

A “HUNGARIAN EXPERIENCE”

SOME FRENCH TRAVELERS IN HUNGARY BETWEEN THE TWO WORLD WARS¹

HENRI DE MONTETY

EPHE
Paris, France

Travelling is often a path to awareness. French travelers in Hungary between the two wars were penetrating another world which, however, was close to their hearts. The *Ancient regime*, for Pierre Delattre. The hope to meet a spirit hostile to all kinds of domination, for Pierre Chaillet. His own dreamt past for the young Nicolas de Rochefort. As far as Aurélien Sauvageot, Aldo Dami and even the journalists of the *Action Française* are concerned, Hungary was a sort of “almost perfect” distorting mirror.

Keywords: travel, French–Hungarian relationship, interwar period

They are not altogether so many, those French who travelled in Hungary between the two World Wars. But they were not as scarce as one might fear. And their profiles were diverse enough to draw an image of Hungary, their image of Hungary, in which one can decipher, through scintillations of various ideological impressions, the French spirit gleaming in the depths – more precisely, one can see what, in Hungary, could then attract the interest of the French spirit (and curiosity).

The idea is not to launch an exhaustive and detailed description full of dates and data, routes, travel objectives and conditions, etc. I’d rather try to concentrate my attention on a few moments of illumination, seeking to uncover the motivations that provoked in the mind of a few people a sudden awareness, or a radical change of opinion, or, possibly, the final consolidation of an *idée fixe* (whether good or bad, true or false).

Jesuit priest Pierre Delattre SJ felt a great passion for Hungary. Over the course of his six journeys to Hungary from 1926 to 1932, he was able to reassess his opinion of the country. His insatiable curiosity was regularly punctuated with striking experiences, for example a procession of the holy crown. “Nothing immature,” he writes, “nothing childish in this somehow theatrical machinery, though our eyes are deprived of this luxury coming from another age.”² Not to mention a visit in the miserable suburbs of Budapest, where he met families of seven “packed in six

square meters.”³ Or an excursion in Košice (Kassa) in Slovakia: “My impressions?” he writes.

The most noteworthy is the following: one immediately feels himself in a Republic, in Košice. What a difference between the two sides of the border in the general standing and politeness. Nowhere there can one hear the *God bless you* that is so frequently heard in Hungary or even in Germany.

Sure: these “impressions” do not always refer to the field of (one would say) objective observation. The priest meant particularly politeness when it came with well-stamped piety. But that should not deter him from drawing general conclusions, for example, the one that appears in the golden book of the family estate of Móric Kornfeld, dated 13th of September 1932:

from this dear country where they keep more jealously than anywhere else the antique tradition of hospitality, Felső-Ireg [the name of the place] shall remain forever among my most favorite memories. Following our great historian, Jules Michelet, I cannot help repeating, with my soul full of the deepest sympathy: when will we finally pay our debt to this blessed people, who once saved the Occident?⁴

Nevertheless, these “impressions” are at the same time sincere and somehow volatile. In his journal, Father Delattre would write that the Kornfeld family keeps true to the paradigm of the 14th century saint: “the baroness... so charitable, so beneficial, with so little noise, almost anonymous”.⁵ At the same time, he would confess that, indeed Catholic, they were nonetheless capitalists.⁶ Where the middle ages meet capitalism. These “impressions” were not necessarily consistent, all the more so if the situation itself was not (as was frequently the case for a French traveler in Hungary). Let us add that the Father’s predilection for the picturesque was particularly fed by his visits to the princess Lónyay, born Stéphanie de Belgique and widow of the archduke Rudolf. The latter had become a rather patriotic Hungarian aristocrat when she’d married a Calvinist count raised to the condition of Catholic prince for the occasion. She would regularly provide the French Jesuit with crucial data during his training years on Hungarian culture and politics.

