to her diary hangs. She replaces the golden chain with a velvet ribbon, politely asking the policeman: "Mr. Inspector, may I take a velvet ribbon along to the Ghetto?"[52] She thus demonstrates a certain presence of mind and acceptance of the situation, much unlike the adults around her. Éva describes in great detail their moving to the ghetto and their new quarters at the Rabbinical Residence that used to belong to her late uncle.

From there, Éva reports on their new living conditions that worsen with every day: the terrible crowdedness (over ten people per room) and further and further harassment "by the gendarmes who took everything away from us"[53] including their provisions. Éva's optimism is faltering at this point: "Every time I think: This is the end, things couldn't possibly be worse, and then I find out that it's always possible for everything to get worse, and even much much worse."[54] The beating and torture of people at the Dreher brewery to give away alleged hiding places of whatever valuables they may have left is one of such episodes.[55] Éva briefly reports what she hears the adults say, especially regarding what women are exposed to, and this time around, words fail her: "Things that I am incapable of putting into words, even though you know, dear diary, that I haven't kept any secrets from you till now."[56] Here the usually verbose Éva is faced with the limits of language when it comes to expressing liminal experiences in the world of an adolescent girl.

This narrowing down of what language can (or is supposed to) convey goes parallel to the spatial narrowing down of Éva's universe, similar to how Elie Wiesel, another Jewish adolescent from Transylvania who was only a few years older than Éva at the time of his deportation, later described his experience of the Holocaust: "The universe began shrinking, [...] [F]irst we were supposed to leave our towns and concentrate in the larger cities. Then the towns shrank to the ghetto, and the ghetto to a house, the house to a room, the room to a cattle car..."[57] When the Nagyvárad ghetto is divided into sectors to be deported one after the other, Éva writes a short note into her diary on May 29: "And so, dear diary, now the end of everything has really come."[58] But she refuses to give in to despair, and her last entry, from May 30, ends with the words:

> [D]ear diary, I don't want to die, I want to live even if it means that I'll be the only person here allowed to stay. I would wait for the end of the war in some cellar, or on the roof,[59] or in some secret cranny. I would even let the cross-eyed gendarme the one who took our flour away from us, kiss me, just as long as they didn't kill me, only that they should let me live.
>
> Now I see that friendly gendarme has let Mariska come in. I can't write anymore, dear diary, the tears run from my eyes, I'm hurrying over to Mariska...[60]

Here Éva Heyman's diary ends. The following day, Éva, her father and her grandparents were herded into a crowded cattle wagon that carried them away to Auschwitz. When Anne Frank and her family arrived in

Auschwitz on September 6, Éva was still alive. When Mengele sent Éva to the gas chamber on October 17, 1944 Anne was still alive in Auschwitz from where she and her sister would be deported at the end of October to Bergen-Belsen. Both Éva and Anne died while Germany and its allies were already losing the war. Their diaries live on as testimonies and as a warning for the present and the future, particularly as we commemorate 70 years of the Holocaust in a climate of rising anti-Semitism in many countries, including Hungary.

NOTES

[1] Louise O. Vasvári, "Introduction to and Bibliography of Central European Women's Holocaust Life Writing in English," in *Comparative Central European Holocaust Studies,* edited by Louise O. Vasvári and Steven Tötösy de Zepetnek (West Lafayette, Indiana: Purdue University Press, 2009), 175.

[2] See Vasvári's list in "Bibliography," 175.

[3] Jacob Boas in *We Were Witnesses: Five Diaries of Teenagers Who Died in the Holocaust* (New York: Square Fish, 1995), includes, in addition to Éva Heyman and Anne Frank, David Rubinowicz, Yitzak Rudashevski, and Moshe Flinker.

[4] Carol Iancu, "Préface," in Éva Heyman, *J'ai vécu si peu: Journal du ghetto d'Oradea,* (Geneva: Éditions des Syrtes, 2013), 8.

[5] On Northern Transylvania and in particular Nagyvárad, its history and significance for Jewish-Hungarian culture see Dr. Judah Marton, "Introduction," in *The Diary of Éva Heyman* (Jerusalem: Yad Vashem, 1974), 7-18; Randolph L. Braham, *The Holocaust in Hungary, Vol. I* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1981), 163-177; Carol Iancu, "Préface," in Heyman, *J'ai vécu si peu*, pp. 7-30. Northern Transylvania, which was one of the territories Hungary had lost with the Treaty of Trianon, was returned to Hungary with the Second Vienna Award in 1940. Thus Nagyvárad fell under Hungarian jurisdiction again after having been part of Romania for two decades. The events described in Éva Heyman's diary can thus be understood within the context of Hungary's role in World War II and the Hungarian Holocaust. As described by Balázs Ablonczy, in the years following the Second Vienna Award, a highly nationalistic image of Transylvania was promoted "in which Romanians, Jews and Saxons (Germans) did not exist" (Balázs Ablonczy, "Promoting Tourism: Hungarian Nation-Building Policies in Northern Transylvania, 1940-1944," in *Hungarian Studies Review* 36, 1-2 [2009], 56). According to Randolph L. Braham, following the re-acquisition of Northern Transylvania by Hungary, Nagyvárad became the town with the numerically largest Jewish population in the region. Braham quotes the number of 21,333 in 1941. This represented about 23% of the total population of the town (Braham, *The Holocaust*, 168).

[6] Cornelius Hell, "Das Tagebuch als Freundin," *Die Presse Online*, April 1 2013, accessed May 15 May 2014, http://DiePresse.com.

[7] Susanne zur Nieden, *Alltag im Ausnahmezustand: Frauentagebücher im zerstörten Deutschland 1943 bis 1945* (Berlin: Orlanda Frauenverlag, 1993), 27.

[8] Gergely Kunt, "Egy kamasznapló két olvasata" [Two readings of a teanager's diary] *Korall* 41 (2010), http://www.ceeol.com/aspx/issuedetails.aspx?issueid=db7d5801-a3fe-47d2-a8bd-4c58af93b85b&articleId=421b23d7-76bf-42e2-ac7b-8b6d5a8a34a1. Accessed 14 May 2014.

[9] Tim Cole, *Traces of the Holocaust: Journeying in and out of the Ghettos* (London: Continuum, 2011), 119.

[10] On this point, see Cole, *Traces of the Holocaust,* 127; Marton, "Introduction," 16-17.

[11] Marton, "Introduction," 17.

[12] Béla Zsolt, *Nine Suitcases,* transl. by Ladislaus Löb (London: Jonathan Cape, 2004), 232.

[13] Hell, "Das Tagebuch," http://DiePresse.com.

[14] On life writing, see Louise O. Vasvári "The Fragmented (Cultural) Body in Polcz's *Asszony a fronton* (A Woman on the Front), in *Comparative Hungarian Cultural Studies*, edited by Steven Tötösy de Zepetnek and Louise O. Vasvári (West Lafayette: Purdue University Press, 2011), 72-85; Suzette A. Henke, "Introduction," in *Shattered Subjects: Trauma and Testimony in Women's Life Writing* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1998), xi-xxii; Marlene Kadar, "Coming to Terms: Life Writing - from Genre to Critical Practice," in *Essays on Life Writing; From Genre to Critical Practice*, edited by Marlene Kadar (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1992), 3-16.

[15] See Dagmar Günther, "'And now for something completely different': Prolegomena zur Autobiographie als Quelle der Geschichtswissenschaft," in *Historische Zeitschrift* 272.1 (2001), 59, quoted in Roger Woods, "Introduction: The Purposes and Problems of German Life Writing in the Twentieth Century," in *German Life Writing in the Twentieth Century*, edited by Birgit Dahlke, Dennis Tate, and Roger Woods (Rochester, NY: Camden House, 2010), 6.

[16] Marton, "Introduction," 11-12.

[17] Ladislaus Löb, "Translator's Introduction," in Béla Zsolt, *Nine Suitcases,* translated by Ladislaus Löb (London: Jonathan Cape, 2004), ix.

[18] *Kilenc koffer* was published as a book only in 1980, but as a series in the weekly *Haladás* already in 1946-1947. Cole, *Traces of the Holocaust*, 119.

[19] See Cole, *Traces of the Holocaust,* 118-31.

[20] Zsolt writes his memoir as a masterful, philosophical yet gripping tale about torture, greed and sadism on the part of the Hungarian gendarmerie while offering flashbacks about his earlier experiences as a forced labourer in the Ukraine and the occasional memory of "normal" life before the Holocaust.

[21] On Rezső Kasztner and his controversial place in the rescue of about 1,600 Hungarian Jews see Eli Reichenthal, "The Kasztner Affair: A Reappraisal,"

in *The Auschwitz Reports and the Holocaust in Hungary*, edited by Randolph L. Braham and William J. vanden Heuvel (New York: Rosenthal Institute for Holocaust Studies, distributed by Columbia University Press, 2011), 211-253; Anna Porter offers a much more positive portrayal of Kasztner in *Kasztner's Train: The True Story of Rezső Kasztner, Unknown Hero of the Holocaust* (Vancouver: Douglas & McIntyre, 2008).

[22] Kunt, "Egy kamasznapló két olvasata." In 1989, director Krisztina Deák made a film based on Ágnes Zsolt's and Éva's story entitled *Eszterkönyv*.

[23] For my analysis I will be relying mainly on the English translation of Éva's diary while inserting occasional comparisons with the French translation.

[24] *The Diary of Éva Heyman*. Introduction and notes by Judah Marton, translated from Hebrew by Moshe M. Kohn (Jerusalem: Yad Vashem, 1974).

[25] See also Cole, *Traces of the Holocaust*, 123.

[26] In interwar Hungary, *vitéz* was a title offered by the Horthy regime to people for special merit and their loyalty to his right-wing politics. The fact that *vitéz* appears in italics in the diary can be interpreted as irony. In Hungarian, the traditional meaning of *vitéz* is that of a hero, a valiant and chivalrous fighter. The *vitéz* in Éva's diary is all but that: he is a cowardly thief who is only interested in stealing another man's lawfully acquired property.

[27] Cathy Caruth, *Unclaimed Experience: Trauma, Narrative, and History* (Baltimore, ML: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1996), 3 and 17.

[28] Dominick LaCapra, *Writing History, Writing Trauma* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2001), 141-143.

[29] Susan J. Brison, *Aftermath: Violence and the Remaking of the Self* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2002), 68.

[30] LaCapra also recognizes that for severely traumatized people, the "acting out" may be unavoidable.

[31] *The Diary,* 19.

[32] *The Diary*, 31.

[33] Jacob Boas, *We Are Witnesses: Five Diaries of Teenagers Who Died in the Holocaust* (New York: Henry Holt, 1995), 126-127. Braham offers a detailed account of the September 1941 massacres in Kamenets-Podolsk, which he locates in Eastern Galicia. He contends that the exact number of the victims cannot be established, and quotes the number of 23,600, of which an estimated 14,000 to 18,000 were from Hungary. Braham considers these massacres along with the massacres in the winter of 1942 in what was then Délvidék (where 3,309 Serbs, Jews, Russians [refugees of the Civil War in Russia] and even Hungarians were massacred), as a "prelude to the Holocaust in Hungary." Randolph L. Braham, *The Politics of Genocide: The Holocaust in Hungary, Volume 1* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1981), 199; 199-207; 211.

[34] *The Diary*, 80.

[35] *The Diary*, 82.

[36] *The Diary*, 96.

[37] *The Diary*, 80.
[38] *The Diary*, 72.
[39] *The Diary*, 73.
[40] *The Diary*, 62.
[41] In the French translation, it is twenty-one.
[42] *The Diary*, 63.
[43] This is in reaction to her reading the famous novel for the young by Ferenc Molnár, *The Boys from Pál Street* (*A Pál utcai fiúk*), in which little Nemecsek dies at the end.
[44] *The Diary,* 65.
[45] *The Diary,* 66.
[46] *The Diary,* 64.
[47] *The Diary,* 79.
[48] *The Diary*, 80.
[49] Zsolt, *Nine Suitcases*, 232.
[50] Zsolt, *Nine Suitcases,* 233.
[51] *The Diary*, 83.
[52] *The Diary*, 85.
[53] *The Diary*, 91.
[54] *The Diary*, 91.
[55] Béla Zsolt describes at length the incredible torture methods used by the gendarmes and the horrid suffering people, both men and women, were subjected to, even if they didn't have anything to hide.
[56] *The Diary*, 97.
[57] Elie Wiesel, "Introduction," in *The Holocaust in Hungary: Forty Years Later,* edited by Randolph L. Braham and Béla Vágó (New York: Columbia UP, 1985), xv, quoted in Cole, *Traces of the Holocaust*, 3.
[58] *The Diary*, 103.
[59] In the French translation, it is "attic."
[60] *The Diary*, 104.

Works Cited

Ablonczy, Balázs. "Promoting Tourism: Hungarian Nation-Building Policies in Northern Transylvania, 1940-1944." In *Hungarian Studies Review* 36.1-2 (2009): 39-63.

Boas, Jacob. *We Are Witnesses: Five Diaries of Teenagers Who Died in the Holocaust.* New York: Henry Holt, 1995.

Braham, Randolph L. *The Politics of Genocide: The Holocaust in Hungary.* Vols. 1 and 2. New York: Columbia UP, 1981.

Brison, Susan J. *Aftermath: Violence and the Remaking of the Self.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2002.

Caruth, Cathy. *Unclaimed Experience: Trauma, Narrative, and History.* Baltimore, ML: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1996.

Cole, Tim. *Traces of the Holocaust: Journeying in and out of the Ghettos.* London: Continuum, 2011.

The Diary of Éva Heyman. Introduction and notes by Dr. Judah Marton, translated from Hebrew into English by Moshe M. Kohn. Jerusalem: Yad Vashem, 1974.

"The Diary of Eva Heyman. Introduction, translated by Susan Geroe," http://www.jewishgen.org/yizkor/oradea/oradea320.html. Accessed May 15, 2014.

Eszterkönyv. Dir. Krisztina Deák, with Eszter Nagy-Kálózy, András Bálint, Károly Eperjes, and Mari Törőcsik. Hungary, 1989.

Hell, Cornelius. "Das Tagebuch als Freundin," *Die Presse Online*, April 1 2013, http:// DiePresse.com. Accessed May 15 May 2014.

Henke, Suzette A. *Shattered Subjects: Trauma and Testimony in Women's Life Writing.* New York: St. Martin's Press, 1998.

Heyman, Éva. *J'ai vécu si peu: Journal du ghetto d'Oradea.* Translated by Jean-Léon Muller. Geneva: Éditions des Syrtes, 2013.

Iancu, Carol. "Préface." In Éva Heyman. *J'ai vécu si peu: Journal du ghetto d'Oradea.* 7-30. Geneva: Éditions des Syrtes, 2013.

Marlene Kadar, "Coming to Terms: Life Writing - from Genre to Critical Practice." In *Essays on Life Writing; From Genre to Critical Practice.* Ed. Marlene Kadar. 3-16. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1992.

Kunt, Gergely. "Egy kamasznapló két olvasata," *Korall* 41 (2010), http://www.ceeol.com/aspx/issuedetails.aspx?issueid=db7d5801-a3fe-47d2-a8bd-4c58af93b85b&articleId=421b23d7-76bf-42e2-ac7b-8b6d5a8a34a1. Acc'd. 14 May 2014.

LaCapra, Dominick. *Writing History, Writing Trauma.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2001.

Löb, Ladislaus. "Translator's Introduction." In Béla Zsolt, *Nine Suitcases.* Translated by Ladislaus Löb. London: Jonathan Cape, 2004. v-x.

Lustig, Oliver. *Jurnalul lui Éva Heyman. "Am trăit atît de puțin."* 1991.

Marton, Yehudah, ed. *Yomanah shel Evah Hayman*. Jerusalem: Yad Vashem, 1964.

Marton, Judah Dr. "Introduction." *The Diary of Éva Heyman.* Jerusalem: Yad Vashem, 1974. 7-18.

Porter, Anna. *Kasztner's Train: The True Story of Rezső Kasztner, Unknown Hero of the Holocaust.* Vancouver: Douglas & McIntyre, 2008.

Vasvári, Louise O. "Introduction to and Bibliography of Central European Women's Holocaust Life Writing in English." In *Comparative Central European Holocaust Studies,* edited by Louise O. Vasvári and Steven Tötösy de Zepetnek, 173-184. West Lafayette, Indiana: Purdue University Press, 2009.

———. "The Fragmented (Cultural) Body in Polcz's *Asszony a fronton*" (A Woman on the Front). In *Comparative Hungarian Cultural Studies.* Ed. Steven Tötösy de Zepetnek and Louise O. Vasvári. 72-85. West Lafayette, Indiana: Purdue University Press, 2011.

Wiesel, Elie. "Introduction." *The Holocaust in Hungary: Forty Years Later*. Ed. Randolph L. Braham and Béla Vágó. New York: Columbia UP, 1985. xv.

