HSR

Hungarian Studies Review

Vol. XX, Nos. 1-2 (Spring-Fall, 1993)

In this volume Virginia L. Lewis analyses the works of two Austro-Hungarian novelists that deal with class relations before and after the liberation of serfs in East Central Europe. Tibor Glant examines the wartime efforts of propagandists to influence the policies of U.S. President Woodrow Wilson concerning Austria-Hungary. Seven Bela Vardy explores the issue of dual and multiple ethnic identities among Hungarians in the United States and Hungary. Kalman Dreisziger reports on the situation of Hungarian community folkdance groups in Canada today. Nora Nixon gives an account of the teaching of English to Hungarian teachers of mathematics and sciences. Tamás M. Révész discusses the evolution of the idea and reality of press freedom in Hungary between 1848 and 1914. And, Nandor Dreisziger produces documentation on the activities of exiled Hungarian students after the 1956 Hungarian Revolution.

Hungarian Studies Review

The *Hungarian Studies Review*, formerly the *Canadian-American Review of Hungarian Studies*, is a semi-annual interdisciplinary journal devoted to the publication of original articles and critical book reviews relating to Hungary and Hungarians. Since is launching in 1974, the *Review* has been committed to the policy of providing a non-partisan forum for the scholarly discussion and analysis of issues in Hungarian history, politics and cultural affairs. It is co-published by the Hungarian Studies Association of Canada and the National Széchényi Library (Budapest, Hungary).

Institutional subscription to the Review are $12.00 per annum. Individual subscriptions are $12.00 for one year and $20.00 for two years.

Correspondence regarding the publication of manuscripts, book reviews, etc., as well as subscriptions and donations should be addressed to:

The Editors,
Hungarian Studies Review,
University of Toronto
21 Sussex Avenue
Toronto, Ontario, Canada, M5S 1A1

Statements and opinions expressed in the *Review* are those of the individual authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the journal's editors.

Articles appearing in the *Review* are indexed in:
HISTORICAL ABSTRACTS and,
AMERICA: HISTORY AND LIFE.

ISSN 0713-8083 (replacing 0317-204X)

Typesetting by N. Dreisziger.
Printed and distributed by the National Széchényi Library.

Hungarian Studies Review, Vol. XX, Nos. 1-2 (Spring-Fall, 1993)

CONTENTS

Articles:

The Price of Emancipation: Peasant-Noble Relations as Depicted by Novelists József Eötvös and Marie von Ebner-Eschenbach
VIRGINIA L. LEWIS 3

The War for Wilson's Ear: Austria-Hungary in Wartime American Propaganda
TIBOR GLANT 25

Hungarian National Consciousness and the Question of Dual and Multiple Identity
STEVEN BELA VARDY 53

Hungarian Community Folkdance Groups in Canada
KALMAN DREISZIGER 71

Designing an English Curriculum for Hungarian Teachers of Math and Science
NORA NIXON 83

Freedom of the Press: Its Idea and Realization in Pre-1914 Hungary
TAMÁS RÉVÉSZ 93

Documents:

The 1956 Hungarian Student Movement in Exile
NANDOR DREISZIGER (editor) 103

Book Reviews:

Works by Miklós Kontra, Chris Corrin, and Ignác Romsics are reviewed by Andrea Horvath, Marlene Kadar, and N. Dreisziger 117

A brief note from the editors 127

Hungarian Studies Review, Vol. XX, Nos. 1-2 (Spring-Fall, 1993)

Our Contributors

KALMAN DREISZIGER has been involved in Hungarian community folk-dancing since the 1960s. He has been choreographer and artistic director for groups in Toronto and Montreal, has conducted folk-dance research in Hungary and Romania, and has been a guest teacher with Hungarian and international folk-dance groups in Canada and the United States.

TIBOR GLANT received his undergraduate education at Lajos Kossuth University in Debrecen, Hungary, and his M.A. degree at the University of Warwick in the United Kingdom where he is a Ph.D. candidate at the present. He is a member of the faculty of the Institute of English and American Studies at Kossuth University.

VIRGINIA L. LEWIS was an Annenberg Fellow at the University of Pennsylvania, where she received her Ph.D. in modern German literature. She has published a book and several articles on German and Austrian prose writers from the late nineteenth century. Currently she is Assistant Professor of German at Drake University.

NORA NIXON is Associate Director of Academic Year Programs at Educational Resource Development Trust in Marina Del Rey, California, and a recipient of a Fulbright scholarship. She graduated from the Teaching English as a Second Language department at University of California at Los Angeles, and has trained teachers in this field in the United States, Hungary, Italy, and the People's Republic of China.

M. TAMÁS RÉVÉSZ teaches at Eötvös Loránd University in Budapest. He has published on Hungarian legal history widely, and has given papers at conferences in Europe and North America.

STEVEN BELA VARDY is Professor of History at Duquesne University, Director of Duquesne University History Forum, immediate past Chairman of the Department of History, and Adjunct Professor of East European History at the University of Pittsburgh. He is the author or co-author of over a dozen books and a great many papers, including several in our journal.

Hungarian Studies Review, Vol. XX, Nos. 1-2 (Spring-Fall, 1993)

The Price of Emancipation: Peasant-Noble Relations as Depicted by Novelists József Eötvös and Marie von Ebner-Eschenbach

Virginia L. Lewis

The year 1848 marks a critical caesura in the rural class relations of the Habsburg empire. The emancipation of the serfs had far-reaching consequences not only for the daily lives of nobles and peasants, but also for the economy, social structure, political process, and cultural life of the monarchy. Prior to 1848, the serfs in Austria and Hungary were suppressed and exploited by the feudal order. After 1848, they were abandoned by it and left to fend for themselves with neither the economic nor the political means to do so.[1] The emancipation engendered developments in agrarian society that were unique to the nations under Habsburg hegemony. By this time, serfdom had ceased to exist in the western half of Europe.[2] It continued, however, in parts of the Balkans and in Russia.[3] The conjuncture of the social developments leading up to and following in the wake of the 1848-49 Revolution with the increasing role of objective portrayal and social engagement in literature resulted in a distinctive brand of literary realism in East Central Europe.

While there was certainly increasing attention paid to bourgeois and industrial society even in overwhelmingly agricultural Hungary,[4] rural themes continued to dominate East Central European literature up to World War I and beyond. The stranglehold of the landed oligarchy and feudal institutions on the economy and government of the Habsburg Monarchy simply did not permit industrialization and urbanization on the scale at which it proceeded in Germany, France, and England in the nineteenth century.[5] The demographic realities of East Central Europe, where more than half of the population still consisted of peasants as late as 1900,[6] are reflected in the literary works produced there. Rural class reform was a major theme in Austrian and Hungarian literature up to 1848. After the failure of the Revolution, passionate hope of reform was gradually replaced by resignation and eventually fatalism as it grew ever more clear that the situation among the lower classes in Austria-Hungary had if anything worsened since the emancipation of the serfs. The tran-

sition from Karl Beck (1817-1879) to Leopold von Sacher-Masoch (1836-1895), from Sándor Petőfi (1823-1849) to Zsigmond Móricz (1879-1942), is enormous and models the progression from patriotic, nationalistic Romanticism through the melancholy detachment of Realism to the hopelessness of Naturalism in its peculiar, East Central European form. This progression from impassioned hope to fatalistic pessimism can be traced, in durkheimian terms, to the persistent and intensifying anomie that burdened agrarian society in the nations united under the Habsburg monarchy.

The purpose of this article is to illustrate a segment of the path from Romanticism to Naturalism in East Central Europe through the example of two authors who focused their attention on the misery and injustices of rural society: József Eötvös (1813-1871) who stands at the threshold of Hungarian Realism, and Marie von Ebner-Eschenbach (1830-1916) who represents the late stages of Poetic Realism in German literature.

With *A falu jegyzője* (1845), Eötvös emerged as pre-revolutionary Hungary's foremost exponent of social criticism in the novel.[7] The crying need for social reform was recognized across the Habsburg empire and became a dominant theme in Austrian, Hungarian, and Czech literature. Bohemia's Karel Havlíček Borovský (1821-1856) advocated reform in his journalistic writings and in brilliant political satires.[8] With *Spaziergänge eines Wiener Poeten* (Promenades of a Viennese Poet, 1831), Slovenian native Anastasius Grün (1806-1876) produced one of the most important works of his career as a lyric poet and political satirist.[9] While Eötvös belongs to the same reform-minded tradition with these and numerous other East Central European writers, he drew his poetic inspiration from the Romanticism of France's Victor Hugo, whom he met personally in 1838.[10] What appealed most to Eötvös about Hugo's theories was his notion of the social mission of dramatic literature.[11] Sőter cites the following passage from Eötvös's essay "Hugo Victor mint drámai költő":

> All *poesis* has its origin in the people, and only as long as it maintains its tie with them, as long as it makes an impression on them and, through teaching or delighting, has an effect on their inner life, only then does it answer its great vocation, only then does it merit that majestic position which it occupies.[12]

Eötvös was committed to the belief that literature must implement a sort of liberal democratic version of Horace's "utile dulci," must entertain readers while at the same time instructing them in important contemporary moral issues, with the goal of rousing them to action in the

name of social reform. This is the principle that underpinned the creation of *A falu jegyzője*.

Yet Eötvös's vision of "*a nép*" [the people], is tainted with Romantic idealism and reveals the peculiar nature of the relationship of the humanitarian-minded noble to the social groups whom he wanted to involve in the reform process. Baron József Eötvös, who grew up in a conservative aristocratic household speaking German and Latin,[13] was in a poor position to bring his message to the masses of underprivileged Hungarians who needed most urgently to benefit from it. In the first place, a majority of Hungarians were illiterate during Eötvös's lifetime.[14] Thus reaching them by means of a sprawling three-volume novel was impractical at best. Nonetheless, *A falu jegyzője* achieved great popularity, not among the lower classes who might have identified with the serf protagonist Viola, but with literate bourgeois and aristocratic readers both in and outside of Hungary.[15] Eötvös's novel could never have had the impact on the local readership that it did had it not been composed in Hungarian. It was at the expense of great effort that Eötvös, inspired as a teenager by the example of his tutor József Pruzsinsky, undertook to learn the language of his homeland.[16] In an era when even great reformers like István Széchenyi could barely communicate in the Magyar language, this was a bold move and illustrates well Eötvös's commitment to Hungarian society and culture. By composing his great social-critical tapestry in a language they could understand, Eötvös hoped to reach the educated Magyar bourgeois and noble audience that was in the best position to initiate the social reforms he believed necessary to bring about stability and justice in Hungary. All ideals concerning the democratic nature of literature aside, Eötvös saw reform essentially as something to be enacted from above, by the aristocrats who ran the government and were both legally and morally responsible for the peasant classes under their tutelage. This understanding of the reform process was natural in a feudal society where serfdom was still an important reality. Loránt Czigány stresses the unusual pre-revolutionary Hungarian situation:

> [. . .] in Hungary, where an urban middle class was still sadly lacking in the first half of the nineteenth century, the road to reform . . . was paradoxically paved by the privileged classes, or rather by an exclusive minority of aristocrats whose enthusiastic liberalism appeared to run counter to their natural self-interest in perpetuating their own privileges and who, unselfishly enough, were willing and able to understand broader considerations than their own class interest when thinking in terms of national economy.[17]

In other words, there was an important minority of Hungarian nobles who desired to live up to the notion that "noblesse oblige." This attitude died a slow and painful death after 1848-49, when feudal obligations were severed with the emancipation of the serfs.

In *A falu jegyzője*, however, it was very much alive. With this novel, József Eötvös created a fictional model of the peasant-aristocrat cooperation he was convinced must be realised in Hungary to bring about constructive social change. The figure constellation is set up in a kind of triangular system, with first the peasants and oppressed minorities, the victims of injustice who demonstrate by all they suffer the urgent need for reform. These include one of two protagonists: the persecuted serf Viola, his wife and children, as well as Peti the Gypsy, "*Üveges* Jancsi" (the Jewish glazier), the *gulyás* István, Ákos Réty's servant János (the old hussar), Liptákné (Mrs. Lipták), and other minor characters such as the members of Viola's band and the degenerate inmates who share Tengelyi's cell with him when he is imprisoned.

Then there are those members of the gentry and bureaucracy who champion reform and, in one way or another, come to the aid of the oppressed peasantry: the protagonist Jónás Tengelyi and his family, his best friend Pastor Boldizsár Vándory (Samuel Réty's brother), then principally the younger generation of the gentry, represented by Kálmán Kislaky, Ákos Réty, and his sister Etelka; another important reformer is the hunchbacked attorney, young Völgyesy. To this list can be added Kálmán's father, Bálint Kislaky who, midway through the novel, struggles against his own passivity and summons the strength to provide instrumental assistance in Viola's escape after the ludicrous *statárium* (the summary court notorious for quick execution of persons charged with capital crimes) that sentenced him to hang. A humorous adjunct of this group is Jakab Bántornyi, otherwise known as "James," whose inordinate admiration for English society provides not only comic relief but also a serious foil to the defect-ridden Hungarian society that Eötvös wanted so badly to see changed.

The third group is headed by two noblemen, Chief Justice Pál Nyúzó (*nyúzó* means "flayer") and his sidekick Macskaházy (*macska*: "cat"), the Réty family lawyer, both of whom serve the ends of the cruel and egotistical Rétyné (Lady Réty), who also maintains full control over the views and conduct of her husband, Deputy Lieutenant Samuel Réty, until her suicide at the end of the novel. Another important member of this group is Viola's rival, the nobleman-turned-robber Czifra. Several minor characters also serve as enemies of reform, including the snuff-pinching judge Zátonyi, and Baron Sóskuty.

There is a certain amount of transition between these two groups. Bálint Kislaky is a good example of this. He allowed himself to be

appointed president of the *statárium* out of little more than a naive sense of duty; but the moment he finds himself responsible for overseeing Viola's hanging, he begins to question his complicity with the unjust laws designed by Hungary's nobility:

> [N]ow that I think the situation over calmly, it appears to me also that the protocol was not drafted properly. Whom are they going to blame for that other than me, the president? But let that be as it may — they may say that I am a fool, they can say anything, I don't care, but if I go out of my house and see that unfortunate man, whom they have hanged on my property, and whose life I could have saved, . . . then my life's peace is lost.[18]

Kislaky's decision to break the very laws his position demands that he uphold in order to save Viola from execution is an important turning point. He later resigns the presidency altogether.

Another transitional character who experiences a conversion of sorts is Jancsi the Jew, whose utter destitution conspires to make him an accomplice of the treacherous Lady Réty:

> [. . .] for he was a Jew: that was the story of his life. Born to share the misery of his family, . . . abandoning his parental home in order to experience not freedom but the totality of his desolation, struggling for his daily bread not through honest work, for that of course was forbidden the Jew, but through cunning and deceit . . .[19]

Jancsi's deathbed conversion to honesty and truthfulness is provoked by Pastor Vándory, seemingly the only person who cares about him as his life nears its miserable end, and his confession results in the destruction of the evil Lady Réty. Both Kislaky's and Jancsi's conversions tilt the balance in the novel in favour of reform.

Both the crying need for and the will to produce reform constitute the primary source of tension in *A falu jegyzője*. The situation is crystallised around the principal character Viola, who is reduced by a single act of injustice perpetrated by the evil trio: Lady Réty, Nyúzó, and Macskaházy, from the status of a wealthy peasant to that of an outlaw. This drastic formulation of the day-to-day oppression weighing down on the lives of millions of Hungarian serfs was calculated to shock readers into an awareness of the urgency of reform. What happens to Viola, the author implies, happens on a daily basis to peasants throughout Hungary. The result can be understood in terms of Durkheim's concept of anomie,

where the peasants are squashed by the nobility to a level of misery far below the standards they deserve for the contributions they have made to the welfare of society through their labours.[20] Viola had acquired his wealth through honest hard work. He was robbed of it by the lazy, unscrupulous nobles. The situation mirrors in harsh terms the repressive exploitation exercised against the Hungarian *jobbágy* by the nobility, and the widespread anomie that reigned in peasant society as a consequence.[21] The reaction Eötvös called for to this desperate situation was not the pathological response outlined by Durkheim in his study of suicide, but a productive, collective effort to reverse the damage caused by ruthless oppression through the violation of antiquated laws and the creation of a new justice.[22]

The effort to spare Viola from the worst of Hungary's medieval justice system is launched from several angles. Early in the novel, Ákos Réty is instrumental in extricating Peti, one of Viola's most important informants, from Justice Nyúzó's clutches. Tengelyi's daughter Vilma, inspired by the humanitarian example of her father, offers their home to shelter Viola's wife and children. Then, when Viola comes by for an ill-timed visit, Vilma, taking her cue from Mrs. Lipták, aids him in his escape from the law by permitting him to hide in the house while Nyúzó is hot on his trail. In return for these favours, Viola pledges to protect Tengelyi's papers (several of which document his nobility), as he knows of lady Réty's conspiracy to steal them. On the night of the robbery, he risks his life to rescue the Notary's papers from Lady Réty's henchmen, Czifra and the Jew (*üveges* Jancsi).

This pattern of mutual cooperation and aid in the face of danger characterises the interpersonal relationships between much of the nobility and peasantry throughout *A falu jegyzője*. The abuse perpetrated by aristocrats on the serfs is represented by the conspiracy of Nyúzó, Macskaházy, and Lady Réty against Viola. The other side of that relationship, the protection and nurturing of the serfs by their lords, can be seen in Ákos and Kálmán's concern for Viola's safety, and the assistance lent Zsuzsi and Viola by the Tengelyi family. The reward for that protection follows when Viola expresses his gratitude by extending help to Tengelyi: "I owe the notary and his family a debt of gratitude," Viola tells Mrs. Lipták, "they took in my poor wife, may God reward them for it, and they've kept me alive — for that I will show my thanks."[23]

Eötvös intensifies this network of relationships with the capture of Viola by Nyúzó and Macskaházy and his rescue from execution, effected by a series of nobles and peasants working in complex cooperation with each other to prevent Viola's death at the hands of one of prerevolutionary Hungary's most barbaric judicial institutions. After Völgyesi's valiant yet unsuccessful attempt to prevent the court from passing a

sentence of hanging, it is Kálmán Kislaky who, moved to action by a letter from Etelka Réty asserting Viola's innocence in the Tengelyi robbery, enlists the old hussar János's help to initiate a plan for Viola's escape. Vándory manages to get the prisoner moved to the chaff-loft, from whence he can escape more easily. Kálmán uses the rich stock of wine donated by his parents to get the judges and guards drunk. Peti the Gypsy makes arrangements for Viola's getaway, using a horse and falsified passport donated by the *gulyás* István. It is difficult to imagine a more ingenious cooperative effort between peasants and nobles. Viola escapes the "justice" system's clutches with ease, and succeeds in beginning a new life for himself and his family outside of Taksony county.

What Eötvös creates in this novel is a fanciful microcosmic depiction of peasant-lord relations in the pre-1848 Habsburg empire. Before the serfs were emancipated, relations between them and their lords were of necessity close, and while at their worst they could be barbaric (persecution of Viola by Nyúzó and cohorts), at their best they were familial (assistance lent Viola by the Kislaky family and friends). The relationship was blatantly hierarchic, as it is in *A falu jegyzője*: the social superiority of the gentry over the peasantry was unquestioned. Yet the rapport between the upper and lower classes was based on a foundation of community and mutual aid and protection.[24] It was within this somewhat idealised framework of patriarchal relations that József Eötvös and many like him envisioned a reform movement in Hungary. Political reform builds the backdrop behind Viola's misadventures throughout the novel. The loudest voice for social change is wielded by Jónás Tengelyi, an influential member of the liberal Bántornyi party, who is a source of great anxiety to Count Marosvölgyi, Taksony's Lord Lieutenant. When the Lord Lieutenant asks the Notary what the county magistrate can do to make productive citizens out of the destitute serfs, Tengelyi answers:

> A great deal, yes, a great deal, Your Excellency! . . . The nobility, through the county system, has built ramparts around itself, behind which it has been able to defend its privileges even against the laws. But if we do not want to change this arrangement, why do we not bring the people behind these ramparts as well? This mechanism, which has been strong enough to maintain our freedom for us, could it be so weak that, if we wanted, it could not protect the people from oppression?[25]

The Count reacts to Tengelyi's plea with disdain. The Notary's determined advocacy for desperately needed improvements among the peasant classes wins him the enmity not only of Marosvölgyi, but of all the

conservatives in Taksony, including his former good friend, Sámuel Réty. Thanks to Nyúzó and Macskaházy's machinations, Tengelyi is denied the privileges of his noble status, and his call for reform is silenced. Eötvös renders Tengelyi's defeat all the more bitter by allowing him to be sent to prison as the accused in the murder of Macskaházy, which Viola had committed.

In the final chapters of the novel, Viola, the serf and principal victim of oppression, sacrifices his life to rescue Tengelyi, a nobleman and Taksony's most ardent reformer. Here the personal and the political come together, in the self-sacrifice of the peasant for the one lord who has done the most for him, in the rescue of the reform movement by the most urgent example of why it is so badly needed. Eötvös communicates real hope for social progress. His proposal involves a cooperative effort between peasants and nobles, where the nobles would lead the charge by putting their political power and economic resources to work in a programme supported by the active involvement of the oppressed peasants in the process of social and legal reform. A similar vision characterises works by other pre-revolutionary Austrian and Hungarian authors. In his poem "An den Kaiser" (To the Emperor, 1831), Anastasius Grün reminds the Austrian emperor of the sacrifice of labour and life made by "*das Volk*," "the people," on behalf of the empire, and asks him in the name of mutual love and respect to reward the people with legal and social reforms. Sándor Petőfi's poem "A nép nevében" (In the People's Name, 1847) likewise underscores the indispensable role of the sweat of the people in cultivating Hungarian soil and safeguarding Hungarian freedom, but also contains the warning that withholding their human rights from them may result in revolution. Alfred Meißner (1822-1885) demands in his poem "Neue Sklaven" (New Slaves, 1845) that the foundation of love upon which the now perverted feudal system was first erected be supplanted by a foundation of justice. Such visions of mutual cooperation between the nobility and peasantry were no longer realistic after 1848, when the emancipation that reformers such as József Eötvös had worked so hard to attain dissolved the legal ties upon which feudal institutions were founded. Eötvös's *irányregény* (*Tendenzroman* — novel advancing a cause) is the product of a distinctive era in the class relations of the Habsburg empire. The cooperative effort he sought came about only three years after publication of the novel with the outbreak of the 1848-1849 Revolution. The failure of the Revolution to guarantee the newly emancipated serfs the political, economic, and social resources they needed in order to survive without the support of their noble protectors explains much of their continuing and intensifying misery as the nineteenth century progressed.

* * *

The landless peasants portrayed in Marie von Ebner-Eschenbach's *Das Gemeindekind* (1887; *The Child of the Parish*, 1893) bear witness to the fact that conditions among the lower classes of rural East Central Europe had not improved by 1887, the year of the novel's publication. Ebner was well aware of the continued need for reform to improve the lot of the agricultural proletariat. She cared deeply about the suffering that went on among the destitute masses that populated the villages of Moravia.[26] Marie von Ebner-Eschenbach, from an influential aristocratic family just as Eötvös had been, did not learn to speak German while growing up. Instead, she spoke Czech and French. Thus even though a member of the privileged aristocracy, she was in a good position to reach the local Moravian population — at least that percentage who were literate — in their own language. But this was not Ebner's goal. Her ambitions were not so much public as they were personal in nature:

> I was still a young girl, almost like a child, my dreamlike views, my likes and dislikes changed like April weather, but one thing stood clearly and firmly in my mind: the conviction that I shall not walk this earth without having left behind at least a slight trace of my footprints upon it.[27]

Ebner identified herself strongly with her role as a writer. As her interest in the literary heritage of German grew, so did her desire to master the language, an undertaking supported actively by her cousin and husband, Moritz von Ebner-Eschenbach.[28] In contrast to József Eötvös, who enjoyed ridiculing the contemporary critics who found fault with his writing, Ebner was anxious to gain critical acceptance.[29] In this she succeeded: she was granted an honourary doctorate by the University of Vienna in 1900, and enjoyed critical acclaim as she rounded out her long literary career.[30] *Das Gemeindekind* was and is regarded as one of her greatest works. But in spite of the harrowing account it gave of peasant suffering in rural Moravia, it was not intended to induce the drastic social change needed to improve a tragic situation. Thus while the topic of the novel may revolve around democratic concerns, it was not constructed, as *A falu jegyzője* was, to arouse democratic appeal. Because Ebner composed *Das Gemeindekind* in German, it was inaccessible even to those literate Moravian individuals who happened only to read Czech. And it was published not in Prague or even Vienna, but in the German capital Berlin, thus entirely outside the Habsburg monarchy of which Moravia was a part.

It is as though Ebner-Eschenbach did not regard the monarchy's ruling classes as capable of implementing effective social reform programmes. Her message was directed at outsiders and intellectuals, rather than at the reformers who, in her mind, did not exist. Ebner's reaction to the injustices of rural Habsburg society effectively mirrors that of many of her contemporaries: resignation and melancholy. As Claudio Magris observes: "Injured by the injustices of her world, Marie von Ebner-Eschenbach forgoes fighting against them and flees into harmony and inner peace, into a troubled plea for love and goodness."[31] This response was shared by a number of Austrian and Hungarian authors, including Elek Gozsdu in his story collection *Tantulusz* (1886), and Ödön Iványi, author of the novel *A püspök atyafisága* (The Bishop's Relatives, 1888).[32] In the case of *Das Gemeindekind*, Ebner ended her incisively critical portrayal of the Moravian village of Soleschau by tying all of the loose ends up into one peaceful, harmonious knot. Pavel Holub overcomes the hardships he experienced throughout his youth, and not because a group of caring, social-activist nobles comes to his aid, but on the strength of his own physical and emotional resources, of his own inner goodness. Thus the only prescription Ebner offered the suffering peasants of her homeland was the tenuous hope that they could improve their lot through their own moral and physical strength.[33] There was no realistic programme for social reform, no practical advice on how Moravia's rural proletariat might emulate as a group the inner strength that enabled rare individuals to rescue themselves from misery. The linguistic and artistic isolation of the aristocratic author from the peasant world she portrayed, the absence of a programme that would engage the ruling classes in a viable reform process, are symptomatic of the dislocation that occurred in East Central European society once the feudal ties linking nobility and peasantry had been dissolved. By this time, the anomie afflicting the lower classes had extended to much of the aristocracy, which was caught up in its own economic and political life-or-death struggle.

The changed social world of 1880s Austria-Hungary is mirrored in the class relations presented in *Das Gemeindekind*. While the serf Viola is surrounded by a network of advocates in the face of persecution, Pavel Holub is repeatedly deprived of the guardians whose help means most to him. Within the first chapter of the novel, he loses his father and mother. In the second, his only sibling, Milada, is torn away from him. Vinska, for years the sole object of Pavel's attraction, abandons him for the mayor's son, Peter. Schoolmaster Habrecht helps Pavel through some of his most difficult struggles only to abandon him in the first fragile stages of his quest for financial and social independence. Pavel gives up Slava to his friend Arnost, because the community has destroyed his

ability to enter into a marital relationship. Milada, Pavel's guardian angel, dies after a short life of senseless hardship and toil in the convent.

This repeated loss of personal advocates is paralleled by the persistent failure of agents of social authority to ensure the well-being of Pavel and, by extension, of the peasantry. There are three principal agents of authority in *Das Gemeindekind*: the community, the church, and the nobility, and each of them fails utterly in its task of looking after the social welfare of the villagers. Ebner-Eschenbach gives a shocking demonstration of this early in the novel, when she describes how the community leaders, doing everything they can to pawn their responsibility off on someone else, finally decide to leave the abandoned Pavel with one of the most notorious families in the village, the drunken herdsman Virgil and his murderous wife. The community fails to see that Pavel receives proper clothing and schooling, allowing him to run around shoeless and in rags and turning a blind eye to Virgil's exploitation of the boy as cheap labour for the guarding of the community's stock animals. Later, when Habrecht presents a perfect solution for Pavel's situation by offering to take him in himself, the mayor is too consumed with his own problems to authorize the arrangement. Pavel must take matters into his own hands, and lives with the schoolmaster at the cost of persecution and harassment.

Not only does the community fail to do Pavel justice, it also fails to prevent him from suffering injustice. When Peter accuses Pavel of poisoning his father to death, the authorities mismanage the case so badly that the accusation is actually held up: the judge assumes Pavel's guilt even before he enters the courtroom; the court chemist's substitute declares on the basis of a botched test the presence of poison in the mayor's stomach. Pavel must waste two months of his life in jail for a non-existent crime. Pavel fares no better in civil conflicts. After risking his life to rescue Peter in the locomobile accident, Peter and the tavern owner conspire to force Pavel to pay for the tavern owner's new fence. The mayor, though convinced Pavel is being done a great injustice, is too weak to prevent it. Pavel must pay, and so he does. The community is guilty at every turn of compromising Pavel's welfare. They overcharge him for the pitiful plot of land he buys for his house. They sit by and do nothing when vandals ruin his crops and destroy his building materials. They deprive him of a decent education. They suspect him of every wrongdoing committed in the community.

The church does no better. Over and over again Ebner insists on the ill-will of the village priest towards Pavel. The most striking instance occurs on the day of the mayor's death, when Pavel meets the priest, who is on his way back from the mayor's house to the church, bearing the chalice in his hands: "Pavel sank to his knees before the holy viaticum,

and the priest, who was passing by him, glanced over him with a look so full of damnation and contempt that he cowered in fear. . ."[34] The priest blindly assumes Pavel's guilt in the "murder" of the mortally ill mayor.[35] When, in a later episode, Pavel turns over the youthful vandals — who have been sabotaging his house-building — to the priest, the priest gives them nothing but a slap on the wrist, and the vandalism continues as before. It is all this supposed moral authority can do to admit that Pavel has suffered unjustly at the hands of the community. The recognition does nothing to amend his failure to provide Pavel with the spiritual nurturing and humanitarian assistance expected of a priest.

Pavel's position with regard to the convent that harbours his sister Milada says much about the failure of the church to look after its members. Access to the convent is so severely restricted as most often to be impossible. Even once he finally gets inside, Pavel is confined to a prison-like chamber isolated from the rest of the building. The nuns there treat him not with Christian warmth and charity, but as unsympathetic, judgmental authorities whose hearts are as inaccessible as the building they live in. Their disinterest in alleviating Pavel's suffering and destitution is highlighted when they refuse to find a place for him in the convent. Pavel explains his impossible situation with clarity to the Mother Superior: "'For God's sake, keep me here, don't send me back to the village. . . My Milada says that I should become good, in the village I can't be good . . .'"[36] He supports his claim that society makes it impossible for a boy like him to resist wrongdoing with evidence that would convince the most cynical courtroom judge. Yet the Mother Superior, whom Ebner describes as "endlessly pious, endlessly indifferent,"[37] refutes the obvious with hair-raising ease: "'Go, my child, . . . go with God and consider that, wherever you walk, you walk beneath his eyes and his protection. And when he is with us, what can the people do against us?'"[38] The church is anything but a helper in time of need. It merely flees in the face of trouble, leaving Pavel precisely where he had been before gaining entrance to the convent: destitute and miserable.

