

JOHN HUNYADI
Hungary in American History Textbooks

by
Andrew L. Simon

1996

Copyright © 1997, Andrew L. Simon

CONTENTS

Prologue

Introduction

Highlights of Hungarian History

Book Reviews

Greaves

Kagan

Kishlansky

McNeill

Perry

Analysis and Conclusions

PROLOGUE

A particularly demagogic member of Hungary's parliament, Representative József Torgyán of the Smallholders Party expressed his bitter frustration in a recent speech. He said: „Hungary received nothing from the West but Trianon and the bells tolling at noon.” This would have puzzled an average well educated American. Most American universities require a course on „Western Cultural Traditions” for graduation. Neither Trianon, nor any bells are mentioned in those courses.

Southern California's well known tourist attraction is the Mission of San Juan de Capistrano. But few Americans would know that Juan's real name was Giovanni, that he was an Italian priest, Pope Calixtus III.'s emissary to John Hunyadi in the summer of 1456. Hunyadi was a legendary commander of the Hungarian army, who fought countless battles against the Ottoman Turks in the Balkans. Capistrano's mission was difficult. Turkish Sultan Mohammed II was assembling a vast army to conquer Europe. The Hundred Years War has just ended, Europe was in disarray. Unable to assemble any force to resist the Turkish onslaught, the pope sent Father Capistrano to Hunyadi with his blessings and his prayers. To pray for this victory Pope Calixtus III commanded¹ all churches of Christendom to toll the bells at noon till eternity.

The Turks encircled Belgrade, the major southern border fort of Hungary. The defenders fought heroically, but with little hope. But Hunyadi's relieving forces reached the fort in time, they surrounded and destroyed the Islamic forces. Bells still ring at noon all over Europe, commemorating Hunyadi's victory. The Capistrano Mission is still standing. This is the place where tourists go to see the sparrows. They never heard of Hunyadi.

On the walls of Hungarian elementary schools one of the ubiquitous historical paintings shows the bastion of Belgrade fort as a Turkish soldier plants the horsehair flag of the Ottomans. One of the defenders, Titus Dugonich, - obviously a Croat soldier, - embraces the Turk and falls to his death with him. This shows how deeply ingrained this minor instance in history is in the consciousness of Hungarians. To see how he is treated in American textbooks will be revealing.

¹ *Bulla Oratorium*, issued on June 29, 1456.

INTRODUCTION

This is a report on a survey. Five leading textbooks were studied in detail for anti-Hungarian bias in introductory European history at American universities.

There may be reason to believe that such bias exists. Not necessarily in the mind of the writers, but in the source material they have available. There several reasons for this assumption. Let us enumerate a few:

For the past 400 years Hungary and Austria shared rulers. There was a lot of internal friction. German being a much more accessible language than Hungarian, most sources are slanted toward the Habsburg interpretation of history. Best example for this is the treatment of Hungary's religious wars during the period of the Thirty Years War, the revolutions led by Bocskay, Rákóczi, and Bethlen. Most American texts, based on German sources, dismiss these with a remark that „the nobles were restless.” Another example of Western historical distortions is the treatment of Transylvania. While Hungarian historians celebrate the seventeenth century as „The Golden Age of Transylvania”, on historical maps the place is painted over as the part of the Ottoman Empire. However, the Principality was not occupied by the Turks. There was religious liberty and national equality, - a rather unique state of affairs in that period in history.

Before and during World War 1 Czech, Serb, and Romanian nationalists exerted great propaganda efforts to dissolve the Austro-Hungarian Empire. Having succeeded in this effort at the end of WW1, the war of propaganda continued to resist Hungary's revisionist attempts. These efforts were greatly aided by Britain's R. W. Seton-Watson. He was an avowed antagonist of the Empire in general and Hungarians in particular. When Seton-Watson first visited Hungary in 1907, his mentor and advisor was Henry Wickham Steed, the Vienna correspondent of *The Times* of London. Vienna's Victorian high society refused to admit Steed's girlfriend, whom he introduced as his wife. The snubbed Steed despised the Monarchy.

Seton-Watson's 1907 visit was ill-timed for Hungary. It was a time of racial strife. Whether the flare-up of disturbances were accidental or they were provocations, we don't know. The conflicts, - demonstrations and brutal police reactions, - inflamed Seton-Watson. He published a book, *Racial Problems in Hungary* (London, 1908) and numerous anti-Hungarian articles afterward. Steed followed suit. During the war the British Government established a Ministry of Propaganda. Steed and Seton-Watson became its department heads. Their efforts were greatly aided by Tomas Masaryk, erstwhile professor of the University of Prague, who was a immeasurably effective proponent of an independent Czecho-Slovak republic. His brilliantly organized propaganda machine, financed by Russia, is unparalleled in history. Its methods are described in his book, *The Making of a State*². He spent the war-years in London, Paris, Tokyo, and the United States, propagandizing tirelessly against the Monarchy. He recurrently repeated the mantra: *The medieval forces of the anti-social monarchism, referring to God-given rights stand against democratic, constitutional countries, that respect the right to political independence of even the smallest nations.* However, in the case of Hungary he refuted himself by writing: *Nothing could be more repugnant and disgusting than the megalomania of such a small nation than the Mongol - descended Hungarians.*³

² Tomas G. Masaryk: *The making of a State*, New York: Frederick A. Stokes Co., 1927.

³ Nemeskürty, I.: *How long we wait?*, Budapest: Szabad Tér, 1996.

Masaryk enlisted the support of influential French and British politicians and journalists. Among others, his work was assisted by Edvard Benes⁴ who called outright for the destruction of Austria-Hungary. His describes their propaganda campaign in his *My War Memoirs*.⁵ The effect of this brainwashing shows up well in Theodore Roosevelt's speeches. In 1910 in Hungary's parliament he said: *I know [Hungary's] history, I would not consider myself an educated person if I wouldn't know it... I will make sure always, everywhere, that you receive the respect that your nation deserves.* By 1917 he changed his mind, saying: *Democracy can not be secure as long as this state [Austria-Hungary] exists.*⁶

The Peace treaties (Trianon for Hungary, St. Germain for Austria) fulfilled the greatest dreams of Masaryk, Bebes, Seton-Watson, and Steed. But Karl Renner, Austro-Marxist theoretician of the nationalities problem summed up the true results: *The former (Habsburg) Empire never pretended to be a national state, but the new succession states were falsely proclaimed as such, and a large part of the domestic difficulties which beset them is due to this pretense. The peace treaties did not solve the problem of the multi-national states but transferred it from each of the big powers to several small states.*⁷ Another leftist, Oscar Jászi, a member of Hungary's first government after the war, lamented: *The bright promise of Wilson's League of Nations, the just peace and the right of self-determination and the plebiscite, in which the Hungarian people had placed their trust, burst like soap bubbles. We saw ourselves not only defeated, broken and plundered, but, a much crueller wound to public feeling, bluffed and swindled. We were doomed by the very internationalism which was the basis of our whole policy.*⁸

For the disaster brought about by the Peace Treaties of the First World War, Senator Daniel Patrick Moynihan⁹ places the blame squarely on the shoulder of the United States of America. He writes: *For all that we were siding with two distinctly imperial powers, Wilson took us into that war in the name of self-determination. There is no historical problem concerning the origins of the doctrine. It begins, as Donald Cameron Watt of the University of London records, as the right of the subject of a state to chose their own government, that celebrated assertion of the American Declaration of Independence of 1776, followed by the French Declaration of the Rights of Man in 1789. ... As with any general assertion, the devil is in the details.* Moynihan then quotes Wilson's Secretary of State, Robert Lansing, who, in his *Confidential Diaries* wrote: *The phrase [self determination] is simply loaded with dynamite. It will raise hopes which can never be realized. It will, I fear, cost thousands of lives. In the end it is bound to be discredited, to be called the dream of an idealist who failed to realize the danger until too late to check those who attempt to put the principle into force. What a calamity that the phrase was ever uttered! What a misery it will cause! Think of the feelings of the author when he counts the dead who died because he coined the phrase! A man, who is a leader of public thought, should beware of intemperate or undigested declarations. He should be responsible for the consequences. (December 30, 1918.)*¹⁰

⁴ Edvard Benes: *Ditruisez l'Autriche-Hongrie*; Paris, 1917; Eng. Transl.: *Bohemia's Case for Independence*, New York: Arno Press, 1971.

⁵ Edvard Benes: *My War Memoirs*, London: G. Allen and Unwin Ltd., 1928.

⁶ Nemeskürty, Op. Cit.

⁷ Johnson, Lonnie R.: *Central Europe, Enemies, Neighbors, Friends*, Oxford Univ. Press, 1996. p. 195.

⁸ Oscar Jászi: *Revolution, Counter-Revolution in Hungary*, London: P.S. King, 1924.

⁹ Moynihan, D. P.: *Pandaemonium, Ethnicity in International Politics*, Oxford Univ. Press, 1993.

¹⁰ Robert Lansing: *Lansing Papers*, Manuscripts Division, U.S. Library of Congress.

The dissolution of the Austro-Hungarian Empire was in the strategic interests of Britain, France and Russia. The responsibility for it rests on the United States. The U.S. Senate did not ratify it, but American academics did. The propaganda of Masaryk, Seton-Watson, Steed has fully infiltrated into American history textbooks soon after the First World War. A standard text by Hall and Davis¹¹ (professors at Princeton and University of Minnesota, respectively,) devoted four pages to describe the pain and suffering of the Little Peoples under Hungarian 'oppression'. One of their rather typical statement, as well as untrue: *In Budapest no inscriptions were allowable on tombstones except in this Turanian speech, unfamiliar and uncouth to the vast majority of all Europeans*. Reprinting this academic gem in 1941, the year when Hungary entered the second world war, and in 1947, the year of the peace treaty ending it, may not have been entirely accidental.

After WWI some of the scattered leaders of Hungary's 1919 Communist regime came to America. The leading representative of this group was Oscar Jászi, already mentioned. A professor, and prolific writer, he poured his venom against his own nation that rejected Communism. This book, full of misstatements, is still an often quoted bible of Hungary-bashing. Those who tend to believe in sinister conspiracy theories may wonder why this clearly biased text had to be republished in English, French, and German after so many years in 1969.

The Slavic Successor States having been cobbled together by the victorious Allies in 1919, have fallen apart. Their ruinous effects are still felt in the region. The names of Sudetenland and Bosnia will forever define Mr. Wilson's legacy.

Between the two wars, little was done to neutralize the anti-Hungarian propaganda. When asked about this, Count Stephen Bethlen, former prime minister of Hungary (1921 - 31) said: „we did not have money for those kinds of things”. Since the Second World War Hungary was under Soviet domination. Her first Communist rulers were Muscovite carpetbaggers, old fighters from the 1919 Soviet regime. Their first priority was to condemn the old bourgeois era, the cursed Horthy regime . Hungarian historians had to follow the party-line: international socialist brotherhood of the oppressed peoples, hatred of the bourgeois past, particularly its nationalistic and religious vestiges . In the past decades little effort was made by Hungarian history writers to offset the ingrained anti-Hungarian bias.

The selection of the books to be reviewed for this study was made by reviewing complimentary 'desk copies' furnished by publishers to university departments in charge of such courses. In the Fall semester of 1993 at The University of Akron's Department of History 1512 students were registered for the course entitled „Western Cultural Traditions”. Publishers would exert great efforts for sales of such magnitude, therefore they submit their most recent textbooks for potential approval and adaption. Seven of the most recently delivered books were selected for this study. After a preliminary survey, two of these were set aside as their contents were more directed toward history of art and culture than toward the history of nations.

From the five books selected, all statements relating to Hungary and the Magyars were excerpted. Where it seemed desirable, the reviewer has inserted comments in the footnotes to highlight some points.

¹¹ Walter Phelps Hall and William Stearns Davis: *The Course of Europe since Waterloo*, New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1926. Republished 1941, 1947.

To eliminate any potential bias by the reviewer, it was decided at the outset that the *Columbia Encyclopedia* will be used as authority to which statements found in the textbooks are compared. No Hungarian source material was used whether published in Hungary or elsewhere to further avoid bias. The 1950 edition of the *Columbia Encyclopedia* was used - an attempt at fairness toward the authors of the texts -, as they had it available long before the book were written. (Two later editions exist.) Twenty excerpts were made, involving important highlights of Hungary's history. These were used as guideposts against which the depth of coverage and accuracy of the textbooks was contrasted. The twenty excerpts are shown below.

The author expresses his sincere thanks to Professor Steven B. Várdy of Duquesne University for his diligence in reviewing and correcting the manuscript.

HIGHLIGHTS OF HUNGARIAN HISTORY

The following excerpts were sculled from *The Columbia Encyclopedia, Second Edition, Collier, 1950*. [Pronunciation guides were deleted and errors in spelling of some Hungarian names were corrected.]

Árpád, c.840-907?, chief of the MAGYARS. He led his people into Hungary in 895. The leaders of the Magyars and the Hungarian kings from St. STEPHEN I to Andrew III were of the house of Árpád (see HUNGARY).

Stephen, Saint, or Stephen I [Hung. István], 969-1038, duke (997-1001) and first king (1001-38) of Hungary, called the Apostle of Hungary. The Hungarian state may be said to date from his reign. He continued the Christianization policy of his father, Duke Géza, and put down revolts by pagan nobles, who also opposed his pro-German policy. Married to a German princess, Stephen favored German immigration and modeled his administration on that of the German kings. He divided Hungary into counties, governed by royal officials, to prevent abuses by the nobles. He was named by the pope apostolic king, a title his successors bore. His crown, sent to him by Pope Sylvester II, remained through the centuries the sacred symbol of Hungarian national existence. Although in the Roman calendar his feast is Sept. 2, it is Aug. 20, anniversary of the removal of his remains to a shrine, that is celebrated in Hungary as a great national holiday.

Ladislaus I, or **Saint Ladislaus**, Hung. László I, 1040-1095, king of Hungary (1077-95). At the invitation of his sister, the widowed queen of Croatia, he invaded and conquered that country in 1091. He successfully fought the CUMANS, compelling those whose lives he spared to turn Christian and to settle in designated regions. He supported Pope Gregory VII against Emperor Henry IV, but rejected Gregory's suggestion that he swear fealty to the papacy. He modified the Hungarian criminal code and issued laws safeguarding private property. In Hungarian tradition he is the model of chivalry and valor. He secured the canonization of St. Stephen, and he was canonized himself in 1198. Feast: June 27.

Andrew II, d. 1235, king of Hungary (1205-35), son of Béla III. He expelled the Teutonic Knights from Transylvania, which he later settled with Saxon immigrants, to whom he gave (1224) the right to establish an autonomous administration. He continued his predecessor's policy of alienating crown lands to the magnates, and the lesser nobles forced him to issue a *Golden Bull* (1222), which strengthened the royal power and the liberties of the majority of the nation. Among the important provisions of this 'Magna Carta,' which was expanded in 1231, were that the diet should meet annually, that no noble should be executed except when regularly convicted, that no tax should be levied on the lands of the nobles or the Church, that charges against nobles for which the punishment was death or confiscation of goods should be heard by the king or at least reviewed by him, that foreigners should not receive offices without the consent of the diet, and that offices should not be perpetual. In the event that the king violated any of these provisions the nobles were to have the right of resistance. Andrew took part (1217) in the Fifth Crusade. He was the father of St. Elizabeth of Hungary and of Béla IV, his successor.

Béla IV, 1206-70, king of Hungary (1235-70). Son and successor of Andrew II. He set out to recover the crownlands his father had alienated. Confronted by the menace of the Mongol invasion, he sent unheeded appeals to Gregory IX and Frederick II and was crushingly defeated at Mohi on the Sajó river in 1241. Returning after the withdrawal of the invaders, he repopulated the country by inviting foreign colonization and encouraged the building of

castles. Béla defeated and killed the last Babenberg duke of Austria in 1240. He was defeated by OTTOCAR II of Bohemia in a war over Styria. His last years were disturbed by the rebellion of his son, later king STEPHEN V.

Ladislaus IV, Hung. László IV, (1272-90), king of Hungary (1272-90), son and successor of Stephen V. His mother was a Cuman, and Ladislaus became unpopular by adopting Cuman customs and surrounding himself with Cuman followers. During his reign Hungary fell into anarchy, the great landowners seizing power and the lower classes forming leagues for protection against them. There were several revolts against the king, who was finally slain by the Cumans. He died heirless; his successor, Andrew III (1290-1301), who issued from another branch of the Árpád dynasty, was succeeded as king of Hungary by King Wenceslaus III of Bohemia.

Louis I or Louis the Great, 1326 - 82, king of Hungary (1370 - 82) and of Poland (1370 - 82). He succeeded his father, Charles I, in Hungary, and his uncle, Casimir III, in Poland. He continued the internal policy of his father, favoring the Church and the commerce of the towns. In 1351 he confirmed the Golden Bull of ANDREW II, but to assure the continuance of a strong and wealthy military class he applied the system of ENTAIL to the estates of the nobles and made it mandatory for serfs to pay one ninth of their farm produce to their overlord. His finances were sound, and he was rarely forced to appeal to the diet for funds; as a result its meetings became less and less frequent. Louis tried, without success, to keep the Venetians from taking Zara (1346). Two expeditions to avenge the murder of his brother Andrew at the court of JOANNA I of Naples ended in a truce (1352) between the two monarchs. Louis fought two successful wars against Venice (1357 - 58, 1378 - 81), which ceded Dalmatia to him. The rulers of Serbia, Wallachia, Moldavia, and Bulgaria became his vassals. In Poland, where his campaign (1354) against the Tatars and the Lithuanians had made him popular, he was unable to prevent revolts and restlessness after his accession (1370). He had no male heir, but provided for his succession by marrying his eldest daughter, Mary, to SIGISMUND (later emperor). and a younger daughter, JADWIGA, to Jagiello (see LADISLAUS II) of Lithuania. In 1377 Louis campaigned successfully against the Turks. Louis not only brought Hungarian power to its greatest height, but also fostered art and learning, which were influenced both by his French background and by his campaigns, which brought Hungarians in contact with the Italian Renaissance.

Zrínyi, noble Hungarian family of Croatian origin. Nicholas Zrínyi, 1508-06, distinguished himself in the defense of Vienna (1529) against Sultan Suleiman I, took part in the campaign of Ferdinand I against John Zápolya, who claimed the Hungarian crown as John I, and was appointed (1542) ban (viceroy) of Croatia. He is famous for his defense of Szigetvár against the army of Suleiman I and was killed there while attempting a sortie. His great-grandson, Nicholas Zrínyi, 1610-64, was made ban of Croatia in 1647. He campaigned successfully against the Turks and was the acknowledged national leader of the Hungarians when he died in a hunting accident. He was a distinguished poet, one of the first to use Hungarian as a literary language. Besides lyric poetry, he also wrote an epic poem on the defense of Szigetvár by his ancestor and several prose works on political subjects, modeled in style on Machiavelli. His brother, Peter Zrínyi, 1621-71, became ban of Croatia in 1605. Disappointed by the absolutist policy of the Habsburgs, who owed their success in Hungary largely to the Zrínyi family, he joined (1071) with several other Hungarian magnates in a conspiracy against Emperor Leopold I. The plot, backed by Louis XIV of France, was ill organized and easily suppressed. Zrínyi was executed. His daughter, Helen (Hung. Ilona) Zrínyi (d. 1703), married Francis I RÁKÓCZI, and, after Rákóczi's death, Emeric THÖKÖLY. She was the mother of the Hungarian national hero, Francis II Rákóczi.