Woods, Roger. "Introduction: The Purposes and Problems of German Life Writing in the Twentieth Century." In *German Life Writing in the Twentieth Century*. Ed. Birgit Dahlke, Dennis Tate, and Roger Woods. 1-24. Rochester, NY: Camden House, 2010.

Zsolt, Ágnes. *Das rote Fahrrad.* Translated from Hungarian by Ernő Zeltner. Introduction by Ágnes Zsolt and postscript by Gábor Murányi. Wien: Nischen Verlag, 2012.

Zsolt, Béla. *Nine Suitcases.* Translated by Ladislaus Löb. London: Jonathan Cape, 2004.

Zur Nieden, Susanne. *Alltag im Ausnahmezustand: Frauentagebücher im zerstörten Deutschland 1943 bis 1945.* Berlin: Orlanda Frauenverlag, 1993.

Hungarian Studies Review, Vol. XLII, No. 1 (Spring-Fall, 2015)

Hungarian Scouting in Exile:
Frame Narratives and the Creation of a Diasporic Community

Katherine Magyarody

Mihály Vörösmarty's 1836 poem "*Szózat*," translated as "The Appeal," is described in the 1969 *Cserkészkönyv I* [*Hungarian Boy Scout Manual*] as Hungary's second national anthem. It begins:

Hazádnak rendületlenül,	[To your homeland, above all,
Légy híve, ó magyar,	Be faithful, oh Hungarian,
Bölcsőd az s majdan sírod is	It was your cradle and will be your grave
Mely ápol s eltakar.	Which nurtures and will bury you.
A nagy világon e kivűl	In the large world beyond,
Nincsen számodra hely;	There is no room for you;
Áldjon vagy verjen sors keze:	Whether fate's hand blesses or beats you,
Itt élned, halnod kell.	Here you must live and die.][1]

The *Hungarian Boy Scout Manual* was published in Garfield, New Jersey, far away from the land in which Vörösmarty insists it is a Hungarian's duty to stay. If the concept of cultural belonging is so rooted to the soil, how can one maintain a Hungarian identity abroad? If not the soil, then what replaces it as the constitutive aspect of Hungarian identity as interpreted by the Scouting movement in the Hungarian Diaspora? In this paper, I assess two shifts in the way the *Külföldi Magyar Cserkészszövetség* [Hungarian Scouting Association in Exteris {i.e. Exile} or KMCSSZ in this paper] preserves and promotes a diasporic cultural identity through the repetition and recreation of narratives of historical and mythical moments in *kerettörténetek* [frame narratives] used in its curriculums and through annual *Akadályversenyek* [Hungarian Scouting competitions] and *vezetőképző táborok* [leadership training camps] in the Sík Sándor Scout Park in upstate New York between 1998 and 2011. I also

suggest that there has been a shift in the way these frame narratives were presented after the Second World War and in the post-communist era. Having been raised within Toronto's Hungarian community as a Scout, I had access to Scouting materials in private collections as well as to individuals willing to share their experiences with me for the purposes of this project.

Besides secondary scholarly sources on Baden-Powell's movement, I will be using and comparing three main types of information: first, official documents such as Scout handbooks, textbooks and annual historical publications used in preparation for and at youth leadership camps which reveal *what* the KMCSSZ wants to accomplish; second, camp schedules and storyboards used by leaders in planning and enacting frame narratives in order to show *how* the Association's objectives are translated into action, and third, interviews conducted by myself, documentaries and archival material such as letters and camp diaries which I have collected or have access to at the Toronto troop's location, which demonstrates *to what extent and to what effect* the objectives of the Association are fulfilled.

After laying out the theoretical background for my project, I begin with an introduction of the development of Baden-Powell's Scouting movement in Hungary and the way its focus turned towards ethnography and culture. Next, I illustrate the way the narrated beginnings of the KMCSSZ invokes myths of a nomadic Hungarian past in order to justify the participants' diasporic identity and how these myths have been fundamentally incorporated into the Scouting curriculum.[2] Subsequently, I analyse the official use of the frame narrative/*kerettörténet*, during the annual *Akadályverseny* in which the children's Scouting skills and cultural knowledge are tested during the re-enactment of a literary work, a historical event or a myth.[3] Within the context of an overall fun event, leaders attempt to impress upon the Scouts the weight of history by making it "real."[4] Although the *Akadályverseny* seemed to promote a historic-nationalistic perspective in the past, I also consider the ways frame narratives/*kerettörténetek* can be used to challenge these perspectives and the way building self-consciousness about frame narratives/*kerettörténetek* is built into the structure of the patrol leadership training camps. Lastly, I briefly look at the KMCSSZ's renegotiation of Hungarian identity throughout the duration of the organization's history and the reflection of this change in the narratives it uses, signalling a break from the more essentialist mind set with which it had started and its turn to a more flexible conception of Hungarian identity that reaches across the borders of the homeland.

Why Scouting? Why Narrative?

Scouting offers an important combination of experiences necessary for the formation of a diasporic community. James Clifford, the prominent cultural theorist and historian, suggests that after three generations, immigrants to the USA metamorphose into "ethnic Americans," (and we can replace American with Canadian, Argentine, German, and any other nationality Hungarian Scouts possess) unless they "resist erasure through the normalizing processes of forgetting, assimilating, and distancing."[5] Diasporic theorist Martin Sökefeld suggests that assimilation-prone immigrants might maintain their identity through engaging "in collective action" and taking part in "associations that create and sustain discourses of community."[6] Scholars conducting field-work on disporic communities generally concur that the maintenance of a community's culture in subsequent generations faces challenges. In Toronto, education researcher Roma Chumak-Horbatsch found that children in Ukrainian schools felt resentful about their cultural isolation, while language teacher Hong Xiao found that weekend language schools were ineffective at culture maintenance because of the limited hours of instruction they offer. However, another language researcher Martin Guardado argued that voluntary, intergenerational cultural activities such as scouting were beneficial to culture maintenance in a diasporic community.

A voluntary heritage language scout troop program in Vancouver, Guardado noted, provided children with an engaging activity that also emphasized their "Spanish language and literacy practices" and "cultural ideologies and practices."[7] In this diasporic Scouting situation, Spanish became a way to resist a hegemonic Anglophone identity and also to foster a community by connecting "*newcomers* and *old-timers*" and building bonds between Spanish speaking children and their parents.[8] In relation to a specifically Hungarian context, Endre Szentkirályi's study of language proficiency and cultural contexts for language use in Cleveland, Ohio, and Katalin Pintz's study of Hungarian heritage maintenance in New Brunswick, New Jersey, both specifically identify Hungarian Scouting as an important venue for community building.[9] Although these three studies spend valuable time assessing the nexus between friendship and language use in the community, they do not focus on what activities are used to socialize children into cultural values, or how those cultural values are defined.[10] One of the most flexible and pervasive vehicles for communi-

cating ideas of "Hungarianness" within the KMCSSZ is the frame narrative or *kerettörténet*.

The narratives constitute an important aspect for understanding Hungarian and diasporic identity formation. In his essay on literary contexts, the noted author Milan Kundera invokes Kafka's words to assert that "a small nation … has great respect for its writers because they provide it with pride 'in the face of the hostile surrounding world'; for a small nation, literature is 'less a matter of literary history' than 'a matter of the people' … 'nothing less than a life-or-death decree.'"[11] Thus, literature and literary practices comprise an essential factor in the creation of a culture. In addition to literature, the narrative framing of historical events and the shaping of folk customs is integral to perceptions of what culture is and how an individual identifies as part of a national/ethnic/cultural group. Canadian philosopher Will Kymlicka maintains that when a group of individuals leave their home for a country where they are "free to try to maintain whatever part of their ethnic heritage or identity they wish," the maintenance of that heritage depends upon a retained consciousness of a literature, a history and the traditions of their culture of origin.[12] In his search for diasporic identity, diasporic and literary theorist Radhakrishnan warns against simplified concepts of "authenticity" in which ambiguities and political controversies are suppressed.[13] Narratives within a diasporic context become contentious because of the particular types of cultural knowledge that are passed on. Radhakrishnan also distinguishes between possessing information and experiential knowledge, a boundary which may be blurred in the attempt to create a cultural consciousness.[14] A narrative might be known, but cultural authenticity relies on possessing that narrative through experience.

Frame narratives have been recognized within the Scouting Movement as pedagogically significant since Baden-Powell's original *Scouting for Boys* in 1908. The original frame narrative of Baden-Powell's text was also, in a sense, diasporic. Rudyard Kipling's *Kim* is about an Irish boy born in India who spies within the global network of Britons who constitute the British Empire. The Scouting founder Baden-Powell saw that by taking on characters and acting out situations, children would be more invested in learning survival skills.[15] The point of a frame narrative is to create a story wherein the child's experiences congeal into a series of related events. When the story is based on historical events, by enacting those events, the history becomes part of the child's "real" life.[16] Within the KMCSSZ, collective reading and acting out of literature and history blurs the boundary between the possession of information about a culture

and experiential knowledge in the attempt to create an "authentic" cultural consciousness.[17] Both the way the KMCSSZ creates experiential knowledge of narratives and has changed the narratives it tells is an important indicator of how it creates and maintains a diasporic community. Before delving into the frame narratives within a diasporic context, however, it is necessary to understand the history of narrative orientation in Hungarian Scouting before 1948 and its relationship to the KMCSSZ.

Scouting in Hungary: How Hungarian Culture became the Focus

The Scouting movement has historically oscillated between the poles of nationalism and internationalism. The Scouting movement was established by Lord Robert Baden-Powell in England in 1907-1908 for the purpose of fostering the future of the British Empire. Despite Scouting's imperial and specifically British origins, the movement spread rapidly across Europe, causing Baden-Powell to turn from endorsing a specifically British identity to accepting a benign national pride in general.[18] In Hungary, then part of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, Magyar Cserkészet had come about as a movement by 1910 — and became an official organization in 1912.[19] The Hungarian Boy Scouts' strong performance at the third World Scouting Jamboree lead to the country's selection to host the fourth Jamboree at Gödöllő in 1933.[20] This event was strongly promoted by the Hungarian government as an opportunity for country to rebuild its national pride which had been bruised after the First World War.[21] Although Scouts followed the original British Kipling narratives in their weekly activities, the Jamboree's mascot derived from Hungarian mythology. The white stag, or *csodaszarvas,* which led the legendary twins Hunor and Magor towards a new homeland, was now presented as a symbol for Scouting. In Baden-Powell's farewell speech, he imbued the national emblem of the white stag with international Scouting virtues:

> The Hungarian hunters of old pursued the miraculous Stag, not because they expected to kill it, but because it led them on in the joy of the chase to new trails and fresh adventures, and so to capture happiness. You may look on that White Stag as the pure spirit of Scouting, springing forward and upward, ever leading you onward and upward .[22]

The connection Baden-Powell had made stuck in the minds of the young Hungarian Scouts. The stag returned as the symbol of the Hungarian

Scouting movement in exile and was officially accepted as the movement's emblem when it came about in West German displaced persons camps in 1945. However, there were other significant ideological changes to be made before the Hungarian Scouting Association in Exteris was officially established.

The success of the Gödöllő Jamboree made Hungarian Scouts possible symbols of the nation's future, similar to Baden-Powell's initial intentions for Scouting in Britain. However, the question remained as to what this nation's future should be. Hungary's head-of-state, Regent Miklós Horthy, recognized the potential that Scouting held for the country and favoured turning the Scouts into a paramilitary youth organization.[23] Against Horthy's wishes, in 1940, the Chief Scout of Hungary Pál Teleki, who happened to be the country's Prime Minister, publicly pronounced the Association's neutral status. Furthermore, Teleki strove to keep Scouting separate from the already existing government-sponsored paramilitary Levente youth group, which had been set up in 1921.[24] In 1939 an act of the Hungarian Parliament declared Levente service for boys between twelve and twenty-one to be mandatory. The following year the Levente adopted many aspects of the Scouting curriculum, thereby increasing the pressure on Hungary's Scouting Association to become part of the Levente movement.[25] The Association itself was split between those attracted to Scouting for its spirituality-based character education and those who were enticed by its military training potential.[26] In September of 1940 Teleki invited the leaders of the Scouting Association to his lodge on Ábrahám-hegy [Mount Abraham], where they rewrote the Scouting curriculum.[27] Based partially on Teleki's background as a geographer and ethnographer — and an increased public interest in the 1930s in *falucserkészet* [village scouting] — the curriculum was refocused from such para-military exercises as games of surveillance to activities emphasizing religious and cultural traditions.[28] *Regőlés*, that is, "Hungarian folklore, traditions, folk music, song, and dance," became the main focus of the Hungarian Scouting's programme.[29] While political science scholar László Kürti objects to the concept of "*regőscserkészet*," or folkloric scouts, as nationalistic essentialism, in the wider political and social context the focus on the diverse regional folk arts rather than military training indicates Hungarian Scouting's resistance to the increasingly constrictive political situation .[30]

A Hungarian scouting motto "Emberebb ember, magyarabb magyar" [More humane humans, more Hungarian Hungarians] calls for balance between the maintenance of a particular cultural identity and the development of broadly humanist principles. The extent to which broad

humanist principles could be maintained in an increasingly tense political situation came under contention during the December 1940 Conference of the Hungarian Boy Scout Association when the suggestion was raised to strike the Fourth Hungarian Scout Law, namely that "A Scout regards every other Scout as his brother."[31] In a country interested in gaining back territory lost after the First World War, such a policy of transnational friendship threatened the effectiveness of the national martial endeavour. Teleki, in his position as Chief Scout of Hungary, defended the law and kept it in place. Nevertheless many changes to Hungarian Scouting that took place under his watch, first as Minister of Culture and Education and then as Prime Minister, can be seen as violations of the basic fraternal principles of Scouting. Historian Paul Lendvai calls Teleki "a convinced, but 'moderate' anti-Semite" who helped to introduce discriminatory laws that stand in sharp contrast to his work at the Gödöllő Jamboree and the non-militaristic nature of *regölés*.[32] Despite the large number of Jewish Scouts and scouts of part-Jewish parentage in Hungary's Scouting movement, and the protest of Jewish Scout masters, in 1940 Teleki allowed boys of Jewish extraction to be excluded.[33] It might be noted that what transpired in this respect under Teleki's watch in 1939-1940 was significantly less harmful than what occurred four years later after the German occupation of Hungary. What happened in 1944 came as the consequence of Hungary's involvement in the Second World War, an involvement that Teleki had resisted. In the spring of 1941, however, with Hitler's decision to invade Yugoslavia and his request to send German troops there through Hungary precipitated a crisis in the Hungarian regime's leadership. Teleki, finding that he was no longer able to maintain his country's neutrality in the war, committed suicide. With his death Hungarian Scouting lost a dedicated and influential friend.[34]

After Hungary's involvement in the war, on the ground level at least, changes in scouting policies were slow to be introduced. Scouting historian Ferenc Gergely noted that while in some troops the anti-Semitic measures were implemented, the leaders of other troops quietly refused to comply with the new regulations.[35] Information from one of my informants also supports the idea that after the spring of 1941 for a while there were little noticeable changes to Scouting practices. For the children, the curriculum remained much the same. The cub Scouts still followed the *Jungle Book*, and the older boys followed their curriculum based off of the story of the white stag, or continued with *regőlés*. My elderly informant, who had been involved in scouting since the early thirties, noted that it was only when he became a scout leader that he recognized the pressures upon

the organization. As an Assistant Scoutmaster, he and his peers became responsible for examining and training Levente youth leaders. Even so, he explained, the Scouts avoided the overt militarism of the Levente: "At that time, the Scouting training was accepted by the Levente as the same as their own — but we still used our own methods. We tried to teach them, not the soldier stuff, but how to be more human."[36] Eventually, as the Red Army began advancing into Hungary in the late summer of 1944, civilian activities became unsustainable and Scout leaders were drafted into the Hungary's wartime army. Many of them were captured and both they and captured Levente members were sent to POW camps in the Soviet Union — from where they returned only years later or never returned at all.

