

The Hungarian Nation: Post-World War I Propaganda Abroad for Protecting Hungary's Territorial Integrity

Cintia Gunda

World War I came to an end rather abruptly, in the span of six weeks between September 30 and November 11, 1918. The epic four-year long war, the last war of the great European empires, thrust the Habsburg Monarchy in a deep economic and moral crisis: war weariness, rising prices, falling standards of living intensified the already existing conflicts between the peoples of the empire, which comprised about fifteen nationalities who belonged to a dozen different religious denominations.

Amid defeat, imperial collapse, political upheaval, and massive social dislocation, national independence and survival became an all around concern in the Carpathian Basin and beyond. Scapegoating and a search for internal enemies had started long before the war was officially lost, resulting in the strengthening of anti-Semitic voices in the press and on the political scene. Many were afraid that the “alien Jewish morality” together with socialism would eventually destroy the nation, which could only be saved from total moral and physical destruction by reasserting Christian values. The “Judeo-Bolshevik” panic had the power to suggest not only the collapse of a nation but also the collapse of the whole order of nation-states in Europe.¹ The war and the following chaos prompted many to believe that national revival could only be brought about if the Jews were removed from the public and economic life of the country.²

By the summer of 1918 the leaders of Hungary's national minorities had begun to agitate for independence, abandoning all efforts to seek autonomy or coexistence with Hungarians under Hungarian rule. As a response, Hungarian authorities often used police force to suppress political activity among ethnic minorities.³ The Habsburg Monarchy's successor states, however, decided to take what they thought was their fair share of the Monarchy by force. The new states of Czechoslovakia and the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes (later known as Yugoslavia), as well as

the greatly enlarged Romania, began to stake a claim to Hungarian territory⁴ and despite the armistice, Hungary was attacked from various directions. 350 to 400 hundred thousand⁵ ethnic Hungarians living in the occupied regions fled their homes for what was left of Hungary, adding a refugee crisis to the already long list of challenges the new regime in Budapest was facing.⁶ To top that, an influx of thousands of Jewish refugees from Galicia further intensified anti-Semitic tensions.⁷

By January 1919 most Hungarian territories inhabited by non-Magyar peoples had come under foreign rule. Fearing that military action would be seen as provocation by the Entente and believing that his good relations with the West would be enough to secure a fair treatment for Hungary in Paris, President of the Republic Mihály Károlyi did not try to prevent the annexation of Hungarian territory by force. He let the Czech, Romanian, and Yugoslavian armies occupy territories in Northern, Eastern and Southern Hungary, and thus, as it turned out, create a *fait accompli* for the Peace Conference.

This strategy failed, and when Károlyi was compelled by diplomatic failure to resign, the Bolsheviks and radical Social Democrats stepped into the vacuum and transformed Hungary in a communist dictatorship. The new regime, however, was no more successful in resisting the annexation of Hungarian territory than Károlyi had been.⁸ 133 days later, then, when the communist regime collapsed, the Red Terror unleashed by the communists gave way to the White Terror.⁹ Mob violence was directed in particular against Jews, exploiting the anti-Semitism that, in the previous two decades, had turned from a “modest opposition movement” to a mainstream ideology.¹⁰ Jews were no longer necessary to tip the ethnic balance in favor of the Hungarians in a smaller yet ethnically more homogeneous country that was emerging after the war. In addition to that, the middle class was terrified by the extent to which Jews dominated the professional sector (a fear that eventually led to the passing of the *numerus clausus* law in 1920).¹¹

Blaming Jews for every single calamity that fell upon Hungary had of course little effect on the country’s situation. Leaders of the pre-war political elite were struck by the degree of passivity the subsequent Hungarian governments exerted in regards to the occupying armies. They realized that no one was going to stand up for Hungary’s interests and this realization prompted them to take action. Action, however, came too late. During and before the Great War, the Habsburg Monarchy did little to inform the international public of its policies and construct a positive image of itself abroad. Count Albert Apponyi complained to Theodore

Roosevelt as early as 1904 that Americans were fairly ignorant of Hungary and her position, and offered to work as the regular correspondent of the American press on European matters, an offer that, sadly, was only realized in part.¹²