Father Delattre, a monarchist, was particularly interested in the Hungarian crown, which the princess described to him as a “symbol of authority originating from God [...] and the whole nation [...] furthermore the symbol of the territorial integrity of the country.”⁷ Furthermore, the Father’s notions of the crown did not remain in the sphere of abstract considerations. We already know his words about the religious procession he once came across. As far as French politics is concerned, he was an inconsolable legitimist; he was also tormented by the fact that

his monarchist grandfather was a Lutheran Alsatian.⁸ Was it not tempting to change a problem of “essence” (being a monarchist in France) for one of “conjuncture” (support the monarchy in Hungary)? One thing was sure, he said: those who wanted to understand the Hungarian situation had to adopt “a pre-revolution way of thinking”.⁹ Let us be more precise: just before the revolution. Because, according to him, the aristocracy was soon to be ruined. *Exit* the aristocracy. In 1932, Father Delattre even ceased to believe in the prospect of a monarchist restoration. He observed that because of the absence or distance of the royal family, “Hungarians finally got used to living without them.” *Exit* the monarchy. So what remained? Catholicism, the third pillar of traditional Hungarian society. But what kind of Catholicism? Sensing the contradictions of “liberal” or “social” circles, of medieval and/or capitalistic milieus, Pierre Delattre was puzzled.¹⁰

Anyone in France who is interested in the history of the Second World War knows Father Chaillet, another Jesuit priest. In 1941 he founded the main Christian underground publication during the German occupation, called *Cahiers du Témoinage Chrétien*. On the one hand, he is therefore the paragon of the early spirit of resistance, and on the other hand, he became after the war a main figure of progressive Catholicism. A less well-known aspect of his life is his travel to Hungary between October 1939 and October 1940, when he might have believed he could reconcile French “modernism” and Hungarian “traditionalism”.¹¹ What did he have in mind? It is difficult to say. He was – as is noted in his biographies¹² – a discreet, even secret man. Pierre Chaillet had spent a lot of time in Germany and Austria during the 1930s. Actually, he was, with Father Delattre, someone who had drawn the attention of French opinion to the dangers of National Socialism in Germany. While being revolted by all kinds of neo-paganisms, he felt some sympathy for chancellor Dollfuss and his attempt to build a new Christian order against Hitler. His book published in 1939 (*L’Autriche souffrante*) gives a lucid description of the situation: “betrayed by Italy, uncared for by England and France, weak and honest Austria has succumbed in an unfair duel, here comes the apotheosis of Germany.” When the war was declared in 1939, Chaillet applied to the Ministry of war, section of military intelligence. Dispatched to Hungary to gather information on local movements opposed to Nazism, he was soon to discover that he could meet people of the kind at the top of the ruling class. A few days after his arrival, he had lunch with Tibor Eckhart, a leader of the smallholders’ party, and during his Hungarian year, he had several times the occasion to meet Pál Teleki, then Prime minister. He published (the publishable part of) his impressions in two articles in the French Jesuit periodical (*Les Etudes*), where he emphasized the benefits of Hungary’s neutrality, recognizing at the same time that prudence being not particularly among their top qualities, Hungarians were particularly to be praised; neutrality was necessary if Hungary wanted to serve the cause of peace and justice in the future.¹³

Father Chaillet was helped by József Balogh, chief editor of the *Nouvelle revue de Hongrie* (published in Budapest for a worldwide francophone readership). His friendship with Balogh illustrates the ambiguity of his feelings towards Hungary. In September 1940, when Balogh asked him to write a few words for the review on the occasion of the restitution of Northern Transylvania (the so-called Second Vienna Award), Chaillet was strongly hesitant. He was indeed at that time shocked by the French defeat, and furthermore going through some convalescence in Hévíz, presumably for a bad cold. Here is what he wrote to Balogh on 7th September:

my concerns about the true interests of Hungary in the future [...] prevent me from expressing at the moment my consent, which, were it to be sincere, would come with qualifications that the Hungarian censor would deem inopportune. I'd rather keep silent".¹⁴ Balogh insisted. Chaillet submitted an article on the 17th of September, imploring Balogh to publish it, lest he "lose the taste for expressing, at least momentarily, his magyarophile feelings."¹⁵

Unfortunately, the article was not published. In the last known letter from Balogh, the latter asks Father Chaillet for a meeting to discuss the content of the article.

