

HCSR

Hungarian Studies Review

Vol. XII, No. 1 (Spring, 1985)

PAPERS

Thomas Kabdebo examines Jacobin military notions and their origins in constitutional proposals in Hungary. George Feuer discusses the contributions of Hungarian scientists in the development of biochemistry. Aniko Varpalotai writes about Physical Education and Socialist ideology in Hungary.

Book Reviews

Hungarian Studies Review

EDITORS

George Bizstray, *University of Toronto*

Nandor Dreisziger, *Royal Military College of Canada*

ASSISTANT EDITOR

Susan M. Papp

EDITORIAL ADVISERS

Marianna D. Birnbaum, *UCLA*

Robert Blumstock, *McMaster University*

Scott Eddie, *University of Toronto*

Iván Halász de Béky, *University of Toronto*

Marlene Kadar, *The University of Alberta*

Martin L. Kovacs, *University of Regina*

Bennett Kovrig, *University of Toronto*

Maria H. Krisztinkovich, *University of British Columbia*

Alfonz Lengyel, *Northern Kentucky University*

B. A. Racz, *Eastern Michigan University*

Thomas Spira, *University of Prince Edward Island*

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

The *Review* is published by the Hungarian Readers' Service in collaboration with the University of Toronto's Chair of Hungarian Studies.

Institutional subscriptions to the *Review* are \$12.00 per annum. Individual subscriptions are \$12.00 for one year and \$20.00 for two years. Subscribers outside of North America please add \$2.00 for postage.

Donations in support of the *Review* may be made through the University of Toronto. Cheques should be made to the "University of Toronto, Department of Private Funding;" please note somewhere on the cheque that the donation is in support of the *Hungarian Studies Review*. These donations are "tax deductible" in Canada. Donations in excess of \$50.00 will be acknowledged in the *Review* on a periodic basis.

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

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

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

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

Copyright ©1985 by the *Hungarian Studies Review*. All rights reserved.

ISSN 0713-8083 (replacing 0317-204X)

Typesetting by Compsetting. Printed at the University of Toronto Press.

Contents

Papers

Some Jacobin Military Notions and Their Roots in Constitutional Proposals in Hungary <i>THOMAS KABDEBO</i>	3
The Impact of Hungarian Scientists on the Develop- ment of Biochemistry <i>GEORGE FEUER</i>	17
Physical Education and Socialist Ideology In Hungary <i>ANIKO VARPALOTAI</i>	25

Book Reviews

Est Vita Extra Hungariam: Hungarians in Canada <i>ROBERT BLUMSTOCK</i>	33
Hungarians in the United States <i>LÁSZLÓ KÜRTI</i>	43
Trianon: Sixty Years After <i>JÁNOS BAK</i>	49
Essays on World War I <i>N.F. DREISZIGER</i>	57
John Komlos, ed., <i>Economic Development in the Habsburg Monarchy in the Nineteenth Century</i> <i>THOMAS HUERTAS</i>	61
Anna Gyivicsán, ed., <i>Tanulmányok a kelet-európai irodalmak és nyelvek köréből</i> <i>CHARLES WOJATSEK</i>	63

The publication of this volume was assisted in part by a grant from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada.

Our Contributors

THOMAS KABDEBO is the librarian at St. Patrick's College in Maynooth, Ireland. Dr. Kabdebo is the author of: *Diplomat in Exile. Francis Pulszky's Political Activities in England, 1849-1860* (1979).

GEORGE FEUER received his medical education at the University of Szeged and the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, Budapest. Since 1968, Professor Feuer has been teaching in the Department of Clinical Biochemistry, at the University of Toronto. His major field of research is liver disease, and liver mediated diseases, including mechanisms of tumorigenesis. He is a member of the New York Academy of Sciences and a Fellow of the Royal Institute of Chemistry in England. Dr. Feuer is the author of the recent textbook: *Molecular Biochemistry of Human Disease* (1985).

ANIKO VARPALOTAI received her B.A. and M.A. degrees in Physical and Health Education from Queen's University in Kingston, Ontario. Presently she is a doctoral candidate at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.

ROBERT BLUMSTOCK is Associate Professor of Sociology at McMaster University in Hamilton. He received his Ph.D. at the University of Oregon. Dr. Blumstock is editor of the volume: *Bekevar: A Hungarian-Canadian Prairie Community* (1979). He has written extensively on public opinion in Hungary.

LÁSZLÓ KÜRTI is a doctoral candidate at the University of Massachusetts at Amherst.

JÁNOS M. BAK is a Professor of History at the University of British Columbia. He has published extensively on medieval and modern Hungarian history.

N.F. DREISZIGER has been teaching at the Royal Military College of Canada since 1970 and has been editing or co-editing the Review since its inception in 1974.

Some Jacobin Military Notions and Their Roots in Constitutional Proposals in Hungary

Thomas Kabdebo

For King and shackled slave, a future and a fate!
(J. Batsányi: On the Changes in France)

The Jacobin conspiracy in Hungary was the Habsburg Empire's most significant progressive movement in the last decade of the 18th century. Unlike its sister movements: the Austrian, Czech, Romanian, Polish and the Southern Slav associations of enlightened burghers, administrators, and intellectuals who had just the general ideals of the French Revolution as their goal, the Hungarians combined their aspirations of national independence with a revolutionary effort to achieve them. Like everyone else, living in the territories not liberated by revolutionary France, they were put down. Tracked by Francis II's police spies, they were arrested; interrogated in Vienna and in Buda, the leaders were tried and executed; the proven members of their twin societies—some 47 people—were imprisoned in Kufstein and their sympathisers were forced out of office in provincial Hungary.¹

The historical postmortems, while never denying the symbolic importance of the Jacobins in the Hungarian context, brand the conspiracy as premature, isolated and lacking in the practical understanding of the exigencies of the situation. Perhaps we may venture to say that the Jacobin movement had only flourished and reached immediate practical results where, as in Belgium, French arms assisted it. Martinovics and Hajnóczy, the leaders of the Hungarian conspiracy, may have built up their organization also in the hope of some type of French assistance.

The conspirators had formed two secret societies: *the Society of the Reformers* and the *Society of Liberty and Equality*. Three directors of the latter—the higher of the two societies—namely

Laczkovics, Szentmarjay and Hajnóczy, confessed to their inquisitors that they had anchored their hopes in the *Convention* organizing and concerting revolts in Central Europe.² Although no such revolts were ever organized and no French military assistance was ever promised, it did not stop the leader, Martinovics, from creating illusions about them nor did it stop the conspirators from believing in these illusions. Whether or not the country as a whole was ready for full scale revolt and military action, the members of these secret societies (Benda estimates them at ca. 300) believed in planning such action.

Looking at it from the point of view of independence, the roots of the conspiracy can be traced to the *noble insurrection* of 1790 against the Germanising and centralising plans of Joseph II. The Hungarian nobility enjoyed the interdependent prerogatives of tax exemption and the duty “to bear arms in defense of the country.”³ The call to arms of the nobles was, in 1790 called the *banderium* because it was an *insurrection* not called by the King but by the nobles to remedy constitutional ills. József Hajnóczy, Deputy County Lieutenant and the best jurist of his age, was busy drafting and re-drafting his constitutional proposals that Parliament should present to the King; János Laczkovics, captain of the Graeven hussars, was engaged in submitting proposals and memoranda to “Magyarize” the Hungarian regiments of the army.⁴ (Laczkovics, who had distinguished himself in the Turkish war of 1788-1789, seems to have held the opinion that the Hungarians constituted the real pride of the Imperial army.) The *insurrection* extended its activities to take the form of encouraging the escape of regulars from the closing stages of the Turkish war and their joining the “banderia” (the noblemen’s army); throughout the country clerks and the Diet’s deputies became involved in rebellious, independentist, nationalist correspondence with officers in the army. Meanwhile the Diet itself—having achieved concessions from the dying Joseph II—persevered with the questions of autonomy together with the proposals to preserve the privileges of the Hungarian counties, and sought to regain those privileges, juridical and civil, that Joseph had wrenched away from them.

Looking again at the mood of the *insurrection* and the subsequent conspiracy, the conflict of loyalty of the participants will be apparent. Hajnóczy, Laczkovics, but also Szentmarjay, Sigray, Pál Óz or Szolártsek, in fact most of the conspirators to

be, had been Josephinists. Some, like the non-noble Hajnóczy, owed their appointments to the emperor, others endorsed the side of the royal plan that had tried to lighten the burden of the serfs, had spread schools around the dominions, and encouraged French culture. Yet, at the same time, the anti-Habsburg sentiment enveloped the country and the Hungarian deputies made overtures to Frederic William II of Prussia in the hope of securing his help for a change of dynasty. Since Leopold's skillful Austrian-Prussian Reichenbach agreement dashed their hopes of offering the crown to the Duke of Weimar, the nobility in the Diet of 1791 accepted a compromise which was to give up independence in exchange for an assurance of autonomy for the county system and their privileges as a class. Those, like Hajnóczy, who had compromised themselves as champions of a wider definition of Magyar nationality, were dismissed or pensioned off, while those who had owed their office to Josephinist legislation found themselves "outside the bastions," or out in the cold.

Assuming that a nation should only flex its muscles if it had military potential to match that of its adversary, or if it could hope for an interventionary force assisting it, we should cast a quick glance at the Hungarian army. The last time the *noble insurrection* had expressed its strength was in 1741 when the Parliament offered *vitam et sanguinem* to Maria Theresa and contributed 26,000 soldiers. Some of these had been absorbed into existing army units, others formed new regular regiments. In Hungary the system of a regular army goes back to 1715 when—after eight years of haggling—the nobles accepted that the *insurrection* alone "was not enough to defend the country." By 1715 the Hungarian contingent in the Habsburg army amounted to 11 infantry regiments: about 25,000 people—10 regiments of cuirassiers: about 10,000 people—3 regiments of dragoons: 3,000 people—4 hussar regiments which are 4,000 people. Altogether 42,000 people. Their own regulars of the standing army, therefore, outnumbered 2:1 the total strength of the *insurrection*. But, the theoretical combined strength of the Hungarian army—out of whom the standing army regulars were, as a rule, posted outside the country, and the *insurrection* soldiers, as a rule, inside the country—could have, at least numerically, matched the rest of the Habsburg regulars. In the year 1740-1741, at the beginning of the Habsburg wars of succession,

Hungary contributed 60,000 soldiers, 35,000 coming from Hungary proper, the rest from Croatia, Slavonia and Transylvania.⁵

In order to draw other general conclusions, it is worth our while to refer to lesser known aspects of the negotiating process between 1708 and 1715 that resulted in the formation of the Hungarian standing army.⁶ The type of taxes which made the keeping of an army possible at all times, the mode of taxation, the general deployment and the control of the army, are dealt with in Béla Király's *Hungary in the Late 18th Century* and in Kálmán Benda's studies.⁷ We merely wish to call attention to their general point, which concurs with that of Hóman-Szekfű, that tax and the recruitment was always made dependent on the Hungarian Parliament.⁸ The particular point Király makes is that—with the exception of the four years between 1786 and 1790—the Habsburg army units serving in Hungary were supplied with food and fodder directly by the Hungarian counties. We would like to add that this could mean—at least theoretically—that in the event of popular discontent the local population could influence the army and in the event of open hostilities with the Habsburgs, as the vital supply line could be cut.

The negotiating process which established the army, the taxes and the supply system, was born of the recognition that a plain un-negotiated military tax, such as the 4 million crowns levied in 1697, could spark off, in fact did spark off an insurrection. When Joseph I convened Parliament in Pozsony in 1708, the chief rebel, Rákóczi, was invited (along with the counties). He refused. The assembled nobility proposed to defend the country by always staying within the frontiers, accepting that it is the King's duty to defend the borders. In 1709 we see the King's rescript which advised the nobility to pay tax in lieu of service. The final answer of the Parliament was that they were not prepared to pay direct taxes, but were willing to administer and apportion the taxes, according to the strength of taxpaying towns and counties. The Estates didn't say, just implied, that they reluctantly accepted the formation of a standing army. It is interesting to note that János Pálffy, the loyal, royal general, voiced the wish of the Diet: only Hungarians may bear higher ranks and the Hungarian regiments should be posted in Hungary. Still in 1711 an ad hoc committee, headed by the archbishop of Kalocsa Imre Csáky, proposed a

“systema militare” with one-third foreign and two-third Magyar troops, which was changed to one-half and one-half by Parliament. The 1714 Parliament requested that billeting and victualling should remain in the hands of the Hungarian Estates. Finally the Act 1715/VIII acknowledged the *de facto* Habsburg army of the day as the standing army, and seven years later, in 1722, the Concursus (a quorum of parliamentary and state officials) transferred the care of billeting to the King.

For a standing army which the nobility did not want to pay for and the feudal tenants and the towns couldn't quite afford, the recruiting was done in recruiting districts delineated by Parliament. Interestingly the regiments recruited their reserves from the recruiting districts where they happen to be stationed, with the occasional proviso that there should be a roughly equal proportion of voluntary recruits and conscripted persons.

Although Hungarians never filled all, or even the majority of officer positions in the eighteenth-century army, the military command for over a decade was under András Hadik as president of the War Council. Moreover, the new regiments of 1741 were initially headed by Hungarian magnates as commanding officers. At the beginning of the French wars the Hungarian regiments—as from the lands of the Hungarian crown—amounted to one-third of the Habsburg forces, with nine regiments of Hungarian hussars, a small portion of the budding artillery and whatever remained of the Hungarian noble guards as specials.⁹ The total Habsburg army of 295,000 was composed of:

57 infantry regiments, 3 garrison regiments, 17 frontier regiments, artillery, sappers, miners, river patrol, 34 cavalry regiments and 13 military cordon detachments.