Hunyadi, John, (Hung. Hunyadi János)¹², c.1385-1456, Hungarian national hero, leader of the resistance against the Turks. He was chosen (1441) voivode of Transylvania under King Uladislaus I (Ladislaus III of Poland) and won numerous victories over the Turks. In 1444, however, the Christians were routed at Varna and the king was slain. Hunyadi, after a period of confusion, was chosen (1440) regent by the Hungarian diet. Young LADISLAUS V, chosen king in 1444, was kept from his kingdom by his guardian, Emperor FREDERIC III, until 1453. When Ladislaus assumed the rule, Hunyadi laid down his regency and devoted his full energy to fighting the Turks. His fight was a Christian crusade and was aided by Pope Calixtus III. With St. JOHN CAPISTRAN, Hunyadi defeated (1458) the Turks at Belgrade and thus staved off the Turkish conquest of Hungary for 70 years. Hunyadi was bitterly opposed by many of the Magyar nobles, among them his own son Ladislaus (Hung. László), who was murdered in 1457 (one year after his father's death), possibly on the instigation of Ladislaus V. John Hunyadi's younger son became king as MATTHIAS CORVINUS.

Matthias Corvinus, 1443?-1490, king of Hungary (1458-90) and Bohemia (1478-90), second son of John HUNYADI. He was elected king of Hungary on the death of LADISLAUS V. Emperor FREDERICK III sought to contest the election, but recognized him in 1482. Matthias won a reputation as a crusader against the Turks. He was persuaded by Pope Pius II to take up arms against his first father-in-law, GEORGE OF PODEBRAD, king of Bohemia. Having conquered Moravia, Silesia, and Lusatia, Matthias had himself crowned (1469) king of Bohemia, but was not recognized by the Bohemian diet. The war continued after the accession of Ladislaus II of Bohemia. In 1478 peace was made: both Ladislaus and Matthias were to keep the title king of Bohemia; Matthias was to keep his conquests, which, however, were to revert to Bohemia after his death. After fighting two wars (1477, 1479) against Frederick III, Matthias began (1482) a third campaign. He took Vienna (1485) and conquered Styria, Carinthia, and Carniola, but his conquests were lost again after his death. His military success was largely due to the establishment of a standing army. During his rule Hungary reached its last flowering before its fall to Turkey. He respected the national institutions but was harsh in his fiscal policy and in his administration of justice. A true Renaissance despot, he protected learning and science. His library at Buda, the Corvina, was one of the finest in Europe¹³. He was succeeded in Hungary by Ladislaus II of Bohemia (ULADISLAUS II in Hungary).

¹² Hunyadi was born in Kolozsvár (now Cluj) in Transylvania. The house he was born in is a heritage site. Romanian propaganda holds that he was of Romanian origin. This is doubtful for three reasons: Romanians were not allowed to spend the night within the city walls of Transylvanian towns until the middle of the 19th century, much less to own homes there. Hunyadi's father was named Vajk, an ancient Hungarian name. He received a royal patent to Hunyad Fort in Transylvania from Hungary's King Sigismund (of Luxemburg) on October 18, 1409. Hunyadi was raised under the tutelage of Cardinal János Vitéz, served in Sigismund's court, even accompanied him to Rome when Sigismund became Holy Roman Emperor. At one time he commanded the guards at the court of Lorenzo de Medici. Not exactly the training for a social upstart. Historians speculate that he was the illegitimate son of Sigismund. In his prime, he was by far the biggest landowner in Hungary. He owned two million hectares of landed estates, and spent all his income on fighting the Turks. Hunyadi's military campaigns are described in detail by Stephen Sisa: *The Spirit of Hungary*. (Toronto: Rákóczi Found., 1983.) After the disastrous Battle of Varna, where Hungary's Jagellion king Wladislaus has died, Hunyadi was elected Regent. Only Kossuth (1849) and Horthy (1920) shared this title later in Hungarian history. Hunyadi was the Christian commander in the Battle of Kosovo (1448), that is mentioned so often these days. It was a three day affair, lost at the end by the Christians when the Wallachian (Romanian) forces, 8,000 light cavalry, switched to the side of the Turks.

¹³ More on this in Norman Davies: *Europe*, Oxford Univ. Press, 1996. p. 522.

Louis II, 1506-26, king of Hungary and Bohemia (1516-26), son and successor of Uladislau II. He was the last of the Jagiello dynasty in the two kingdoms. In face of the intensified attacks by Sultan SULEIMAN I, Louis in 1520 hastily sought to unite Hungary and Christendom behind him, but only the pope sent help. With a pitiful army Louis joined battle with the Turks at MOHÁCS. The Hungarian army was destroyed. Louis was killed. Through the marriage treaty concluded by his father (see ULADISLAUS II) the crowns of Hungary and Bohemia passed to Louis's brother-in-law, Ferdinand of Habsburg (later Emperor FERDINAND I), but Hungary fell under Turkish rule.

Mohács, Hung. Mohács, city (pop. 18,355), S Hungary, an important inland port on the Danube. Mohács is best known for the disastrous defeat (Aug. 29, 1526) there of Louis II of Hungary by SULEIMAN I of Turkey. Hungary was ill prepared for the attack: its nobles had curtailed the royal military power, magnates and gentry were in constant strife, and the oppressed peasantry was not entrusted with arms. Louis's army was poorly equipped, badly led, and outnumbered at least three to one. John Zápolya (see JOHN I), with a large Transylvanian contingent, never joined him, perhaps through treachery. The king, the flower of the Hungarian nobility, and almost every soldier of the army were killed in the battle or massacred after being taken prisoners. This, the worst disaster of Hungarian history, opened the 150 years of Ottoman domination. There are monuments at Mohács¹⁴ to the slain, regarded ever since as martyrs to Christianity and Hungarian independence. Mohács was also the scene (1687) of a Turkish defeat by CHARLES V of Lorraine.

John I (John Zápolya), 1487-1540, king of Hungary (1528-40), voivode of Transylvania (1511-20), son of Stephen ZÁPOLYA. The leader of the anti-foreign party of the Hungarian nobles, he secured a decree at the diet of 1505 by which no foreign ruler would be chosen king of Hungary after the death of king ULADISLAUS II. To strengthen his own candidacy for the crown he sought to marry the king's daughter, Anna, but his suit was rejected and he was removed from the court through his appointment as voivode of Transylvania. He ruthlessly crushed a peasant uprising in 1514. His anger at the marriage of Anna to Ferdinand of Austria (later Emperor FERDINAND I) probably motivated his failure to assist King Louis II at the battle of MOHÁCS (1520). Louis II was killed in the battle. John was crowned king by the Hungarian nobles, but Ferdinand of Austria claimed the crown on the basis of his marriage with Anna as well as previous agreements. In 1527 Ferdinand defeated John and was crowned by John's opponents. John retired to his stronghold in the Carpathians. In 1529 the Turks began to overrun Hungary. John now descended upon and defeated Ferdinand's army and, after surrendering the crown to Sultan Suleiman I, was confirmed king by the sultan, who exercised real control. The struggle between John and Ferdinand ended in 1538 when John who was then childless, agreed that the crown should pass to Ferdinand after his death. The agreement was set aside when, a few months before John's death, a son, John Sigismund (John II), was born.

John II (John Sigismund Zápolya), 1540-71, king of Hungary and prince of Transylvania, son of John I. Through his mother, Isabel (daughter of Sigismund I of Poland), he was related to the Jagiello dynasty. He was crowned king of Hungary on his father's death (1540). Sultan SULEIMAN I, on the pretext of protecting the infant's interests, invaded (1541) Hungary and took the capital, Buda, which remained in Turkish hands for 150 years. John and Isabel were given the principality of Transylvania, under Turkish suzerainty. Actual power was in the

¹⁴ A note of interest here: Saint Thomas More wrote (*Comfort Against Tribulation*) nine years later, just before his execution: *Hungary hath been ever hitherto a very shure key of Christendom*

hands of John's guardian, the monk George Martinuzzi, who sought to restore a unified Hungary. In 1551 Martinuzzi procured the deposition of John and Isabel, who retired to Silesia, and reunited Transylvania with Hungary, recognizing Ferdinand of Austria and Bohemia (later Emperor FERDINAND I) as king. Martinuzzi, made prince-primate and a cardinal, soon fell out with Ferdinand, who accused him of treasonable negotiations and who had him assassinated. On the pressure of Suleiman I the diet of Transylvania recalled (1550) John and Isabel. When Ferdinand made peace (1502) with Suleiman, he recognized John as ruler of Transylvania. John did homage to Suleiman in 1566, when the sultan led his armies into Hungary in his last campaign. An eight-year truce (1568) between Emperor Maximilian II and Sultan Selim II confirmed John in Transylvania. Thus Hungary remained split into three states - an Austrian part, a Turkish part, and Transylvania. John II's rule in Transylvania was remarkable for the adoption (1564) of Calvinism as the state religion by the diet. He was succeeded as prince of Transylvania by Stephen Báthory.

Bocskay, Stephen, Hung. Bocskay István., 1557?-1660, Hungarian noble, voivode (1604-6) and prince (1605-6) of Transylvania. Seeking to secure the independence of TRANSYLVANIA, he supported his nephew, Prince Sigismund BÁTHORY, first against the pro-Turkish, then against the pro-Habsburg, factions of nobles. Sigismund having abdicated (1602) in favor of the king of Hungary (Emperor Rudolf II), Stephen Bocskay, in 1604 led a revolt with Turkish support against Rudolf's attempt to impose Roman Catholicism in Hungary. Bocskay then acknowledged the sultan as his suzerain, but refused his offer of recognition as king of Hungary. In 1606 he negotiated with Archduke (later Emperor) MATTHIAS a treaty at Vienna which legalized the partition of Hungary between the Habsburgs (as kings), the sultan, and Transylvania. The old and sacred Hungarian crown of St. Stephen was returned to Pressburg (Pozsony, now Bratislava), the capital of Habsburg-held Hungary. The importance of the treaty, which was soon afterward supplemented by a peace between Austria and Sultan AHMED I, lay in the guarantee of religious freedom for Hungary. Bocskay was recognized as prince of Transylvania. To avoid paying tribute to the sultan, he presented him with a large gift. He died as he was proposing to renew hostilities against the Habsburgs.

Rákóczi, noble Hungarian family that played an important role in the history of TRANSYLVANIA and Hungary in the 17th and 18th cent. Sigismund Rákóczi, 1544-1608, was elected (1607) prince of Transylvania to succeed Stephen Bocskay. His son, George I Rákóczi, 1591-1648, was elected prince of Transylvania in 1630. He continued the anti-Habsburg policy of his predecessors, Gabriel Báthory and Gabriel Bethlen, and like them he relied on alliances with the Protestant powers. In 1644 he declared war on Emperor Ferdinand III and overran Hungary. Peace was made (1645) at Linz, and the emperor granted religious freedom to the Hungarians and ceded territory to Rákóczi. George I's son, George II Rákóczi, 1621-60, succeeded his father on the throne of Transylvania but was deposed (1657) as a result of his unsuccessful invasion of Poland. He was mortally wounded when the Turks invaded Transylvania. He married Sophia, a niece of Gabriel Báthory. Their son, Francis I Rákóczi, 1645-76, was designated George's successor by the diet of Transylvania in 1652. However, he was never recognized. Having married a daughter of Peter ZRÍNYI, ban of Croatia, he entered with Zrínyi into an unsuccessful conspiracy against Emperor Leopold I. Francis II Rákóczi, 1076-1735, the son of Francis I and Helen Zrínyi, became the leader of the rebellion of the Hungarians against Habsburg oppression. The outbreak (1701) of the War of the Spanish Succession was followed by an uprising (1703) of the Hungarian peasants, particularly of the Calvinists, against the emperor. Rákóczi, at the head of the movement, soon controlled most of Hungary and in 1704 was elected „ruling prince” by the diet. He secured the support of

King Louis XIV of France, who supplied him with subsidies and troops.¹⁵ At the Diet of Ónod (1707) the Hungarian nobles proclaimed the Habsburg dynasty deposed in Hungary and set up an aristocratic republic. Rákóczi, however, suffered severe defeats in 1708 and 1710, and in 1711 the Hungarians and Austrians negotiated peace at Szatmár. The emperor promised an amnesty and the restoration of religious and constitutional freedom in Hungary. Rákóczi, who refused to accept the treaty, fled to Poland, then to France, and eventually to Turkey. He died in exile in Turkey, but his remains were brought back to Hungary in 1906. He left an autobiography. Francis II Rákóczi is a major national hero of Hungary. The stirring Rákóczi March, named in his honor, was composed (1809) by John Bihari. It is possibly based on an older tune, sung by Rákóczi's army and was used by Berlioz in his *Damnation de Faust* and by Liszt in the *Hungarian Rhapsody No. 15*. The playing of the Rákóczi March was long forbidden in Hungary, where the tune was used as a national air by the independence movement. (See Ladislaus Hengelmüller, *Hungary's Fight for National Existence*, - Engl. tr. 1913)

Bethlen, Gabriel, Hung. Bethlen Gábor, 1580-1629, prince of Transylvania (1613-29). He was chief adviser of Stephen BOCSKAY and was elected prince after the assassination of Gabriel BÁTHORY. A Protestant, though tolerant towards all religions, he allied himself (1619) with FREDERICK THE WINTER KING and overran Hungary, of which he was elected king (1620). After the Bohemian defeat at the White Mt. (1620), he signed with Emperor FERDINAND II the Treaty of Nikolsburg (1621), by which he renounced the royal title but retained control of seven Hungarian counties and received the rank of prince of the empire. He continued his relations with the Protestant powers opposing the emperor in the Thirty Years War and married the Sister of the elector of Brandenburg; however, he kept the interests of Transylvania paramount. He was a wise administrator and encouraged the development of law and learning.

Transylvania, Ger. Siebenbürgen, Hung. Erdély, Rumanian Transylvania or Ardeal, historic province (24,009 sq. mi.; pop. 3,420,829¹⁶) in central Rumania. CLUY (Ger. Klausenburg, Hung. Kolozsvár) is the chief city. A high plateau, Transylvania is separated in the south from Wallachia by the TRANSYLVANIAN ALPS and in the east from Moldavia and Bukovina by the CARPATHIANS (of which the Transylvanian Alps are a continuation). In the north and west it borders on Crisana-Maramures, in the southwest on the Bánát. The Transylvanian plateau, 1,000 ft. to 1,600 ft. high, is drained by the Mures, the Olt, and the Somes, all tributaries of the Danube. Its climate is continental. Economically and culturally the most advanced part of Rumania, Transylvania is rich in natural resources, including lignite, methane, iron, manganese, lead, and sulphur, and it has the chief metallurgical and chemical industries of Rumania. Other industries are textile manufacturing, food processing, and lumbering. Stock raising, agriculture, wine production, and fruitgrowing are important occupations. Next to Cluj, BRASOV and SIBIU are the principal cities. Of the total population, 1,015,947 are Hungarian-speaking and 157,715 are German-speaking. The Rumanian population is largely rural, while the Magyar and German minorities are mostly concentrated in the cities. The area now constituting Transylvania was part of the province of DACIA under the Roman Empire. It was overrun, between the 3d and 10th cent. A.D., by the Visigoths, the Huns, the Gepidae, and the Avars, and it was contested in the 10th and 11th cent. between the Petchenegs and the

¹⁵ In fact, he promised his support but little came of it.

¹⁶ Note: all population figures are pre-1950. During the Communist years there was an extensive program of transferring ethnic Romanian population into Transylvania, particularly into regions where Hungarians were in the majority.

Magyars (Hungarians), who finally incorporated it into Hungary. It is not known whether the SZÉKELY, a Turkic people who adopted the Magyar language, came into Transylvania with or before the Magyars. The Székely were the ancestors of most of the Magyar-speaking population of Transylvania. In the 12th and 13th cent. the kings of Hungary settled large numbers of German colonists in Transylvania, where they were active in building fortified towns. The German settlers and their descendants were (and still are) called Saxons, although they came from various parts of Germany. The German influence became more marked when, early in the 13th cent., King Andrew II of Hungary called on the Teutonic Knights to protect Transylvania from the Cumans, who were followed (1241) by the Mongol invaders under Batu Khan. At that period also begun the penetration of Transylvania by the Rumanians, called Vlachs or Wallachians, a penetration which continued for centuries. The Vlachs were, for the most part, semi-nomadic shepherds, but most of them soon settled down to agriculture. The administration of Transylvania was in the hands of a royal governor, called voivode, who by the mid-13th cent. controlled all the seven Transylvanian counties. Society was divided into three privileged „nations,” the Magyars, the Székely, and the Saxons. These „nations,” however, did not correspond to strictly ethnical but rather to social divisions. Although the nonprivileged class of serfs consisted mostly of Vlachs, it also included people of Saxon, Székely, and Magyar origin, while on the other hand many Vlachs assimilated with the Magyars and joined the ranks of the nobility. Thus John Hunyadi, hero of the Turkish wars of the 15th cent. ‘and father of King Matthias Corvinus, was of Rumanian origin¹⁷. After the suppression (1437) of a peasant revolt, the three „nations” solemnly renewed their union; the rebels were cruelly punished and serfdom became more firmly entrenched than ever. When the main Hungarian army and King Louis II were slain (1526) in the battle of MOHÁCS, the troops of John Zápolya, voivode of Transylvania, were saved from destruction through their tardiness. Zápolya took advantage of his military strength and put himself at the head of the nationalist Hungarian party, which opposed the succession of Ferdinand of Austria (later Emperor Ferdinand I) to the Hungarian throne. As JOHN I, he was elected king of Hungary, while another party recognized Ferdinand. In the ensuing struggle Zápolya received the support of Sultan Suleiman I, who after Zápolya’s death (1540) overran all central Hungary on the pretext of protecting Zápolya’s son, JOHN II. Hungary was now divided into three sections - Western Hungary, under Austrian rule; central Hungary, under Turkish rule; and semi-independent Transylvania, where Austrian and Turkish influences fought for supremacy for nearly two centuries. The Hungarian magnates of Transylvania resorted to policy of duplicity in order to preserve independence. The BÁTHORY family, which came to power on the death (1571) of John II, ruled Transylvania as princes under Ottoman, and briefly under Habsburg, suzerainty until 1602, but their rule was interrupted by the incursion of MICHAEL THE BRAVE of Wallachia and by Austrian military intervention. In 1604 Stephen BOCSKAY led a rebellion against Austrian rule, and in 1606 he was recognized by the emperor as prince of Transylvania. He also obtained recognition of religious freedom in Hungary. The Reformation had been widely accepted throughout Transylvania except by the Orthodox Rumanians. The principality was the chief center of Hungarian culture and humanism, and it was the only country in Europe at that period where Roman Catholics, Orthodox Catholics, Calvinists, Lutherans and Unitarians, lived in mutual tolerance. Under Bocskay’s successors - among whom the most notable were Sigismund RÁKÓCZI, Gabriel Báthory, Gabriel BETHLEN, George I and George RÁKÓCZI II, Emeric THÖKÖLY, and Francis RÁKÓCZI II - Transylvania vainly sought to shake off the growing Austrian

¹⁷ A rather dubious assertion, see earlier footnote.

influence, and its alliance with Turkey under Thököly and with France under Francis II Rákóczi proved fatal to its independence. In 1711 Austrian control was definitely established over all Hungary and Transylvania, and the princes of Transylvania were replaced by Austrian governors. The proclamation (1705) of Transylvania as a grand principality was a mere formality. In the revolutionary years 1848-49 the Rumanians rose against the Magyar national state established by the revolutionists; they were aided by Austrian troops, who with the help of Russian intervention put down the Hungarian republic of Louis Kossuth. A period of Austrian military government followed (1849-60); while it was disastrous for the Magyars, it greatly benefited the Rumanian peasants, who were given land and otherwise favored by the Austrian authorities. However, in the compromise (*Ausgleich*) of 1867 which established the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy, Transylvania was made an integral part of Hungary, and the Rumanians, after having tasted equality, were once more plunged into subjection to the Magyar magnates. Transylvania was seized by Rumania after the First World War and was formally ceded by Hungary in the Treaty of Trianon (1920). The expropriation of the estates of the magnates and the distribution of the lands to the Rumanian peasants was a major cause of friction between Hungary and Rumania. It was now the turn of the Magyar and German nationalists to complain of Rumanian oppression. During the Second World War, Hungary annexed (1940) the northern part of Transylvania, which was, however, restored to Rumania after the war. A large number of the Transylvanian „Saxons” fled to Germany as displaced persons before the arrival of the Russian armies. (See Ladislav Makkai, *Histoire de Transylvanie*, 1946, in French).