During the war, propaganda abroad was not limited to allied and neutral countries. Apponyi himself started a one-man campaign in the US and wrote five articles for *The New York Times* during 1914-16. His opinions, however, were often criticized as being "made in Germany." Other attempts in the US included the journalist Géza Kende's letter published in *The New York Times*, explaining Ambassador Constantin T. Dumba's ill-fated action (when he urged Hungarians to go on strike in munitions factories), Cleveland Consul-General Ernst Ludwig's book titled *Austria-Hungary and the War* (1915), and New York Consul-General Alexander von Nuber's pamphlet discussing the Pan-Slav danger to the Monarchy.¹³ *The New Republic*, a leading political weekly, as well as the *New York Times*, was willing to publish articles "from the other side" as late as 1918; however, only three Hungarian-Americans, namely Dr. Árpád Gerster, Alexander Konta, and Jenő Bagger-Szekeres, used this opportunity to present a positive image of Hungary. The bulk of the Hungarian social elite and intelligentsia did not exploit the potential of the American press.¹⁴

In Europe, propaganda attempts were made mainly in Switzerland and Germany,¹⁵ but these were feeble efforts compared to South Slav, Czech, Slovak, and, above all, British propaganda directed against the Monarchy and Hungary. R.W. Seton-Watson and "The New Europe" group used all possible means to persuade US public opinion about the necessity of the dissolution of Austria-Hungary, and French activist Andre Cheradame and the "Austria Delenda" group did the same in Europe. The Monarchy and Germany forming a giant Pan-German state; Hungary, the colonizer of the Slavs; "barbaric Magyars" exploiting national minorities: such was the image of Hungary in the pamphlets published by official and self-appointed propagandists during the war.¹⁶

Well aware of anti-Hungarian propaganda during the war,¹⁷ the old elite of Hungary had every reason to be worried about the country's international reputation. Bad publicity, the imminent threat of territorial dismemberment, the Czech, Serbian, and Romanian armies marching into the country, combined with the realization that Károlyi was not going to defend Hungary by arms, mobilized all layers of society in late 1918. In the final weeks of the year a host of social organizations emerged to protect and argue for Hungary's territorial integrity. Many of them were based on the conviction that without quality international propaganda

Hungary's cause would be lost and, accordingly, they started large-scale propaganda activity in the neighbouring countries and among the victorious powers.

The aim of the present study is to examine one of the most impressive efforts to plead Hungary's case abroad, *The Hungarian Nation*, an English language journal sponsored by the Hungarian Territorial Integrity League. Not much research has been devoted so far to propaganda for territorial integrity between the end of the war and August 1921, when Premier István Bethlen cut all open propaganda short. The most comprehensive work on the subject to date has been Lajos Pallos's article, "Területvédő propaganda Magyarországon 1918-1920" [Propaganda for Territorial Integrity in Hungary 1918-1920]. Pallos devotes special attention to social organizations conducting propaganda, but he focuses on the years before the signing of the Trianon Peace Treaty and he does not even mention *The Hungarian Nation*. Anikó Kovács-Bertrand's thorough study of Hungarian revisionism, *Der Ungarische Revisionismus nach dem Ersten Weltkrieg* [Hungarian Revisionism after World War I]¹⁸ dedicates many pages to non-governmental propaganda for territorial integrity, but she, just like Miklós Zeidler in his comprehensive book *Ideas on Territorial Revision in Hungary 1920-1945*¹⁹ and Tibor Glant in his article about foreign language propaganda 1918-1920,²⁰ pays little attention to *The Hungarian Nation*.

The Territorial Integrity League

By far the most important and powerful of the emerging social organizations was the Territorial Integrity League²¹ (hereafter: TIL), founded in the last days of November, 1918, as a result of the efforts of Dezső Csánky, László Buday, Zsigmond Bátky and Count Pál Teleki.²² Following the short presidency of geographer Lajos Lóczy, who died in 1919, Teleki was elected president of the League. The manifesto of TIL was published in *Budapesti Hírlap* on December 3: it declared that the aim of the association was to organize the country's political, economic, cultural, and social clubs into a single organization which was to conduct propaganda at home and abroad.²³