The troop count of the regiments from the crown land of St. Stephen amounted to a figure in excess of 90,000.¹¹

As we have seen the “nationalist” demands of János Laczkovics' Graeven regiment had had a respectable prehistory in the early parliamentary debates, but they have been echoed by the submissions of other regiments too. In 1790 Hungarian cavalry regiments in Tuscany, the Splényi, Károlyi, Pálffy, Gyulay and Erdődy regiments, demanded the unification of the Magyar regiments into a Magyar army, under a separate *Council of War* which would be responsible to Parliament alone.

These were, of course, the same demands as Laczkovics' and all echoed the sentiments expressed in the beginning of the century; and notwithstanding article 12/1790's pronouncement of power-sharing between King and Parliament, there could be little doubt that the demands were not unconstitutional. Another 58 years would have to elapse, with an independent Hungarian government in the saddle, that on 26th April 1848 it should be decided that 10 permanent National Guard battalions should be set up—which was to form the nucleus of a new Hungarian standing army.¹²

Leopold II (1790-1792) manoeuvred not only the nobility into a sanctioned compromise position between 1790-1792, but he also bribed or cajoled progressive professionals to accept his kind of measured Machiavellian enlightenment that tolerated secret societies far and wide of the empire with built-in spies in the leadership.¹³ In Austria, next to the prime mover of the Jacobin movement Baron von Riedel sat the secret police agent Franz Gotthardi, a coffee-house owner; Nikola Skrlec of Zagreb and Jakov Secanac freemasons kept in touch with Count Lamberg of Vienna and Ignaz Cordova of Prague, their letters were copied and excerpted by the Hungarian informer Ignác Martinovics, himself one of the eminent illuminati.¹⁴ The Hofkommission investigated the conspiracy of the Lemberg Police Commissioner Trall, who had been democratic.¹⁵ But it would be wrong to condemn the activity of secretly informing the King in an age where the monarch appeared to be expressing the collective will. It is well to remember that the intellectually disposed professionals and nobles were elected to be his councillors, like Martinovics, when everything, such as Laczkovics' reinstatement or his full pension in the army depended on the King.

A change of personality and a change of political climate, and within a year Hungary was seething with excitement once again. Francis II mistrusted and alienated the progressives; he declared war on France, the country of their ideals. When this (indirectly) led to dictatorship and the loss of crowned heads in France, his new ministers toughened his security, his judiciary and even his policy of recruitment. They enforced censorship. The reaction of the professionals and enlightened nobles was to seek more radical organisations, to fight for the liberty of man, against—what they called “tyranny,” and “autocracy.” “I call Jacobins all those who like the French constitution and who are

glad of French military successes,”¹⁶ wrote one Hungarian correspondent to another in 1793, when—following the examples of French clubs at many points of the Habsburg empire—the Masons, Rosencrucians, Illuminati and even some Franciscan, Jesuit and Dominican priests became, or were labelled Jacobins.

The two interlocking Hungarian clubs implicated some 300 individuals: noblemen, administrators, ex-soldiers, lawyers, priests, professors and writers, although, for the “lack of evidence” only 47 of these were tried. Since it was the leader Ignác Martinovics who was the first to be arrested in Vienna on 23rd July 1794 and subsequently his co-directors: Hajnóczy, Szentmarjay, Laczkovics, Sigray, Óz and Szolártsek on 16th August 1794, most of the others had some time to burn documents and work out ways mitigating their involvement.

Each of the two societies: the *Hungarian Reformers’ Secret Society* and the *Society of Liberty and Equality* had a written constitution. The *Reformers’* catered to the liberal nobility and the burghers. Written in Latin, their rules appeared to have been composed in the autumn of 1793 by Ferenc Gyurkovics, a professor at Pest, with an important addition in May 1794 by Martinovics, at that time titular abbot of Szászvár, and what we would call today: a double agent. In the Constitution, which takes the form of questions and answers, Martinovics declares that an *armed insurrection* should be organized in Hungary on the pattern of the Polish war of liberation.¹⁷ This is corroborated by his subsequent confession.¹⁸ The constitution warns that should the French win the war, nobility would disappear, and Hungary would be transformed into a republic which shall dethrone the house of Austria. “Ad arma cives Juremus vitam liberam, independentiam a domo Austriaca...”¹⁹ Hungarian soldiers serving abroad would be recalled, while Germans serving in Hungary, either demobilized or chased out by the armed citizens. It will all happen when the Reformers will have increased in number and had a trained core.

The Constitution of the Society of Liberty and Equality was written by Martinovics in French under the pseudonym: *Democrate la Montagne*. It bears the influence of the *Contrat Social*, and of Holbach, Volnay, Collot D’Herbois and undoubtedly, of Thomas Paine’s *The Rights of Man*, which the Hungarian Jacobins must have known in French translation.²⁰ The two “directors” of the society were the two separate

Hungarian translators of its constitution: Szentmarjay and Laczkovics.

The aim of the society was to assume power after the country had risen and the *Reformers* have served their role in popularising the insurrection and the ensuring of the transformation. The *insurrection* merits a sub-chapter in the *Egalitarian Constitution*.

Chap. IV. De l'Insurrection.*

Q. Que faut-il faire aux esclaves, s'ils recouvrent leurs forces?

R. Il leur faut faire valoir leurs droits naturels par une insurrection.

Q. Que veut dire l'insurrection?

R. Si le peuple esclave *se lève en masse*, et si par l'union des ses forces et des talens il brise le joug de son oppresseur: voilà l'insurrection.

Q. Pendant l'insurrection, quelle marche doit-il suivre le peuple?

R. La marche de la sagesse et de la moderation; il ne doit punir que les traîtres a la patrie, et organiser la forme representative democratique.

Q. Quelle difference y-a-t-il entre le peuple éclairé et abruti par rapport a l'insurrection?

R. Le peuple éclairé la fait sans effusion de sang, et sans y mêler ses vengances particulieres. Le peuple abruti tombe dans la plus affreuse anarchie, d'ou il ne sort qu'avec bien de la peine l'ordre et la liberté.

Q. Mais contre qui doit avoir lieu l'insurrection?

R. Contre de triple fléaux du genre humain; contre les rois, la noblesse, et les prêtres, toutefois qu'ils abusent de leur pouvoir.²¹

The pivot of the insurrection should be the "lève en masse," according to both documents. But the tone of the documents leaves no doubt that the members were expecting the approach of the victorious French armies.

There had been Hungarian soldiers in French captivity and

* Certain imperfections to the modern eye are due to the 18th century writer whose mother tongue was not French. Please note that the 18th century French of foreigners was different from the literary French of today.

captive French soldiers were kept in Buda in the summer of 1794. There is evidence of fraternisation with the populace, and a recognition by the French soldiers that the Hungarians, at least in sympathy, were on their side. But was there any more to the French connection than chance encounters, and the spread of French ideas? Was there any more to French assistance than the prisoners of war distributing *liberté-égalité* uniform buttons? ²²

According to the *unproven* theory of Ferenc Pulszky—himself a freemason and an inheritor of some Jacobin ideals—there had been a secret plot to free 3,000 French captives which was to have been the start of the uprising in 1794. ²³ Martinovics, during his interrogation claimed to have received money from the Convention, and encouragement from Robespierre to assist in the insurrection. True or false, it had been the argument that suppressed the doubts of Hajnóczy, Laczkovics and Szentmarjay as it had lent viability to a possible rise of the people.

Since there was strict surveillance of all foreigners in the Habsburg monarchy from 1792 onwards, direct links between French and Hungarian Jacobin clubs were unlikely. Nonetheless, French clubs, aware of their fame as *exporters of liberty* often recited the verse: “Jusques a Vienne et dans Rome/Faites des Droits del’homme/Connaitre la majesté/” ²⁴ just as the Hungarians sung *Ça ira*, the *Carmagnole* and the *Marseillaise*.

It is unlikely that any of the Hungarian Jacobins, despite their cultural and philosophical orientation and their excellent written French had ever visited France. The exception was Martinovics who in 1781 had accompanied the Polish magnate Count Potocki, the author of the 1791 Polish constitution, on his West European travels, in the course of which, he may have visited scholars like the historian G.T. Raynal or printers in France. He certainly had corresponded with Condorcet although none of his letters have ever turned up in France. On the other hand no one has completed a systematic examination of French archives from this angle. Nor, for that matter, have his pamphlets been scrutinised from the point of view of the printer and the place of printing. We do know that the Hungarian Jacobins were loosely allied with the Austrian ones and that one of the Austrian leaders, lieutenant Hebenstreit, had tried to convey a military invention to the *Convention*. A Protestant pastor, Karl Traugott Held took the secret design of this “War machine,” which was invented to help the French against the Austrians, to Paris, and

petitioned the Committee of Public Safety on 20 Thermidor, *an* II. Although the Austrian police, which had learned about this mission, suspected that the envoy was seeking the help of the Convention for Austrian revolutionaries, the French in fact arrested Held as an Austrian spy and only released him after several weeks in gaol. We do not know what happened to the war machine.²⁵

The only figure who might have had contacts with Martinovics from Paris was Cloutz Johann Baptist a Prussian Jacobin nobleman. He had gone to Paris in 1792, played an active role there until 1794 when, as a Hebertist, he was guillotined on 23rd March 1794.

The nearest the Committee of Public Safety came to a plan that involved the “liberation” of a good portion of Europe was at the beginning of 1793 when Barere advocated that France defend “its natural frontiers” by assisting the formation of two friendly neighbouring republics. One would be the Roman, composed of most of the Italian states, the other one would be the German containing Switzerland, Bavaria, Austria with her dominions including the Transdanubian part of Hungary, Croatia and Dalmatia.²⁶ No Hungarian would ever have welcomed such a plan.

The idea of the *levée en masse* was very likely, germinating in the French successes of 1793 as reported by the *Moniteur* which all Hungarian Jacobins read. Furthermore, in a written submission to his interrogators on 10 March 1795 Martinovics claimed that even Montesquieu had observed in *De l'esprit des lois* (Livre VIII. Chap. LX) that whereas Hungary had little money it had military potential.²⁷

The term *levée en masse* covers several connected meanings and it evolves with the passage of time. In a certain sense, the Hungarian Jacobins could have discovered it in Hungarian history: the crusader-type recruitment among the peasants by Capistrano for Hunyadi in 1456, the rising of Dózsa's peasants in 1514, the popular support for Bocskay and Rákóczi were all that tradition. Martinovics warns in his note written in September 1794 from prison that Laczkovics' father alone, could arm 5,000 peasants.²⁸ Yet the *levée* in the societies' constitution must have meant a plan for a conscription law similar to what Danton proposed in the Committee of Public Safety and which subsequently had practical results. The clue to what the

Hungarian Jacobins must have meant is to be found in Martinovics' plan for a new *Constitution for Hungary* that he worked out together with Laczkovics in 1793 and which they had based on an earlier *constitutional proposal* by Hajnóczy.²⁹ Under Chapter 12 entitled "Von der ungarischen Armee" we find a statement that Hungary's total military might, if conscription was introduced, could reach a total of 300,000 soldiers.³⁰ This may not sound at all fantastic if we consider that Carnot in the years 1793-1795 raised 14 armies in France with the total strength of 500,000 people.³¹

Beyond the societies' closer circle which included only one professional soldier, Laczkovics, their sympathisers included cavalry general János Fekete, correspondent of Voltaire and dilettante in the arts, Count Mihály Sztáray, former imperial guard and prominent member of the noble resistance of 1790, and many other gentlemen who had had military experience.

All that does not add up to more than saying that Hungary seems to have had the potential to stage a revolt, yet it had neither possessed the wide base of a burgher class that would have supported it, nor had the organization that could have converted peasant and noble to fight for the same cause. Without that, the *levée en masse*—militarily always a possibility—would have been the sleeping body of an army in revolt. Since the Jacobin conspiracy was nipped in the bud in 1794 it remained to be seen how far the Jacobin ideas were to be the portents of the future.

As a witness of its almost immediate consequences we may quote colonel Gerard Lacuée, Napoleon's official representative, who in 1802 wrote to Paris, that *the memory of the martyrs was revered in Hungary although their imprudence was blamed.*³²

The ideas of the Jacobins, in a new context, came to blossom in the 1848/1849 Hungarian Revolution and war of independence, when the revolutionary left wing built its programme of social reform on Jacobin principles, and the middle nobility, their reluctant allies, drew on their own tradition of the resistance of 1790 to enforce *national* reform. In a certain sense, as Professor Deák in his book on Kossuth reminds us, the freedom fight tried out the *levée en masse* in October and December 1848, then again in May-June 1849 with very limited success.

What did happen in 1849 was, in a military sense, similar to the French successes of 1793: although recruited rather than conscripted, the Hungarian new recruits eventually blended in

with the regulars of a standing army, not unlike the French conscripts who had been regimented with the veterans.



This article presented one facet of the Jacobin military notion: *levée en masse* which connects the French revolutionary wars with the “catechisms” of the Hungarian Jacobins.* As the aims of their secret societies had spelt it out the Hungarian Jacobins wanted to overthrow Austrian absolutism with the help of an armed revolt. The short analysis of Jacobin action in other Habsburg territories shows that none of the other regions had a serious commitment to revolution. In Hungary, on the other hand, there was a tradition of “armed resistance” as well as a standing army, both of which could be boosted numerically. It is conjectured that through the military expertise of some top Hungarian Jacobins, the leading *Liberty and Equality* society had hoped to involve the army into a revolution, an army whose numbers would swell by the *levée en masse*. Furthermore, the directors of the society were led to believe (by Martinovics, their leader) that a Hungarian revolt would be followed by similar revolts in other Habsburg lands. The leaders of the society believed in help from the Convention—it is conjecture that such assistance might be military—although there was no evidence of any promised assistance. Most probably it was the fabrication of Martinovics, but such fabrication was necessary in making out a convincing case for the successful revolution.