Kossuth, Louis, Hung. Kossuth Lajos, 1802-94, Hungarian revolutionary hero. Born of a Protestant family and a lawyer by training, he entered politics as a member of the diet and soon won a large following for his liberal and nationalist program; he did not shrink from the possibility of dissolving the union of the Hungarian and Austrian crowns. He was arrested in 1837, but popular pressure forced the Metternich regime to release him in 1840. Kossuth, a fiery orator, was one of the principal figures of the Hungarian revolution of March, 1848. When, in April, Hungary was granted a separate government, Kossuth became finance minister. Kossuth continued and intensified his anti-Austrian agitation. His extreme nationalism, which was opposed to the fulfillment of the national aspirations of the Slavic, Rumanian, and German minorities in Hungary, was particularly resented in Croatia. When the Austrian government, supported by the ban of Croatia, JELACICH DE BUZIM, prepared to move against Hungary, Kossuth became head of the Hungarian government of national defense and virtual dictator. His government withdrew to Debrecen before the advance of the Austrians under WINDISCHGRAETZ. In April, 1849, it declared Hungary an independent republic and Kossuth became president. The Hungarians won several victories, but in 1849 Russian troops intervened in favor of Austria, and Kossuth was obliged to resign the government to General GÖRGEY. The Hungarian surrender at Világos marked the end of the republic. Kossuth fled to Turkey. After visiting England and the United States, where he received ovations as a champion of liberty, Kossuth lived in exile in England and (after 1885) in Italy. He unsuccessfully tried to stir uprisings in Hungary in 1859 and 1866. He was dissatisfied with the *Ausgleich* of 1867, by which the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy was created, and he refused an offer of amnesty in 1890. After his death at Turin, Italy, his body was brought to Budapest and buried in state.

Horthy de Nagybánya, Nicholas, Hung. Nagybányai Horthy Miklós, 1868-[1957], Hungarian admiral and statesman. He commanded the Austro-Hungarian fleet in the First World War. After Béla Kun seized (1910) power in Hungary, the counterrevolutionist government put Horthy in command of its forces. When the Rumanian force, that had defeated Kun

evacuated Budapest (Nov., 1019), Horthy entered it and in 1920 was made regent and head of the state. He checked two attempts (March and Oct., 1021) of Emperor CHARLES I to regain his throne in Hungary, once by persuasion and once by armed force. Charles was then formally barred from the throne, and Horthy found himself regent of a kingless kingdom. A nationalist and distinctly inclined toward the right, he guided Hungary through the years between the two world wars, but left the actual management of government to his premiers, notably Stephen BETHLEN and Julius GÖMBÖS. His influence diminished after the death (1936) of Gömbös. The succeeding premiers, Koloman Darányi (1936-38), Béla Imrédy (1938-39), and Paul TELEKI (1939-41), brought Hungary into the Axis, and after Teleki's suicide Hungary entered the Second World War. Despite Horthy's opposition, German troops occupied Hungary in March, 1944. When Russian troops entered Hungary, Horthy sent an armistice commission to Moscow and announced (Oct., 1944) the surrender of Hungary. The Germans immediately forced Horthy to countermand his order and to resign. He fled to Bavaria, where he was captured (1945) by American troops. Released several months later he retired to a country house near Munich¹⁸.

In the foregoing two places and eighteen persons (three family names including more than one notable family members) that could be considered important mile-posts in Hungary's history. The first seven are related: they all belong to Hungary's first ruling dynasty, the House of Árpád. The Árpáds were in power for over 300 years. Hungary was established as a major European power in this period. When in 1186 Béla III married the daughter of Louis VII of France (Margaret Capet, widow of crown prince Henry of England) the assessment of the royal income has shown Hungary to be the richest kingdom in Europe.¹⁹

These selections were made in a somewhat arbitrary manner. Some could have been dropped in favor of a few other equally notable persons. Overall, this list of twenty names can be considered a measure of qualitative rating of a general history book. If all the twenty names could be found, the book would give a superior coverage of Hungarian history. Even ten items mentioned may be called an acceptable coverage. Less than that, and a charge may be made of shabby coverage of Hungary's history. One could argue that this is a matter of personal choice of the respective authors. It can be countered by a question: In contrast, how extensively did the writer discuss the marital difficulties of Henry VIII? Were they really that consequential in their influence on the history of Europe? The arguments could go on.

¹⁸ Horthy never countermanded his armistice order. He was arrested by the Germans and was held in house arrest in Germany by the Gestapo, while his son, Nicholas, was imprisoned at Mauthausen concentration camp. Horthy was in the protective custody of the American Army, as a witness at the Nuremberg trials. He died in Portugal in 1957.

¹⁹ Nemeskürty, Op. Cit.

BOOK REVIEWS

In the followings, all references or discussions of Hungary and the Magyars will be quoted with the page number marked in brackets. The reviewer's comments will be in footnotes, unless they refer to maps or pictures. Such comments will be in the main text without quotation marks.

I. Greaves

Greaves, Richard L. & Robert Zaller, Philip V. Cannistraro, Rhoads Murphey: Civilizations of the World, The Human Adventure, Second Ed.; New York, NY: HarperCollins, 1993. pp. 1175.

This is a monumental book. Almost 1200 pages, full of color pictures, maps, (including a series of colored geographic maps of the world, missing from most other history texts) and generous lists of further readings. Compared to its competitors, the book is less centered on European history, but, as its title indicates, provides a general coverage of the civilizations of the world. In spite of this, Hungary is treated relatively in more detail, than those that ostensibly centered on Europe.

[page 217] Magyars appear on a map that shows the expansion of Islam, locating them east of the Carpathian mountains, with the Avars being in the Danubian basin.

[333] „Byzantine miscalculation was responsible for the invasion of eastern Europe by the Magyars, a nomadic people from central Asia. In 896 the Byzantines encouraged the Magyars to attack the troublesome Bulgars, but the latter outwitted the Byzantines by persuading the Pechenegs, Turkic nomads from the area around the Volga River, to attack the Magyars. Instead of fighting the Bulgars, the Magyars moved west, invading Germany, France, and Italy and plundering virtually at will. Not until 955 were they defeated by the army of the German king Otto I, but they retained control of the great Hungarian plain. There they gradually settled down, established their own kingdom, and converted to Christianity.”

[334] Map showing Viking, Magyar and Muslim invasions shows Hungarian invasion routes from 883 through 917.

[335] „In Germany the substantial size of the Magyar armies meant that the nobles could not marshal adequate defenses; hence the kings actually increased their influence, as exemplified by Otto I's revival of the imperial tradition.”

[345] „Henry I (919-936) ...strengthened Saxon defenses against the Magyars and Norsemen.”

[346] „When the Magyars took advantage of the civil strife to invade Germany, Otto crushed them at Lechfeld, near Augsburg, in 955.”

[350] „The Peasants' crusade ended in disaster, not only for the crusaders but also for the thousands of Hungarians and Jews they killed en route..”

[352] „A third order, the Teutonic Knights, was established by German Crusaders in 1198, though most of their efforts were devoted to campaigns in Hungary and the Baltic region.”

[357] The Mongols... „invaded Poland Silesia, Bohemia, Moravia, and Hungary, only to pull back to Russia when another khan died in 1241.”

[391] ...around 1450 ... „In Italy, Germany, Hungary, and Poland, however, territorial princes and cities prevented the growth of centralized states.”

[397] In 1377... „The Bohemians, Hungarians, Poles, and Scandinavians also supported the Roman pope.” (re. Urban VI)

[411] In article on Venice, about 1329„the Habsburgs and the Hungarians, who were unsettled by Venetian expansion around the head of the Adriatic.”

[413] French king Francis I, in his confrontation with Charles V„allied with the Turks, who defeated the Hungarian army at Mohács in 1526.”

[414] Map shows the empire of Charles V (brother of Ferdinand I) depicting Turkish domination of Danube-Tisza valley up to ‘Budapest’ (sic) and Habsburg domination of the rest of the country including Transylvania.

„Although the Hungarians had developed a reasonably strong state in the 1200s, during the following century they were weakened by a dynastic struggle involving Bavarian, Bohemian and Angevin claimants; the Angevins triumphed with the support of the papacy. There were further problems due to the frequent absences of King Sigismund (1387-1437) from the country, partly because of his campaigns against the Turks and partly because of his responsibilities as Holy Roman Emperor (1433-1437). In 1458 the nobles gave the crown to Matthias Corvinus (1458-1490), son of the great military leader János Hunyadi, who had successfully repulsed the Turks. Matthias increased royal authority through administrative and judicial reforms, higher taxes, and the creation of a standing army. Abroad, he used Hungary’s new power to conquer Bohemia, Moravia, and Austria. Following his death, however, a disputed succession enabled Maximilian to regain Austria and to bring Hungary into the imperial orbit by two dynastic marriages involving his grandchildren, Mary and Ferdinand. The nobles subsequently took advantage of weak rulers to disband the standing army. As in Germany, the real struggle in Hungary then took place between the magnates and the lesser nobility. Although the latter won their claim to equality in the eyes of the law, in practice the magnates were dominant.”

In the Chapter Summary: „The failure of the Italians, Germans, Hungarians, and Poles to establish strong centralized states left them vulnerable to their neighbors and a perpetual source of temptation to expansionist-minded states.”

[425] On humanists outside Italy: ... „Other Italian humanists took their views to the courts of Spain, Hungary, and Poland...”

[436] on women artists of the renaissance: „Catharina van Hemessen of the Netherlands, who enjoyed the support of Queen Mary of Hungary...”²⁰

[461] Luther’s ... „doctrines were preached as far afield as Hungary, Prussia, and the Netherlands.”

²⁰ Wife of Louis II, king of Hungary who lost his life at the battle of Mohács in 1526. She was virtually chased out of Hungary by the Hungarians after her husband died.

Charles V ..., was preoccupied too by the advancing Turkish forces of Suleiman the Magnificent (1520-1566), which soundly defeated the Hungarians at Mohács in 1526 and advanced to the very gates of Vienna before retreating.”²¹

[465] „Under Calvin, Geneva was the focal point of an expanding network of reformers who carried his message as far afield as France, the Netherlands, England Scotland, and even Hungary”

[467] Map titled „The Division of Christendom, c. 1550” shows Catholics, Anabaptists and Calvinists throughout Hungary and Transylvania.

[475] In the article on witch-hunts in Europe: „Lutherans introduced the witch-hunt to Denmark, ... and Calvinists carried it to Scotland and Transylvania.”

[482] On commercial innovation: Jacob Fugger’s ... „company dominated the copper supply in Europe by its acquisition of Hungarian mines...”

[514] Map entitled „Europe, c. 1560” correctly shows partitioned Hungary and Transylvania.

[532] After the Peace of Westphalia ... „emperors ... govern the small German states and their own patrimony in Austria, Bohemia, and Hungary.”

„Much of the unrest in central and eastern Europe was sparked by the gradual enserfment of the peasants in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.”

[540] On Ottoman history: Suleiman I has ... „captured ... Belgrade on the Danube, gateway to central Europe; and much of Hungary. He besieged Vienna, but his forces both the supplies and the resolve to take the city, and he was forced to retreat in 1529.”

[545] „After 1716, Ottoman officials, stung by the loss of Transylvania and most of Hungary to Habsburg armies (which had been confirmed in the 1699 Treaty of Karlowitz), began trying to reorganize their decaying army...”

[620] Map entitled „Europe in 1714” depicts Hungary under „Habsburg dominions” correctly. A line, separating Austria from Hungary, is labeled „Boundary of the Austrian empire. Strangely, later on throughout the book even Transylvania is labeled „Austria”.

[625] Article entitled „Austria: The Dynastic State”:

„After the division of the Habsburg crown in 1555 between its Spanish and Austrian branches, the Austrian monarchy consisted of three major units, the hereditary provinces of Austria itself; the so-called crown of Wenceslas, comprising Bohemia, Moravia, and Silesia; and the crown of St. Stephen, including Hungary, Transylvania, and Croatia. Bohemia and Hungary had become part of the Habsburg dominions in 1527 after the battle of Mohács, though much of Hungary was still contested. Indeed, only the continuing threat of the Turks in southeastern Europe could have united so disparate a group of peoples - Germans, Czechs, Magyars, Croats, Slovaks, Slovenes, Italians, Rumanians, Ruthenians - under a single head. Turkey may, in this sense be said to have engendered the Austrian monarchy; nor was it a coincidence that the final expulsion of Turkey from Europe in the early twentieth century should have been followed shortly after by the collapse and dismemberment of the Habsburg empire. The histories of Turkey and Austria rose and fell together.

Austria in the seventeenth century might be described as a power but not a state. The imperial title was recognized only in the Austrian provinces proper; the Habsburg emperor was sepa-

²¹ Actually, the Turks went north as far as Buda, sacked the royal palace, carried away the famed library of king Matthias (the Corvina), and then evacuated Hungary.

ately king of Bohemia and Hungary. ... His government was actually a series of ongoing negotiations with the provinces of his realm, whose noble estates possessed extensive powers, including the right to veto imperial taxes and, in Hungary, even to rebel.

The Counter-Reformation in Austria was, in its political dimension, a struggle against the Protestant nobility who were dominant in Bohemia and Hungary. Bohemian Protestantism had been ruthlessly suppressed after 1620, and the native nobility was replaced by Catholic loyalists. A similar policy was applied in Hungary after 1671 following an abortive rebellion...

Religious orthodoxy was linked to what the Habsburgs saw as their special mission: the defense of Christian Europe against the menace of the Ottoman Turks. After a period of quiescence following the Treaty of Sitva-Torok (1606) the Turks crossed the Danube in strength in 1663, ravaging Hungary, Moravia, and Silesia. Repulsed at St. Gotthard by papal-sponsored and Austrian led army, they acceded to the Truce of Vasvár (1664).²² This treaty formally divided Hungary, which, though nominally a Habsburg principality, had long enjoyed semi-independence as a border region between the two great powers. When the Turks renewed the war in 1683 with an army of 200,000 men, the Hungarians, preferring the Ottoman yoke to what they have seen of the Habsburg, joined forces with the invaders.²³ The Turks were also assisted by Louis XIV, who saw the attack as a welcome opportunity to divert Leopold's attention from his own aggression on the Rhine, though he temporarily suspended aid as a gesture to European public opinion when the Turks stormed up to the very gates of Vienna, subjecting it to a two month siege.

The relief of the Habsburg capital by Jan Sobieski of Poland (1673-1696) was hailed throughout Europe as a miraculous deliverance. It was a historic moment, for it marked the last great thrust of Muslim power that had threatened Europe for nearly 1,000 years. In the war that ensued, climaxed by Prince Eugene of Savoy's great victory at Zenta (1697), the Turks were driven permanently from the Danube basin and back upon the Balkans. ...

The Treaty of Karlowitz (1699) gave the Habsburgs possession of virtually all of Hungary, Transylvania, and Croatia. Hungary's crown of St. Stephen was declared hereditary in the Habsburg family (1687). The Magyar nobility was not purged, as in Bohemia, and it was permitted to retain its provincial assemblies and national diet. But its power was curbed, and non-Magyar nobles were settled in the new lands, as well as German and Slavic peasants. The result was a new Magyar rising under Prince Ferenc Rákóczy, which lasted from 1703 to 1711. The defiant Magyars, with their proud sense of isolation among the surrounding Slavic populations, remained the most refractory of the Habsburg empire's many peoples." ...

[669] „Maria Theresa (1740-1780) became empress of Austria and queen of Hungary, the first female sovereign in the history of the Habsburg dynasty.”

[695] „The empire Joseph (II) inherited was a crazy quilt of territories and populations that spread across Europe... Its various peoples - Flemish, Italian, German, Czech, Croatian, Magyar, Polish - had little in common, and their loyalty to the Habsburg throne had been purchased

²² This treaty was considered a travesty by Hungarians who felt that the Turkish forces could have been pushed out of Hungary by General Montecuccoli, who lacked initiative.

²³ Prince Thököly's forces actually did join the Turks during the fight at the gates of Vienna. As the younger Zrínyi wrote: Between two pagans, for one country. Thököly considered the Austrians worst pagans than the Turks. His forces, however, changed sides later, and were instrumental in reconquering Buda. Meanwhile strong Hungarian contingents fought with the Habsburg armies from the beginning.

only by conceding a large measure of self-rule, especially in Hungary and Bohemia. Joseph set out to compress this explosive mixture into a single political and social order and to transform some of the most backward regions of Europe into instant models of progress and enlightenment.”

... „Rebellion flared in Hungary, the Tirol and Flanders, and by the end of Joseph’s reign large parts of the empire were held down only by force.”