Ebner-Eschenbach's portrayal of the relations between the baroness and the villagers dependent upon her is fascinating. The baroness herself presents a wonderfully suggestive caricature of the Habsburg nobility in the 1880s. She is elderly, extremely nearsighted, and walks with a noticeable limp. Yet in everything she does and says, she preserves the air of authority the nobility continued to claim even in the final death throes of its hold on political power. Her motto is: "Alles wie immer," "Everything as it always was."[39]

Ebner's description of the festivities on St. Aegidius day provides a brilliant caricature of the hollow rapport between the baroness, who

surrounds herself in meaningless pageantry, and the poor villagers who gather to meet her:

> The Lady Baroness, who otherwise regardless of the weather scurried and tottered humbly to church on foot, today rode the five hundred paces from the castle, in the greatest pomp and procession. Jakob and Matthias on the coach-box, suggestive of majestic examples of ornamented livery, in blue tailcoats with yellow stripes across the back, with yellow vests and lapels, the white, cucumber-shaped horses in heavy harnesses studded with silver. And in the spacious "swimmer" the aged, tiny, half-blind Lady, who greeted in a haphazard manner to the left and right and thanked with a friendly nod of the head many a ruffian who stared her unabashedly in the face, and allowed many a deferential greeting to go unanswered. . .[40]

The peasants assemble *en masse* before the church and greet the baroness's arrival with excitement. Yet the emptiness of the goodwill displayed on both sides is underscored in Ebner's account of the baroness's misdirected greetings:

> An unmarried woman was asked about her child, a young husband about his sweetheart, but that harmed nothing, it only enhanced the joyful mood that could express itself unreservedly. The manorial lady enjoyed the game and forgave it, even when it was at her own expense, because she knew that she was basically highly esteemed by the people — and that was her strength. The baroness did not doubt that the people cheated and robbed her wherever they could, but she forgave them the dishonesty, because she knew she was loved by them — and that was her weakness.[41]

Appearance and reality do not meet in this outmoded social confrontation. Not only was peasant-noble cooperation sincere in the fictional world of Eötvös's novel, *A falu jegyzője*, it also existed on a major scale in the real world of revolutionary Hungary. The alienation of the peasantry from their former noble protectors in the era after the 1868 Compromise is revealed in all its blind cruelty in *Das Gemeindekind*. There is little more than hollow symbolism linking the villagers with the baroness. Nor have any new social ties emerged to replace the loss of

feudalism. The result is a dislocated, anomic society where stability and tradition have become mere chimeras.

Yet the spirit of the pre-Emancipation serf-noble rapport lived on in Habsburg memory.[42] Ebner gives evidence of a generation gap that helped the aristocracy preserve the veneer of its waning authority. It is none other than Pavel's greatest advocate, the schoolmaster Habrecht, who represents the old guard in his rapport with the aged baroness. The respect he demonstrates to her at their meetings is worthy of the most submissive hound dog. Habrecht tries desperately to get young Pavel to follow his example, prompting him to fold his hands in supplication, to call the baroness "Your Grace" instead of "you."[43] But Pavel is so utterly divorced from the noblewoman who supposedly looks after him that he has no concept of the deference historically shown by peasants to their upperclass superiors. After killing the baroness's peacock, he refuses to ask forgiveness, instead secretly hoping that the chandelier under which the fragile old lady stands will fall down and crush her.[44] Pavel's disregard for the nobility is not a fluke — it is Habrecht who, by living in the past, presents the exception. His replacement, for instance, the new schoolmaster Georg Mladek, gives a modern reaction to his predecessor's recommendation that he announce himself to the baroness:

> "Gladly, if she's young and beautiful. Otherwise, I have nothing to do with baronesses and no business in their castles. . ."
>
> "But," Habrecht asserted, "courtesy requires. . ."
>
> "Not for everyone — I, for example, have no prejudices "[45]

Ebner says the most about late nineteenth-century Habsburg peasant-noble relations through her protagonist. The first meeting between Pavel and the baroness occurs early in the novel, and reveals how prejudiced the old noblewoman is toward the neglected orphan. It is with utter heartlessness that she consigns Pavel to the wretched life of a village ward: "he certainly deserves to be a child of the parish."[46] The contrast here between Pavel's and Viola's situation is enlightening. Residents from all over Taksony county come to the aid of Viola, the robber, the murderer, in order to rescue him from certain execution, and it is the richest nobles who often provide the most crucial assistance. Pavel, on the other hand, the abused child whose worst crime is the stealing of cherries, is treated from day one like a murderous robber and willfully doomed to a life of misery. In a period of only forty years, the relationship of the nobles to the labourers who worked their land has

deteriorated from one of support and advocacy no matter what the circumstances to one of disinterested cruelty.

It takes many years for the baroness to give up her assumption that Pavel Holub is an incurable criminal. Even when she does, her kind feelings toward the *Gemeindekind* are inconsistent at best. The good deeds she does for him are selfishly motivated and also misguided. As she nears her death, the baroness is anxious to have some assurance that there will be Christian souls lifting up prayers for her sake once she leaves her earthly life. After years of watching Pavel suffer from the multiple injustices of poverty, abuse, prejudice, and exploitation without so much as lifting a finger to help him, the baroness presents him with a valuable piece of land merely because he offers to pray for her in the next life. The gift, while generous, is destined to do Pavel as much harm as good, for as the baroness's estate-agent observes, she "has unfortunately allowed her magnanimity to carry her away. The gift is far too considerable, and must arouse envy among the village residents toward the recipient, and discontent toward the noble benefactress."[47] The priest agrees with this assessment, and the prophesy indeed proves accurate. The peasants vandalise Pavel's fields as never before. It is all he can do to raise a crop on his new land.

The one thing Pavel most needs from the baroness: permission to visit his sister during her illness, she denies him. In fact it is the robbing of the only family member left to him during his childhood, Milada, that is the greatest wrong done to Pavel by the baroness. Throughout the novel, Ebner-Eschenbach insists upon the importance Pavel attaches to his sister. Shortly after their separation, he has nightmares about her and is profoundly anxious about her safety. He even tries to "rescue" her from the baroness's castle. Later, he relies on Milada's support and advice as he struggles against the difficulties in Soleschau that drive him to sin and crime. Any contact with her, no matter how insignificant, means the world to him. Yet he is continually forbidden access to her. The baroness did not take Milada so much out of charity as out of a desire to have an advocate in the Catholic church. Her love for the girl is excessive and selfish in nature. She repeatedly refers to Milada as *mine*, "my dear child,"[48] ignoring the fact that the girl's mother is still alive. The baroness cares no more about Pavel's desperate need to have his sister back than she does about the destruction Milada's penance is wreaking on her health. The separation of the siblings is senseless and cruel and exemplifies the hopeless insensitivity of the aristocracy toward the landless peasants who remain under their control. Pavel loses his sister, and Milada loses her life, all because of the blind selfishness of a noblewoman whose "good works" towards the peasantry do nothing but raise her own self-esteem.

It is both amazing and tragic that Pavel Holub's struggle for self-realisation proves successful after all the hardships society has subjected him to: amazing because of the improbability of his success; tragic because of the message it sent to contemporary readers. Both József Eötvös and Marie von Ebner-Eschenbach, by the way in which they addressed the plight of the peasantry in their day, mirror the relationship that existed between peasants and nobles before and after the Emancipation. Baron Eötvös was an activist in peasant affairs. Much as the noble landowner took responsibility for the welfare of his serfs during the feudal era, so Eötvös saw it as his role to intervene in the matter of securing for the peasants basic rights and some sort of economic security. The noble protagonists in *A falu jegyzője* behave according to the same principle. The community counters the anomie afflicting the oppressed peasantry with group mobilisation and concerted action for change. They are successful to the extent that, by the close of the novel, the social enemies Lady Réty and Macskaházy are dead, and Nyúzó is stripped of his office and thus of the ability to bring further harm to the community. Eötvös gave contemporary readers the impression that injustice was the work of several evil individuals, and that it would take little more than organised action to rid society of their influence, in order to return justice to those who had so long been deprived of it. This message provided readers with a sense of hope that, *if they acted*, they could succeed in making society better. There remains only the tragic irony that Viola, in spite of the gargantuan efforts undertaken on his behalf, nonetheless dies at the hands of the justice system. His killer is none other than the villainous nobleman Czifra, the criminal-turned-constable, who testifies to Eötvös's contention that the Hungarian justice system before 1848 was little more than an injustice system, administered by criminals — the fictional judges Nyúzó and Macskaházy also indulge in crimes ranging from theft to perjury and fraud. There is nothing inconsistent in Viola's deplorable death. It sent the message that the problems Eötvös was most concerned about remained unsolved. The cooperative efforts of the peasants and nobles in *A falu jegyzője* resulted only in temporary victories. It was up to the readers to build on the record established by the likes of Jónás Tengelyi, Kálmán Kislaky, and Boldizsár Vándory, and to bring about the permanent victories that eluded these fictional heroes.

Baroness Marie von Ebner-Eschenbach cared deeply about Moravia's rural poor. But she was no activist. She created masterful literary works about the peasantry that earned her the respect and praise of the Viennese elite, yet did nothing to alleviate the sufferings of the people they described. Nor were they intended to have any significant practical effect. Caught up in the trials afflicting their own moribund class, the nobles of late nineteenth-century Austria-Hungary had little interest in

providing practical support to the struggling proletariat the Emancipation had created. The lifting of feudal bonds had released them from their obligation to ensure the basic welfare of the agricultural workforce. As dayworkers, labourers, and servants, the former serf population now had to look out for themselves, independent of noble protection. Baroness Ebner-Eschenbach's novels no more helped the peasantry than did the fictional baroness of Soleschau help the members of the Holub family. Full of goodwill, but lacking the resources to improve the lot of the destitute masses, these noblewomen concentrated their energies on self-fulfilment and self-preservation, leaving the peasants to fend for themselves.

That is why Pavel Holub achieves his goal of self-realization in spite of the odds against him. Were he to die as Viola did, it would have signalled a call to action to the privileged German consumers who read *Das Gemeindekind*. But there was no sense in issuing a call to action to this readership — what could they have been expected to do? Making rural Moravian society better was not the business of these outsiders. It was the business of the suffering peasant individuals like Pavel Holub. Ebner-Eschenbach was dealing in the realm of impossible ideals. If there is any social message at all in *Das Gemeindekind*, it is that society will change for the better only if the destitute peasants change. That is exactly what Pavel does. No less the victim of bigotry and injustice at the end of the novel than he was at the beginning, Pavel buys personal contentment at the price of his own sweat, blood, and tears. He abandons petty crime for honesty and decency. He adopts an ascetic lifestyle, centred around celibacy and hard work. He learns the art of self-sacrifice, giving his beloved to friend Arnost to marry, and accepting his mother into his home at the risk of social ostracism. The inner transformation that occurs in Pavel Holub is extraordinary. He realises at the individual level what LaCapra, in his discussion of Durkheim and Weber, calls "the birth of a new 'nomie,'" "an ethic of 'this-worldly asceticism' which combined anxiety about one's fate with a rigorous form of individualistic self-discipline and formally rational activity."[49] While LaCapra refers principally to the Protestant work ethic studied by Max Weber, the ascetic lifestyle Pavel adopts as an adult has deep roots in the Roman Catholic tradition in which Marie von Ebner-Eschenbach was raised. The individualised "nomie" with which Pavel counters his anomic environment creates a rational foundation for his existence and restores his ability to attain self-fulfilment. While readers may see a ray of hope in Ebner's implication that even the lowliest, most miserable of individuals, even the hopelessly abandoned and destitute *Gemeindekind*, possess the capacity to overcome society's most destructive forces, it hardly constituted a practical solution to the catastrophic problems plaguing the

rural masses of East Central Europe. Pavel's transformation is, as far as his Moravian peasant counterparts are concerned, less than impractical: it is useless, because the same message that persuaded German-speaking readers that the destitute peasants of Austria-Hungary could take care of themselves if they just tried did not even reach the rural Moravian public that could possibly have benefitted from learning about Pavel Holub's moral and personal victory.

The chasm separating the Habsburg nobility from the agricultural proletariat during Marie von Ebner-Eschenbach's day only widened. The screams of anguish emanating from writers in close contact with the peasants prior to World War I bear witness to the ever intensifying horrors of agrarian destitution and misery. Writers such as Leopold von Sacher-Masoch (*Volksgericht* [People's Tribunal], 1882) and Zsigmond Móricz (*Sárarany* [Mud-Gold], 1910) describe with naturalistic graphicness the brutal realities of everyday peasant life in the Habsburg territories in the latter years of the monarchy. Such works demonstrate that emancipation was as much a curse as it was a blessing for its beneficiaries, because it granted the peasants freedom without also providing them with the economic and political means to benefit from it. The necessary improvements were tragically long in coming.

NOTES

[1]Erika Fischer, *Soziologie Mährens in der zweiten Hälfte des 19. Jahrhunderts als Hintergrund der Werke Marie von Ebner-Eschenbachs* (Leipzig: Ernst Wunderlich, 1939) 22. Péter Hanák provides a detailed description of the plight of the emancipated serfs in the section entitled "*Das Pußtavolk*" in *Ungarn in der Donaumonarchie: Probleme der Bürgerlichen Umgestaltung eines Vielvölkerstaates* (Wien: Verlag für Geschichte und Politik, 1984) 418-424.

[2]*The New Encyclopaedia Britannica*, ed. Philip W. Goetz, 15th ed., vol. 10 (Chicago: Encyclopaedia Britannica, 1989) 647. For discussion of the role of the bubonic plague in ending serfdom in western Europe, as well as introducing it into Prussia, Poland, and Hungary, see Robert S. Gottfried, *The Black Death: Natural and Human Disaster in Medieval Europe* (New York: The Free Press, 1983) 135-140. See also the informative chapter "Why Is There an Eastern Europe?" in E. Garrison Walters, *The Other Europe: Eastern Europe to 1945* (New York: Dorset, 1990) 110-131. Oscar Jaszi singles out Hungary as the most feudal of all European countries prior to 1848 except for pre-partition Poland and tsarist Russia. *The Dissolution of the Habsburg Monarchy* (Chicago: Chicago UP, 1929) 220.

[3]Some examples: Austria-Hungary undertook emancipation of the *Kmets* in Bosnia after occupying Bosnia-Herzegovina in 1878 (Jaszi 225). In the Russian empire, emancipation occurred in 1861 (W. Bruce Lincoln, *In War's Dark Shadow: The Russians Before the Great War*, New York: Dial, 1983, 36). Alexander Cuza legislated peasant emancipation in Romania in 1864 (Robert Lee Wolff, *The Balkans in Our Time*, rev. ed., New York: Norton, 1978, 81).

[4]Sándor Bródy is perhaps the best example of this. See chapter XVI: "The Metropolitan Experience: the Cult of Illusion," in Lóránt Czigány, *The Oxford History of Hungarian Literature: From the Earliest Times to the Present* (New York: Oxford UP, 1984) 263-88.

[5]Jaszi 201. See also Robin Okey, *Eastern Europe 1740-1985: Feudalism to Communism*, 2nd ed. (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1986) 118-123.

[6]Okey 118-119. Hanák states that the percentage of agricultural workers in Hungary in 1910 was 62 percent (*Ungarn in der Donaumonarchie*, 397). In the same year, according to Fischer (*Soziologie Mährens*, 33), the percentage of rural inhabitants in Moravia was 59.4 percent.

[7]See Czigány 168, and also *A History of Hungarian Literature*, Tibor Klaniczay, ed. (Budapest: Corvina, 1982) 261.

[8]See Arne Novák, *Die Tschechische Literatur* (Potsdam: Akademische Verlagsgesellschaft Athenaion, 1931) 52-53.

[9]See Ernst Alker, *Die deutsche Literatur im 19. Jahrhundert: (1832-1914)* (Stuttgart: Kröner, 1969) 179-180.

[10]István Sőtér, *Eötvös József*, 2nd ed. (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1967) 47. Eötvös wrote two essays on Victor Hugo: "A francia drámai literatúra és Victor Hugo" (French Dramatic Literature and Victor Hugo, 1835) and "Hugo Victor mint drámai költő" (Victor Hugo as Dramatic Poet, 1837). They are discussed in Sőtér, 55-58, as well as in Paul Bődy, *Joseph Eötvös and the Modernization of Hungary, 1840-1870: A Study of Ideas of Individuality and Social Pluralism in Modern Politics* (Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1972) 16-18. As both Sőtér and Bődy report, the influence of Hugo extended to a number of Hungarian authors in the years leading up to the Revolution, including Mihály Vörösmarty and Sándor Petőfi.

[12]Sőtér 56. This and all other English translations from Hungarian and German sources, unless otherwise indicated, are my own.

[13]See D. Mervyn Jones, *Five Hungarian Writers* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1966) 160-161.

[14]Hanák cites a literacy rate of 31.3 percent for 1870 (*Ungarn in der Donaumonarchie*, 344).

[15]See Bődy, 44. *A falu jegyzője* reached English audiences through Otto Wenckstern's 1850 translation *The Village Notary: A Romance of Hungarian Life* (published both in London and Philadelphia), and German readers through Johann Mailath's translation *Der Dorfnotair*, which came out in Leipzig in 1846.

[16]Jones 160.

[17]Czigány 157.

[18]József Eötvös, *A falu jegyzője*, 4th ed. (Budapest: Ráth Mór, 1891) 2:198.

[19]Eötvös 3:202.

[20]See Emile Durkheim, *Le Suicide: Etude de Sociologie*, new ed. (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1960) 276-277.

[21]Denis Sinor gives a pointed account of noble exploitation of the lower classes in *History of Hungary*, 1959 (Westport: Greenwood Press, 1976) 236-241.

[22]"Durkheim failed in *Suicide* to relate his sociological and cultural variables. . . to more specifically social forms of action and reaction. Yet one typical response to anomie and the anxiety it provoked was the attempt to 'reintegrate' experience through collective action and group mobilization" (Dominick LaCapra, *Emile Durkheim: Sociologist and Philosopher*, Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1972, 154). This is precisely what Eötvös proposes through the example of the figure constellation in *A falu jegyzője*. LaCapra suggests further that, in a society burdened by anomie, anxiety and isolation unite even socially unequal individuals in a fundamental human equality that may serve as "motivation for the creation of a just society" (170). Eötvös accomplishes this symbolically by allowing the reform-minded Tengelyi to be deprived of his noble status and united with the mistreated social outcasts in the Taksony county prison.

[23]Eötvös 1:122.

[24]See Marc Bloch, *Feudal Society*, L. A. Manyon, trans. (Chicago: Chicago UP, 1961) 219-230.

[25]Eötvös 1:247.

[26]Helga H. Harriman, introduction, *Seven Stories by Marie von Ebner-Eschenbach*, trans. by Helga H. Harriman (Columbia: Camden House, 1986) xxi. Danuta S. Lloyd focuses on the role of social criticism in Ebner's works in "Dorf and Schloß: The Socio-Political Image of Austria as Reflected in Marie von Ebner-Eschenbach's Works," *Modern Austrian Literature* 12 (1979): 25-44.

[27]The statement is from Ebner-Eschenbach's *Aus einem zeitlosen Tagebuch* (1916). Translation is quoted from Danuta S. Lloyd, "Marie von Ebner-Eschenbach," *Major Figures of Turn-of-the-Century Austrian Literature*, Donald G. Daviau, ed. (Riverside: Ariadne, 1991) 109.

[28]See Harriman, xiii-xv.

[29]Eötvös was perfectly content to sacrifice aesthetic quality in his works if it meant that they would better serve the interests of social reform. He admired in a writer: "the self-denial, with which he, who could find diamonds in the depths of his heart, prefered to break up his field with a sharp plow, because he felt that with this work he could do less for his own glory and more for the good of mankind. . ." *A falu jegyzője*, 2:73. The entire lengthy paragraph from 2:71-74 gives an excellent account of Eötvös's views concerning the optimal role of the writer in society.

[30]Harriman xvi.

[31]Claudio Magris, *Der habsburgische Mythos in der österreichischen Literatur* (Salzburg: Otto Müller, 1966) 154.

[32]See Czigány, 243-244.

[33]Danuta S. Lloyd, "Waifs and Strays: The Youth in Marie von Ebner--Eschenbach's Village Tales," in *Views and Reviews of Modern German*

Literature: Festschrift for Adolf D. Klarmann, Karl S. Weimer, ed. (Munich: Delp, 1974) 50.

[34]Marie von Ebner-Eschenbach, *Das Gemeindekind* (Stuttgart: Reclam, 1985), 89.

[35]*Ibid.*, 95.

[36]*Ibid.*, 66.

[37]*Ibid.*, 67.

[38]*Ibid.*

[39]*Ibid.*, 136, 137.

[40]*Ibid.*, 136.

[41]*Ibid.*

[42]A number of authors indicate that it was more than just the spirit of feudalism that lived on in late nineteenth-century East Central Europe. Hanák asserts that, for the lowest classes of agricultural workers in Hungary, the dissolution of feudal ties amounted to little more than a legality. Individuals who made their living working on the huge noble estates were treated much the same as the tenant farmers and servants of the feudal era (*Ungarn in der Donaumonarchie*, 418-419). Fischer explains that, in Moravia, the landless villagers continued to depend upon the manorial lords for their material and legal welfare (*Soziologie Mährens*, 76-77, 84). For analysis of how the perpetuation of feudal institutions in Austria-Hungary after 1848 undermined social development, see Jaszi 220-239.

[43]Ebner-Eschenbach 49, 51.

[44]*Ibid.*, 48-49.

[45]*Ibid.*, 124.

[46]*Ibid.*, 10.

[47]*Ibid.*, 180.

[48]*Ibid.*, 51, 201.

[49]LaCapra 181.

Hungarian Studies Review, Vol. XX, Nos. 1-2 (Spring-Fall, 1993)

The War for Wilson's Ear: Austria-Hungary in Wartime American Propaganda

Tibor Glant

Much has been written about First World War propaganda and it is generally understood that the years between 1914 and 1918 saw the emergence of propaganda as an important means of influencing major political decisions.[1] Anti-Habsburg and anti-Magyar propaganda enjoyed significant support in France and Great Britain, and Stephen Borsody has suggested that "the Trianon peacemaking was above all the triumph of propaganda."[2] It is the aim of the present study to examine the major trends and promoters of propaganda regarding the Habsburg Monarchy and, where possible, Hungary, to decide whether this was true of the United States as well. A considerable amount of propaganda directed against the Habsburg Monarchy promoted the concept that the Magyars were responsible for the minority problems of the Dual Monarchy, with the primary aim of justifying certain territorial claims against Hungary. This is why discussions on Hungary and Magyar policy towards ethnic minorities are given special attention in this study.

When hostilities began the United States quickly established herself as the major neutral provider of war supplies, and by 1917 it had also become clear that American intervention would be a decisive if not the deciding factor in the final outcome of the war. Studies of World War propaganda in the United States reveal that the attack on the Central Powers focused largely upon Germany. However, both pro- and anti-Habsburg campaigns were also launched as early as the autumn of 1914, though some of the methods applied successfully against Germany were either simply dropped in the Habsburg case or, due to lack of credibility, failed to work. As Jeszenszky points out, the Bryce Report type of atrocity stories,[3] although used by all the nationalities of the Monarchy and allied propagandists alike, did not carry sufficient conviction and were received with very limited interest.[4] These stories were less sensational than the atrocities supposedly committed by the public enemy number one, Germany, against neutral citizens, women, and children.

Most World War I propaganda was printed material. Besides the press, cartoons, posters, maps, pamphlets, and books were extensively used

while films and oral propaganda were hardly ever utilised in relation to Austria-Hungary. Successful foreign and domestic propaganda in America may have influenced the Wilson administration indirectly through public opinion; yet the further we move away in time from the war the more difficult it becomes to give an accurate account of the actual scope, methods, and effect of these efforts. Proof of the American circulation of books and pamphlets cited hereafter has been established in a variety of ways, from the survey of the libraries of the University of Chicago, the School of Slavonic and East European Studies, and the Imperial War Museum in London, to consulting contemporary and subsequent secondary sources. Nonetheless, in certain cases it has been impossible to establish further details of the authors' identity.

During the neutrality period there was no official federal propaganda agency in the United States. Wilson's call for neutrality "in thought as well as in action" received general approval. The President remained the chief propagandist of the whole period although some prominent politicians discussed the war and the necessity of American intervention. Austria-Hungary, if mentioned at all, was treated as a vassal of Germany and not a single American author dealt with her extensively. In *National Strength and International Duty* (1917) former president Theodore Roosevelt expressed sympathy for "the mass of men of different races to whom liberty is denied by the dual tyranny of the Germans and Magyars of Austria-Hungary." He concluded that the "war has shown that Austria has become a subject ally of Germany and an enemy of freedom and civilization. Unless we resolutely intend to break up Austria and Turkey, and insist on liberty for the subject races in the two countries, our talking about 'making the world safe for democracy' is a sham."[5] George D. Herron, one of the President's personal agents in Europe, revealed a similar attitude to the Monarchy: "We may now rest assured that no peace will be made with the Hapsburgs or the Hohenzollerns. . . over the Central Empires she [the United States] sees the rule of that Oriental and anachronistic absolutism which had so long perverted mankind — so long prevented the true progress and self-expression of the people."[6] In some contrast with these pieces, S. Ivor Stephen questioned the neutrality of the American press because of certain aspects of its news presentation regarding the Central Powers.

The few American pamphlets which at least mentioned Austria-Hungary carried similar generalisations and reflected no particular interest. James M. Beck, for example, "a prominent Republican lawyer and one of his [Wilson's] bitterest opponents and critics,"[7] hardly ever mentioned Austria in his widely circulated pamphlets.[8] At the same time, the author of *The Great Illusion* Norman Angell, referred to Austria as a German power which must be opposed by international cooperation in *America and*

the Cause of the Allies (1916). George Louis Beer, later American Peace Commissioner in Paris, remarked that the Central Powers were in a sense right when protesting against the British blockade which denied them equal access to neutral, i.e. American, war supplies.[9] In accordance with this tendency, domestic American newspapers paid little attention to dismemberment propaganda. Herbert A. Miller, who was a close friend of Thomas G. Masaryk (then leader of the Czech independence movement), noted that "in the early years of the war there was scarcely any reference in the newspapers to central Europe. In fact it was not until the spectacular march of the Czechoslovaks across Siberia at a moment when other war news was scarce that attention finally became focused on the issues created by the Czechoslovaks."[10]

Of all foreign propaganda in the United States prior to April 1917 the British was by far the most effective. Conducted "unofficially" from Wellington House, London, by the very gifted Sir Gilbert Parker, this campaign proved to be highly successful, not least because the American public was simply not aware of the involvement of the British government in it. With every pamphlet mailed to some 260,000 American addresses a personal letter from Parker was also enclosed.[11] The British, having cut the German underwater cables to the United States during the first month of the war, practically had a monopoly of news, although the Germans continued sending their news via South America, and by wireless or telegraph, through neutral capitals.[12] The next steps were to put the entire blame on Germany for starting the war and to present her in the worst possible light. A major success was scored with the Bryce Report on German atrocities in Belgium which became the model for this type of propaganda. With Germany defined as the main enemy, Austria-Hungary did not have a place in the front line of British government propaganda. Historian James D. Squires published a list of Wellington House pamphlets sent to America in 1935: out of 231 items only five dealt with the Monarchy in detail.[13] In his writings Lewis B. Namier, a member of the Foreign Office, introduced the Czechs and Slovaks as branches of the same nation ruthlessly oppressed by Germans, Austrians and Magyars alike. In *The Case of Bohemia* (1917) he approached the question through the problems and threats posed by a German *Mitteleuropa*. In *The Czecho-Slovaks. An Oppressed Nationality* (1917) he presented it in a historical perspective from the cooperation of "Teuton Huns" and "Magyar Huns" over the centuries to the Czechs fighting for Allied victory in the war.[14] Written by the "neutral" Prof. R. A. Reiss of Lausanne University on the special request of the Serbian Prime Minister Nicola Pasič, *How Austria-Hungary Waged War in Serbia* (1915) is no more than a piece of atrocity propaganda. Member of the Foreign Office A. W. A. Leeper's essay on Greater Rumania, influenced by R. W. Seton-Watson's (then a British journalist

and leader of a pro-dismemberment group centred around his periodical, *The New Europe*) ideas,[15] was also circulated by Rumanian-Americans. The fifth pamphlet in Squires' list was written by Take Jonescu, a prominent Rumanian politician, later Rumanian peace commissioner. His *The Policy of National Instinct* (1916)[16] was quoted in *Magyar and Rumanian in Hungary*,16 a recommendation produced by the Inquiry, Wilson's peace planning research group:[17] "Either the Hungarians are to occupy the heights of the Carpathians and from that position to dominate us, or we are to establish ourselves in the citadel of Transylvania and from that position to dominate the plains of Hungary. There is no third possibility." It must be emphasized that there is not a single pamphlet by Seton-Watson or Henry Wickham-Steed, another New Europe propagandist and journalist, in Squires' Wellington House list, which proves that British government propaganda did not promote the dismemberment of the Habsburg Monarchy at that stage.

A few other British pamphlets must have reached the American public via other channels. One route was through church connections, which was probably the case with Pearson's *The Nemesis of Germany and Austria*, an emotionally overheated piece with several references to "the whole rotten fabric of the detested Austrian monarchy." Another possibility was simultaneous publication in both countries like in case of Beaven's *Austrian Policy Since 1867* (1914) and *What Is at Stake in the War* (1915), a rare Seton-Watson pamphlet circulated by the British in America before April 1917. Both *The Austro-Servian Dispute* (1914) and Woods' *War and Diplomacy in the Balkans* (1915) discussed the road to Sarajevo and Austria's role in the outbreak of the war. Serbia featured in two more British pamphlets: while Lady Paget's *With Our Serbian Allies* is practically insignificant, Lipton's *The Terrible Truth about Serbia* is the report of a 1915 Red Cross mission.

French propaganda in the United States against the Monarchy is hardly worth mentioning at all. Even the chief advocates of the Czech case, like Ernest Denis, Ernest Lavisse, Emile Durkheim and Henri Bergson,[18] failed to join the American campaign. The two really significant French contributions were the release of Benes' *Détruisez l'Autriche-Hongrie!* (1916), and the writings of André Chéradame, the chief French propagandist of dismemberment in the United States. Chéradame spoke out against the Monarchy as early as 1901 when his *L'Europe et la Question D'Autriche* was published in Paris. In his wartime writings, three of which were published in the United States, he argued that the break-up of the Monarchy and the liberation of the peoples of Central Europe (including the Magyars) were the only means of containing pan-Germanism.[19]

The Italian campaign was even less productive with one single piece of atrocity propaganda. *Austrian Barbarity Against Italian Churches* in-

cluded 16 dated photographs and 8 pages of text. The fact that the latest picture was taken in December 1917 suggests that the release of this pamphlet was inspired by the American declaration of war on Austria-Hungary.

German propaganda in the United States focused on three things: (1) winning the German-Americans for the cause of their homeland, (2) rejecting responsibility for the outbreak of the war and (3) denying atrocity stories. This propaganda, organised and run by Dr. Derenburg and Ambassador von Bernstorff, had serious shortcomings: the open campaign started in the early days of the war was simply out of place in neutral America, support from Germany remained ineffective, and the pamphlets circulated were stylistically very poor and carried the emblem of the Imperial German Government.[20] Only two pamphlets, both printed in Germany, dealt with the Monarchy: the first one was a collection of articles on the Monarchy surveying her ethnic, economic and financial conditions while the other one was not even translated into English.