Despite some initial criticism from the press (which labeled the organization "suspicious" and "harmful"²⁴), TIL became popular almost overnight. Charges of "counter-revolutionarism,"²⁵ were raised probably because the majority of its members represented the conservative middle

class and the elite of the pre-1918 era (such as Gyula Andrásy, Albert Apponyi, Ferenc Herczeg, Ferenc Molnár, among others). The Founders of the League did everything to attract followers from all layers of society; they justified the necessity of joining forces, without respect to social status, party and religious affiliation, with the need to build up the nation's self-esteem once again. In their view that was the only way to ensure that the country would have a firm moral standing at the upcoming peace conference. It seems their efforts were fruitful; Secretary-general Miklós Szegedy (soon replaced by Sándor Krisztics, editor of *The Hungarian Nation*) reported nearly a million members on December 14.²⁶ The supporters of TIL included such well-known public figures as Count Gyula Andrásy, Ferenc Herczeg, Count Albert Apponyi and Zsolt Beöthy. Numerous economic, scientific, and professional groups (such as the Hungarian Lawyers' Sport Association, the Székely National Council, and the National Balneology Association) joined forces with TIL. The Károlyi regime befriended the League, but did so unofficially; and Károlyi's wife, Katinka Andrásy, joined the organization.²⁷

The agitation of TIL targeted 1) the general Hungarian public, to keep nationalistic feelings alive, 2) the minorities of the occupied areas, to ensure that in case of a plebiscite they would opt for Hungary, and 3) the Allied Powers and the Paris Peace Conference.²⁸ The League meant to reach its target groups by the publication and circulation of pamphlets, postcards, maps, posters, leaflets, and books, all campaigning for Greater Hungary's territorial integrity. Besides, it volunteered to defend the country by arms if necessary.²⁹ The activities of TIL were financed partly by private contributions,³⁰ and partly by the government, which, at that stage, openly encouraged propaganda activities by social organizations.

During the Hungarian Soviet Republic (March–August 1919) the organization, like all other patriotic civil associations, was dissolved. The regime was unacceptable in the eyes of the Entente, which rendered any attempts for propaganda on the part of Kun and his associates impossible. Besides, the internationalist ideology of the Bolshevik regime, which did not recognize borders and nations, was irreconcilable with nationalist propaganda. Following the collapse of the Hungarian Soviet Republic it was the presence of the Romanian occupation army that made it well-nigh impossible to conduct any sort of propaganda for Hungarian territorial integrity. Only after the Romanians had left Budapest in November 1919 were TIL and its activity revived, with substantial help from Hungary's new provisional government headed by Károly Huszár.³¹

On December 2, 1919 Hungary was once again invited to join the Peace Conference.³² This invitation had certain immediate consequences. The government felt that it had to earn recognition from the Entente by not supporting and not being (officially) involved in territorial propaganda anymore; instead, it encouraged propaganda covertly. By that time TIL had obtained a leading position among the several social organizations that were campaigning for territorial integrity and, after 9 months of forced suspension, its operation was in full vigor. The invitation to the conference fostered new hopes. Therefore, it seemed to make sense to launch informative English language publications presenting Hungary's viewpoint to the world. In consequence, in 1920-21 the League published a series of books simultaneously in London, New York and Budapest entitled *East European Problems*, with such well-known figures as Albert Apponyi, Ferenc Fodor, or János Kovács as authors. *EEP* consisted of twenty-four publications and was soon followed by its French version, *Questions de l'Europe Orientale*, which resulted in seven publications.³³ Journals were also launched: the English *The Hungarian Nation* in 1920, and the French *Les pays du Danube* in 1921 were distributed in Western Europe as well as the US.

Though it was seemingly pointless to keep on campaigning after the peace treaty was signed, in reality the possibilities of propaganda improved in western countries after June 4, 1920.³⁴ Count Apponyi himself shared this opinion, and he was not alone.³⁵ Besides, people were confident that the peace terms would soon be revised. Scarcely a month after the signing of the treaty, TIL declared that it intended to continue its activity since "it is of vital importance in regard to the impending revision of the peace treaty."³⁶ Certain signs indicated that although propaganda was officially called off, political circles did not want to terminate it once and for all; just two weeks before the signing of the treaty the government allocated 40 million crowns for propaganda, clearly for the times coming after Trianon. In 1920 and 1921 some government officials took up employment in the League, while receiving salary from their original employer, i.e. the government.³⁷ Soon afterwards, however, the government refused to finance directly the activities of TIL. The main reason for this must have been the fact that during the weeks before June 4 the League openly campaigned against the signing of the treaty. Although in most cases the League cooperated with the government, it would not acquiesce in the partitioning of the country, not even seemingly.³⁸