[705] on the arts: ...„Haydn ... was employed by the greatest noble family of Hungary, the Esterházy’s, who maintained a private orchestra for his use. Haydn remained with the Esterházy’s all his life...”

[806] Map showing „The Urbanization of Europe” indicates that Budapest was a city of half million population in 1930. Contrary to this, the table entitled „Population of the major Cities of Continental Europe Around 1910” lists the population of Budapest as 880,000.

[824] „The very name, Austria, had been adopted no less recently than 1804 to describe the patrimonial lands of the emperor, ...”²⁴

[825] Map depicting the „Ethnic Composition of the Austro-Hungarian Empire” .²⁵

[839] On the „Revolutions of 1848” the book states: „More serious were nationalist uprisings by the Bohemians in Prague and the Hungarians in Budapest. The latter, under the leadership of the fiery journalist and orator Louis Kossuth (1802-1894), demanded virtual independence from Austria, with separate army, government, and a system of finance. In addition, the Hungarian Diet, composed exclusively of noblemen and long one of the most reactionary assemblies in Europe,²⁶ *Contemporary Europe, a History*, 7th Ed. Prentice Hall, 1961. page 5.²⁷ voted for constitutional government, the abolition of serfdom, and the imposition of taxes on the nobility. ...

In Hungary the Magyar majority under Kossuth rapidly alienated the various minorities under its control by proclaiming what amounted to racial hegemony: it abolished local assemblies in non-Magyar provinces and prescribed that Hungarian be the exclusive language of all higher education as well as of the Diet.²⁸ This stimulated Slavic nationalism, which culminated in a pan-Slavic congress that convened in Prague in June (of 1848), only to be suppressed by

²⁴ The book, however, uses the expression „Austrian Empire” on pages 696, 725, 731, 793, 819, 821, and 856 referring to the Habsburg Empire, well before 1804.

²⁵ By not indicating population densities, the map allows as much weight to highly mountainous areas populated, allegedly, by Rumanians and Slovaks, as densely populated agricultural areas populated by Magyars. Also, in large areas the population was mixed with various single-ethnic villages adjacent to each other. The fact is that the Magyar population of historic Hungary (with the exclusion of Croatia) was 54.5 percent at the beginning of WWI.

²⁶ This is a patently absurd interpretation. The so called „Age of Reform” started decades earlier, in 1825, when Széchenyi pledged a year’s worth of his income toward the establishment of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, and brought about a variety of economic and political developments. In another standard history text, Hughes and Wilkinson

²⁷ (*Contemporary Europe, a History*, 7th Ed.; Prentice Hall, 1961, page 5) wrote that „late nineteenth-century European society was frankly aristocratic” and they go on to explain that the nobility occupied positions of leadership throughout. Why make a negative point of this in the case of Hungary?

²⁸ Up until 1919 Croat members of the Hungarian parliament were allowed to use their own language. It was, of course, as unwise to speak Croatian, as for Senator Inouye to speak Hawaiian.

troops under General Alfred Windischgraetz still loyal to the Habsburgs. This victory emboldened the court party to attempt the liberation of Vienna. In October, Windischgraetz occupied the city after a bombardment and executed or exiled its radical leaders on the spot. Two months later the feeble-minded Ferdinand I was induced to step down in favor of his 18-year-old nephew, Franz Joseph I (1848-1916), who, unhampered by his predecessor's promises to the liberals, completed the process of restoration the following summer by crushing the Hungarian revolt with the aid of 140,000 Russian troops."

[857] In the mid-nineteenth century Habsburg empire:,Twelve million Germans controlled political power and enjoyed special status in a state that reached 50 million by 1914 and included 24 million Slavs to the south, 10 million Magyars and 4 million Rumanians to the east, as well as Czechs, Slovaks, Poles, Croats, Serbs, Italians and a variety of other ethnic groups. The Habsburgs made a number of attempts to bring the forces of nationalism under control, but neither reforms, the granting of limited provincial autonomy in 1859, nor the new constitution of 1861 was effective.

The Austro-Prussian war of 1866 demonstrated just how divided and weak the Austrian (sic) Empire was, and defeat provoked still one more effort at reform. After difficult negotiations, Emperor Franz Joseph reached a compromise (*Ausgleich*) with Hungarian leaders. The new constitution created the Dual Monarchy, in which Franz Joseph was both king of Hungary and emperor of Austria. Foreign affairs, finance, and military matters were conducted by common ministers, but otherwise the two parts of the monarchy was autonomous, each with its own constitution, official language, and parliament.

The *Ausgleich* did not, of course, eliminate the serious problems facing the empire but merely enabled the Hungarians to share with the Germans in its rule. The other nationality groups continued to demand their freedom." ... „However, in both halves of the Dual Monarchy most inhabitants were landless, backward peasants burdened by conservative landowners and heavy taxes. Despite the ancient lineage of the Habsburgs and the importance of its strategic position in Europe, the Dual Monarchy remained an anachronism in a Europe rapidly dividing along national lines.”²⁹

[947] In 1914, during WWI,Russians fared better against the Austrians (sic) overrunning Galicia and driving into Hungary. The Austrians suffered further setbacks in the Balkans, where the Serbs twice repelled their armies."

[951] „The peace terms with Germany's allies were hardly less severe. Austria was reduced to a third of its former size. Hungary was left with a fourth of its former territory. Bulgaria, too, lost land, and all three states had to reduce their armies.”³⁰

[975] By the end of the struggle the Bolsheviks had recovered much of the old imperial lands on the western front, except for the Baltic states and the territory lost to Romania and the new states of Czechoslovakia and Poland.”³¹

²⁹ Reading Daniel Patrick Moynihan's *Pandaemonium* (Oxford, 1993) would cause the reader to draw a diametrically opposite conclusion.

³⁰ It would be most useful to mention at this point that one out of three Magyars ended up as oppressed minorities in the 'successor states'.

³¹ No part of Czechoslovakia has ever been Russian imperial land. It was Northern Hungary.

[1021] „New states had arisen after 1919 out of the remnants of the shattered German, Austro-Hungarian, Russian, and Ottoman empires. These „successor” states were Poland, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, Hungary, Austria, Turkey, and the Baltic republics of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania. In these nations democracy proved less resistant to the political and economic stress of the postwar period.”

[1022] „A variety of factors retarded economic development. Before 1918 the region had functioned, directly or indirectly, as colonial territory for larger powers, which had supplied it with investments and manufactured goods in return for agricultural goods and raw materials. When the war ended, the area faced the sudden loss of secure markets and the inexpensive resources necessary for industrial modernization. To these problems were added a lack of native investment capital, outmoded commercial and agricultural structures, and inadequate communication and transportation systems. Indeed, except for portions of Czechoslovakia, Poland, and Austria, the economies of eastern Europe resembled those of colonial areas in Asia, Africa, or the Middle East.”

...,these states were characterized by enormous ethnoreligious diversity. For historical reasons, nearly all of them had a heterogeneous population composed of groups whose ethnic and religious affiliations were different from those of the ethnic majority. In some cases, notably Poland, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, Hungary, and Romania, these minorities formed a substantial proportion of the inhabitants.”³²

„Perhaps the most serious political liability was the intense nationalism that pervaded the region and colored the perceptions of leaders and common people alike. ...”

„It is hardly surprising that parliamentary democracies often failed to cope with these difficulties and gave way to authoritarian dictatorships. The first nation to adopt dictatorial government was Hungary,³³ which turned to Admiral Miklós Horthy after a short-lived Communist regime under Béla Kun in 1919.” ... „Only Czechoslovakia, under the leadership of Tomas Masaryk and Edvard Benes, managed to retain its democratic government, despite authoritarian tendencies and serious internal problems.”

[1030] Map showing „Central Europe, 1939” shows Czechoslovakia with „areas annexed by Hungary” labeled „Southern Slovakia.”³⁴

[1033] „Together with Hungarian and Bulgarian troops, the Germans overrun Yugoslavia and defeated Greece.”³⁵

³² This last statement is grossly untrue. The ‘successor states’ were carved out in such a manner that their border regions were almost entirely populated by Magyars. Hungary was left with virtually no minorities except perhaps a few isolated villages deep in Hungarian territory.

³³ After WWI Hungary remained a constitutional monarchy with Charles IV, Franz Joseph’s brother’s grandson, as king. Because the allied powers forced Charles into exile, the Hungarian parliament appointed Horthy as regent. While the country can not be called democratic in the western sense, the Hungarian parliament had a variety of parties in it, including a Social Democratic Party with some forty elected members. Only the Communist Party was outlawed. See John F. Montgomery: Hungary - the Unwilling Satellite, New-York: Devin-Adair Co. 1947.

³⁴ Why not label it, perhaps, „part of former Hungarian Highlands populated by Magyars”.

³⁵ Under German pressure, Hungary occupied part of its former southern territory detached some twenty years earlier. Hungarian Prime Minister Count Paul Teleki committed suicide on the eve of this action.

[1045] In 1944 ...by „July the situation had changed drastically, for the Red Army had overrun Poland, Romania, Hungary, Bulgaria, and most of Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia, and pro-Soviet governments dominated by Communists were installed.”

[1047] „In June 1947, Secretary of State George C. Marshall offered economic assistance to any European nation” ... „Although Czechoslovakia, Poland, and Hungary was interested, the Soviet Union vetoed their participation in the Marshall Plan. fearing that Western economic penetration would weaken its hold on the eastern European states.”

„In 1946 Stalin already controlled Poland, Romania, Bulgaria, and Albania, and over the next two years he consolidated Russian influence over Hungary and Czechoslovakia.”

[1144] „...between 1945 and 1947 the national front governments of Hungary and Czechoslovakia were true coalitions in which parties possessed a wide degree of freedom.”

[1145] „The October 1956 Hungarian revolution challenged to USSR more directly. When Hungarian police fired on protesters in Budapest, sparking anti-Soviet demonstrations, the government called in Soviet soldiers. Throughout the country, worker’s councils were formed, demanding free elections, the end of the security police, and the withdrawal of Soviet troops. On October 28, when Imre Nagy (1896-1958) became premier and the Soviets began to withdraw, it appeared that the Hungarians had won. Nagy announced the reestablishment of the multiparty system, and a return to the national front coalition of Communists, Social Democrats, and peasant leaders and proclaimed Hungarian neutrality between East and West. Convinced that a failure to respond would provoke further revolts throughout the Soviet bloc, Khrushchev ordered an invasion. Some 2,500 Russian tanks moved into Hungary, shelling Budapest and other cities. When the repression was over, thousands of Hungarians were dead and more than 200,000 refugees had fled. Though some westerners had urged or expected American intervention, none came.”

„The new Soviet-installed Hungarian premier, János Kádár (1912-1989) cautiously led the nation to a more liberal form of communism over the next three decades. Imprisoned for nationalist activity earlier in his life, Kádár understood his country’s desire for reform and independence. By the early 1960’s he had removed Stalinists from the Hungarian Communist party and induced programs that improved the standard of living. Although Kádár’s role in the 1956 uprising undermined his leadership in the eyes of many, he remained in power until 1988.”

[1161] „In the last months of 1989, ... in the late summer East Germans, frustrated by the refusal of Communist party leader Erich Honecker (born 1912) to institute reforms, began leaving their country for the West. As East Germany celebrated its fortieth anniversary in October, mass demonstrations were organized and the number of refugees reached tens of thousands.”³⁶

„Inspired by success in Poland and Germany, the people of Hungary and Czechoslovakia moved cautiously toward liberation. In Hungary, despite reforms that permitted private enterprises, economic setbacks resulted in the fall of János Kádár in 1988. Deep-seated dissatisfaction led to the emergence of new political parties, a change of name in the Hungarian Communist party, and free elections, in which the Communists were repudiated.”

³⁶ No mention is made here of the fact that their escape was made possible by the Hungarian government that opened the Iron Curtain.

II. Kagan

Kagan, Donald & Steven Ozment, Frank M. Turner: The Western Heritage, Fourth Ed.; New York: Macmillan, 1991. pp. 1157.

In its fourth edition, this book can be considered to be one of the classics among American textbooks for general western cultural traditions courses. One of interesting features of the book is the inclusion of a number of original historical documents.

[209] Hungary first appears in the book on the map depicting the Byzantine Empire in A.D. 1025

[237] „The late ninth and the tenth centuries saw successive waves of Normans ... from Scandinavia, Magyars, or Hungarians, the great horsemen from the eastern plains; and Muslims from the south.” Map shows Hungarian migration routes from the Volga region to the West without date.³⁷

[244] Henry I „secured imperial borders by checking the invasions of the Hungarians and the Danes.”

Otto I, In 955 he won his most magnificent victory when he defeated the Hungarians at Lechfeld. The feat was comparable to Charles Martel’s earlier victory over the Saracens at Poitiers in 732 in terms of defining western boundaries. The victory at Lechfeld secured German borders against new barbarian attack, further unified the German duchies, and earned Otto the well-deserved title „the Great”.³⁸

[273] Table entitled „Major Political Events of High Middle Ages” states: „955 - Otto I defeats Hungarians at Lechfeld, securing Europe’s eastern border.”³⁹

[336] Hungary is mentioned among countries supporting the Roman pope, Urban VI in 1378.

[392] Hungary appears on map captioned „The Empire of Charles V.”⁴⁰

[393] In a segment entitled „Imperial Distractions: France and the Turks”... „In 1526 the Turks overrun Hungary at the Battle of Mohács, while in Western Europe the French-led league of Cognac formed against Charles...” ... „thus preoccupied, the emperor agreed” ... etc.

[404] „Poland, primarily because of the absence of central political authority, became a model of religious pluralism and toleration in the second half of the sixteenth century.”⁴¹

³⁷ By the end of the ninth century Magyars were settled in the Carpathian basin, although they raided the west frequently for another sixty years.

³⁸ Otto’s granddaughter, Gisele (sister of Henry II, the Saint) married Stephen I of Hungary, who has firmly established western Christianity in Hungary.

³⁹ The author defines Europe as the range of Western Civilization, located east of Augsburg at the time.

⁴⁰ While Charles’ brother Ferdinand was crowned king of Hungary in 1526, it was a part of Charles’s empire only according to the family laws of the Habsburgs. At the same time John Zápolya was also crowned king, - both paid tribute to Suleiman the Great.

[426] Full page portrait shows Titian's picture of „Alfonso d'Avalos, Marchese del Vasto (1541) famed Spanish military commander, who helped stop the advance of the Turks under Suleiman the Magnificent into eastern Europe in the 1530's”⁴²

[458] Map showing Habsburg holdings is confusing.⁴³

[536] In explaining the Turkish siege of Vienna in 1683: The Ottomans... „In the outer provinces, such as Transylvania, Wallachia, and Moldavia (all parts of modern Romania) the empire depended on the good will of the local rulers, who never submitted themselves fully to the imperial power.”

...„In 1699 the Turks concluded a treaty with their longtime Habsburg enemy and surrendered all pretensions of control over Hungary, Transylvania, Croatia and Slavonia.”

[538] On the consolidation of Habsburg power at the close of the Thirty Year's War: Hereditary possessions included: ... „the Crown of Saint Stephen which ruled Hungary, Croatia, and Transylvania.”

[539] Map showing „The Austrian Habsburg Empire, 1521-1772” depicts Croatia as located from the Adriatic all the way to Galicia. Clearly, the mapmaker confused it with Royal Hungary as it looked before the recapture of the rest of that country from the Ottomans.

The text states: „The most difficult province was Hungary, where the magyar nobility was ever ready to rebel. There was almost no common basis for political unity among peoples of such diverse languages, customs, and geography. Even the Habsburg zeal for Roman Catholicism no longer proved a bond for unity as they continued to confront the equally zealous Calvinism of the Magyar nobles.”⁴⁴ Over the years the Habsburgs established various central councils to chart common policies for their far-flung domains. Virtually all of these bodies dealt with only a portion of the Habsburgs' holdings. Repeatedly they found themselves compelled to bargain with nobles in one part of Europe in order to maintain their position in another.

Despite all these internal difficulties Leopold I (1657-1705) rallied his domains to resist the advances of the Turks and to resist the aggression of Louis XIV. He received Ottoman recognition of his sovereignty over Hungary in 1699 and suppressed the long rebellion of his new Magyar subjects between 1703 and 1711. He also extended his territorial holdings over much of what is today Yugoslavia and western Romania.”

[603] In the section entitled” Maria Theresa Preserved the Habsburg Empire” ...„she succeeded in rallying to her side the Magyars of Hungary and the aristocratic leaders of her other domains.” ...

⁴¹ Transylvania would be another example, where religious freedom was constitutionally guaranteed between 1571 and 1691.

⁴² There is no record of this person in the history of Hungary's wars with the Turks. Most likely this picture was a vanity project.

⁴³ The western part of Hungary, including western Croatia, with its capital Pozsony (Pressburg, today Bratislava) was „Royal Hungary” under St. Stephen's crown worn by the Habsburg kings.

⁴⁴ Not only the nobles, most Hungarians after the Reformation. Then again, the *cuius regio, eius religio* rule was prevalent throughout Europe at the time.

„Maria Theresa achieved these new loyalties, especially between herself and the Magyars, not merely through heroism but more specifically by granting new privileges to the nobles of the various Habsburg realms. The empress recognized Hungary as the most important of her crowns and promised the Magyars considerable local autonomy. In this fashion she preserved the Habsburg state, but at considerable cost to the power of the central monarchy. Hungary would continue in the future to be, as it had been in the past, a particularly troublesome area of the Habsburg empire. When the monarchy enjoyed periods of strength and security, guarantees made to Hungary were sometimes ignored. At times of weakness or when the Magyars could stir sufficient opposition, the monarchy made new promises or concessions.”

[749] In the section on „Nationalism”: „The idea of nationhood based on language and ethnic bonds was not necessarily or even logically linked to liberalism. There were conservative nationalists, and there were nationalists who wished their own particular national group to dominate smaller national or ethnic groups within a particular region. This was very much the case of the Hungarian Magyars who sought to gain political control over non-Magyar peoples living within the historical boundaries of Hungary.”

[795] Picture: „Louis Kossuth (1802-1894) Hungarian nationalist led the revolution of 1848 in Budapest.”

„The Hungarian Diet also abolished serfdom in March 1848. These actions smothered the most serious potential threat to order in the empire. The emancipated serfs now had little reason to support the revolutionary movement in the cities.”

„The Magyar Revolt. The Vienna revolt had further encouraged the Hungarians. The leaders of the Hungarian March revolution were primarily liberal Magyars supported by Magyar nobles who wanted their aristocratic liberties⁴⁵ guaranteed against the central government of Vienna. The Hungarian Diet passed a series of March Laws that ensured equality of religion, jury trials, the election of a lower chamber, a relatively free press, and payment of taxes by the nobility. Emperor Ferdinand approved these measures because in the spring of 1848 he was in position to do little else.