Austro-Hungarian propaganda in America was conducted by the embassy and the consulates (especially the ones in New York and Cleveland). Besides subsidising Hungarian-American papers for carrying pro-Habsburg articles, the New York consulate (lead by von Nuber) published a 64-page general pamphlet, very similar to the first German one mentioned above. A small book, Ernest Ludwig's *Austria-Hungary and the War* (1915) was published with Ambassador Dumba's introduction and was translated into Hungarian as well. This was the only attempt to justify Austria's case, a fact proving that lack of interest was mutual between the two countries (i.e. The United States and the Monarchy) all through the period of American neutrality. Ludwig claimed that with the defeat of the Allies "England will lose her German and Austro-Hungarian customers to a very large degree and . . . this trade will shift to other countries, preferably to the United States." This rather weak appeal was complemented with references to the friendly relations between the two countries before the war and to Hungarians fighting in the American Civil War.[21]

As the British blockade cut off American war supplies from the Central Powers their respective American embassies tried to sabotage or, at least, hinder the manufacturing of munitions in America. Both ambassadors issued statements that, for German or Austro-Hungarian subjects, working in American munition factories might result in capital punishment on returning to the home country, which was the aim of many immigrants. Dumba's other move was a call for a strike by Hungarian-American workingmen. It appeared in *Szabadság* (Liberty), a Hungarian-American paper published in Cleveland. He later claimed that it was the editor of *Szabadság* who approached Consul-General von Nuber with the idea, and that he (Dumba) just gave his consent to it.[22] Dumba sent his report to Foreign Minister Burian by an American journalist, James Archibald. On the way

to Vienna Archibald was arrested by British authorities acting upon information coming from Emmanuel Voska, a member of the Bohemian National Alliance.[23] The captured documents were published and Wilson and Lansing immediately demanded Dumba's recall, declaring him *persona non grata*. This so-called Dumba affair became a standard feature in all war fact handbooks and had grave consequences. The Czechs scored a major success: Dumba's successor, Count Tarnowski, was not allowed to present his credentials to Wilson. Clearly, the Monarchy's prestige had been impaired.

* * *

The American declaration of war on Germany and the Habsburg Monarchy proved to be a turning point in World War I propaganda in America. The British abandoned Parker's covert campaign for a sweeping and overt one organised by Lord Northcliffe, while German and Austro-Hungarian propaganda slowly died away as financial support vanished with the closing of the Embassies. Meanwhile, immigrant groups from the Monarchy started canvassing openly for the independence of their respective homelands and the Committee on Public Information, an official federal agency, was set up to conduct American propaganda both at home and abroad. By the end of 1917 pro-Habsburg, and for that matter pro-Magyar, statements disappeared.

The increased American interest in the war prompted various people to step forth and satisfy this need. One contributor to American, but not government controlled propaganda was former president Theodore Roosevelt who published a series of articles for the *Kansas City Star* between October 1917 and his death in early January 1919. He reacted mainly to the events of the war but he also lent considerable support to dismemberment propagandists.[24] The National Security League, basically an interventionist organization led by former Secretary of State Elihu Root, issued a *Handbook of War Facts and Peace Problems* (1918), which discussed German and Austro-Hungarian activities in America and analyzed Czech, Rumanian and Yugoslav territorial claims. The Review of Reviews Company released a collection of *Two Thousand Questions and Answers about the War* (1918), with a large section on nationalities. John Price Jones in *The German Spy in America* (1917), published with an introduction by Theodore Roosevelt, devoted a whole chapter to Dumba's activities. Two books, both published in early 1918, revealed opposing views about Hungarians. Former ambassador to Germany, James W. Gerard's *Face to Face with Kaiserism*, despite the author's family relations to prominent Hungarian politician Count Sigray, presented Austria-Hungary as the "Kaiser's

vassal state." An entirely different view was presented in Mrs. Bullitt's diary of a visit to Hungary in the company of her husband, William C. Bullitt, later American Peace Commissioner, in 1916. Published two years later, Mrs. Bullitt's diary revealed her high opinion of Hungarians.[25]

British government propaganda in the meantime reached new heights. Working in a co-belligerent state, Northcliffe's agency had a relatively easy task. The volume of anti-Habsburg propaganda did not grow significantly, but its content underwent radical changes as the New Europe group was given a free hand.[26] Steed's *Austria and Europe*, written on the occasion of Emperor Francis Joseph's death in November 1916, was reprinted from *The Edinburgh Review*. The author proposed the total dismemberment of the Habsburg Monarchy along ethnic lines. These new nation-states would include a diminished Hungary while the Austro-Germans would join Germany. It was Seton-Watson who introduced the distinction between Hungarian and Magyar, the former referring to all inhabitants of the Kingdom of Hungary, the latter depicting the ethnic group. This distinction was widely used both in war propaganda and Peace Conference rhetoric. According to Arday, it is also due to his influence that the word "Magyarization" came to imply the adjective "ruthless."[27] Seton-Watson was co-author of *The War and Democracy*, first released in 1914 and reprinted twice in 1915. It was a collection of nine essays with eight maps discussing the causes and problems of the war. In *German, Slav, and Magyar* (1916) Seton-Watson devoted an entire chapter to "Magyar racial policy." In *Rumania and the Great War*, published in 1915, he introduced the concept of Daco-Rumanian continuity to the general public, elaborated upon Rumania's aspirations and explained her position in the war. His pamphlets available in the U.S. were equally informative and well-presented. In *The Spirit of the Serb* (1915) he called attention to the sufferings of Serbia, both past and present, and suggested the creation of a united South Slav state. In *The Balkans, Italy and the Adriatic* (1915) he reiterated that Germany must be defeated through the destruction of her ally, the road to Berlin — he argued — led through the Balkans. In *What Is at Stake in the War* (1915) he wrote: "The dissolution of Austria-Hungary — an event which is only conceivable if Germany should be completely defeated — would include a complete regrouping of Central and South-eastern Europe." The main features of the proposed reorganisation, besides Polish independence, were the creation "of an independent Bohemia — including not merely the Czechs, but their Slovak kinsmen in Northern Hungary," and of a Greater Rumania "including the Roumanian populations of Hungary and the Bukovina"; the foundation of "a new Southern Slav state, composed of the present kingdoms of Serbia and Montenegro, the ancient but dormant Triune Kingdom of Croatia-Slavonia-Dalmatia, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Eastern Istria and perhaps the Slovene dis-

tricts of Austria," and the establishment of "an independent Hungary, a national state shorn of the races whom she has so long and so grossly misgoverned, and herself set free for a new era of democratic development." He also insisted that no race should be "handed over to an alien rule without [being] previously consulted."[28] Two further pamphlets were also circulated by the British. *The War of Liberation* (1917) called for the freedom of all subject races in the world. More important was Headlam-Morley's (later British Peace Commissioner) *The Dead Lands of Europe* (1917) which was written for Americans.[29] He too suggested the creation of independent nation states in Central Europe and explained the Allies' reply to Wilson's peace note of December 1916. British propagandists also used cartoons on a large scale to promote their ideas. The American press was flooded with the works of Louis Raemakers, a Dutch artist. A three volume collection of his cartoons was released in 1918-1919 and he had an exhibition in Chicago.[30] Overall, British government propaganda gained new dimensions and liberties with American intervention and Northcliffe's agents took full advantage of the situation.

Meanwhile, the nationalities of the Habsburg Empire were also industriously promoting their ideas. The Polish campaign for liberation produced one of the few pro-Monarchy manifestations of all nationality movements. Felix Mlynarski, a delegate of the Polish Supreme National Committee to America, remarked in his book on peace problems (1916) that the "entire world looks at Austria-Hungary's part through the spectacles of hatred against Germany. This is the reason Russian diplomacy was able to make the idea of a partition of Austria-Hungary generally popular." The core of his argument was that in case Austria-Hungary was dismembered "the German provinces of the Hapsbourg [sic] empire would naturally fall to Germany" which, "from the point of view of national evolution . . . would mean a triumph for Germany and national unification would be a balm on the defeat."[31] Mlynarski's position is clear: the main enemies are Germany and Russia; Austria-Hungary — with South Slav trialism — could guarantee Polish independence.

The discussion of the aims and strength of the Czech-Slovak movement in America would extend beyond the scope of the present study. Suffice it to say that it was by far the most organised one and propaganda was seen as one of the obvious means of realising its ultimate goal: securing American support for the creation of a new state of Czechs, Slovaks, and Carpatho-Ruthenians. Yet, America's overall ignorance and lack of interest rendered the task of Czech propagandists extremely difficult.[32] The whole campaign was launched in London, on the 500th anniversary of the burning of John Hus, who was one of the forerunners of the European Reformation.[33] The Czech campaign is best known for two books. An extended version of Benes' *Détruisez l'Autriche-Hongrie!* was published

as a small volume in English with an introduction by Steed in 1917, while Masaryk summed up his earlier thoughts in *The New Europe (The Slav Standpoint)* in 1918. Benes argued that it was the Monarchy who had started the war, the triggering force being Magyar ethnic policy represented by Premier István Tisza. According to Benes, the Monarchy was the most dangerous tool of Germany and the Magyars were the most loyal allies of the Germans. He accused Magyars of historic crimes: the Slavs, democratic and peaceful, had been ruthlessly oppressed by the German-Magyar alliance since medieval times. Consequently, Austria-Hungary deserved nothing short of destruction while the creation of independent Slav national states in the "heart of Europe" would have the double benefit of hitherto unexperienced development in the region on the one hand, and the containment of German eastward expansion on the other. Released in 1918, Masaryk's *The New Europe (The Slav Standpoint)* was possibly the most important propaganda publication about the Habsburg Monarchy. Masaryk too pointed to the necessity for the destruction of Austria-Hungary: she was an outpost of Germany, an "artificial state," whose partition would be in accordance with the will of her peoples and would remove the German threat to Russia by eliminating their common boundaries. In the new order thus created, a United Poland and Yugoslavia but, above all, a strong and democratic Czechoslovakia, would act as a buffer zone. Therefore, the creation of a non-German, anti-German, Slav national Central Europe was in the interest of the whole democratic world. After the present war, for which he too blamed the Magyars, this New Europe would be the key to European peace and prosperity.[34]

With the guiding principles set by Benes and Masaryk, the Bohemian National Alliance (hereafter B.N.A.), seated in Chicago, started its campaign in America.[35] According to Vojta Benes, Edvard Benes' brother and B.N.A. activist, by December 1916 they had circulated some 20,000 pamphlets in the United States.[36] These included Seton-Watson's *The Future of Bohemia* (1915), and several works by Masaryk, which formed the basis of *The New Europe. The Problem of Small Nations* (1915) was his inaugural speech at the School of Slavonic Studies, King's College, London; his *The Slavs Among the Nations* (1916) was reprinted from the March 15, 1916 issue of Ernest Denis' *La Nation Tcheque*; *The Declaration of the Bohemian (Czech) Foreign Committee* (1916), also by Masaryk, was one of the first B.N.A. publications and *Austrian Terrorism in Bohemia* (1916), with Masaryk's introduction, was the Czech version of atrocity propaganda. The most productive Czech propagandist in America before Masaryk's arrival in May 1918 was Charles Pergler, originally a lawyer from Iowa. Pergler was vice-president of the B.N.A., head of the Czech-Slav Press Bureau, Masaryk's American secretary, Czechoslovak envoy in Washington during the Armistice period and the new republic's first ambassador to

Japan. His first pamphlet was *Bohemia's Claim to Independence* (1916), a transcript of his speech delivered to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on February 25, 1916. This was followed by three more publications which were further elaborations on the aims of the Czechs. The only pamphlet circulated in America going beyond the Benes-Masaryk line of propaganda was Pergler's *Should Austria Exist?* (1918), reprinted from the *Yale Review*. Its first paragraph was so uniquely extreme that it must be quoted: "Metternich once called Italy a mere geographical expression. This statement was never really true of Italy, but it may be applied to the Austro-Hungarian Empire. Who ever heard of anyone calling himself an Austrian? Even Francis Joseph, the late Austrian Emperor, once asserted that he was a German prince. There is no Austrian language, no Austrian literature, no Austrian nationality, no Austrian civilization. Still, states do not come into being without the aid of powerful social, economic, and political factors. Austria's main justification for existence may be found in Asiatic invasions, that is, of the Huns (Magyars) and later the Turks." Three book length works of propaganda were also circulated in America by the Czechs. Edited by Thomas Čapek, *Bohemia Under Hapsburg Misrule* (1915) consisted of eight studies on Czech and Slovaks. Vladimir Nošek, the head of the Czech Press Bureau in London, gave an account of the Czechoslovak movement in *Independent Bohemia* (1918). The third book was Schwarze's *The Life of John Hus*, which appears to be the only separate piece of Hus-propaganda in America. Two journals, the *Bohemian Review* and the *Bohemian Correspondence* were also published regularly in Chicago, while Pergler's Press Bureau circulated the *Czecho-Slovak Bulletin* in New York City. Badges and postcards were also used to promote the Czech case. Around the signing of the Armistice, a detailed map of Central Europe, with the Czecho-Slovak ethnic boundaries highlighted, was publicly exhibited on 5th Ave., New York. Public meetings, especially after Masaryk's arrival, were also held, and Bohemian-American artist Vojtech Preissing prepared some recruiting posters for the Czechoslovak Legion.[37] Masaryk crowned all Czech efforts with the Declaration of Czecho-Slovak Independence in Paris and Washington on October 18, 1918.[38]

By contrast with Czech, Rumanian propaganda activities remained rather limited all through the war period. With the possibilities inherent in an organization like the B.N.A. lacking, it was the members of the Transylvanian mission who conducted propaganda in the United States. The mission included Vasile Stoica, Ion Mota, and the Rev. Vasile Lucaciu, father of the Rev. E. Lucaciu, mentioned below. They arrived in America in June 1917 to win support for Greater Rumania plans and to establish a Transylvanian Legion.[39] Stoica met Theodore Roosevelt on several occasions and secured his support. Rumanian-Americans, especial-

ly the Rev. E. Lucaciu, were also involved in counter espionage activities but, unlike the aforementioned Voska, they failed to score any major success. It was not until the Rumanian National League of America was founded (July 5, 1918) that a major Rumanian-American organization declared the education of American public opinion to be its main objective. Public meetings in Chicago, Boston, Cleveland, New York and Washington, D.C. were held, some under the auspices of the Committee on Public Information. To secure greater publicity, Stoica and Nicolae Lupu (of Bucharest University) supplied Boston, New York, Cleveland and Washington papers with information, and the League's own magazine, the *Periscope*, was published, although no Rumanian Press Bureau was established. Some 6,000 copies of 6 pamphlets and some maps were circulated. Stoica's *Suffering in Transylvania* and the *Book of Sorrow* (1917), edited by E. Lucaciu, were pieces of atrocity propaganda directed against the Magyars. Mitrany's *Greater Rumania* (1917) and Leeper's *Justice of Rumania's Cause* (1917) both attempted to justify Rumanian territorial claims against Hungary. Lupu's *Rumania and the Great War* consisted of a short account of Rumanian aspirations, her reasons for joining the Allies and her war sacrifices while Queen Marie of Rumania supplied the sixth piece. The circulation of three books dealing with Rumania, including Seton-Watson's *Rumania and the Great War*, was largely due to British efforts. Magnus' *Rumania's Cause and Ideals* (1917) contributed but little: besides discussing population statistics and enumerating various methods of "forced Magyarization," the author elaborated upon the Rumanian aspects of the German Mitteleuropa plan. Hirst's book was written for the British public but was released in America as well. A forth book briefly mentioned the Transylvanian mission working in the United States.[40]

South Slav propaganda in America was divided over the Pan-Serb versus Yugoslav issue. By early 1918, when immigrant propaganda was likely to have some influence, the Yugoslav idea became the preference of both the South Slav Americans and the Wilson administration.[41] It appears that the British circulated more pamphlets in America about Serbia than the Serbians themselves, mainly because the South Slav immigrants in America came almost exclusively from the Monarchy where the Pan-Serb idea was not very popular. An extended version of Professor Reiss' account of Austro-Hungarian atrocities in Serbia was circulated as a book. Velimirovič's *Serbia's Place in Human History* (1915), dedicated to Seton-Watson, was the only Serbian pamphlet definitely circulated in America. Tučič's *The Slav Nations* (1915),[42] one of the *Daily Telegraph War Books*, was published in the United States as well as in England. Another rare piece of pro-Habsburg, yet at the same time anti-Magyar, propaganda in America came from a Croatian-American, the Rev. Krmpotič. In *Are*

Italy's Claims Justified (1915) he rejected the "Pan-Serb illusion" and argued: "If after this war the Austro-Hungarian empire is desmembered [*sic*], of which, so far, there is not the slightest indication, the only successful adjustment among the Southern Slavs would consist in a federalization of the states on the basis of equality, and in not allowing any one state to absorb any other." He went on to discuss what he considered to be the more likely outcome: "If, on the other hand, when the cloud of war has cleared, Austro-Hungarian sovereignty and monarchical integrity is not broken down, it is most certain that a new policy of federation must be carried out, which will give the Slavs in the Monarchy full power in the government of their respective countries." He put the blame on the Magyars for the lack of trialism in the Monarchy, and also warned that "democracy is coming; she shall break the Magyar oligarchy. The price for the long existing oppression of Croats by the Magyars is to be paid."[43]

The arrival of Hiňko Hiňkovič and Bogumil Vosnjak revitalized Yugoslav propaganda in America.[44] Hiňkovič, a former Croatian member of the Hungarian parliament, was sent to America by the Serbian Premier, Nicola Pasič. During his stay in the United States Hiňkovič abandoned the Pan-Serb programme and came to represent Ante Trumbič's Yugoslav Committee. Vosnjak, a Slovenian by birth, was sent to America by Trumbič to promote the Yugoslav idea. Evidence proves that at least three Yugoslav Committee pamphlets (all published in England) reached the American public.[45] *Austro-Magyar Judicial Crimes* (1916), released in a slightly altered version by the Yugoslav Committee in North America as well, was the South Slav contribution to the atrocity propaganda campaign against the Monarchy. In *The Jugoslavs In Future Europe* Hiňkovič discussed "Magyar misrule in Croatia" and argued for dismemberment on the grounds that if Austria-Hungary, "this monstrous phenomenon," survived the war it would "repeat itself in yet another war." He also echoed the German-Magyar conspiracy theory: "The Magyars have always sought and found in Berlin support for their Imperialistic fancies just as, on the other hand, in Germany they have always been considered a most important pawn in the Hamburg-Bagdad game." He summed up the Yugoslav idea in the following words: "That ideal is the unity in one single State of all the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes, who are one nation, with the same language, and the same tendencies, and whom only adverse fate has divided."[46] *The Jugoslav Problem* (1918), reprinted for circulation from the *World Court*, a New York magazine, followed the same line of thought in many cases with word for word correspondence. Vosnjak's *Jugoslav Nationalism* (1916) was another lengthy discussion of the South Slav question, while in *A Dying Empire* (1918) he introduced new arguments as well. An independent Yugoslav state, argued Vosnjak, would be the key factor in the economics of the Balkans. Yugoslavia would also

contain German eastward expansion by cutting her off from the East and frustrating her plan to connect the Rhine and the Danube (which would be the guarantee of German economic and political domination in Central Europe). Vosnjak called the making of Hungary "one of the most striking sociological processes." He claimed that "historical research will prove the great share of Slavdom in the foundation of the Hungarian State." Of all Slavs the Slovenes "taught the Magyars the art of peace-agriculture, industry, and statecraft." The Magyars were "warriors and nomads bearing their home and their constitution on the backs of their horses. Slav civilization changed them, and gave them more Western notions." Still the Magyars refused to admit their indebtedness to the Slavs. They were always a minority in their own country and they "began with brutal denationalization" in the late eighteenth century to change this situation. The only Magyar to be respected was Kossuth who suggested the creation of a Danubian Confederation based upon the equality of nations in the region. Instead, the *Ausgleich* of 1867 secured Magyar domination in the Eastern half of the Monarchy and the Magyars "became worse than Prussians, their ideology became more [than] Prussian."[47] Not surprisingly, he called for the establishment of an independent South Slav State and Bohemia at the expense of reducing Hungary to her ethnic boundaries. In *A Bulwark Against Germany* (1919) Vosnjak introduced the Slovenes to the American public and gave arguably the best contemporary account of the Yugoslav movement.

* * *

To promote his ideas, President Wilson created the Committee on Public Information (hereafter C.P.I.), an official ministry of propaganda, by an executive order on April 4, 1917. It consisted of the Secretaries of State (Lansing), Navy (Daniels) and War (Baker), and George Creel.[48] Creel was a pro-Wilson progressive journalist and his appointment as chief of the C.P.I. had a rather reserved press reception. Financed from a special Presidential fund, the C.P.I. achieved considerable success in mobilizing American public opinion for the war.[49] Creel had supervision over the publication of war news though he denied the existence of any kind of censorship.[50] The *Official Bulletin* was published daily from May 10, 1917, reaching a monthly circulation of 118,008 by August, 1918. For further education of the public no less than 75,117,178 copies of 94 pamphlets were circulated. The Division of Films produced approximately 20 films, including Pershing's *Crusaders*, *Under Four Flags*, *America's Answer*, and an official weekly *War Review*.[51] Donald M. Ryerson organized the first group of the so-called Four Minute Men in Chicago, then

contacted Creel. The C.P.I. chief liked the idea, embraced it and, by the end of the war, 75,000 government agents had delivered 755,190 four-minute long speeches (hence the name, besides its reference to the Revolution) to a total audience of 314,454,514 people in American cinemas before the show of the main feature films. To the 47 *Official Bulletins*, 3 Army-, 4 Junior Four Minute Men-, and 6 News Bulletins were added.[52]

By early 1918 Creel believed that the dismemberment of the Habsburg Monarchy was necessary and inevitable. Yet, at the same time he had to secure the loyalty of enemy aliens including the Hungarian Americans. On the initiative of Frank I. Cobb (editor of *The New York World*) Creel entrusted Alexander Konta, a New York banker of Hungarian birth and a personal acquaintance of the President, with the organization of the American-Hungarian Loyalty League in January, 1918.[53] In May 1918 the Division of Work Among the Foreign-Born was established with Miss Josephine Roche as its director and Konta was replaced by Arthur Markus as head of the Hungarian Bureau. Creel's final report on the C.P.I. revealed that: "54 articles based on Government material were released by the bureau and published in practically all the 28 Hungarian papers extensively."[54] Establishing control over the Hungarian-American press was justified by the fact that it had supported the Monarchy in return for financial aid during the early years of the war and its involvement in the rather awkward Dumba affair. Furthermore, the C.P.I. supervised the meetings of the League and printed Liberty Loan posters and a pamphlet, *A Message to American-Hungarians* (1918), both in English as well as in Hungarian.[55] The Division of Work Among the Foreign-Born also had a Czechoslovak Bureau which was in regular contact with Bohemian-American organizations and the Czech-Slav Press Bureau. The Yugoslav Bureau, besides its routine work, lent support to South Slav relief organizations, and Hiňkovič also helped the work of the Bureau.[56] Surprisingly, no Rumanian and Carpatho-Ruthenian bureaus were created. Only a very small percentage of this, in some respects impressive, American propaganda effort was devoted to the Monarchy, and the dismemberment of Hungary was never even mentioned. There was not a single C.P.I. poster about the Administration's approach to Austria-Hungary. Nor did the Four Minute Men Bulletins or the C.P.I. pamphlets deal with the question extensively. *The War Encyclopedia* (1918) carried references to Austria-Hungary, Magyarization, Count István Tisza and Transylvania. Wilson's 1917 *Flag Day Address*, and Four Minute Men Bulletins Nos. 14 and 31 (August-September 1917, and May-June 1918 respectively) reflected the President's well-known views of the Monarchy in general terms.

In striking contrast with its rather lacklustre propaganda effort as far as the Monarchy was concerned, the C.P.I. was actively involved in the organization of the Mid-European Union (hereafter M.E.U.). In

September 1918 Creel entrusted Herbert A. Miller with the creation of a league involving all the advocates of the reorganization of Central Europe. Membership of the M.E.U. ranged from representatives of the nationalities (Masaryk, Paderewski, Stoica, and Hiňkovič) to prominent Americans (ex-president Taft, Senators Lodge and Hitchcock). Nevertheless, heated arguments over regional interests (Czech vs. Polish, Italian vs. Yugoslav) destroyed the M.E.U. within three months.[57] The actual importance of the organization of the M.E.U., however, must not escape attention: for the first time ever in American history a Federal Agency not merely financed but created an organization aiming to destroy and replace a significant European power. The administration's involvement with the M.E.U. also indicated that Wilson had irrevocably abandoned Point X of the Fourteen Points by the fall of 1918.

Propaganda may have come of age in the First World War but propaganda regarding the Monarchy, at least in America, remained rather limited in scope as well as in effect. In terms of scope the output is unconvincing: four years of activities yielded some 100 posters, pamphlets, and books most of which were released and circulated by immigrant organizations. The books were hardbound, pocket-sized (with a very few exceptions), relatively cheap and due to their physical appearance they carried more authenticity than the best pamphlet, being an obvious piece of propaganda, could ever achieve. A quick check of the list of pamphlets and books in the Appendix reveals that most of this propaganda material was released through some half a dozen publishers: Nesbit and Co., George Allen and Unwin Ltd., and Hodder and Stoughton in Britain; G.B. Putnam's Sons, E.P. Dutton Co., Fleming H. Revell Co., and George H. Doran Co.(the American branch of Hodder and Stoughton) in America. The B.N.A. alone released or circulated almost one fifth of all these publications.

To a large extent propaganda produced by immigrant groups was informative: the Czechs, Slovaks, Slovenes, etc. had to be introduced to the American public. The pattern was quite simple: a presentation of (sometimes invented) historical facts was followed by an extensive list of grievances, and the bases for the argument for creating national states were the right to self-determination and the containment of Germany, both reflecting Wilson's rhetoric. These introductions, more often than not, went hand in hand with anti-Magyar propaganda. Hungary and the Magyars were presented as Germany's main allies and the archenemies of minority groups and democratic institutions not least because, unlike in the case of Germany, a clear distinction between the People and the Government was denied to the Magyars in Wilsonian rhetoric. All through the war, calls for dismemberment overwhelmed pro-Habsburg and pro-Hungarian propaganda. Austria and Hungary were not listened to partly

because of their obvious enemy status but mainly because they did not have much to say.

In terms of efficiency French and Italian efforts were hardly worth mentioning. A significant contribution came from Britain, though not primarily in the form of government propaganda but through a handful of intellectuals, the *New Europe* group, who enjoyed considerable government support only after the United States had entered the war. They managed to reach the Inquiry and the American public but failed to influence the President himself. Actual dismemberment propaganda was promoted by immigrants, spearheaded by the Czechs with considerable support from Britain. However, it was not the Czech campaign for independence that opened the way for Masaryk and his team to the White House but an issue of high politics: when Wilson needed the Czechoslovak legion in the Russian intervention the American press (under C.P.I. control) "discovered" the heroic struggle of these legionaries. This was a golden opportunity for propaganda but the underlying image of the conflict between "democratic Slavs" and "autocratic Germans and Magyars" did not allow for an attack on Soviet Russia. Rumanian-American efforts, due to ineffective support from home and the country's prewar record (tariff disputes with the U.S., and anti-semitism), proved even less successful. Yugoslav propaganda was similarly fruitless, although for different reasons. Divided in language and religion as well as over the form of their future government, no coordination was exercised by any South Slav authority. Domestic American, especially C.P.I., propaganda hardly ever carried any reference to the future of the Monarchy, but when it did, it favoured dismemberment. Creel's involvement with the M.E.U. demonstrated that the American decision regarding the future of the Habsburg Monarchy was final and irreversible. It also indicated that the Wilson administration was willing to go all the way with dismemberment despite all the obvious difficulties which were carefully avoided by immigrant propagandists but which surfaced immediately with the first attempt at putting theory into practice.

Anti-Habsburg and anti-Magyar propaganda in the Allied countries proved to be extremely successful due to the fact that it enjoyed the support of governments and pressure groups alike. In the entirely different setting of the United States this was not the case. President Wilson's final decision in favour of dismemberment was the result of military and diplomatic developments during the last year of the war. Hence, it can be said that the war for Wilson's ear was never won on the battlefield of American propaganda.

NOTES

The author would like to take this opportunity to thank Drs. Robin Okey and Callum A. MacDonald for the guidance and help they had extended to him while he was a graduate student of theirs at the University of Warwick.

[1]See for example Charles Roetter, *Psychological Warfare* (London: B.T. Batsford Ltd., 1974); M. L. Sanders and Philip M. Taylor, *British Propaganda During the First World War, 1914-1918* (London: The Macmillan Press Ltd., 1982); Harold D. Lasswell, *Propaganda Technique in the World War* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1927). Further references are given in the footnotes below.

[2]Stephen Borsody, "Hungary's Road to Trianon: Peacemaking and Propaganda," in *Essays on World War I: Total War and Peacemaking, A Case Study on Trianon*, Bela K. Kiraly, Peter Pastor, and Ivan Sanders, eds., (Boulder, CO: East European Monographs, 1982), p. 26.

[3]On the Bryce Report see Arthur Ponsonby, *Falsehood in War-Time. Containing an Assortment of Lies Circulated Throughout the Nations During the Great War* (London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd., 1928); H.C. Peterson, *Propaganda for War. The Campaign Against American Neutrality, 1914-1917* (Norman, OKL: Oklahoma University Press, 1939), pp. 55-70; James Morgan Read, *Atrocity Propaganda, 1914-1919* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1941. Reprint. New York: Arno Press, 1972), pp. 51-63. It is obvious that most of the stories were either invented or forged.

[4]Géza Jeszenszky, *Az elveszett presztízs. Magyarország megitélésének megváltozása Nagy-Britanniában, 1894-1918* (The Lost Prestige. The Change in the Image of Hungary in Great Britain) (Budapest: Kossuth, 1986), pp. 277-278.

[5]Roosevelt, *National Strength*, pp. 89, 91. The Appendix at the end of the present study lists all the propaganda material cited hereafter. Books and pamphlets are listed separately with full bibliographical references where available.

[6]Herron, *Woodrow Wilson*, p. 142. Herron's book is actually a collection of articles, the one quoted here appeared first in the March 4, 1917 issue of *Il Giornale d'Italia*, a Rome daily.

[7]Joseph P. Tumulty, *Woodrow Wilson As I Know Him* (London: William Heinemann, 1922), p. 364.

[8]A collection of Beck's speeches and pamphlets was reprinted in *The War and Humanity*, which appeared with an introduction by Theodore Roosevelt.

[9]Beer, *America's International Responsibilities*, pp. 1, 12-13.

[10]Herbert Adolphus Miller, "What Woodrow Wilson and America Meant to Czechoslovakia," in *Czechoslovakia*, Robert J. Kerner, ed., (Berkeley and Los Angeles, CAL: University of California Press, 1949), p. 74. These "issues" included the dismemberment of the Monarchy.

[11]On Parker's American connections see Sanders and Taylor, *British Propaganda*, pp. 169, 171-172. A letter by Parker is reprinted in Peterson, *Propaganda for War*, facing p. 52.

[12]Sanders and Taylor, *British Propaganda*, p. 171; Robert W. Desmond, *Windows on the World. World News Reporting, 1914-1920* (Iowa City: University of Iowa Press, 1980), p. 293. Neutral capitals involved in German news transfer were Amsterdam, Berne, Copenhagen, Stockholm and The Hague.

[13]James Duane Squires, *British Propaganda at Home and in the United States from 1914 to 1917* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1935), appendix.

[14]The word "Hun" requires some explanation: in the usual tendency of scapegoating British propagandists put the label "the Hun" on Emperor William II because of his infamous speech delivered to German troops sent to put down the Boxer rising in China in 1900. On the other hand, it is one of the popular misconceptions of Hungarian history, dating back to Medieval chronicles, that the Hungarians were descendants of Attila's Huns. This coincidence was also noticed and abused by Czech propagandists.

[15]Lajos Arday, *Térkép, csata után. Magyarország a brit külpolitikában (1918-1919)* (Map After the Battle. Hungary in British Foreign Policy) (Budapest: Magvető, 1990), p. 48.