NOTES

1. Cf. K. Benda, *A magyar jakobinusok* (The Hungarian Jacobins) (Budapest: Bibliotheca Kiadó, 1947): pp. I-XXVIII and Albert Gárdonyi, *A magyar jakobinusok története* (The history of the Hungarian Jacobins) in: *A magyar jakobinusok emlékezete* (The memory of the Hungarian Jacobins) (Budapest: a Fővárosi Tanács, 1919), pp. 3-56.
2. V. Fraknói, *Martinovics és társainak összeesküvése* (The conspiracy of Martinovics and his associates) (Budapest: Ráth Mór, 1880), pp. 262-263.
3. B. Király, *Hungary in the Late Eighteenth Century* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1969), pp. 183, 261.
4. K. Benda, *A magyar jakobinusok iratai* (The papers of the Hungarian Jacobins) (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1942-1957), 3 vols., Vol. 1, pp. 207-13. With copious notes the original petition of 5 July 1790 is reproduced in Benda's compilation. The co-author György Festetich was deputy colonel of the Graeven hussars. After 1790 he retired from the army and established the famous Georgicon at Keszthely.

* The name given to the *Constitutions* of the two secret societies.

5. J. Bánlaky, *A magyar nemzet hadtörténete* (The military history of the Hungarian nation) (Budapest, 1941), p. 113.
6. This and the following paragraphs are based on D. Szabó, *Az állandó hadsereg beczikkelyezésének története III. Károly korában* (A History of the codification of the Hungarian permanent army at the time of Charles III.) (Budapest, 1911).
7. K. Benda, *Emberbarát vagy hazafi?* (Humanitarian or patriot?) (Budapest: Gondolat, 1978), pp. 336-7.
8. B. Hóman and Gy. Szekfű, *Magyar történet* (Hungarian history) (Budapest: Királyi Magyar Egyetemi Nyomda, 1928-1935), Vol. 5, Ch. 1.
9. P. Újhelyi, *Az állandó hadsereg története, 1657-1780* (The history of the standing army) (Budapest, 1914), Chapter V.
10. C.A. Macartney, *The Habsburg Empire* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicholson, 1966), p. 130.
11. Bánlaky, p. 276.
12. I. Deák, *The Lawful Revolution* (New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1979), p. 135.
13. D. Silagi, *Jakobiner in der Habsburger-Monarchie* (Wien-München, 1962). Wiener historische Studien, 6. It is fair to say that Leopold II is credited here with more honesty than we are prepared to accept.
14. E. Wangermann, *From Joseph II to the Jacobin Trials, 2nd ed.* (London: Oxford University Press, 1959), and W. Markov: *I giacobini dei paesi asburgici* (Studi Storici, 3, 1962), pp. 493-525 compliment each other on this topic.
15. Silagi, p. 214.
16. Benda, *A magyar jakobinusok iratai*, Vol. 1, p. 179.
17. *Ibid.*, pp. 1002, 1007, 1014.
18. *Ibid.*, pp. 58-9, 149.
19. *Ibid.*, p. 1014.
20. *Ibid.*, p. 1017.
21. Ignaz von Martinovics, "Zweitschrift seines französischen Katechismus," in Silagi, p. 212.
22. Wangermann, p. 146.
23. F. Pulszky, *A magyar jakobinusok* (The Hungarian Jacobins) (Pest: Engel és Mandello, 1862), Vol. 1, p. 71. Pulszky may have drawn inference from the fact that in May 1794 Martinovics visited the French prisoners in Pest (Gárdonyi, p. 49).
24. C.C. Brinton, *The Jacobins*, (New York, 1930), p. 148.
25. Wangermann, p. 143.
26. "La Monarchie d'Ancien regime et les frontieres naturelles," *Revue d'Histoire Moderne*, 1933, pp. 305-33.
27. Benda, *A magyar jakobinusok iratai*, Vol. 1, p. 399.
28. Andor Csizmadia, *Hajnóczy József Közjogi-politikai munkái* (József Hajnóczy's legal and political works) (Budapest: Közgazdasági és Jogi Könyvkiadó, 1958).
29. "XCIX. Die streitende Macht der Urgarn bestehet aus der Ganzen Nation. C. Dreimalhundert Tausend Stehen aber unter der Requisition, der Heist sie sind bewafnet und beritten.
Cl. Diese sind aus der Ganzen Nation auserwahlt und eingeschrieben, wie auch im Kompagnien, Bataillone, Escadrone und Regimenten eingetheilt...." (Benda: *A magyar jakobinusok iratai*, Vol. 1, p. 904).
30. Bánlaky, pt. 20.
31. D. Kosáry: "Napoleon és Magyarország" (Napoleon and Hungary) *Századok*, 1971, pp. 545-626.
32. *Ibid.*

The Impact of Hungarian Scientists on the Development of Biochemistry

George Feuer

It may be stated, without being pompous or arrogant, that the development of biochemistry dominates most of the twentieth century medical science. Major achievements in the years between 1930 and 1960 have placed biochemical sciences in the centre of the scientific scene. Important consequences of these successes have led to the trend to describe all life processes in biochemical terms, apply biochemical methods in almost every field of medical and biological research, investigate biochemical mechanisms underlying disease conditions and utilize biochemical laboratory techniques for the diagnosis of the cause of illness.

The roots of biochemical research started in the middle of the last century. The year 1861 is considered the beginning, when the first chair of biochemistry was established in Tübingen for Felix Hoppe-Seyler. At the heroic beginning, many investigators were engaged to study an interplay of biology and chemistry, the main concept being to reveal the chemical structure of substances which occur in biological systems and to understand the chemistry of life. There were several schools mainly in Germany and to a minor extent in France. The core of their program was laboratory investigations where the analytical work was carried out. This analytical era resulted in many basic discoveries. Emil Fischer and his school established the composition of carbohydrates (sugar derivatives) and amino acids which are the building stones of proteins. Friedrich Miescher studied nucleic acids responsible for cell mitosis and characteristics of genes and heredity. Louis Pasteur's work led to the knowledge of enzymes which catalyze chemical processes essential in all cellular functions and for the maintenance of a balanced living organism. Later I.P. Pavlov described the enzymic and hormonal mechanism of digestion. The essential role of vitamins had also been discovered.

The importance of the new direction, studying the chemical composition of living organisms, was quickly recognized by the Hungarian medical public. At the beginning of the nineteenth century there was only one place in Hungary where medicine was taught, namely, the Royal University of Science in Pest, and this university wanted to adopt the results of the new progress. Although the legal rights and financial support were greatly curtailed after the defeat of the Hungarian army in the War of Independence in 1849, the school submitted a proposal to the government that a chair in pathological chemistry should be created for studying chemical changes in the living cell and in post mortem tissues. The proposal was rejected by Vienna, and only after the compromise in 1867 was the government allowed to set up a pathological chemistry department. The first was established in Kolozsvár in 1872, organized by Lajos Markusovsky and in 1874 in Budapest with the leadership of Pál Plósz. Many years later, after the First World War when the University of Kolozsvár was relocated to Szeged, a chair was created for medical chemistry in 1930 and was offered to Albert Szent-Györgyi. The biochemical departments of Debrecen and Pécs universities were set up after the Second World War between 1950 and 1960.

From the early stages of biochemical research Hungarian scientists exerted an impact on the development of this discipline. The reason for this may originate from the advanced scientific interest and outstanding intellect of several individuals such as Pál Bugát, Károly Than, Ottó Hermann, József Lenhossék, Jenő Jendrassik, Ignác Semmelweiss, just to name a few. These men excelled either in various branches of the natural sciences or medicine. Their inspiration significantly influenced the course of young people interested in studying the foundation of biological phenomena. However, since the possibilities in Hungary were limited during the last century, Hungarian scientists learned the *métier* mainly at German universities. After this training many students returned to Hungary where they continued to teach and conduct research.

Some Hungarian scientists settled in Germany and became internationally known. Many scientists left Hungary after the First World War, during the periods of religious discrimination and persecution, or after the Revolution in 1956. Several Hungarian biochemists continued to further their scientific

career and made significant contributions to the advancement of biochemical sciences in their host countries.

Two of these Hungarian emigrants were among the first Nobel Prize winners. In 1914 Róbert Bárány won the Nobel Prize for his study on the physiology and pathology of the human vestibular apparatus in the ear and cerebellum. In 1904 Richard Zsigmondy invented the ultramicroscope in collaboration with Heinrich Siedentopf. With the help of this new research tool Zsigmondy determined the movement of colloidal protein particles. He described their heterogenous nature leading to important information on the status of colloids in the cell protoplasma. For this study Zsigmondy won the Nobel Prize in chemistry in 1925.

In later years some other scientists of Hungarian origin won the Nobel Prize for biochemical or related studies. When Albert Szent-Györgyi received the award in 1937, he was the only biochemist working in Hungary. He won the Prize for his investigations of biological combustion, for the discovery of vitamin C and the catalysis of fumaric acid oxidation.

In 1943 George C. de Hevesy, who lived in Sweden, received the award; he was the first who used isotopes as tracer elements in research. In 1961 George de Békésy was recipient of the Prize for the discovery of the physical mechanism of stimulation of hearing within the cochlea (inner ear). In 1967 George Wald, a third generation Hungarian American, was awarded the Prize for his discovery of vitamin A and A-2 in the retina, and their role in the mechanism of colour vision. Imre Szörényi, who lived in the Soviet Union, also belonged among the great Hungarian biochemists. Szörényi received the Stalin Prize during the Second World War for his studies on the crystallization of muscle enzymes.

Generally, in the early years of biochemistry the Hungarian contribution was very modest, due to inadequate state support. Still, there were valuable contributions: István Bugarszky and Leo Liebermann described for the first time in 1898 that the surface of the egg white protein contains electric charges. This measurement was so accurate that even with the utilisation of modern methods, half of a century later, their data proved to be correct.

The second important period in the history of biochemistry was the investigation of metabolic processes and energy requirement of the cell. In this direction in Hungary Ferenc Tangl and Pál

Hári were outstanding. Tangl was first appointed to the chair of pathological chemistry, at the University of Budapest in 1903, Hári was his docent who became professor in 1915. The Tangl-Hári school was really the first in establishing biochemical research in Hungary. The central theme of their investigations was how metabolism regulates cell function, how this is connected with energy circulation and heat production and through this with the maintenance of health. Hári was also known for his spectrophotometric measurements of hemoglobin.

The application of isotopes, first introduced by Hevesy, represented a revolutionary advancement. The attention of biochemists turned to changes constantly occurring in the cell. It became known that the properties of the living matter are dynamic and ever changing, special qualities of life are associated with continuous turnover and modifications. This was the period when Szent-Györgyi started working in Szeged. He laid down the basis of modern biochemistry in Hungary. A brilliant and original investigator, his personality created a stimulating atmosphere and he trained many enthusiastic pupils. Most of the present generation biochemists learned from Szent-Györgyi or from his pupils the art of scientific thinking and investigations. Szent-Györgyi produced significant results in three areas: mechanism of cellular oxidation, identification of vitamin C, and the role of actomyosin and adenosine triphosphate, a high energy containing molecule in muscular contraction. A number of basic discoveries are attached to the achievements of the Szent-Györgyi group, including the isolation of myosin and actin, and the contraction of the actomyosin complex by the action of adenosine triphosphate. One of Szent-Györgyi's best pupils was F.B. Straub who discovered the actin. As a young assistant to Straub, I was the first who found that the actin contains adenosine triphosphate and that this compound is metabolised when actin filaments were formed.

The scientific activity in Szent-Györgyi's laboratory was various. Ilona Banga was involved in biological oxidation studies and later became interested in the synthesis of collagen, an important protein in connective tissue. Kálmán Laki's major contribution was related to the blood coagulation process and to the maintenance of hemostasis.

The roots of biochemical research was strongly planted by the Szent-Györgyi school and its merits were awarded by the Nobel

Prize. After this promising start, however, circumstances spoiled the smooth development. World War II scattered the members of the Szent-Györgyi group and after the revolution even more scientists left Hungary. Szent-Györgyi emigrated to the United States, and some of his co-workers followed him. In his eighties, Szent-Györgyi still works at the Marine Biological Laboratory in Woods Hole, Massachusetts.

Meanwhile the focus of biochemical research has changed. In this new period it seemed to be important to investigate the following: "what regulates the dynamic processes in the cell and what is the relationship between the cell and its surrounding?" Biological studies have established a principle that the living organism forms a unit with the environment and its existence can only be assessed by considering the interaction. With the recognition of the dynamic status of cell composition, biochemistry extended this principle to every constituent of the cell. Earlier the properties of isolated proteins, carbohydrates, and lipids have been studied, now researchers began to explore how these components manifest themselves in the unity of an organ and how various organs are interrelated by affecting the status of the living body.

This direction was recognized by Szent-Györgyi when he started studying the function of the muscle and the mechanism of muscular contraction. Following this tradition some investigators still continue research in this direction, Endre Biró in Budapest, John Gergely in Boston, Mihály Bárány in New York. Other investigators have been studying the processes of blood coagulation, the function of hemoglobin and role of abnormal hemoglobins in disease, Kálmán Laki in Washington, László Loránd in Chicago, and Zsuzsa Hollán in Budapest. Some investigations have attempted to reveal the biochemical mechanisms underlying brain functions. Maria Wollemann and myself, while working in Budapest at the Institute of Biochemistry, Hungarian Academy of Sciences, became interested in the problem of how energy producing processes are connected with the function of the brain cell and transmission of neural messages. Attila Fonyó and his co-workers investigated the association of adenosine triphosphate with subcellular particles of the nerve cell, particularly the characteristics of the mitochondrial transport adenosine triphosphatase enzymes. Maria Wollemann continued her interest in neurochemistry: at

the Szeged Biological Centre she has been working on biochemical changes occurring in brain tumors and on the molecular mechanism of how tranquilizers and sedatives affect the nerve cells. Meanwhile in London, I had been studying what is the biochemical basis of our emotional responses and how behavioural changes are connected with different emotional expressions such as cowardice and courage. We have found that these are regulated by hormones produced by various endocrine glands.