Before ending with the last days of Chaillet in Hungary, let us come back to the early months of 1940, before the French debacle. A curious venture took place in April, showing that at the time Father Chaillet still strongly believed in Hungary's vocation as a neutral country. We know he was on relatively intimate terms with Teleki. The Prime minister surely knew the secret nature of the mission of the Jesuit in Hungary. One day, he informed him that a German officer was in Paris under a false identity in order to build connections with French official corners. His objective was to kill Hitler. Pál Teleki asked Father Chaillet to go and meet the German and help him find his way to the right persons in the French capital. Chaillet travelled a few days to France and it seems he did meet the officer, but all progress was soon jeopardized by the German offensive on the 10th of May.¹⁶

Even the story of the real return of Chaillet to France is an adventure. As his position in Hungary was under debate, he was presumably going to be questioned by the police. Before that, the Minister of Foreign Affairs, István Csáky, provided him with a car and a chauffeur that took him right to the Romanian border. Chaillet then took a boat in the Levant and landed in Marseilles in December 1940. Then he really began his underground and half-underground activities related to assistance for refugees and Jews, something he continued until the end of the war.

So, what was the outcome of his Hungarian experience? First of all, one should remember that it coincided with the French defeat, which shocked him. I'm therefore tempted to think it was the end of Chaillet's illusions. After the wreck of

Christian corporatism in Austria, after the military and moral debacle in France, the Jesuit seemed to foresee the soon-to-come disaster of the “neo-baroque” neutral Hungary.

However, his affinities were strong with Hungarian Catholicism. The June issue of the *Nouvelle revue de Hongrie* published a necrology of Béla Bangha by Chaillet in which he praises in his Jesuit colleague for his devoted work in the fight against “the methodical organization of neo-pagan and de-christianizing forces”. It is also possible that Bangha’s famous propaganda was a model for Father Chaillet in his understanding of the importance of the press in the dissemination of the Christian message. “Already in 1914,” he writes, “[Bangha] founded *Magyar Kultura*, which he ran until his death with the almost jealous predilection of a man who built his house with his own hands.”¹⁷ This is a strong parallel with what was going to happen to Chaillet himself after the war. The experiences of Chaillet in Hungary, searching for truth and justice at a time when truth and justice seemed to be at inaccessible heights, were rich in censorship, self-censorship, and inevitable misunderstanding. They illustrate eloquently a part of the paradox of the French–Hungarian relationship.

To these two analyses, I now add a few shorter elements that also contribute to an understanding of the depths of the “Hungarian experience” for French travelers between the two World Wars.

I begin with a blunder. In point of fact, in the case of viscount de Rochefort, we are dealing with a voyage that never took place. For some years, Nicolas de Rochefort lent his pen to the Hungarian propaganda machine. He was in regular contact with the Hungarian legation in Paris and with journalists. Then in April 1935 came the official invitation to Budapest for a conference on the French–Russian pact. While at the French Ministry of Foreign Affairs tense discussions regarding the opportunity of such travel were underway (the Ministry would eventually decide to work against it),¹⁸ Rochefort wrote a letter to his Hungarian correspondent, József Balogh: “I would be much obliged if you could let me know what dress code in Budapest is: I will bring my white tie, shall I also bring my tuxedo? Shall I bring a morning coat or a simple jacket will suit?”¹⁹ Balogh, who himself was never to be faulted on the question of etiquette and who had always been very attentive to the concerns of his French correspondents, felt he had to moderate the ardor of Rochefort and recommended a simple tuxedo for all evening occasions and furthermore advised him not to bring a top hat.²⁰ The trip, however, was cancelled for mysterious reasons, and shortly afterwards, Rochefort went through some personal drama and moved to the provinces. It seems he lost contact with his Hungarian friends. All things considered, it seems this missed trip to Hungary was for him something like a first ball, a return not precisely to his childhood, but to his past. One should keep in mind that Rochefort’s background was that of French family installed in Saint Petersburg in

1789 and repatriated to France after the Russian revolution in almost miserable condition. Hungary was going to be for young Rochefort a way to reconnect with his buried past. As it so happens, this did not come to pass.