[16]This pamphlet is a transcript of two speeches delivered by Jonescu in the Rumanian Parliament on December 17 and 18, 1915.

[17]Inquiry Document No. 240, by Max Handman. See: National Archives, Washington, D.C. Record Group 256. On the Inquiry see: Lawrence Emerson Gelfand, *The Inquiry. American Preparations for Peace, 1917-1919* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1963).

[18]Durkheim and Bergson do not need introduction, Lavisse was President of the French Academy while Denis, a well-known historian of Bohemia, was appointed as chief of the Comite d'Etudes, one of the French peace preparation committees.

[19]Arthur J. May, *The Passing of the Hapsburg Monarchy, 1914-1918*, 2 vols. (Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1966.), 2: 554.

[20]Roetter, *Psychological*, pp. 37-41, 54-59; Squires, *British Propaganda*, p. 45; Lasswell, *Propaganda Technique*, pp. 146-149.

[21]Ludwig, *Austria-Hungary*, pp. 187-188, 192-194.

[22]Constantin Theodore Dumba, *Memoirs of a Diplomat* (London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd., 1933), pp. 256-258. The journalist involved in the Dumba affair was Martin Dienes.

[23]On Voska's activities see: Emmanuel V. Voska and Irwin Will, *Spy and Counterspy* (New York: Doubleday, Doran & Co., 1940); Arthur Willert, *The Road to Safety. A Study in Anglo-American Relations* (London: D. Verschoyle, 1952.), pp. 22-31; Sanders and Taylor, *British Propaganda*, p. 201.

[24]Theodore Roosevelt, *Roosevelt in the Kansas City Star. War-Time Editorials by Theodore Roosevelt* (Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1921).

[25]Bullitt, *Uncensored Diary*, pp. 254-268.

[26]The New Europe group has been sufficiently studied; this essay focuses exclusively on their American propaganda. For further details in English see Harry Hanak, *Great Britain and Austria-Hungary During the First World War. A Study in the Formation of Public Opinion* (London: Oxford University Press, 1962); Hugh and Christopher Seton-Watson, *The Making of a New Europe. R.W. Seton-Watson and the Last Years of Austria-Hungary* (London: Methuen & Co. Ltd., 1981). In Hungarian see Arday, *Térkép*, pp. 32-71, 112-119; Jeszenszky, *Elveszett presztízs*.

[27]Arday, *Térkép*, p. 312, elaboration on footnote 6 from p. 113.

[28]Seton-Watson, *What Is at Stake*, p. 12.

[29]Headlam-Morley, *Dead Lands*, p. 6: "The United States of America have been founded to maintain the principle of government of the people by the people for the people." is a typical statement. This version was published in the U.S. only.

[30]The exhibition, back in 1916, was a failure, but by the end of the war 2,224 Raemakers' cartoons were printed in American papers. See Sanders and Taylor, *British Propaganda*, pp. 176-177.

[31]Mlynarski, *Problems*, pp. 57, 80.

[32]Miller, "What Woodrow Wilson," pp. 71-72.

[33]This was the best possible choice for two reasons: (1) Masaryk had been in touch with Seton-Watson for almost a year; (2) besides Comenius, Hus was the only Czech known in the West and both his role in paving the way for the Reformation and his martyrdom had high emotional appeal.

[34]For a comparison of Masaryk's plan and Oscar Jaszi's Danubian confederation idea (discussed in *The Future of the Monarchy*, Budapest, 1918) see: Borsody, "Hungary's Road," pp. 37-38, footnote 12.

[35]On Czech propaganda in America see: Thomas Čapek, *The Čechs [Czechs] (Bohemians) in America: A Study of Their National, Cultural, Political, Social, Economic, and Religious Life* (Boston and New York: Houghton and Mifflin Co., 1920), pp. 265-278; Charles Pergler, *America in the Struggle for Czechoslovak Independence* (Philadelphia, PA: Dorrance and Co., 1926.), pp. 11-34; Miller, "What Woodrow Wilson," pp. 71-76.

[36]Robert William Seton-Watson, *Masaryk in England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1943), pp. 96-100.

[37]On posters see *War Posters Issued by Belligerent and Neutral Nations, 1914-1919*, Martin Hardie and Arthur K. Sabin, eds., (London: A. & C. Black Ltd., 1920.), p. 42; Čapek, *Čechs in America*, p. 273.

[38]Otakar Odlozilik, "The Czechs," in *The Immigrants' Influence on Wilsonian Peace Policies*, Joseph P. O'Grady, ed., (Louisville, KY: University of Kentucky Press, 1967), p. 221.

[39]On discussion of Rumanian propaganda see *Unification of the Rumanian National State. The Union of Transylvania with Old Romania*, Miron Constantinescu and Stefan Pascu, eds., (Bucharest: Publishing House of the Academy of the Socialist Republic of Romania, 1971); Thomas A. Devasia, *The United States and the Formation of Greater Romania, 1914-1918* (Ph.D. Thesis. Boston College, Boston, MA, 1970); Victor S. Mamatey, *The United States and East-Central Europe, 1914-1918. A study in Wilsonian Diplomacy and Propaganda* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1957).

[40]Halsey, *Balfour*, p. 111.

[41]George J. Prpič, "The South Slavs," in *Immigrants' Influence*, O'Grady, ed., p. 188.

[42]Tučič was co-editor of the *Southern Slav Bulletin*, published in London. See Hanak, *Great Britain*, p. 81.

[43]These sections were reproduced in Inquiry Document No. 38.

[44]Prpič, "South Slavs," pp. 176-177, 180.

[45]*Austro-Magyar Judicial Crimes*, and one each by Hiňkovič and Vosnjak.

[46]Hiňkovič, *Jugoslavs*, p. 51.

[47]Vosnjak, *Dying Empire*, pp. 140-145.

[48]On the C.P.I. see, George Creel, *How we Advertised America* (New York: Harper and Brothers Co., 1920. Reprint. New York: Arno Press, 1972); James R. Mock and Cedric Larson, *Words That Won the War. The Story of the Committee on Public Information, 1917-1919* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1939); Stephen Vaughn, *Holding Fast the Inner Lines. Democracy, Nationalism, and the Committee on Public Information* (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1980).

[49]George Creel, *Complete Report of the Chairman of the Committee on Public Information, 1917:1918:1919* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1920), pp. 8-10.

[50]George Creel, *Rebel at Large. Recollections of Fifty Crowded Years* (New York: G.B. Putnam's Sons, 1947), pp. 156-165.

[51]Creel, *Complete Report*, pp. 15-18, 47-61, 63-67.

[52]*Ibid.*, pp. 32-43. See also *The Four Minute Men of Chicago* (Chicago, IL: privately published, 1919); Alfred E. Cornebise, *War As Advertised: The Four Minute Men and America's Crusade, 1917-1918* (Philadelphia, PA: American Philosophical Society, 1984).

[53]Mock and Larson, *Words*, pp. 220-225; Creel, *Complete Report*, p. 91; Creel, *How We Advertised*, pp. 184-200. On Cobb's initiative see also *The Papers of Woodrow Wilson*, Arthur S. Link *et al.*, eds., 66 vols. (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1966 onwards), 45: 241. 54. Creel, *Complete Report*, p. 91.

[55]For the programme of such a meeting see Mock and Larson, *Words*, p. 224. The same book also features a Liberty Loan poster in Hungarian on p. 220. 35,000 copies of the pamphlet were released. See Creel, *Complete Report*, p. 91.

[56]On the Czechoslovak and Yugoslav Bureaus see Creel, *Complete Report*, pp. 88-89, 93-94 respectively. On cooperation between Pergler, Hiňkovič, and Creel see: Creel, *How We Advertised*, pp. 186-187.

[57]Arthur J. May, "The Mid-European Union," in *Immigrants' Influence*, O'Grady, ed., pp. 250-271.

APPENDIX

A list of World War I Pamphlets and Propaganda Books Circulated about Austria-Hungary in the United States

PAMPHLETS

Angell, Norman. *America and the Cause of the Allies*. London: Union of Democratic Control, National Labour Press, 1916.

Austria-Hungary and the War. New York: Austro-Hungarian Consulate General, 1915.

Austrian Barbarity Against Italian Churches. Florence: Istituo Micrografico Italiano [no date].

Austrian Terrorism in Bohemia. London: The Czech National Alliance in Great Britain, 1916.

Austro-Magyar Judicial Crimes. Persecution of the Jugoslavs. Political Trials, 1908-1916. London: H. Howes and Co., 1916; Chicago: The Jugoslav Committee in North America [no date].

The Austro-Servian Dispute. London: Macmillan and Co. 1914.

Beaven, Murray. *Austrian Policy Since 1867*. London, Edinburgh, Glasgow, New York, Toronto, Melbourne, Bombay: Oxford University Press, 1914.

Beck, James. *The United States and the War*. New York: The Pennsylvania Society [no date].

Beer, George Louis. *America's International Responsibilities and Foreign Policy*. Philadelphia: American Academy of Political and Social Science, 1916.

Benes, Edvard, *Détruisez l'Autriche-Hongrie! Le martyre des Tchéco-Slovaques a travers l'histoire*. Paris, 1916.

Cserny, Karl von. *Deutsch-ungarische Beziehungen*. Leipzig: Verlag von Johann Ambrosius Barth, 1915.

Headlam[-Morley], J. W. *The Dead Lands of Europe*. New York, George H. Doran Co., 1917.

Hiňkovič, Hiňko. *The Jugoslav Problem*. New York, 1918.

_____. *The Jugoslavs in Future Europe*. London: The Near East Ltd. [no date].

Jonesco, Take. *The Policy of National Instinct*. London: Sir Joseph Canston and Sons Ltd., 1916.

Krmpotič, M. D. *Are Italy's Claims on Istria, Dalmatia and Islands Justified: On Greater Serbia*. 1915 [no further details].

Leeper, A. W. A. *The Justice of Rumania's Cause*. London, 1917.

Lipton, Sir Thomas. *The Terrible Truth about Serbia*. London: The British Red Cross Society, 1915.

Lucaciu, Rev. E. ed. *The Book of Sorrow*. 1917 [no details].

Lupu, Nicolae. *Rumania and the Great War*. [no details].

Marie, Queen of Rumania. *My Country*. [no details].

Masaryk, Thomas G. *Declaration of the Bohemian (Czech) Foreign Committee*. Chicago: Bohemian National Alliance of America, 1916.

--------. *The New Europe (The Slav Standpoint)*. London, 1918.

--------. *The Problem of Small Nations in the European Crisis*. London: Council for the Study of International Relations, 1915.

--------. *The Slavs Among the Nations*. London: The Czech National Alliance in Great Britain, 1916.

Mitrany, D. *Greater Rumania: A study in National Ideals*. London, New York, Toronto: Hodder and Stoughton, 1917.

A Message to American-Hungarians. Washington, D.C.: C.P.I., 1918.

Namier, Lewis B. *The Case of Bohemia*. London: The Czech National Alliance in Great Britain, 1917.

--------. *The Czecho-Slovaks. An oppressed Nationality.* London, New York, Toronto: Hodder and Stoughton, 1917.

Paget, Lady. *With Our Serbian Allies.* London: Serbian Relief Fund [no date].

Pearson, John J. *The Nemesis of Germany and Austria. According to the Scriptures.* London: Christian Globe Office [no date].

Pergler, Charles. *Bohemian Hopes and Ambitions.* Chicago: Bohemian National Alliance of America, 1916.

--------. *The Bohemians (Czechs) in the Present Crisis.* Chicago: Bohemian National Alliance of America, 1916.

--------. *Bohemia's Claim to Independence.* Chicago: Bohemian National Alliance of America, 1916.

--------. *The Heart of Europe.* Chicago: Bohemian National Alliance of America, 1917.

--------. *Should Austria-Hungary Exist?* [reprint from Yale Review].

The President's Flag Day Address. With Evidence of Germany's Plans. Washington, D.C.: C.P.I., 1917.

Reiss, R. A. *How Austria-Hungary Waged War in Serbia. Personal Investigations of a Neutral.* Paris: Libraire Armand Colin, 1915.

--------. *The Kingdom of Serbia. Infringements of the Rules and Laws of War Committed by the Austro-Bulgaro-Germans.* London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd., 1919 [2nd ed.].

Report of the Committee on Alleged German Outrages, Presided over by the Right Hon. Viscount Bryce. London, 1915 [no publisher].

Seton-Watson, R. W. *The Balkans, Italy and the Adriatic.* London: Nisbet and Co. 1915.

--------. *The Future of Bohemia.* London, Nisbet and Co. 1915.

--------. *The Spirit of the Serb.* London, Nisbet and Co. 1915.

--------. *What Is at Stake in the War*. London, New York, Toronto, Melbourne, Bombay: Oxford University Press, 1915.

Steed, H. W. *Austria and Europe*. [no details].

Stoica, Vasile. *Sufferings in Transylvania*. [no details].

Velimirovič, Nicholas. *Serbia's Place in Human History*. London: Council for the Study of International Relations, 1915.

Vosnjak, Bogumil. *Jugoslav Nationalism*. London, 1916.

War Cyclopedia. Washington, D.C.: C.P.I., 1918.

A War of Liberation. New York: George H. Doran Co., 1917.

Woods, H. Charles. *War and Diplomacy in the Balkans*. London: The Field and Queen Ltd. 1915.

The Work and Wealth of Austria-Hungary. A Series of Articles Surveying Economic, Financial and Industrial Conditions in the Dual Monarchy During the War. Berlin: Continental Times, 1916.

BOOKS

Allison, J. Murray ed. *Raemakers' Cartoon History of the War*. 3 vols. New York: The Century Co., 1918-1919.

Angell, Norman. *America and the New World State. A Plea for American Leadership in International Organization*. New York, London: G.B. Putnam's Sons, 1915.

Beck, James M. *The War and Humanity. A Further Discussion of the Ethics of the World War and the Duty of the United States*. New York, London: G.B. Putnam's Sons, 1917.

Benes, Edouard. *Bohemia's Case for Independence*. London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd., 1917.

Bullitt, E. D. *An Uncensored Diary from the Central Empires.* London: Stanley Paul and Co., 1918.

Can Germany Win? The Resources and Aspirations of Its People. By an American. London: C. Arthur Pearson Ltd., 1915 [5th ed.].

Čapek, Thomas ed. *Bohemia Under Hapsburg Misrule. A Study of the Ideals and Aspirations of the Bohemian and Slovak Peoples, as they relate to and are affected by the great European War.* New York, Chicago, Toronto, London: Fleming H. Revell Co., 1915.

Chéradame, André. *The Pangerman plot Unmasked. Berlin's Formidable Peace Trap of the "Drawn War".* New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1917.

--------. *Pan-Germany: The Disease and Cure.* Boston, 1918.

--------. *The United States and Pangermania.* New York, 1918.

Frothingham, Arthur L. *Handbook of War Facts and Peace Problems.* New York: National Security League of America, 1919 [4th ed.].

Gerard, James W. *Face to Face with Kaiserism.* London, New York, Toronto: Hodder and Stoughton, 1918.

Halsey, Francis W. Balfour, *Viviani and Joffre. Their Speeches and Other Utterances in America, and Those of Italian, Belgian and Russian Commissioners During the Great War.* London, New York: Funk and Wagnalls Co., 1917.

Herron, George D. *Woodrow Wilson and the World's Peace.* New York: Mitchell Kennerley, 1917.

Hurst, A. Herscovici. *Roumania and Great Britain.* London, New York, Toronto: Hodder and Stoughton, 1916.

Jones, John Price. *The German Spy in America. The Secret Plotting of German Spies in the United States and the Inside Story of the Sinking of the Lusitania.* London: Hutchinson and Co., 1917.

Ludwig, Ernest. *Austria-Hungary and the War.* New York: J.S. Ogilvie Publ. Co., 1915.; in Hungarian: Youngstown, Ohio, 1915.

Magnus, Leonard A. *Pros and Cons in the Great War. A Record of Foreign Opinion with a Register of Fact.* London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co., 1917.; New York: E.P. Dutton & Co., 1917.

--------. *Roumania's Cause and Ideals.* London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co., 1917; New York: E.P. Dutton & Co., 1917.

Młynarski, Felix. *The Problems of the Coming Peace.* New York, Polish Book Importing Co., 1916.

Nošek, Vladimir. *Independent Bohemia. An Account of the Czecho-Slovak Struggle for Liberty.* London, Toronto: J.M. Dent and Sons Ltd., 1918.; aew York, E.P. Dutton and Co., 1918.

Reiss, R. A. *The Kingdom of Serbia. Report upon the Atrocities Committed by the Austro-Hungarian Army During the First Invasion of Serbia.* London: Simpkin, Marshall, Hamilton, Kent & Co., 1916.

Roosevelt, Theodore. *National Strength and International Duty.* London: Oxford University Press, 1917.; Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1917.

Schwarze, W. N. *The Life of John Hus. The Martyr of Bohemia.* [no details].

Seton-Watson, Robert William. *German, Slav, and Magyar. A Study in the Origins of the Great War.* London: Constable and Co., 1916.

--------. *Roumania and the Great War.* London: Constable & Co., 1915.

Seton-Watson, Robert William, J. Dover Wilson, Alfred Zimmern, and Arthur Greenwood. *The War and Democracy.* London, New York, Toronto: Macmillan Co., 1914.

Stephen, S. Ivor. *Neutrality? The Crucifixion of Public Opinion. From the American point of View.* Chicago: Neutrality Press, 1916.

Tučič, Srgjan. *The Slav Nations.* London, New York, Toronto: Hodder and Stoughton, 1915.

Two Thousand Questions and Answers About the War. New York: The Review of Reviews Co., 1918.

Vosnjak, Bogumil. *A Bulwark Against Germany. The Fight of the Slovenes, the Western Branch of the Jugoslavs, for National Existence.* New York, Chicago, London, Edinburgh: Fleming H. Revell Co., 1919.

--------. *A Dying Empire. Central Europe, Pan-Germanism and the Downfall of Austria-Hungary.* London: George Allen & Unwin, 1918.

Zanardi Landi, Countess. *Is Austria Doomed?* London, New York, Toronto: Hodder and Stoughton, 1916.

Hungarian Studies Review, Vol. XX, Nos. 1-2 (Spring-Fall, 1993)

Hungarian National Consciousness and the Question of Dual and Multiple Identity

Steven Bela Vardy

Dual and multiple identity — and the resulting changes in the concept of national consciousness — is becoming evermore common in the modern world. The speeding-up of global communications, the growth of mobility, mass migrations resulting from regional and continental economic inequalities, the gradual termination of the localized way of life, and the continued homogenization of modern culture, are all phenomena that contribute to the dissolution of traditional national-ethnic-linguistic communities. These tendencies — at least in the advanced parts of the world — are also undermining the "nationalist nation-states" that have come into being during the past two centuries under the impact of the ideology of modern nationalism. At the same time, these developments are also questioning the validity of the type of national consciousness that has evolved during the past two centuries in conjunction with these allegedly homogeneous ethnic-national communities.

One of the unavoidable by-products of this phenomenon is the ever more bitter struggle that arose between the proponents and the opponents of traditional nationalism, i.e. between those who want to perpetuate nineteenth century national consciousness and those who would like to adjust it to the needs of the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries.

In its Hungarian context, one of the saddest manifestations of this struggle is the recently resurrected rivalry between the so-called "populists" and the "urbanists" that used to plague Hungarian national life during the 1930s and early 1940s. The revival of this struggle divided once more the best Hungarian minds into two antagonistic camps — involving people who during the 1970s and 1980s fought shoulder to shoulder in undermining Hungary's communist regime.

In light of these developments, we can rightfully pose the question: Has the time come for the reevaluation of the meaning of national consciousness so as to make it less exclusive? More specifically, isn't it time to cleanse the ideology of nationalism from its tendency to demand absolute

dedication and undivided loyalty to the nation as interpreted by the nineteenth century apostles of this ideology?

As an example of the outdated nature of this interpretation, let us just cite the views of the highly regarded nineteenth century poet, Mihály Vörösmarty (1800-1855), who was convinced that one of the primary touchstones of one's true Hungarianness was one's continued presence in Hungary: "There is no place for you anywhere in this world. Be you blessed or damned by fate, here [i.e. in Hungary] you must live and here you must die!" ["A nagyvilágon e kivül nincsen számodra hely. Áldjon vagy verjen sors keze: itt élned, halnod kell!"] In other words, under the influence of nineteenth-century nationalism, Vörösmarty was unable to imagine Hungarian national life, except on Hungarian soil. Moreover, he viewed the survival of his nation largely as a by-product of the reemergence of national greatness, which appears to have been a virtual precondition for the coming of a "grander age that is being yearned by hundreds of thousands" [egy jobb kor, mely után buzgó imádság epedez százezrek ajakán]. Yet, not even Vörösmarty was certain in his mind about the coming of this future greatness, therefore he also speculated about the possibility of a national decline, ending in what he called a "glorious death" [a nagyszerü halál].

The decline that Vörösmarty feared did in fact take place with the post-World War I disintegration of Historic Hungary. True, the total demise — the "glorious death" of the nation — did not take place. Yet, it is still in the realm of possibility, especially if the nation is unable to adjust itself to the realities of the new age, which includes the necessary reassessment of its concept of national consciousness.

This reassessment is unavoidable. Its portent has already been raised by several Hungarian scholars during the past few years, among them László Bihari, who wrote in 1991 as follows: "Its time for us to reassess our views concerning patriotism, [i.e. to ask the question:] do these views approximate the altered norms appropriate for the late twentieth century?" And then, displaying a somewhat idealized view of reality, Bihari continues: "The idea of a homogenized and conquering nation-state that dominated the nineteenth century is not very attractive to us any more. We are pleased to see foreigners among us, we accept them, we do not wish to assimilate them forcibly, in point of fact we are glad to experience multiculturalism."[1]

While Bihari was right in calling for a reevaluation of the current Hungarian views on national identity and patriotism, his assessment proved to be too optimistic. Were it not so, there would be no "Jewish question," nor any other "minority question" in today's Hungary. Nor would there be any manifestations of animosity towards "foreigners." But these questions and problems do exist. And their existence is hardly mitigated by the fact

that these problems exist to a greater extent in all of Hungary's neighbours with the possible exception of Austria. With regard to anti-Semitism, this has been demonstrated by a recent survey sponsored by the American Jewish Committee and the Freedom House concerning anti-Semitism in East Central Europe. The survey found Hungary and the Hungarians to be the most tolerant and least anti-Semitic of all the peoples of the region. In point of fact, the only nationality that displays a degree tolerance comparable to that of the Hungarians is the Czech. This is easily explained by their millennial existence within the confines of the German-dominated Holy Roman Empire, which made the Czechs more Westernized, more urbanized, and thus more "modern" in outlook than any of the other nations of East Central Europe.

The Hungarians are among the region's two most tolerant, least anti-Semitic, and most modern nations. Yet, they too are suffering from an outdated view of nationalism, an ideology that demands total dedication and undivided loyalty from every single member of the nation. In other words, Hungarian political reality and national consciousness still requires that "a Hungarian be more Hungarian than he is . . . , and that he be a patriot with his whole being."[2] But total dedication to an ideology — be it national, religious, or otherwise — is very dangerous. This had been amply demonstrated by the religious wars, ideological struggles, and blood-letting of the past centuries. And it is being demonstrated once again today by the impact of the primitive and destructive forces of nationalism that have been unleashed by the collapse of the Soviet Union and its European Empire. As an example, in former Yugoslavia and Czechoslovakia, as well as in Rumania, one's "national purity" has become a virtual precondition for any kind of acceptance and recognition by the new political leadership. Consequently, persons born into mixed marriages: CroatoSerbs, Czecho-Slovaks, Romano-Hungarians, and Jewish-whatever-elses, are viewed with suspicion and displeasure.[3] And in Bosnia, some of them are even subjected to treatments reminiscent of the manifestations of the Holocaust.[4]

Given these unwelcome global developments, and in light of the Hungarian nation's dismemberment and dispersal among seven surrounding so-called nation-states — today's Slovakia, Ukraine, Rumania, Serbia, Croatia, Slovenia, and Austria — its path to survival must lead in the direction of ethnic and national tolerance. In practice this means the reassessment of the nature of Hungarian national consciousness and the acceptance of the concept of dual and multiple national identity. This would be in harmony both with the above-mentioned global tendencies, as well as with the path followed — with various degrees of success — by the United States ever since its emergence as a nation in the eighteenth century. This is also the only path that can lead Hungary and other nation-

states out of the quagmire of destructive nationalism and onto the path of a decent human existence.

Dual and Multiple Identity in the United States

In light of its multi-ethnic roots, the United States has always had to face the problems stemming from the dual and/or multiple identity of its citizens. American society and the American political system always had to adjust itself to this reality. This was particularly true for the post-Civil War period, because prior to that conflict the majority of the immigrants came from Northwestern Europe and represented mostly the Anglo-Saxon, German, and Scandinavian stock.

Because of the relative ethnic, cultural, and partial linguistic homogeneity of the pre-Civil War immigrants, the question of dual identity was of secondary importance. Thus, neither the pre-revolutionary English colonies, nor the United States during its first century of existence paid much attention to it (1607-1865). Not even the immigration law of 1868 did much more than to defend the rights of the naturalized citizens against the claims of their original home country. This was the law that first proclaimed that emigration is "a natural and inherent right of all people."[5] This meant that, in contrast to European traditions, contemporary American views held that one's membership in a nation and one's national loyalties were not the results of the accident of birth, but rather one of a conscious decision.

American tradition, however, went even beyond this principle of national identity based on personal decision. It also recognized the rights of its naturalized citizens to feel continued loyalties to their original homelands. This principle, which was and is unacceptable to most European nations, received further reinforcement in the immigration laws of 1907, 1940, and 1952. And this was true notwithstanding the fact that the primary purpose of these laws was to define the conditions under which United States citizenship could be acquired or lost. According to these laws, under certain conditions and by professing certain disloyalties, U.S. citizenship could in fact be lost. These conditions included the official assumption of a foreign citizenship, and — in case of naturalized citizens — protracted residence in a foreign country (i.e. two years in the original homeland or five years in any other country). In case of women — until 1922 and 1931 — loss of citizenship could also result from their marriage to foreign citizens.[6] In practice, however, not even these conditions and limitations were implementable. This has been demonstrated, among others, by several Supreme Court decisions (e.g. Perez v. Brownell,

1958; Schneider v. Rusk, 1964; and Afroyim v. Rusk, 1967).[7] These findings "recognized the individual and not the nation as the ultimate arbiter of his own loyalty." Thus, since the third quarter of the 20th century, "American citizens legally have virtually unlimited scope for the expression of dual loyalties."[8]

This dual loyalty can and has been expressed in many different ways by all of the immigrant nationalities. These included extending financial and economic support (e.g. Soros and Sarlós in the case of Hungary) and entering or reentering the political life of the mother country (e.g. Panić in Serbia, Király in Hungary, and several ministers in Poland, Lithuania, and Bulgaria). But these also included attempts at influencing U.S. foreign policy in favour of, and/or neutralizing unfavourable propaganda against the mother country (e.g. the Israeli, Polish, Arab, Afro-American lobbies), and even temporary or permanent repatriations.

Hungarian Americans have displayed all of these manifestations of dual loyalty. Naturally, they took different forms, shapes, and intensities among the immigrants than among their American-born offspring. As an example, since 1989 many post-World War II immigrants have repatriated (e.g. the poet G. Faludy, the political activists G. Pongrácz, E. Hóka), while thousands of their American-born children have moved to Hungary on a temporary basis — attracted not only by the unusual opportunities presented by that newly opened country that approximates the "Wild West", but also by their reemerging secondary loyalty, i.e. by their attachment to their "roots."

Notwithstanding the legal-constitutional validity of dual loyalty, the de facto recognition of this right is still a matter of social practice, because the collective attitude of American society also had and still has something to say about it. In point of fact, depending on the existing sociopolitical conditions, social pressures are of decisive nature in defining what constitutes "acceptable" versus "non-acceptable" dual loyalty. Thus, during the period of the two world wars, social pressures upon the immigrants and their native born offspring were significantly greater than in times of peace. Naturally, the weight and orientation of these pressures depended primarily on the position of the mother country within the system of alliances, or more specifically, how it related to the United States and to her combatant allies. In light of the fact that Hungary found herself on the wrong side in both of these world wars, the question of dual loyalty assumed considerably greater importance for Hungarian Americans than for nationalities who were fighting on the to "right" side (e.g. the Belgians, Serbians, etc.). At the same time, however, one has to acknowledge that during World War I, it was primarily the Germans, and during World War II, primarily the Japanese who suffered from the existence of their real or potential dual loyalties.

In the three decades prior to World War I, when among the nearly two million Hungarian citizens about 650,000 Magyars also transplanted themselves to the United States, the issue of dual loyalty was of very little consequence in American society. First, because most of the immigrants who arrived to the United States did so as temporary migrants ("guest workers") without the intention of staying permanently, and thus had no intention of dividing their loyalties. Second, because their native-born offspring became natural components of American society, who lived the lives and enjoyed the culture of other Americans of their class.

This relatively problem-free situation remained intact until 1914, in spite of the fact that in the preceding decade the Hungarian government undertook a major effort, known as the "American Action" (1904-14), to influence the immigrants' political and ideological orientation and to assure their ultimate repatriation. This program, whose first goal was to prevent the immigrants' assumption of U.S. citizenship, was initiated with the cooperation of patriotic Hungarian clergymen, editors, teachers, and other community leaders, whose activities were often subsidized by the Hungarian government. Although much less successful than planned, the "American Action" may have had a role in the fact that in 1914 only about 15% of the immigrants were U.S. citizens; and that — notwithstanding the Americanization pressures during the war — not even in 1920 was this ratio higher than 28.4%.

During the war, and especially after 1917 when the United States intervened militarily, Hungarian Americans were forced to become aware of the fact that their dual loyalties were heavy encumbrances. In spite of the open American sympathies for England and France, during the early phases of the war, the Hungarians were still able to show their loyalty to their mother country openly, and also to help Hungary with money, propaganda, and prayers. By 1917, however, the situation changed completely. Thereafter they were forced by political and social pressures to shift their pro-Hungarian to pro-American loyalty, and even to establish a so-called "American Hungarian Loyalty League."

Naturally, this new situation produced many personal and social conflicts, which later were summarized by the New York-based *Amerikai Magyar Népszava* [American Hungarian People's Voice] as follows:

> American Hungarians found themselves . . . in a painful and excruciating situation. The fact that fate had endowed . . . [us] with two homelands now fell upon us like a lash that tore into our very souls. Not only were we forced to cease our noble efforts to aid our brethren, but we were also compelled to support the American cause . . . to purchase American War Bonds, to work in factories

> manufacturing war materials . . . and to shed our blood [fighting against our brethren] . . . . On top of this all, Hungarian ethnic islands found themselves in an alien sea that surrounded them with a fermenting stream of suspicion and hate . . . If there ever was a period of trials for our souls, nerves, hearts . . . and minds, and for our loyalties to our new country . . . those were the times: the times of trials and tribulations, the times of hidden tears.[9]

The same situation applies also to the period of World War II, when Hungary's alliance with Hitler and the resulting partial revision of Hungary's frontiers put the Hungarian Americans, and especially the immigrants among them, into an impossible situation. In this connection one must recall that in the period between the two world wars — largely because of the effects of World War I — most immigrants were forced to decide to remain permanently in the United States. Even so, they fell just as much under the impact of the so-called "Trianon syndrome" as did those who had remained at home.[10] In point of fact, because of their minority situation, and because most of them came from territories lost by Hungary after World War I, the emotional impact of their native country's mutilation may have affected them even more deeply than those who remained at home. In light of this phenomenon, Hungarian Americans were in the forefront in the struggle against Trianon and in the effort to revise its undeniably unjust territorial terms. Thus, they viewed the territorial revisions of 1938-41 simply as corrections of historical injustices, notwithstanding the fact that they were achieved with Hitler's and Mussolini's help. But this attitude placed them into a difficult situation very similar to that in which the mother country found herself. The impossibility of this situation was hardly altered by the fact that Hungarian-American spokesmen constantly emphasized that they only supported the Hungarian government's policies concerning justifiable territorial revisions, but not its pro-Axis stance. At the end, however, Hungarian Americans were again forced to choose between their two loyalties. Because on this occasion a pro-Axis stand would have been unthinkable, virtually all of them opted for a pro-American loyalty.