In the summer of 1920 propaganda activity abroad intensified, with the active participation of TIL. It campaigned relentlessly in the neigh-

bouring countries as well as Western Europe believing, like millions of Hungarians, in the imminent revision of the borders. In 1921, however, the government decided to examine civil associations and to dissolve those ones which were considered too irredentist. At that time the League was not dissolved like most other irredentist associations, thanks to its good relations with the government. Soon, however, it merged with other civil associations, which, at least legally, meant the end of TIL. Its activities, however, continued uninterrupted in the next two years.³⁹

In 1923 Premier Count István Bethlen admitted that international backing for revisionism was lacking. At that time Hungary was facing serious economic challenges, the victorious powers were not at all inclined to modify the frontiers, and neither were the countries of the Little Entente (Czechoslovakia, Romania and Yugoslavia). Bethlen decided to wait until Hungary became internationally consolidated and economically stronger. Once again, propaganda was called off, this time not only seemingly, which meant the end of the activities of the former TIL, and thus, the end of the publication of *The Hungarian Nation*.⁴⁰

The Hungarian Nation: Publication Details, Contributors, Structure

The Hungarian Nation (hereafter: *HN*) was the first English language journal about Hungary founded explicitly for propaganda purposes. The first issue was published a month after the Hungarian peace delegation had arrived in Paris, in February 1920, with the subtitle *A Monthly Review, Political and Economic*, to which, with the creation of a literary magazine, *Literary* was added from the 1920/6 issue onwards. The paper was published by Ferdinand Pfeifer (Zeidler Brothers), TIL's own dealer,⁴¹ and circulated by the Foreign Ministry's Press Department⁴² first in London, New York, Paris, Milano, Leipzig, Lugano, and from the 1920/6 issue on also in Bern and Geneva. In the course of four years 32 issues were published, their length varying between 14-30 pages. We know that initially at least 4,000-5,000 copies were published monthly⁴³ and sold for the price of 1 shilling or 20 US cents.

The renowned political scientist and university lecturer, Sándor Krisztics,⁴⁴ secretary-general of TIL, became the editor of *HN*. Krisztics had had some experience in editing: in 1916 he filled the same position for *The Hungarian Review*, another attempt to introduce Hungary to the English-speaking world.⁴⁵ From issue no. 6 on Krisztics was joined by Arthur L. Delisle, an English journalist based in Budapest, who had also

tried his hands at journalism before: in 1913-14 he edited *The Hungarian Spectator*.⁴⁶ A great many of the articles were written by Krisztics and Delisle themselves; the rest were contributed by prominent figures of Hungarian public life, aristocrats, academics, and journalists, such as Count Teleki, the Baron Gyula Wlassics, Count Apponyi, Consul-General Ernest Ludwig, Mayor of Budapest Jenő Sipőcz, the director of the Hungarian Statistical Office Alajos Szabóky, or the Bishop János Karácsonyi.⁴⁷ The majority of articles published in *HN*, however, did not indicate an author at all.

HN's aim was first and foremost to influence the outcome of the Paris Peace Conference, and it deployed its whole arsenal to achieve this goal. Historical, cultural, economic, political, ethnographical, and, above all, geographical arguments were employed to prove Hungary's right to her territories. To some extent, the structure of the journal reflected the structure of reasoning: each issue (until 1922/8-9, when all thematic sections disappeared) started with a collection of unclassified articles: appeals to the world or a world leader in particular, memoranda, reports of political events such as the dethronement of Charles IV or the Genoa Conference, summaries of Hungary's history or geography, and so on, all with a strongly propagandistic edge. These were followed by 3-6 articles grouped under the common title *Political Events*; articles of this section reported about the internal political situation of Hungary and the neighbouring countries, parliamentary elections, political parties, the program of the National Assembly as well as the debate and ratification of the Hungarian Peace Treaty in the US/British/French parliaments. They were designed to prove that Hungary was a most democratic country as opposed to the "barbaric" Successor States which exemplified the very opposite. They included excuses and apologies for the white terror (which, according to *HN*'s reasoning, never actually happened), anti-Semitism (which was claimed to be anti-Bolshevism) and the *Numerus Clausus* Act (which was presented as an "absolute necessity" and a "defensive measure").⁴⁸