At present the biochemical research field is divided into two areas. Classical biochemistry is interested in the molecular basis of cellular function and how this molecular arrangement is connected with the structure of the cell and its subcellular components. Briefly, molecular biochemistry is concerned with the molecular mechanism of the regulation of life processes. The second direction is related to disease, it is called clinical biochemistry, aiming to reveal what kind of abnormalities or derangements of the normal molecular association represent the underlying mechanism of disease conditions. Briefly, what are the molecular changes leading to cell impairment and disease?

Our body is built of molecules, mainly simple or complex protein macromolecules, and it is logical to assume that all biological reactions have to be molecular, making life a molecular phenomenon. In 1950, the Hungarian Academy of Sciences created an institute for furthering biochemical investigations and training of post-doctoral students. The first director of this institute, Imre Szörényi, initiated studies on the structure and function of enzymes which remained the major direction of research under the directorship of F.B. Straub. The major achievements of this institute were to reveal the primary structure, and the effect of proteolytic modifications of the structure on enzyme activity. They found that enzyme action fluctuated in association with amino acid side chains but restricted when the prosthetic group of the enzyme became bound to the protein. The scientists involved in this program were Gertrud Szabolcsi, Tamás Keleti, Pál Elödi and Tibor Dévényi. Other investigations on molecular aspects of biochemistry included the regulation of enzyme action by Géza Dénes and his associates, alteration of the active centre of enzymes by L. Polgár, stereospecificity of hydrolytic enzymes by L. Ötvös, elucidation of the substrate specificity of some

proteolytic enzymes by T. Vajda, hormonal control of protein synthesis by F. Antoni and structural and functional studies on polypeptide hormones by G. Cseh.

An essential factor in the existence of higher organisms is the formation of cells and subcellular structures. The structural organization of the living matter into functional units provides the vital framework for survival. Considerable parts of cellular processes and regulation are connected with biomembranes. György Gárdos and his group have been investigating the importance of electrolyte transport through erythrocyte membranes. Recently, with my research team, I have been studying the role of a particular subcellular membrane, the endoplasmic reticulum of the liver cell; this cell particle is involved in the detoxication and elimination of foreign compounds. It is a puzzle why this membrane responds to the action of certain drugs or several foreign compounds by rapidly metabolizing them, while other compounds destroy these membranes leading to liver disease. The development of certain tumors caused by chemicals is also connected with the function of these particles. The results of this and similar investigations permit the fundamental conclusion that many if not all diseases originate from an impairment of the biochemical organization of the cell. This is mainly reversible but if the abnormal process does not turn back to normal level, it results in chronic disease and death.

There are many more brilliant immigrant Hungarian scientists who have participated in outstanding discoveries towards the advancement of biochemistry such as Mihály Polányi, who studied the crystalline structure of molecules and reaction kinetics, the basis of enzyme function. Paul György discovered riboflavin, vitamin B-6 and the role of growth factor in the development of the cell. Mihály Somogyi was a pioneer of abnormal carbohydrate metabolism and established an excellent method for the measurement of blood glucose. Hans Selye made a fundamental contribution to our present understanding of the onset of disease when he described the effect of stress as an important factor in the development of abnormal life conditions.

In this short paper I have attempted to illustrate the impact of Hungarian scientists on the development of biochemical research. The list is far from complete, and I may have unintentionally omitted valuable results and eminent

Hungarians. I had to restrict myself, however, to thematic selections as associated with the major directions and advancements of biochemistry.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Friedrich, P. "Biochemistry in Hungary: A Review," *International Journal of Biochemistry*. 4, No. 1, 1973.

Fruton, J.S. *Molecules and Life*. New York-London-Toronto: Wiley-Interscience, 1972.

Hári, P. *Az élet és kórvegytan tankönyve*, 3rd Edition. Budapest, 1929. .

Les Prix Nobel, 1901-1981. Imprimerie Royal, Stockholm: P.A. Norstedt and Söner, 1904-1982.

Liebermann, L. and Bugarszky, I. *Chemia*, 2nd Edition. Budapest, 1908.

New Encyclopaedia Britannica, Micropaedia, 15th Edition. Encycl. Brit. Inc., 1980.

Physical Education and Socialist Ideology in Hungary

Aniko Varpalotai

The concept of a physical culture is based on a number of theories.¹ Some of these ideas are traced back to Karl Marx, others have been elaborated since that time. Marx, in his treatise on polytechnic education, mentioned the need for "bodily education," both in the school curriculum and as a part of military training.² Though Marx and his close friend Friedrich Engels had little more to say about physical education, contemporary socialist educators consider the "education of the physical" to be of fundamental importance in the development of a socialist society and in the all-round, harmonious development of the new socialist man and woman. Socialism, it is argued, is to be a total way of life, encompassing not only economic or political advances, but also the transformation of the social and cultural world. Sport and physical education, as aspects of culture (hence physical culture) would also be transformed.

A great deal has changed since Marx wrote his 1866 treatise on polytechnic education. The most notable as far as physical culture is concerned are the increased amounts of both sedentary work, and leisure time. Perhaps what is important to us today is not so much the theoretical origin of socialist practice, but rather the aims and goals, the socialist developmental process itself, and the practical manifestations of these efforts to achieve a better way of life for all people. It must also be remembered that each nation within the socialist bloc is unique in its history and cultural traditions, and for this reason will necessarily use different means to achieve the ultimate end of a socialist society. In Hungary the political changes seemed to usher in scientific and technological transformations of the economic sphere, and ultimately cultural changes as well. These would radically alter the essence of education and would require the development of a physical culture for all ages.³

History demonstrates that mankind has engaged in forms of play, games and sports since the beginning of social life. Aside from the pleasurable moments provided by these activities they have also been utilized for military, political, ideological, educational and countless other instrumental functions. The significance of this popular cultural form, though, has received surprisingly little serious consideration.

Those who work most fully within the area of cultural studies, such as Britain's Paul Willis, believe that any social transformation will arise only from "reinterpretations, reformations of consciousness and fermentation from below around the most trivial, everyday and commonplace items."⁴ Socialist revolutionaries, similarly, have always regarded a cultural revolution as vital for the victory of socialism. In Hungary it was only "towards the end of the sixties that the recognition became general that the structure of socialist society in itself does not do away with social problems."⁵ Nor does a socialist culture spontaneously emerge with a change in the polity and productive relations.

It is not by accident that within the past two decades "cultural studies" in the west (such as Hall, Williams, Willis), and concern with a "cultural revolution,"⁶ particularly in Eastern Europe, (e.g., Bahro, Köpeczi, Sapora, Terényi) have come to the forefront. This upsurge of interest in the area of culture, and in particular, physical culture, is what I intend to discuss next.

Eastern European nations, perhaps more than other nation-states, have realized and harnessed the power and appeal of sport to promote the cause and creation of socialism. In Hungary this was a particularly attractive public forum because of the centuries of tradition related to Hungarian sport.⁷ In fact, Hungarian sport records are among the oldest to be found in Europe.⁸ But the institutionalized use of sport to promote socialism has its inherent contradictions. Much of Hungarian sport had been traditionally the domain of royalty, aristocracy and the bourgeois classes. The socialist revolution was to have dramatically altered the basis of privilege and physical culture was to be democratized. Despite the term's incorporation into the socialist vocabulary, however, sport has basically remained the domain of the "elite," albeit a re-defined elite.

The early years of socialism in Hungary (1945-48) encouraged the democratization of sport as the exclusive clubs and facilities

were taken over by the workers' movement. Despite serious political and economic setbacks, sport in Hungary managed to flourish internationally, nationally, and to a lesser extent, locally. Attempts were made to provide underprivileged groups: workers, women, students, peasants, with opportunities to participate. These initiatives were organized campaign-style and although they received much publicity, economic conditions restricted any large-scale reorganization.

By 1950, the initial enthusiasm of the people was waning. State control was strengthened, clubs were given more direct support, and at the same time were pressured to produce more world-class athletes, at the expense of the mass participation programs.⁹ The 1951 government organization of the OTSB (National Physical Education and Sport Council) united the political and professional leadership of physical education and sport in a single state apparatus, and thus solidified centralized state control.

The performance of athletes from socialist states at the 1952 Helsinki Olympics, where Hungary finished third, the Soviet Union, second, astounded the sports world. The Hungarian performances coupled with the phenomenal successes of the "Golden Team" in international soccer, encouraged Hungarian state authorities to further their investments in elite sport. The success of the Hungarian athletes was used to suggest, both internationally and internally, that socialist development was progressing at a smooth and steady rate.¹⁰ Since, at this time, physical culture was seen as synonymous with international sport the Hungarian successes obscured any need for a critical examination of the actual development of a total physical culture program.¹¹

Hindsight allows us to realize that although international sport, during this period, served the political ideology of the socialist government, it could hardly be called "physical culture" in the true sense of the term. Hungarians continue to be proud of their successful sports "ambassadors" but, notwithstanding this fact, the majority of the people still experienced physical culture only vicariously, from the spectator stands or through the mass media.

Clearly, there continue to be problems in defining and achieving a socialist society and within that context, a socialist physical culture. This is not to imply that no progress has been made in the area of sport and physical education in Hungary.

Opportunities for participation, and access to an ever increasing number of facilities has improved steadily during the 20th century. At the same time, these advancements cannot be attributed solely to the socialist system. In fact, the gap between the theory and current practice of socialist physical culture is almost as wide today as it ever was. One has to question how much of the state's commitment to physical culture is primarily to provide an international sport showcase for political ideology, and how much is truly a commitment to the incorporation of the cultural revolution into the totality of socialist transformation.

While sports authorities continue to struggle with these contradictions, there have been significant improvements in the area of *physical education*. Education, and especially the process of teacher training, is given a place of primacy in the socialist system. It is argued that since attitudes and lifelong habits are developed during the formative years, any lifelong commitment to physical culture must be commenced during the school years.¹²

Thus, in January of 1980, at the Moscow Scientific Coordination Meetings, the socialist countries agreed to cooperate in the 1981-85 plan to research the area of "Physical Education and Sport in the Socialist Lifestyle."¹³ The first phase of this study was a comparative survey of "Coaches' and Physical Education Teachers' Training in Socialist Countries." The results of this study indicate a disproportionate emphasis on sports performance, even now, but indications from Hungary suggest that there is a growing concern for physical education and leisure time activities among Hungarians.¹⁴ Two examples will illustrate the increased interest in physical culture. The five-day work week was initiated in 1982 which provides the possibility of the leisure weekend, common to other industrialized countries. Second, physical education has been increased from two to three hours per week at the high school level. This in itself is not unique but the comprehensive nature of the program is matched by few nations. Hungarian students now receive physical education training from nursery schools to university and other post-secondary educational institutes. Moreover, participation is compulsory for all students, with special classes offered for the handicapped and the gifted.

There is an obviously growing, and more sophisticated awareness of the meaning and values of physical culture. This is

in evidence in the mass media, and has been confirmed by sociological surveys.¹⁵ But despite well-developed theories, and a clearer understanding of what physical culture means in socialist society, regular participation is not as good as the authorities would like.

The Hungarian College of Physical Education is a microcosm of the tensions and contradictions that exist between sport and recreation, participation and non-involvement. The institute is responsible for the training of the best qualified physical educators, coaches, and sports administrators in the country, and as such it plays an especially significant role in the development of Hungarian physical culture.

Some of the most fundamental tensions are best expressed in the following apparent dichotomies: the traditional and the progressive; the “theoreticians” and the “practitioners”; the goals of sport and physical education; and sport-for-all and high performance sport. Though these tensions are familiar to physical educators, coaches, and other sports leaders world-wide, they pose a particularly significant problem for the architects of a socialist physical culture. Physical culture in this context has to be related to the social totality philosophically, theoretically and practically.

Published material would suggest that there is a well-developed theoretical argument linking the various component parts of physical culture together. Moreover, elaborate studies like that of Földesi’s (1980) would suggest that the inseparable links had reached the general population as well.

My many conversations with, and observations of the physical educator at work in the college and in schools suggests, however, that there is a discrepancy between the written policies and the lived experience of the teacher/student. Many of the respondents felt that there was an overemphasis on elite sport at the expense of mass participation and that this imbalance should be redressed. There was a significant “generation gap” between the faculty and students, as well as a distinct polarization among the faculty who taught theoretical subjects and those who instructed sports and coaching. Almost without exception the “sports faculty” members expressed a deep commitment to the continued pursuit of sporting excellence (citing this pursuit as the ultimate aim of physical education), while other faculty members, and the majority of the students, stressed broader educational goals, such

as the aim of encouraging life-long mass participation. The students also complained of the high and often unrealistic expectations demanded of the applicants to the college, and of those subsequently accepted into the program. These were deemed to be generally unnecessary and inappropriate to the socialist ideals of physical culture. For their part, the older faculty (and many citizens, generally) still lament the decline of Hungarian sport and blame the lack of “discipline” in modern youth and the inadequate content of the physical education curricula in the schools.

A major curriculum review at the Hungarian College of Physical Education in 1978 has dramatically altered the direction which physical culture has and will take in future years. The rigorous, though revised, entrance exam remains, as does a reduced, but still demanding, skill component. The reforms also emphasized that sports excellence should be accompanied by more extra-curricular activities. Greater attention is to be paid to the creation and development of a physical education adapted to all of life’s stages. It was also noted that physical education as a school subject, and physical culture generally, are still underrated by most Hungarians. This, despite the fact that in 1945 the state officially granted equal status to physical education with all other subjects in the curriculum,¹⁶ and that the Hungarian College of Physical Education, elevated to university status in 1975, is internationally renowned.

To combat this indifference to physical culture students and teachers suggest that a daily physical education program with: an emphasis on the enjoyment of a variety of physical activities, and, the knowledge of the individual health and social benefits, would go a long way to improving the status of physical culture.