Aurélien Sauvageot was the child of a republican family in which the French revolution was still alive in everyone's heart. He was a member of the Socialist Party (SFIO), a freemason and of a rather anticlerical bent (this did not prevent him from meeting with high society in Budapest). In his book *Découverte de la Hongrie* (1937), he remembers the feelings he first had when he entered the building of the Eötvös Collegium, where he was to live for almost ten years. His room was too big, he writes, and not adequately furnished. "I felt a bit disoriented in this big space, I was behaving clumsily like someone who is wearing clothes that are too large."²¹ If he considered this relatively trivial experience as one that deserves to be recalled, it is probably because it corroborates a more diffuse feeling referring to the idea of greatness. Does this suggest that for those who know Hungary, who know how to love Hungary, the country is great? Greater Hungary is a thing of the past, yet Hungary is great because of its past, the past still lives in its present. This close relationship between the country and its past, its source of greatness, seems to have impressed French travelers. In February 1941, while in a hospital in the Pyrenees, diagnosed with bone tuberculosis, the Dominican priest Ambroise-Marie Carré wrote to József Balogh that under such sad circumstances, his only consolation was to listen to Radio-Budapest: "truly, of all the countries in which I traveled, of all the cultures I encountered, the Hungarian spirit, the history and the culture of your country talk to me the most fraternally."²² Here are the words: spirit, culture, history. Father Carré was also impressed by the coexistence of this strong national culture and the love of his Hungarian friends for France. As he wrote in June 1939 in the golden book of the Kornfeld estate, already mentioned above, "a family with strong French culture and fervent sympathy, what a comfort for the solitary traveler, and such evidence of security for the future!"²³ Still, the prophecy was wrong: the future would not bring any comfort. And one should not forget that Francophilia was hardly widespread in Hungary.

Let us come back to Sauvageot. "One more time," he wrote to his friend Endre Bajomi Lázár,

I admire the leniency with which you Hungarians treat too many people who never were your friends, but whom you always address with kindness, sometimes even respect, simply because they happen to have had some kind of business with Hungary. I appreciate this generosity, which I have known as a remarkable aspect of your mentality. Alas, you seldom enjoy reciprocity.²⁴

These reflections show the extent to which magyarophilia, as a sentiment or a posture, can be of various natures. What does it mean exactly to be a "friend of Hun-

gary”? The meaning given by Aurélien Sauvageot was probably not universal, surely not founded on a reality shared by many among the French or among Hungarians. We’re precisely now studying the Hungarian experience, as – in Sauvageot’s words – a way to “have business with Hungary”. It is worth considering another picturesque case. This is an article named “Ruthenian memories”, published on the 24th of October 1938 in the monarchist daily *l’Action française*. The author, Jacques Delebecque, foreign affairs redactor, recalls a highly unexpected trip into Hungarian territory. The context of the article was tense, almost exactly between the Munich agreements (September 30th) and the First Vienna Award (November 2nd). Soon the Hungarian invasion of Ruthenia would take place (March 19th, 1939), as an extrapolation of the return of upper Hungary decided at the Vienna Award.

Let us be clear: the monarchist newspaper was then more on the side of Hungary against Czechoslovakia, considered a shelter for freemasonry. However, Jacques Le Boucher, another journalist of *l’Action française*, used to explain that the situation in Central Europe was not to be judged in ideological or sentimental terms, but on the basis of a geopolitical analysis – one can recognize the Bainville school of international relationship, built on the pragmatic spirit of the *Action française*. “It is up to us,” le Boucher wrote, “to see what is the most desirable in the current context: is it a Hungary growing stronger? Or is it a Czechoslovakia that risks remaining totally under the influence of Berlin?”²⁵ Let us not forget that the *Action française* had not always been magyarophile. In 1934, Jacques Bainville himself had blamed Hungary for always being on the opposite side of the war.²⁶ Following on his illustrious predecessor, Jacques Delebecque had expressed in 1935 his suspicions regarding the Hungarian aristocracy, calling them “humiliated feudal people living in a constant state of boiling, a source of danger for peace in Central Europe”.²⁷ (What strange terminology for a royalist!)