The Nationalities of Hungary for the Integrity of the Country section collected articles asking for help on behalf of the Slovak, Croatian, German, Ruthenian, and Hungarian minorities that now suddenly found themselves outside Hungary. *Notes and Comments* comprised short (10-30 lines) reports, always without author, about the atrocities these minorities had to endure in the Successor States. "Forcible removal of school-boys from Igló,"⁴⁹ "The Magyars of Transylvania being exterminated,"⁵⁰ "Even the dead are taxed by the Roumanians,"⁵¹ "Dismissal of Hungarian Railway-men by the Austrians,"⁵² "Nationalities deprived of suffrage

rights in Yougoslavia [sic]⁵³ are just a few examples of the incessant stream of reports on the everyday life for nationalities in Serbia, Romania, and Czechoslovakia.

Articles in the section entitled *Economic Life* informed the public about the financial situation of the country, emphasizing that with all natural resources detached from Hungary, it was next to impossible to satisfy the demands of the victors. *Our Literary Magazine* was added in late 1920, presenting the works of Cecile Tormay, Ferenc Herczeg, Géza Lampért, Géza Gárdonyi, Kálmán Mikszáth and (most often) Delisle. Sections *Appeals* and *Social Conditions* appeared only once, describing the torments of Hungarians in Romania in a dramatic tone.

The journal changed format and abandoned all sections in 1923. The last couple of issues were double and triple issues, respectively, containing the same type of articles from the pens of the same authors as before. When Premier Bethlen, trying to please the western powers, put an end to all propaganda in 1921, activities, slogans, and charters of patriotic organizations were investigated. Moderate groups were reformed, extremist ones were disbanded. As has been explained, TIL was dissolved, its publications and propaganda material were taken over by the Hungarian National Alliance, and *HN* was terminated in mid-1923.

Style and Language

HN was written in excellent English, especially compared to the language of wartime publications from the Austro-Hungarian Empire. The grammar and wording of the articles would have satisfied the tastes of a native speaker. The style, however, was exceedingly pompous and overdramatic; the journal did not confine itself to mere facts, but engaged in lengthy descriptions of the torments of and abuses against Hungarians. Phrases like “[the Treaty] ‘tore us limb from limb’ and threw the morsels to the vultures to feed upon”⁵⁴ were frequent on almost every page.

The very first article of the first issue is a fine example of the journal's style:

The Council of Paris has pronounced the verdict; [...] Never yet has peace been assured at so high a cost: the condemnation to death for the nations that had suffered defeat. Hungary belongs to them, her place is [...] among those assigned to the nations' catacombs. We have to prepare for death. No fear, the vaults are spacious enough, the whole nation will find room in them; slow, painful death by

starvation and cold, by artificially suffocating the weak breath of life still left to them, will embrace them all. Life is made impossible, we have to face death. [...] Unflinchingly they tore us to pieces, without a glance of pity for the mutilated body at their feet.⁵⁵

At other times the tone was elevated and solemn, such as when describing the ratification of the treaty in the Hungarian parliament:

The late autumn sunlight filtered through the painted windows of the dome, its glorious colour effects lightening the gloom and revealing the seats filled with sombre-clad men. All the cabinet ministers were in their places, and the deputies waited in silent immobility for the moment when they would be called upon to seal the fate of their country. To seal it forever? The answer is on the knees of the gods! [...] But as the solemn chant rose heavenward, heads were raised, cheeks flushed, eyes kindled, and it seemed verily as if the intrusive sunbeams were born of the words that ascended to the heights...⁵⁶

When writing about what ethnic Hungarians had to endure in their new countries, *HN* abounded in dramatic descriptions of the atrocities committed by Serbians, Czechs, and above all, Romanians against “Magyars” (“their finger and toe-nails are torn off by pincers,” “needles are driven between the nails and the flesh,” “[they are] used in experiments by the hangman’s apprentices”⁵⁷ and so on). This rhetoric was an answer to wartime atrocity propaganda, which painted a horrifying image of the ruthless “Teutonic Huns” and “Magyars,” who oppressed the Slavs, “Magyarized” them, stole their lands, but learned agriculture and industry from them.⁵⁸