Not only does there appear to be a change of attitude among the students with regard to the philosophy of physical culture but also in the types of positions they accept following graduation. As little as ten years ago, the majority of students graduating from the Hungarian College of Physical Education were seeking and finding coaching positions with one of the many prestigious sports clubs. Coaches were (and still are) granted a higher social status and receive more pay than the school teacher. Today, despite the continuing discrepancies, the trend has shown a gradual reversal. The majority of the students (86.5 percent of 4th year students in 1983) indicated that pedagogy as opposed to sports training was

among the most important subjects at the College as far as their professional training was concerned. They continue to find the practical requirements unnecessarily high and time-consuming, and desire an increased time-allotment to practise teaching, both to their peers and in actual schools.

This is not to imply that the coaching profession has been abandoned. Many students still engage in coaching upon graduating but more frequently this is a secondary occupation. What students are saying, in essence, is that physical education, and *not* sport, should be the foundation stone of a socialist physical culture.

There are important lessons to be learned from the ongoing Hungarian experience to develop socialist physical culture. Hungary is a powerful sports nation which has achieved tremendous international success. Olympic gold medals, however, do not make a nation of participants. The observations which faculty, teachers, but most particularly, the students, shared with me suggest that gradual, almost indiscernible changes are occurring in physical culture. No longer is it synonymous with international sports victories. It is much more than that. There is a serious and conscious attempt to realize the importance of sport-for-all programs and general leisure practices.¹⁷ Change brings with it both contradictions and tensions, and, as Marx suggested in the *Theses on Feuerbach*, "it is men (and women) who change circumstances and...the educator himself needs educating." How much the circumstances will change, how far the educator will permit re-education remains to be seen. One thing is certain though, and I again quote Paul Willis:

Culture is not artifice and manners, the preserve of Sunday best, rainy afternoons and concert halls. It is the very material of our daily lives, the bricks and mortar of our most commonplace understandings, feelings and responses. We rely on cultural patterns and symbols for the minute, and unconscious, social reflexes that make us social and collective beings: we are therefore most *deeply* embedded in our culture when we are at our most natural and spontaneous: if you like at our most workaday. As soon as we think, as soon as we see life as parts in a play, we are in a very important sense, already, one step away from our real and living culture.¹⁸

NOTES

1. The term "physical culture" used in Hungary, and socialist countries generally, is understood to include the whole range of physical activities such as physical education, both in the general sense: *testnevelés*, and as part of the school curriculum: *testnevelés*; recreational and competitive mass sport, elite sport, and the general maintenance of physical health.
2. Castles, S. and Wustenberg, W. *The Education of the Future; An Introduction to the Theory and Practice of Socialist Education* (London: Pluto Press, 1979) :38-9.
3. Terényi, I. "A mai testkultúra fejlődésének tendenciái," *A sport és testnevelés időszzerű kérdései*, 23 (Budapest: Sport, 1980) :31-2.
4. Willis, P. *Profane Culture* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1978) :7.
5. Boldizsár, I., ed., "Metaphor and Reality," *The New Hungarian Quarterly*, Vol. XXIII, No. 86 (Summer 1982) :4.
6. The term was not invented by Mao Tse-Tung, as is sometimes presumed. It appears to have been first used by Lenin in 1923; but the concept of cultural revolution is implicit in the whole of Marxist thought. (Castles & Wustenberg, p. 202)
7. Vető, J., ed., *Sports in Hungary* (Budapest: Corvina Press, 1965).
8. Földes, E., Kun, L., and Kutassi, L. *A magyar testnevelés és sport története*. Testnevelési Főiskolai Tankönyv (Budapest: Sport, 1982) :9.
9. A similar pressure is now being exerted on sports clubs, universities and voluntary sports associations in Canada.
10. Földes *et al.*, p. 422.
11. Schiller, J. "A sportszociológia aktualitása," *Testnevelés és Sporttudomány*, 1 (Budapest, 1980) :16.
12. Schiller, p. 13.
13. Schiller, p. 17.
14. Central Committee of the Czechoslovak Union of Physical Education, *Coaches and Physical Education Teachers Training in Socialist Countries* (A collection of studies in the International Scientific Cooperation) Prague, 1980.
15. Földesi, T. and Földesi, T. "Expectations Related to Physical Culture in Hungary," *International Review of Sport Sociology*, 3, No. 16 (Warsaw, 1981) :45.
16. Kerestes, A. "Physical Education and Sport in Hungary," Masters Thesis (University of Alberta, 1967) :16.
17. Zsiday, I., "Sports for Everyone," *Hungarian Digest*, 5 (Budapest, 1982) :117.
18. Willis, *Profane Culture*, op. cit.

REVIEW ARTICLES

Est Vita Extra Hungariam: Hungarians in Canada

Robert Blumstock

N.F. Dreisziger *et al.*, *Struggle and Hope: The Hungarian-Canadian Experience* (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1982).

If there were ever to be a contest to decide which people has wandered more over the face of the earth than any other, Hungarians might not win first prize, but they would certainly come close. From the moment that Árpád and his fellow tribesmen took those crucial first steps across the Carpathians and 'conquered' the fertile basin that comprises the core of the Hungarian homeland, it has been the rare generation of Hungarians who have not for one reason or another looked at their circumstances, pulled up stakes, and set out (often not quite sure of where they were going) to test their mettle in the world beyond their borders. Hungarians, consequently are to be found everywhere. This peripatetic, one might even say nomadic quality of Hungarian existence has not raised the status of the Magyar language to the level of French, German or English as an international means of communication. However, there is no shortage of stories which place Hungarians at the centre of world-class intellectual and artistic endeavours, from the creation of the atomic bomb, to the more glittering illusions of Hollywood and the Folies Bergère.

One of the places where Árpád's heirs migrated was Canada and now thanks to Nandor Dreisziger and his worthy phalanx of Bennett Kovrig, Paul Bódy and Martin Kovacs, we have a detailed account of this important story in *Struggle and Hope: The Hungarian-Canadian Experience*.

All too often in a multi-authored book there are differences in the quality of the contributions. In this case, however, there is a consistent high quality and each chapter's theme is clearly

defined. The end result is a well organized and nicely crafted book which begins with a brief summary of Hungarian history and moves through the different eras of Hungarian migration to this country.

There are however some interpretations, particularly in Kovrig's short chapter on "The Magyars and their Homeland," which require comment. To attempt to encapsulate Hungarian history in twenty-three pages can only be defined as heroic and Kovrig certainly does an excellent job, touching on all periods and highlighting the major figures. Yet there are, given the constraints of space, several points where brevity inspires elusion. This is particularly the case when the inter-war period is analyzed. For example, Nicholas Horthy is introduced as "a dignified and honourable figure..." (p. 16). This is too brief and simple a characterization and does not capture the contradictions of both the man and his times. To be fair, Horthy certainly was a popular leader who played a curious role as an Admiral of a Navy that no longer existed; a regent for a King whose return was actively discouraged; an acknowledged anti-semite who feared the consequences of the Arrow-Cross lust for power more than he detested Jews, among whom were several of his closest cronies.

Further, the Horthy era was the prelude to the ultimate destruction of Hungary's Jews. However, while Horthy remained in power, Jews bore their difficulties in increasingly straitened circumstances, yet they remained virtually intact until the German occupation of the country. As Kovrig rightly notes, "Hungary remained a haven for Jews until...1944." (p. 18).

In discussing the Bethlen era, Kovrig also glosses over some important details. He states, "...the regime made peace with the Social Democratic Party and the trade Unions on condition that they abjure the radicalism that had characterized the Republic of Councils. The franchise was extended to some two-thirds of the adult population." (p. 17). While this is not incorrect, it avoids noting that one of the conditions agreed to by the Social Democrats was that their activity was to be restricted to Budapest. In addition the extension of the franchise was soon abolished and the "open ballot" was reintroduced in rural areas. This meant as Istvan Deak notes..."the dead were made to vote in the open ballot areas, and the living were kept

away from the polls by the gendarmes.”*

Finally, Kovrig acknowledges that educational facilities were vastly expanded under the guidance of Count Kuno Klebelsberg. (p. 17) He fails to mention the *numerus clausus* law of 1920, which was meant to restrict the number of Jews admitted to institutions of higher education. While this law was largely ignored, it was not repealed and the later and much harsher Jewish laws of 1938, 1939 and 1941 were introduced into an environment in which restrictive legislation was well known.

If interwar Hungary is presented too benignly by Kovrig, he may well be too aggressively hopeful and optimistic about the quest for political democracy and national independence in Hungary today. Hungarians have always thrived on their illusions. This has led to renown in the arts and international recognition in the sciences, yet when translated into the often murky and practical world of politics, the end product has been the source of good jokes, but very dismal government. Hungary's "Goulash Communism" under Kádár's accomodating posture toward the Soviet Union is far from being the best of all possible worlds. However, this compromise does provide a measure of freedom and opportunity which Hungarians have rarely if ever experienced living at home. We in the West who live in democratic societies know what is lacking, and so do most Hungarians. If this accomodation to reality is something relatively new in Hungarian history, then the experience may well have its politically beneficial consequences in the future.

From the often debatable interpretations of Hungarian history, the next seven chapters, one each by Paul Bódy and Martin Kovacs and the final five by Nandor Dreisziger, all have more limited foci which present the patterns, events and issues which define the immigrant experience. The organization of the material is direct and flows easily. We are led from an analysis of emigration to the nature and types of settlements in Canada, culminating in a concise summary of the consequences of the Hungarian presence in Canada and the changing character of the Hungarian-Canadian community.

*Istvan Deak, "Hungary," H. Rogger and E. Weber, eds., *The European Right* (University of California Press, 1966): 375.

Paul Bódy's chapter, "Emigration from Hungary 1880-1956" brings together a mass of detail on who the immigrants were and why they decided to migrate. The basic organizing principle is the various periods of mass emigration from Hungary; before World War I, between the Wars, and finally the period after World War II, including those who left Hungary in 1956. Bódy notes that prior to World War I, the United States was the preferred destination, while during the interwar years, Canada was more generous in opening her doors to Hungarians and others from East Central Europe. The reason for this was the quota restrictions on immigrants, which limited entry to the United States to only 869 Hungarians a year. After World War II, this restrictive policy changed, yet proportionately more Hungarians came to Canada during the period 1945-1970 than to the U.S., with the vast majority coming after the 1956 Revolution.

The early emigration from Hungary, excluding the relatively small number of those who left after 1848, began in the latter part of the 19th century, largely as a result of the economic dislocations associated with industrialization. The major source of immigrants was the northeast, the area most affected by agricultural unemployment. The migrants were largely young men who looked to America as a place to earn money with which they hoped to buy land in Hungary. For most this dream never became reality, yet the money they sent home and their letters to friends and family were a major source of information for those who followed them. Bódy sees this information and the linkages established both at home in Hungary and in North America as part of a 'migration chain' which eased the confusion and pain of the migration process.

The second wave of immigration after World War I was not limited to economic motives, although this was a constant factor. Now the truncated Hungary that emerged after the shattering Treaty of Trianon, and the Red Terror of the Republic of Councils, and the White Terror of the Horthy regime found a more varied and urban population seeking refuge in the West. In addition the Hungarian minorities in the neighbouring countries found themselves less than comfortable and for many the only solution was to move, either back to Hungary or to any place where they could gain entry. The numbers, compared to the earlier migration were small. This was not a time when immigrants were welcomed anywhere.

The post World War II migration was the most varied in its composition. There were first those whom we have come to know as Displaced Persons, who as a result of the War found themselves outside Hungary's borders. Among them numbered Jews who were forcefully transported from their homes after the German occupation in 1944 as well as those who left with the retreating Germans and now found themselves stateless. A bit later there were also those who saw the handwriting on the wall and feared the new reign of terror which did occur after the Communist seizure of power in 1949. Finally, 1956 saw the consequences of eight years of enforced isolation when over 200,000 Hungarians voted with their feet and left their homes rather than continue to be players in a humiliating totalitarian farce. Since then there has been little new blood added to the now aging, assimilating and increasing native born Hungarian communities that began their 'conquest' of North America over 100 years ago.

While Canada was not the primary destination of Hungary's pre-World War I emigrants, the combination of effective promotion through immigration agents and the lure of a 160 acre homestead was sufficient to attract many both from Hungary and those who had earlier gone to work in the mines and mills of the burgeoning industrial cities of the U.S. Martin Kovacs, drawing from his extensive research on the Hungarian farming communities in Saskatchewan, presents in his chapter, "The Saskatchewan Era, 1885-1914," a capsule analysis of the nature, history and changes which have affected the earliest Hungarian settlements in Canada. The result is one segment of the development of the Canadian West: the survival of a tough breed of pioneers facing harsh conditions, who managed to organize their communities and lives so that future generations would reap the harvest of their toil. The transition from 19th century Hungarian peasantry to 20th century Canadian farmer was not easy and Kovacs presents the strains between the desire for cultural continuity and the necessity for change in an expansive environment which threatened tradition while offering opportunities all but unheard of by those who took the first important steps to "The Last Best West." These Saskatchewan farming communities are no longer the centre of Hungarian life in Canada. As generations have come and gone they have come to resemble the amalgam which defines the mosaic of

Canada. The historical markers, cemeteries, churches and small museums which dot the prairies recall the simpler times of the past when the demands of existence were met with vigour and hope for a better life.

From these beginnings Nandor Dreisziger in the final five chapters takes us through to the present, decade by decade, describing the character, issues and organizational dynamics of the developing Hungarian-Canadian community.

In the 1920's with entry into the U.S. restricted, Canada became the primary target for Hungarians coming to North America. However, it was not all that easy as Canada's immigration regulations limited entry to those with either the money to buy a farm or those who were guaranteed farm jobs. Dreisziger goes beyond the official statistics and notes that more than a few thousand of this cohort were middle and upper class refugees who sought sanctuary from the disorder which was convulsing East Central Europe. Although the data are admittedly sparse, this new migration tended to adopt an urban life style more quickly than those who had settled a decade or two earlier on Saskatchewan homesteads. It was a young, predominantly male group from varied backgrounds with a wider range of experiences than those who had arrived earlier. This ethnic generation gap did not enhance the cohesiveness of the Hungarian community, yet it was at this juncture that the associational bases of the Hungarian-Canadian community was established with churches, schools, sick-benefit associations and newspapers organized to help the immigrants confront their new homes in the language of their birth.