After this diversion into the peculiar way of thinking of the main French monarchist movement in the 20th century, it is worth returning to the picturesque case, the personal experience of Jacques Delebecque. It took place before the First World War. In this article published in October 1938, Delebecque recounted that once he had by accident “fallen from the sky in Ruthenia”. Indeed, shortly before the war he had ended an aeronautical trip in an unexpected manner, when his balloon was diverted and eventually suddenly fell down in a remote place in the Carpathian forest. He had met there “bear hunters who were terrified by his appearance”. Finally, he had been directed to a small settlement where some German was spoken. And this allowed him to “then reach Budapest and meet civilization again”. From this experience, Delebecque drew the following conclusion: the peoples’ right to self-determination has no meaning in this region of the world.²⁸

Let us recapitulate. Ruthenia, as an allegory of Hungarian confines, is populated (in Delebecque’s assessment) with savages; the only tracks of education are

German. (Delebecque was probably referring – without knowing? – to the local Jewish pub and shop keeper. Remarkable, for a nationalist who is necessarily suspected of being, at the same time, germanophobic and anti-Semitic.) Finally, real civilization is to be found only in the center, in Budapest. Therefore the conclusion: the center shall go on ruling the peripheries. All the reasoning above is implicitly encompassed in the short narrative about the lost balloon. This equivalence between direct experience and the formation of an abstract opinion would be a striking illustration of our starting point; but we should not forget the years in which the *Action française* vilified Hungary. Would this mean that we are faced with a falsification, a construction in order to justify a change of opinion? As if Delebecque had wished to illustrate a new theory with a false memory. Alternatively, was it a late awareness of the deep meaning of his old Ruthen experience? A meaning that the doctrinal discipline of the *Action française* had until then put out of his reach? Difficult to say, all the more so in part because consistency was not Delebecque's forte. Indeed, on the 27th of October, he proclaimed that Hungarian arguments were irrefutable because of the need to curb the violation of the peoples' right to self-determination,²⁹ the same right that he himself had found groundless in the region three days before in the same newspaper. Everything depends, of course, on which people and people's right we're speaking of. Furthermore, Delebecque admitted modestly that in the game of reciprocal affirmation, France was out of the game and the winner was going to be declared in Berlin and Rome. One could not have put it better.

About Ruthenia, there was, if not in France, in Switzerland an expert who would soon write a 380 pages book about the region.³⁰ In the 1930s Aldo Dami was renowned for his ethnic and linguistic maps aiming at a moderate revision of the Hungarian boarder (in the same spirit as those of Lord Rothermere). "As a somehow theoretical geographer," he wrote, "focusing on grasping the limits between two language areas in the most humble wall, in any furrow crossing a field, I travel in order to see whether the reality matches up with the map."³¹ In this spirit, he planned to travel in upper Hungary after it was returned to the Hungarian kingdom. However, because of his paradoxical relationship with Hungarian authorities in Budapest, Hungarian diplomacy did not hurry to organize his trip.³² In the end Dami did go the following year. In the meantime, Hungary had also managed to put its hands on Ruthenia. So the Swiss journalist traveled to Ruthenia in order to realize, according to his own words, "the old oriental dream and tread upon the Occident's fearsome confines, the precise place where Slavic, Romanian and Hungarian people meet – this critical point of the universe".³³ One does not tread upon the "critical point of the universe" without being profoundly impressed by this experience. In terms of experience, Aldo Dami started his article with one by someone else, that is with baron Perényi's experience (a long one, so to say,

since the latter had been born in this region and had been the chief administrator there):

he greets me with open arms and starts praising the local population's sweetness, which recalls somehow the Slavic or even the Russian idealism; a people full of heart, generous, not yet corrupted with our Occidental capitalism – it could be one of the best people in the world were it to have the sense or order, or is that because he hasn't?³⁴