Following World War II, with minimal variations, the primary loyalties of Hungarian Americans remained with the United States. For the native-born second and third generations this question was not even an issue any more. For the political immigrants of the post-World War II decades on the other hand, notwithstanding their differences with the United States, pro-American loyalty was still preferable to a loyalty to communist Hungary. Only after the decline and collapse of communism did the rivalry between the two loyalties surface once more, in some cases

leading to the repatriation of a number of the older political immigrants. But not even this repatriation could eradicate their dual loyalty. In point of fact, their attachment to the United States usually gained strength in the years following their repatriation, partially because of the harsh realities of everyday existence in today's Hungary, and partially because the merits of American society tend to grow proportionately with the length of the time absent from it.

In general, we can assert that, with a few exceptions, all Hungarian immigrants have retained some degree of loyalty to the country of their birth, and none of them were able, nor did they wish to eradicate this loyalty. Naturally, with the passing of time, this loyalty to Hungary would turn into a dual loyalty, involving both their old and their new countries.

The situation was and is naturally different with the American-born generations, who have grown up as Americans and have become natural members of American society. They also display elements of dual loyalty, but their primary attachment is already to the United States. Thus, at least from the vantage point of the emigre patriots, these generations are already lost for Hungary. This fact was recognized even in the period before World War I, when one of the patriotic Hungarian priest had this to say about this question: "not even the children of the most patriotic [Hungarian] . . . parents displays five cents worth of [Hungarian] patriotism."[11]

This basically meant that while the native generations still spoke the language of their parents up to a certain point, they still knew something about their parents' views and way of life, and they still displayed some degree of attachment to the far-off homeland of their forefathers, but their primary attachment was already to American society and to the United States. This had also been recognized and recorded by the receptive diplomat, Géza Hoffman, when in 1911 he stated: "The fact that besides English an American of Hungarian extraction also speaks the language of his parents and displays some degree of remote affection for their homeland, does not really make him less of an assimilated [American]."[12]

And this statement basically points to the essence of dual loyalty: The fact that these loyalties are not of equal significance, and that under certain circumstances the primary loyalty always triumphs over the secondary one[s]. In case of the immigrants among Hungarian Americans the relative importance of two parts of their dual loyalty is not always recognizable. Initially it is always to the mother country, later it becomes somewhat uncertain, and still later it may become primarily an American loyalty. Such assumed loyalties, however, are easily reversible — a fact that generally does not apply to the native-born members of the second, third, and fourth generations. The latter's primary loyalties always belong to the United States. Thus, the nature of their loyalties is basically very similar to the dual loyalties found in Hungary — loyalties, which none-

theless still create considerable problems in a society which is unwilling to accept that validity of such split loyalties.

The Question of Dual and Multiple Identity in Hungary

Returning to the question of dual and multiple identity and loyalty within Hungarian society — which manifests itself, among others, in the already mentioned populist-urbanist controversy — let me first reemphasize that in my view the primary cause of this controversy and divisiveness is the survival of an exclusivist nineteenth century national consciousness, which is unable to accept the validity of dual/multiple identity and loyalty. This outdated view of nationalism is unwilling to concede that an individual may in fact have two or more legitimate loyalties. But in this age such multiple loyalties are unavoidable, hence they should be legitimized and acceptable — all the more so as in such cases these loyalties are not of the same level and intensity.

As has been seen in conjunction with Hungarian Americans, the primary loyalty of the native-born generations already belongs to the United States. This was true about all ethnic and national groups in American society — at least until the recent appearance of what Arthur Schlesinger Jr. called "divisive diversity."[13] This also applied — and still applies — to all Hungarians of Hungary, virtually all of whom — regardless of their origins, place of birthplace, or even citizenship — are first of all Hungarians. They are Hungarians notwithstanding the fact that some of their ancestors spoke German, Yiddish, Armenian, French, Italian, Greek, Turkish, or one of the Slavic languages. Thus, even if there are Hungarians with two or more loyalties — as there undoubtedly are — their non-Hungarian loyalties are only of secondary importance, and in case of crises naturally relinquish their positions to an all-Hungarian identity and affiliation.

In this connection it should be noted that this assertion also holds true for those who, because of the shifting political borders, have in the twentieth century found themselves in the newly created or enlarged neighbouring states — and did so without having moved an inch from the lands of their ancestors. Wile these Hungarians were compelled to become the citizens of states created mostly out of former Austria-Hungary, and while they were and are obliged to observe the laws of their new countries, they never gave up their Hungarian identity, nor their Magyar national language. And this is all the more so as many of them are just on the other side of the artificially created political frontiers.

Being a member of a nation — being a Hungarian — therefore, is not a biological, nor a racial, but rather a cultural issue; and before that it

is the result of a series of historical events and accidents. In other words, "a Hungarian is one who claims to be a Hungarian." This oft-cited statement reflects today's reality and fulfils today's needs much more faithfully than any nineteenth-century notion about nationality. This means that most Hungarians today are Hungarians not because their ancestors were among Prince Árpád's conquering Magyars, but because by some accident of fate or history they or their ancestors have become Hungarians. In other words, they are Hungarians today because they were born either in the Carpathian Basin or, in some instances, in one of the Hungarian ethnic islands somewhere in a far-off country. By virtue of their birth they went through their early childhood experiences as Hungarians, they were taught the Magyar language which distinguishes them form the speakers of all other languages, and along with this language they also picked up other aspects of Hungarian culture, to which they are bound by strong emotional and intellectual ties throughout their lives.

Naturally, we are aware that one can also make a conscious decision to become a Hungarian (or any other nationality), but that is a very rare phenomenon. Becoming a Hungarian has always been a slow and mostly natural phenomenon, just like becoming an American on the part of the immigrants and their native-born children. In most instances one does not even chose to become a Hungarian or an American. That comes of its own, derived from the given conditions of an individual. But once this metamorphosis has taken place, it is rather difficult to reverse it.

This thought about being a Hungarian, or rather of being attached to one's acquired nationality, has recently been beautifully expressed by a noted Hungarian publicist, Pál Bodor (1930-), in his essay on the so-called Jewish question in Hungary. Writing on the pages of *Élet és Irodalom* [Life and Literature], Bodor — who left Transylvania in 1983 to escape Ceausescu's chauvinistic wrath — writes as follows: "What should one do, who — although never denying his Jewish roots . . . — is attached . . . to his Hungarian identity in spite of being lashed, spit upon, humiliated, and threatened with death? He knows that this is a one-sided love affair, but he still can't live without it . . . for his mother tongue, his culture, his historical consciousness, and his emotions are all Hungarian . . . ." As an example, continues Bodor:

> I am the descendant of Székely noblemen, Calvinist preachers, Austrian alchemists, Saxon stonemasons, and Spanish-Jewish rabbis. I have never . . . denied anyone of my ancestors . . . Yet, since I live in Hungary [i.e. since 1983], this fact is being brought to my attention virtually every minute . . . I confess honestly and without reservations: If there were no anti-Semitism, I would regard the fact that I

> also have Jewish blood in me a very minor biographical data. I have devoted most of my novels, essays collections and publicistic volumes to the problems of Hungarian minority existence [in Rumania]. Is this one-sided love? Undoubtedly so, but it is love nonetheless. If the Hungarians of Transylvania were less oppressed than they are, would I love them differently? Am I being ridiculed because they cannot "Jew" me out from among the Magyars? I don't really care. I have never denied the facts of my origins, nor my emotions. To Hungarian-hater I am a Hungarian, but to a hate-filled Hungarian I am not [a true Hungarian].[14]

I would like to finish my essay with the following hypothetical question: Which Hungarian is a more genuine Hungarian? He who — while a carrier of the genes of several other nationalities or ethnic groups, to which he may even feel a degree of attachment — remains faithful to Hungary, to the Hungarians, and to his own Hungarianness, and does so in spite of all attempts to read him out of his nation? Or he who can trace his roots right back to Prince Árpád and to the conquering Magyars, but at the same time feels no affinity to the Hungarian nation and Magyar language, nor to its culture, way of life, and spirituality?

NOTES

This paper was presented at the University of South Florida, New College, International Conference on Eastern Europe, March 25-27, 1993, Sarasota, Florida, USA.

[1]László Bihari, "Ön milyen televiziót venne?" [What Kind of Television Would You Buy?], in *Kapu* [Gate], June, 1991, p. 23.

[2]*Ibid.*

[3]Budapest News, Dec. 1992

[4]Elmo R. Zumwalt, Jr., "Cry Out Against the Injustice in Yugoslavia: Savagery is Return to the Dark Ages," in *USA Today*, December 22, 1992. p. 9A. Judy Darnell, "Bosnia Rapes: Neither Young nor Old Spared," in *USA Today*, January 13, 1993. p. IIA.

[5]Mona Harrington, "Loyalties: Dual and Divided," in the *Harvard Encyclopedia of American Ethnic Groups*, Stephan Thernstrom *et al.* eds. (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1980), p. 676.

[6]*Ibid.*, p. 678.

[7]*Ibid.*, p. 679.

[8]*Ibid.*

[9]Steven Bela Vardy, *The Hungarian-Americans* (Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1985), p. 91.

[10]Steven Bela Vardy, "The Impact of Trianon upon the Hungarian Mind: The Nature of Hungarian Irredentism," in *Hungarian Studies Review*, vol. 10, nos. 1-2 (1893), pp. 21-42.

[11]Géza Hoffmann, *Csonka munkásosztály. Az amerikai magyarság* [Crippled Working Class: The Hungarian Americans] (Budapest: Magyar Közgazdasági Társaság, 1911), p. 337.

[12]*Ibid.*

[13]Arthur Schlesinger Jr., "Toward a Divisive Diversity," in *The Wall Street Journal* (New York. 1991. June 25), p. A1 8.

[14]Pái Bodor, "Ironikus kisérlet a zsidókérdés (ideiglenes) megoldására" [An Ironic Attempt (Temporarily) to Solve the Jewish Question], in *Élet és Irodalom*, May 17, 1991, p. 8.

Bibliography

American Jewish Committee [AJC] and Freedom House. *Attitudes toward Jews in Poland, Hungary, and Czechoslovakia: A Comparative Survey*. New York and Washington. January 1991. Mimeographed.

Amerikai Magyar Népszava 1924-es jubileumi száma [The 1924 Anni versary Issue of the American Hungarian People's Voice]. New York: Amerikai Magyar Népszava, 1924.

Asante, Molefe Kete. *Afrocentricity*. New York: Africa World Press, 1988.

Beke, Albert. "Népi és/vagy urbánus — ma" [Populist and/or Urbanist Today], in *Kapu* [Gate], June, 1991, pp. 71 -72.

Bernal, Martin. *Black Athena*. 2 vols. New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press. 1987-1991.

Bihari, László. "Ön milyen televiziót venne?~ [What Kind of Television Would You Buy?], in *Kapu*, June, 1991, pp. 22-23.

Bloom, Allan. *The Closing of the American Mind*. New York: Simon and Schuster Inc., 1987.

Bodor, Pál. "Ironikus kisérlet a zsidókérdés (ideiglenes) megoldására" [An Ironic Attempt to (Temporarily) Solve the Jewish Question], in *Élet és Irodalom*, May 17, 1991, pp. 5 & 8.

Borbandi, Gyula. *A magyar emigráició életrajza, 1945-1985* [The Biog raphy of the Hungarian Emigration, 1945-1985]. Bern: Az Európai Protestáns Magyar Szabadegyetem, 1985. New edition, Budapest, 1989.

Csepeli, György. "Ki a hiteles magyar?" [Who is the Real Hungarian?], in *168 óra* [168 Hours], vol. 4, no 26, June 30, 1992, pp. 24-25. Eszter Radai's interview with Csepeli about his book, *A nemzet által homályosan* [Vaguely by the Nation], second, revised edition in 1989.

Csurka, István. "Nehány gondolat a rendszerváltozás két esztendeje és az MDF új programja kapcsán [A Few Thoughts on the Occasion of the Bi-Centennial of the Change of Regimes and in Connection with the Hungarian Democratic Forum's New Program], in *Magyar Forum* [Hungarian Forum], August 20, 1992, pp. 9-16. Perhaps the most controversial essay in Hungary of the year 1992.

Csurka, István. "Keserü hátország" [Bitter Hinterland], part 1, in *Magyar Fórum*, Dec. 24, 1992, pp. 3-5. A follow-up to the above essay.

Csurka, István. "Keserü hátorszag" [Bitter Hinterland], part 2, in *Magyar Fórum*, December 30, 1992, pp. 8-9. Part 2 of the follow-up.

Darnell, Judy. "Bosnia Rapes: Neither Young nor Old Spared," in *USA Today*, January 13, 1993. p. 11A.

Dési, János. "Kettős gyökerüség. Hogy oldódjanak a szorongások" [Dual Roots: How Should Feelings of Distress Dissolve], in *Magyar Nemzet* [Hungarian Nation], February 19, 1991, p. 6.

Diop, Cheikh Anta. *Civilization or Barbarism*. New York: Lawrence Hill Books. 1991.

Domonkos, István. "A történet mindannyiunkról szól" [The Story is About All of Us], in *Ring* (Budapest), September 16, 1992, pp. 40-42. Commentary on István Csurka's controversial study of August 20, 1993.

Dojcsák, Győző. *Amerikai magyar történetek* [Hungarian American Stories]. Budapest: Ifjusági Lap- és Könyvkiadó, 1985.

D'Souza, Dinesh. *Illiberal Education: The Politics of Race and Sex on Campus*. New York: Free Press-Macmillan Co., 1991.

Epstein, Arnold L. *Ethos and Identity. Three Studies in Ethnicity*. London: Tavistock Publications, 1978.

Fermi, Laura. *Illustrious Immigrants. The Intellectual Immigration from Europe*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1968.

Glatz, Ferenc. "Ki a magyar? 1992" [Who is a Hungarian? 1992], in *História*, vol. 15, no. 1, January 1993, pp. 2f.

Harvard Encyclopedia of American Ethnic Groups, Stephan Thernstrom *et al.* eds. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1980.

Harrington, Mona. "Loyalties: Dual and Divided," in the *Harvard Encyclopedia of American Ethnic Groups*, pp. 676-686.

Hoffmann, Géza. *Csonka munkásosztály. Az amerikai magyarság*. [Cripled Working Class: The Hungarian Americans]. Budapest: Magyar Közgazdasági Társaság, 1911.

Kende, Géza. *Magyarok Amerikában. Az amerikai magyarság története. 1583-1926* [Hungarians in America: The History of Hungarian Americans], 2 vols. Cleveland: Szabadság Könyvomdája, 1927. The half-finished third volume of this work is in the Archives of the American Hungarian Reformed Federation in Ligonier, Pennsylvania.

Kende, Péter, *Röpirat a zsidókérdésről* [Pamphlet about the Jewish Question]. Budapest: Magvető, 1989.

Lengyel, Emil. *Americans from Hungary*. Philadelphia and New York: Lippincott Company, 1948.

Márton, László. *Kiválasztottak és elvegyütek*. [The Chosen Ones and the Mixed Ones]. Budapest: Magveto Könyvkiadó, 1989.

Nádor, Tamás. "Kettőzött porté, ikonfüstben" [Dual Portrait in Ikon Smoke], in *Világszövetség* [World Federation], February 16, 1893, pp. 4-5. Interview with the literary scholar Sztojan D. Vujicsics.

Nagy, Kázmér. *Elveszett alkotmány. A magyar politikai emigráció, 1945-1975* [The Lost Constitution: Hungarian Political Emigration, 1945-1975]. Budapest: Gondolat, 1984. Earlier editions abroad in 1974 and 1982.

Novak, Michael. *Further Reflections on Ethnicity*. Middletown, Pennsylvania: EMPAC Book, Jednota Press, 1977.

Patterson, Orlando. *Ethnic Chauvinism. The Reactionary Impulse*. New York: Stein and Day Publishers, 1977.

Puskás, Julianna. *Kivándorló magyarok az Egyesült Államokban 1880-1940*. [Immigrant Hungarians in the United States, 1880-1940]. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1982.

Rácz, István. *A paraszti migráció és politikai megitélése Magyarországon, 1849-1914* [Peasant Migrations and its Political Assessment in Hungary]. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1980.

Rádai, Eszter. "Ki a hiteles magyar?" [Who is a True Hungarian?], in *168 óra* [168 Hours], June 30, 1992, pp. 24-25.

Reminick, Ronald A.: *Theory of Ethnicity. An Anthropologist's Perspective*. Lanham, Maryland: University Press of America, 1983.

Schlesinger, Arthur, Jr. *The Disuniting of America*. New York: Whittle Direct Books, 1991.

Schlesinger, Arthur, Jr. "Toward a Divisive Diversity," in The Wall Street Journal (New York. 1991. June 25), p. A1 8.

Szántó, Miklós. *Magyarok Amerikában* [Hungarians in America]. Budapest: Gondolat, 1984.

Száraz, György. *Egy elöitélet nyomában* [In Search of a Prejudice]. Budapest: Magvető Kiadó, 1976.

Szenes, Sándor. *Befejezetlen mult. Keresztények és zsidók, sorsok. Beszélgetések* [Unfinished Past. Christians and Jews, Destinies]. Budapest: Szenes Sándor kiadása, 1986.

Szilassy, Sándor. "Az amerikai magyarság a második világháboruban" [Hungarian Americans in the Second World War], in *Új Látóhatár*, vol. 30., nos. 1-2. (June 15, 1979), pp. 138-143.

Thompson, Richard H. *Theories of Ethnicity. A Critical Appraisal.* Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1989.

Vagó, Béla and George L. Mosse, eds. *Jews and Non-Jews in Eastern Europe, 1918-1945.* New York: John Wiley & Sons; Jerusalem: Israel Universities Press, 1974.

Vardy, Steven Bela. *Clio's Art in Hungary and in Hugarian-America.* New York: East European Monographs, Columbia University Press, 1985.

Vardy, Steven Bela. *Modern Hungarian Historiography.* New York: East European Monographs, Columbia University Press, 1976.

Vardy, Steven Bela. *The Hungarian-Americans* (Boston: Twayne Publi shers, 1985).

Vardy, Steven Bela. *The Hungarian Americans. The Hungarian Experience in North America.* New York: Cheslea House Publishers, 1989.

Vardy, Steven Bela. "The Great Economic Immigration from Hungary: 1880-1920," in *Society in Change: Studies in Honor of Béla K. Király,* eds. S. B. Vardy and A. H. Vardy. New York: East European Monographs, Columbia University Press, 1983, pp. 189-216.

Vardy, Steven Bela. "The Impact of Trianon upon the Hungarian Mind: The Nature of Hungarian Irredentism," in *Hungarian Studies Review*, vol. 10, nos. 1-2 (1893), pp. 21-42.

Vardy, Steven Bela. "Trianon in Interwar Hungarian Historiography," in *War and Society in East Central Europe.* Vol. Vl. *Essays on World War I. A Case Study of Trianon*, eds. Béla K. Király, Peter Pastor, and Ivan Sanders (New York: Brooklyn College Press and Columbia University Press, 1982), pp. 361-89.

Vardy, Steven Bela and Agnes Huszar Vardy, eds. *The Austro-Hungarian Mind: At Home and Abroad.* New York: East European Monographs, Columbia University Press, 1989.

Vardy, Steven Bela and Agnes Huszar Vardy, eds. *Triumph in Adversity. Studies in Hungarian Civilization in Honor of Professor Ferenc Somogyi on the Occasion of his Eightieth Birthday.* New York: East European Monographs, Columbia University Press, 1988. Several studies on Hungarian Americans.

Várdy, [Steven] Béla. "A magyarság összefogásának és tudományos tanulmányozásának kisérletei 1920-t61 1945-ig" [Attempts at the Unification and Scholarly Examination of the Hungarians between 1920 and 1945], in *A XV. Magyar Találkozó Krónikája* [Proceed ings of the Fifteenth Hungarian Congress]. ed. János Nádas and Ferenc Somogyi. Cleveland: Árpád Könyvkiadó Vállalat. 1976. pp. 239-250.

Várdy, S[teven] Béla. "A magyarságtudat megtartásáért" [The Preservation of the Hungarian Consciousness], in *Forrás* [Source], March 1991, pp. 63-68.

Várdy, [Steven] Béla. "Az amerikai magyar történettudomány és a magyar öntudat ápolása" [American Hungarian Historical Scholarship and Hungarian Consciousness], in *Nyelvünk és Kulturánk.* [Our Language and Culture], Budapest: Az Anyanyelvi Konferencia Védnöksége, 1987, pp. 229-33.

Várdy, [Steven] Béla. "Kárpátaljai magyarság csehszlovák és szovjet uralom alatt" [Sub-Carpathian Hungarians under Czechoslovak and Soviet Rule], in *A XXIII. Magyar Találkozó Krónikája* [Proceedings of the Twenty-Third Hungarian Congress], ed. Janos Nadas and Ferenc Somogyi. Cleveland: Árpád Könyvkiadó Vállalat, 1984, pp. 78-94.

Várdy, [Steven] Béla. "A kettős kötődés kérdése Magyarországon. Tanulságok a hazai magyarság részére. [The Question of Dual Affiliation in Hungary. Conclusions for the Hungarians at Home], in *Kapu*, October 1991 (vol. 4, no. 10), pp. 78-80.

Várdy, [Steven] Béla. "Magyar zsidó, vagy zsidó magyar?" [Hungarian Jew or Jewish Hungarian?], in *Új Látóhátár* [New Horizons] (Munich), December 1, 1977 (vol. 28, nos. 3-4 [4-5]), pp. 378-381.

Várdy, [Steven] Béla. "Magyarok az Egyesült Államokban" [Hungarians in the United States], in *História*, vol. 7, no. 2 (Spring 1985), pp. 26-27.

Vasváry Ödön. *Magyar Amerika* [Hungarian America]. Szeged: Somogyi Könyvtár, 1988.

Weinstock, Alexander S. *Acculturation and Occupation: A Study of the 1956 Hungarian Refugees in the United States.* The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1969.

Zacsek, Gyula. "Termeszek rágják a nemzetet, avagy gondolatok a Soros-kurzusról és a Soros-birodalomról" [Termites are Gnawing the Nation, or Thoughts about the Soros Establishment and the Soros Empire], in *Magyar Fórum*, September 3, 1992, pp. 9-16.

Zumwalt, Elmo R., Jr. "Cry Out Against the Injustuce in Yugoslavia: Savagery is Return to the Dark Ages," in *USA Today*, December 22, 1992. p. 9A.

Hungarian Studies Review, Vol. XX, Nos. 1-2 (Spring-Fall, 1993)

Hungarian community folkdance groups in Canada

Kalman Dreisziger

When Hungarians in the larger cities of Canada get together to celebrate, a folkdance performance is always a favourite part of the program. From Montreal to Victoria, Canada has over two dozen Hungarian community folkdance groups. To put the significance of this statistic into perspective, one needs to consider that the USA, with its considerably larger Hungarian population, has about a dozen. This study will examine this unusually vibrant Hungarian-Canadian phenomenon and give a detailed picture of the size, artistic direction, and working life of Canada's Hungarian community folkdance groups.

Of the twenty-six regularly functioning Hungarian community folkdance organizations in Canada, many have several constituent groups composed of dancers of different ages. Thus the total number of sub-groups is well in excess of fifty. Statistically, each sub-group has an average of fifteen members. The total number of members listed by the twenty-six organizations of the survey is 801. The following chart details the breakdown of groups, sub-groups and members by province:

Province	Number of groups	Number of subgroups	Number of dancers
British Columbia	4	7	88
Alberta	4	8	128
Saskatchewan	2	4	47
Manitoba	2	7	67
Ontario	11	24	386
Quebec	3	7	85

There are no functioning Hungarian folkdance groups in the Atlantic provinces or in the territories. Canada-wide, the dancers range in age from three to fifty-five, with the average age being sixteen. Females outnumber males by a ratio of 5 to 3.

The larger organizations tend to have a three-tiered sub-group system with a children's group extending from very young kids to age ten or twelve; a junior group of teenagers to age sixteen, and a senior group of dancers sixteen plus. The smallest groups are those in Kelowna, Saskatoon and Oshawa; the largest is Toronto's Kodaly Ensemble with 100 members. The youngest group is the Oshawa children's group; the oldest is Welland's all woman ensemble.

Hungarian community folkdance groups in Canada are now largely an urban phenomenon though there is still an echo of the original turn-of-the-century Magyar settlement patterns in the unexpected strength of the groups in Saskatchewan and Ontario's Niagara Peninsula.

Community relations

Of the 26 groups surveyed, eleven are organizationally independent, ten have loose ties to Hungarian community churches, clubs or associations and five are totally linked to another, larger community organization. In addition to these five, only two others (in the loosely-linked category) reported receiving some direct funding support from Hungarian community associations.

The independent nature of Canada's Hungarian folkdance groups is reflected in their remarkably open policy towards new membership. Only four listed "Hungarian descent preferred" as a membership restriction and, in fact, in only one case is this a hard-and-fast rule and even there it is imposed by the "mother" organization, not the dance group. The only other restrictions mentioned had to do with age (2 groups) and dance experience, which one group listed it as a preference.

There is an interesting progression discernible in the community relations of Canadian-Hungarian folkdance groups. Most of them were originally founded by various Hungarian clubs or associations and functioned initially within the bounds of the founding organization. Over the years many dance groups split off or broke away, citing meddling and artistic interference, and established independent life, or at least a much less restrictive association with Hungarian community organizations.

Today, Canada's Hungarian dance groups are by-and-large artistically independent. However their community ties are still very much evident. More then half of them hold practices at Hungarian churches or

clubs. These same organizations provide central costume storage for many dance groups. And the Hungarian community continues to be an important part of the audience for the groups surveyed.

Goals, performing activity, and orientation

The preservation of Hungarian folk traditions emerged in the survey as the primary aim of Canada's Hungarian folkdance groups. (First choice for 17 groups, second for 4). The presentation of these traditions to the Canadian public ranked second. (First choice for 4, second for 15). In third place was a goal that reflected the groups' concern for community survival: To serve as a social vehicle for keeping young people in the Hungarian community. (First choice for 3, second for 7).

Six of the 26 groups reported performing less than ten times per year. Twelve perform more than twelve times per year, while eight listed their performance level at over twenty a year. (One group, the Tulipan Dancers of Ottawa gave 32 performances in the past season.) The total number of stage appearances reported by Canada's Hungarian folkdance groups approaches 400.

Who is the audience for these performers? More than half the groups (14) list non-Hungarians as their primary audience. The fact that fourteen groups mention that they often take part in multi-ethnic festivals and appearances, seems to corroborate this fact.

The orientation towards a non-Hungarian audience attests to the power of Canada's multicultural policy. Its attraction seems to be strongest for the larger groups in Western Canada and the smaller ones in Ontario and Quebec. The other side of the coin is that the smaller western groups and some of the largest eastern ones (12 in total), are more oriented towards their own communities. In fact, of the three groups which listed "parents and friends" as their primary audience, two were the largest in Ontario and Quebec respectively.

Regardless of whether they are inwardly (community) or outwardly (larger, non-Hungarian audience) oriented, Canada's Hungarian folkdance groups share an interest in taking part in Hungarian folkdance festivals. All the western groups belong to — and take part in — the annual Western Canadian Hungarian Folkdance Festival, and all but two of the eastern groups regularly take part in *Pontozó*, a Hungarian festival held annually in southern Ontario. These festivals have an immense effect on the groups. They serve as a venue for performing, a goal for preparing new choreographies, a point of comparison and provide an opportunity for networking. The role of the two festivals in preserving Canada's Hun-

garian folkdance groups might be an interesting study, however it exceeds the scope of this survey.

The festivals also provide an opportunity for the groups to travel. Because the Western Festival is hosted each year by a group from a different city, all the western groups have performed outside their province in the past few years. Many of the eastern groups also travel outside their province to perform. Ontario groups close to the U.S. border seem to find a natural outlet for their talents in the northern states (New York, Ohio, Michigan). The Birmingham (Toledo, Ohio) Hungarian Festival regularly attracts several Ontario groups. All in all, six Canadian groups reported performing in the U.S. in the past two years. Going further back, the Kodaly Ensemble of Toronto has the singular distinction of having participated as the "Canadian" contingent at an international folkdance festival in Puerto Rico in 1980.

Hungary is a desirable but difficult-to-attain destination for Canadian groups. Nevertheless, three groups mentioned having visited Hungary in the past 5 years.

Repertoire

What kind of material do Canada's Hungarian folkdance groups perform? The uninitiated might think that it is some sort of generic Hungarian national dance. All the more so because the members of the groups come from all parts of Hungary or from the Hungarian minorities of the surrounding countries, so the only common link they have is their national identity. In addition, their non-Hungarian audience — and we've already seen that a "Canadian" audience is very important to most of the groups — knowing little about the complexities of Hungarian regional dance styles, generally expects to see a Hungarian national dance, especially in the context of a multi-ethnic festival. The reality is very different.

Canada's Hungarian folkdance groups perform choreographies based on the various regional folkdance styles of the Hungarian communities that live in the Carpathian Basin. For the most part, these are collective regional choreographies representative of a larger geographic area. (Déldunántúl, Szatmár and Székelyföld being the most popular dance dialects). In addition to these, there are many choreographies featuring the dances of certain villages (Bag, Lőrincréve, Szék, etc.). Only the Vadrózsa Dancers of Calgary retain a few generic Hungarian choreographies in their extensive repertoire. As for thematic choreographies, Toronto's Kodaly Ensemble is unique in featuring Zoltán Zsuráfszky's composition: "*Eddig vendég*".

Practices and training

The survey asked several questions to gather information about the weekly working life of the groups. Because most responses concentrate on giving data about the senior group, this section of the study does not deal with children or intermediate dancers.

The average senior Canadian Hungarian folkdance group holds practices once a week. Seventeen, in fact do so. Eight — mostly ones from Western Canada — practice more than once per week, while only one group gets together less often. The average practice is three hours long, though some western groups hold five to six hour weekend sessions; but there are some groups whose weekly practice is only 1-1½ hours long. Twenty-one of the groups start practice with warm-ups. Fifteen include dance dialect and styling practice in their regular sessions. Virtually all incorporate singing into their practice time.

Finally, a significant minority of the groups (12) claim to do *Táncház* style improvised dancing during or after their regular practice sessions. This is an unusually high number, bearing in mind that "*Táncház*" dancing makes far greater demands on the dancers — especially males — than do stage choreographies.

Costumes

With an estimated total value of over half-a-million dollars, stage costumes are a serious business for Canada's Hungarian folkdance groups. How did this wealth of costuming come about? The quality of costuming for a dance group tends to be a function of the group's age, size, and community support. Since a large number of the groups in the survey have been functioning in their community for decades, it is no surprise that they are rich in costumes. In fact, the average group has six or seven different sets of regional costumes at an estimated total value of $20,000 per group. Of course, there is a great variety, ranging from Oshawa's 2 sets of costumes valued at $1,000 to Toronto's 17 sets at $100,000.

