

conflicts, and he appropriately stresses the damage that struggles between the two caused for the whole of the Hungarian-Canadian community. Indeed, one of the shortcomings of Bakó's book is the limited coverage of the history of communist organizations.

As a study in ethnography, Bakó's volume is the most substantial, certainly the bulkiest, work on Hungarian Canadians. Its appearance reminds one of the situation regarding the history of the American-Hungarian community, where the most substantial work is also by a scholar who lives in Hungary, Julianna Puskás: *Kivándorló magyarok az Egyesült Államokban, 1880–1940* [Immigrant Hungarians in the United States, 1880–1940] (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1982). Bakó's work, however, does not match Puskás's either in quality or in scope. The research behind it is far less substantial. Bakó's field-work was done in two months, it concentrated on a small region of Canada and on a small section of the Hungarian-Canadian community: the interwar immigrants. Bakó's lack of extensive knowledge of Hungarian-Canadian history, and of the Hungarian-Canadian community outside of south-central Ontario, also allowed him to accept inaccurate information from a few of his informants. There are some minor problems as well in the volume: one illustration is mis-identified (the Kossuth house in Welland), and the printers have inverted some lines (p. 287). These shortcomings notwithstanding, Bakó's book makes a valuable contribution in the field of Hungarian-Canadian studies.

As a final note it might be mentioned that Bakó's project, along with other studies sponsored by the National Museum of Man, was undertaken about the same time the "ethnic histories" series, including the volume *Struggle and Hope*, was started under the sponsorship of Multiculturalism Canada. Little if any coordination took place between the two projects, indeed, the writer of these lines was not aware of Bakó's work until after the appearance of his book. Fortunately, the result was not two overlapping books, but works that, on the whole, complement each other.

N.F.D.

*Horthyist-Fascist Terror in Northwestern Romania, September 1940 – October 1944* ed. Mihai Fatu and Mircea Musat (Bucharest, 1866).

The tone of this book is set right at its beginning. In the Table of Contents, the title of the book's first chapter is given: "The fascist dictate of Vienna, August 1940: A hateful attempt against Romania's independence and sovereignty and against the integrity of its frontiers." The second sentence of the Introduction contains a quotation from Romanian Communist

Party leader Nicolae Ceausescu: "After the First World War, fascism seized political power in Hungary, Italy, Portugal, Bulgaria . . ." These states are next described as having established "totalitarian political regimes." Political tendencies in interwar Romania are not mentioned, permitting the reader to assume that that country was a democracy.

The tone established in this book's first pages is maintained throughout. Though allegedly written in the "spirit of scientific truth" (p. vii), the book is an indictment of the "Horthyist-fascist" regime that held sway over northern Transylvania from 1940 to 1944, "that ancient Romanian territory—part of the ancestral hearth where the Romanian people had always lived . . ." (p. xliii). As is the case with most historical indictments, this book turns out to be rather crude polemics instead of objective scholarship.

In a manner typical of present-day Romanian historical publications, the book asserts the theory of Daco-Roman continuity right in its introduction (pp. vii–xi). According to this theory, the Romanians have lived in the "Carpathian-Danubian-Pontic space . . . without interruption since the time of their Geto-Dacian ancestors . . ." The presence of Hungarians in Transylvania after the Hungarian conquest in the ninth century is acknowledged; however, the Hungarian claim to that land is dismissed in the explanation that in modern history "Transylvania was annexed to Hungary for only 51 years, and even then Hungary exercised only some of the attributes of government. . . ," (p. xxiii). The historical circumstance that Hungarian culture flourished in that land for more than ten centuries, and that at times it gained expression there more than in other (mainly foreign-occupied) Hungarian territories, is obscured in this book.

During the First World War, Hungary found herself at war on the side of the Central Powers when the Habsburg court declared war on Serbia. Romania stayed out of the conflict until the Allies bribed her to enter by promising her much of the eastern half of Hungary, including Transylvania. After some severe losses by the Austro-Hungarian forces on the Russian front, Romania invaded Hungary. The invasion failed and Romania was forced out of action; however, two years later she re-entered the hostilities against the (by then collapsing) Central Powers and occupied Transylvania and later other parts of Hungary as well. In the post-war peace settlement the Romanians were rewarded: they received more territory from the old Kingdom of Hungary than was left to Hungary herself.

These developments are not explained in this book this way. In Romanian historical writing there can hardly be a Romanian invasion of Hungary, only a war of liberation of "ancient Romanian lands" from the Hungarian invaders. The acquisition of Transylvania by Romania is explained this way: "The formation of the unitary Romanian national state is, therefore, not a gift, it is not the result of international conferences; it is . . . a natural outcome of the historical, social and national development of the Romanian

people” (p. xxxv).

There is no need to describe in detail the twisted arguments and logic of this work. Contrary to the claim of the book’s editors, the history of northern Transylvania between 1940 and 1944 is not an unknown subject, not even before English-speaking audiences. It constitutes a good part of some chapters of the massive two-volume work of the late Professor C.A. Macartney of Oxford University, *October Fifteenth: A History of Modern Hungary, 1929–1945* (Edinburgh, 1956–57). There is also Nicholas M. Nagy-Talavera’s part first-hand and part historical account, *The Green Shirts and the Others: A History of Fascism in Hungary and Rumania* (Stanford, Ca.: Hoover Institution Press, 1970).

The first of these works paints a picture that vastly differs from the one described in the Romanians’ book. While it does not deny the occurrence of some incidents between Hungarians and Romanians, and the infliction of some injustices by the former on the latter, Macartney’s work on the whole exonerates the Horthy regime of willful and systematic persecution of its subject peoples, while it was in actual control of the situation in Hungary (see especially chapter 21).