Scouting in the Displaced Persons Camps and the Wide World

At the end of the Second World War prospects for the revival of Scouting in Hungary were bleak. Still, the first reaction of Scout leaders and their troops to the conclusion of hostilities was to get out and clear rubble from the streets, aid the war's civilian victims, distribute food to the starving, and help with the harvest in the countryside.[37] Although the country did not become a communist dominated nation until 1948, a resurgent Communist Party, aided and abetted by an Allied Control Commission under the direction of its chairman, former Soviet Commissar of Defence Marshal Klimenty Voroshilov, established a rival youth organization, the *úttörők* [the Pioneers] in the fall of 1945.[38] In the two years following, the Pioneers received increasing political and financial support. By early 1948 the Communists had gained complete control of Hungary's government and in May of that year they ordered the absorption of what remained of the Scouting movement into the Pioneers. In September a decree declared the latter the "only democratic youth movement" and ordered the formation of units of the Pioneers in all of Hungary's elementary schools.[39] This decree brought a formal end to Scouting in the country; however, Hungarian Scouting by then had reappeared in the displaced persons camps of the Western Sectors of Germany. Its headquarters had already been established in 1947 in Pfarrkirchen in Bavaria. Former Scout leaders saw in the re-introduction of scouting activities a means of distracting the children, both male and female, from the difficulties of everyday life in the refugee camps.[40] As one of my informants explained, when they were camping, the fact that eight girls had one blanket between them and slept on pine needles in a tent borrowed from American soldiers, was a novelty rather than a hardship to be endured.[41]

Baden-Powell's Hungarian nomadic mythology reappeared in this context of displacement. In 1947, a select group of young men convened to consolidate the leadership of the fledgling movement.[42] This "*törzs,*" or tribe, named themselves the *Hontalan Sasok* or Homeless Eagles.[43] The narration of the Eagles' formation within Hungarian Scouting materials evokes the mythological moment of Hungary's birth in reverse. In myth, the princes of seven Hungarian nomadic tribes swore fealty to Prince Árpád when they entered a land that seemed very promising.[44] They convened, gathered their blood into a cup and drank a blood covenant, thus creating the Hungarian nation and divesting themselves of their tribal particularisms.[45] In an inverse enactment of this event, the leaders of the Hungarian Scouts in Exteris swore fealty to each other under the leadership of Gábor Bodnár and created their own "tribe," united in their goals despite the diverse destinations to which they would travel.[46] In 1947 the Eagle tribe declared its mission to the cultural lives of Hungarian youth growing up overseas through Scouting.[47] Thus, the Hungarian refugee identity began to resemble an ancient Hungarian nomadic mythology that predated Hungary, justifying their ability to remain Hungarian without remaining in their native land.

The connection between the fledgling KMCSSZ and the Hungarian Diaspora grew stronger when Bodnár immigrated to the United States in 1951. After settling in New Jersey, he set up a network of chosen leaders in Europe, the Americas and Australia, and retained various leadership positions in the organization until his death in 1996.[48] One of his primary goals was to provide whatever literature necessary to imbue the lives of Hungarian youth growing up overseas with Hungarian culture through Scouting, pronouncing to future Scoutmasters that "we will give the necessary and appropriate books into the hands of every Hungarian youth."[49] In this attempt to give every youth the chance at attaining cultural literacy, the focus of the KMCSSZ differed greatly from Scouting in pre-communist Hungary, which was an elitist movement. Bodnár published multiple Scouting guide books, leadership protocols and histories, rewriting the Scouting curriculum set forth at Ábrahámhegy for a diasporic context.[50]

Tellingly, the Hungarian Boy Scout manuals of 1969, 1970 and 1972 are infused with pre-settlement Hungarian mythology. The first story in the manual is that of the white stag, whose promise of a better place prompts its pursuers to follow it far from home.[51] Although the original legend talks about the conquest of a homeland, in the KMCSSZ retelling, the story focuses on skills needed during the journey rather than on

reaching the destination. A quotation from János Arany's nineteenth century epic poem Rege a csodaszarvasról [Tale of the miraculous stag] prefaces each camping skill, which is also explained in terms of essential nomadic know-how. For example, in the *Cserkészkönyv I* for the youngest age group, the section on archery begins with a stanza on Hunor and Magor's flashing arrows, followed by an explanation that "in our ancestors' time, they did not know guns. Their preferred weapon as the bow and arrow; this is what they used in their battles, with this they hunted and caught fish."[52] Thus, in its week to week activities, Scouting became a way to re-live an older version of Hungarianness.

Frame Narratives at the 2011 Scout Competition: More Hungarian Hungarians?

While in his Scout manuals Bodnár knit together scouting knowledge with history and literature, he did not overtly suggest the re-enactment of any historical events. Rather, subsequent generations of Scout leaders have elaborated upon the importance of enacting stories to teach skills. The concept of the frame narrative is formalized and taught in the camp for Assistant Scoutmasters, whose responsibilities include the planning of narrative-driven competitions. The *2006 Segédtiszt Emlékeztető* [*Assistant Scoutmaster's Guidebook*], a compilation of essential documents distributed to all Assistant Scoutmasters, explains that the frame narrative is "an IMPORTANT teaching tool" because it allows Hungarian culture to be passed on at the same time as teaching or testing other Scouting skills.[53] The frame narrative accomplishes this by providing a better atmosphere, making "dry," academic or boring material easier to teach and enacting history so it better sticks in the child's mind.[54] In theory, the frame narrative can be a "historical event, folklore, geography, etc," but it is important that it remain within the bounds of believability.[55] Thus frame narratives increase the effectiveness of the Scouting competitions and even the *vezetőképző táborok* [leadership training camps]. The point of a frame narrative, the *Assistant Scoutmaster's Guidebook* continues, is to create a story wherein the child's experiences congeal into a series of related events. When the story is based on historical events, by enacting those events, the history becomes part of the child's "real" life.[56] From Benkő's material it seems that the frame narrative is a mode by which to enact the "more Hungarian Hungarian" part of the Hungarian Scouting motto.

The frame narrative is thought to be of utmost importance to the *Akadályverseny* [Scouting competition], because the knowledge learned or

tested leaves a greater impression on the Scout in a memorable environment.[57] Each year, a text is selected and distributed to the troops. The children read and study the text concurrently with practicing scouting skills. When they arrive at the Sík Sándor Cserkészpark, they are expected to take on characters from the texts and go on a hike where they encounter scenes derived from the context of the frame narrative in which they must solve scouting problems.[58] The Scouts leave the relative safety of the camp for the unknown, where they are confronted with difficult challenges until they reach the climax of the trail and a test of their bravery through their encounter with the "enemy" whose identity shifts according to time period. Before 2000, the frame narratives were Hungarian literary texts: the fantastical *János Vitéz* [translated as *John the Valiant*]*, Egri csillagok* [translated as *Eclipse of the Cresent Moon*], and *A rab ember fiai* [*Sons of the Slave*]. After 2000, the frame narratives became historical: the life and deeds of Saint Stephen, the golden age of Transylvania, and the 1848-49 War for Independence. As in previous years these historical contexts were adapted to narratives of adventure meant to highlight the excitement and attractiveness of being Hungarian. It is important to note the contrasting tones of narrative between the authors of the general text and the interpretation of a particular frame narrative by the leaders actually enacting historical characters engaging with the children. In 2008, for example, the frame narrative was the 1848-49 War for Independence, a frame narrative that lends itself to representations of the highest flung patriotism. Instead of a patriotic interpretation on the event, the Scout leaders enacting the Austrian adversaries in one of the camps called themselves Gunther Von Trapp and General Schwarzenegger, prompting laughter from the children around them. The parody of Austrian identity derived from Hollywood stereotypes points to the thin line between the pathos and bathos of patriotism even within an allegedly patriotic framework. The sentimental victimization of Hungarians written into the storyline by older leaders easily becomes a parodic game between younger leaders and children.

The younger leaders' awareness of the constructed quality of the stories the Scouting community tells itself to maintain a central, diasporic identity opens up the possibility for creating new narratives. By 2010, those born around the demise of the Soviet Union grew into positions of planning the *Akadályverseny,* rather than participating in them. Around this time, a change is visible in the ways the frame narrative texts are interpreted for a new generation of Scouts. For example, the 2011 theme was "*Híres Magyar Feltalálók és Tudósok*" or "Famous Hungarian Inventors and Scientists" and the textbook contained a rather dry list of

biographies of people like Eötvös Loránd, Bíró László József, Telkes Mária and Teller Ede.[59] Throughout the year this text was translated into various science experiments conducted during weekly meetings.[60] At the same time Scout leaders expressed concern about the lack of narrative coherence in the material given to them. The inventors and scientists featured lived across three centuries and several continents. How could this chronological and geographical spread be adapted into an exciting, cohesive narrative suitable to a forest setting? How could the objectivity of science and pervasive nature of technology fit with a tradition of stories based on romantic adventure?

As a solution, the writers and organizers of the *Akadályverseny/* Scout competition chose to play with the chronologies and geographical limits of historically-defined nationality. On May 1, troop leaders received a forwarded email from "Rubik Ernő" to the director of the Eötvös Loránd Tudományegyetem announcing that his newly isolated element "*pannoannominium*" — the element that will power a time machine made possible by solving a Rubiks cube — has been stolen. Worse still, the thief, Doktor Nem [Doctor No, an obvious reference to the British James Bond franchise] is intent on rewriting history by stealing patents from all Hungarian inventors throughout time. He has already begun by rewriting the Wikipedia page on the "Doktor-Nem Kocka" [Doctor No Cube], a link to which was also provided.[61] In the competition, the scouts received a small vial of "*pannoannominium*" to travel through time portals — the forest — and help Hungarian inventors reclaim their inventions and to collect the scattered element. Having set history aright and gathered the *pannoannominum*, the climax of the event occurred at the campfire, when Ernő Rubik recognized that the concentrated "*pannoannominium*" was a hazard to humanity and blew it up with the help of Ede Teller in a magnificent mushroom-cloud.

The 2011competition's style of frame narrative presents a very different take on nationality and community. Rather than representing a specific group of people acting at a specific point in time in a way that represents heroism or patriotism, there are inventors living in very different contexts, whose lives are not defined by geographical borders and who are not limited to actions of national importance. The *pannoannominium*, whose name derives from the Roman Carpathian province of Pannonia, functions ironically as an elemental idea of Hungarian identity that can traverse time and space without changing. The need to physically possess *pannoannominium* in order to ensure the security of Hungarianness and the vulnerability exposed by Doktor Nem's theft points to the

weakness of such an idea. Indeed, that Teller — here lionized — left Hungary in the 1920s because of the Anti-Semitic Numerus Clausus Law points towards the danger of such a narrow definition. Despite the serious implications of *pannoannominum*, it is presented as ridiculous. Doktor Nem, who wishes to concentrate diffuse inventions through time into pure glory and honour is a parody of a Bond villain. What the frame narrative of the 2011 Akadályverseny presents is a new idea of cultural identity that reflects a North American post-Soviet relationship between the diasporic community and the home country. It has no enemy to define itself against and must relinquish the fantasy of a return to a glorified homeland.

More Humane Humans: Frame Narratives at Patrol Leadership Training Camp

Although the Scout competition emphasizes and experiments with the KMCSSZ concept of "more Hungarian Hungarians," frame narratives are also used to try to shape "more humane humans" in *örsvezetőképző tábórok* [patrol leadership training camp or ÖV for short]. In contrast to the *Akadályverseny*, the ÖV camps are meant to transition Scouts in their mid-teens from learning Scouting skills to becoming responsible leaders. Unlike the competition, in order to participate in the camp, Scouts aged over thirteen must pass exams based on a year-long curriculum in Hungarian literature, history and geography.[62] The requirements of patrol leadership training camp also require familiarity with the details of Ferenc Molnár's 1906 novel *A Pál utcai fiúk* [The Paul Street Boys] and must write an about group leadership in the text.[63] Unlike the competition frame narratives' playful submersion into adventure, *The Paul Street Boys* deliberately provokes a self-conscious investigation into the consequences of losing oneself in narrative.

The plot of *The Paul Street Boys* initially presents the mix of adventure and serious make-believe made familiar by the *Akadályverseny.* The titular group of school-age boys and their protection of the *grund*, the lumberyard they play in, against a rival gang, the nefarious Redshirts. Near the beginning of the novel, the leader of the Redshirts, Feri Áts, steals the Paul Street boys' flag from the *grund*, while his cronies challenge the boys to an all-out battle for possession of the lumberyard. The youngest member of the boys, Nemecsek, is blamed for negligence leading to the theft of the flag, and after much deliberation, the leader of the Boys, János Boka, puts Nemecsek on probation from the group. Nemecsek goes on a mission to

vindicate himself and retrieve the flag. At this point in the plot, the novel form complicates the moral absolutes of mock warfare.

While Molnár initially presents the Paul Street Boys as noble and the Redshirts as thuggish, he unsettles the reader's identification with the Paul Street Boys' childish interests by extending the plot beyond the stakes of the battle for the *grund*. Nemecsek, who catches pneumonia on his mission for the flag, sneaks out of his room to fight in the battle for the lumberyard. He collapses after sealing the victory and dies at home a few days later. While the gang's elected leader, Boka, rules his peers with a just hand throughout the novel, Nemecsek's illness causes him to reconsider his position. The post-battle chapters detail the growth of his consciousness from that of a boy amongst boys to that of a young adult. In the section of the novel dealing with Nemecsek's declining health, Boka's behaviour is characterized in the same manner as Nemecsek's impoverished parents. He is one of the three "adults" who keep the child in comfort. By comparison, the rest of the Paul Street boys are still children unable to think beyond their own interests; they visit Nemecsek in an attempt to absolve themselves of formerly rejecting him.[64] The novel has transitioned from childish adventure to an analysis of patriotic feeling and of the role of leadership.

Boka's example purposefully disturbs the binaries which have dominated the morally simple world which the Scouts have previously encountered. Nemecsek cannot live into adulthood precisely because his idealism and fire cannot survive past childhood. Boka's greatest error as a leader is to be too invested in the game he plays with the other boys, to mistake the stakes of a game with those of real life. Because he cannot distinguish between the two, one of his friends dies. Boka's example acts as a warning to patrol leaders always to be conscious of the boundaries between enthusiasm and zealotry, to be mindful of the artificial constructs of frame narratives in events like the competition. In his analysis of *The Paul Street Boys*, the literary critic Franco Moretti identifies the wisdom of the novel in its disavowal of blind patriotism. Rather than an automatic obligation, "collective ideals are no longer a duty to which one is called by the fanfare of the Fatherland's authorities, but a *choice*."[65] When the *grund* is slated for development, Boka does not mourn the loss of a kingdom, but feels relief that his dead friend's illusion of victory remained undisturbed.[66] Although literary disillusionment is often followed by a rejection of the standing social order, Boka's mental estrangement with his former peers strengthens his resolve to watch over them.[67] Just so, the camp's success depends upon the candidates' decision to engage with the frame

narrative and with Scouting material in self-conscious and deliberate fashion.

At the camp, the director plays Boka and his or her assisting leaders take on the roles of other Paul Street Boys.[68] All patrol leader candidates are assigned roles as probationary boys. "Boka" has the responsibility of teaching the lessons on being a good role model, dealing with conflict and with discipline, while his or her supporting leaders introduce the concept of lesson plans, methods to teach songs and crafts. While the frame narrative guides the details of camp life (the candidates play marbles, patrol for Redshirts and refer to the campground as the *grund*), Boka remains most important role in the camp. The use of "role" instead of "figure" is deliberate, because Boka's leadership characteristics are meant to pass from the camp-director and his or her leaders to the candidates themselves. Divided into patrols of four to six teenagers, the candidates rotate the role of Boka/patrol leader every day to experience responsibility for others than themselves. Several times over the course of the ten day camp, the candidates also practice their Boka persona by leading younger Scout patrols from a camp run within the same Scout Park in activities for an hour and a half each day.[69] While the original frame narrative followed one boy's maturation, the patrol leadership camp is designed to present responsibility as a conscious choice to facilitate younger children's desire for adventure while protecting them from the potential dangers of immersive play.

More Humane Humans and more Hyphenated Hungarians in a Changing World

The narratives used within Scouting reflect back into how this Hungarian diasporic community's understanding of cultural identity has evolved over the past sixty-five years. As Bodnár writes in his *A Magyar Cserkésztisztképzés Anyaga* [*Material for the Evaluation of Hungarian Scoutmasters*], as immigrants, the Hungarian Scouting community will inevitably absorb some characteristics of its host nation.[70] Similarly, in his 1969 *Hungarian Boy Scout Handbook*, he states that Hungarian Scouts have two tasks: "They will faithfully work for that country which accepted them, or in which they were born. But just as faithfully, they will also serve the Hungarian community, to which they are tied by culture, tradition and family."[71] In such statements, Bodnár places Hungarian Scouts in a position of hyphenated identity.[72] They cannot be only Hungarian, but to divest themselves of all cultural associations would be to divest themselves of the

family either with them or the family they left behind. In such circumstances an essentialist conception of Hungarianness is inadequate. Instead, Bodnár demands a commitment to Hungarian identity from his Scouts. Rather than chalking Hungarianness up to their social surroundings, he tells them: "*Te, Magyar cserkész, mondd ezt: Szolgálom a magyarságot, mert kötelességemnek tartom*" [You, Hungarian scout, say this: I serve the Hungarian community, because I hold it as my duty].[73] While duty suggests rather weighty connotations, the true core of the sentence, as in all sentences, lies in the verb. To say "*kötelességemnek tartom*" or "I *hold* it as my duty" makes cultural participation a voluntary duty, rather than a blood right or privilege.