Most of these costumes are made in the community by members of the group or their relatives or friends, using local expertise and/or published material on costuming. However, a surprisingly large number of groups (16) obtain at least part of their costuming from Hungary. Two groups did so exclusively.

Generally the costumes are owned by the group (18 groups). However, eight reported mixed ownership. For footwear, it is a different story. Only six groups own boots and shoes, while in ten, members own their own footwear. Ten of the groups are on some form of mixed

ownership, typically the group providing "loaners" to members who cannot or will not buy their own footwear. Where possible the groups keep their costumes in a central storage room, usually provided by the community church or club hall. Where this is not possible, a mixed form of storage evolves, with members keeping some of their costumes while the group leader warehouses extras or less frequently used sets. Only seven groups reported storing costumes totally at members' homes.

Group leadership and teaching

Leadership and teaching are crucial factors in the success of Canada's Hungarian folkdance groups. The ability to guide the artistic functioning of a dance ensemble — even at an absolute amateur level — requires some amount of expertise in folklore and dance, a talent for leadership, dedication, and a lot of hard work. That so many dance groups in Canada have found a solution to this problem is all the more remarkable because there is no formal training available for these tasks.

In general, the groups have a dual strategy to meet the challenge of leadership and teaching. First, a resident group leader — usually a current or former dancer (or dancing couple) — takes care of the week-to-week functioning of the group. Next, the overwhelming majority of groups imports the choreographic and folklore expertise required for new stage material by inviting a guest teacher/choreographer, often from Hungary.

To establish what the groups considered necessary for leadership, the survey asked them to list the qualifications of the group leader. "Dance experience" was rated first by most respondents, followed by "responsible leader" and "organizational and people skills." Only one of the 26 groups — the Deilbáb Dancers of Lethbridge — has a leader with professional dance instructor's accreditation. In 19 of the groups the leader also dances with the group, while in 7 he or she does not. The ratio is exactly the same for leaders who also choreograph for their groups versus those who don't. (Though, of course, the groups are not necessarily the same). This last statistic is significant, because it is a strong indication that the groups are, at least to some extent, self-reliant. In addition to week-to-week leadership, Canada's Hungarian folkdance groups also face constant need for new material. Increasingly, many of them are turning to experts from Hungary to satisfy this need. Thus, in the past few years, over a dozen instructors from Hungary have been invited to teach groups in Canada. At the moment, the Western groups seem to be using this resource more than the ones in Ontario and Quebec.

Some groups develop lasting relationships with Hungarian teachers. Zoltán Zsuráfszky, Artistic Director of the professional Budapest Ensemble in Hungary, made his first teaching visit to Toronto in 1980 and has been returning regularly ever since, having taught the Kodály Ensemble about a dozen choreographies in as many years. The Buzavirág Dancers of Victoria are building a long-term relationship with Sándor Román of the Honvéd Ensemble of Budapest, the Csárdás Dancers of Edmonton with László Gyalog, the Vadrózsa Dancers with Péter Lévai, and the Szittya Dancers of St. Catherines with Péter Ertl. Only six of the 26 have not worked with someone from Hungary in the past couple of years. However, even these six have indicated a desire to work with Hungarian instructors if the opportunity arises.

There is one other resource for instruction available to the groups in the survey: guest teachers from North America. Andor Czompo and Kathy Kerr, independent folkdance professionals who have taught some of the Western groups in years past, are at one end of this resource spectrum. At the other are the leaders of some of the groups surveyed — Sue Biro, Ibolya Baulin, Louise and Iggy Kadar, Andrea and Gabor Dobi, Kalman Dreisziger and Zoltan Katona, to name just a few — occasionally guest-teach with other groups.

Current concerns, future prospects

Hungarian folkdance was born in a traditional world of relatively closed village societies. The passing of this world was a gradual process that spanned the first half of this century in Hungary and lasted perhaps 20 to 30 years longer in parts of Transylvania. The transformation of live village dancing into a stage artform also took place during the same timeframe. Today's urban teenagers in a Budapest performing group are separated from traditional village life by two generations. For them, a glimpse into the past is difficult but not unattainable. Their counterparts in Canada are separated by the same timeframe, plus the Atlantic Ocean, plus the stuck-on-fast-forward American culture that neither values nor validates their Hungarian roots.

Small wonder then, that Canadian-Hungarian dance groups listed problems that are primarily the consequences of this separation or cultural discontinuity. Lack of motivation and related issues, like sporadic attendance and lack of discipline topped the "problem list" for 18 groups. On the "wish list" side, *more dancers* — more specifically *more boys* — came first for the majority of the groups. In other words, motivation for getting involved with and working hard at an art form, that seems ever more remote from the day-to-day realities of childhood in Canada, is the

number one problem for the continued survival and functioning of Canadian-Hungarian folkdance groups.

Separation from the source continued to be the key for the second issue on the wish list: better teaching (13 groups) or, more specifically, the availability of an expert instructor from Hungary (7 of those groups). Next came the problem of live music, which is on the wish list for nine groups. Here the gap between Hungary and Canada is immense. No self-respecting dance group in Hungary works without live music. Yet of the 26 Canadian groups only three have musicians available. The problem seems so insurmountable, so pervasive, that most groups have come to terms with it — completely accepting the sad solution offered by canned music. That may be the explanation why relatively few respondents have put live music on their wish list. Lack of adequate financial support was cited by nine groups as a problem and appeared, in the form of "more funding," on the wish list of six.

A catch-all category that included trouble with the dancers' parents, personality or ego problems within the group, and lack of help for the group leaders comprised a final set of problems.

What are the future plans of Canada's Hungarian community folkdance groups? The survey data provides an indication in two different areas. Where artistic direction is concerned, the groups are almost evenly split between pursuing authenticity as a goal (12 groups) versus "show" or stage orientation (9 groups). In view of the fact that the respondents are performing groups, for whom the stage is the ultimate venue, and that their Canadian audience — but even the Hungarian community — often values stage showiness above authenticity, even the small majority leaning towards authenticity has to be viewed as a surprise. The explanation can be found in the extensive connection Canadian groups maintain with the folkdance movement in Hungary and the strong influence Hungarian experts bring to bear on them.

Finally, the major concern for the future of any expatriate cultural movement is survival. Here the focus is on continuity and the role children's groups play in providing it. All the 26 groups consider it important to have a children's group — even the seven who currently don't have one. The majority (17 groups) cited the future survival of the dance group as the primary reason for starting a children's contingent. Five respondents broadened the concept to encompass the idea of bringing families into the Hungarian community.

Conclusion

The mosaic theory of Canadian multiculturalism has received much attention and has invited constant comparison to the "melting pot" south of the border. In reality, the mosaic is a false analogy because it presupposes that the bits of ceramic, out of which the total is made, remain unchanged. This is not the case. Immigrant groups generally change, eventually adapt and ultimately melt into Canadian society. The mosaic theory has initial validity in as much as Canadian ethnic groups have official sanction and even encouragement to keep their cultural identity. However, in the long run it is as if the cement that binds the bits together had the effect of slowly changing the ceramic, first fuzzing the edges, then dissolving the fragment itself.

Canada's Hungarian communities are well along the process of dissolution. The last major wave of Hungarian immigration to Canada took place well over a generation ago. Since then, the ties that might bind individual Canadian Hungarians to their cultural community have loosened, lost their power, and in many cases totally disappeared. In this general environment, one would expect Canadian-Hungarian folkdance groups to be in the same pattern of decline as the community. All the more so, because this is exactly what has happened in the U.S., where there has been a drastic drop during the last twenty years in the number of Hungarian community folkdance groups. In fact, there are some signs of decline in Canada as well. In Ontario, for example, eight to ten years ago there were still active community dance groups in Delhi, Windsor and Kingston. That they have disappeared is lamentable but not surprising. What is surprising is the picture that emerges from the survey: a Hungarian community folkdance network that is extensive, strong and still vibrant.

What are the reasons for this relative success? The first is that, though aged and much weakened, Hungarian communities still exist in Canada's large urban centres and they continue to provide approval and often active support for "their" folkdance group. It is this role as a symbolic manifestation of the communities' cultural roots that provides dance groups with their most powerful *raison d'être*. Next in importance is the role played by the annual festivals. *Pontozó* in the East but especially the Western Canadian Hungarian Folkdance Festival have continually exerted a powerful influence on the participating groups. The need to appear year after year with new material, perhaps with new costumes, with as large a contingent of dancers as possible, has had the net effect of improving the groups' repertoire, widening their horizons, making some of them more resourceful and keeping others alive.

There are two additional benefits that have accrued from the festivals which need to be looked at on their own. First, the festivals have given dancers from individual communities validation for their participation. It might be a very queasy feeling for a teenage boy in Winnipeg, for example, to think of himself as a folkdancer. However, if he sees dozens of his peers from various cities dancing on stage, it is reasonable to assume that the problems he may have had with his self-image might diminish. Second, the festivals are mainly responsible for groups bringing dance experts from Hungary to work with them. These experts have had a deciding influence on the artistic direction of the groups. They are perhaps the main reason why groups in Canada perform authentic Hungarian regional folkdance compositions rather then tending towards the presentation of "national" dance, as had been the case with some Ukrainian-Canadian groups in years gone by.

What does the future hold for Canada's Hungarian community folkdance groups? Given that the communities themselves are in a process of slow decline, it is inevitable that the groups themselves will diminish in strength and size. If we take the U.S. as the advance model, even the stronger groups that remain will go through a process of significant change. Their membership will be increasingly composed of serious, older non-Hungarians whose principal motivation is to add Hungarian folkdances to their repertoire of knowledge. These groups will become ever more distant from the Hungarian community, while paradoxically their ambition to perform at a higher artistic level will increase. (At the two ends of the Hungarian network in Canada, the Buzavirág Dancers of Victoria and the Új Magor Dancers of Montreal are already tending in this direction.)

On the brighter side, the survey reveals that most of the groups have recognized the problem of survival and have made effective plans to assure future continuity. Given that a performing groups needs to renew itself every ten years or so, the three-tiered age structure (children's, teenagers' and senior group) adopted by many of Canada's larger Hungarian dance groups is eminently suited to overcoming the problems of survival. Added to it is the strength derived from the increasing co-operation between groups, the growing capabilities of resident leaders, and the beneficial effect of working with suitable experts from Hungary. All in all, the findings of the survey give cause for much optimism. Canada's Hungarian communities will likely be able to enjoy their dance groups for years, even decades to come.

Appendix

Hungarian community folkdance groups by province:

British Columbia		
Victoria	-	Búzavirág
Vancouver	-	Csárdás
Vancouver	-	Hungarian Folkdance Ensemble
Kelowna	-	Kisfalusi
Alberta		
Calgary	-	Bartók
Calgary	-	Vadrózsák
Edmonton	-	Csárdás
Lethbridge	-	Délibáb
Saskatchewan		
Regina	-	Balaton
Saskatoon	-	Fonyó
Manitoba		
Winnipeg	-	Kapisztrán
Winnipeg	-	Kárpát
Ontario		
Sudbury	-	Heritage School
Ottawa	-	Tulipán
Oshawa	-	Hungary House Dancers
Toronto	-	Kodály
Hamilton	-	27./59. Cs. Cs. Dancers
St. Catherines	-	Szittya
Welland	-	Hunor
Niagara Falls	-	Bartók
Brantford	-	Csárdás
Kitchener	-	Kossuth
London	-	Hungarian Folk Troupe
Quebec		
Montreal	-	Gyöngyösbokréta
Montreal	-	Százszorszép
Montreal	-	Új Magor

NOTES:

This paper had been presented at an international folkdance conference in July of 1993 in Kalocsa, Hungary. Data for it were gathered through a questionnaire that was sent to the administrator or leader of each folkdance group in Canada during the winter of 1992-93. No survey has been made of Hungarian community folkdance groups in Canada previously; however, some aspects of the Hungarian folkdance movement in Toronto have been studied. See Stephen Satory, "*Táncház*: Improvisatory Folk-Dancing and String Playing in Toronto's Hungarian Community," *Hungarian Studies Review* XIII, 2 (fall 1986), pp. 53-62.

Hungarian Studies Review, Vol. XX, Nos. 1-2 (Spring-Fall, 1993)

Designing an English Curriculum for Teachers of Hungarian Math and Science

Nora Nixon

With the recent political changes in Eastern Europe, there are changes in language policy which reflect a growing need for content-area instruction in the major European languages. In Hungary, the need for Hungarian teachers of math and sciences who can teach these subjects in English has now become a priority. This demand for linguistically proficient teachers and students was recognized during the mid-1980s with the establishment of dual language schools (DLS) by the Hungarian Ministry of Education. These secondary schools provide courses in mathematics, physics, chemistry, biology, and geography, which are taught in a chosen target language, such as English, German, French, Russian, or Spanish. In the beginning, many of these courses were being taught by native speakers from other countries who already had training and experience in the particular field; however, these teachers are now becoming scarce because of the limited economic benefits which exist for them if they remain in Hungary. Now the objective is to employ Hungarian teachers who are recent university graduates in math and science, and who have completed an extended language training program for prospective secondary teachers in Hungarian DLS.

In order to train Hungarian teachers for DLS where the medium of instruction is in English, an English for Pedagogical Purposes (EPP) program was initiated in 1989 at the Faculty of Sciences at Eötvös Loránd University (ELTE) in Budapest. During the summer of 1989, an interinstitutional agreement between the University of California, Los Angeles, (UCLA) and the Hungarian Ministry of Education was reached in order to guide important aspects of this training. A major goal of the agreement is to develop a curriculum for a five-year program to train Hungarian DLS teachers of math and sciences to effectively teach these subjects in English. This curriculum project has involved British and Hungarian ELTE faculty as well as visiting applied linguists from UCLA. The 1989-1990 academic year was devoted to establishing a needs anal-

ysis of both the students already enrolled in the EPP program and the secondary students enrolled in several Hungarian DLS. During the spring term of the 1990-1991 academic year, an EPP curriculum was designed and implemented.

I

All students in the EPP program are Hungarian ELTE students who are majoring in math and/or sciences. They have all passed an EPP entrance examination which consists of an oral interview and a grammar test for those who have not passed the Hungarian State Examination of English at the intermediate level. Students in the program are characterized as having an intermediate level knowledge of English.

The students enrolled in the EPP program during the academic year of 1990-1991 were divided into four groups. Those in Group IV were fifth year students in the process of completing their final requirements for the university diploma in a chosen math and/or science major; nine of the eleven had received USIA scholarships to attend a special EPP program at UCLA which was held during fall term, 1990. Group III consisted of twelve students, all in their fourth year at the university. Seven of the twelve were selected for the EPP program to be held at UCLA during fall term, 1991, and two of the remaining five students received scholarships for teacher training in Great Britain for the academic year of 1991-1992. The students in Group II were third year students and those in Group I were second year students. These two groups were not eligible for scholarships, having completed less than two years of the program.

A profile of the students is shown in Table I, which gives the breakdown of sex, age, origin, and major for each group. Table I indicates that both sexes are almost equally represented in the total number of students, with 21 males and 23 females enrolled in the program for 1990-1991. It is interesting that in Group IV there are almost twice as many females as males, whereas in Group III the males number twice as many as the females. Group II is the smallest, with only two males and six females. Group I, the youngest and newest to the program, is the most balanced in terms of sex distribution. Of the 44 students, 27 are from Budapest, and 17 are from other places in Hungary. There is a large number of students whose major subjects are math and physics; 31 of the 44, or approximately 70% of the students enrolled in the program, are training to be teachers of math and physics. If we include the 5 students who are majoring in either math and technology or math and computer science, then the total number of students with math as one of

their majors increases to almost 82%. There is a large proportion of math students in the program because math is almost always paired with a science major. It is, however, unclear why there are so many students enrolled with math and physics majors.

Table 1 Student Profiles, 1990-1991

Group	Male	Female	Age	Origin Bp/other	Major m/p	Major m/t	Major b/c*
VI	4	7	23	6/5	8	1	2
III	8	4	22-24	8/4	9	2	1
II	2	6	20-24	3/5	4	0	4
I	7	6	19-22	10/3	10	2	1

*Key to majors: m/p = math/physics
m/t = math/technology or math/computer sciences
b/c = biology/chemistry

II

The curriculum committee consisted of American, British, and Hungarian faculty in the EPP program at ELTE during the spring term of the academic year 1991-1992. Faculty and administrators from Karinthy Frigyes Gimnázium, the DLS in Budapest, also contributed their suggestions for the curriculum. The aim of the project was to design 10 courses for the five-year program; students would attend one course per semester for a total of approximately 600 hours of instruction.

In March, 1991, the first draft of the ten courses in the five-year curriculum was produced. The course titles are shown in Figure 1. The first year would be devoted to grammar review, listening comprehension activities, and brief discussions. In the second year, students would study the organizational principals of academic writing and speaking, as well as prepare extensive assignments to improve their oral and written English skills. The two third year courses were designed to introduce students to current American and British cultural issues through reading, writing, and speaking assignments based on selected pieces of contemporary American and British literature. Instruction in English for science and technology was the basis for the courses in the fourth year. Students would learn how to present ideas about general science materials in English. The fifth year would be devoted to pedagogical issues in the English as a

Foreign Language (EFL) classroom, content-area instruction and language immersion education.

EPP faculty members began to incorporate components of the curriculum into their EPP classes to determine the feasibility of the first draft, with the idea of meeting again at midterm. A curriculum revision meeting was then held at the end of March, 1991. Discussion of classroom experiences and an analysis of the aims and goals of each course were used to determine the scope of the revision, with particular emphasis on the third year of the curriculum concerning American and British culture and literature. The consensus of the curriculum team was that, even though an understanding of both American and British culture and literature is desirable, the curriculum would need to be changed so that less time would be used for instruction in culture and literature. Devoting the entire third year to only these topics would not adequately prepare the students for their teaching responsibilities and would be inappropriate to the aims of the EPP program. Accordingly, the Hungarian EPP teachers agreed to establish the course requirements for the first two years of the EPP Program, which would include substantial use of current authentic English language material from all available periodicals. This material would be supplemented by discussions of either American or British culture and related current events.

Figure 1. First Draft of EPP Curriculum

	FALL TERM	SPRING TERM
1st year	English for general purposes I	English for general purposes II
2nd year	English for academic purposes: Composition	English for academic purposes: Oral Presentations
3rd year	Concepts in American culture and literature	Concepts in British culture and literature
4th year	English for science English for technology	English for science English for technology
5th year	English for pedagogical purposes I	English for pedagogical purposes II

The next curriculum meeting was held in June of 1991, at the end of the academic year. The analysis and discussion of the various examination procedures and the objectives for each of the ten courses for the EPP Program determined the final draft of the curriculum. The course titles appear in Figure 2. The first two years of the EPP program are designated as English for general purposes, and these courses are de-

signed to provide a thorough review of English grammar as well as extended practice in listening comprehension and speaking activities. In addition, EPP students receive an introduction to American and British culture through speaking and writing activities related to current events in the United States and Britain. The third year is designed to incorporate communicative tasks in composition and oral presentations which will prepare the students for the pedagogical courses in the fourth and fifth years. Students will concentrate on preparing their own teaching materials in math and the sciences during the fall term of their fourth year, and will begin peer teaching in the following spring. In the fifth year of the program they will focus on linguistic and educational issues as they arise in the course of their practical teaching in the DLS.

Figure 2. Second Draft of EPP Curriculum

	FALL TERM	SPRING TERM
1st year	English for general purposes	English for general purposes
2nd year	English for general purposes	English for general purposes
3rd year	English for academic purposes: Composition	English for academic purposes: Oral Presentations
4th year	English for pedagogical purposes I	English for pedagogical purposes II
5th year	Seminar on English immersion Education	Seminar on practical issues in the English DLS classroom

Of considerable importance was determining examination procedures to ensure that students are on their way to becoming capable teachers. Three methods of eliminating any students who are not progressing linguistically in the program were established. The first would be known as the Preliminary Examination, and all students would be required to take it after completion of the third year of study. This examination would test the students' written and oral English skills, and those who pass this exam would be permitted to continue in the program. The second examination would occur after the fourth year of study, when a Teaching Demonstration in English in one of the student's major subjects would be required. This would be evaluated by all teachers in the EPP Program. All students who pass this teaching demonstration would be permitted to begin their practice teaching in a DLS in the fifth year of the program. The third and final examination is held at the end of the program, when students will be required to take the Hungarian State Examination of Extended Language Training.

III

Although much has been accomplished towards establishing a working curriculum of the five-year EPP program, the project is far from finished. The limited amount of time and resources available for faculty training and program evaluation are concerns which should be addressed. These constraints will inevitably affect course design, examination procedures, and selection and development of materials. American and British participation in the program has continued to decrease since 1991, making the Hungarian EPP faculty responsible for maintaining the evolution of the program.

Another concern is that while the number of applicants to the EPP program is growing, the number of EPP faculty members will not be increased. As the interest in English instruction continues to expand, competition for acceptance into the program will increase as well, because the number of students to be accepted will remain essentially the same. In choosing students for the program two questions are continually being raised:

1. What are the best methods of selecting future Hungarian teachers who will teach math and science courses in English ?

2. Are these future teachers sincerely interested in teaching careers, or are they only interested in improving their English skills in order to compete for better jobs and opportunities to study abroad?

Answers to these questions can be found by examining the design and implementation of the EPP Entrance Examination, the competition for scholarships to study and teach abroad, practice teaching in the DLS, and the Hungarian State Examination of Extended Language Training.

The immediate challenge of selecting sincere and motivated prospective DLS teachers is found in the design of the EPP Entrance Examination, which continues to evolve as the parameters of the program are defined. In 1991, the examination consisted of an oral interview of general questions, similar to section one of the Test of Spoken English (TSE), and a description of a picture, similar to section five of the TSE. All applicants who had not already passed the Hungarian State Language Examination at the intermediate level also had to complete an inhouse 100-item, multiple-choice timed test of American grammar usage.

Of the twenty-two applicants, only nine were chosen for Group I for the academic year 1991-1992, and five of the remaining thirteen applicants were placed on a waiting list.

Especially problematic was the process for determining the final selection of students, which was ultimately based on each applicant's performance during an oral interview with several EPP faculty. While some of the questions used by the faculty to discuss the qualifications of

each applicant after the interview are indeed linguistically sound, many of the questions will clearly reveal the interviewer's subjective observations of an applicant's personality which is based on one interview of only five to ten minutes with two or three members of the EPP faculty. This aspect of the selection process, the oral interview, became the most important to address. The EPP faculty feel that the oral interview is necessary and effective because it is desirable to select students quickly and efficiently. Therefore, the content of the oral interview was expanded to include brief questions about the applicant's background and motivations for wanting to teach. Then the line of questioning is directed towards the applicant's ideas on the characteristics of both excellent and poor teachers. This is followed by the applicant's description of a picture. The last portion of the interview is a task which is more related to teaching ability: each applicant is presented with different school announcements and information which must be explained to the interviewers, who pose as students and ask questions for clarification. As a way of closing the interview, the interviewers ask the applicants if they have any questions about the EPP program. After the interview, a method for rating overall oral proficiency and comprehensibility is employed in order to standardize the final decision of each applicant's score. The Rating Scale for the English Examination for DLS Math and Science Teachers is now used, which was adapted from the Oral Proficiency Test for Non-Native Teaching Assistants and the Interagency Language Roundtable Proficiency Test.

Figure 3

Questions used to discuss the applicants after each interview
Can you imagine [applicant] as a teacher?
Can you imagine [applicant] in front of a class?
Do you think [applicant] was sincere?
Was [applicant] able to provide supplementary explanation?
Was [applicant] able to paraphrase when we couldn't understand; and, how did he or she finally get the message across?
Will [applicant] fit in with the rest of the group?

Even after expanding the content and duration of the oral interview, the issue of how best to select these future teachers remains. A written component of the test which all applicants complete is also now desirable. In 1991, the inhouse multiple-choice grammar test was the

only instrument available, and this was used only for those applicants who had not successfully completed the Hungarian State Examination. The EPP teachers were reluctant to include an essay in the entrance examination because of the amount of time and training necessary to evaluate these writing samples. They also felt that the same information, in terms of content, can be obtained in the oral interview. However, writing samples are also very informative about an applicant's attitudes and motivations when the topic is a teaching problem and the solutions to the problem. This section of the entrance examination would not only demonstrate the applicant's linguistic ability, but would also reveal his or her methods of problem solving and interpersonal relationship skills. In addition, the decision as to whether or not the applicant should be accepted is also based on an easily retrievable document which can be reviewed by the EPP faculty as well.

Another method for further discrimination of teaching ability has to do with the selection of EPP students who are eligible for the various teaching positions and scholarships available at schools in the United States and in Britain. In May of 1991, criteria were developed for selecting seven students from the twelve in Group III who would receive scholarships to attend the special EPP program at UCLA during the fall term, 1991. The recipients are expected to participate as student teachers in a Los Angeles high school; therefore, their teaching and language skills must be well developed. The competition consisted of three components: a demonstration of teaching ability, a multiple-choice American English grammar test, and a listening comprehension test.

The participants in the competition prepared and taught a "mini-lesson" in one of their major subjects in English, and were evaluated by the teacher trainers in the EPP Program. The mini-lessons were also videotaped so that these demonstrations could be viewed again. The grammar examination was a variation of the one used in the EPP entrance examination. The listening test was a true/false test of ten questions, and the listening passage was taken from an American science professor's lecture about his teaching techniques. The passage is 14 minutes long, and students were permitted to listen to the passage twice, while taking notes on paper provided for them. The grammar and listening components of the examination were designed mainly as screening devices to ensure that all students selected would have at least intermediate levels of American English competence. In the future, these components of the selection process will be given as part of the Preliminary Examination after the third year. The Teaching Demonstration will be required after the fourth year; it will be used both as a screening instrument and as the basis of competition for scholarships.

Since the fifth year of the curriculum is designed to provide more supportive instruction for students during their practice teaching in a

DLS, extensive coordination between the EPP Program and the DLS is necessary for this goal to be achieved. Each student observes a master teacher at work in one of the DLS in Budapest, and then teaches the class for several weeks. Ideally, students would be able to observe master teachers in their classes at the DLS in Budapest, and then teach the next classes there for an entire term. In this way, the fifth year of the curriculum would enable the students to discuss problems as they occur. Suggestions have also been made for students to do their practice teaching outside of Budapest so that future teachers can experience teaching in both settings. This, however, is problematic, as students must also attend their university courses during this period.

The final requirement for completion of the EPP program is successful completion of the Hungarian State Examination of Extended Language Training, which determines the student's level of teaching competency of the student's chosen major subjects in English. Each student prepares and presents a teaching demonstration of each chosen major subject. The Rating Scale for the English Examination for DLS Math and Science Teachers is again used to evaluate the students, which also provides a comparison with the student's initial evaluation during the EPP entrance examination. The evaluation categories on the official state examination certificate are expanded to include: pronunciation, fluency, grammar, vocabulary, organization, listening comprehension, body language, facial expressions, handling of questions, and student involvement. Each student is required to submit a brief outline of the lesson, prior to the examination, to ensure that the level of material is appropriate for students at the secondary level. These lesson plans are approved by the EPP faculty a few weeks in advance of the examination. Every student must be able to demonstrate effective lesson planning and teaching skills in each major subject at the secondary level in order to successfully complete the EPP program.

IV

The challenge of selecting and training enough Hungarian teachers to teach their major subjects in English can be met through the collaborative efforts of American, British and Hungarian faculty at the interinstitutional level. The implementation of an English for Pedagogical Purposes Program at ELTE in Budapest has resulted in the curriculum design and development of criteria for teacher training and selection. Graduates of the program are now teaching in special secondary schools, known as dual language schools, throughout Hungary. Equally important is that the evolution of the project has raised compelling questions about determining the best methods to select and train future teachers of math and

sciences in English for Hungarian secondary schools. In the years to come, the EPP curriculum will continue to be implemented, revised and evaluated. These tasks will most likely be carried out by the Hungarian EPP faculty, and there is no doubt that the real challenge is theirs.

It is also without doubt that the Hungarian students and teachers in the EPP Program will benefit from all opportunities to study and teach in English-speaking countries. Programs that can provide teacher-training in countries such as Britain and the United States are essential to the evolution of DLS teacher-training in Hungary and other countries interested in establishing this system. Unfortunately, these types of programs are expensive and the costs must be compared with the ultimate benefits. As these students graduate, and face the economic pressures which now exist in Hungary, perhaps the most important question is: How many of these specially trained teachers will truly devote themselves to teaching careers, and how many of them will opt for higher-paying positions?

NOTES AND BIBLIOGRAPHY

This project was funded by a USIA grant to Dr. Russell N. Campbell at the Language Resource Program at UCLA.

1. An Evaluation of Hungarian Dual-Language Schools: Year One (1989-1990) Research Report. Patricia Duff. 1990.

2. English for Pedagogical Purposes Program, Budapest, Hungary: Year One (1989-1990) Final Report. Sara Cushing. 1990.

3. The English DLS Teacher-Training Program at Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest, Hungary. Year Two (1990-1991) Spring Semester Report. Nora Nixon (1991).

4. Proposal to the United States Information Agency. Renewal of Dual Language Education. Russell N. Campbell (1989).

5. Report and Evaluation: English for Pedagogical Purposes Project. Sara Cushing (1989).

6. Test of Spoken English Manual for Score Users. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service, 1990.

Hungarian Studies Review, Vol. XX, Nos. 1-2 (Spring-Fall, 1993)

Freedom of the Press: Its Idea and Realization in Pre-1914 Hungary

Tamás Révész

In nineteenth century Hungarian scholarship of the history of law, the following — not exactly flattering — view was formulated: "The free press, in this country, matured to a ripe fruit under the magic of the legislation of 1848." One can hardly agree with this generalization. The achievement of the freedom of the press cannot simply be explained by reference to the impact of a few action-packed revolutionary days. In a well-documented study, Ödön Both pointed out that the proponents of Hungarian progress fought almost sixty years for the freedom of publishing and spreading ideas. They persisted in their struggle until it became law that "everyone may freely publish and freely spread their ideas through the press." In this paper we cannot undertake the in-depth investigation of the struggle for a free press prior to the enactment of the Press Act of 1914, we can only undertake a brief outline of it.

The first advocates of the need for the freedom of the press in Hungary were the Hungarian Jacobites. Behind this demand lies the fact that following the 1790 "realization of the incurable crisis of feudalism," philosophers and politicians intended a decisive role for the press, and for the free dissemination of ideas. They did this at a time when official policy in the Habsburg Empire after Joseph II's death "established a system of the most narrow-minded paternalism," in which the press was burdened with innumerable regulations.

Those who struggled for the freedom of the press took natural law as their point of philosophical departure, and defied growing political repression. Their demands for the abolition of censorship became increasingly vociferous. Private individuals and bodies, philosophers and legal authorities, raised their voice "for the finest human right," the freedom of the press. It should be admitted that the local movements for a free press, instead of demanding the liberation of the press as a point of principle, initially merely objected to the excesses of censorship. By 1832, however, a good many counties instructed their deputies to the legislature to participate in the struggle for the complete freedom of the press.

The conservative majority of the Lower House stood in the path of this aspiration. Moreover, the Diet of 1839-40 did not enact legislation on the freedom of the press, and the Diet of 1843-44 also failed to fulfil the hopes of its advocates. The debate on the proposed Press Act was postponed -- despite increasingly categorical instructions by the reformist counties to their deputies for the enacting of legislation concerning the freedom of the press. At the preliminary sessions of the 1847-48 Diet, the efforts of the opposition bore fruit. A parliamentary committee on the press was established under the chairmanship of Széchenyi. Bertalan Szemere became the committee's secretary. It is true that, as a body, the committee achieved little, but in the spring of 1848, Szemere started, single-handed, work on the draft of the future legislation guaranteeing the freedom of the press in Hungary.