The Magyars also hoped to establish a separate Hungarian state within the Habsburg domains. They would retain considerable local autonomy while Ferdinand remained their emperor.⁴⁶ As part of this scheme for a partially independent state, the Hungarians attempted to annex Transylvania, Croatia, and other territories on the eastern border of the Habsburg empire.⁴⁷ That policy of annexation would bring Romanians, Croatians, and Serbians under Magyar government. These national groups resisted the drive toward Magyarization. They believed that they had a better chance of maintaining their national or ethnic identity and self-interest under Habsburg control. Consequently, they turned against Hungary. In late March the Vienna government sent Baron Joseph Jellachich to aid the national groups who were rebelling against the rebellious Hungarians. By early September 1848 he was leading an invasion force against Hungary.”

⁴⁵ They had relinquished their noble prerogatives, paid taxes, what they insisted on was Hungary’s liberty.

⁴⁶ King, really, he was ruling under St. Stephen’s crown.

⁴⁷ All parts of „St. Stephen’s crown.”

[797] „On December 2 Emperor Ferdinand. now clearly too feeble to govern, abdicated in favor of his young nephew Francis Joseph (1848-1916). Real power now lay with Prince Felix Schwartzemberg (1800-1852), who intended to use the army with full force.

On January 5, 1849, troops occupied Budapest. By March the triumphant Austrian forces had imposed military rule over Hungary,⁴⁸ and the new emperor repudiated the recent constitution. The Magyar nobles attempted one last revolt. It was crushed in August by Austrian troops reinforced by 200,000 soldiers happily furnished by Tsar Nicholas I of Russia. The imperial Habsburg government had survived its gravest internal challenge because of the diversions among its enemies and its own willingness to use military force with a vengeance.”⁴⁹

[826] „In 1860 Francis Joseph issued the October Diploma, which created a federation among the states and provinces of the empire. There were to be local diets dominated by the landed classes and a single imperial parliament. The Magyar nobility of Hungary rejected the plan.”⁵⁰

[827] Picture shows the coronation of Francis Joseph as king of Hungary in 1867.

....„Again the Magyars refused to cooperate in a system designed to permit German speaking Austrian domination of the empire. The Hungarians sent no delegates to the legislature. Nevertheless, for six years, the February Patent governed the empire, and it prevailed in Austria proper until World War I.”

„Meanwhile, negotiations continued between the emperor and the Magyars. These produced no concrete results until the defeat of Austria by Prussia in the summer of 1866 and the consequent exclusion of Austria from German affairs. The military disaster compelled Francis Joseph to come to terms with the Magyars. The subsequent Ausgleich, or Compromise, of 1867 transformed the Habsburg Empire into a dual monarchy.”

„Francis Joseph was separately crowned king of Hungary in Budapest. Except for the common monarch, Austria and Hungary became almost wholly separate states. They shared ministers of foreign affairs, defense, and finance, but the other ministers were different for each state. There were also separate parliaments. Each year sixty parliamentary delegates from each state were to meet to discuss matters of mutual interest. Every ten years Austria and Hungary were to renegotiate their trade relationship. By this cumbersome machinery, unique in all European history, the Hungarian Magyars were reconciled to Habsburg rule. They had achieved the free hand they had long wanted in local Hungarian matters.”

[828 - 829] „Unrest of Nationalities”

....„In Hungary the principle of political loyalty was based on nationality because Hungary had been recognized as a distinct part of the monarchy on the basis of nationalism. In effect Hungary had been recognized as a distinct Magyar nation under the Habsburg emperor.” ...

⁴⁸ Then came Hungary’s Spring Offensive, beginning on March 20, 1849: Habsburg forces under Puchner were driven out of Transylvania into Bukovina; the armies of Windisch-Graetz were beaten in a series of major battles and about to be driven out of Hungary, the fort of Buda was taken after a siege, and Windisch-Graetz was desperately begging the emperor for fresh troops. Then came the Russians.

⁴⁹ This whole description of Hungary’s 1848 - 49 revolution is grossly biased and distorted.

⁵⁰ Strangely, the author refers to the Magyar „nobility” throughout while he does not do so when it comes to, for example, British nobility as leaders of their country.

„Many of those other national groups - including the Czechs, the Ruthenians, the Romanians, and the Serbo-Croations (sic)⁵¹ - opposed the Compromise of 1867 that in effect had permitted the German-speaking Austrians and the Hungarian Magyars to dominate all other nationalities within the empire. The most vocal critics were the Czechs of Bohemia. They favored a policy of trialism or triple monarchy. In 1871 Francis Joseph was willing to accept this concept. However, the Hungarian Magyars vetoed the proposal for fear that they might have to make similar concessions to their own subject nationalities.”...

„In effect, by 1914 constitutionalism was a dead letter in Austria. It flourished in Hungary, but only because the Magyars relentlessly exercised political supremacy over all other competing national groups.

[830] Map showing „Nationalities within the Habsburg Empire” in caption:„Only the Magyars were recognized in 1867, leaving nationalist Czechs, Slovaks, and the others chronically dissatisfied.”

[851] „In Austria-Hungary full legal rights were extended to Jews in 1867. Indeed, from approximately 1850 to 1880 there was relatively little organized or overt prejudice toward Jews. They entered the professions and other occupations once closed to them. They participated fully in the literary and cultural life in their nations. They were active in the arts and music. They became leaders in science and education. Jews intermarried freely with non-Jews as legal secular prohibitions against such marriages were repealed during the last quarter of the century.”

[952] In 1919„The revolution seemed likely to spread as communist governments were established in Bavaria and Hungary.”

[955] „The Austro-Hungarian Empire disappeared entirely, giving way to many smaller successor states.”

„The Magyars occupied the much-reduced kingdom of Hungary.” ...

„Romania was enlarged by receiving Transylvania from Hungary...”

[956] „It was not a peace without victors. It did not put an end to imperialism, but attempted to promote the national interests of the winning nations. It violated the principles of national self-determination by leaving significant pockets of minorities outside the borders of their national homelands.”⁵²

[957] „The peace, nevertheless, was unsatisfactory in important ways. The elimination of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, however inevitable that might seem, created a number of serious problems. Economically it was disastrous, ...”

„Poland contained unhappy German minorities, and Czechoslovakia was a collection of nationalities that did not find it easy to live together as a nation. Disputes over territories in eastern Europe promoted further tension.”⁵³

[963-964] The political reconstruction of eastern and central Europe into the multitude of small successor states broke up the trade region formerly encompassed by Germany and Austria-Hungary. Most of those new states had weak economies hardly capable of competing

⁵¹ The word ‘Croations’ is often misspelled this way throughout this book. They are *Croats*.

⁵² One third of the Magyar population became minorities in the successor countries.

⁵³ No mention is made of the single biggest minority group of Europe, the Hungarians.

in modern economic life. The new boundaries separated raw materials from the factories using them. Railway systems on which finished and unfinished products traveled might now lie under the control of two or more nations. Political and economic nationalism went together. New customs barriers were raised.”

[965] „In 1920 and 1921 three eastern states that had much to lose from revision of the treaty - Czechoslovakia, Romania, and Yugoslavia - formed the Little Entente.”...

...,the main target of the Little Entente was Hungary.”

[971] „It had been an article of faith among nineteenth-century liberals that only good could flow from the demise of Austria-Hungary. The new states in eastern Europe were to symbolize the principle of national self-determination and to provide a buffer against the westward spread of Bolshevism.”

„HUNGARY In Hungary during 1919 the Bolsheviks had erected a socialist government led by Béla Kun (1885-1937). The Allies quickly authorized⁵⁴ an invasion by Romanian troops to remove the communist danger. They then established Admiral Miklós Horthy (1858-1957) as regent, a position he held until 1944⁵⁵. During the 1920s the effective ruler of Hungary was Count Stephen Bethlen (1874-1947). He presided over a government that was parliamentary in form but aristocratic in character. In 1932 he was succeeded by General Julius Gömbös (1886-1936), who pursued policies of anti-Semitism and rigged elections. Now matter how the popular vote turned out, the Gömbös party controlled the Parliament. There was also deep resentment in Hungary over the territory it had lost to other nations through the Paris settlement.”

[1034] „Even in the short run the appeasement of Hitler at Munich was a failure. Soon Poland and Hungary tore bits of territory from Czechoslovakia.”

[1035] Map captioned „Partitions of Czechoslovakia and Poland” shows areas „Acquired by Hungary, 1938 - 39.”⁵⁶

[1063] „By 1944 ... Soviet armies ... gained control of Romania and Hungary, advances of which centuries of expansionist tsars had only dreamed. Alarmed by these developments, Churchill went to Moscow and met with Stalin in October. They agreed to share power in the Balkans on the basis of Soviet predominance in Romania and Bulgaria, Western predominance in Greece, and equality of influence in Yugoslavia and Hungary. These agreements were not enforceable without American approval and the Americans were known to be hostile to such un-Wilsonian devices as „spheres of influence”.”

[1065],it was not until 1947 that Italy, Romania, Hungary, Bulgaria, and Finland signed treaties.”

[1077] „Unlike the NATO states, the eastern alliance system was under direct Soviet domination through local Communist parties controlled from Moscow and overawed by the presence of the red Army. The Warsaw Pact of May 1955, which included Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, Hungary, Poland, Romania, and the Soviet Union, merely gave formal recognition to a system that already existed.”

⁵⁴The invasion was against the express orders of the Peace Commission. See H. H. Bandholtz: An Undiplomatic Diary, New-York: Columbia University Press, 1933.

⁵⁵ See the Annotated Memoirs of Admiral Miklos Horthy, Regent of Hungary.

⁵⁶ These were areas largely populated by Magyars.

[1092] In 1956 ...,the Soviet Union confronted major political crises in Poland and Hungary. In the latter case the Soviets used troops to crush a popular revolt against Communist Party domination.”

[1093] Photograph showing street fighting scene in Budapest in October, 1956.

„UPRISING IN HUNGARY Hungary provided the second trouble spot for the Soviet Union. In late October, as the Polish problem was approaching a solution, demonstrations of sympathy for the Polish people occurred in Budapest. The communist government moved to stop the demonstrations, and street fighting erupted. A new ministry (sic) headed by former premier Imre Nagy (1896-1958) was installed by the Hungarian Communist Party.”

„Nagy was a communist who sought a more independent position for Hungary. He went much further in his demands than had Gomulka in Poland, and Nagy made direct appeals for political support from non-Communist groups in Hungary. Nagy called for the removal of Soviet troops and the ultimate neutralization of Hungary. He even went so far as to call for Hungarian withdrawal from the Warsaw Pact. These demands were wholly unacceptable to the Soviet Union. In early November Soviet troops invaded the country, deposed Nagy, who was later executed, and imposed János Kádár (b. 1912) as premier.”

...,the failure of the United States to take any action in the Hungarian uprising demonstrated the hollowness of American political rhetoric about liberating the captive nations of eastern Europe.”

[1149] Map captioned „The Real Nations in the Center of Europe” ...,This map illustrates the chief ethnic borders in the area and indicates where there are major ethnic enclaves within areas generally dominated by a single ethnic group.” Hungarian minority areas are correctly identified with the exception of the Hungarian minority in Carpatho-Ukraine.

[1150] On the year of revolutions in eastern Europe, 1989: „HUNGARY Of the eastern European nations, Hungary had for some time demonstrated the most economic independence of the Soviet Union.” ... „In January its parliament passed legislation to permit independent political parties. Soon thereafter the government opened the Hungarian border with Austria and permitted the free travel between the two nations. One immediate result was the movement of thousands of East Germans into Austria through Hungary. from Austria they proceeded into West Germany. This situation marked the first breach in the Iron Curtain.”

„Not long thereafter⁵⁷ ... Kádár ... was voted from office ... people gave a honored burial to the body of Hungarian Premier Imre Nagy ...”

„In October Hungary proclaimed itself an independent republic. ... By 1990 a coalition of democratic parties controlled by the parliament governed the country.”

⁵⁷ Before, not thereafter, in 1988.

III. Kishlansky

Kishlansky, Mark & Patrick Geary, Patricia O'Brien: Civilizations in the West; New York, NY: HarperCollins, 1991. pp. 1021.

This beautifully illustrated comprehensive text is probably a strong competitor compared to others reviewed. As the title indicates, it concentrates on the western civilizations. This would indicate that it may contain more details than, for example, Greaves' text, which is about the same length. In the introduction the writers claim that:

[xxi] „with the help of a specialist reviewer, we worked to integrate more of the history of eastern Europe” ... „presented these regions as integral,” ... „rather than peripheral to Western Civilization.”

[220] Hungary first appear on a map captioned „The Crusades”, being on the path of the 1096 and 1189 campaigns.

[221] Kingdom of Hungary is depicted on map captioned „The Ottoman Empire, ca. 1450”.

[248] In the article entitled „A Tour of Europe in the Ninth Century” Magyars are located between the Dnestr and Dnieper Rivers.

[251] On map Magyars are shown to enter the Carpathian basin from the east „ca. 896” and the approximate boundaries of the „Magyar Kingdom” is drawn in with Visegrád shown. The text indicates that „In 906 a new steppe people, the Magyars, or Hungarians, swept into Pannonia as had the Huns and Avars before them. These new invaders destroyed the Franks' puppet Moravian empire and split the Slavic world in two.”

„The Magyar Kingdom proved a greater threat to the Franks than the Slavs or Avars. The Magyars not only conquered Pannonia as far as the Enns River, but they raided deep into the Carolingian empire. For fifty years swift bands of Magyar horsemen crossed the Alps and pillaged the Po Valley, terrorizing the eastern portions of the empire, and even striking as far west as modern Burgundy.”

[252] „The frankish armies ... were too clumsy and slow to deal with the lightning raids of Northmen, Magyars, and Saracens.”

[255] „Duke Henry of Saxony (919 - 36), who had proven his abilities fighting the Danes and Magyars. Henry's son Otto the Great (936 - 73), proved to be a strong ruler who subdued the other dukes and definitely crushed the Magyars.”

[262] „In Hungary during the twelfth century free peasants and unfree servants merged to form a stratum of serf tied to the emerging landed aristocracy and the lesser nobility composed of free warriors.” ... „The aristocracy rose on the backs of the peasantry.”

[294] „...descendants of Charles of Anjou” ... „Charles Robert secured election as king of Hungary in 1310. His son Louis (1342 - 82) added the crown of Poland (1370-82) to the Hungarian crown of St. Stephen.”⁵⁸

⁵⁸ St. Stephen, his four hundred year long dynasty, the House of Árpád with its five saints (St. Stephen, St. Emeric, St. Margaret, St. Elisabeth, St. Ladislaus) are not mentioned in the book. Nor in any of the others either. See: C.A. Macartney: Hungary, a Short History, Edinburgh Univ. Press, 1961.

[295] ...,the Christian kingdoms of Poland, Bohemia, and Hungary beckoned different sorts of westerners. Newly opened silver and copper mines in Bohemia, Silesia, southern Poland and Hungarian Transylvania needed skilled miners and artisans. Many were recruited from the overpopulated regions of western Germany. East west trade routes developed to export these metals, giving new life to the Bohemian towns of Prague and Brno, the Polish cities of Cracow and Lwow, and Hungarian Buda and Bratislava.”

„The wealth of eastern Europe, its abundant land, and its relative freedom attracted both peasants and merchants. The promise of profitable marriages with eastern royalty drew ambitious aristocrats.⁵⁹ Continually menaced by one another and by the aggressive German aristocracy to the west, the royal families of Poland, Hungary, and Bohemia were eager to make marriage alliances with powerful aristocratic families from farther afield. Through such marriage, for example, Charles Robert of Anjou became king of Hungary after the extinction of that realm’s ancient royal dynasty. Similarly, Charles Robert’s son Louis inherited the Polish crown in 1370 after the death of Casimir III, the last king of the Polish Piast dynasty. Nobles of the eastern European kingdoms were pleased to confirm the election of such outsiders. The election prevented powerful German nobles from claiming succession to the Bohemian, Hungarian, and Polish thrones. At the same time, the families of the western European aristocracy did not have sufficiently strong local power bases to challenge the autonomy of the eastern nobility. For the outsiders, eastern alliances meant the expansion of family power and the promise of glory.”

[296] Map showing „Eastern Europe, ca. 1378” identifies Buda as ‘Ofen’ and Pozsony as ‘Bratislava’. (The former is German, the latter is Slovak equivalent.)

[297] Charles IV’s son ... „Sigismund, king of Germany (1410 - 37), of Bohemia (1419 - 37), of Hungary (1387-1437), and Holy Roman Emperor (1433 - 37).”

[349] „... the Ottomans had replaced the stagnant Byzantine rule with a virile and potent empire.” ... „First they gobbled up the towns and cities in a wide arc around Constantinople. Then they fed upon the Balkans and the eastern kingdoms of Hungary and Poland. By 1400 they were a presence in all the territory that stretched from the Black Sea to the Aegean.”

[366] By 1500, ...,A perilous frontier was established on the Balkan peninsula. There the principalities of Moldava, Wallachia, Transylvania, and Hungary held out against the Ottomans for another quarter century before being overrun.”

„Poland-Lithuania ... their dynastic history was tied up with the nations of Bohemia and Hungary to their west and south. While Bohemia was increasingly drawn into the affairs of central Europe, Hungary remained more eastern in orientation. This was partly because the Bohemians gave nominal allegiance to the Holy Roman Emperor and partly because the Ottoman conquests had engulfed a large part of Hungarian territories. At the end of the fifteenth century Poland, Lithuania, Bohemia, and Hungary were all ruled by the same family, the Jagiellons.”

[373] „While the Polish-Lithuanian monarchs enjoyed longevity similar to that of the Muscovites, those who ruled Hungary and Bohemia were not so fortunate. By the sixteenth century a number of claimants to both crowns existed and competition was handled by diplomacy rather than war. The accession of Vladislav II, for example, by large concessions first to the Bohemian towns and later to the Hungarian nobility.”

⁵⁹ That would have been *mesalliance* by the royals.

„There were many reasons why a unified state did not appear in east central Europe. In the first place, external forces disrupted territorial and political arrangements. Wars with the Ottomans and the Russians absorbed resources. Second, the princes faced rivals to their crowns. Though Casimir IV was able to place his son on the thrones of both Bohemia and Hungary, he managed to do so against the powerful claims of the Habsburg princes, who continued to intrigue against the Jagellions. These contests for power necessitated concessions to leading citizens, which decreased the ability of the princes to centralize their kingdoms or to effect real unification among them. The nobility of Hungary, Bohemia, and Poland-Lithuania all developed strong local interests that increased over time.”

[382] After the victory at Pavia in 1525 ... Charles V (of Habsburg) ... „Charles’ position was much less secure than it appeared. The Ottomans threatened his Hungarian territories and the Protestants threatened his German lands.”⁶⁰

[383] „...Francis I (of France) entered into an alliance with the Ottoman Sultan, Suleiman the Magnificent (1520 - 66), whose armies were pressing against the southeastern borders of the Holy Roman Empire. In the year following Pavia, the Ottomans secured an equally decisive triumph at Mohács, which cut Hungary in two, and threatened Vienna, the eastern capital of Habsburg lands.”