This acknowledgement of a flexibility of cultural identity within Hungarian Scouting links to historically significant choices of identity. In his 1934 *History of Hungarian Literature,* Antal Szerb emphasized that one of Hungary's greatest poets and heroes of the seventeenth century, Count Miklós Zrinyi, was a Croat by birth, but chose to be Hungarian by writing in Hungarian and acting in their national political realm.[74] The same is true for Hungary's nineteenth century national poet, Sándor Petőfi, the son of Serbian immigrants who was baptized under the surname Petrovics. Thus, if nationality is "an attitude, a matter of choice," Hungarianness and participation in Hungarian Scouting cannot be exclusive.[75]

Such a conception of cultural identity, paired with immersion in cultures across four continents has opened up Hungarian Scouting to anyone who wishes to enact the version of Hungarianness promoted by the organization. As a result, there are Hungarian Scouts and indeed Hungarian Scout leaders and Scoutmasters who have Canadian (or even Irish-Canadian), American, Venezuelan, Brazilian, African-American, Polish, Japanese, German, Austrian and Russian backgrounds. In addition, while Hungarian Scouting has historically been a strongly Christian movement, though non-denominational, in recent years Scouts of Jewish and Muslim faith have entered its ranks, first as Scouts, then as leaders. It is possible to link new interpretations of Scouting frame narratives such as the 2011 *Akadályverseny/*Scout competition to both these changing demographics and to the rise of multicultural and transnational rhetoric.

Indeed, according to contemporary Hungarian Scouting practices, as long as a child speaks the language and wishes to participate, they are included. However, if a child is of "one hundred percent Hungarian heritage" but cannot speak the language, they are told to attend Hungarian language lessons and return when they are able to hold a conversation. Thus, while political scientist Safran identifies of "language, memory, and

religion as elements of collective identity and ingredients of cultural reproduction," it seems that within the Hungarian Scouting community, the language is of greatest importance.[76] Language offers a bond between diasporic Hungarian children convening from Spanish, Portuguese, French, German and English speaking countries, and through reading identical Hungarian Scouting manuals and frame narrative source books, they gain a common set of Hungarian cultural markers. By requiring all leaders to have a grasp of Hungarian literature, and to have pondered the ambiguities presented by Molnár's *Paul Street Boys*, the organization prompts its members to look beyond the nationalistic and dogmatic elements of a national literature and to develop a true appreciation for it, and through that appreciation, an affirmation of the worth of Hungarian culture. While Scouts learn to throw themselves into a story, as leaders, they have learned to take responsibility for others, to think of the others' safety before they think of their own. Like Boka, they must cast their childish illusions away, and to see life and narrative in all their complexity. Like him, they cannot linger in the space between. They cannot retreat into childhood but must step into adulthood where they must recognize identification as a game to be played wisely.

The recognized importance of creating and maintaining a community through narratives, might be best expressed in the words of Zoltán Kodály quoted in the curriculum for Hungarian Scoutmasters: "*Kultúrát nem lehet örökölni. Az elődök kultúrája egykettőre elpárolog, ha minden nemzedék újra meg nem szerzi magának*" [You cannot inherit culture. The culture of ancestors evaporates, if each generation does not acquire it for themselves].[77] Reading through the frame narratives of the KMCSSZ shows a Hungarian diaspora making and remaking its vision of community. Some stories it is determined to pass on, others it has slowly let go of. The old sex-segregated *Cserkészkönyvek* [*Scouting Handbooks*] have been replaced with a new unified curricula that lack frame narratives altogether, strengthening the power of the annual *Akadályverseny*/Scout competition text. Milan Kundera expresses the danger of a "nation's possessiveness towards its artists' works as a *small-contexts terrorism* that reduces the entire meaning of a work to the role it plays to its homeland," and a danger lurks in the creative potential of the Scout competition as it distributes roles to be interpreted by leaders from many cities and many opinions.[78] This continuous reconsideration and presentation of Hungarianness in ever-changing forms, reflects the need of diasporic cultures to change and recreate themselves, for good or ill.

NOTES

I would like to thank Ato Quayson and the Centre for Diaspora and Transnational Studies at the University of Toronto for giving me the opportunity to begin this research in 2010. Thank you also to the members of the Hungarian Studies Association of Canada for listening to a version of this paper at their conference in May, 2013, held at the University of Victoria, in Victoria, B.C. Lastly, I am especially grateful for my family and to all the Hungarian Scouts, young and young at heart, who let me watch them and learn from them.

---

[1] Unless indicated, English translations will be my own. For quotations which interfere with the flow of the sentence, the original Hungarian will be provided in footnotes. In this case, I have chosen literal, rather than lyric translation in order to retain Vörösmarty's sense of the trauma that accompanies a separation from the homeland.

[2] Gábor Bodnár, *A Magyarországi Cserkészet Története* [The history of Scouting in Hungary] (New Brunswick, N.J: Magyar Cserkészszövetség, 1980), 19; Imre Lendvai-Lintner, "A Cserkészet újra indul nyugaton" [Scouting begins again in the West], *Száz Éves Magyar Cserkészet* [A hundred years of Hungarian Scouting], ed. Imre Lendvai-Lintner (Garfield, N.J.: Külföldi Magyar Cserkészszövetség, 2010), 13.

[3] While *kerettörténet* literally translates to frame narrative, the meaning differs from that used in literary criticism. Literary criticism considers a framing narrative to be "preliminary and/or concluding material" which is not essential to the main story. This definition transfers to Scouting if we see the "main story" as the development of the child and the attainment of scouting skills. The child Scout, however, is meant to view the development and attainment of skills as almost secondary to the excitement of the *kerettörténet.* H. Porter Abbott, *The Cambridge Introduction to Narrative,* 2nd ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2008), 234.

[4] Marian Hirsch explores this concept in "Past Lives: Postmemories in Exile," in *Exile and Creativity: Signposts, Travellers, Outsiders, Backward Glances*, ed. Susan Rubin Suleiman (Durham and London: Duke UP, 1998), 426.

[5] James Clifford, "Diasporas," in *Routes: Travel and Translation in the Late Twentieth Century* (Cambridge MA.: Harvard UP, 1994), pp. 244-279. 255. While Clifford only discusses an American context, the nature of the KMCSSZ opens it up to addressing a variety of dual cultural identifications. I refer any interest in demographics to the organization's global list of active troops may be found on its website, "KMCSSZ Csapatai" [Troops of KMCSSZ] *KMCSSZ,* 2012. Website accessed 12 Nov. 2013. http://www.kmcssz.org/.

[6] Martin Sökefeld, "Mobilizing in transnational space: a social movement approach to the formation of diaspora**,"** *Global Networks* 6, 3 (2006): 265-284, 270.

[7] H. Xiao, "Chinese language maintenance in Winnipeg," *Canadian Ethnic Studies* 30, 1 (1998): 86-96; R. Chumak-Horbatsch, "Language change in the Ukrainian home: from transmission to maintenance to the beginnings of loss," *Canadian Ethnic Studies* 31, 2 (1999): 61-75, 111.

[8] Chumak-Horbatsch, "Language change," p. 114.

[9] Katalin Pintz, "Huntarian Heritage Maintenance in the USA: New Brunswick N.J. as a Magyar Ethnic Island" *Hungarian Studies Review* 38, 1-2 (2011): 83-120; Endre Szentkirályi, "Growing up Hungarian in Cleveland: case studies of language use," *Hungarian Studies Review* 40, 1-2 (2013): 39-68.

[10] For example, Pigniczky Réka's documentary film *Inkubátor* (Budapest: 56Films, 2009) considers the gathering of one specific Hungarian Scouting community through amateur productions of *István, a Király*.

[11] Milan Kundera, "Die Weltliteratur: How we read one another," trans. Linda Asher, *The New Yorker,* 8 Jan 2007: 28-35. 30.

[12] Will Kymlicka, "The Origins of Liberal Multiculturalism: Sources and Preconditions," in *Multicultural Odysseys* (Oxford: Oxford UP, 2007), 3-4.

[13] R. Radhakrishnan, "Ethnicity in an Age of Diaspora," in *Theorizing Diaspora*, ed. Jana Evans Braziel and Anita Mannur (London: Blackwell, 2003), 120.

[14] *Ibid.*, 119.

[15] Robert Baden-Powell, *Scouting for Boys: A Handbook for Instruction in Good Citizenship* (1908), reprint ed. Elleke Boehmer (Oxford: Oxford UP, 2005), 51-2, 67.

[16] Zoltán Benkő, "Kerettörténet" [Frame narrative] in *Központi Segédtiszti Tábor: Emlékeztető* [Central Assistant Troop Leader Training Camp: Memos] (Fillmore, N.Y.: Külföldi Magyar Cserkészszövetség, 2006), 2.

[17] Radhakrishnan, "Ethnicity in an Age of Diaspora," 119.

[18] Elleke Boehmer, "Introduction" in *Scouting for Boys,* ed. Boehmer, lv.

[19] Bodnár, *A Magyarországi*, p. 9; Paul Robert Magocsi *Historical Atlas of Central Europe*. 2nd ed. (Toronto: U of Toronto P, 2002), 36. Hungary was only one of several Central and Eastern European nations to take up Scouting. For instance, between 1910 and 1913, Scouting organizations had formed amongst subject peoples such as Ukranians, Poles, Czechs and Armenians as well as nationalities dominating empires, such as the Russians. For a large-scale survey of these organizations through the political travails of the twentieth-century, see Piet J. Kroonenberg's *The Undaunted — The Survival and Revival of Scouting in Central and Eastern Europe* (Geneva: World Organization of the Scout Movement, 1998).

[20] Mária Benedek Micsinay, "Gödöllő — IV. Világzsembori: "Az egész ország dzsemborija — A csodaszarvas nyomában," in *Száz Éves Magyar*

Cserkészet ["Gödöllő — 4th World Jamboree: "The entire country's Jamboree — in the footsteps of the White Stag. *100 Years of Hungarian Scouting*], ed. Imre Lendvai-Lintner (Garfield, N.J.: Külföldi Magyar Cserkészszövetség, 2010), 7-8; Ferenc Gergely, *A Magyar Cserkészet Története 1910-1948* [The history of Hungarian Scouting 1910-1948] (Budapest: Göncöl Kiadó, 1989), 156.

[21] See for example, Gergely, *A Magyar Cserkészet Története 1910-1948*, 156-157. Although Hungarian cultural identity had already been maintained separately from the various levels of Hungarian political dependency until the creation of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, the forcible disconnection of political and cultural identity after the 1920 Trianon treaty's redrawing of borders was felt to be particularly harsh. In Kornél Bakay, *Ragyogj, cserkészliliom!* [*Shine, Scouting fleur de lis!*], intro. Imre Sinkovics (Budapest: Metrum, 1989) features a picture of a troop flag in which the modern, political Hungary is superimposed onto a silhouette of the pre-Trianon borders; because the separation between political and cultural national identity was perceived as forced and new, it was also seen as impermanent (41). As we will see, the KMCSSZ's status as a diasporic organization makes the gap between these types of identities more legible.

[22] Quoted in R.H. McCarthy, *Magyar Cserkész*, 9 August 1933. Masthead. Reproduced in *White Stag Leadership Development*. Last modified 18 September 2010. Accessed 10 November 2010, http://www.whitestag.org/history/farewell.html.

[23] Gergely, *A Magyar Cserkészet Története 1910-1948*, 168.

[24] Gabor Bodnar, *Scouting in Hungary,* (Cleveland, OH: Hungarian Scout Association, 1986), 88; Attila Horvath, "War and Peace: the Effects of the World War II on Hungarian Education" in *Education & the Second World War: Studies in Schooling & Social Change*, ed. Roy Lowe (London: Falmer, 1992), 147.

[25] Horvath, "War and Peace," 147.

[26] Gergely, *A Magyar Cserkészet Története 1910-1948*, 238.

[27] Bodnár, *A Magyarországi Cserkészet Története,* 88.

[28] Gergely, *A Magyar Cserkészet Története 1910-1948*, 298.

[29] *Ibid.*, 88.

[30] László Kürti, The Remote Borderland: Transylvania in the Hungarian Imagination. (Albany: SUNY P, 2001), 150; Gergely, A Magyar Cserkészet Története 1910-1948, 300-2.

[31] Bodnar, *Scouting in Hungary,* 85; Gergely, *A Magyar Cserkészet Története 1910-1948*, 250.

[32] Paul Lendvai, *The Hungarians: A Thousand Years of Victory in Defeat*, trans. Ann Major (Princeton: Princeton UP, 2003), 384; Bakay, *Ragyogj, cserkészliliom!,* 48; Gergely, *A Magyar Cserkészet Története 1910-1948*, 253, 306-314. Baden-Powell's organization was distinctly ecumenical and demanded only that Scouts adhere to some religious belief. Despite the development of a religious curriculum for Jewish Scouts in 1938 it became increasingly clear that

"religion" in Hungarian Scouting was to be synonymous with Christianity (Gergely, 309). Even this basis for exclusion became problematic once Judaism became defined as a race, rather than a religion. Under the new race laws of 1939, Scouts and Scout leaders who had converted, married a Jew or had Jewish parents or grandparents became subject for expulsion (Gergely 314; see also Balázs Ablonczy, *Pál Teleki (1874-1941): The Life of a Controversial Hungarian Politician.* Trans. Thomas J. and Helen D. DeKornfeld. [New York: Columbia UP, 2006], 181-6).

[33] Gergely, *A Magyar Cserkészet Története*, 312-314.

[34] Lendvay, *The Hungarians,* 408**.** It is important to note that despite Teleki's significance to the early history of Scouting in Hungary, the current organizations has taken decided measures to distance itself from his legacy. The old Scouting curriculum incorporated both Baden-Powell and Teleki's biographical material for children aged 12-14 and using them as frame narratives for curricular material (Eva Tirczka Piller, *Leánycserkészkönyv, II. Kötet* [*Girl Scout handbook*] [Garfield, NJ: Külföldi Magyar Cserkészszövetség, 1997], 9-10, 125-8). The updated 2010 curriculum diminishes the importance of Scouting history in favor of an increased focus on practical skills. It reduces Teleki's role to a point on scouting history and by emphasizing post-1945 leadership of the diasporic organization (Péter Jablonkay and László Arató, *Külföldi Magyar Cserkészszövetség Próbarendszer 2010* [*KMCSSZ Curriculum 2010*] [n.p. 2010]. 16).

[35] Gergely, *A Magyar Cserkészet Története,* 309. On the subject of the implementation of anti-Semitic practices, Gergely notes that "in practice, the implementation of discrimination against Jews met considerable opposition. In the spring of 1939, organizing bodies, principles, and Scoutmasters were not ready to implement the 1936 changes to the rules" [végrehajtása, és általában a zsidókkal szembeni diszrimináció gyakorlati átültetése számottevő ellenállásba ütközött. Szervezőtestületek, iskolaigazgatók, parancsnokok még 1939 tavaszán sem voltak hajlandók végrehajtani az 1936-os alapszabályok rendelkezését].

[36] "Azokban az időkben, a leventék ugyanolyannak vették a cserkészvezetőképzést mint a sajátjukat. De még a saját módszereinket használtuk, hogy emberiségre tanitsuk, nem katonaságra," Szabolcs Magyarody, interview, 2 December 2010.

[37] Deborah S. Cornelius, *Hungary in World War II: Caught in the Cauldron* (New York: Fordham U.P., 2011), 394.

[38] Gergely, *A Magyar Cserkészet Története*, 379; George Csicsery's film *Troop 214* (Oakland, CA: Zala Films, 2008) is an even-handed examination the similarities and differences between the two movements. Pigniczky's *Inkubátor* also discusses the casual stigmatization of the *úttörők* by diasporic communities in the early post-communist era.

[39] László Borhi, *Hungary in the Cold War, 1945-1956* (Budapest: Central European University Press, 2004), 38; Lajos Nádházi, *A magyar úttörőmozgalom történeti kronologiája (1945-1998)* [The historical chronology of the Hungarian

Pioneer movement] (Budapest: Magyar Úttörők Szövetsége, 1999), see the preface; also, private communication from Professor Mari Palasik, via e-mail.

[40] The participation of both boys and girls under one organization differentiates the KMCSSZ from its predecessor in Hungary. Although boys and girls were often segregated into different troops, the collaboration of these troops contributes to the community cohesion offered by the KMCSSZ as a diasporic organization.

[41] "Egy pokróc volt, és egy rajtunk, de és akkor a teherautón álltunk, és jöt egy vihar, de eltettük a pokrócunkot és eláztunk….és amikor odaértünk, vittük ezt a takarót, és akkor a fenyőfáknak, tudod, az uj hajtását szedtük le, mért az még nem, tudod, kemény, hanem puha, és akkor azt leszórtuk egy nagy sátrunk volt, mert a Bodnár Gábor, azt beszerezte az Amerkai katonák a hatalmas nagy sátraikat, szoval az volt…" Rose Kiss, Interview, 2 December 2010.

[42] Lendvai-Lintner, "A Cserkészet újra indul nyugaton," 13.

[43] Eva Tirczka Piller, *Leánycserkészkönyv, II. Kötet* [Girl Scout handbook] (Garfield, NJ: Külföldi Magyar Cserkészszövetség, 1997), 82.

[44] Lendvai, *The Hungarians: A Thousand Years of Victory in Defeat*, 6.