The revolutionary wave of 1848 accelerated the birth of the Press Act. In the wake of the revolution in Vienna, Louis Kossuth could announce at the 14th March meeting of the Lower House, that "the freedom of the press is granted by the ruler." "Do you want to . . . open this country to the flood of printed matter not written in the Hungarian language inundating the country under responsibility not in accord with Hungarian law" asked Kossuth, suggesting the need for the speedy enactment of the Press Act. "What is needed," he continued, is someone to "write down" the following: "The freedom of the press is restored in Hungary. Press offenses are placed under court procedure. Court procedures and punishments are those laid down by the last Diet in the Criminal Code." Kossuth's appeal prompted the Lower House to instruct the "committee entrusted with the drafting of the Press Act" to hammer out this piece of legislation "as soon as possible."

Developments in Pest overtook the proceedings in Parliament when the revolution swept away censorship. The very first demand of the Twelve Points, formulated also on 14th March, was the "freedom of the press and the abolition of censorship." Point One of the decree of the Council of the Governor General stated that "The press operates freely, without any prior censorship whatsoever." This set of regulations established a twenty-five member provisional committee and empowered it — and the ordinary courts — to retaliate for "abuses and irregularities" committed through the press. A few days later, Szemere hastily submitted his first draft of the proposed Press Bill to the legislature. Keeping the interests of the well-to-do classes in mind, it stipulated the depositing of twenty or ten thousand forints caution-money by the founders of political periodicals. After a brief debate, Parliament adopted the draft with a few minor changes. However, the revolutionary action of the March Youth in Budapest prompted the legislators of the liberal nobility to change their mind at the last moment, as a result of which the amount of the "caution-money" was reduced to half. The Act now reached its final form and the

king gave his royal assent on 7th April. The law establishing the bourgeois freedom of the press in Hungary became effective on 11th April. It was to serve the Hungarian state and society for some fifty years.

The provisions of the Press Act proclaiming the liberation of the press were not entirely progressive. Almost from the moment of its birth it encountered resentment. The debate over the bill in the Lower House had produced some favourable changes, but these failed to justify Kossuth's hopes that the "improved structure" would forestall public debates about the act. The Act's critics: Táncsics, Ákos Birdnyi, Ferenc Toldi and others, objected primarily to its severe penal provisions. Sebő Vukovics, the future Justice Minister, wrote, in not exactly flattering terms, that "the Lower House's momentary deviation from the path of liberty has given birth to an act that has engendered general anxiety: the Press Act."

Bearing in mind the principle of the bourgeois freedom of the press, the Press Act of March abolished "preliminary scrutiny", and declared, for the first time in Hungary, that "everybody is entitled to publish and spread their ideas through the press." This declaration, and its honest intentions, however, were somewhat overshadowed by other sections of the act, particularly the strict penal provisions regarding press offenses classified under criminal law.

First mention in connection with these provisions must go to Secion Six of the Act which proposed to punish sedition aimed at "changing the constitution by force and stirring up discontent against the lawful higher authorities" by a maximum of four years imprisonment and a fine of two thousand forints. Section Seven contained rather strict provision for the protection of the king's person and the order of succession, whilst Section Eight did the same with respect to members of the royal family.

The above examples are, perhaps, sufficient to illustrate the ambiguity of the Press Act of 1848. We may therefore agree with Ödön Both who stressed that the Press Act progressed along the path of freedom as far as could be expected of its drafters.

It must, however, be noted in defence of the legislators, but even more so of those who enforced it, that the Act's stringent penal provisions were not used at all in 1848-49. This despite the fact that, according to contemporaries, at that time "there surfaced vast numbers of publications representing the interests of the various parties, with passionate debates in their columns, alternating with the most vicious personal attacks."

The March Laws of 1848, laid down the foundations of Hungary's bourgeois transformation. The War of Independence, and the dark years of Neo-Absolutism in the wake of defeat, excluded the possibility of further constitutional and political progress. The Compromise of 1867 between Austria and Hungary allowed the resumption of the political trends interrupted in 1848. In particular, the "deal" gave the Hungarian

ruling class the opportunity to continue the country's capitalist development, within a multi-national empire characterized by numerous contradictions.

In the new Dualist state elements of parliamentarianism and certain absolutist tendencies co-existed, and so did the liberal face of the political system and the predominance of the executive branch of government. In this regard it needs to be emphasized that even though in this fledgling democracy "bourgeois liberties and minority rights were restrictive, they nonetheless existed and provided a suitable framework for the development of the forces of democracy, . . . The best illustration for this is the evolution of the issue of the freedom of the press after 1867.

The defeat of the War of Independence, the terror and oppression in its wake, signified the temporary death of the freedom of the press. Hungarian legislation was replaced by Austrian law and its string of decrees on the press. For the next eighteen years these kept the Hungarian papers under control with varying degrees of severity.

In the mid-1860's, the country and its Parliament gradually prepared for a peaceful pact with the Habsburg dynasty and with Austria. As part of these preparations, a 12 member committee of the Lower Chamber of the 1865 Parliament studied the questions that could require "the attention of the legislature" following "the restoration of constitutionality."

This body first demanded significant changes in the patched-up edifice of the Hungarian legal system. In its report dated 12th April 1866, the committee recommended that the issue of the press ought to be out of Parliament's agenda.

At this stage the legislative body did not yet begin work on the realization of this ambitious plan. Nevertheless, the aforementioned report rendered perceptible the reform aspirations with which contemporary politicians and prominent public figures became involved. The need to achieve press reform also figured among these ideas. This could be explained by press law of 1848 throughout its existence.

However, this discontent was not enough to bring about the birth of a comprehensive law, one with due consideration to the changes in social and political conditions. Apart from the parliamentary committee's proposal, nothing else was happening in this regard. Thus, when the Compromise came into force, the Andrássy government, on entering office, had no alternative but to return to the press law of 1848. This solution was not only the most obvious, but as had been pointed out, was "also politically the most attractive."

As the first step, the new Cabinet restored the municipal authorities and introduced measures to settle the issue of the press. On 28th February, 1867, the government promised the reintroduction of the Press Act of 1848 as soon as possible. The revival of Act 18 of 1848 did not, however, mean that a piece of complimentary legislation, the Assizes Act of

1848, would also be revived without any changes. In 1848 this decree, following the intentions of the Press Act, declared the setting up of juries at the municipal level. Andrássy and his government had no intention of reviving it. The government felt that implementing the Assizes Act of 1848 would not only give rise to complications, but would also be inexpedient. Therefore, as early as February 1867, it requested the approval of the Lower Chamber to ignore the decree and to empower not the municipal juries but the royal court of appeal, and the district courts of appeal, to deal with the matter.

The request did not seem to have disturbed the legislature's unduly, even though the majority of them probably still vividly recalled Sec. 18 of the 1848 Press Act. This had instructed the government to "provide for the setting up of juries" authorized to judge press offenses. Parliament was not made anxious even by the fact that the authorization they had voted for could enable the executive branch to enter the terrain of passive legislation. At the time, politicians professed, and applied, the "French revolutionary concept" with regard to executive and legislative powers. This theory stipulated that the executive branch may not possess independent legislative authority, and "in principle every legislative act of the government and public administration is issued on the basis and for the implementation of a specific act that is, the authorization therein contained." Acceding to the government's request did not appear as a violation of concept.

The motion was debated in Parliament on the 9th March. The brief, almost formal discussion merely gave an opportunity to minority MP's to voice their displeasure with the Press Act. First to speak, György Sztratimirovich stated with laconic simplicity that the Press Act of 1848 was "inadequate," its penal clauses were too stringent, and that caution money was not the paragon of liberalism. Rumanian MP József Hodosium went so far as to draw the attention of the House to Act 18 of 1848 on the "unfree press." However, the Deák Party and the ministers present displayed no inclination for serious, substantive debate. Only Pál Jámbor emphasized, as a quiet manifestation of disagreement, the "freer nature" of Hungarian press legislation in comparison with its Austrian counterpart.

The relocation of the juries to the seats of the courts of appeal did provoke a greater controversy. MP's representing the nationalities were concerned that by adopting the motion, non-Hungarian speaking members of the press would in reality be removed from the courts of their municipal authorities, and juries in distant towns would be passing sentences in their cases. "Being sentenced by a jury that was alien and of opposing principles amounts to being convicted in advance," stressed Svetozar Miletic. Speaking out against centralization, Sztratimirovich echoed the gloomy prophesy: "within half-a-year a certain number of editors and

staff in our provincial towns . . . will be jailed . . . I am so bold as to ask the government to supply an adequate number of journalists so that it [could] replace those put in jail."

Opponents of the motion concerning juries did, however, come forth with counter-proposals. Several MP's supported the idea of setting up courts in Pécs, Arad and Újvidék in addition to the five planned by the government. The majority of the Lower Chamber, however, agreed with Zsigmond Bernáth who held that if the government was only capable of setting up five courts, then "it is not advisable to oblige it to do something it is not capable of doing." In the end this meaningless argument carried the day. With a few minor, insignificant changes, Parliament accepted the government's proposal, thereby giving a free hand to the Cabinet's press policy.

Only a few months after the decision of Parliament, the need for enacting a new and more comprehensive press act was voiced in several quarters. Nográd County was first to call on the Lower Chamber to "enact legislation as soon as possible to make up for the deficiencies of Act 18 of 1848." The contradictions of and the loopholes in the Press Act of the 1848 revolution presented difficulties not only to local political entities, however. For already in the first year following the Compromise of 1867, the almost unrestricted functioning of the liberated press caused so much annoyance to government officials that in February, 1868, the Cabinet announced that in the realm of the domestic press the situation "can, on account of the deficiencies of our laws, be regarded abnormal."

Himself in the firing line of attack by the opposition press, the Justice Minister could boast with confidence before his colleagues that he had "worked out a bill concerning the press." Admittedly, the weight of this announcement was slightly diminished by the minister's comment to the effect that, as he saw it, the enactment of the finished draft would require some time. Considering, however, the "absurd state of affairs", immediate steps must be taken over a host of issues — stated the minister. To this end, he planned to inaugurate new regulations affecting such issues as parliamentary immunity, allegations made in Parliament, disrespect for laws, the importing of foreign publications (especially anonymous pamphlets), and the question of the editor's responsibility. The minutes of the Cabinet meeting failed to throw more light on points enumerated above, but from earlier statements by officials it becomes obvious that the Justice Minister intended to restrict the freedom of the press.

The attacks on the Dualist Hungarian government by the opposition press often forced government politicians to make bitter statements. This indicated that the representatives of power regarded the sharp voice of the press as licentiousness rather than a manifestation of liberty. Basically though, the party in power was seeking protection against attacks on the

law that had created the Austro-Hungarian Compromise. The proposed amendments to the press law announced by the Justice Minister probably had this purpose. The bill limiting the freedom of the press, however, never found its way to the legislators, despite several promises, made in public, by the minister himself. It was similarly in vain that speeches from the Throne inaugurating subsequent parliamentary sessions of the period stressed the need for "separate regulations to be enacted with regard to the press." For a long time the amendment of the Press Act of 1848 was not on the Parliament's agenda.

* * *

In the last quarter of the nineteenth century, Hungary's politicians, lawyers, and journalists revealed a growing willingness to acknowledge the loopholes in the first Press Act, and increasingly urged its fundamental revamping.

Sándor Dardai, the well-known legal expert, wrote as early as 1873 that Act 18 of 1848 "met neither the ideal of legal perfection nor that of the freedom of the press." For its part, the Fourth Hungarian Lawyers' Congress set up a special section, still in that year, to debate the question of press legislation. Though a few years later the first Hungarian Penal Code significantly modified regulations concerning "press offenses," the Act of 1848 remained valid for the constitutional aspects of the freedom of the press, thereby delimiting government policy with respect to opposition and minority papers.

The failure to enact comprehensive laws to regulate the publication and dissemination of ideas in print did not, however, mean that there was no legislation in this regard in Hungary between 1867 and 1900. On the contrary. Besides the first Hungarian Penal Code, curtailments were introduced concerning advertising. Also, the institution of the "journalists prison" was abolished, the jury's sphere of authority was restricted, the right to anonymity was eliminated, the institution of "detention under remand" involving press matters was established and judicial practice was also changed. All of this indicated how significantly the issue of the freedom of the press had been complicated or even changed for the worse. In view of the above we must agree with the verdict rendered in the first decade of this century that "a basic law with so many loopholes could no longer be patched up and rendered fully suitable with minor improvements . . . "

The bill undertaking the full transformation of the press law, was introduced by the government of István Tisza. It bore the laconic title "On the Press," and was submitted to the legislature in November 1913. The new press reform was debated at various meetings. Besides the

learned members of the Lawyers' Association, publishers and journalists also took part in the preparatory work. The debates indicated how widely opinions on the government's press reform differed. The liberals firmly denounced the bill's apparent intention to curtail the freedom of the press, which they discerned by reading between the lines. Government spokesmen were claiming just the opposite: "In the provisions on the dissemination of press products and on press law liability . . . the proposal not only retains the press' privileges which have proved expedient in the past, but renders a hitherto unknown institutional guarantee for the freedom of thought . . . it significantly eases the responsibility of the intellectual workers of the press . . . also adequately providing for their interest in terms of their independence . . . it lays the noble principle of the freedom of the press on a more solid foundation." Understandably, these rather divergent standpoints do not make it very easy for posterity to form an objective opinion of the second major law of the Hungarian press.

The text of the bill itself can provide the safest point of departure for judgment. Only after an in-depth scrutiny of the Act's individual provisions can it be judged, praised or denounced.

The new press law consisted of five chapters. The preamble defined fundamental concepts. Conspicuously, this section of the Act reiterated the provisions of the revolutionary press law verbatim: "Everybody may publish and disseminate their ideas freely through the press." Obviously, by retaining this passage, the government wanted to show its respect of the 1848 tradition. Defined in the next section of the Act were the concrete stipulations that set boundaries for the realization of the principles proclaimed in the preamble. They concerned, amongst other things, conditions for manufacturing press products, regulations concerning the registering of printing shops, and the stipulation that printers are obliged to keep books in which "a record must be kept of the name of the publisher of the press product, the title of the press product, its shape, the number of sheets and copies."

The principle stipulations of these administrative provisions reformulated the rules governing the distribution of the daily and weekly papers, prescribing the authorities' permission for street distribution. Permission for such distribution of papers of nation-wide circulation could be obtained from the Minister of the Interior, whilst the head of public administration was empowered to issue permission for the sale of local papers.

This by no means marked the end of the end of the stipulations dealing with the conditions of distribution. Bearing in mind the elementary interests of politics, the legislation stipulated that "Permission shall not be issued for the street distribution of press products that violate or endanger public order or public morality, [might] . . . arouse hatred

against some minority, class, or denomination, or [which] discusses intimate family matters without public interest requiring this."

The already enumerated regulations, as well as those not mentioned here, could, upon a superficial reading, prompt posterity to infer that the Press Act of 1914 radically curtailed the previously free distribution of the printed idea, veritably restoring the system of a priori censorship that had been denounced in 1848. This was, however, by no means the case. The legislators and their political supporters pointed out, with justification, that the stipulations so fiercely denounced by the opposition had been a fact of life for decades, and all the law did was to incorporate them into the system of written legislation. In passing judgment on this legislation, we can hardly speak of the "inquisition-like" persecution of members of the press. The Press Act of 1914 did not even contain provisions that could have been used to curtail left-wing newspapers in the interwar period. At this time the leftist press was brought to heel not with reference to the provisions of the Press Act of 1914, but through lower-level regulation. But the tribulations of the Hungarian press after 1914 — through war, revolution, counter-revolution, a new war, and foreign occupations — is another theme that will have to be explored in a future study.

EDITORS' NOTE:

This paper's references are predominantly to Hungarian works that are rarely available in North American libraries. Those readers who are interested in these endnotes should request a copy of an annotated, manuscript version of this paper from the journal's editors.

Hungarian Studies Review, Vol. XX, Nos. 1-2 (Spring-Fall, 1993)

Documents:

The 1956 Hungarian Student Movement in Exile: An Introduction

N.F. Dreisziger (editor)

The outbreak of the 1956 Hungarian Revolution was precipitated by demonstrations by college and university students in Budapest.[1] Students continued to play an important role in the Revolution's events even after the onset of fighting on the streets of Hungary's cities, and they constituted a substantial part of the exodus of refugees after the Revolution was crushed by Soviet troops.

The number post-secondary students who left Hungary in the wake of the Revolution has been estimated at 8,000.[2] With their arrival and settlement in the countries of Western Europe and the New World, began the peculiar life of a student emigration. One of the first acts of these refugee students was the establishment in exile of the organization MEFESZ or Magyar Egyetemisták és Főiskolások Szövetsége [Federation of Hungarian University and College Students] which had originally come into existence shortly before the outbreak of unrest in Budapest. Preparations for this move took place at a meeting of refugee students from fourteen countries in Lichtenstein in May of 1957. This conference was followed by a much larger gathering in Paris in October of the same year, which proclaimed the launching of the Union of Free Hungarian Students (UFHS).[3]

In addition to reviving MEFESZ in its new incarnation, members of the refugee Hungarian student diaspora undertook establishing their national (or, in some cases, city-based) organizations in the various countries that had admitted them in the fall and early winter of 1956. Among these organizations were the Verband der Ungarischer Studenten im Deutschland, Hungarian Students in Great Britain, Union de los Estudiantes Hungaros Libres en la Argentina, Union des Etudiants Hongrois Libres en Belgique, Verband Ungarischer Studenten (Graz, Austria),

Verband der Freien Ungarischer Studenten (Innsbruck, Austria), and the Union des Etudiants Hongrois Libres (Paris).

In North America, the United States and Canada had taken in about 1,500 post-secondary refugee students in the wake of 1956.[4] Already in the early months of 1957 these students brought into existence the organization called Északamerikai Magyar Egyetemisták és Főiskolások Szövetsége (ÉMEFESZ, as opposed to MEFESZ) which assumed the English name "Association of Hungarian Students in North America" (AHSNA). AHSNA held its first congress in Chicago in the summer of 1957 and established offices in Boston and New York. It helped its parent organization, the Union of Free Hungarian Students, to launch two periodicals, the *A magyar diák* [The Hungarian Student] in Hungarian, and *the hungarian student* [*sic*, The Hungarian Student] in English. The latter was a bi-monthly journal with editorial offices in New York City and in St. Gallen, Switzerland. The first document reprinted below appeared in its November-December 1958 number (Vol. 3, No. 2), pp. 9-11.

* * *

The Union of Free Hungarian Students functioned for eight years after the Rome Congress of 1958. By 1965 it seems to have operated under a different name. In the press release of 1 Aug. of that year (see below) it is mentioned alternately as United Federations of Hungarian Students or United Federation of Hungarian Students. Further, the UFHS of 1965 was evidently a much poorer organization than its 1958 predecessor. It seems to have relied on brief press releases rather than a periodical to inform the public of the Western World of its activities, and it evidently could no longer afford the services of copy editors and proofreaders. The 1965 press release is written in awkward English and contains typing errors, at least one of which is quite embarrassing. The second document appended to this introductory essay is re-printed in part to illustrate the UFHS's decline between 1958 and 1965.

The truth is that by 1965 the UFHS was plagued by a number of problems. One of these was the fact that from the start, the organization depended very heavily on the Free Europe Committee (FEC) for financial support. The FEC was a New York-based private organization which in turn depended for much of its finances on the American government.[5] Furthermore, there was internal dissention within the UFHS' leadership and there were "scandals," such as the return of two members of the executive to Hungary. But the most serious difficulty appears to have been the fact that the UFHS's various component organizations — autonomous in local matters from the start — seems to have been increas-

ingly reluctant to cooperate in joint ventures and to coordinate activities. It is not surprising under the circumstances that in 1966 the UFHS suspended its activities.[6]

Similar fate awaited the AHSNA or ÉMEFESZ. Cooperation between its American executive and its Canadian branches (by the early 1960s the only viable Canadian branch was the one at the University of Toronto) became increasingly strained. Eventually the AHSNA split into two separate national organizations which for a while continued to function within the framework of the by then moribund UFHS.[7]

The demise of the Hungarian refugee student movement of 1956-1966 illustrates the truth of the observation made by scholars of immigration history that emigre organizations tend to be ephemeral. Associations of exiled student activists are even more likely to be short-lived. After all, students complete their studies and go on to other things in life (even though some of us had done our best to remain university students for an extraordinarily long time — nearly a decade in the case of the writer of these lines). The vast majority of the Hungarian students who entered the post-secondary institutions of the Western World after the early 1960s had not been personally involved in the events in Budapest of October 1956 and, as a result, had little interest in their refugee predecessor's political agenda, and rarely shared their patriotic zeal. Hungarian student organizations continued to function at many universities of Western Europe and North America after the mid-1960s, but their attention was increasingly focused on non-political affairs.

Long before the demise of the HFHS, its early periodicals ceased to exist. By the 1960s, newsletters appear to have replaced the journals that had exited earlier. The AHSNA by then was publishing the *Hiradó* [Courier], an inexpensively produced in-house publication. Nearly a generation later, even scattered issues of the UFHS's early journals still in the possession of their original owners, are in danger of being thrown out, as the one-time student refugees of 1956 grow old and begin to move into condominiums for senior citizens. The propose of re-printing a part of one of these issues is to make sure that information which might be useful to historians of the twenty-first century has a better chance to survive.

NOTES

[1]The historical literature of the Hungarian Revolution of 1956 is enormous. In our journal alone more than a dozen articles have appeared on the subject over the years. Among these, a general overview is offered in Peter Gosztony, "The Hungarian Revolution of 1956 Viewed from Two Decades' Distance," see the predecessor of the *HSR*, the *Canadian-American Review of*

Hungarian Studies III, 2, (Fall 1976), 139-153. Other studies in this volume devoted to the origins and events of 1956 are: Tamas Aczel, "Between the Awakening and the Explosion: Yogis and Commissars Reconsidered, 1953-1956" 107-114; and Béla K. Király, "The First War Between Socialist States: Military Aspects of the Hungarian Revolution," 115-123. These two works are both recollections (or, in fact, eye-witness accounts) and products of scholarly research.

Some of the literature of the Revolution is given in the same volume by I.L. Halasz de Beky, "A Bibliography of the Hungarian Revolution 1956," pp. 195-202. A more comprehensive collection of essays is: *The First War Between Socialist States: The Hungarian Revolution of 1956 and its Impact*, B.K. Király *et al.* eds. (New York: Social Science Monographs, 1984), which contains an extensive bibliography compiled by Enikő Molnár Basa. Relevant studies that have appeared in the *Hungarian Studies Review* since 1980 are: Tamás Szendrey, "Remembering 1956: Some Reflections on the Historical Consciousness of a New Generation," XIV, 1 (Spring 1987), 27-38; and Andor C. Klay, "Document: Budapest—Washington, 1956," VII, 2 (Fall 1980), 145-162.

[2]This figure is given in the document printed below. It has been accepted by Gyula Borbándi, *A magyar emigráció életrajza, 1945-1985* [The Biography of the Hungarian Emigration, 1945-1985] (Munich: Europai Protestáns Magyar Szabadegyetem, 1985), p. 273

[3]Among the participants were non-Hungarian students invited from Third World countries. The establishment of contacts with Asian, African and South American students was no doubt sought in order to spread knowledge of the oppression under which Hungarians in Hungary were suffering ever since the imposition of Soviet totalitarian rule in the late 1940s.

[4]This figure is given by Borbándi, *ibid.* For information on refugee Hungarian students in Canada see N.F. Dreisziger, *et al. Struggle and Hope: The Hungarian-Canadian Experience* (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1982) pp. 205-10; also by the same author, *The Hungarian Experience in Ontario*, a special issue of the *Hungarian Studies Review*, Vol. XII, No. 2 (fall, 1985), pp. 51-58. At the present, this subject is the focus of Professor Peter Hidas' (Dawson College, Montreal) research interests.

[5]Originally named the National Committee for a Free Europe, this ostensibly non-government organization served to channel funds to exiles from the Soviet bloc because the various administrations in Washington did not want to appear to be supporting opponents of regimes with whom they had formal diplomatic contacts. The Committee solicited donations from the American public. See Borbándi, pp. 96f.

[6]*Ibid.*, pp. 274f.

[7]Although the writer of these lines, who was President of the Hungarian Student Association of the University of Toronto at the time, was involved in these developments, he does not recall exactly why the separation had taken place. Part of the reason seems to have been the growth of a "Canadian" sentiment among the members who resented what they perceived to be *American* control of their *Canadian* organization.

DOCUMENT 1

Rome, 1958: Congress of the U.F.H.S.

(Reprinted from *the hungarian student* Vol. 3, No. 2, Nov.-Dec. 1958. pp. 9-11.)

On October 20, 1958, in Italy, Hungarian refugee students gathered from all over the world, for the third time, to evaluate the work and accomplishments of the past and to chart the course to be followed in the future. The meeting, influenced by the spirit of October, 1956, was characterized by the same unity displayed by the students during the Hungarian Revolution.

This is the fourth important step taken by Hungarian students. It all started in October, 1956, when the first organizations of the MEFESZ materialized during the days of oppression, and the youth printed its 16 point demand for freedom. The demands were answered by bullets, and the Revolution broke out.

When the Revolution was suppressed thousands fled from the country to freedom. But this freedom placed heavy obligations on the shoulders of the students. Obligations to work for those who remained behind. The second important step was born of this realization when, in May 1957, the Hungarian student delegates from fourteen countries gathered in Liechtenstein. The task was to establish one unified organization and to formulate the manifold duties which confronted them in exile. These duties included the maintenance of the possibility for 8,000 Hungarian refugee students to continue their studies and the creation of opportunities for them to get acquainted with the free world after the complete physical and intellectual isolation forced upon them by their oppressors.

This aim led to the third step, the International Congress of the Union of Free Hungarian Students in Paris, in October, 1957, with the participation of the representatives of students from twenty-seven foreign countries. Most of these delegates came from Asia, Africa, and Latin America. We wanted to meet the youth of these distant continents, familiar to us only through the pages of history books, and to get to know them really well as our fate has been similar to theirs so often.

A year has passed since that Paris congress. Unfortunately, time has brought little change to our country. Hungary is still in bondage. But the 8,000 Hungarian students living on free soil cannot resign themselves to this as inevitable. Scattered now in nineteen countries they have maintained the unity of their organization and they continue their work in the spirit of the Revolution.

Nineteen local organizations sent their elected representatives to the third Congress of UFHS. Hungarian students came to Rome from such faraway places as the United States, Argentina and Chile. They came from all the hospitable countries of Scandinavia, from England. The Benelux countries were represented as well as the Latin peninsulas: Spain, Italy. This list was completed by the delegations from Austria, Germany, and France. As the former president of the Union stated in his opening remarks: "We hope that the cooperation between Hungarian and other European students will bring not only Europe but the whole world closer to freedom."

The main address stressed the theme of the utilization of our bitter experiences for a common good. Aladár Merényi, the outgoing President, said among other things: "Our memories obligate us to fulfill our duties toward a community. . . Up till now we have often lived on the hopes we brought with us from home. We shall never forget our memories but from now on we must utilize them. We can utilize them as past experience, as a knowledge. With them we must continue our work with results which further the hope that Hungary will become free again without another October 23. This is what we have tried to work for since the last Congress. The solution of the problems still before us will be the task of this Congress. . ."

The opening ceremonies continued and the messages to the Congress were read. The persons and organizations conveying their good wishes to the students included heads of states and governments, rectors and professors, writers and artists as well as our fellow exiles.

The actual work of the Congress started with the reports of the outgoing officers. Our work had three major directions, the internal organization, our cultural relations, and the fate of our fellow students in Hungary. At the time of the Congress in Liechtenstein the Union consisted of student groups in fourteen countries, today Hungarians study in twenty countries. We have reasons to hope that students will be able to attend universities in Asia and Africa, too. A student association is in process of formation in Australia at the present time. How important this organizational growth is for the cultural and intellectual relations becomes apparent if we consider the fact that in these countries our students study with the aid of scholarships donated by local student bodies. We tried to follow the lives of our fellow students in Hungary closely. Unfortunately

the Union was able to help them only once, when, during a polio epidemic, we sent to Hungary 2,000 Units of Salk vaccine and about the same amount of other drugs.

The organizational and financial reports and the ensuing discussions went into the minutest details. They were followed by summaries given by the various delegations about the work of local associations.

We shall attempt to give a few examples. In Innsbruck, Austria, 125 Hungarian students were attending lectures at the university during the academic year 1957-58. Out of this total eighty students received Rockefeller Foundation scholarships while forty-five were studying with the aid of UNESCO and the Republic of Austria. There are forty medical students, six are studying theology, twenty-four law and economy, and fifty-five are enrolled at the faculty of philosophy. The students organized numerous exhibits and meetings. On February 2, 1958, they had a very successful party attended by 380-100 people, among them many outstanding educators and diplomatic or social personalities. They organized, or were instrumental in organizing, lectures, excursions both for Hungarians and for their fellow students of other nationalities. Local students helped Hungarians in securing summer jobs both in Austria and abroad. Beside these widespread activities they were able to fulfill their academic requirements.

Innsbruck is a small community of Hungarian students. An entirely different world is the one in which the Association of Hungarian Students in North America operates. There are 2,908 members in the Association which is incorporated under the laws of the state of Massachusetts. The members are scattered over the United States and Canada. Out of the total 1,485 are enrolled in universities and colleges. Local chapters were formed at the principal universities or cities where Hungarian students live. These local chapters organized over 250 lectures, discussions, and exhibits all over the United States and Canada. The Association issues a bi-weekly circular letter to keep in contact with its members. These are the means by which the Association tries to overcome the difficulties created by the tremendous distances separating the individuals and the various groups from each other.

The publication of a bilingual magazine facilitated mutual acquaintance and closer cooperation between Hungarian students and their foreign colleagues. In its efforts to place Hungarian students at universities, the Association maintained close contact with the World University Service, and the Institute of International Education as well as with different voluntary agencies. Close contact has also been established with the student organizations of the host countries and of other exiled nationalities.

The Association considered as its major task the representation of the students' interest, to keep them informed, and to support all their endeavors. In essence the Association tried to exist for the benefit of the students and to give them the opportunity of utilizing the Association to the fullest. This was the reason why the Association supported local programs, refrained from prescribing the activities of local groups, and confined itself to the coordination of student activities.

The Association held its second Congress at Purdue University, Lafayette, Indiana, in June 1958. At this congress an alumni branch was formed and a merger of United States and Canadian associations effected.

These reports, which went into great details and are given only summarily here, were part of a mosaic giving a precise picture of the life of Hungarian students in exile. They were followed by lively discussion indicating the interest of the students in each other's affairs.

The second day of the Congress charted the road for the future. The plans were crystallized in the resolutions passed by the plenary session.

Among other things the Congress held that the establishment of a network encompassing all countries in which Hungarian students are living is imperative. This network would facilitate the widening of our foreign contacts. For this reason the Congress instructed the national presidents to select as many students for this task as possible. These persons will participate actively in student events of their host country, will represent the Union at various gatherings, congresses, and will report to the Union on any event or news item, concerning Hungarians or the Union.

The Congress also found that the local member organizations have done a good job and have accomplished much in the field of cultural matters, fine arts, and applied arts. At the same time, however, it found that there is hardly any contact among the cultural and art groups of various countries. As Hungarian artists have made a considerable impression on their host countries it is important that we introduce young talents. The International Secretariat of the UFHS was therefore instructed to establish contact with individual artists as well as with groups, and to arrange for tours and exhibitions outside of the immediate physical range of the artist. At the same time the Congress requested the presidents of the member organizations to report on the cultural and artistic activities of their members. Upon receipt of these reports the Union will exchange and circulate the information among member organizations to facilitate guest tours and exhibitions among the different countries.