The second of these works is by a Jewish scholar who had grown up in wartime Transylvania. It is far less sympathetic to the Hungarians than Macartney’s volumes; however, it paints a picture of contemporary Romania that is just as, if not more, unflattering than that painted by the Romanians of Hungary, and of Hungarian-controlled Transylvania. Nagy-Talavera, in particular, describes, often in gory detail, the suffering, indignities and brutality, that was inflicted on minorities, especially Jews, in Romania and Romanian-controlled lands, on the eve of and during World War II.

It is ironical that the most restrained and yet balanced account of this subject seems to be not the two works described above, and certainly not the 1986 Romanian publication, but the passages in the 1986 work published in Hungary: *Erdély története* [The History of Transylvania], ed. Béla Köpeczi *et al.* Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1986. In 3 volumes. (See vol. 3, pp. 1, 753–57)

In sharp contrast with the books just described, the book *Horthyist-Fascist Terror*, presents a one-sided view of its subject. It is based mainly on sources (to a large extent Romanian works) that tend to present the Romanian viewpoint. It uses evidence selectively, citing facts that corroborate the authors’ arguments, while ignoring evidence that would detract from the book’s thesis.

What is not in the book is more significant than what is in it. Though claiming to aim for an explanation of hostility between Hungarians and Romanians, the book fails to explain that, within living memory in 1940, Romania had twice invaded Hungary, and her troops had occupied that country in 1919 causing much distress to the country’s population. How-

ever, the book's major omission is the one that has been already alluded to: a near-total lack of acknowledgment of the persecution that many minorities—in particular, Hungarians—had been subjected to in Romania (and Romanian-occupied lands) before, during, and after the “Horthyist interlude” in Transylvania.

This book is not what could be called historical scholarship. Its purpose is not really to help the reader to understand the situation, but to *prove the guilt* of the Hungarian “occupation regime.” Even the language used in the book is the language of invective.

Especially misleading is the section dealing with the deportation of Hungary's Jewry in the spring of 1944, to German labour (and, as it was found out later, extermination camps). Here the book skims over the fact that in the late winter of 1943–44 Hungary was occupied by German forces and lost practically all measure of her independence.

The book's one-sidedness is particularly blatant here. Its editors, for example, quote at length descriptions of the maltreatment of the Jews by Hungarian authorities that have been written by Randolph L. Braham, North America's foremost student of the Jewish holocaust in Hungary. However, they fail to cite anything this scholar has said that is favourable to the Horthy regime. Let us quote a passage from one of Braham's recent publications on the subject:

. . . as long as this [“Horthyist-fascist”] aristocratic elite remained in power, the vital interests of the Hungarian Jewry were preserved relatively intact. This remained so even after Hungary entered the war against the Soviet Union in June 1941. The regime continued not only to provide haven to the many thousands of Polish and other refugees, including about 16,000 Jews, but also consistently to oppose the ever greater pressure by the Germans to bring about the Final Solution of the Jewish question. While the Jews in Nazi-controlled Europe were being systematically annihilated, Hungary continued to protect its close to 800,000 Jews until it practically lost its independence.

(R.L. Braham, “The Uniqueness of the Holocaust in Hungary” in *The Holocaust in Hungary: Forty Years Later* ed. R.L. Braham and Bela Vago [New York, 1985], p. 184.)

The suggestion, by the editors of *Horthyist-Fascist Terror*, that the Horthy regime and its Hungarians were primarily responsible for the holocaust for a large part of the Romanian Jewry is unjust and unfortunate. Especially deplorable is the use by this book, of pictures of the dead from German concentration camps, as it aims to prove the Hungarians' guilt by “association.”

Besides being an unjustified attack on the reputations of Hungarians in general, it is an unwarranted attack on Hungarian historians living in the

West. The reason for publishing this book is identified by its editors as the need to counteract the work of:

a number of hostile elements, imbued with revenge-seeking, revisionist ideas, who have fled the Hungarian People's Republic and have taken residence in various Western countries, are increasingly trying to falsify the truth with regard to the historical right of the Romanian people in Transylvania, to the disastrous consequences which the Horthyist occupation regime brought upon the Romanian people, upon all democratic and antifascist forces, . . . (p. viii)

Elsewhere in the volume's introduction it is stated that the book was necessary because:

certain revisionist and revenge-seeking elements are still trying to 'prove' that Horthyism is not guilty of the atrocities perpetrated against the Romanian people and against all democratic and progressive forces . . . and of the deportation of the virtually entire Jewish population . . . (p. viii)

The works of these "revisionist and revenge-seeking elements" are not identified. The reason that they are not identified is the fact that a body of such literature hardly exists. Much has been written by Hungarians in the west about the history of Transylvania, but most of this is journalistic in nature, or is written for a strictly Hungarian audience, in Hungarian.

We are not aware of significant scholarly books, written by "people who have escaped the People's Republic of Hungary," that aim to defend the record of the Horthy regime in 1940–1944. Therefore, the claim of the Romanian editors that the publication of this book was necessary, especially in English and French, is unwarranted.

After its publication, this book was distributed, free of charge, to numerous influential people, as well as to libraries, in Canada and, presumably, in other countries as well. This act can only stir up hatred between peoples, not only in Eastern Europe, but also elsewhere. Hungarian-Canadians in particular, are concerned about this book. They see it as an attempt to discredit Hungarians everywhere. They no doubt see the book and its wide-scale distribution as an attempt by the Romanian authorities to divert attention from Romania's ever worsening record in the field of human rights.

N.F.D.