[45] *Ibid*, 15; Gábor Bodnár, *Cserkészkönyv I.* [Hungarian Boy Scout manual for age group I.] (Garfield, N.J.: Magyar Cserkészszövetség, 1969), 45.

[46] Gábor Bodnár, *A Magyar Cserkésztisztképzés Anyaga* [Material for the evaluation of Hungarian Scoutmasters] (New Brunswick, N.J: Külföldi Magyar Cserkészszövetség, 1996), 21.

[47] "A most külföldön nevelkedő fiataloknak írott szellemi alapokat teremptünk. Minden Magyar ifjúnak kezébe adjuk a szükséges és megfelelő könyveket." *Ibid*.

[48] Lendvai-Lintner, "A Cserkészet újra indul nyugaton," 27. His remaining Eagles continued to be active in the Scouting community, teaching at Scoutmaster training camps and regaling Scouts with stories of shaking hands with Baden-Powell. In turn, the deaths of the last Eagles, Ede Császár in 2012 and Ferenc Beódray in 2013, were publicly acknowledged (Nádas, "Beodray Ferenc Gyaszjelentes"). In the case of Bodnár and Beódray, memorialization continues through troop names in Boston and Wallingford CT. Tas Nádas, "Beodray Ferenc Gyaszjelentes" [Obituary for Ferenc Beodray], Clevelandi Magyar Cserkész Csapatok [Hungarian Scout Troops of Cleveland], 10 May 2013. Website accessed 12 November 2013. http://www.clevelandcserkesz.org/beodray-ferenc-gyaszjelentes/; "Bodnár Gáborról szóló irások" [Writings about Gábor Bodnár], *2. Bodnár Gábór Cserkész Csapat*. [2. Bodnár Gábór Cserkész Csapat], 12 Nov. 2013. Website accessed 22 Nov. 2012. http://boston-cserkesz.org/2012/11/bodnar-gaborrol-szolo-irasok/.

[49] "A most külföldön nevelkedő fiataloknak írott szellemi alapokat teremtettünk. Minden Magyar ifjúnak kezébe adjuk a szükséges és megfelelő könyveket." Bodnár, *A Magyar Cserkésztisztképzés Anyaga,* 21.

[50] *Ibid.*, 29.

[51] Bodnár, *Cserkészkönyv I.*, 18.

[52] *Ibid.,* 9-11. "Őseink korában még nem ismerték a puskát. Legfőbb fegyverük a nyil volt; ezt használták a harcaikban, ezzel vadásztak, halásztak." Bodnár, *Cserkészkönyv I.*, 24.

[53] "FONTOS tanítasi és nevekési eszköz." Benkő, "Kerettörténet," 1.

[54] *Ibid*.

[55] "Lehet: történelem, néprajz, földrajz, hires ember, stb," *Ibid*.

[56] *Ibid*., 2.

[57] Irén Dala, "Akadályverseny" [Competitions], in *Központi Segédtiszti Tábor: Emlékeztető*. [Central assistant troop leader training camp: memos] (Fillmore, N.Y.: Külföldi Magyar Cserkészszövetség, 2006), 1.

[58] Dala, "Akadályverseny," 2.

[59] Imre Lendvai-Lintner, János Nádas, Gábor Szorád. *Híres Magyar Feltalálók és Tudósok* [Famous Hungarian inventors and scientists] (Garfield, N.J.: KMCSSZ, 2010).

[60] The description of the following section is based on the cited sources as well as my own observations.

[61] Imre Varga, "Email Rubik Ernőtől az Eötvös Loránd Tudomány Egyetem (ELTE) rektorához: Dr. Mezey Barna" [Email from Erno Rubik to the director of the Eotvos Lorand University: Dr. Barna Mezey] *Akadályversenyi központ* [Scouting competition headquarters], email, 1 May 2011.

[62] The literature portion of the curriculum is the first and longest, focusing on poetic works with a range of thematic concerns, from Károly Kisfaludy's diasporic "Szülőföldöm Szép Határa," [Borders of My Land of Birth], Reményik Sándor's linguistic fetishism in "Az Ige" [The Verb] and Dezső Kosztolányi's verbal coloratura in "Mostan Színes Tintákról Álmodom" [Now I'm dreaming of coloured inks]. Veremund Tóth, ed., *Magyarságismeret Örsvezetők Számára* [Hungarian cultural instruction for patrol leaders] (Garfield N.J.: KMCSSZ, 2006), 1. 11-12. Incidentally, the KMCSSZ's preoccupation with literature and narrative extends to the highest levels of leadership. A full fifty-four of the ninety pages of required reading for Scoutmasters comprises of language and literature and literary analysis. *Haza a magasban* [Home on high ground], *A KMCSSZ E-könyvtára*, KMCSSZ. Website accessed 10 July 2013. http://www.kmcssz.org/.

[63] Ferenc Molnár. *A Pál Utcai fiúk* [*The Paul Street boys*] (Budapest; Móra, 1994).

[64] *Ibid.*, 169.

[65] *Ibid.*, 166.

[66] *Ibid.*, 182.

[67] *Ibid.*, 175.

[68] The camp in the Sík Sándor Cserkészpark has been co-educational since 2007. Before that, two concurrently run single-gender camps simultaneously enacted the same frame narrative. The following observations are based upon my presence at the camp in 2007, 2009 and 2011.

[69] Endre Szentkirályi, "*Napirend*" [Day's schedule], *Örsvezetőképző Tábor 2007* [Patrol Leader training camp 2007], Sík Sándor Cserkészpark, 7 August 2007.

[70] "A külföldi magyarok eltérő körülmények között élnek. Környezetünk erös hatást gyakorol életünkre." Bodnár, *A Magyar Cserkésztisztképzés Anyaga,* 22.

[71] "Becsülettel dolgoznak azért az országért, amely befogadta őket vagy ahol születtek. De éppúgy szolgálják a magyarságot is, amelyhez kulturájuk, hagyományaik és családjuk köti őket." *Ibid.*, 2. In discussion with one of my informants on this particular quotation, a concern arose over its translation. Does "*magyarság*," in being an adjective describing the state of being Hungarian, translate to mean one's personal understanding of Hungarian identity, to the local Hungarian community, to a nation understood in cultural terms, or to the political entity? I have chosen "community," an intermediary between individual and nation, because it captures the social construction of culture without tying it to a particular political or geographic entity.

[72] Indeed, one of my informants described Bodnár's great enthusiasm for America in the following story. While still based in the displaced persons camps, the scouts went to a camp where there was a group of extremely sloppy American Boy Scouts. At a group campfire, the Americans were asked to sing their national anthem…and they did not know the words. Bodnár and his Eagles promptly stood up, clapped their hands to their hearts and sang the American anthem. The recollection of this event brought tears of mirth to my informant's eyes as she described the Eagles as being better Americans than the Americans.

[73] "Te, Magyar cserkész, mondd ezt: Szolgálom a magyarságot, mert kötelességemnek tartom." Bodnár, *A magyar cserkésztisztképzés*, 2.

[74] Lendvai, *The Hungarians: A Thousand Years of Victory in Defeat,* 6.

[75] *Ibid.*

[76] William Safran, "The Jewish Diaspora in a Theoretical and Comparative Framework," *Israel Studies* 10, 1 (2005): 36-60, 41.

[77] Zoltán Kodály, quoted in *Haza a magasban,* 169.

[78] Kundera, "Die Weltliteratur: How we read one another," 31.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1956 Forradalom. [The 1956 Revolution] New Brunswick, N.J: Külföldi Magyar Cserkészszövetség, 2006.

Ablonczy, Balázs. *Pál Teleki (1874-1941): The Life of a Controversial Hungarian Politician.* Trans. Thomas J. and Helen D. DeKornfeld. New York: Columbia UP, 2006.

Baden-Powell, Robert. *Scouting for Boys: A Handbook for Instruction in Good Citizenship*. 1908. Ed. Elleke Boehmer. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2005.

Bakay, Kornél. *Ragyogj, cserkészliliom!* [Shine, Scouting fleur de lis!] Intro. Imre Sinkovics. Budapest: Metrum, 1989.

Benedek, Micsinay Mária. "Gödöllő – IV. Világzsembori: "Az egész ország dzsemborija — A csodaszarvas nyomában." [Gödöllő – 4th World Jamboree: "The Entire Country's Jamboree — in the footsteps of the White Stag." *Száz Éves Magyar Cserkészet* [Hundred years of Hungarian Scouting]. Ed. Imre Lendvai-Lintner. Garfield, N.J.: Külföldi Magyar Cserkészszövetség, 2010. 7-8.

Benkő, Zoltán. "Kerettörténet." *Központi Segédtiszti Tábor: Emlékeztető* ["Frame Narratives." Central Assistant Troop Leader Training Camp: Memos]. Fillmore, N.Y.: Külföldi Magyar Cserkészszövetség, 2006.

"Bodnár Gáborról szóló írások." [Writings about Gábor Bodnár] *2. Bodnár Gábór Cserkész Csapat*. 2. Bodnár Gábór Cserkész Csapat, 12 Nov. 2013. Web. 22 Nov. 2012. <http://boston-cserkesz.org/2012/11/bodnar-gaborrol-szolo-irasok/>.

Bodnár, Gábor. *A Magyarországi Cserkészet Története* [The history of Scouting in Hungary]. New Brunswick, N.J: Magyar Cserkészszövetség, 1980.

———. *A Magyar Cserkésztisztképzés Anyaga* [Material for the evaluation of Hungarian Scoutmasters]. New Brunswick, N.J: Külföldi Magyar Cserkészszövetség, 1996.

———. *Cserkészkönyv I.* [*Hungarian Boy Scout Manual for Age Group I.*] Garfield, N.J.: Magyar Cserkészszövetség, 1969.

Boehmer, Elleke. "Introduction." In Robert Baden-Powell, *Scouting for Boys: A Handbook for Instruction in Good Citizenship*. 1908. Ed. Elleke Boehmer. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2005.

Chumak-Horbatsch, R. "Language change in the Ukrainian home: from transmission to maintenance to the beginnings of loss." *Canadian Ethnic Studies* 31.2 (1999): 61-75.

Clifford, James. "Diasporas," *Routes: Travel and Translation in the Late Twentieth Century*. Cambridge MA.: Harvard UP, 1994. 244-279.

Csicsery, George, dir. *Troop 214.* Zala Films, 2008. Film.

Dala, Irén. "Akadályverseny." *Központi Segédtiszti Tábor: Emlékeztető* ["Scouting Competition." Central Assistant Troop Leader Training Camp: Memos]. Fillmore, N.Y.: Külföldi Magyar Cserkészszövetség, 2006.

Gárdonyi, Géza. *Egri csillagok* [The eclipse of the Crescent Moon]. Budapest: Corvina Press, 1991.

Gémes Istvánné, Réka. "Tábortűzvezetés" [Leading a Campfire] *Központi Segédtiszti Tábor: Emlékeztető* ["Frame Narratives." Central Assistant Troop Leader Training Camp: Memos]. Fillmore, N.Y.: Külföldi Magyar Cserkészszövetség, 2006.

Gergely, Ferenc. *A Magyar Cserkészet Története 1910-1948* [The History of Hungarian Scouting 1910-1948] Budapest: Göncöl Kiadó, 1989.

Guardado, Martin. "Speaking Spanish Like a Boy Scout: Language Socialization, Resistance, and Reproduction in a Heritage Language Scout Troop," *The Canadian Modern Language Review / La revue canadienne des langues vivantes* 66.1 (2009): 101-129.

Haza a magasban [Home on high]. *A KMCSSZ E-könyvtára.* [Hungarian Scouting Association in Exteris library] Külföldi Magyar Cserkészszövetség. 10 July 2013. 2012. http://www.kmcssz.org/.

Hirsch, Marian. "Past Lives: Postmemories in Exile," *Exile and Creativity: Signposts, Travellers, Outsiders, Backward Glances*. Ed. Susan Rubin Suleiman. Durham and London: Duke UP, 1998.

Horvath, Attila. "War and Peace: the Effects of the World War II on Hungarian Education." *Education & the Second World War: Studies in Schooling & Social Change*. Ed. Roy Lowe. London: Falmer, 1992. 139-150. Print.

"KMCSSZ Csapatai." *KMCSSZ.* Külföldi Magyar Cserkészszövetség. 12 Nov. 2013. Web. 2012. <http://www.kmcssz.org/>.

Kymlicka, Will. "The Origins of Liberal Multiculturalism: Sources and Preconditions," *Multicultural Odysseys*. Ed. Will Kymlicka. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2007. 61-87.

Kundera, Milan. "Die Weltliteratur: How we read one another." Trans. Linda Asher. *The New Yorker* 8 Jan 2007: 28-35.

Kürti, László. *The Remote Borderland: Transylvania in the Hungarian Imagination*. Albany: SUNY P, 2001.

Lendvai, Paul. *The Hungarians: A Thousand Years of Victory in Defeat*. Trans. Ann Major. Princeton: Princeton UP, 2003.

Lendvai-Lintner, Imre. "A Cserkészet újra indul nyugaton." *Száz Éves Magyar Cserkészet*. ["Scouting begins again in the West." A hundred years of Hungarian Scouting] Ed. Imre Lendvai-Lintner. Garfield, N.J.: Külföldi Magyar Cserkészszövetség, 2010.

Lendvai-Lintner, Imre, Pándine Uray, Erzsébet and Gábor Szórád, eds. *Szent István*. [*Saint Stephen*] *KMCSSZ E-könyvtára*, KMCSSZ. 10 July 2013. 2000. <http://www.kmcssz.org/>.

Lendvai-Lintner, Imre, János Glaser, and Gábor Szórád, eds. *Bethlen Gábor*.

[*Gabor Bethlen*] *A KMCSSZ E-könyvtára.* [Hungarian Scouting Association in Exteris Library] Külföldi Magyar Cserkészszövetség. 10 July 2013. <http://www.kmcssz.org/>.

McCarthy, R.H. *Magyar Cserkész*. 9 August 1933. Masthead. Reproduced in *White Stag Leadership Development*. 18 September 2010. Web. 10 November 2010. <http://www.whitestag.org/history/farewell.html>.

Molnár, Ferenc. *A Pál utcai fiúk* [The Paul Street boys] Budapest: Móra, 1994.

Moretti, Franco. *Signs Taken for Wonders: Essays in the Sociology of Literary Form*. London: Verso, 1983.

Nádas, Tas. "Beodray Ferenc Gyaszjelentés." ["Obituary for Ferenc Beodray"] *Clevelandi Magyar Cserkész Csapatok/Hungarian Scout Troops of Cleveland*. 12 Nov. 2013. Web. 10 May 2013. < http://www.clevelandcserkesz.org/beodray-ferenc-gyaszjelentes/>.

Ormay, Gabriella, ed. *2008-as Májusi Akadályverseny: 1848 Forradalom*. *A KMCSSZ E-könyvtára.* [Hungarian Scouting Association in Exteris Library] Külföldi Magyar Cserkészszövetség. 10 July 2013. 2008. <http://www.kmcssz.org/>.

Petőfi, Sándor. *János Vitéz* [John the Valiant]. Trans. John Ridland. Budapest: Corvina Press, 1999.

Pigniczky, Réka, dir. *Inkubátor*. [Incubator] 56 Films, 2009. Film.

Piller, Eva Tirczka, ed. *Leánycserkészkönyv, II. Kötet*. [Girl Scout manual, Volume II] Garfield, NJ: Külföldi Magyar Cserkészszövetség, 1997.

Pintz, Katalin. "Huntarian Heritage Maintenance in the USA: New Brunswick N.J. as a Magyar Ethnic Island." *Hungarian Studies Review* 38. 1-2 (2011): 83-120.

"Plast Canada." *Plast Canada.* Plast Canada National Executive, 2009. Web. 30 Oct. 2010.

Radhakrishnan, R. "Ethnicity in an Age of Diaspora." *Theorizing Diaspora*. Ed. Jana E. Braziel and Anita Mannur. London: Blackwell, 2003 119-130.

Safran, William. "The Jewish Diaspora in a Theoretical and Comparative Framework." *Israel Studies* 10. 1 (2005): 36-60.

Sökefeld, Martin. "Mobilizing in transnational space: a social movement approach to the formation of diaspora**.**" *Global Networks* 6.3(2006): 265-284.

Szentkirályi, Endre. *Napirend* [Day's Schedule]. Sík Sándor Cserkészpark, NY. 7 August 2007.

———. "Growing up Hungarian in Cleveland: case studies of language use." *Hungarian Studies Review*. 40. 1-2 (2013): 39-68.

Veremund, Tóth, ed. *Magyarságismeret Örsvezetők Számára* [Hungarian cultural instruction for patrol leaders] Garfield N.J.: KMCSSZ, 2006.

Varga, Imre. "Email Rubik Ernőtől az Eötvös Loránd Tudomány Egyetem (ELTE) rektorához: Dr. Mezey Barna" [Email from Ernő Rubik to the director of the Eötvös Loránd University (ELTE): Dr. Barna Mezey.] *Akadályversenyi Központ* 1 May 2011. Web. 1 May 2011.