„The French were no more capable of dislodging the Habsburgs from Italy than were the Habsburgs of forcing the Ottomans out of Hungary.”⁶¹

[408] „Anabaptists ... were driven to town to town ... from Germany to Swiss cities, from Switzerland into Bohemia and Hungary.”

[422] In the sixteenth century. ..”in Hungary and Bohemia, the great (cattle) breeding center of the continent, they were raised for export;...”

[423] „German and Hungarian peasants normally owed two or three days’ labor on the lord’s estate each week.”

[437] „...vagrants in Hungary were sold into slavery.”

[438] „A call for a crusade against Ottoman advances in 1514 provided opportunity for Hungarian peasants to revolt against their noble landlords. Thousands dropped their plowshares and grasped the sword for a holy war. But, in fact, war against the Ottomans did not materialize. Instead the mobilized peasants under the leadership of disaffected army officers and clergymen, issued grievances against the labor service that they owed to their lords as well as numerous violations of customary agricultural practices. Their revolt turned into a civil war and was crushed with great brutality.”

[452] „Only Poland-Lithuania, Hungary, and a few German states experimented with religious toleration during the sixteenth century.”

[457] „Lewis (II) of Hungary died at the battle of Mohács in 1526..”

[466] Map showing „Northeastern Europe, ca. 1550” depicts Hungary as a sliver adjoining Austria. Transylvania is not shown, it is absorbed into the Ottoman Empire on the map.

[467] „Poland was the only state in Europe where religious toleration was practiced as well as preached.”

⁶⁰ Hungary’s king at that time was Louis II who lost his life at Mohács in 1526, furthermore Hungary was never a part of the Holy Roman Empire.

⁶¹ The Turks withdrew from Hungary after Mohács and did not return until 1541.

[468] On the family tree of the Jagellion monarchy „Barbara of Transylvania” shown to be the wife of Sigismund I (1506 - 48)

[473] After 1618,„Fear of Ferdinand’s (religious) policies led to Protestant uprisings in Hungary as well as Bohemia.”

[479] After the Peace of Westphalia (1648)„the Austro-Hungarian empire (was) at a beginning,”

[507] The maps of „Russia under Peter the Great” labels the Habsburg empire as „Austria”.

[540] On the map Hungary is shown as part of the Grand Alliance during the war of the Spanish Succession (1702 -14).⁶²

[552] „...in the middle of the seventeenth century ... the Ottomans made their last great thrust into the interior of Europe. They captured more of Hungary and threatened Leopold’s hereditary lands. In 1683 the Ottomans besieged Vienna itself, and only the arrival of seventy thousand Polish-led troops saved it from falling. But from that time forward, Austrian forces scored stunning victories. By 1699 almost all of Hungary had been retaken by Austria; at the Treaty of Passarowitz in 1718 Austria gained the rest of Hungary and Serbia.”⁶³

[562] By the beginning of the eighteenth century....„The Austrian empire was composed of Austria and Bohemia, the Habsburg hereditary lands, and as much of Hungary as could be controlled.”

[565] „Austrian forces recaptured a large part of Hungary from the Turks, thereby expanding their territory to the south and the east. Hereditary ruler of Austria, Bohemia, King of Hungary, and Holy Roman Emperor of the German nation, Charles VI (1711 - 40) was recognized as one of Europe’s most potent rulers.”

[566] „Maria Theresa (1740 - 80) quickly discovered what it was like to be a pregnant woman in a man’s world. In 1740 Frederick of Prussia invaded the rich Austrian province of Silesia and attracted allies for an assault upon Vienna. Faced with Bavarian, Saxon, and Prussian armies, Maria Theresa might well have lost her inheritance had she not shown her remarkable capacities so early in her reign. She appeared before the Hungarian estates, accepted their crown, and persuaded them to provide her with an army capable of halting the allied advance. Though she was unable to reconquer Silesia, Hungarian aid helped her hold the line against her enemies, ...”

....„The efforts of Maria Theresa and Joseph II to overcome provincial autonomy worked better in Austria and Bohemia than in Hungary. The Hungarians declined to contribute at all to state revenues, and Joseph II took the unusual step of refusing to be crowned king of Hungary so that he would not have to make any concessions to Hungarian autonomy. He even imposed a tariff on Hungarian goods sold in Austria.”⁶⁴

⁶² Prince Ferenc Rákóczi’s rebellion between 1703 and 1711 was in alliance with Louis XIV, during which time Rákóczi’s forces dominated practically the whole territory of Hungary with the exception of Transylvania. It was another phase of the Thirty Years’ War.

⁶³ Actually it was more of an all-European effort. For example, General James Oglethorpe, founder of the state of Georgia has allegedly fought in that campaign.

⁶⁴ As the Hungarians have it, at the Diet in Pozsony (now Bratislava) their representatives declared: „*Vitam et sanguinem pro rege nostro, Maria Theresia, sed avenam non.*” (Our lives and blood for our Queen, but no grains.)

[580] On the nobility: „Some of them were wealthy beyond description, like the Esterházy family of Hungary, who owned in excess of 10 million acres of land and controlled 700,000 peasants. But also considered part of the Hungarian nobility was the much larger number called the „sandal nobility” because of their reputed inability to buy proper shoes⁶⁵. While Prince Miklós Esterházy (1714 - 90) built himself a palace modeled on Versailles, most of the sandal nobility lived in houses of clay roofed in reeds.”

[581] In different parts of Europe the nobility used different methods to maintain their land-based wealth. In places like Britain, Spain, Austria, and Hungary forms of entail were the rule. Simply, the entail was a restriction prohibiting the breakup of a landed estate either through sale or inheritance.”

[591] „By the end of the eighteenth century, ... by contrast, the Russian and Hungarian urban elites were less than 2 percent of the population...”

[597] About the significant growth of Europe’s population: ... Russia and Hungary may have tripled in number.”⁶⁶

[598] „In the late eighteenth century the average age at marriage for Hungarian women had dropped to 18.6.”

[599] The widespread practice of quarantine, especially in Hungary, which had been the crucial bridge between eastern and western epidemics, (i.e. the plague) went far to eradicate the scourge of centuries.”

[602] In the 18th century: „In Russia, Prussia, and Hungary hundreds of thousands of new acres came under the plow, though it must be admitted that some of it simply went to replace land that had been wastefully exhausted in previous generations.”

[634] Map labels Hungary as „Austria”, however on page -

[646] subsequently it is correctly labeled as „Habsburg empire”.

[675] In the article entitled „The Lands That Time Forgot” lack of industrial development is caused by the fact that ... „Austria-Hungary and Spain, faced difficulties of transport and communications that could not easily to overcome.” ...

„Two thirds of Austria-Hungary is either mountains or hills, a geographic feature that presented obstacles that not even the railroads could easily solve. But there was far more than natural disadvantage behind the failure of these parts of Europe to move in step with the industrializing states. Their social structure, agricultural organization, and commercial policies all hindered the adoption of new methods, machines and modes of production.”

[676] „In Hungary, Poland, and Russia it was illegal for people to change occupations, and serfs who engaged in industrial activity paid their lords for the privilege.”

[677] „In Austria-Hungary, for example, it was Hungary that was kept from industrializing, first by the continuation of the serf-based agriculture, then by the high internal tariffs that favored Austrian over Hungarian manufactures.”

[682 through 686] Text uses „Austrian empire” throughout, rather than „Habsburg empire”.

⁶⁵ They, however, were free of taxation.

⁶⁶ Large-scale immigration by Serbs and Romanians into Hungary escaping their Turkish occupied homelands led to major problems later.

[695] „Hungarian concert pianist Franz Liszt (1811 - 86), who composed symphonic poems and Hungarian rhapsodies.”

[705] In the article entitled „The Revolutions of 1848”:„Austria, Hungary, and Bohemia were shaken to their foundations. Switzerland, Denmark, and Romania experienced lesser upheavals.”⁶⁷

[708] „Liberal lawyers, teachers, and businessmen from Dublin to Budapest to Prague agitated for the separation from foreign rule. Austria, with an empire formed of numerous ethnic minorities, had the most to lose. Since 1815, Metternich had been ruthless in stamping out nationalist dissent. By the 1840’s national claims were assuming a cultural legitimacy that was difficult to dismiss or ignore.”

Map on this page, again, depicts the „Austrian empire.”

[710] „Revolution in Austrian-dominated central Europe was concentrated in three places: Vienna ...; Budapest, where the Magyars, the dominant ethnic group in Hungary, led a movement for national autonomy; and Prague, where the Czechs were attempting self rule. By April 1848, Metternich had fallen from power and the Viennese revolutionaries had set up a constituent assembly. In Budapest, the initial steps of patriot Lajos Kossuth (1802 - 94) toward establishing a separate Hungarian state seemed equally solid, as the Magyars defeated Habsburg troops. Habsburg armies were more successful in Prague, where they crushed the revolution in June, 1848.”

[711] „By the fall of 1849, Austria had solved the problems in its own capital and with Italy and Hungary by military dominance. Emperor Ferdinand I (1835 - 48), whose authority had been weakened irreparably by the overthrow of Metternich, abdicated in favor of his eighteen-year-old nephew, Franz Josef I (1848-1916).”

[723] „In 1867, in response to pressures from the subject nationalities, the Habsburg Empire transformed itself to a dual monarchy of two independent and equal states under one ruler, who would be both the emperor of Austria, and the king of Hungary. In spite of the reorganization, the nationalities problem persisted, and the ethnic groups began to agitate for total independence from imperial rule.”

[762] In the article entitled „Defeating Liberalism in Austria”: „In the 1870s the liberal values of the bourgeoisie dominated the Austro-Hungarian Empire. The Habsburg monarchy had adjusted to constitutional government, ...”

[789] „Even in autocratic states like Austria-Hungary, the opinion of the masses was a powerful political force that could destroy individual careers and dissolve governments.”

[809] „In 1873 Bismarck joined the three most conservative powers of the Big Five - Germany, Austria-Hungary, and Russia - into the Three Emperors’ League.”

[810] „Austria-Hungary was Europe’s second largest landed nation and the third largest in population. The same factors that had made it a great European power - its size and diversity - now threatened to destroy it. The ramshackle empire of Europe, it had no geographical unity. Its vulnerability came from within, from the centrifugal forces of linguistic and cultural diversity. Weakened by nationalities clamoring for independence and self-rule and by an unresponsive political system, Austria-Hungary remained backward agriculturally and unable to respond to the Western industrial challenge. It seemed most likely to collapse from social and political pressures.”

⁶⁷ Romania did not exist until 1862.

[812] „A second war broke out in 1913 over Serbian interests in Bulgaria. Russia backed Serbia against Austro-Hungarian support of Bulgaria. The Russians and Austrians prepared for war while the British and Germans urged peaceful resolution. Although hostilities ceased, Serbian resentment toward Austria-Hungary over its frustrated nationalism was greater then ever.”

[819] Map entitled „Linguistic Groups in Austria-Hungary” is misleading.⁶⁸

[821] On Franz-Ferdinand’s assassination:„A Habsburg noble, window dressing for a decaying monarchy, assassinated while he was performing the useless function of reviewing military exercises in a backwater province, hardly seemed a likely candidate to shatter the peace of Europe.”

[839] Map shows „new and reconstituted nations” does not indicate „reconstituted Romania”, as if Transylvania was never a part of Hungary.

Text: „Much time and energy were devoted to redrawing the map of Europe.” ... „In eastern Europe territorial changes were extensive. New states were created out of the lands of three failed empires. Based on self-determination, Finland, Latvia, Estonia, Lithuania, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Austria, Hungary and Yugoslavia were granted status as Nation-states. However, the rights of ethnic and cultural minorities were violated in some cases because of the impossibility of redrawing the map of Europe strictly according to the principle of self-determination. In spite of good intentions, every new nation had its own national minority, a situation that held the promise of future trouble.”⁶⁹

[852] „By 1921, revolutions had been brutally crushed in Berlin, Munich, and Budapest.”

[853] „Austria and Hungary shriveled to small independent states, no longer part of the once great Habsburg empire.” ... „Romania swelled, fed on a diet of settlement concessions.”

[854] „Hungary, having lost the most territory in World War I, held the distinction of having the greatest number of territorial grievances against its neighbors - Czechoslovakia, Romania, and Yugoslavia.”⁷⁰

[874] „nazism, ... were just beginning in the late 1920s. In the same period, fascist movements were making their appearance in England, Hungary, Spain, and France.”

[890] Map entitled „Europe: Types of Government” indicates that Hungary was a dictatorship „by 1938” just like the Soviet Union, Spain, or Germany, etc. Ireland, Great Britain, Sweden and Finland remain democratic by 1940.⁷¹

[913] Upon describing the Holocaust:„There were some heroes like Raoul Wallenberg of Sweden, who interceded for Hungarian Jews and provided Jews in the Budapest ghetto with food and protection.”

⁶⁸ Most of the areas shown to be populated by Romanians and Slovaks are scarcely populated mountainous regions, while those with Magyar populations are densely populated agricultural plains.

⁶⁹ No plebiscites were ever held on this matter. The only exception was the city of Sopron, given to Austria, where the population forced a plebiscite and decided to stay part of Hungary.

⁷⁰ In fact, one of every three Hungarians became minorities in successor states.

⁷¹ There was no dictatorship in Hungary until October 15, 1944, when Hitler installed Ferenc Szálasi after Horthy was arrested by Nazi troops.

[914] Table showing Jewish population losses between 1939 and 1945 shows that Hungary's Jewish population was reduced from 400,000 to 200,000. Probably correct figure.

[921] On Yalta: ...„Romania, Bulgaria, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, and Poland, the Big Three decided, would have pro-Soviet governments.”

[934] „With the support of local Communist parties” Soviet-dominated governments were established in Poland, Hungary, Bulgaria, and Romania in 1947.”

[935] „Hungarians followed suit with their demands for diversity and for the withdrawal of Hungary from the Warsaw Pact. On 23 October 1956, inspired by events in Poland, Hungarians rose up in anger against their old-guard Stalinist rulers. Imre Nagy (1896-1958), a liberal Communist, took control of the government, attempted to introduce democratic reforms, and relaxed economic controls. The Soviets, however, were unwilling to lose control of their sphere of influence in eastern Bloc nations and to jeopardize their system of defense in the Warsaw Pact. Moscow responded to liberal experimentation in Hungary by sending tanks and troops to Budapest. Brutal repression and purges followed. The Hungarian experience in 1956 made clear that too much change too quickly would not be tolerated by the Soviet rulers.”

[936] The correct spelling of the name is Mátyás Rákosi, not Rakoski on the picture's caption.

[960] „In September 1989 East German citizens flooded into Hungary at the rate of 300 people an hour with the hope of escaping to West Germany and political and economic freedom.”⁷²

[975] „The barbed-wire fences on Hungary's Austrian border were dismantled; all of its borders to the West were opened in September 1989.”

[991] „Nationalist feelings were intensifying within eastern Europe at the very moment of integration in the West. demands for autonomy lay behind the revolutionary events in Poland, the Baltic Soviet states, Hungary, Bulgaria, and Romania.”

IV. McNeill

McNeill, William H.: A History of the Human Community, Prehistory to the Present, Fourth Ed.; Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1993. pp. 704.

This book was written from the point of view of an anthropologist. Its main theme is change caused by interaction within the human community. The book analyzes the reasons why western civilization has spread over the world. Purposefully, it is short on local historical detail, offers just enough to understand the general concepts. Consequently, few references to Hungary were expected at the outset.

⁷² The Hungarian government has opened the Iron Curtain which precipitated the collapse of the East German regime, as explained on page 975.

[275] „The Magyar and Viking Assaults”

„Fleeing from a defeat they had suffered on the Russian steppe, the Magyars crossed into Hungary in 895. From this base they soon began to raid western Europe, just as the Huns and the Avars had done before them. German foot soldiers could not oppose the mobile Magyar raiders effectively.”...

„Where the Vikings did not penetrate, the Magyars usually did.”

[276] Map shows Hungarian-settled areas (practically historic Hungary) and paths of raiding parties.

[281] ...,a new ruler, Otto I, the Great, claimed the imperial title in 962. He did so after defeating the Magyars in a great battle at Lechfeld in 955.”

„The conversion of Poland in 966, and of both Hungary and Scandinavia in the year 1000, to the papal form of Christianity showed how attractive the new style of life emerging in western Europe had become.”

„The westernmost portion of the steppe in Hungary had been Christianized too.”

[306] „In 1241, for example, after subduing Russia, the Mongols started toward central Europe, where they defeated a Polish and German force in Silesia and overran all of Hungary. But the death of Ogadai called them home...” ...,and the Mongols never returned to Hungary.”

[329] Around Europe’s rim, however, larger kingdoms took form. In the east, Poland and Hungary stood guard against the steppe. Like the Scandinavians kingdoms, they were relatively poor and thinly inhabited.”⁷³

[335] „Mining also became big business in the late Middle Ages.” ... „Prospectors opened up new bodies of ore in Bohemia and Hungary.”

[383] „In the next generation, Sultan Suleiman the Lawgiver (ruled 1520-1566) brought the Ottoman empire to its peak. In 1526 he invaded Hungary, killed the king, and took control most of the land.”⁷⁴ A claim to the Hungarian crown, however, has passed to Ferdinand of Habsburg, who has married the sister of the Hungarian king. The Habsburgs therefore took over the part of Hungary that escaped Turkish control. This meant that later Turkish campaigns against Christendom pitted the sultan’s forces against Habsburg imperial armies. In 1529, for example, Suleiman besieged Vienna but failed to capture it. Border warfare became normal, and every once in a while the sultan set forth with his field army to settle accounts with the Christians. Suleiman died on such an expedition in 1566.”⁷⁵

[389] Map showing „Europe in the Reformation” indicates religious affiliations in Hungary correctly.

[390] „In both Poland and Hungary, also, Calvinism had a considerable success, mainly among the nobility.” ...,and in Hungary the majority also returned to Catholicism, although in the eastern parts of Hungary important Calvinist communities still survive.”

[394] „Protestant heresy throughout a broad band of territory that reached from Italy northward across the Alps into Austrian, south German, Hungarian, and Polish lands. Only

⁷³ In 1500 Hungary’s population was about the same as that of England’s.

⁷⁴ In fact, after sacking Buda, he has completely withdrawn from Hungary until 1541.

⁷⁵ It happened during the siege of Szigetvár defended by Miklós (Nicholas I) Zrínyi.

northern Germany and Scandinavia, together with the parts of Hungary under Turkish rule and areas of the Rhineland under Protestant German princes, escaped the force of this Catholic counteroffensive.”

[396 -397] Map shows Transylvania as part of the Ottoman empire.⁷⁶

[398] „In Poland and Hungary the nobles kept sovereign political and military power in their own hands, for elected kings of these two countries had no administrative machinery to make their will effective.”