The 1930's were a tough time for all in Canada. The promise of the first three decades of the century were replaced by drought, unemployment and bread lines. For some a return to Hungary was the only alternative, for others a knowledge of the geography of Canada was gained as they travelled from one end of the country to the other looking for work. To the older farming communities in Saskatchewan were added two new identifiable Hungarian centres, the 'Tobacco Belt' area of southern Ontario and the Okanagan Valley of British Columbia. This pattern of dispersal throughout the country continued the pattern of the 1920's and while Hungarians entered urban areas in increasing numbers, their general pattern of life was still very much rooted in the soil of rural Canada.

Few new immigrants entered Canada during this decade

and consequently the community was characterized by an increasing proportion of Canadian-born Hungarians. Further, the economic difficulties led to a decline in the support of many of the struggling organizations and churches which had been established in more prosperous times. Adding to the general difficulties of Hungarian community life was the ideological debate between left and right which likely alienated many second generation Hungarians whose Canadian experience hardly gave them the background to appreciate and involve themselves in these old-country debates. It was an unhappy time and for the most part Hungarian associational life languished as the great depression ran its course.

A limited and superficial solidarity developed during World War II, but this unity was short lived and Hungarian-Canadian community life did not experience a lasting renaissance. On the contrary, the economic prosperity of this period saw less rather than more emphasis on maintaining community facilities. The battle between maintaining cultural interests and the seduction of economic rewards was resolved with Hungarian ties increasingly replaced by Canadian involvements. It was clear that the process of adjustment and assimilation had taken hold and was not to be reversed.

The postwar period, including the period after 1956 which saw the mass emigration of over 35,000 Hungarians, significantly augmented the numbers of the declining Hungarian-Canadian community. However, a familiar scenario was replayed. The new migrants had different experiences from those who preceded them and these differences were expressed in life style variations which precluded any overarching organizational unity. The temporary vitality of Hungarian-Canadian associational life was closely tied to the necessity of aiding the large number of newcomers. But this was short lived as again assimilation and the attractions and rewards of life in Canada took precedence over cultural affinities. Dreisziger notes that Hungarian-Canadian institutional life has always been characterized by atomization. Each generation of immigrants would join existing organizations, but as needs and interests differed new organizations were continually developing, while the older facilities declined through natural attrition. One explanation is offered in which Dreisziger attributes the organizational problem to "the Hungarian national traits of excessive individualism and pride, which make cooperation within institutions

difficult.” (pp. 225-226) This is certainly a plausible explanation, but in order for it to be taken seriously, comparative work on the institutional vitality and decline of other nationality groups would have to be examined. This clearly is beyond the scope of the work undertaken. Yet, it may be that these ‘traits’ are less crucial to the understanding of the problems of ethnic organizational continuity, than the different generational experiences of the various migrant cohorts. The time of migration has important consequences in terms of the ways in which interests and goals are articulated. In addition, education, region, and religion, not to mention occupation and more general class factors, all of which inspire and generate different world views, are too powerful to be conflated by the ties of language and culture.

Since this great inflow over twenty-five years ago there has only been a trickle of Hungarians immigrating to Canada, hardly enough to maintain a continuing and significant presence. Further, Dreisziger notes that Hungarians, in contrast to others, are less enthusiastic about language maintenance. With the loss of language as a crucial bonding element, the panoply of cultural distinctiveness will inevitably fade. But before the funeral dirge for Hungarian-Canadian life is played, it might be well to note that this process is not unnatural. The immigrants who took the risks of beginning a new life in a foreign land hoped that the future would be different from the past. This insight was very much part of their motivation. Of course the details of the differences were only to become clear when the realities of the new opportunity structures became available to their children and grandchildren. Transitions of this magnitude are never easy and the exchange of one life style for another is never accomplished without some losses.

At this point I would like to add a personal reflection. I know, as many readers of this journal know, either through their own experiences or through those of friends and relatives, what the pain of leaving familiar surroundings entails. Accompanying the burden of loneliness and alienation of the immigrant is the necessity to justify the decision for the life chosen. My mother, with a wisdom honed by her own experiences as an immigrant, knew very well what the costs and benefits were of having to begin life anew. She often reiterated a phrase in Hungarian which roughly translated suggests that given the nature of human anatomy, it was impossible to sit comfortably on two chairs at the

same time. Her resolution was to accept the consequences of her decision and to get on with life.

The fact is that it was nearly impossible for her to feel completely at ease in her North American 'chair'. In her formative years she had become accustomed to Hungarian upholstery and she was always more relaxed in it than in anything else. For those of us born and educated on this continent, we are confidently aware that we can sit on a variety of chairs. We know that Canada has the better chairs and there is little doubt that it is here that we feel most at home. Hungary will always remain the source of our origins. Understanding the immigrant experience makes it easier to see why our parents and grandparents decided to emigrate. One important consequence of this knowledge is to reaffirm our own commitments to their choice.

The title of this essay derives from a well known patriotic maxim, *Extra Hungariam non est vita — si est vita non est ita*, which translates as "Outside of Hungary there is no life — if there is life it is not comparable." What we learn in this welcome and thoughtful work is that life for Hungarians in Canada is different from that in Hungary, and in many ways it offers more, even as it seems likely to be less Hungarian in time. But there is no doubt that there is a good life outside of Hungary. How this life has evolved and developed is ably documented in *Struggle and Hope: The Hungarian-Canadian Experience*.

Hungarians in the United States

László Kürti

Julianna Puskás, *Kivándorló magyarok az Egyesült Államokban 1880-1940* (Hungarian Immigrants in the United States 1880-1940). Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1982. 639 pages.

Julianna Puskás' study is about Hungarian immigration to North America between 1880-1940, a subject that has been neglected in recent Hungarian scholarship. Puskás, a member of the Institute of History, Hungarian Academy of Sciences, has been an exception. She has won recognition for her studies of Hungarian immigrants and immigrant life. Since the late 1960s she has been active as a researcher and author in both Hungary and the United States. She has written valuable studies relating to the early Hungarian migration and the lives of Hungarians in the New World. The present book is the culmination of this two decades efforts.

This bulky book is divided into three major parts: the first part deals with the early period of emigration from Austro-Hungary, roughly from 1880 until 1914, and the official attitudes and policies concerning emigration in Hungary. The second part describes Hungarian immigrants in their new environment; and the third analyzes Hungarian-American society between 1920 and 1940, including the problems of acculturation and integration of immigrants into the larger host society. The actual text comprises 400 pages, with an additional 200 pages reserved for tables, indexes, figures and contemporary and archival documents. In a short introduction the author places her subject into the current historical framework on migration and emigration. Puskás admits, and rightfully so, that earlier historical literature in Hungary neglected this topic and that previous American scholarship, the "melting pot" theory, did not contribute to the objective understanding of this huge mass-movement at the turn of this century that involved more than 50 million people from Europe (pp. 20-2). She calls

attention to the fact that only recently there has been a major shift in historical research on American immigration and ethnicity. She contends that in Europe it was the Scandinavian scholarly community, through the works of F. Thistlethwaite, S. Akerman, C. Erikson, H. Norman and others, that pioneered investigation into western European emigration to America. In fact, she models her analysis on the Scandinavian results, although she also takes into account some recent American historical works that deal with East European immigration to the United States. In this part, she also surveys the most important literature on the subject but this should not be taken as exhaustive (pp. 50-6).

In Chapter 1 the author expands on her original 1975 essay dealing with the process of pre-World War I Hungarian emigration. Puskás lists the main factors that caused Hungarian emigration overseas: demographic pressure, limited social mobility, discontent on the part of the agricultural population within the borders of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy, wide gaps between wages, and the emergence of the so-called “pull” factors of American jobs and income (pp. 87-98). Her discussion parallels, but is not always coincidental with, the analysis provided by István Rác in his *A paraszti migráció és politikai megítélése Magyarországon 1849-1914* (Peasant Migration and its Political Policies in Hungary 1849-1914) (Budapest Akadémiai Kiadó, 1980). Puskás well illustrates most of her theses with charts, graphs, maps and tables that provide additional data on the age, sex, religion, locality and ethnic background of emigrants.

In the second part Puskás deals with the foundation of Hungarian-American society and surveys, perhaps somewhat superficially, Hungarian settlements in the United States (p. 186). The farming settlement in Florida that was known as Kossuthville; the strawberry farming community, Árpádhon in Louisiana; and Himlerville, the once-famous mining settlement in Kentucky, to mention only a few, receive trivial attention and treatment. It seems, furthermore, that most of the author's information comes from second-hand sources. I feel that an examination of the study by K. Bonutti and G. Prpic, *Selected Ethnic Communities of Cleveland* (1974), could have strengthened the author's conclusions as to the nature and characteristics of immigrant settlements. Cleveland is a major

American city and was built by many ethnic groups, among whom the Hungarians played a major role.

Puskás surveys the many and diverse cultural institutions of Hungarian immigrant society, an area that is difficult to deal with. Puskás categorizes immigrant institutions into the following groups: religious, lay and social (p. 231). This fails to take account of the complexities of Hungarian life and the diverse organizations that have played major parts in it. Where would, to give an example, the Hungarian Scout Movement fit in the author's typology? Obviously, it could belong in all three types. The danger of Puskás' typology is clear: the Hungarian immigrant experience does not allow for such a simplified generalization.

In the third part the author discusses the period between 1920 and 1940, and deals with the conflicts and major problems that created various processes within the immigrant society. Puskás is right in stressing that this period is particularly notable for the marked changes that occurred in Hungarian-American circles; for example, the stronger tendency toward assimilation; the upward mobility of certain immigrant circles within the ethnic enclave; disintegration of a considerable number of social, cultural and religious institutions; and even the creation of new settlements and organizations (pp. 319-404). This chapter seemed to be somewhat better balanced than the other two. I was able to detect only a few minor mistakes, among them the date of the first Pittsburgh "Hungarian Day" (p. 349), which was not in 1926 but in 1925; its purpose was to collect money to mount a permanent Hungarian exhibit at the Cathedral of Learning. The first Hungarian Day in New York was organized only in 1934. The author dates the foundation of the first singing societies (*dalárda* in Hungarian) and theatres to the first decade of this century (pp. 240-41). The fact is that the first such attempts may be traced back to the 1848 immigrants and to the 1880s and early 1890s. Perhaps not all of these performances were organized and shown in the Hungarian community *per se*. In documenting the history of the early Hungarian theatre, the names of the Királffy brothers and Jenő Endrei should be remembered and recognized as they contributed to the emergence of this major part of the ethnic community.

In the final section of the book Julianna Puskás included

several letters and interviews, obviously to support her conclusions on Hungarian immigrant life in America (pp. 551-79). It is not known, however, how the selection was made. Moreover, it seems that they were carefully edited, some appear fragmented, others seem to be only an abridged version of the original. One of the letters is dated 1963 (p. 579). Since there is no reference to earlier years in the letter it is puzzling how this letter can refer to the time period discussed in the book.

Unfortunately, there are some major mistakes in the figures and tables of the Appendix. One would hope that these are just misprints, but they are too numerous not to be mentioned. A few examples follow. On page 617 the author mentions the *Hungarian Miners' Journal* (Magyar Bányászlap) and locates its editorial offices in New York in 1914, and then in Himmlerville, Kentucky. The journal, however, moved to Columbus, Ohio in 1928; in 1931 to Cleveland; then in 1933 to Detroit; and finally, in 1950, to Pittsburgh. The *American Magyar Review* was published not only in 1937 (p. 611), but in the subsequent years as well. At the same time, the *Magyar Napi Híradó* was initiated in New York in 1937, and the *Amerikai Magyar Világ*, established in the same year in New York, are not mentioned in Puskás' list. Another journal, the *Szabad Sajtó*, was not printed in Passaic (p. 620), but in Garfield, New Jersey. The socialist *Munkás* was printed in New York and not in Cleveland (p. 619). Several cities in New Jersey, such as Passaic, Newark, Hoboken, Roebling and others, all large centres of Hungarian life, are placed by Puskás in New York State (p. 535).

Aside from these outright errors there are several broader issues that could detract from the seriousness of this otherwise tremendous study. The author seems to take a rather ethnocentric look at the immigrant society. She puts an undue emphasis on the role of the leftist, in particular communist tradition within the history of immigrant society. By limiting its point of view to organizations and newspapers of the left, the book also ignores or treats lightly the essential contributions made by immigrant institutions, especially those outside the church. For example, more emphasis should have been placed on cultural and educational circles, artists' colonies, foundations, benefit societies and others as institutions that shaped the immigrant society and promoted ethnic awareness among Hungarians.

The section on work and immigrant lifestyle (pp. 203-222) is marred by a lack of definitions. Phrases such as *etnikai tudat* (ethnic consciousness) and *közösség-centrikus tevékenység* (community-centred functions) are not clear to this reviewer in light of data presented. There are also conceptual problems that stem from the material. For example, the dichotomy between *amerikai magyarok* (American-Hungarian) and *magyar etnikai csoport* (Hungarian ethnic group) is confusing. In the former she includes only those “who grew up with Hungarian culture and language” (p. 15), while in the latter she includes the second and even the third generations as well. It is not clear why this distinction is meaningful.

The author also avoids the problems of ethnic tension and the ongoing ethnic hostilities that have characterized East European immigrant life from the beginning. The problems of Hungarian-Slovak, Hungarian-Rumanian, Hungarian-Jewish and other inter-ethnic relations have played a fundamental role in shaping ethnic consciousness and identity among Hungarians in America. Puskás also classifies the Hungarian-Jewish community as being part of the greater Hungarian-American society (p. 16), where, in fact, this group has consistently formed a separate social and cultural group.