Xiao, H. “Chinese language maintenance in Winnipeg.” *Canadian Ethnic Studies* 30. 1 (1998): 86-96.

Hungarian Studies Review, Vol. XLII, Nos. 1-2 (Spring-Fall, 2015)

Miscellany:

László Réthy and the Quest for an Ancient Hungarian Homeland

Nándor Dreisziger

Hungarians live surrounded by peoples who speak Indo-European languages but their own tongue is quite different. Where did this language come from? And where was the ancient Hungarian homeland where the Magyar language developed? These questions have puzzled Hungarians for centuries and historians, anthropologists, paleo-linguists and archaeologists have given widely divergent answers to these questions. Especially disparate were the explanations that some enthusiastic amateur scholars have offered, some of whom placed this "ancient homeland" in such exotic locations as the Near East, North Africa, Siberia, in what are now North-Western India, even Ecuador, and an island in the Pacific Ocean that had disappeared a long time ago. Miklós Érdy in his book *A magyarság keleti eredete* [The eastern origin of Hungarians] enumerated nine locations where Hungarian and international scholars (as opposed to amateur historians) had placed the land where the Hungarian language and its linguistic relatives developed. Not one of these experts, according to Érdy, pointed to the present homeland of the Hungarians.[1]

A few students of the Magyar past, however, begged to differ. They placed the ancient Hungarian homeland, where the Magyar language had developed, right where Hungarians are living today, in the Middle Danube Basin of Central Europe. And, as far as we know, the first scholar to do so was László Réthy.

Réthy, or Réthi as he spelled his name when he was a young man, was born in 1851. He attended school in Budapest, Vienna and in the Polish city of Krakow. From early on he had an interest in languages and, in addition to studying several European ones he familiarized himself with such exotic tongues as Armenian and Sanskrit. As a professional scholar he is best known for his work in numismatics, especially the coin-making of Muslim tradesmen in medieval Europe. For much of his adult life he was a member of the Department of Coins and Ancient Artefacts of the National Museum of Hungary. In this field he is best known for the mas-

sive two volume *Corpus nummorum Hungariae. Magyar Egyetemes Éremtár* [Hungarian compendium of coinage] I - II (Budapest, 1899-1907). As a private person he wrote a large body of bawdy poetry under the pen name Árpád Lőwy. He also had an interest in history, especially in the birth and evolution of languages and nations. In this field he is perhaps most famous for the monograph *Az oláh nyelv és nemzet megalakulása* [The genesis of the Romanian language and nation] (Budapest, ca. 1887). Few people know that Réthy also produced a work on the birth and evolution of the Magyar language and its related tongues, which he published under the title *Hol van az urali nyelvek szanszkritja?* [Where is the Sanskrit of the Uralic languages?] (Vienna: Sommer, 1871). The conclusion of this pamphlet was that the Magyar language, in fact the Uralic languages collectively, evolved in the Carpathian Basin of East-Central Europe.[2]

The afterlife of an idea

Réthy died in 1914, forty-three years after he announced his brave theory about the Magyar, in fact Uralic, ancient homeland. It was also in 1914 that a book by Ármin Vámbéry, one of Réthy's contemporaries, appeared posthumously. The monograph was entitled *A magyarság bölcsőjénél: A magyar-török rokonság kezdete és fejlődése* [At the cradle of Hungarians: The beginning and evolution of Magyar-Turkish relatedness] (Budapest: Athenaeum, 1914). This was Vámbéry's third and last book about Hungarian ethnogenesis and it was a summation of his ideas on the subject. His theory can be considered an elaboration upon Réthy's idea, except for the fact that Vámbéry dealt only with the genesis of the Hungarian language and not with the origin of all the Finno-Ugric tongues. Basically, his 1914 book underscored Réthy's thesis: the Hungarian language developed in the Middle Danube Basin where the ancestors of the Hungarians had lived from Avar times, possibly from late-Roman times, or even earlier. Vámbéry's theory had an important corollary: the nomadic tribes that conquered the Carpathian Basin at the end of the 9th century were Turkic-speaking peoples who were few in numbers — "a few thousand" — and who were in time assimilated by the masses of this land's Magyar-speaking autochthonous population.[3]

In less than two decades after the appearance of Vámbéry's book anther Hungarian scholar questioned the orthodox theory of the Hungarian past, the one that holds that the ancestors of the Hungarians appeared in their present homeland at the end of the 9th century a.d. This person was

Lajos Kiss of Marjalak (in Hungarian: Marjalaki Kiss Lajos). Through his archaeological studies and his examination of old Hungarian place names Marjalaki Kiss also came to the conclusion that Hungarians must have been living in the Carpathian Basin since time immemorial and that their language had no doubt developed there — long before Prince Árpád's nomadic warriors arrived in that land. Parts of Marjalaki Kiss's views are worth quoting:

> At the time of [Prince] Árpád's [arrival] the land [that later became] Hungary was a densely populated place. The regions of this… fertile land… were inhabited by a Hungarian-speaking… settled people. These peaceful fishers, tenders of animals and tillers of the soil, during the millennium before the Hungarian conquest… had changed masters so many times that they never even thought of resisting Árpád and his conquerors. Their masters of the time were not of their people, and [the struggle for their land] was not their business but that of the people who ruled them….

After these comments Marjalaki Kiss explained that the conquerors of the late 9th century became assimilated by their subjects just as the [Turkic] Bulgar tribes who conquered the Lower Danube Basin were assimilated by their Slav subjects; the [Scandinavian] Varangians who moved to Novgorod, by the Russians; the Germanic Longobards who conquered much of the Italian peninsula, by the Italians; the Germanic Goths and Franks by the French; the French-speaking Normans who occupied England, by the English; the Mongolian conquerors [of China] by the Chinese; and so on.[4]

Neither Vámbéry's nor Marjalaki Kiss's views received much attention or sympathy in the Hungary of their times. Both of these authors were outsiders in the Hungarian society of the first half of the 20th century. The former was the son of impoverished Jews and the latter was of peasant background. Neither carried much credibility in the eyes of their country's political and intellectual elites. Their works were ignored or became forgotten, but the idea that the ancestors of Hungarians — and the Hungarian language — had been in the Carpathian Basin long before 895 re-surfaced with vengeance in the second half of the 20th century.

First to resume the assault on the orthodox theory of Hungarian ethnogenesis was Gyula László. He was a native a Transylvania who completed his university education in Budapest where he studied art, art history, ethnography, geography and archaeology. He began his career in various museums and later became the head of the Medieval Department

in Hungary's National Museum. In 1957 he joined the faculty of Eötvös Loránd University in Budapest where he taught until his retirement in 1980. Starting with the 1940s he was involved in numerous archaeological investigations, mainly in his native Transylvania. László's examination of 7th to 10th century graveyards led him to an interpretation of Hungarian ethnogenesis that resembled the theories of earlier critics of historical orthodoxy. The evidence he found, rather than reinforcing in him the idea that the ancestors of Hungarians arrived in the Carpathian Basin at the end of the 9th century, suggested to him that the vast majority of them had settled there during the Avar Age of Central European history. One circumstance that buttressed his questioning the orthodox interpretation of the "Hungarian conquest" was the fact that his study of contemporary graves and cemeteries told him that the subject peoples of 10th century Hungary greatly outnumbered the newly-arrived conquerors. The ancestors of the Hungarians lived in large villages and their cemeteries contained the remains of thousands, while the graves of the newly-arrived numbered in the dozens. When 20 members of the military elite lived among 2,000 of their subjects, who assimilated whom? — László asked. László tried to popularize his theory until the very end of his life. He said that he didn't mind if his name was forgotten, as long as his ideas survived. He died in 1998 while he was on another lecture tour of the towns and cities of his native Transylvania.[5]

In the last two decades of László's life, and in the nearly two decades since his death, at least half-dozen more high-profile Hungarian academics have questioned the orthodox version of Magyar ethnogenesis, all of them arguing that the ancestors of Hungarians had arrived in the Middle Danube Basin long before the end of the 9th century. In a short study such as this one it's not possible to outline in any detail these dissident scholars' arguments. We can do not much more than list their names and academic affiliations. First to be mentioned should probably be János Makkay, an archaeologist who was a close associate of László and who for many years had defended László's views after his death in 1998.[6] Still another scholar who should be alluded to in this connection is archaeologist Dezső Simonyi who placed the arrival of the Hungarians in the Carpathian Basin in the 5th century a.d.[7] Still another high-profile historian who came out with similar views was Pál Engel who for much of his career was a professor at Hungary's premier university, the Eötvös Loránd (ELTE), in Budapest. In one of his English-language studies Engel pointed out that of the ca. 2,100 graves known from the 11th to 13th centuries in Hungary, ca. 95-97 percent contained remains that were "Europoid".[8]

About half decade after the publication of Engel's last study on this subject there appeared a book by another ELTE professor, Gábor Vékony. One remarkable feature of this book was the conclusion that when the nomadic warriors of Prince Árpád had settled in their newly-conquered homeland they constituted about "one percent" of the inhabitants there — an observation that harked back to Vámbéry's estimate of the size of the conquering population of the late 9th century. Another noteworthy suggestion made by Vékony was that the conquerors might have been mainly or predominantly Bashkirs.[9]

A few years after the publication of Vékony's book there appeared still another work that questioned the timing of the arrival of Hungarians in the Carpathian Basin. The new book was by veteran linguist-historian Péter Király and it dated this development to the end of the 6th century a.d. Király had examined the archives of numerous Central and Western European monasteries and over the decades found some five dozen references in them to a group or individuals by the names of Ungar, Ungari, Ungarus, Wenger, Hungarius etc. who, according to the authors of monastic documents, lived in the Middle Danube Basin or had migrated — or in a few cases, raided — from there to places further West in Europe.[10]

About half-a-decade after Király's book appeared there came another work, also by a historian, that claimed that speakers of the Magyar language had lived in the Middle Danube Basin long before the end of the 9th century. The new book was by Elek Benkő, and what was notable about it was that it was published by one of the institutes of Hungary's Academy of Sciences.[11] Much of volume 2 of this work was devoted to the subject of Hungarian origins and the main author of this section was Erzsébeth Fóthi. Since Fóthi is a paleo-anthropologist a few sentences should be said about the opinions of anthropologists on this subject.

One of Hungary's most noted anthropologists was Pál Lipták. He taught at the University of Szeged and later at ELTE. Through his examinations of the anatomy of the nomadic warriors who conquered the Carpathian Basin at the end of the 9th century he came to the conclusion that Hungarians are the descendants of the peoples who lived there before the conquest and that they probably arrived there in several waves of migration starting with the second half of the 5th century.[12] Some three decades later another anthropologist, the above-mentioned Erzsébet Fóthi, came to similar conclusions. After studying for many years the skeletal remains of conquerors she began arguing that Árpád's warriors were different anatomically both from the commoner population of 10th century Carpathian Basin and from the population of present-day Hungary. At the same time,

according to Fóthi, the population of some of Transylvania's Székely villages was remarkably similar anatomically to the pre-10th century peoples of western Transdanubia. In fact Fóthi argued that in their anatomy the conquerors resembled more the people, the Bulgar-Turkic tribes, who conquered the Lower Danube Basin centuries earlier than they did the autochthonous populations of 9th century Carpathian Basin — and that populations similar to the conquerors existed then and later in the southern Urals. Furthermore, according to Fóthi, the anatomical features of the pre-895 population of the western parts of the Carpathian Basin must have developed in the preceding centuries from people with European features that had intermixed in that land with smaller groups of individuals with Asian anatomical characteristics. For Fóthi then, the "ancient homeland" where the anatomy of Hungarians had evolved was the western half of the Middle Danube Basin.[13]

In the nearly century-and-a-half since László Réthy penned what must have appeared at the time an outlandish opinion about the ancient Hungarian homeland, not much progress has been made in this regard. Most members of Hungary's academic establishment and a large majority of the country's politicians continue to place the ancient homeland of Hungarians in the distant east, somewhere in Central Asia or at least east of the Volga River. In the meantime the genetic identity of an increasing number of present-day Hungarians — and also of people who have lived long time ago in various parts of Eurasia, is becoming known.[14] According to this wisdom, the overwhelming majority of Hungarians — judging from the DNA testing that has been done on thousands of them — belong to genetic groups whose ancestors have been living, for at least a few thousand years, in Central Europe — and only exceptionally east of the Volga River or in Central Asia. For how long more will official historiography — and political opinion — in Hungary place the "ancient homeland" of the Hungarian people to places where it could not have possibly been? We may also ask for how long more will László Réthy, Armin Vámbéry, Lajos Kiss of Marjalak and their successors be ignored or forgotten in the face of new scientific evidence that strongly suggests that the ideas of these scholars — at least regarding the location of an ancient Hungarian homeland — are probably much closer to the truth than those of their detractors.

NOTES

[1]Miklós Érdy, *A magyarság keleti eredete és hun kapcsolata* [The eastern origins and Hun relation of Hungarians] (Budapest: Kairosz, 2010), 425-426. On

this subject see a recent study, published by the Department of Finno-Ugric Studies at Eötvös Loránd University: "Újra kell írni a finnugor őstörénelmet?!" [Must the ancient history of the Finno-Ugrians be written anew?!], published on the Department's website http://finnugor.elte.hu/index.php?q=print/905 accessed 2 July 2015. The paper's anonymous author argues that in Hungary research on this theme is thirty years behind international, archaeological research. Genetic research related to the subject is hardly mentioned in this study.

[2]See especially page 6 of this pamphlet. In addition to this work see literary critic Aladár Schöpflin's detailed obituary: "Réthy László," *Nyugat*, 23 (1914) http://www.epa.oszk.hu/00000/00022/00163/05285.htm .

[3]The text of Vámbéry's 1914 book can be found on one of the websites of the National Library of Hungary: http://mek.oszk.hu/06900/06996/06996/pdf . For a detailed analysis of Vámbéry's views see my study: "Ármin Vámbéry (1832-1913) as a Historian of Early Hungarian Settlement in the Carpathian Basin," the *E-journal of American Hungarian Educators' Association,* vol. 6 (2013) http://ahea.net/e-journal-6-2013 .

[4]Kiss published these views in an article that appeared in the journal *Nyugat* [West] that often featured unconventional opinions. The article's text can be found on the website: http://epa.oszk.hu/00000/00022/00492/15257.htm. See also my article: "The Székelys: Ancestors of Today's Hungarians," *Hungarian Studies Review* 36, 1-2 (2009): 153-169.

[5]One of László's early works on this subject is *A „kettős honfoglalás"* [The "dual conquest"] (Budapest: Magvető, 1978). In a later version of his theory László emphasized the fact that the ancestors of Hungarians were a "late Avar people". See the interview he gave in 1997: "Életem egyik fele, a régészet" [One half of my life, archaeology] Akadémiai beszélgetések, 17 April 1997, http://www.mmakademia.hu/ab/3/303.php (accessed 13 Dec. 2010), as well as: "A szlávok régészeti kutatása hazánkban" [Archaeological research on the Slavs in our country] http://betiltva.com/files/laszlo_szlavok_hazankban.php accessed 23 Sept. 1997. In this study László concluded: "… a mai magyar pépesség voltaképpen egyenes folytatása a késő-avarkor (nagyrészt ugyancsak magyar) népességének…." [today's Hungarian population is basically the direct continuation of the (mainly also Hungarian) population of the late-Avar age].

[6]Makkay's major work on the subject is *A magyarság keltezése* [The dating of Hungarians] (Szolnok: Jász-Nagykun-Szolnok Megyei Múzeumok, 1994, 2nd edition). Since then Makkay has produced a 3rd expanded edition of this work but has not been able to find a publisher for it. Makkay's ideas on Finno-Ugric origins are highly praised by the author of the paper "Újra kell írni…" (see note 1 above.)

[7]Dezső Simonyi, "A pannóniai bolgárok és a Magyarság kialakulása: Tanulmányok a bolgár-magyar kapcsolatok köréből" [The Bulgars of Pannonia and the ethnogenesis of the Hungarians: Studies relating to the contacts of the Bulgars and Magyars] in *Tanulmányok a bolgár-magyar kapcsolatok köréből,* ed.

Csavdar Dobrev, Péter Juhász and Petar Mijatev (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1981), 71-88.

[8]Engel's most relevant book on the subject is *Beilleszkedés Európába, a kezdetektől 1440-ig* [Fitting into Europe, from the beginnings to 1440] (Budapest: Háttér, 1990); the English-language paper that he published a decade later is "The House of Árpád and its Times," *The Hungarian Quarterly* 41, 1 (Spring 2000) http://www.hungarianquarterly.com/no157/074.shtml .

[9] Gábor Vékony, *Magyar őstörténet − Magyar honfoglalás* [Hungarian proto-history — Hungarian conquest] (Budapest: Nap Kiadó, 2002), see especially this book's last pages.