The Congress accepted wholeheartedly the initiative of the students in Lundi, Sweden, for a comprehensive plan of "Sunday Schools." The youth brought up under the Communist régime who learned our history

and literature only from a Communist angle or not at all, present a problem. The Congress therefore calls upon every member organization to establish such "Sunday Schools" in every city where Hungarian students are living. The schools shall conduct courses in Hungarian history, literature, and folk art, according to age and interest.

The Congress also dealt with the question of scholarships. It realized that the Hungarian exiles, as time goes on, must shoulder the responsibility of the education of the youth. For this reason it decided that a separate scholarship fund be established, the plans for which have to be submitted by May, 1959. It should function within the framework of the Union's Social Secretariat under the supervision of the President and the Congress. It should issue interest free loans to deserving and needy students graduating from high school.

The Congress dealt with matters pertaining to Asia and Africa in separate resolutions. It held that the strengthening of ties with the youth of Asia is of utmost importance. To do so is a primary duty of the Union, partly because it sympathizes with the aspirations of Asian students for freedom and democracy, and partly because of the warm friendship extended toward Hungarians by the youth of Asia at the time of the Revolution. The Congress therefore resolved that close contact be established with Asian youth organizations, institutions, mutual exchange of news and information be initiated, and the possibilities of obtaining scholarships in Asia be explored. Furthermore the Congress called upon the member organizations to report on all Asiatic events taking place in the countries of their residence. Similarly in connection with the young African nations the Congress felt that it is the duty of the Union to spread its belief in the principles of human and social justice as well as to pass on its experiences under Communist rule. The Congress called upon the leaders of he Union to realize these aims by establishing contacts with those countries in Africa in which such contact is non-existent, by exchanging information with various African youth organizations. Furthermore, the Union has to work for the realization of scholarships offered by various African countries at the Seventh International Student Congress, and it has to be instrumental in the actual placement of Hungarian students in those countries.

On October 22, the new leadership of the UFHS was elected. Géza Mihályi from Italy became the new President. Aladár Merényi from Switzerland, and László Hollósy from the United States were elected as new Vice-Presidents. The Treasurer's job was filled by Antal Lökkös while László Luka became Secretary for social work. The field of publications will be handled by the Union's new Press Secretary, László Alföldy. Furthermore, it has been decided that the Presidents of the five

largest member associations shall form a supervisory committee to give guidance to the Union leadership between congresses.

With this the actual work of the Congress has been completed. Now it is up to the new leaders, and to all of us, to implement the decisions, to fulfill the promises.

On October 23, the second anniversary of the Hungarian Revolution, the delegates of the Congress paid homage to the fallen heroes of the Revolution. The students placed a wreath on the memorial of Italy's soldiers with a short ceremony. They wanted to express their belief that liberty is indivisible everywhere. This was followed by a well attended press conference where the new leaders of the UFHS outlined their program and answered questions of the journalists gathered. The day was completed by a concert given in the Sala Borromini by young Hungarian artists.

The Congress began with bitter memories. Looking back to the past however, is a negative attitude. Such defeatism cannot be the attitude of 8,000 Hungarian students who have so much before them. The Congress was only one station in our long uphill fight. It gave us strength, confidence when no enthusiasm filled our imagination, when no friend was there to encourage us. The work started must be continued in the spirit of the Revolution for the liberty of the Hungarian people and the good of mankind.

DOCUMENT 2

Press Release

MEFESZ / UFHS UNITED FEDERATIONS OF HUNGARIAN STUDENTS

INTERNATIONAL SECRETARIAT P.O.B. 162, 1211 GENEVA 1. SWITZERLAND

No. 1. /1965-66

TENTH ANNUAL JUBILEE CONGRESS OF THE UFHS / MEFESz

Dear Friends,

The Tenth Annual Jubilee Congress of the UNITED FEDERATION OF HUNGARIAN STUDENTS–MEFESz / UFHS, held in NYON (Switzerland) from 15th to the 18th July of 1965, has elected the following officers to the International Secretariat:

President: Eugene D. GABOR. Mr. Gabor is the immediate past Internal Vice-President, he is 25 years old and student in international economic sciences;

International Vice-President: Gyula VERMES. Mr. Vermes is elected as I.V.P. for a second year, he is 23 years old and student in Arts and History;

Internal Vice-President: Mariann WEIDLICH. Miss Weidlich is 25 years old and student in Law;

Secretary General: Elizabeth HORVATH. Miss Horvath is the former Vice-President for Overseas Affairs, she is 21 years old and student in economics;

Charge d'Affairs: László UNGER. [A]s formerly, Mr. Unger is the immediate-past President, he is 30 years old and candidate for doctoral examinations in economics.

AIMS AND ACTIVITIES OF THE CONGRESS:

Considering that the main political lines of the UFHS has been already based upon the resolutions of the First Congress of the UFHS, held in 1957, and according to the important changes in the international policy and in the international student policy of the last years, the Tenth Congress of the UFHS has decided that the UFHS needs a "new deal".

Considering the results of the 11th ISC, the Congress decided to revive the Basic Principles of the UFHS and has adapted a new Charter, according to, in its main points, the ISC Charter.

One of the most important point of the activity of the Congress have been the report on the situation in Hungary, presented, as a resolution, by the outgoing International Secretariat. For the first time the International Secretariat has united in May 1965, in Evian a Conference of specialists of the economic and cultural life in Hungary, with the participation of economists living abroad, and some others, coming for this occasion directly from Hungary. (A special report in English is under preparation.)

In the international field:

The Congress welcomed the representatives, or messages and cables of the following international or national student organizations and foundations:

KOSSUTH FOUNDATION–New York;
WORLD UNIVERSITY SERVICE–Geneva;
INTERNATIONAL STUDENT CONFERENCE–Leiden;
INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY EXCHANGE FUND–Leiden;
Research and Information Commission–Leiden;

Scottish Union of Students;
United States National Student Association;
Canadian Union of Students–Union Canadienne des Etudiants;
National Union of South–African Students;
Nederlandse Studenten Raad;
Verband Deutscher Studentenschaften;
National Council of University Students of India;
New Zealand University Students Association;

National Union of Iraqi Students;
Union Nationale des Etudiants de Suisse–Verband der Schweizerischen Studentenschaften;
National Union of Australian University Students;
Federation of Turkish Students in Germany;

As to the international policy, the Congress expressed its conviction that the intensification of international student cooperation is a possible way towards the realization of world student unity.

The Congress emphasises the importance of cooperation among the National Unions of Students with different political and ideological convictions in the following activities:

a) exchange of informations [*sic*! information]
b) exchange of scholarship-holders and professors
c) student travels
d) cultural meetings
e) regional conferences (rencontres européennes).

The Congress welcomed the signs of approach of the ISC and IUS. The Congress has voted the ISC-Charter, has required the Supervision Commission to inwite [*sic*! invite?] the UFHS as an Observer to the 12th ISC.

According to our basic principles the Congress adapted the following statements of support and solidarity:

South-Africa;
South-Rhodesia;
Marocco [*sic*! Morocco];
Portugal-Colonies;
Spain;
Iran;
Paraguay;
Racial discrimination in the USA;
Santo-Domingo;

During the last year the concrete cooperation in the field of the student-exchange have been particulary good between the Nederlandse Studenten Raad and the UFHS. The Congress expressed the friendly feelings and thanks.

On behalf of all the Hungarian students members of the UFHS the Congress expressed its sincere thanks and warmest feelings to the VSS / UNES – Switzerland (and particulary to the President) for the good co-operation of the past year.

---oooooooooo--

A complete report with the texts of resolutions and proceedings of the Congress in French and in English is under preparation. It would be sent as soon as possible to all NUS that it may interest.

We send our all best wiches [*sic*! wishes?] to all our friends,

Sincerly [*sic*! Sincerely] yours:

UNITED FEDERATION OF HUNGARIAN STUDENTS—International Secretariat

Geneva, 1rst [*sic*! 1st] of August 1965.

Hungarian Studies Review, Vol. XX, Nos. 1-2 (Spring-Fall, 1993)

BOOK REVIEWS

Miklós Kontra. ed. *Tanulmányok a határainkon túli kétnyelvűségről* [Studies on bilingualism beyond our borders]. Budapest: Magyarságkutató Intézet, 1991. 164 pages.

In the last few decades the linguistic problems of Hungarian minorities beyond the mother country's present borders attracted only limited interest. While the disastrous consequences of the Trianon peace treaty and the oppression of Hungarian minorities gradually gained acceptance as facts, the change of the language of these minorities was a relatively less discussed subject. As we know, ignorance can be dangerous. Therefore the importance of scholarly works presenting facts in a maximally objective manner is obvious. One of such works is the present volume: the eleventh in a series titled "Magyarságkutatás Könyvtára" [The Library of Hungarian Studies]. Kontra's volume consists of three studies examining the language usage of the Hungarian minorities in Slovakia and Austria between 1918 and 1991.

The first paper: "A szlovák nyelv árnyékában" [In the Shadow of the Slovak Language — pp. 11-72] was written by István Lanstyák, a professor at the University of Bratislava and a researcher of Hungarian-Slovak bilingualism. His sociolinguistic study gives a well documented survey of the language rights of the Hungarian minority in Czechoslovakia. His statements are based on official and often quite up-to-date data, such as those of the 1991 census of the Slovak Statistical Bureau. Developments are divided into five periods: 1918-38, 1938-45, 1945-48, 1949-89. 1989-91, of which the second one is not described in detail due to the insufficiency of sources. These periods are discussed in sequence.

After the prefatory section, the author reviews the different laws and regulations determining the legal rights of the Hungarians in Slovakia in the different periods. Perhaps the most striking data of this part are those indicating that the legal rights of Hungarians since the 1989 "velvet-revolution" have not been expanded — on the contrary, they have been reduced. Next, the reader learns about the situation of the Hungarian school system in Czechoslovakia, which went through repeated attempts

at "Slovakization" throughout the different periods. Unfortunately, the changes after 1989 have not been positive in this respect, either. The fourth part of the study examines the cultural and academic institutions of the Hungarian minority in Czechoslovakia, the role of this minority's language in the media, and the degree of governmental support these had enjoyed over the decades. The final section gives the author's conclusions: during the past 73 years the main ambition of Czechoslovakia's successive governments was to reduce, as much as possible, the rights of the country's minorities. The final goal of such policies is the creation of a "real national state." This study's conclusions have become especially relevant now, on the eve of the break-up of Czechoslovakia and the establishment of Slovakia as an independent state.

The second study: "Magyarul beszélők a mai Ausztriában" [Speakers of Hungarian in Austria Today – pp. 73-121] was written by István Szépfalusi. It examines the number of Austrian Hungarians according to censuses between 1920-71, 1971-81, 1981-90, and in 1991. Following this, the knowledge of foreign languages (especially Hungarian) in Austria is explored. The third part gives an account of official language use, and lists the Hungarian programmes of the media.

Szépfalusi's paper has two main conclusions. In the 1980s there was in Austria a sizeable influx of Hungarians from both Hungary and the neighbouring countries: altogether 11,000 Hungarians came, which number is approximately the equivalent to the number of Hungarians who settled in Austria in 1956-57. While the language shift from Hungarian to German continues among the Hungarian speakers in Burgenland, there is a growing demand for the teaching of Hungarian as a foreign language to Austrians as a result of the growing economic relations since 1989.

The third study: "Kódváltás és öntudat az európai periférián" [Codeswitiching and Consciousness in the European Periphery – pp. 123-157] was written by Susan Gal. This article was first published in English in the *American Ethnologist* in 1987 (pp. 637-653). Gal analyses the codeswitching patterns of Italians in West Germany, Hungarians in Austria, and Germans in Romania. While this is an interesting paper, its availability in English makes its assessment less necessary within the frame of the present review.

On the basis of these studies one can distinguish between two basic models of language retention in general: a) under oppression, b) under the relative tolerance of a democracy. While oppression evokes self-defensive reflexes, such as resistance against the domination of the "official" language, relative tolerance often results in a higher recognition of the prestige of the official language. Of course, these are not the only factors influencing language use within a minority group. The prestige of a given minority group within the state is another important factor; it is largely influenced by the role played by this group in the local economy. The

level of consciousness of a given ethnic community also influences language use.

Although in the past few years there has been a growing interest in the problems of Hungarian minorities beyond the mother country's borders, the linguistic consequences of these problems still have not received sufficient scholarly attention. It would be desirable to survey the situation of the Hungarian language in all countries where there is a sufficient presence, in the neighbouring countries of Hungary, as well as in Canada and the United States.

Andrea Horvath
University of Toronto

"Gendered Identities: Women's Experience of Change in Hungary" by Chris Corrin, in *Women in the Face of Change: The Soviet Union, Eastern Europe and China*, eds. Shirin Rai, Hilary Pilkington and Annie Phizacklea. London and New York: Routledge, 1992.

Chris Corrin and other scholars of Eastern and Central Europe are eager to include women and women's issues in contemporary analyses of what Corrin and her colleagues call the "desocializing societies" in a recent British publication, *Women in the Face of Change*.

Now that the "Soviet Union" has crumbled, and state socialism no longer controls the Hungarian state and its economy, it has also lost a certain hold over its women. As Corrin's argument goes, this offers new opportunities for research and debate. Feminist scholars in the West are interested in more permanent links with Central European women. Corrin, for example, wants to address the specific concerns of Women in Hungary as they begin to experience the new freedoms (and burdens) which a "free market economy" can bring. At the very least, Corrin persuades the reader that it is now possible to discuss the politics of gender with Hungarian women and men in spite of the bad name (western) feminism has been given in Hungary.

The editors of *Women in the Face of Change*, Shirin Rai, Hilary Pilkington and Annie Phizacklea are British academics who aim to record the economic and social changes which are taking place in the former 'communist bloc' countries, including the former Soviet Union, China, Poland, and Hungary. Chris Corrin's specific interest in Hungary is not new. She has been visiting Hungary — largely Budapest — and researching the roles of women since 1982. It has always been her goal to "privilege women's experience of change," so that now her work coincides

with the sweeping political changes that effect women — such as no guarantee of paid labour, and increasing food shortages. Corrin believes that her interpretations of change can "feed back into some of the debates now developing in Hungary." Like the more recent publication, *Gender Politics and Post-Communism: Reflections from Eastern Europe and the Former Soviet Union*, edited by Nanette Funk and Magda Mueller (Routledge 1993), Chris Corrin and fellow contributors to *Women in the Face of Change* claim to redress the gender imbalance in contemporary analyses of the former communist bloc countries. This means that the researchers take gender into account when documenting recent political change; but it also means that the researchers apply a variety of feminist principles (influenced primarily by socialist and postmodernist theory) to their discussions. In so doing, it appears there are roadblocks in the discussions, and also the possibility that the western definitions of feminism are being revised.

In eighteen pages, Corrin begins an analysis of the position of women in Hungary since the most recent political changes of 1988-89. Corrin is cautious but optimistic that these changes have at least allowed the "feminist debate or dialogue" to emerge in Hungary. Corrin's methodology is feminist ethnography. First she met with as many women-subjects as she could, most of whom lived in Budapest. She attempted to interview a broad range of women — women of different classes and ethnicities, and she quotes from conversations she has taped with her subjects. She is conscientious enough to refer to the 2% of women in Hungary who are not of Magyar origin, including women of Romany origin, of German descent, and rural Slavic women, though it is not clear that she interviewed members of these minoritised cultures.

Corrin claims to be interested in women's "everyday concerns", not in pressing academic issues. She discussed work, childcare, money, sexuality and health with her subjects, even though no consensus was possible, and previous research slim.

Like many North American feminist anthropologists — such as Ruth Behar, Sally Cole, and Barbara Myerhoff — Corrin says she participated as an equal" in her interviews, not as the better informed social scientist. However, she also interviewed Hungarian sociologists who had examined what has been known since Frederick Engels' *Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State* as the ambiguous "woman question" (see, for example, Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin's contributions to the discussion, and an appendix by Clara Zetkin, in *The Woman Question*, New York: International, 1951).

Corrin rightly explains that, for a number of reasons, the term "feminist" itself is problematic in Hungarian society. Firstly, feminism has very little history in Hungary, even among dissident theorists who offered a critical political economy of state socialism such as György Konrád, Iván

Szelényi, János Kiss and György Bencze; and former communist leaders, including János Kádár, did not appreciate any contribution the feminist movement in the capitalist west could make to an evaluation of state legislated equality in Hungary. Indeed, one angle of the Hungarian "men's rebellion" of the 1980s was that "men's rights have been injured by women's liberation." Secondly, Hungarian women do not see that it is in their best interests to join the feminist cause, insignificant as it may yet be. Hungarian women worry about the breakdown of the family, and about adding responsibilities to the already heavy double burden they carry in the workforce and in the family. As it stands now, the great majority of Hungarian women tend to work outside the home, and are also responsible for the house, the home and children.

For wage earning women, it is difficult to see from Corrin's analysis exactly how Hungarian customs are in effect so different from, say, Canadian customs, except that until now Hungarian women have been told by the state that they are equal because they have been guaranteed "full employment." "Full employment" is a double-edged sword. In her review of *Gender Politics and Post-Communism*, Mariana Katzarova quoted Enikő Bollobás from Hungary: "when in Hungary we hear about full employment, we know that it has the effect of killing ambition and initiative in millions of people, and that it masked unemployment" (*The Nation* July 26/August 2, 1993, p. 150). Moreover, "full employment" enslaves women in the Soviet mould of "mother heroine," a mould which also influenced Hungarian constructions of woman. In 1977, the Soviet government officially flattered its mother-heroines: "It is in woman's character readily to take on a large and varied load" (Women in Eastern Europe Group, Introduction, *Woman and Russia: First Feminist Samizdat*, London: Sheba, 1980).

Although Corrin does not state it explicitly, the implicit criticism of Western feminism by the women she interviewed is that it spends too much time fighting for the rights of the individual rather than the rights of the larger citizenry, a citizenry which would include men. Corrin explains that there is a trend in her research which she sees as hopeful; that is, women organized in favour of pro-choice legislation, such as the pro-choice group, *Igen* ["Yes"]. Members of *Igen* support "abortion rights" as a social issue, not solely as a women' s issue. This idea led me to compare this nascent Hungarian feminism with American anti-racist theory. Bell hooks, too, for example, is eager to make the oppression of women the responsibility of men and women, and also to uphold the benefits of the family in an impoverished and suffering society (*Feminist Theory: From Margin to Center*, Boston: South End, 1984). Is there a link between the two positions, a link that may have something to do with a respect for the institution of the family, including its men and its children? In other words, even among women, individual freedoms go only so far in Hun-

garian society, and must be weighed against other rights and freedoms, including those of the larger group.

Corrin's final evaluation about such a trend is that it indicates the requirement that "de-socializing" Hungarian citizens participate in an active "civil society," thereby preventing the state from ever proclaiming "the truth" again.

Marlene Kadar
York University, Toronto

Romsics, Ignác, ed. *Wartime American Plans for a New Hungary: Documents from the U.S. Department of State 1942-1944.* Boulder, Colo.: Social Science Monographs; Highland Lakes, NJ.: Atlantic Research and Publications, 1992. 319 pages, tables, maps. $45.00.

Ignác Romsics is a young Hungarian historian best known for his biography of the conservative twentieth century Hungarian statesman, István Bethlen. He is a prolific scholar and dedicated researcher who spent the first half of 1991 examining government records in Washington D.C. and elsewhere in the U.S., on the subject of American wartime planning for a post-war Hungary. The result is this collection of documents, introduced by a 50-page essay written by Romsics himself.

The awakening of America's interest in Eastern Europe is usually dated from the fall of 1944. Indeed, there is little evidence to suggest that the Roosevelt administration was greatly concerned with the affairs of this part of Europe until the closing phases of the war. Never-the-less, the discussions of the problems of the lands between the Baltic Sea in the North and the Adriatic and Aegean in the South had started among the experts of the wartime Advisory Committee on Post-War Foreign Policy soon after America's involvement in the war late in 1941. Romsics's book offers selections from the records of two subcommittees of this agency: the Political and the Territorial. The volume also contains documents produced by the Advisory Committee's post-1943 successors.

Three problems received attention in the deliberations of the Advisory Committee's subcommittees and their successors: the issue of Hungary's role in the post-war international organization of Eastern Europe, the question of Hungary's post-war boundaries, and the problem of her future system of government. Everyone associated with the Political Subcommittee's work favoured the creation of some kind of a supra-national state in Eastern Europe, a federation or a number of federations, the primary

purpose of which would have been keeping German and Russian influence at bay in the region.

Two of the plans for an East European federation brought before the Subcommittee envisaged the establishment of a state organization similar to the defunct Habsburg Monarchy. One of these was known as Archduke Otto's proposal and the other, as the Eckhardt-Pelényi plan, named after two leaders of the conservative Hungarian emigration in the United States: politician Tibor Eckhardt and ex-diplomat János Pelényi. The former scheme envisaged a Danubian federation made up of the main constituents of the Habsburg realm in which "dynastic and national aspirations were reconciled in the spirit of the twentieth century" — to use the words of Romsics (p. 6). The second plan called for the creation of three federations in Eastern Europe: the Polish-Baltic, the Balkan, and a Danubian which would have included less of the Balkans than Otto's scheme.

The Subcommittee made short-shift of these plans. To some of its members, they smacked of attempts to restore the Habsburg Empire and, in case of the second, historic Hungary. The opponents of these plans favoured other plans that promised to create a larger East European federal state and were less "self-seeking" in terms of attempting to look after the interests of only one or two of the nations concerned. After much discussion, however, the experts of the Subcommittee had to admit that other federative schemes too, had problems of their own. In the end, all American discussions regarding the creation of an East European federation came to naught as the Soviet leadership categorically refused to agree to the establishment of anything that resembled a cordon sanitaire on the U.S.S.R.'s western borders.

The deliberations of the Territorial Subcommittee were similarly fruitless. Although on many occasions the committee's members had to admit that on ethnic grounds Hungary's post-Trianon borders warranted adjustments in her favour, political considerations negated such proposals. Nevertheless, when in 1943 the task of writing summaries of the Subcommittee's deliberations was given to the Advisory Committee's successor, the Division of Political Studies, recommendations emerged that were a little more respectful of the principle of ethnic fairness. Romsics attributes the reason for this minute shift in emphasis to the fact that the Division's staff was made up of the young research personnel of the defunct Territorial Subcommittee who disagreed with their former superiors.

The Division's summaries were next considered by the Inter-Divisional Balkan and Danube Region Committee, set up in the late summer of 1943. According to Romsics, this bureau made recommendations regarding Hungary's borders that were "more concrete and more unambiguous" than previous proposals, but did leave "room for some flexibility" (p. 26). In particular, the Inter-Divisional Committee suggested the adjustment of

Trianon Hungary's borders in her favour in places where the majority of the population was Hungarian: along Slovakia's southwestern border, in southern Ruthenia, and in the northernmost areas of Serbia. In the East, concerning Transylvania, the Committee recommended that the borders established in 1940 be kept for the time being, until another solution could be implemented. This envisaged the ceding to Hungary of a strip of territory along her eastern border, and granting autonomy for the Székely districts in southeastern Transylvania. These recommendations were incorporated in a May, 1944, Department of State document: "The Treatment of Enemy Alien States: Hungary," with the exception of the business of autonomy for the Székely region. However, the new document resurrected an earlier proposal regarding the possible independence of the whole of Transylvania. Late in May, a high-powered committee, the Committee on Post-War Programs endorsed these recommendations. Later, the proposals were revised slightly and abbreviated. Minimal land concessions to Hungary were suggested and all mentions of possible further concessions were cut. The final summaries of these American plans were then taken, in September of 1944, by President Roosevelt to the second Quebec Conference, thereby to the higher level of inter-allied diplomacy.

The opinions of America's decision makers on the matter of Hungary's future system of government were somewhat divided, just as the American public had been divided on the question of the nature of Hungary's inter-war regime. Nevertheless, no one of influence in Washington contemplated the survival of Hungary's wartime government in power — not even of such respected members of the country's elite as István Bethlen. On the question of Habsburg restoration, opposition was equally firm. The reason for this, according to Romsics, was twofold: Otto was not seen as a man favouring far-going land reform in Hungary and, his elevation to the Hungarian throne was expected to be adamantly opposed by the country's neighbours. Unlike American expectations for border changes in the Carpathian Basin, which became disappointed even before 1944, Washington's hopes for the establishment of democracy in post-war Hungary lasted almost until the end of the war.

American plans for post-war Hungary disintegrated during the last year of the war and in the immediate post-war era. The prime reason for this was the success of the Soviets in establishing predominant influence in Eastern Europe, but there were other, contributing factors. Concerning the question of Hungary's boundaries, the proposed adjustments in Hungary's favour in the areas of Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia populated by Hungarians change came in the American plans because the governments of these two states by 1945 — contrary to their positions a year or two earlier — were adamantly opposed to any such changes. In fact, they made demands for additional Magyar territory, demands which the US administration resisted with partial success. Still another reason for the

abandonment of the earlier American stand on these issues was the fact that the British government supported the idea of restoring Hungary's borders to what they had been before 1938.

In the matter of the Hungarian-Rumanian border, American intentions to see a more equitable division imposed were not abandoned quite so swiftly, yet abandoned they were in face of persistent Soviet opposition, voiced at various conferences from 1945 to 1946. And, in the following year, even the hopes for a democratic government in Budapest faded, as the Soviets and their local collaborators embarked on the liquidation of the left-of-centre but anti-communist Smallholders Party. The "game was up" as Soviet hegemony was on its way to being established in the country.

The Americans, according to Romsics, never gave up hope of seeing the reduction of undue Russian influence in the area. Half a century later, these expectations are once more in the realm of the possible. "Far from being up," Romsics concludes his introduction to this volume, "perhaps the game is just starting." (p. 46). His book and, especially, his publications on this subject in the Magyar language in Hungary, are important contributions to the understanding of American attitudes to that part of the world, both in East Central Europe and elsewhere.

The volume is attractively produced, and Romsics's introduction is written in smooth, highly readable prose. One error that this reviewer was sad to discover, was Romsics's dating of János Pelényi's defection to December of 1941. Actually, it had taken place more than a year earlier. Pelényi's excuse was Hungary's adhesion to the Berlin-Tokyo-Rome Tripartite Pact, but we can suspect other reasons for his decision to become an emigre in America: he wished to take a part in the preparation of the ground for the possible establishment of a Hungarian government-in-exile in the U.S., an idea that he had originally suggested to Prime Minister Pál Teleki on the eve of the war. This minor mistake notwithstanding, Romsics's book is a valuable and timely contribution to the literature of wartime American attitudes to Hungary.

N.F. Dreisziger
Royal Military College of Canada

A brief note from the editors:

A recurring difficulty our journal had to cope with during its two decades of existence has been the problem of typesetting. The traditional typesetting methods, used at the time when the journal was launched in the mid-1970s, were time-consuming and expensive. They were also unsatisfactory, as most Canadian printing establishments could not produce characters used in Hungarian (such as the ő, ű, and í — not to speak of their upper-case equivalents) which appear frequently in our endnotes. For years, diacritical marks on these letters were inserted by hand.

With the arrival of the electronic age, we began experimenting with preparing our journal for typesetting on personal computers. The characters with diacritical marks remained a problem as they required elaborate coding and even this way some commercial typesetters had difficulties handling them. An additional problem we had all through these years was the fact that typesetting text containing non-English (or non-French) characters, was quite costly.

At the end of the 1980s we thought we had a solution. The University of Toronto's Centre for Computing in the Humanities established the Humanities Publishing Services (HPS). The HPS' staff typeset journals affiliated with the university, from electronically submitted manuscripts, at lower than commercial prices. Some problems remained, as HPS often had an extensive backlog of work, which meant delays for us in our production schedule.

In 1993 this timely and very useful service seems to have come to an abrupt end. We do not know whether this development is the result of a budget-crunch or staffing difficulties, but we have not been able to reach anyone associated with HPS. We have heard from outside sources that the operation is no longer staffed. As we cannot afford to turn to commercial typesetting services, we had no alternative but to try accomplishing this task ourselves. Fortunately, advances in computer electronics — in particular, in desk-top publishing — have made our task easier. Nevertheless, the switch required that the member of the editorial team in charge of production (Dreisziger) learn a new word-processing program and purchase a suitable laserjet printer with features such as 600 by 600 pot-per-inch resolution printing.

The introduction of this new technology will result in slight changes in the appearance of our journal. The font and pitch of the text, titles, and subtitles, might not be exactly the same as had been the case in

the past few years, and our endnotes might resemble a little more those recommended by the Chicago Manual of Style.

This transition in our production process took place just as one of our editors was absent on a European sabbatical. This fact made the 1993 volume of the *HSR* even more experimental in nature than would have been the case otherwise.

The switch to desk-top publishing should make our operations less expensive and might sometimes eliminate the kind of delays that have taken place in the journal's production in the past. At the same time it imposes even more work on one of the editors, and it does not solve our other problems: the shrinking of our subscription base, the unpredictable flow of publishable articles, and the lack of help with the translation of good manuscripts from Hungarian into English — or, with the transformation of articles written in unidiomatic English ("Hunglish" as we call it) into acceptable English prose.

N.F. Dreisziger
Kingston, Dec.
1993

TO THOSE WISHING TO SUBMIT MANUSCRIPTS

1. The editors of the *Hungarian Studies Review* invite the submission of original articles and review articles in the field of Hungarian studies.
2. All manuscripts should be sent to the Editors, *Hungarian Studies Review*.
3. Persons wishing to review books for the journal should get in touch with the Editors.
4. Persons wishing to prepare review articles–either detailed discussions of a single book or a review of some area of Hungarian studies–should get in touch first with the Editors.
5. Since the *Review* does not normally publish highly specialized studies intelligible only to people in a particular discipline, contributors wishing to submit very specialized work should consult the Editors before sending in their manuscript.
6. The submission of an article to the *Review* is taken to imply that it has not been previously published and it is not being considered for publication elsewhere.
7. Manuscripts submitted to the journal are usually reviewed by two members of the editorial board (or outside readers) with the authors remaining anonymous. Comments on articles are conveyed to the authors with the commentators remaining anonymous.
8. Articles submitted to the *Review* should be between 4,000 and 8,000 words (ca. 15 to 30 pages) in length. Review articles should be between 1,500 and 3,000 words (ca. 6 to 12 pages) in length. Manuscripts outside of these limits will be considered if there is some good reason for their exceptional length or brevity. Articles in two parts may be accepted provided each part is independently meaningful and intelligible.
9. All manuscripts intended for publication should be submitted IN DUPLICATE. They should be clearly typed on one side of 8 1/2 by 11 inch or similar size paper. The entire manuscript should be double spaced with ample margins. FOOTNOTES should be numbered consecutively in the text and typed double spaced at the end, beginning on a new page. The *Review* prefers to receive articles in electronic form, in ASCII or compatible format. Articles in such form would save much time in editing and typesetting.
10. To avoid the loss of manuscripts in the mail, authors should always retain a copy of their contribution for themselves. The *Review* will not be responsible for lost articles. To save on postal costs, manuscripts are not normally returned to the authors.
11. On style, authors should follow previous issues of the *Review* or should use the *Chicago Manual of Style*. When in doubt, they should get in touch with the Editors.
12. Contributors whose native tongue is not English should have their manuscripts carefully edited by someone experienced in writing for English-language journals BEFORE submitting their work to the *Review*.