[410] Map showing „The Realm of Islam” notes „Hungary lost to the Ottoman Empire in 1699.”

[411] „In 1683 the Turkish imperial army again besieged Vienna, as in the days of Suleiman the Lawgiver, and again failed to take the city. The long war that followed ended in 1699 with the first really serious defeat the Turks had ever suffered in Europe. By the treaty of Karlowitz, which ended the war, the Turks had to yield most of Hungary to the Habsburgs.”

[445] On „The eastward Movement in Eurasia” ... The Habsburgs, for example, conquered thinly settled lands along the Danube from the Turks in 1699; and for seventy-five years thereafter, the Austrian government and Hungarian nobles shared the task of planting settlers on the grasslands of central Hungary.”⁷⁷

[453] On map showing the partitions of Poland, Hungary is mislabeled as Austria, instead of Habsburg Empire.

[454] In a 20 line insert entitled: „Maria Theresa and the Hungarian Diet” the author explains in specific, - and correct-, detail king Charles VI’s efforts with the Hungarian Diet to accept the Pragmatic Sanction:

....„According to their ancient constitution, the Diet had to approve a new king: how could they accept a woman as their ruler? A king was supposed to command in battle; no woman could do that.” ...

....„An army had to be raised and Hungarian help was required. Maria Theresa journeyed to Pressburg (called Bratislava today), where the Hungarian Diet was meeting. She appeared before the assembled nobles, carrying her infant son in her arms, and appealed for help.

„In a sudden burst of enthusiasm, the Hungarians promised to fight for her cause and did in fact take the field against the invaders with considerable success.” ...

....„For the rest of her long reign, Maria Theresa remained grateful to the Hungarians for coming to her rescue. She therefore did nothing to hurt the interests of the nobles or to alter the ancient Hungarian constitution that protected the nobles privileges.”

[506 and 510] Maps label the Habsburg empire as „Empire of Austria”.

[537] „the most important consequence of the Crimean war was the bitter feeling that arose between Austria and Russia.” ... „The Russians felt that their help in 1849, when the Russian army had invaded Hungary to put down rebels against the Habsburg authority, had been repaid with the basest ingratitude.”

⁷⁶ While Moldavia was occupied by the Turks in 1546, Transylvania was an independent principality whose prince governed „with the approval of the Porta” but with no Turkish presence.

⁷⁷ The original Magyar population of these lands were either killed or carried off by the Turks.

[559] ...,the Habsburg emperor, Franz Josef I (reigned 1848-1916) ... agreed to an alliance with Germany. The major reason behind this move was that Austria suffered from internal frictions among the many different nationalities that made up the empire. In 1867 a constitutional settlement between the Hungarians and the rest of the empire sharpened the political appetites of Czechs and other Slavs who wanted similar privileges for themselves. But Austrian Germans and Hungarians were not willing to share their political privileges with Czechs and other Slavs. Resulting domestic confrontations meant that the Habsburg monarch badly needed all outside support he could get, and the German alliance of 1879 served this purpose admirably.”

[611] „In Sarajevo, the capital of Bosnia, on June 28, 1914, an angry young man named Gavrilo Princip shot and killed Archduke Francis Ferdinand, heir to the throne of Austria-Hungary.”⁷⁸

[620] After WW1: „But the victors were only partly in control of the situation. Throughout eastern Europe where the Austrian⁷⁹, Ottoman, and Russian governments had ruled before the war, confusion reigned. Socialists and nationalists collided, and rival nationalities disputed rights to nearly every territory and province.”⁸⁰

[633] After Yalta: ... „it soon became obvious that the sort of „friendly” governments the Russians wanted in eastern Europe were undemocratic and unacceptable by British and American standards.”

[641] After WW2: „Recovery in eastern Europe involved greater hardships, since outside assistance was not forthcoming. Nevertheless, the planned economies of the Soviet Union and of its new satellite countries, Poland, Romania, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, and East Germany, made a remarkably rapid recovery, too, even though living standards remained far lower than in western Europe.”

[643] ... „in 1989 the Warsaw Pact suddenly unraveled when first Poland and then the other countries of eastern Europe asserted their independence from the USSR by overthrowing communist governments that had been installed there by Russian bayonets after World War II.”

[646] „A prominent feature of the breakdown of Communist party control in eastern Europe, 1989-1992, was the upsurge of nationalist feeling that accompanied a popular repudiation of communism. Where ready-made nation-states already existed - as in Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Hungary - new governments took over without special difficulty, but in several parts of Europe, nationalities and political boundaries did not match up accurately.”

[655] In the section on postwar population history: „In some places, Hungary, for example, replacement of existing population became problematic.”

⁷⁸ In the ensuing explanations the word „Austria” is used throughout, instead of Austria-Hungary.

⁷⁹ Meaning Austro-Hungarian.

⁸⁰ This concludes the discussion of the Treaty of Trianon.

V.
Perry

Perry, Marvin & Myrna Chase, James R. Jacob, Margaret C. Jacob, Theodore H. Von Laue: Western Civilization, Ideas, Politics & Society, Third Ed.; Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin, 1989. pp. 862.

As its subtitle states, this book stresses the ‘ideas, politics, and society’ of western civilization: broad concepts, cultural, social, political developments are explained in detail. Historical facts are presented only when required to buttress these concepts. As a result, Hungary is hardly mentioned between the entrance of the Magyars into the Carpathian basin in 896 and the siege of Vienna in 1683. On the other hand, Magyars are featured prominently as the nineteenth century’s nationalistic movements are discussed, mostly as the villains.

[180] On Mongol invasions: „After the death of Genghis Khan, some Mongol forces swept across Russia and threatened Central Europe⁸¹; others...”

[190] „The Magyars, originally from western Asia and linguistically related to Finns and Turks, crossed the Carpathian Mountains in the ninth century and established themselves on the plains of the Danube; their horsemen launched lightning raids into northern Italy, western Germany, and parts of France. Defeated in Germany in 933 and 955, the Magyars withdrew to what is now Hungary; they ceased their raids and adopted Christianity.”

[191] Maps entitled „Ninth-Century Invasions” depicts Viking, Magyar, and Muslim invasion routes in Europe.

[195] Chronological table shows „c. 890 Magyars invade central Europe.”

[214] During the Peasants Crusade„While Peter’s (the Hermit) army made it’s way to Constantinople, another army of commoners recruited in Germany began their crusade by massacring the Jews of the Rhineland despite the efforts of bishops to protect them. Unlike Peter’s army, these commoners never reached Constantinople; after plundering Hungary, they were slaughtered by Hungarians (Magyars).”

[295] Map showing religious affiliations after the Reformation correctly shows Reformed pockets in Transylvania and Hungary, but Austria’s label is shifted over western Hungary.

[362] „As a result of the settlement at Westphalia, the Austrian Habsburgs gained firm control over Hungary and Bohemia,...”

„A Catholic and unified Austrian army, composed of a variety of peoples from that kingdom and assisted by the Poles, managed to defeat the Turks and recapture the whole of Hungary and Transylvania and part of Croatia. Austria’s right to govern these was firmly accepted by the Turks at the Treaty of Karlowitz (1699).⁸²

⁸¹ In fact, they utterly destroyed Hungary. See Istvan Lazar: Hungary, a Brief History, Budapest: Corvina, 1889.

⁸² Hungary’s Habsburg king, - crowned with St. Stephen’s crown, - not Austria had the right to govern.

[407] On map the legend „Austria” is placed over the Carpathian mountains. The correct label would be „The Habsburg Empire”.

[409] During the reign of Maria Theresa:„Frustrated in their German territories, the Austrian Habsburgs concentrated their attention increasingly on their eastern states. Vienna gave them a natural power base, while Catholic religiosity gradually united the ruling elites in Bohemia and Hungary with their Habsburg kings.”

[497] In the early 19th century„Liberals called for the unification of Germany,” ... „and the granting of autonomy to the Hungarians of the Austrian Empire.”

[502] „Metternich also feared the new spirit of nationalism. As a multinational empire, Austria was particularly vulnerable to nationalist unrest. If its ethnic groups - Poles, Czechs, Magyars, Italians, South Slavs, Rumanians - became infected with the nationalist virus, they would shatter the Habsburg Empire.”

[504] Map shows „Peoples of the Habsburg Monarchy, 1815” does not indicate population density and ethnic mixing.

[518] In 1848„revolts in other parts of the empire - Bohemia, Hungary, and northern Italy - added to the distress of the monarchy.”

[519]„the most serious threat to the Habsburg realm came from the Magyars in Hungary. Some 12 million people lived in Hungary, 5 million of them were Magyars. The other nationalities consisted of South Slavs (Croats and Serbs) and Rumanians. The upper class were chiefly Magyar landowners, who enjoyed tax exemptions and other feudal privileges. Drawn to liberal and modern ideas and fearful of peasant uprisings, some Hungarian nobles pressed for an end to serfdom and the tax exemptions of the nobility. Louis Kossuth (1802-1894), a member of the lower nobility, called for both social reform and a deepening of national consciousness. The great landowners, determined to retain their ancient privileges, resisted liberalization.

Led by Louis Kossuth, the Magyars demanded local autonomy for Hungary. Hungary would remain within the Habsburg Empire, but would have its own constitution and national army and would control its own finances. The Hungarian leadership introduced liberal reforms - suffrage for all males who could speak Magyar and owned some property, freedom of religion, freedom of the press, the termination of serfdom, and the end of the privileges of nobles and church. Within a few weeks, the Hungarian parliament changed Hungary from a feudal to a modern liberal state.

But the Hungarian leaders' nationalist dreams towered above their liberal ideas. The Magyars intended to incorporate lands inhabited by Serbs, Slovaks, and Rumanians into their kingdom⁸³ and transform these people, whom they regarded as ethnic inferiors, into Hungarians. As 'Scotus Viator', R. W. Seton-Watson has written,

Kossuth and his friends genuinely believed that they were doing the non-Hungarians a kindness by giving them a chance of becoming absorbed in the superior Hungarian culture. To refuse this kindness was nationalist fanaticism; to impose it by force was to promote progress. The suggestion that Romanians, Slovaks, or Serbs were nations, with a national culture of their own, was simply ridiculous nonsense [Ref.: S.-W.: Nations and States, Westview Press, 1977]

⁸³ Which were, in fact, integral parts of Hungary.

In the spring of 1849, the Hungarians renounced their allegiance to the Habsburgs and proclaimed Hungary an independent state with Kossuth as president.

The Habsburg rulers took advantage of the ethnic animosities inside and outside Hungary. They encouraged Rumanians and South Slavs to resist the new Hungarian government.⁸⁴ When Habsburg forces moved against the Magyars, they were joined by an army of South Slavs, whose nationalist aspirations had been flouted by the Hungarians.⁸⁵ The recently ascended Habsburg emperor, Francis Joseph, also appealed to tsar Nicholas for help.⁸⁶ The tsar complied, fearing that a successful revolt by the Hungarians might lead the Poles to rise up against their Russian overlords. The Hungarians fought with extraordinary courage but were overcome by superior might. Kossuth and other rebel leaders went into exile; about one hundred rebel leaders were executed. Thus, through division and alliance, the Habsburgs prevented the disintegration of the empire.”

[520] In an assessment: „Hungarian revolutionaries dismissed the nationalist yearnings of South Slavs and Rumanians living in Hungary, who in turn helped the Habsburg dynasty to extinguish the nascent Hungarian state.”⁸⁷

[521] In the chronological table: „August 1849 -- The Hungarians’ bid for independence is crushed by the Habsburg forces, aided by Russian troops⁸⁸.”

[557] „In the first half of the nineteenth century, the Germans, constituting less than one-quarter of the population, were the dominant national group in the empire. But Magyars, Poles, Czechs, Slovaks, Croats, Rumanians, Ruthenians, and Italians were experiencing national self-awareness.

Poets and writers ... began to write in their mother tongues and extol their splendor. ...”

[558] „Magyarization”

...The defeat by Prussia also forced the Habsburg monarchy to make concessions to the Magyars, the strongest of the non-German nationalities; for without a loyal Hungary, the Habsburg monarchy could suffer other humiliations. The Settlement of 1867 split the Habsburg territories into Austria and Hungary. The two countries retained a common ruler, Francis Joseph (1848-1916), who was emperor of Austria and king of Hungary. Hungary gained complete control over its internal affairs - the administration of justice and education. Foreign and military affairs and common financial concerns were conducted by a ministry consisting of delegates from both lands.”

⁸⁴ They fostered animosities even if there were none before.

⁸⁵ Habsburg general Puchner had Wallachian insurgents under him when he nearly occupied Transylvania but these forces were driven out. South Slavs, - Croats -, served in the imperial army. Slovaks fought, in large numbers, alongside the Magyars.

⁸⁶ Only after his forces were about to be driven out of Hungary.

⁸⁷ A great majority of non-Magyars fought in the Hungarian army. General Görgey’s winter campaign in the northern highlands, now Slovakia, included several Slovak regiments that fought with great distinction. In contrast, the Habsburg forces could recruit only a few scores of Slovaks to fight against the Hungarians. The 13 generals executed in Arad on October 6, 1849 eleven were not ethnic Magyars.

⁸⁸ An overwhelming Russian Imperial Army of 300,000 men.

... „The other nationalities felt that the German - Magyar political, economic, and cultural domination blocked their own national aspirations. nationality struggles in the half century following the settlement of 1867 consumed the energies of the Austrians and Hungarians.”

„The nationality problems in Hungary differed substantially from those in Austria. Constituting slightly less than half the population of Hungary,⁸⁹ the Magyars were determined to retain their hegemony over the other minorities - Rumanians, Slovaks, Ruthenians, Serbs, Croats, and Jews. In the first phase of the national struggle, the Hungarians also sought to liberate their nation from German domination. In the second phase, after 1867, the landholding aristocracy that ruled Hungary tried to impose the Magyar language and traditions on the other nationalities. Non-Magyars who learned the magyar language and considered themselves Hungarians could participate as equals in Hungarian society.⁹⁰ Those who resisted were viewed as traitors and conspirators and faced severe penalties. Non-Magyars were largely excluded from voting and virtually barred from government jobs, which were reserved for Magyars and those who had adopted Magyar language and culture.”

„The government tightly controlled the non-Magyar peoples. It suppressed their cultural organizations and newspapers, and the great majority of public schools, even in predominantly non-Magyar regions, carried on instruction largely in Magyar.⁹¹ Because of limited suffrage, the manipulation of districts, and threats of violence, non-Magyars were barely represented in the Hungarian parliament.⁹² Protests by the nationalities against this forced Magyarization often led to jail sentences. The repressive measures strengthened the Slavs' and Rumanians' hatred of the regime. At the same time, however, Magyarization brought economic and cultural opportunities. Jews in particular accepted the Magyar government and took advantage of what it offered.”⁹³

„But nationality movements within Hungary constituted less of a threat to the preservation of the Austro-Hungarian Empire than Magyar nationalism itself did. The Independence party, whose influence grew after 1900, began to demand a complete end to the link with Austria and the ‘cursed common institutions’.”

[572] „The emergence and concentration of heavy industry in large firms” ... „characterized the post-1890 period all over Europe. This tendency was marked in Austria-Hungary, ... „In Austria-Hungary one or two giant entrepreneurs dominated steel, mines, and munitions...”

[592] „Meanwhile, throughout the period from 1867 to the outbreak of World War I, Hungary moved toward greater centralization, demanding more room for independent action. The hottest issue revolved around the army, where the Magyars insisted on separate Magyar regiments with Magyar, rather than German, as the language of command. The emperor

⁸⁹ With the exclusion of autonomous Croatia, 54.5 percent of the population was Magyar.

⁹⁰ Had the author used the term ‘melting pot’, it would have far less sinister implication.

⁹¹ All of this is grossly overstated.

⁹² There were, for instance, thirty Croat members of parliament. The manipulation of districts was hardly possible as the county system was just as it was set up by St. Stephen a thousand years before.

⁹³ Most Jews moved into Hungary from Polish Galicia in the nineteenth century. Many of their descendants distinguished themselves in the arts and sciences and they proudly maintain their Hungarian Jewish culture to this day.

insisted on a unified army and refused to accept the Magyar demands. The Magyars finally relented, but not until legislative debate on the issue had nearly ended in violence.”⁹⁴

„In the decade immediately before the outbreak of World War I ... In Hungary, oppressed peasantry, usually Slavs, challenged all powerful Magyar landlords whose great wealth was based on export agriculture.”

[595] On Austria-Hungary, 1866-1914: ...In Hungary a large percentage of the population worked in agriculture. About 30 percent of the urban population were independent artisans who did not hire any laborers; another 30 percent were employed in small workshops of not more than twenty workers, and usually fewer than ten.

The European-wide tendency toward heavy industry concentration in large firms, which characterized the 1890s, was exaggerated in the underdeveloped states, such as Austria-Hungary.” ...

„In Hungary, the entrepreneurial and business classes were even less respected than they were in Austria, a reflection of the backward state of Hungary’s industrial development. The dominant magyar landed magnates and gentry cared so little for commerce and industry that the field was left to non-Magyar subjects, in particular, Austrian Germans, Czechs, and Jews. Non-Magyars were constrained from political activity, but economic development was almost totally in their hands. In this instance, the minorities benefited greatly from Magyar prejudices.”⁹⁵

[658] „Aggravated Nationalist Tensions in Austria-Hungary” ... „a young terrorist ... murdered Archduke Francis Ferdinand” ... „And nowhere were conditions more volatile than in Austria-Hungary, the scene of the assassination.”

„With its numerous nationalities, each with its own national history and traditions and often conflicting aspirations, Austria-Hungary stood in opposition of nationalism, the most powerful spiritual force of the age. Perhaps the supranational Austro-Hungarian Empire was obsolete in a world of states based on the principle of nationality. Dominated by Germans and Hungarians, the empire remained unable either to satisfy the grievances or to contain the nationalistic aims of its minorities, particularly the Czechs and South Slavs (Croats, Slovenes, Serbs.).”

„Austria-Hungary’s failure to solve its minority problems had significant repercussions for international relations. The more moderate leaders of the ethnic minorities did not call for the secession from the empire. Nevertheless, heightened agitation among the several nationalities, which worsened in the decade before 1914, created terrible anxieties among Austrian leaders.”...

[659] Another irritant to Austria-Hungary was Russian Pan-Slavism, ...”

... „Moreover, their provocative and semireligious proclamations frightened Austria-Hungary, which did not draw a sharp line between Pan-Slavic aspirations and official Russian policy.”

The tensions arising out of the multinational character of the Austro-Hungarian Empire in an age of heightened nationalist feeling set off the explosion in 1914. Unable to solve its minority problems and fearful of Pan-Slavism and Pan-Serbism, Austria-Hungary felt itself in a life-or-death situation.”

⁹⁴ By 1914 there were separate Hungarian divisions in addition to the ‘joint’ ones.

⁹⁵ How true.