Puskás also makes some claims that are not verified by her data. For example, on page 248, she states the following: “The feeling of nationality and nationalism and its development in this period (the first decade of this century) was felt in wider social circles of Hungarian immigrants.” The question that comes to mind immediately is, of course, was that not also true of Hungary and Hungarians as a whole in that time? She also argues that Hungarian immigrants participated in the production and fostering of “fake Hungarian” and “bourgeois ethnic symbols” (p. 246) in order to express their ethnic identity. It is important to point out here that this was not only the case with Hungarian immigrants, as Puskás seemingly suggests, but of Hungarians as a whole. Hungarian-American society received not only political and economic help from the various governments of Hungary but it has been manipulated greatly by the latter regarding political and economic goals as well. One fundamental aspect of this process has been the creation of different “ethnic” and “national” symbols. In this, the role of the upper class élite, both here and in Hungary, has been overwhelming, a fact that is outside of Puskás’ real interest.

There are some other questionable propositions as well. The problem of socio-economic heterogeneity of the immigrants and the limits of social mobility, areas of sociological and anthropological interests, are mentioned by Puskás only in passing. Her argument, however, is not very convincing. She asserts that the former, Old World, background largely determines the new socio-economic standing (pp. 218, 219). While this might well be the case to a certain extent, it cannot be applied to all cases and every period of Hungarian immigrant history. There are two final comments that should be made. First, Puskás' view of the decay of the Hungarian immigrant schools (p. 276) might be misleading. Accounts of early schools and the immigrant teachers themselves clearly show that the failure of the educational system was not based on solely generational problems, as she claims, but on economic hardships and diverse ideological attitudes, such as lay versus religious leadership, and real differences in pedagogical principles, foundations. The second comment, or rather suggestion, has to do with the time and spatial limits of Puskás' study. The 1940 cut-off point of Hungarian-American community life does not refer to the end of Hungarian culture in America. In fact, a renaissance of the immigrant community has been attributed to the newcomers after 1940. The role of the 1956-ers, in creating and helping the emergence of new Hungarian life in North America, is well known. In this sense, in future studies, it will not be justified to simply talk about "emigrant Hungarians," for the second and third generations and other later newcomers may not belong to this category.

In conclusion, it should be stated that this book is a valuable addition to the growing literature on Hungarian immigration history and ethnicity. It deals with an immense amount of data and a subject of great complexity that would require volumes. Puskás has done a valuable service in gathering important information and archival materials on this topic. I believe that this book will be of great use not only in its assertions and conclusions but by the many intriguing questions it will surely generate.

Trianon: Sixty Years After

János M. Bak

Béla K. Király, Peter Pastor and Ivan Sanders, editors, *Essays on World War I; Total War and Peacemaking. A Case Study on Trianon. War and Society in East Central Europe*, Vol. VI, New York: Social Science Monographs, Brooklyn University Press, 1982. 678 pages.

A comparative study of the verbal and other commemorations of the anniversaries of the Trianon Peace Treaty of June 4, 1920 would yield an interesting potpourri of intellectual and political history of Hungary and Hungarians. The tenth anniversary must have been drowned in the miseries of the Great Depression, while the twentieth may have been blotted out by the "successful" revision of it with the help of Hitler and Mussolini, which was partially the cause of the twenty-fifth anniversary's being marked by the preparation of the "re-edition" of Trianon in the Paris Peace Treaty of 1946. The thirtieth, fortieth (and even fiftieth) anniversaries were probably commemorated only by the openly revanchist "right" in exile or small "underground" circles in Hungary. In Communist Hungary the mere mention of the name of this pavilion in the garden of Versailles would have counted as subversive nationalist propaganda in 1950, 1960 or even 1970, despite the fact that Lenin's Soviet Russia and the Comintern had repeatedly denounced the imperialist peace treaties of Versailles. Democratic emigrés shied back from the subject, for they were, understandably, primarily interested in building a common front against Stalinist and post-Stalinist dictatorships with exiles from other successor states rather than risking such an alliance by raising questions of borders and minorities. However, the sixtieth anniversary in 1980 triggered reflections in highly varied quarters, and in the very last years several conferences, books and

articles addressed the question “sixty years after.” I am referring not only to the University Symposium in New York (of which this book is an extended record), but, among others, to a conference in Strasbourg in the Summer of 1984, devoted to Trianon, and to the fact that the problems connected with that peace treaty and its consequences loomed also large at the internal debates on “problems of national consciousness” held in June 1984 at the Historical Research Institute in Budapest.

I wonder, whether it is mere Hungaro-centric myopia, but it seems that of all the peace treaties following the First World War the many problems “of Trianon” are perhaps the most vivid, but in comparison to their significance, the least widely discussed in any contemporary terms. Of course in Germany, discussions and soul-searching about the rise of Nazism always imply questions going back to Versailles, but the treaty is only one of many. German ethnic minorities created by Versailles have been long ago either called “home into the Reich” or expelled by post-World War II régimes. St. Germain commands more scholarly than popular interest in Austria, even though the borders and the autonomy of the present-day republic are based on those decisions. True, the *Südtirol-Alto Adige* irridenta still excites a small and militant constituency, but the rest of the Austrians learned to appreciate the 1920 prohibition of an *Anschluss* to their peril. The history of Bulgaria has certainly changed much after Neuilly, but at least the size of the national minorities on both sides of the borders is limited. Finally, pre-Sèvres Turkey belongs most definitely to ancient history and the Turks of today do not regret not being in charge of the most conflict-torn regions of the world, that formerly belonged to “their” Empire. In contrast, historical Hungary’s loss of sizeable territories and of millions of ethnic Hungarians to the newly established or extensively enlarged successor states did not quite become “past.” To begin with, unlike the other peace treaties, Trianon was re-decreed in 1946. To an even greater extent it is the consequence of a failure to face realities. Neither the Horthy régime nor the Communist one permitted open and sincere discussion of Trianon. The former – while actively politicking for its revision – utilised it primarily as an excuse for conservative authoritarianism, and the latter pretended that it was a “non-issue.” In the years of Stalinism, or even longer, the quite explicit charge of Hungarians being a “guilty nation” that

deserved its losses by having “abandoned Communism” in 1919, then by joining the anti-Soviet war (and jumping off too late) was consciously nurtured by the Party ideologues. But it is also a fact that more than half a century and more than one political and social revolution later the issues left unsolved (or created) in Trianon are still causing misery to considerable-sized ethnic minorities and tensions between allegedly allied and “brotherly” states. Hence, the present renewed interest in Trianon, in Hungary and abroad, does not originate in mere coincidence, although the generational change may have something to do with it. The truly alarming conditions in Rumania, where the Hungarian population is clearly suffering more than others, and signs of anti-Hungarian sentiment in Slovakia acted as catalysts that made a wide range of Hungarians, including even the official Hungarian authorities, overcome their understandable reluctance of discussing these matters. For decades any mention of the problems of Trianon was inevitably tinted with implications of Horthyite revisionism. That, however, was seen by many as responsible for the devastations suffered by Hungary in and after the war, and—in the last resort—for the re-imposition of the borders of 1920. When, however, several decades during which only “socialist internationalism” and “Leninist nationality policies” were preached, proved to be unable to overcome old nationalist prejudices or even created new ones, the unsavoury implications of speaking of Trianon had to be suspended for the sake of a sober review. Were one not aware of these far reaching implications, all this might appear as digging up long buried battle axes, but—alas—the issues are not dead and mere silence does not make them go away.

The purpose of this handsomely produced and well written (in parts also well translated) book is a scholarly re-visitation of Trianon by Hungarian and non-Hungarian scholars, authors from the Hungarian People’s Republic, Britain, Israel and North America. Many of them prepared original material for the volume utilising archival research on documents that became recently accessible, others offered summaries of their previous research or articles published in less accessible languages. It would be futile—and for the reader tedious—to summarize and comment on thirty-two articles on diplomatic, intellectual, social, economic and literary history, all of which are more or less relevant to the problem of Trianon. That all authors agree, the

Trianon Settlement was unjust, influenced as it was by prejudice, bias and resentment (to say nothing of a good measure of ignorance), is not surprising, and may not originate merely in editorial choice. It is notable that the authors living in Budapest provide a more nuanced approach to Trianon than those abroad, and, maybe, not merely because of internalized censorship. But, in general, few historians and political scientists would today approve of the inconsistent and often haphazard decisions taken in the years of debates in Paris. What remains to be asked are questions about the background of the decisions of those years and the significance of their consequences for our world.

As to the reasons of the admittedly unjustified harsh treatment of Hungary, the main issue seems to be the long standing anti-Hungarian (or anti-Magyar) sentiment in the West, probably in France first and England later. The exact chronology, the addressees and motives of it still demand detailed inquiry. One of the crucial figures in the background of Trianon, whose role—played partially by omission—emerges here more clearly than before, was R.W. Seton-Watson. He, as *Scotus Viator*, had set the tone vis-a-vis Old Hungary around the turn of the century and did not hasten to revise it in the face of a revolutionary, democratic one in November 1918. Since, as Stephen Borsody points out, “Trianon was above all a triumph of propaganda,” the analysis of the opinion-makers is of paramount importance. Hence a short piece by Hugh Seton-Watson on his father, augmented by a contribution from Budapest (by Károly Vigh) and an excellently researched study by Thomas Sakmyster are among the most interesting papers in the volume. Sakmyster draws, on the basis of extensive archival material from the Public Record Office and elsewhere, a much more differentiated picture of British policies vis-a-vis Hungary than those hitherto presented. He shows the difference, the incoordinated divergence and even conflict between the views and interests of Lloyd George’s government, the diplomats and the “experts.” Sakmyster augmented considerably what Hugh Seton-Watson was able—or willing—to tell about his father. Still, neither of them offers an explanation for R.W. Seton-Watson’s failure to support his old friends, such as Oscar Jászi, when the chips were falling. Jászi and his associates had placed their hopes in the democratic West, represented by Seton-Watson and Steed, and had suffered maltreatment in their country for keeping

friendship with these Englishmen. Why did they not speak up for their prewar colleagues, who were now in the government of a new, democratic Hungary in the crucial last months of 1918? Would Seton-Watson's suspicion of "Count" Károlyi as just another aristocrat be a sufficient explanation? Or was Jászi right, when he—already before the war—warned Seton-Watson of losing his political judgment and accusing "the Hungarians" without any differentiation of chauvinism, instead of addressing the active culprits: the régime? Or was it rather so that the revolutionary events in Germany and Russia, together with the many domestic and colonial problems in the first months after armistice, simply diverted the interest from the Danubian Basin. Sakmyster's conclusion supports the last option. It is a very sobering and realistic one, sad as it may sound to the people in the Danubian Basin: among the many issues Britain had to face in 1919-1920, the Hungarian borders were hardly of high priority. The fate of the constituent parts of the Habsburg Empire was decided, at any rate *de facto*, during the months between October 1918 and May 1919, before serious work on "peacemaking" had even begun. Those who really could have offered a differentiated view on the Entente side, and those—such as Jászi—who had opposed the pre-1914 policy of Magyarisation, were overwhelmed by events in which the shots were called by local commanders of Allied forces and politicians of the successor states. This is also the scenario that emerges from the detailed studies of these months, such as Peter Pastor's, Mária Ormos's and Zsuzsa L. Nagy's. While the Western friends of democracy and national self-determination cannot be exonerated for what happened in these months, they may have seen themselves faced with *faits accomplis*: a situation in which, essentially French interests (see the excellent archival studies of M. Ádám and A. Orde), anti-Habsburg propaganda, dislike for the Hungarian Establishment in liberal circles of the West, and—increasingly—fear of Soviet-type revolutions dictated the steps.

The volume contains much information on the immediate and long-term effects of Trianon, including the Baranya-dispute and the plebiscite on the Austrian border (around Ödenburg-Sopron). A few other topics, such as the impact of Trianon on the Jews and on Anti-Semitism in Hungary would have deserved a less cursory treatment ; but space was, of course,

limited. Lee Congdon's brief survey of the democratic emigration and its dilemma of choosing between cooperation with the Little Entente or remaining politically ineffective protesters against the Horthy-régime is indeed a very astute analysis. It draws attention to a peculiar *cul de sac* (with the word of the oft-quoted István Bibó) of Hungarian intellectual history: the country's great contemporary poet, the recently deceased populist Gyula Illyés, felt it appropriate as recently as a few years ago, to intimate that Jászi, Károlyi and their political friends may have pursued treacherous paths when they cooperated with Beneš against Horthy. (This problem is not touched upon in K. Nagy's paper on a recent collection of Illyés's relevant essays.)

It was a valiant effort by the editors to include intellectual and literary aspects of "Trianon" as well. It is much more difficult, however, to correlate a peace treaty with poetry or historiography than with economic and social consequences. The studies on László Németh, Sándor Reményik, Gyula Illyés and on the interwar historians add interesting spotlights, yet do not add up to a systematic analysis. One of the crucial issues was that the victorious democracies, by refusing to grant credibility to a pro-Entente revolution in Budapest or to negotiate a solution out of a dictatorship of desperation, seemed to be responsible for having abandoned the weak forces of democracy in Hungary. Thus, many a Western-oriented intellectual saw the events of 1918-20, not unfoundedly, as having caused not only unjust borders but — and this is more profound — having also discredited democracy and social transformation for generations. This disappointment shaped the better part of Hungarian intellectual life for more than just a few years after Trianon. The myth—mixed with reality—of "being abandoned" grew and resurfaced many times since. We still are in need of a consistent evaluation of the impact of lost wars, failed revolutions and unjust peace-treaties on the consciousness of the nation. Because 1945 was experienced not only as "liberation," but also as destruction and humiliation; the borders of 1946, equal to those of 1920, not only as logical outcome of misdirected revisionism, but also as one more example of historical "bad luck." And, for the last 30 years little of all this could be cleared up in open debate and analysis. It is indeed a question worth exploring: how can a healthy—neither crushed nor chauvinistically inflated—national self-respect emerge from this

history, one that is able to accommodate concern for the fate of ethnic minorities without nursing revanchist dreams. Some of these points are raised very succinctly in the last section of this book.