This was followed by a few comments of the same kind and some information on the first success of the Hungarian administration (bilingual schools and street signs).³⁵ Aldo Dami would also list the colourful names of the towns and counties with delight, such as *Kőrösmező*, *Munkács*, *Beregszász*, *Ungvár*, *Máramaros*, *Ugocsa*, *Bereg*, *Ung*, *Zemplén*, *Nagyszöllős*, *Királyháza*, *Técső*, *Nagyszalánc*, etc. Then return to *Kőrösmező*, more precisely to the Central hotel of *Kőrösmező*, where feeding a client was not an easy job, since this client is generally “not expected”.³⁶ At least, this was the pretext brazenly invoked by the little kid who seemed to be the maidservant there, and it cast Dami into an abyss of delight. One is at “the center of the universe” and he’s “not expected”. This is, in a few words, the synthesis of his Hungarian experience.

It is not uncommon to blame Hungarians for living in the past. These few French–Hungarian experiences shed some light on a certain manner of seeing the past that is probably specific to Hungary, on what in the past continues to subsist in a thousand different ways. The sense of hospitality, according to Father Delattre, which counterbalances possible adjustments with modernity. The impression of greatness, solemnity, according to Aurélien Sauvageot, who was particularly sensitive to this aspect in poetry (Endre Ady's). The opportunity – or maybe the hope – for Nicolas de Rochefort to track down an aspect of his own glorious past. For Aldo Dami, who hardly ever was understood, a kind of intensity that makes a brief moment (in Ruthenia) equivalent to the complexity of an entire life. And finally, Father Chaillet and Jacques Delebecque are a little bit off the tracks. The first, in 1940, founded a lot of his future engagement on the violent exit of the Hungarian mirage. The second, in 1910, seems to have entered it only by breaking into it.

Notes

- ¹ This is an English adaptation of a shorter article published in French in *Öt Kontinens* (Budapest, 2012), 11–17.
- ² *Delattre Papers* JDE 106. 6th travel in Hungary. 14 July – 2 November 1932. (All extracts from Delattre's journal are available at the Jesuit archives in Vanves, near Paris.)