[660] „Bismarck also hoped to prevent a war between Russia and Austria-Hungary, for such a conflict could lead to German involvement, and to Russian expansion in eastern Europe. To maintain peace ... [he] created the Triple Alliance - consisting of Germany, Austria-Hungary, and Italy -”

[664] In the Balkan wars ... „Thus, during a five-year period, Austria-Hungary inflicted on Serbia two terrible humiliations. Russia shared these humiliations, for it had twice failed to help its small Slavic friend...”

„Archduke Francis Ferdinand (1863-1914) ... was sympathetic to the grievances of the South Slavs and favored a policy that would place the Slavs on equal footing with Hungarians and Germans within the Habsburg Empire.” ... assassination described.

[666] Throughout the page, Austria-Hungary is referred to as „Austria”.

[684] „In separate treaties the conference dealt with the dissolution of the Habsburg Empire. In the closing weeks of the war, the Austro-Hungarian Empire had crumbled as the various nationalities proclaimed their independence from Habsburg rule. In most cases, the peacemakers ratified with treaties what the nationalities had already accomplished in fact. Serbia joined with Austrian lands inhabited by Croats and Slovenes to become Yugoslavia. Czechoslovakia arose from the predominantly Czech and Slovak regions of Austria.⁹⁶ Hungary, which broke away from Austria to become a separate country, had to concede⁹⁷ considerable land to Rumania and Yugoslavia.”⁹⁸

[739] „The new Hungary that emerged at the end of World War I faced an uprising by communists inspired by the success of the Bolsheviks in Russia. Béla Kun (1885-1937), supported by Russian money, established a Soviet regime in Budapest in March 1919. But Kun could not win the support of the peasants and was opposed by the Allies, who helped Rumania crush the revolutionary government. In 1920, power passed to Admiral Miklós Horthy (1868-1957), who instituted a brief white terror that exceeded the red terror of the Kun regime.”⁹⁹

During the Great Depression, the Horthy government, which favored the large landholders, was challenged by the radical right, which preached extreme nationalism, anti-Semitism, and anticapitalism and sought to win mass support through land reform. Its leader, Gyula Gömbös (1886-1936), who served as prime minister from 1932 to 1936, sought to align Hungary with Nazi Germany. Seeking to regain territories lost in World War I¹⁰⁰ and aware of Hitler’s growing might, Hungary drew closer to Germany in the late 1930s.”¹⁰¹

[787] After WWII ... „Millions of Germans fled or were forced out of Prussia and regions of Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Yugoslavia, and Hungary, places where their ancestors had lived for centuries.”

⁹⁶ Both Croatia and Slovakia was carved out of Hungary, not Austria.

⁹⁷ Cede, not concede.

⁹⁸ Along with the land, went one third of the ethnic Magyar population.

⁹⁹ Only according to the emigres of the failed communist regime, particularly prof. Oscar Jászi, who wrote extensively against his former country while living in the United States.

¹⁰⁰ That is, in the aftermath of the war.

¹⁰¹ The formation of the Little Entente with the encouragement by France helped in this move.

[810] „Poland was on the brink of rebellion by 1956; a workers’ uprising forced a change of leadership. In Hungary in 1956, the entire communist regime was overthrown before the red Army reoccupied the country.”

[817] „Although the ‘Polish October’ ended peacefully, events moved to a brutal showdown in Hungary. The Stalinists had suppressed national pride in Hungary for too long. On October 20,¹⁰² 1956, an uprising in Budapest raised anti-Soviet feeling to a fever pitch and forced Soviet troops to withdraw from the country. Next, a moderate communist government, eager to capture popular sentiment, called for Western-style political democracy and Hungary’s withdrawal from the Warsaw Pact. Thoroughly alarmed, and with the backing of Mao and even Tito, the Soviet leaders struck back. On November 4, 1956, Soviet troops re-entered the country and crushed all opposition. Yet the bold uprising had left its mark.”

„The new communist leader of Hungary, János Kádár (b. 1912) was a moderate, who with Khrushchev’s approval built a pragmatic regime of consumer-oriented „goulash communism” that granted considerable opportunity to private enterprise. Kádár’s regime also allowed non-communists to participate extensively in public affairs. Relaxation and decentralization of planning made possible in the 1970s a remarkable increase in popular prosperity¹⁰³ and individual freedom; the Hungarian experiment became the envy of all other Soviet-bloc countries and invited imitation even in the Soviet Union itself. In return for this moderate self-determination, the Hungarians resumed their membership in the Warsaw Pact and demonstrated loyalty to the Soviet leadership. In its essentials the Kádár regime has lasted even beyond Kádár’s retirement in 1988.”

¹⁰² October 23, not 20.

¹⁰³ Borrowing some \$ 22 billion from international bankers helped in this.

ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS

The quotations in the previous pages contain all what is covered about Hungary in the five reviewed American history textbooks. Comments concerning the authors statements are made either along with the quotations or in footnotes. However, those historic facts the authors chose not to discuss may be even more revealing. The clippings from the *Columbia Encyclopedia* will now be contrasted with the textbooks. Here are the results:

Árpád's name never mentioned. Regarding Magyar conquest of the Carpathian basin in A.D. 896, Greaves provides a detailed accounting of the particulars that induced them to make the move. Others generally give the date only.

Saint Stephen and the other medieval kings of Hungary are usually unmentioned with few exceptions. Concerning the first 600 years of Hungary's history, all authors seem to agree that the defeat of a Magyar raiding party in 955 by the Lech river was a preeminent date. The Christianization of Hungary, beginning with the 973 Quedlinburg peace treaty between Otto the Great and Grand Prince Géza, and the coronation of his son, St. Stephen in A.D. 1,000 goes unmentioned. Later on Greaves, Kagan, and Kishlansky mentions St. Stephen's crown, but only in relation to the Habsburg successions, never mentioning who St. Stephen was. The Árpád dynasty, stretching from 996 to 1312, received only a single oblique reference; by Kishlansky who mentions that „Charles Robert of Anjou became king of Hungary after the extinction of the realm's ancient royal dynasty”. Greaves takes note that the Angevins won the Hungarian crown but mentions no name. In fact, Charles Robert was maternally related to the House of Árpád. So did most royal dynasties of Europe. St. Margaret of Scotland, for instance, was the granddaughter of St. Stephen of Hungary. Kishlansky also mentions the name of the son of Charles Robert, Louis the Great, under whose reign Hungary has reached its zenith. The other authors made no such reference.

Hunyadi's name appears only once. Greaves mentions that the father of king Matthias Corvinus was „the great military leader János Hunyadi, who had successfully repulsed the Turks.” Again, Greaves is the only one who writes about Matthias Corvinus, whose Renaissance court rivaled any in Europe.

The battle of Mohács is mentioned by all authors except Perry. The lack of military support from Christian powers in this crucial battle, that was caused by the conflict between Emperor Charles V and the holy alliance, France, Milan, Venice and Pope Clement (Treaty of Cognac, May 22, 1526) is unmentioned. No one describes the details, for instance the application of intense concentrated artillery fire in battle, which was perhaps a first in the Gunpowder Revolution. In Hungary's history this was the most cataclysmic event until the Trianon peace treaty in 1920.

Not one of the great leaders of Hungary's history named anywhere with the sole exception of Prince Ferenc Rákóczi who was mentioned by Greaves. Elsewhere, the Zrínyi-s, Bocskay, the Rákóczi-s, and Gabriel Bethlen are unmentioned. Hungarian leaders are impersonally referred to as „the Hungarian nobles” throughout these books. Greaves points out that Hungary's nobility was Protestant. „The nobles” are generally presented as being almost congenitally inclined toward revolting against their Habsburg kings. Greaves elsewhere mentions the spread of Protestantism into Hungary, Kagan dismisses it by referring to the „equally zealous Calvinism of the Magyar nobles” and goes on to mention that Leopold I „suppressed a long rebellion of his new Magyar subjects between 1703 and 1711.” The name of the Hungarian

leader, Prince Francis Rákóczi II, is not mentioned. Kishlansky mentions that after 1618 „fear of Ferdinand’s policies led to Protestant uprising in Hungary”. McNeill states that „in both Poland and Hungary, also, Calvinism had a considerable success” but qualifies in, incorrectly that it happened „mainly among the nobility”. The facts were that behind the Ottoman border Calvinism spread freely among the common people, and that „the nobles” mentioned here were popular leaders of Hungary’s version of the Thirty Years’ War: Protestant Hungary against arch-Catholic Habsburgs. Gabriel Bethlen, Prince of Transylvania, was a signatory to the Peace of Westphalia.

With regard to the Magyar nobility, one must recall that in Hungary an unusually large segment of the population were nobles. The whole nation of Szeklers received nobility in payment for their service in protecting the eastern borders. Nobility was inherited by all descendants, not only the first born son, as in England. Many of these nobles were poor. Kishlansky refers to them correctly as „sandaled nobility”. At least, they enjoyed freedom from taxation. During the Turkish wars many noble titles, if not land grants, were given for military valor both in the kingdom of Hungary and in the Principality of Transylvania. (According to Captain John Smith, the Virginia colonist, he received a noble title in Transylvania for fighting against the Turks and „cutting the head off three of them”. His crest of arms, according to him, pictured the heads, - a common practice at the time. He named a Virginia lake after „Three Turks Head” in commemoration.) It may be mentioned also that there was little strife between nobles and peasants in Hungary after the Dózsa revolt in 1514, which Kishlansky mentions. Nobles and peasants held together against the two enemies: Turks and Austrians. „Between two pagans, for a single country”, as Miklós Zrínyi (the younger) wrote. Many peasants were known to pay rent to their escaped noble landlords during the Turkish occupation, who moved north to carry on the fight.

Transylvania’s history during the Ottoman times is not mentioned by any of the authors. This, perhaps, is the greatest discrepancy between American and Hungarian historiography. The so called „Golden Age of Transylvania” is blanked out, certainly to the great distress of all Hungarian readers.

Kossuth received various treatments in the textbooks, but not the lionization he got during his celebrated American visit after the war. Kagan includes a picture of him. His revolution, on the other hand, is not treated in an evenhanded matter. Greaves claims that the various minorities rapidly alienated on account of the Magyars attempt at racial hegemony. Kagan believes that the „emancipated serf had little reason to support the revolutionary movement.”¹⁰⁴ He also dismisses the war by stating that „the magyar nobles attempted one last revolt.” In fact, the Emperor did grant the wishes of the Hungarian Diet; - an independent Government was authorized and set up, units of the army stationed in Hungary reported to the Hungarian Minister of Defense, the country peacefully adjusted to the changes until a Habsburg palace coup forced Emperor Ferdinand out of office, installed Francis Joseph in power, and the new regime attacked Hungary. In the beginning, imperial armies, all sworn to a king, fought each

¹⁰⁴ The contemporary popular Hungarian folk song, still well known, contradicts this statement:

*Louis Kossuth sent a message
That all his regiments are gone;
If once more he sends such message
Then all of us shall go.
Long live Hungarian liberty;
Long live the homeland.*

other. Kishlansky admits that the Magyars initially defeated the Habsburg troops, but does not mention Kossuth and his program. McNeill does not discuss the subject at all. Perry claims that „Magyars intended to incorporate lands inhabited by Serbs, Slovaks, and Rumanians into their kingdom”. This is contrary to the fact, that the revolution was an internal affair of the kingdom of Hungary. The mentioned minorities have, with the possible exception of the Slovaks, immigrated into Hungarian territories long after the country has been established. Perry also makes a great issue of the Magyarization program, even quotes R. W. Seton-Watson,¹⁰⁵ which tells it all. Neither author makes an appropriate comparison to similar situations in Britain and France, where the gaelic and breton languages were suppressed for the benefit of the common ‘national’ language.

If the implications were true that Hungary’s fight was lost on account of the resistance of its minorities to aggressive Magyarization, this would have been quite well known at the time. Kossuth would not have been invited to address the United States Congress on January 7, 1852, a honor accorded only to Lafayette before him. After his speech, Secretary of State Daniel Webster said: „*Hungary stands out above her neighbors in all that respects free institutions, constitutional government and a hereditary love of liberty.*” Meanwhile, large scale colonization of Hungary by Germans was encouraged. Julian Chownitz wrote in his *Handbook for Emigrants to Hungary*¹⁰⁶: *in the recent past Hungary was conquered by German arms. Germany is overpopulated. Masses emigrate to the United States. Instead, it is more advantageous to move to Hungary, because the Imperial Government grants benefits and complete freedom to immigrants. In the past Hungarians have received everything that is good from the Germans. Hungarians were still wandering around the Dniester when in the land of present Hungary German towns were already flourishing. Because of this, immigrating Germans should not consider themselves to be guests; the Hungarians should not be considered hosts, because they are simply backward natives.* As a secret presidential emissary, well known American social reformer Charles Lornig Brace (1826-90) was sent to Hungary to establish contact with the freedomfighters in hiding. His report was published as a book: *Hungary in 1951*, New York, 1952. It depicted Hungary as the beacon of freedom, under despotic yoke. Almost fifty years of propaganda by the likes of Seton-Watson, Henry Wickham Steed, Thomas Masaryk, and Benes was required to change this perception. These were discussed in the Introduction.

Horthy’s name evokes wide differences of opinion. Greaves goes as far as claiming that „the first nation to adopt dictatorial government was Hungary which turned to Admiral Miklós Horthy”. In fact, it was a constitutional, parliamentary system in which the powers of the Regent, Horthy, were rather limited. Kagan, on the other hand mentions Horthy without any such slander. Kishlansky does not mention Horthy but describes Hungary’s territorial grievances after W.W.I. McNeill does not mention Horthy either and he glances over the matter of Hungary’s dismemberment with a statement that „rival nationalities disputed rights to nearly every territory and province”. Perry provides a rather fair accounting of Horthy and his governments. Placed in a very difficult position as the constitutional leader of a defeated, mutilated country in total economic ruin, Horthy and his government was a stellar economic success by the beginning of the Great Depression. But he had four groups of mortal enemies: First of all, were the emigrant leaders and sympathizers of the 1919 Soviet regime. Some of these came to the United States (e.g. Oscar Jászi) and kept up the anti-Horthy propaganda.

¹⁰⁵ One wonders in whose interest this ultra-biased book had to be republished in 1977.

¹⁰⁶ *Handbuch für Auswanderer nach Ungarn*; Bamberg, 1850.

Others of the same ilk have gone to Moscow and became the leaders for the Soviet terror regime during the 1950's. (Namely: Rákosi, Gerő, Vas, Münnich, and others.) One of their publication, *Horthy's Secret Documents*, was a complete fabrication, yet it has found its way into American scholarly works¹⁰⁷. Second, the official propagandists of the Successor States, who were worried about Hungary reclaiming her lost territories. They have maintained a constant propaganda barrage against Hungary, and her Regent. Thirdly, a significant share of Hungary's Jews turned bitter against Hungary as a result of the 1944 deportations to Auswitz, and they blamed Horthy, the leader. To document that this blame is misplaced one may quote Adolf Eichmann: *resistance [to the deportations] in Hungary was offered by Horthy and his close associates*¹⁰⁸. Raoul Wallenberg wrote similarly: *His [Horthy's] position is illustrated by the very real fact that the deportations were canceled per his order, but also by a number of smaller interventions. Among them, two verified instances of trains loaded with prisoners being ordered to turn back just before reaching the border. That Horthy's power is a factor to be reckoned with is shown by the fact that while the above mentioned trainload of intellectuals was sent across the border, the entire Jewish Council was detained by the Gestapo, so that they would not be able to report the matter to the head of state, who was judged to have enough power to order the train to turn back.*¹⁰⁹ Lastly, admirers the short-lived Hungarian Nazi regime, that deposed Horthy when his attempt at armistice failed in October, 1944, hated Horthy for turning against Hitler. The combined effects of these disparate groups' anti-Horthy brainwashing in the news media and in Western academic publications are deep-rooted.

Summing it up, Hungary's 1,100 year history received a rather scanty coverage in the reviewed books. Using our improvised rating system based on the *Columbia Encyclopedia* quotations, none of the book rate six on a scale of twenty. One wonders, why?

Herodotos wrote that the Persians believed that they were the best, that those nations bordering on them were next best, that those nations bordering on the nations bordering on them were the third best, and so on. The nations worth declining as the concentric circles were farther from the Persian center. Did American history writers follow the rule of the ancient Persians? Or was British historian Norman Davies¹¹⁰ correct when he wrote that *Historians most given to thinking of themselves as from the West - notably from England, France, Germany, and North America - rarely see any necessity to describe Europe's past in its entirety. They see no more reason to consider the countries of Eastern Europe than to dwell on the more westerly parts of Western Europe. ... In many such works there is no Portugal, no Ireland, Scotland or Wales, and no Scandinavia, just as there is no Poland, no Hungary, no Bohemia, ... Davies goes on: By taking transient contemporary divisions, such as the Iron Curtain, as a standing definition of 'West' and 'East', one is bound to distort any description of Europe in earlier periods. Poland is neatly excised from the Renaissance, Hungary from the Reformation, Bohemia from industrialization, Greece from the Ottoman experience. More seriously, one deprives a large part of Europe of its true historical personality, with immeasurable consequences in the miscalculations of diplomats, business people, and academics.*

¹⁰⁷ E.g. Thomas Sakmyster: *Admiral on Horseback*, NY: Columbia, 1993.

¹⁰⁸ Jochen von Lang, Ed.: *Eichmann Interrogated, - Transcripts from the Archives of the Israeli Police*, New York: Farrar, Straus & Giroux, 1983, pp. 232.

¹⁰⁹ U.S. Holocaust Museum: *Raoul Wallenberg: Letters and Dispatches 1924-1944*; New York: Arcade, 1995, p. 241. From a July 29, 1944 report.

¹¹⁰ Norman Davies: *Europe, a History*, Oxford University Press, 1996. 1365 pages.

Davies gives more attention to the history of Hungary than any of the reviewed American authors. He even devotes a whole page on the magnificence of King Matthias' renaissance library, the Corvina, and gives testimony to the stellar qualities of Tokay wine. But he too has fallen victim to the pervasive Romanian propaganda: On page 934 he claims that in 1919 the Hungarian national government requested that the Romanians occupy Hungary against the Communist government in Budapest. To begin with, the nationalist government came into being after the Romanian invasion. That the Hungarians asked for the looting of their country is about the same as saying that Sherman visited Georgia on an invitation by its inhabitants.

But let us turn back to Hunyadi. Davies, in spite of his resolve to give equal treatment to the histories of the Poles, Hungarians, and Czechs, introduces him on page 520 as follows: *Yet none deserves more attention than Matthias Hunyadi 'Corvinus', King of Hungary (r. 1441-90). Corvinus - so called from the raven in his coat-of-arms - was a social upstart, the son of a Romanian crusader from Transylvania, Iancu of Hunedoara, who had made his name fighting the Turks.* So much for John Hunyadi, the pride and joy of Hungarian history, for whom the bells toll at noon for eternity.

-&-