Essays on World War I

N.F. Dreisziger

Samuel R. Williamson, Jr., and Peter Pastor eds., *Essays on World War I: Origins and Prisoners of War*, War and Society in East Central Europe series, Vol. 5, Brooklyn: Social Science Monographs, 1983. 264 pages.

Peace on earth and human rights: these are the burning issues of the Twentieth Century. Both had been profoundly affected during 1914-1918, especially through events that had taken place in those years in East Central Europe and Russia. Some of these developments are discussed in ten papers collected in this volume.

The first part of this book is entitled *The Origins of World War I Reconsidered*. It contains essays by Paula Sutter Fichtner, William Jannen, Jr., Michael Palumbo, as well as Professor S.R. Williamson, the editor of this section. Professor Fichtner, to take the papers in no particular order, deals with the wartime roots of the conservative revolution of the 1920s, particularly in Austria. Dr. Palumbo explains how Austrian misconceptions about Italian loyalty to the Triple Alliance contributed to Vienna's decision to embark upon what was expected to be a "local war" against Serbia. Professor Jannen outlines an even broader basis for miscalculation on the part of the Viennese leaders. Using the approach of psychoanalytical history, he asserts that by July of 1914 Austrian leaders were so frustrated with the Serbian terrorist onslaught on their Balkan provinces that they came to the conclusion that military action was the only way out of an untenable political situation. Up to July of 1914, the Austrian leadership had always considered Russian sensitivities, but after the assassination of Archduke Francis Ferdinand, it abandoned this policy of caution. Hungarian Minister President István Tisza warned against the "terrible calamity of a European war," but his peers among the Austro-Hungarian elite were determined to risk a war lest their country

would be considered weak both by other powers and by their own minorities, especially the South Slavs. The peculiarly “blinkered approach” of these men, Jannen argues, was shared by other European leaders at the time who “repeatedly perceived themselves as having no choice but to issue an ultimatum, or to mobilize, or to fight, while they saw their opponents as free to back down, to compromise, or to pursue some alternative line of action.” (p. 59). Where the Austro-Hungarian leaders differed from the other European leaders was that in July of 1914 they paid even less attention as to how other countries’ governments might react to their decisions. The responsibility for the calamity of the war then lies heavily with the Viennese leadership, a conclusion that editor S.R. Williamson also endorses in his own study. His essay, based on a more traditional historiographical approach, examines among other things the increasingly hawkish attitudes to the question of Austro-Serbian relations of such men as General Franz Conrad von Hötzendorf, Count Leopold Berchtold, and even the aging Francis Joseph. It is an irony of history, that the very man who could and probably would have opposed this trend effectively, Francis Ferdinand, was killed by the Serbian terrorists themselves.

The second part of the volume, edited by Professor Peter Pastor, is entitled *Case Studies on East Central European Prisoners of War in World War I*. It contains six papers as well as a list and a map of prisoners-of-war camps in the Russian Empire (1914-1917). Most of the essays deal with one or more Central or East European national groups in Russian captivity after 1914.

In his introduction to this half of the book, Professor Pastor suggests that the Soviet tradition of the *gulag*, a network of concentration camps stretching from Poland to the Far East, had its roots not so much in Stalin’s time, but in the prisoners-of-war camps of World War I. Most of the two million POWs held by the Russians during the war came from the Habsburg army, and were made up of various nationalities. Tsarist Russia was not prepared for their reception. Arrangements for their transportation, care and housing often had to be improvised under adverse conditions. According to Professor Pastor, the Russian military leadership’s “callous handling of its own troops also extended to the prisoners of war.” (p. 114).

The POWs were often neglected, manipulated, exploited and, after the revolution, were increasingly subjected to political

propaganda and were dragged into the country's nascent civil war. Ethnic divisions and national animosities among the POWs were exploited and exacerbated to the extent that within the Russian civil war there developed a civil war of East Central Europeans as well.

The most comprehensive paper in this collection is Gerald M. Davis' "The Life of Prisoners of War in Russia, 1914-1921." Its author assigns responsibility for the misfortunes of many POWs not so much to the callousness of the Russian command, but to the harshness of Russian conditions — both climatic and economic — as well as to administrative ineptitude. With inefficient transportation, and inadequate medical services, sanitation, housing and food supplies, coupled with hostility from the local population, it is not surprising that hundreds of thousands of POWs failed to survive their ordeal. Those that did, found their lives further complicated by the Russian Revolution and the Civil War. During 1917-1921 POWs "became actively involved in every aspect of the struggles and in every geographical area." (p. 185). The process of final repatriation was undertaken only in 1920.

The essay that is of most interest to Hungarian specialists is Professor Pastor's own paper, "Hungarian POWs in Russia during the Revolution and Civil War." The study points out that under the Provisional Government of Alexander Kerenskiy, discrimination against non-Slavic POWs increased. Among the revolutionary parties only the Bolsheviks paid attention to the plight of the prisoners-of-war, and promised peace with the prospect of return home. These and other factors induced many Hungarian captives to hope for Bolshevik victory. In the meantime most Slavic POWs pegged their hopes on the triumph of the Kerenskiy government in Russia and an Entente victory in the war. The stage was set for conflict among Hungarian subjects among the POWs within the larger civil war brewing in Russia. Indeed, many Hungarians did end up fighting on the Bolshevik side. Professor Pastor argues that their motive for joining was not so much ideology but the fact that in Bolshevik victory they saw a "new chance to return home." (p. 152).

Collections of essays can often be criticised for not including enough papers to cover most aspects on their subject. In connection with this particular collection it might be said that a few more papers on each of its main subjects would have

justified the printing of two books rather than one, yet such criticism should not be made lightly. Editors and publishers are limited in what they can offer at a given time, and for them to wait until more, and more suitable papers become available might mean the demise of their publishing project. If this had happened to the volume under review, students of history would have been deprived of a collection that offers much that is new and one that is helpful for the understanding of the roots of our days' most profound issues.

Book Reviews

Economic Development in the Habsburg Monarchy in the Nineteenth Century. John Komlos, ed., New York: Columbia University Press, 1983. East European Monographs, No. 128. 204 pages.

For nearly twenty years economic historians have laboured to revise the picture of the economic development of the Habsburg Monarchy inherited from traditional historians—that the Empire was economically backward, and remained so because it could not overcome certain institutional and natural barriers to growth, such as its feudal structure, lack of entrepreneurs, lack of financial institutions, lack of natural resources and unfavourable location. This poor economic performance, traditional historians contended, contributed to the political disintegration of the Monarchy and to its break-up into national states following World War I.

Economic historians have demolished practically every element of this traditional view, and this volume of reprinted and original essays presents an extensive sampling of that work. In the opening essay, “Austria-Hungary in the World Economy,” Nachum Gross places the Habsburg economy in an international context. True, the Habsburg economy was backward relative to the United Kingdom, Germany and France, but it was advanced relative to Italy, Russia and the Balkan countries. Thus, it fell in the midst of the northwest-southeast path of development that traversed Europe during the nineteenth century.

In addition, Gross shows that backwardness did not mean stagnation. The Habsburg economy underwent considerable growth and development during the years prior to 1914. It industrialized gradually, starting as early as the eighteenth century and continuing through into the twentieth—a pattern, Gross believes, that is far more typical than the “big-spurr” experienced by Germany.

Most of the essays concern an evaluation of the barriers to growth listed above and of the government policies designed to

remove those barriers. In “Agriculture as a Source of Labor Supply: Conjecture from the History of Hungary, 1870-1913,” Scott Eddie demonstrates that Hungary’s feudal structure did not pose a barrier to growth. Despite the dominance of the lords’ latifundia, Hungarian agriculture did release sufficient labour to allow industrialization to proceed at a rapid pace. In “Industrial Growth and Entrepreneurship in the Early Stages of Industrialization in the Czech Lands,” Arnost Klima shows that resident and immigrant entrepreneurs, both common and noble, initiated industrial ventures in Bohemia and Moravia as early as the eighteenth century. In “The Austrian Credit Mobilier in a Time of Transition,” Eduard Marz describes the entrepreneurial activities of the Empire’s foremost financial institution. John Komlos further refutes the notion that Austria-Hungary lacked financial institutions. His essay, “The Diffusion of Financial Technology into the Habsburg Monarchy Toward the End of the Nineteenth Century,” describes the benefits of various financial reform measures undertaken by the Empire in the 1880s and 1890s. The last two barriers mentioned above—the lack of natural resources and the Empire’s unfavourable location—from the foil for the essay by László Katus, “Transport Revolution and Economic Growth in Hungary.” Through building a transport network, especially railroads, Hungary was largely able to overcome its natural disadvantages. Rail lines linked coal and iron-ore deposits, allowing a domestic iron industry to develop; rail lines linked the grain growing areas to world markets, fueling exports. Overall, therefore, transport became a leading sector in the Hungarian economy.

What of government policy? Did it hinder or promote development? Three essays address this topic. In “Economic Revolution in Austria,” Richard Rudolph downplays the influence of policy, especially the neo-absolutist reforms that followed the 1848 revolution, on the Monarchy’s development. In contrast, David Good, in an essay entitled, “Economic Union and Uneven Development,” stresses the high degree of economic unification achieved by the Monarchy. This benefited the more backward regions of the Monarchy, especially Hungary, as noted by György Ránki in his essay, “On the Economic Development of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy.”

Taken together these essays comprise a new composite view of the Monarchy’s economic development—that of a growing

economy modernizing itself in response to stimulus from the more advanced countries of Europe. Therefore, if economic performance undermined the Monarchy's political cohesion, it was probably by making nationalist causes the vehicle for the rising expectations of the bourgeoisie and workers.

Thomas Huertas
New York City

Gyivicsán, Anna, ed., *Tanulmányok a kelet-európai irodalmak és nyelvek köréből* (Essays from the Sphere of East European Literatures and Languages). Budapest: Eötvös Lóránd University, 1980. 376 pages.

This work is a *Festschrift* in honour of the 70th birthday of László Dobossy, Professor of Czech literature at the University of Budapest. It contains forty-three literary and linguistic articles written by colleagues, students, friends and followers of the celebrated professor.

Professor Dobossy's birthdate and the geographic location of his birthplace on the Central European political map has had much more influence on his intellectual development than these factors usually have on individuals. He comes from that disputed territory between Hungary and Czechoslovakia which, during his lifetime, has changed national sovereignty three times due to the unwanted interference of more powerful governments. Consequently, he was exposed to different cultural trends. He studied in a Hungarian secondary school and at a Czech university. He later completed his education at the Université de Paris. The *Festschrift* contains a bibliography of his publications, about 350 titles, on topics of Central European and French literature and linguistics. His publications demonstrate a typical Central European erudition. The title of one of his publications, *Our Homeland; Central Europe*, is symbolic of this Central European man who, in the racially and linguistically mixed region, was exposed to more than one cultural tradition. One can find the following qualities in a Central European man: he owes allegiance to his homeland, to his nation, he speaks several languages and with his cultural curiosity he turns towards the cultural centres of Budapest, Cracow, Paris, Prague, Rome and Vienna.

From such horizons, László Dobossy looked at the special Central European problems with the perspective required for the objectivity of his writings. By choosing to write in Czech, French, German and Hungarian about comparative literary topics, he served as an intermediary among those European nations which were unaware of each other's culture due to language barriers. Similarly, the contributors to the *Festschrift* originated from various countries from Canada to the Soviet Union written in English, Czech, French, Magyar and Russian. The volume is proof of the widespread recognition of the extraordinary literary productivity for the septuagenarian professor on the part of his colleagues living in other countries. László Dobossy, with his scholarly abilities and literary activity, is propagating understanding among the highly cultured nations of Central Europe which have had to endure many calamities—past and present.

Charles Wojatsek
Bishop's University

TO THOSE WISHING TO SUBMIT MANUSCRIPTS

1. The editors of the *Hungarian Studies Review* invite the submission of original articles and review articles in the field of Hungarian studies.
2. All manuscripts should be sent to the Editors, *Hungarian Studies Review*.
3. Persons wishing to review books for the *Review* should get in touch with the Editors.
4. Persons wishing to prepare review articles—either detailed discussions of a single book or a review of some area of Hungarian studies—should get in touch first with the Editors.
5. Since the *Review* does not normally publish highly specialized studies intelligible only to people in a particular discipline, contributors wishing to submit very specialized work should consult the Editors before sending in their manuscript.
6. The submission of an article to the *Review* is taken to imply that it has not been previously published and it is not being considered for publication elsewhere.
7. Manuscripts submitted to the *Review* are usually reviewed by two members of the editorial board (or outside readers) with the authors remaining anonymous. Comments on articles are conveyed to the authors with the commentators remaining anonymous.
8. Articles submitted to the *Review* should be between 4,000 and 8,000 words (ca. 16 to 32 pages) in length. Review articles should be between 1,500 and 3,000 words (ca. 6 to 12 pages) in length. Manuscripts outside of these limits will be considered if there is some good reason for their exceptional length or brevity. Articles in two parts may be accepted provided each part is independently meaningful and intelligible.
9. All manuscripts intended for publication should be submitted IN DUPLICATE. They should be clearly typed on one side of 8 1/2 x 11 inch or similar size paper. The entire manuscript should be double-spaced with ample margins. FOOTNOTES should be numbered consecutively in the text and typed double spaced at the end, beginning on a new page. The *Review* will also accept articles on 5 1/4 inch diskettes which fit TRS-80 computers and are in ASCII or Superscript format. Articles already on diskette would save the editorial office much time in editing and typesetting.
10. To avoid the loss of manuscripts in the mail, authors should always retain a copy of their contribution for themselves. The *Review* will not be responsible for lost articles. To save on postal costs, manuscripts are not normally returned to the authors unless their return is specifically requested.
11. On style, authors should follow previous issues of the *Review* or should use the *Chicago Manual of Style*. When in doubt, they should get in touch with the Editor.
12. Contributors whose native tongue is not English should have their manuscripts carefully edited by someone experienced in writing for English-language journals BEFORE submitting their work to the *Review*.