[10]Péter Király, *A honalapítás vitás eseményei: A kalandozások és a honfoglalás éve* [The disputed events of the establishment of a homeland: The marauding expeditions and the year of the conquest] (Nyíregyáza: Nyíregyházi Főiskola, 2006). See especially p. 214 of this work. Király nearly lived to age 100.

[11]Elek Benkő, *A középkori Székelyföld* [The Székelyland of the Middle Ages] (Budapest: MTA Bölcsészettudományi Kutatóköszpont, Régészeti Intézet, 2012), 2 volumes. For Benkő's own views on the subject see pp. 429-430.

[12]Lipták published many books on he subject but for a succinct overview of his ideas see "A finnugor népek antropologiája [The anthropology of the Finno-Ugric peoples] in *Uráli népek: nyelvrokonaink kultúrája és hagyomanyai* [Uralic peoples: the culture and traditions of our linguistic relatives], ed. Péter Hajdú (Budapest: Corvina, 1975): 129-137. One of Lipták's books is available in English: *Avars and Ancient Hungarians* (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1983) see especially p. 30.

[13]Erzsébet Fóthi, Zsolt Berner, Tamás Hajdu and Ivett Kővári, "Középkori embertani leletek a Székelyföldön" [Medieval anthropological specimens in Székelyland] in *A középkori Székelyföld* [The Székelyland of the Middle Ages] author and editor Elek Benkő (Budapest: MTA Bölcsészettudományi Kutatóközpont Régészeti Intézet, 2012), vol. 2, 473-552, especially p. 506.

[14]Carl Zimmer, "DNA Deciphers Roots of Modern Europeans," *The New York Times*, 10 June 2015, http://www.nytimes.com/2015/06/16/science/dna-deciphers-roots-of-modern-europeans.html?sm... This article is a summation of a scientific study that appeared under the name of forty-four scholars a day earlier: Morten E. Allentoft *et al.* "Population genomics of Bronze Age Eurasia," *Nature* vol. 522 (11 June 1025): 167ff. Available to selective audiences online. Allentoft and his co-authors speculate about the arrival in Europe of the people of the Yamnaya culture whom they assume, with some reservations, to be the ancestors of today's Indo-Europeans. The article's authors, however, say nothing about the ancestors of the Uralic peoples — where they might have lived during the Bronze Age — so their homeland before some of them had apparently settled in the Middle Danube Basin remains a mystery.

Hungarian Studies Review, Vol. XLII, Nos. 1-2 (Spring-Fall, 2015)

Book and Conference Reviews

Katalin Fenyves. *Képzelt asszimiláció? Négy zsidó értelmiségi nemzedék önképe* [Imagined assimilation? The self-image of four Jewish intellectual generations]. Budapest: Corvina, 2010. 304 pages. ISBN 9789631359220.

Katalin Fenyves's monograph explores what it was like to be a Jew in Hungary in the long 19th century. She mined József Szinnyei's biographical encyclopaedia *The life and works of Hungarian writers*, and dug beyond the clichés for the personal insights. Her conclusion is that individual Hungarian Jews responded to the transformation of everyday life through the adaptation of differing identities.

It was inconceivable for the Jewish community to remain untouched by the fundamental cultural and political changes that affected every aspect of Hungarian society in the 19th century. The most important priority for the country's ruling classes was national unification and the establishment of a uniform language. This attitude presumed that all residents of Hungary would accept these language demands and assimilate into the national culture. The country's Liberal politicians assumed that Jewish integration was not sufficient and presumed that civil rights granted to Hungarian Jews would result in their assimilation. This presumption was characteristic of the era, not only in Hungary.

Szinnyei's encyclopaedia was a compendium of detailed biographical information about Jewish Hungarian authors from the Enlightenment to 1918. Fenyves takes advantage of sociological statistical analysis to mine this database. She analyzes name changes, language use, education, career, and family structure. Using the Szinnyei encyclopaedia's lengthy autobiographical sketches combined with the authors' writings and other available primary sources, Fenyves provides colourful and insightful examples. Fenyves's book is divided into four parts, defining four generations. Each chapter is constructed around three different biographies, which encapsulate the range of pitfalls and potentials for each generation with 30 years between each generation. Fenyves believes, the golden years

of the Jews in Hungary were the period between the reform era and the creation of a constitutional democracy.

The study deals with four generations. The authors of the first generation were born between 1780 and 1810; the second generation between 1811 and 1840; the third generation between 1841 and 1870, and the final generation, who presumably experienced World War I, were born between 1871 and 1900. An introductory chapter discusses the forerunners amongst the Jewish writers (authors who were born between 1750 and 1780). They were the first representatives of the Jewish Enlightenment, were Yiddish speaking, but helped spread the ideas of the German Enlightenment in Hungary. The works of this "generation" created a rich and new Hebrew literature and culture in Hungary. These books, still written in Hebrew, were written not only for the rabbis but members of the Jewish community and the themes of the books were also varied, from scientific works to children's books and textbooks. One of the well-known figures of this group was Áron Chorin, a rabbi from Arad (Oradea), who suggested the introduction of the German language homilies (*hitszónoklat*) next to the Hebrew ones. He did so, a few years before Joseph II's Edict of Tolernce (1782), which forced the Jewish people to use German instead of Hebrew or Yiddish in public discourse, and instituted forced acquisition of German-sounding family names. Chorin's suggestion was not popular among other rabbis forecasting the resistance a few years later to Joseph II's reforms.

In Fenyves's treatment of the forerunner generation, the reader comes to appreciate the series of little steps taken by the Jewish community. As Fenyves wrote in her book "one of the most important aims of the Jewish Enlightenment was to move the Jewish society out from its cultural isolation, redefining the Jewish doctrine in the European Enlightenment."(p. 39)

Neither the German nor the Hungarian language became dominant in Jewish circles until the second half of the 19th century. The Jewish population living in the Hungary of the times used Yiddish in their everyday conversations. The chapter of the first generation focuses on three Jewish authors, Joseph Bach, Moris Saphire Gotlieb and Joseph (Rosenzweig) Ágai. Unfortunately, Fenyves didn't explain why she chose these particular authors. Each had a religious education; after which their careers went in different directions: rabbi, businessman/journalist, and doctor. Although their comfort level in Hungarian probably differed, each chose at some point to use Hungarian professionally: Bach produced a Hungarian sermon in the 1840s; Saphire wrote in several languages, and Ágai com-

pleted his dissertation in Hungarian. In this chapter Fenyves raises general questions and engages current literature about language acquisition, multilingualism, and cultural identity. These are still timely questions.

The longest chapter and the book's main body revolves around the second generation, authors who were born between 1811 and 1840. Their adult life overlapped with the Reform era, the 1848 Revolution, and the Ausgleich of 1867. In this chapter Fenyves also examines the roles of urbanized, emancipated, and secularized Jews in the 1848 Revolution and in the establishment of the modern nation state in Hungary. The second generation was the so-called "magyarization generation" and we can find here Lipót Löwl, Ármin Vámbéry, or Miksa Falk among its representatives. According to Fenyves the members of this generation had the opportunity to integrate into Hungarian society without renouncing their Jewish identity (p.140). However, this chapter includes descriptions of pogroms against Jewish communities during the revolution, and the resulting fear-filled withdrawal of many Jews into their communities. These events are not well known facts in the standard Hungarian historiography of 1848. Despite this, many Hungarian Jews supported the Hungarian revolution and freedom fight as soldiers or publicists.

The end of the 19th century brought the most dramatic change in Hungary's Jewish communities. The gap between urban and provincial Jews became deeper. This is well represented in the biographies chosen by Fenyves for the third generation. After the Austro-Hungarian Ausgleich of 1867, Hungarian liberalism sought to integrate the Jews, but in normalizing the state relations toward the Jewish faith, they set off a schism between Orthodox and Neolog, e.g., between traditional and modernizing elements. For lay readers these terms needed to be better explained. The division was so acerbic, that the internal invective provided fuel for the anti-Semitic movement in the 1880s. While the new governments counted on Jewish intellectuals, they also hindered Jewish advancement to totally assimilated individuals. Jews were still excluded from the highest offices of the realm as a Christian baptismal certificate was required for those aspiring to the high bureaucratic or legal positions.

The 4th generation, born between 1871 and 1888, was comprised of adults in World War I, but their careers had not reached their pinnacle in time for Szinnyei's encyclopaedia. This generation generally published in Hungarian and was as a result isolated from Jewish writers in other countries. Their work gained only minimal notice abroad. However, they could read broadly, and were open to idealist thought, including socialist ideas.

Although the Hungarian middle class was largely a Jewish middle class, many kids were raised without consciousness of their Jewishness. Sándor Brody, for example, only discovered he was Jewish late in childhood. To be born Jewish for many didn't mean anything but was simply a formality. The traditional Jewish family became smaller, with the number of children per family dropping from ten to just a couple. This new middle class focused especially on quality education for their children.

During these years the inhabitants of the capital, Budapest, were tarred as "strangers" to the country. At the same time being more cosmopolitan meant being less of an authentic Hungarian citizen. This trend could also be observed in other counties' big cities, but the gap between the "nation" and Budapest was exceptional. Later this difference, between the county and the capital, would be linked to the image of a "sin city" (*bűnös város*). Budapest was treated as if it was not really Hungarian, but the city where the assimilated and educated Jewish people lived. According to the census in 1910 the Jewish population of Hungary was less than 5% of the total, while Budapest's Jewish population was around 23%.

When Theodore Roosevelt visited Budapest, one of his hosts, Count Albert Apponyi, told him that Budapest was not Hungarian and that he should, instead of spending time there, visit the countryside. The writer Ferenc Molnár wrote:

> Where one million people run after wealth, nobody has time to remember those elements of Hungarianess that characterize life in the countryside… Budapest became a big city. Apponyi told Roosevelt that the capital is not Hungarian. He took him to the countryside to show him Hungary. Roosevelt would never have told Apponyi that New York is unpatriotic, because it had no prairies and the real… farmers are not living there.

In the meantime assimilated urban Jews were ironically solidifying their Magyar identities by distancing themselves from the rural, Orthodox Jewry.

Fenyves argues that the positive results of Jewish assimilation are still visible in Hungarian culture; such as its scientific language, in Hungarian literature, fine arts, music, architecture and other disciplines. And by the time of the last generation, these achievements were made as Hungarians.

Edith Nagy
University of Florida

Tibor Glant. *Amerika, a csodák és csalódások földje. Az Amerikai Egyesült Államok képe a hosszú XIX. század magyar utazási irodalmában*. [America, the Land of Wonders and Disappointments. The Image of the United States of America in the Hungarian Travel Literature in the Long 19th Century]. Debrecen: University of Debrecen Press, 2013. 259 pp.

Historian Daniel Boorstin defined the difference between a traveler and a tourist in his 1962 book titled *Image*, as "The traveler was active; he went strenuously in search of people, of adventure, of experience. The tourist is passive; he expects interesting things to happen to him. He goes "sight-seeing." Travel writing, done by travelers, is an interdisciplinary art; it includes the field of history, geography, cultural studies, anthropology and ethnography. The goal of travel writing is to inform the reader of little known traditions, exotic peoples and about the unknown lands, and customs. Tibor Glant's book looks at the picture painted by Hungarian travelers to the USA about the USA for the Hungarian public, by analyzing over 80 books and several scholarly articles.

The travelers to America can be put into two broad categories, those that traveled to the US before the Civil War and those that visited after the War, after 1870. To explain the books to the current day Hungarian reader, the first and the fifth chapter are explanations to the political, economic, cultural changes that the US underwent in the two periods. The corresponding changes in Hungary are also included.

The first books about America in Hungarian were translations. The very first was a translation of Increase Mather's missionary work amongst American Indians, and was published in Kolozsvár in 1694. The first American travel book translated into Hungarian was Isaac Weld's — an Irish writer — Travels Through the States of North America, which was sixth in an eight volume series of travel writings published in Pest between 1816-19. The most well-known pre-Civil War writers were Bölöni Farkas, Nendtvich, and Haraszthy whose focus was on the political liberty, political freedom and economic well-being that they found in the USA. All three believed that the political model they found in the USA could be transplanted to Hungary. Another group of pre-Civil War travelers were those Kossuth followers who were forced to flee Hungary after the failure of the Hungarian War of Independence. Though they were close in biological age to the previously mentioned authors, their works were published much after their tours of the America and for political reasons, and fear of retribution, concentrated on discussing Kossuth's American

tour and their own impressions of the country.

Béla Széchenyi's tour of America in early 1860s falls between the pre- and post-Civil War era. Béla, was the son of István Széchenyi, whom Kossuth called "the greatest Hungarian". Béla's tome, published in 1863, even though titled "My American Travels", is not really about America or about his travels, but is a collection of theoretical musings on politics.

The end of the Civil War and the Austro-Hungarian Compromise of 1867 bought economic and political changes in both countries. At the same time the political relationship between the two countries became closer. Both countries opened Embassies in each other's capital, and communication between them improved because of the transatlantic cable network that was laid. Information traveled faster and interest in America deepened and widened. American statistics show that between 1900 and 1909, 338,151 *Magyars* immigrated to the USA and their remittances represented a significant flow of funds ($42,193,906.62) to Hungary. News and information from and about America reached wider audiences, as both American pulp fiction and literary works (Harriet Beecher Stowe, Cooper, Mark Twain) were translated into Hungarian and popular Hungarian authors (Jókai, Mikszáth) wrote stories set in America.

Of course there were many Hungarian travelers to the USA in between 1870 and 1914. Many came to study various aspects of the American economy, especially agriculture and the educational system. Often the travelers' were sent on fact finding missions and their reports were published. The writings of Count Imre Széchenyi (Béla Széchenyi's cousin), István Bernát, Adolf Loosy, Iván Ottlik and Zoltán Szilassy are the best known from this group. Although they were critical of many things they saw in America, there were many agricultural innovations that they believed should be transplanted to Hungary, e.g. land security achieved through the Homestead Acts, public health regulations, etc. The three World Fairs (1876 Philadelphia, 1893 Chicago and 1904 in St. Louis) also attracted official Hungarian visitors and five books were written on the fairs. Kecskeméthy's book on Philadelphia, Miklós' on Chicago and Gelléri's on St. Louis were scholarly works. It is interesting to note that Zsigmond Falk's book on his tour and the Chicago World Fair, which had several self-published editions — he was the head of the Pesti Könyvnyomda Rt. (The Book Printing Company of Pest, Inc.) — was negative about everything in America, which may be explained by the fact that he did not speak English.

Writing to specialized Hungarian audiences were scientists who visited the USA. For example, Dr. René Berkovits, a medical doctor, wrote

about medical care, medical, nurse and midwife training and financing research in the USA. Jenő Cholnoky and his student, Pál Teleki, later to become the prime minister, were guests at the NY Geographical Society's conference in 1912. Cholnoky not only published several studies on America, but his photographs are now available on the net (http://hagyatek.cholnoky.ro/kulfold-album/?wppa-album=27&wppa-cover=0&wppa-occur=1).

Two women published travel books. Mrs. István Jakabffy's travelogue was published in 1893 and Mrs. Béla Mocsáry, née Mária Fáy who toured the USA in 1896, but published her book only in 1902. Both are more traditional tourist books as they describe beautiful scenery, tourist sites. Of the two, Jakabffy also wrote about American political life, understandably as she was the wife of a member of parliament, and was critical of racial discrimination, and the plight of the homeless. She wrote about the role of women in America, who she saw as openly expressing their opinions and are viewed as equal partners.

Tibor Glant's book analyzes several more dozen books written for Hungarians about America. In the last chapter he condenses the changes in travel writing about America since the 1920s and the issues surrounding the starting, in Hungary, in the 1960s of an American Studies department at the University of Debrecen.

Travel writing is always as much about the author as it is a memoir. This book is a wonderful read, it is not only an analysis of the books, but each book is placed in the Hungarian and American historical context in which it was written.

Susan Glanz
St. John's University, New York

Judit Kádár. *Engedelmes lázadók: Magyar nőírók és nőideál-konstrukciók a 20. század első felében* [Obedient Rebels: Hungarian Women Writers and Constructions of the Ideal Femininity in the First Half of the 20th Century]. Pécs: Jelenkor, 2014. Pp.305. ISBN 978-963-676-540-8.

In this study of selected Hungarian women prose writers and poets who were active and very well received on the Hungarian literary scene during

their lifetime only to be 'forgotten' or, as the author formulates it, "*shut out* of literary history" (6) after World War II, Hungarian university lecturer and literary scholar Judit Kádár attempts to raise two points: one, she searches for the authors' personal and professional histories; and two, she examines patriarchal gender roles, cultural norms and ideologies left over from a feudal system as reflected and/or challenged in the selected works. The focus of Kádár's analysis is sexual norms, identities and practices in the selected authors' chosen prose writings and poems. As the title *Engedelmes lázadók* [Obedient Rebels] suggests, Kádár follows the ways in which these writers and poets, on the one hand, resisted and challenged the dominant gender and racial ideologies and, on the other hand, to what degree they absorbed these very same ideologies in their works. Finally, she also looks into the mechanisms that led to the "shutting out" i.e. marginalization and trivialization of these writers whose works by no means only follow aesthetic standards of 'light' literature, and reflects on what has or has not changed with respect to what can and cannot be said in Hungary about gender and sexuality in the 21st century.