- ³ The *Kiserdő* suburb was inhabited by 250,000 totally unable to sustain themselves. Delattre, Pierre (1935) *Nos amis les Hongrois* (Paris: Figuières), 111 et 164.
- ⁴ According to a copy of the Golden book provided to me by Ágnes Széchenyi. Many thanks to her.
- ⁵ *Delattre Papiers* JDE 106. 6th travel. Friday 9 September [1932].
- ⁶ This remark was made on the occasion of a discussion with József Balogh on Thursday 8 September (6th travel. 14 July – 2 Novembre 1932. *Delattre Papers* JDE 106, 109). But a parallel between Balogh and Kornfeld was made on their critical approach of György Széchenyi's social Catholicism.
- ⁷ Princess Lónyay – RP Delattre SJ, 14th Mai 1930. *Delattre Papers* JDE 220.
- ⁸ 2nd travel, 27 July – 14 August 1928 (revised in 1932), 49–50. *Delattre Papers* JDE 120. His memories on his grand father reveal a certain “chambordism”, state of mind where the religious content surpass the simple temporal loyalty. See Simpson Martin (2001) ‘The death of Henri V: Legitimists Without the Bourbons’ *French History*, Vol. 15, No. 4, 80.
- ⁹ At the high school, children are called according to the title of their parents, “and this seems all them more natural.” In the college of Gödöllő managed by the Prémontrés order, there was a domestic for ten schoolboys. [3rd] travel, in 1928, 316 (*Delattre Papers* JDE 105).
- ¹⁰ *Loc. cit.*, 12.
- ¹¹ ‘Chaillet atya titkos küldetése Magyarországra, 1939/40’ (Father Chaillet’s secret mission in Hungary, 1939/40) (2006) in *A magyar jezsuiták küldetése a kezdetől napjainkig* (Hungarian Jesuit’s mission since the early days) [Pázmány Péter Catholic University; 8–10 November 2004] (Piliscsaba: Pázmány Péter Katolikus Egyetem, Bölcsészettudományi Kar) Művelődés-történeti műhely, Rendtörténeti konferenciák 2, 677–83.
- ¹² Bédarida, Renée (1988) *Pierre Chaillet. Témoignage de la résistance spirituelle* (A witness of spiritual resistance) (Paris: Fayard), 330 pp.
- ¹³ Sçay, Pierre (Pierre Chaillet’s pen name) (1939) ‘Climat de neutralité: Impression de voyage’ (Neutrality climate: travel’s impressions) *Les Études*, October–December, 637–52.
- ¹⁴ Pierre Chaillet – Balogh József, Hévíz, 17th September 1940. National Széchenyi Library (Kézirattár, 1/551/5004).
- ¹⁵ Balogh József – Pierre Chaillet, 21st September 1940, National Széchenyi Library (Kézirattár, 1/551/5005).
- ¹⁶ The story is recalled in Bédarida, Renée *op. cit.*, 95, grounded on a document named ‘notes relatives au séjour du P. Chaillet en Hongrie en 1940’ (notes on P. Chaillet’s travel in Hungary) from a certain Jean P., 15 Februar 1973. The author of the biography, who knew well father Chaillet and presumably Jean P. as well, authenticated the document.
- ¹⁷ *Nouvelle Revue de Hongrie*, January–June 1940, 473.
- ¹⁸ Balogh – Rochefort, 22 Mai 1935. National Széchenyi Library (Kézirattár, 1/2744/24480).
- ¹⁹ Rochefort – Balogh, 15 mai 1935. National Széchenyi Library (Kézirattár, 1/2744/24476).
- ²⁰ *Loc. cit.*
- ²¹ Sauvageot, Aurélien (1937) *Découverte de la Hongrie* (Paris: Alcan), 10.
- ²² Carré – Balogh, 21 février 1941. National Széchenyi Library (Kézirattár, 1/523/4865).
- ²³ Livre d’or du château de Felső-Ireg, 11 juin 1939.
- ²⁴ Sauvageot, Aurélien – Bajomi Lázár, Endre, Aix-en-Provence, 23th February 1985 (Petőfi Museum of Literature, V4750/47/1-24).
- ²⁵ Le Boucher, Jacques (1938) ‘Hongrie et Ruthénie’ *Action française*, 18 October.
- ²⁶ Bainville, J. (1934) *L’Action française*, 22 October.
- ²⁷ Delebecque, J[acques] (1935) *Action française*, 18 August.
- ²⁸ Delebecque, Jacques (1938) ‘Souvenir de Ruthénie’ *Action française*, 24 October.
- ²⁹ Delebecque, Jacques (1938) ‘Les Hongrois sont pressés’ *Action française*, 27 October.

- ³⁰ Dami, Aldo (1944) *La Ruthénie subcarpathique* (Genève, éditions du Mont-Blanc), 381 pp.
- ³¹ Dami, Aldo (1940) ‘Ce que j’ai vu en Subcarpathie’ *Nouvelle revue de Hongrie*, Mai, 345.
- ³² “This is not topical, but we might come back to the subject in the future, if Dami take himself the initiative.” László Bartók – Szent-Ivány (Ministry of foreign affairs). 9 and 21 November 1938 (Hungarian National Archives, K66 370 cs. 1938 III-4 (A-J) doc. 460 et 461).
- ³³ Dami, Aldo ‘Ce que j’ai vu en Subcarpathie’ *ibid.*
- ³⁴ *Ibid.*, 347.
- ³⁵ On the ambiguities of the Hungarian projects for Ruthenia in 1939, among others on the debate between territorial and personal autonomy, see Vasas, Géza (2000) ‘A ruszin autonómia választójain (1939. március–szeptember)’ (Various options for the Ruthenian autonomy, March–September 1939) *Aetas*, No. 4, 64–87.
- ³⁶ Dami, Aldo ‘Ce que j’ai vu en Subcarpathie’ 351.