Kádár divides her book into twelve chapters which are preceded by a brief introduction and followed by a bibliography and an appendix. The first chapter gives a succinct overview of women's organizing and the fight for women's educational and political rights in the second half of the 19th and at the beginning of the 20th century. The following six chapters are each dedicated to a different writer. Although the appendix features the names of thirty women writers as well as their schooling and professional activities (where known), only the six writers receive a thorough analysis in Kádár's book, other names are merely mentioned in passing. The writers analyzed in great detail and to whom at least one chapter is dedicated (with the exception of Renée Erdős who receives two chapters) are, other than Erdős, Anna Tutsek, Terka Lux, Cecile Tormay, Margit Kaffka, and Mrs. Kosáry (Kosáryné) Lola Réz. The latter is, by far, the writer on whom Kádár places the greatest emphasis. The chapter dedicated to Kosáryné is divided into four sub-headings whereas Kaffka, the only writer from this list who had not been "shut out" from literary history, is definitely short-changed when it comes to the inclusion of her major works that do not get discussed at all. While this could be justified given the imbalance in the existing scholarship between Kaffka and the other writers, especially Kosáryné, such justification should have been provided in one form or the other. What does provide a balance in the selection of the writers discussed, however, is the variety regarding their backgrounds, life and career paths, and the literary styles and genres they used. This is

what makes these six biographical chapters a very interesting read and a valuable contribution to scholarship.

From chapter eight to eleven, the volume turns to a variety of topics. Chapters eight and nine discuss a number of women poets, most notably Minka Czóbel and Renée Erdős. Whereas in the previous six chapters the emphasis was on the writers' biographies and the development of gender and racial themes in their selected prose works, here Kádár is interested in why these supremely modern and subversive poets still have not received the full recognition they deserve. She convincingly argues for giving back especially Erdős her due place in Hungarian literary history (which has suffered from a sexist bias) as *the* modern poet who introduced a fresh new voice in Hungarian poetry and influenced Endre Ady, not the other way around as claimed by some.

Chapter ten and eleven are, in our opinion, the least convincing and fitting parts of this otherwise important and well-argued book. Chapter ten turns to the image of femininity as manifested in three selected weeklies between 1900 and 2001: *Új idők* [New Times], *A nő* [Woman], and *Nők lapja* [Women's Magazine]. This time frame clearly goes beyond the time frame defined by the volume's subtitle. Whereas chapter ten offers relevant insights into the role magazines play in shaping gender ideologies, the inclusion of *Nők lapja*, established by the Communist Party in 1949, breaks the announced time frame of Kádár's study. The subtitle should be changed accordingly to omit "in the first half of the 20th century" and leave simply "in the 20th century". Otherwise, should the author want to limit herself to the study of women's magazines in the first half of the 20th century, she should definitely include *A nő és a társadalom* [Woman and Society], the official organ of the Feminist Association (Feministák Egyesülete) between 1905 and 1914 when it changed its title to *A nő*. Her conclusion regarding Hungarian women's magazines from the first half of the 20th century that they were all dominated by a conservative ideal of femininity, as she claims on page 243, would then have to be modified as *A nő és a társadalom* was very much a progressive journal.

Chapter eleven introduces the theme of sexual taboos, such as homosexuality and incest in 20th century Hungarian translations of selected English and French language literary works, among them Oscar Wilde's *The Picture of Dorian Gray,* Balzac's *Le Père Goriot,* and Virginia Woolf's *Mrs. Dalloway.* Based on selected passages from various translations, Kádár concludes that what earlier Hungarian translators tried to deemphasize not to say censure regarding "other" manifestations of human sexuality becomes sayable in the newer translations at the end of

the 20th century. Although we find this chapter interesting, methodologically speaking it constitutes the weakest part of the book. Why rely on translations from English and French literature to demonstrate that even in Hungary sexual taboos have become less strict and more open to discussion by the end of the 20th century? There are very interesting examples from Hungarian literature proper, and Kádár could have stuck to women writers, too, to prove her point. Kaffka's novel *Hangyaboly* [Ant Hill], which she mentions in her chapter on Kaffka, could have been a starting point for analyzing lesbian love in Hungarian literature and whether this aspect of the book received any reception at the time or later. As a comparison with more recent works by women writers on the same topic, Kádár could have included Erzsébet Galgóczy's *Törvényen kívül és belül* [Outside and Inside the Law, 1983] and Agáta Gordon's *Kecskerúzs* [Goat Lipstick, 1997]. This would have kept the scope of her study within the frame set by the title that only mentions women writers and constructions of femininity.

Despite the noted weaknesses, *Engedelmes lázadók* is a significant book. It is extensively researched and includes hitherto unknown material, such as interviews with family members, photographs and excerpts from letters and manuscripts. All in all, this study of Hungarian women writers with an emphasis on sexuality, gender and racial ideologies in Hungary is a very welcome contribution to and a considerable expansion of Hungarian gender studies.

Agatha Schwartz
University of Ottawa

International scientific conference: *350. obljetnica smrti Nikole Zrinskog VII i pada Novoga Zrina* (350th anniversary of the death of Zrínyi Miklós VII and the fall of Zrínyiújvár), held in Donja Dubrava, Republic of Croatia, on 5th July 2014

Zrínyi Miklós VII (1620-1664; in Croatian: *Nikola Zrinski VII*), Hungarian and Croatian statesman, military leader and poet, a distinguished warrior in the wars against the Ottomans, still remains a figure of intense historical interest both in Hungary and in Croatia. As a way of shedding new light on his actions and his time, and especially on the history of one of his most famous castles, Zrínyiújvár (Croatian: *Novi Zrin*), numerous Croatian

organisations have organised an international conference taking place on 5th July 2014. It was held in Donja Dubrava, a Croatian place closest to the site of the castle of Zrínyiújvár, today in Hungary. The conference's main organisers were the Croatian cultural societies "Zrinski Guard Čakovec" and "Brethren of the Croatian Dragon", the Military College "Petar Zrinski" and the Croatian cultural institution "Matica Hrvatska Čakovec". The main patron of the conference was Ivo Josipović, President of Croatia. Fourteen historians and other scholars participated in the conference, and three of them were Hungarian researchers. Speakers had fifteen minutes to present their exposés in Croatian or Hungarian, and during the presentations, questions and debates the organisers provided consecutive (a few sentences at a time) interpretation from Croatian and Hungarian and *vice versa*.

After the welcoming speeches of the organisers' representatives the presentations started. The assembled researchers shared their latest findings. At the beginning of the conference's first part, Hrvoje Petrić presented an exposé on the role of Miklós Zrínyi VII and the castle of Zrínyiújvár played in the defence from the Ottomans in the light of new archive research. Petrić described the situation in Central Europe after the Peace of Westphalia was signed, in 1648, Zrínyi's attitude towards the changes in international political relations of the time, and the contemporary situation in the lands ruled by the house of Zrínyi. Ivica Mandić spoke on the topic of Zrínyi as a military strategist and concluded that he was a fine strategist who, nevertheless, naively interpreted the politics of Habsburg rulers. Ivo Zvonar held a talk on Zrínyi's poetic legacy and cited a number of poetic works that still have not been presented before a wide audience. Vladimir Kalšan talked about the town of Čakovec in the time of Zrínyi, based on the historical sources which mention the town, especially the ground plans of the Čakovec castle, its moat, and its inhabitants. Juraj Kolarić presented a paper on the religious life in the Muraköz (Croatian: *Međimurje*) region in Zrínyi's time, on the cooperation of the Zrínyi family with the Protestant and Catholic powers in their common struggle against the Ottoman Empire, and on the re-conversion to Catholicism of the Muraköz region in the period before the Great Turkish War (1683-1699). Darko Varga gave an exposé of fruit and vegetable production in the gardens of Zrínyi's house, thus contributing to the knowledge of everyday life in the 17th century.

On the beginning of the second part of the conference, Aleksej Milinović held a talk on new contributions to Tacitism and Machiavellianism in Zrínyi's political and military theory, basing his findings on

Zrínyi's works and on his commentaries about the political events of contemporary Europe. Vladimir Kapun spoke on the topic of some lesser known facts of Zrínyi's time, more precisely on Zrínyi's relations with the Catholic Church and his contributions to the construction of the town of Čakovec. Marijan Varga presented an exposé on the Zrínyi family and Zrínyiújvár as the impetus for the cooperation of municipalities around the confluence of the Mura and Drava rivers, which started in 2005 through the European IPA Cross-Border Cooperation Programmes, and still continues. Three Croatian and five Hungarian municipalities actively supported that cooperation and based it on their common legacy, i.e., the legacy of the house of Zrínyi.

The first of the three Hungarian researchers, Lajos Négyesi, gave an exposé on the research of the Zrínyiújvár castle in the Hungarian historiography. Hungarian scientists explored the castle's location and the congruence of their findings and the surviving maps of the castle. Négyesi emphasised the influence of cooperation with the local population during the mentioned research. József Padányi spoke on the topic of Zrínyiújvár in the light of the newest archaeological research conducted on the site of the castle. Padányi presented a map demonstrating the excavation site and the artefacts found on the site: Ottoman cannon balls, remains of the castle walls, etc. László Vándor held an exposé on the significance of Zrínyiújvár in the defence and liberation of the Kanizsa Generalate from the Ottomans. Vándor pointed out that, during the 16th and 17th centuries, the whole defence system was in the hands of the members of the Zrínyi family. Krešimir Regan talked of Zrínyiújvár's architectural and defence characteristics. Zrínyiújvár was built in 1661 on the most critical point of the defence of the Muraköz region against the Ottomans. The contemporary reports on the castle state the condition of its moat, bastions and numerous other characteristics of the castle, which was conquered by the Ottomans in 1664 and never rebuilt. Dragutin Feletar and Petar Feletar presented a paper on the role of Zrínyiújvár in the defence of the Légrád Captaincy and on the functioning of the town of Légrád (Croatian: *Legrad*) as a part of the Military Frontier (Croatian: *Vojna krajina*).They concluded that the functioning of the Military Frontier in that region so far hasn't been sufficiently researched in Croatia.

In the closing words of the conference, Juraj Kolarić thanked the Organisational Committee, all the speakers for coming and sharing their research, and everyone who assisted in the organisation of the conference. The meeting in Donja Dubrava was an expression of a fruitful collaboration between Croatian and Hungarian scholars researching the still under-

researched topics of their mutual history. The gathered researchers agreed that the conference comprised valuable presentations, that it covered a wide range of topics, and that it should serve as an incentive for similar conferences in the future.

Anđelko Vlašić, PhD,
Independent scholar, Zagreb, Croatia

Hungarian Studies Review, Vol. XLII, Nos. 1-2 (Spring-Fall, 2015)

Obituary:

Gábor Vermes
1935-2014

Gábor Vermes was not yet ten years old when his — and his family's — situation went from bad to worse after Nazi Germany occupied Hungary in March of 1944. He survived the persecutions and deportations of the rest of that year by living in an orphanage for Christian children in Budapest. After the war he completed his basic schooling and in 1952 embarked on his university studies. His real interest in humanities but the communist ideological orientation of the time pushed him into studying something more in line with the requirements of the new socialist society and he undertook a post-secondary program in earth sciences. In 1956 he graduated and in the fall of the same year he began working in one of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences' research institutes. Soon a great change took place in his life: after the crushing of the Revolution by Soviet troops he fled Hungary.

He arrived in New York in February of the following year. Soon Gábor had the opportunity of following a course of studies in his field of real interest, history. With the help of a scholarship he entered Stanford University. By 1962 he was ready to commence his doctoral research the subject of which was the political career of Hungarian statesman István Tisza. Gábor began his teaching career as an instructor at Stanford but in 1972 he joined the History Department of Rutgers University and began teaching on this university's Newark campus. He remained on the faculty of Rutgers till his retirement in 2001.

Professor Vermes's teaching fields were the history of modern Central and Eastern Europe while his research continued to focus on the history of Hungary in the 19th and 20th centuries. In 1985 his work on Tisza was published in book form: *István Tisza: The Liberal Vision and Conservative Statecraft of a Magyar Nationalist* (Boulder CO: East European Monographs), which was followed by a Hungarian edition. A quarter century later Gábor published another book, this time in Hungarian: *Kulturális változások sodrában: Magyarország 1711 és 1848 között* [In the current of cultural changes: Hungary between 1711 and

1848] (Budapest: Balassi, 2011). In the meantime he also produced several articles and numerous book reviews. Some of these appeared in our journal. The most recent one, "'Extra Hungarian Non Est Vita' and the Baroque in 18th and Early 19th Century Hungary" saw the light of day in volume 39 (2012).

While he served as president of the American Association for the Study of Hungarian History (AASHH), Dr. Vermes was instrumental in establishing a formal link between that organization and the *Hungarian Studies Review*. Later the AASHH changed its name to the Hungarian Studies Association but the link between the two scholarly ventures remained.

For his teaching, research and other academic activities Professor Vermes was awarded several prizes and decorations.

Nándor Dreisziger

Hungarian Studies Review, Vol. XLII, Nos. 1-2 (Spring-Fall 2015)

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

ANDRÁS BECKER teaches history at the University of Southampton, UK, where he completed his doctorate in 2014. He is specializing in the diplomatic, political, military and international history of Europe in the twentieth century, with particular emphasis on how territorial and minority disputes in Central and South East Europe affected the region and international power politics. One of his latest publications re-examines the Hungarian angle of the Munich crisis (1938) with the help of previously unexamined British archival material (it is forthcoming in the *Slavonic and East European Review*). His current research focuses on the comparative analysis of the diaries, memoirs and diplomatic dispatches of György Barcza, the Hungarian Minister in London from 1938 to 1941.

VIRGINIA L. LEWIS is a scholar of modern narrative literature with a focus on land relations and depictions of rural subalterns. She earned her doctorate in Modern German Literature from the University of Pennsylvania in 1989 and has published numerous articles on novels from Germany, Austria, Switzerland, and Romania. In her book *Globalizing the Peasant: Access to Land and the possibility of Self-Realization*, published in 2007, Lewis proposes a new "global literature" framework for understanding narratives that document the impact of globalization of humanity. In 2014, her translation of Zsigmond Móricz's first novel, *Sárarany*, appeared in print. Lewis is Professor of German at Northern State University.

KATHERINE MAGYARODY is a Ph.D. candidate in English Literature at the University of Toronto. Her dissertation, "Boy Republics and Imperial Guides: Small Social Groups in the Literature of Empire, 1850-1914," focuses on the representation of small social groups (ranging from school boy tribes to terrorist networks) as a constitutive element in the creation and destabilization of empire in nineteenth century literature. Her research interests include children's literature, diasporic literature, trans-nationalism and post-colonialism. She is the Editorial Assistant of the journal *The University of Toronto Quarterly*.

ÉVA MATHEY is an Assistant Professor in the North American Department of the University of Debrecen's Institute of English and American Studies. She teaches American history and culture. Her special fields of research include American society and politics during the period between the world wars, Hungarian-American relations with special emphasis on the interwar years, and her interest also extends to American women's history. She earned her Ph.D. in American Studies from the University of Debrecen in 2012. The title of her dissertation was *Chasing a Mirage: Hungarian Revisionist Search for US Support to Dismantle the Trianon Peace Treaty, 1920–1938*. She has published articles and essays both in Hungarian and English in journals such as, for example, *Aetas*, *Studii de limbi si literature moderne*, *Eger Journal of American Studies*.

ZSOLT NAGY is an Assistant Professor of History at the University of St. Thomas in St. Paul, Minnesota. He earned his PhD in Modern European History at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill in 2012. Dr. Nagy is currently working on his manuscript: "Great Expectations and Postwar Realities: Cultural Diplomacy in Interwar Hungary," in which he seeks to examine how the Hungarian leadership sought to mobilize diverse cultural and intellectual resources to improve the country's international situation and to amend its post-1920 borders. In the process he aims to shed light on the complexities of national identity construction and the limitations that the small countries of East-Central Europe faced as they engaged in both traditional and cultural diplomacy.

AGATHA SCHWARTZ is a Professor and a former chairperson in the Department of Modern Languages and Literatures at the University of Ottawa. She is the immediate past-president of the Hungarian Studies Association of Canada. She is the author of numerous scholarly articles as well as of the monograph: *Shifting Voices: Feminist Thought and Women's Writing in* Fin-de-Siècle *Austria and Hungary* (McGill-Queen's University Press, 2008). More recently she co-authored, with Professor Helga Thorson of the University of Victoria, the volume: *Shaking the Empire, Shaking Patriarchy: The Growth of a Feminist Consciousness across the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy* (Ariadne Press, 2014). She also co-edited (with Prof. Judith Szapor of McGill University) the 2014 special volume of our journal entitled *Gender and Nation in Hungary since 1919*.