Argumentation

The arguments put forward in *HN* in defense of Hungary’s territorial integrity were by no means new at the beginning of 1920. All the arguments listed by the journal had been around for years (some even for decades), and they tended to follow the logic of TIL pamphlets and leaflets circulated between 1918 and 1920. The reasoning tried to confute Andre Cheradame’s and Robert William Seton-Watson’s anti-Monarchy and anti-Hungarian propaganda during World War I, just as well as former Romanian, Czech, Serbian propaganda, accusing Hungary of having taken the

lands of the Slavs, oppressing and “Magyarizing” national minorities, and in 1914 provoking the war.⁵⁹

Since TIL was closely associated with the Hungarian Geographical Society⁶⁰ and many of its prominent figures were geographers, it is no wonder that the primary argument of the journal was of geographical nature. According to that argument St. Stephen's Hungary was such a perfect geographical and economic unit that it would have been unnatural to detach a single square mile of it. The Carpathian Basin was meant to be one country from the beginning of times, and while Greater Hungary exemplified unity in all respects, the Successor States lacked all kinds of (geographical, economic, ethnographical, and cultural) unity. Besides being, in Apponyi's words, “the finest natural geographic unity in Europe,”⁶¹ the

uniform, characteristic Hungarian region is possessed of its peculiar individuality as regards geographical economics as well. [...] The economic individuality of the basin system involves the outspoken individuality of the traffic within the boundaries of the Hungarian region. [...] The basin-system enclosed by the Carpathians is thus, geographically speaking, peopled by the Hungarians; the region belongs to them, for, economically, they have conquered it and penetrated it with their culture.⁶²

Even though Apponyi was anxious to point out the state of perfection represented by Greater Hungary, he did admit that “one factor... was wanting: *racial unity*. On this plea is [Hungary's] dissection planned.”⁶³ This statement leads us to the next pivotal point of the argumentation: namely, that though Hungary's population was ethnically mixed, Hungary did not treat the national minorities unkindly. Ever since St. Stephen welcomed western settlers in the country, Hungarians have been most tolerant towards foreigners, “and the policy of the ancient Hungarian constitution, founded on privilege, suffered shipwreck on the rock of the nationalities owing to *the hostility of the Vienna Government*.”⁶⁴ The argument was developed further in an appeal to US President Warren G. Harding: “Hungarians did not exterminate or enslave alien tribes and settlers;” instead, they lived peacefully together in a “community of rights and liberties.... All the inhabitants of the country were equal citizens of the nation, without regard to tongue or race.”⁶⁵ The Bishop János Karácsonyi went as far as stating that by ruling Croatia for long centuries, Hungary did not oppress the Croatian nation but saved it from assimilation with the Serbians.⁶⁶

HN was anxious to make readers aware that what they had heard and read before was merely malicious propaganda, and that minorities, having developed an intense attachment to Hungary over the centuries, did not wish to be separated from their “mother country:”

Facts were represented as if the parts of alien peoples under Hungarian rule were oppressed and had to be delivered from the yoke. And thus it happened. Soon, however, it was discovered that the liberators were worse tyrants than the ‘oppressors’ of old had ever been.

The events since come to pass upon the Hungarian territories furnish ample proof. Though one or the other of the “delivered” peoples might have betrayed some joy at the beginning, gladly welcomed the unification with its neighbouring kindred, prepared by a long press campaign [sic] and in the hope of improving its position, now [...] they all are entirely disillusioned and have [...] changed their views. Slowly it begins to dawn on the peoples seceded from Hungary that their adversaries are to be found not among the Magyars but in Prague, Belgrade and Bucharest.⁶⁷

In sharp contrast to what minorities were used to under Hungarian rule, the newly-formed Successor States abused them; the torments of the Croats, Bunjevci, and Šokci under Serbian rule, the Czech abuse of Slovaks and Ruthenians, and the Romanian aggression and oppression experienced by the Hungarians and Saxons of Transylvania were enumerated in dramatic tone. Titles like “The people of Muraköz do not desire separation from Hungary,” “Ruthenians protesting against separation from Hungary,” “Slovakian, Ruthenian and German Declaration of Allegiance to Hungary,” “The Position and Wishes of the Wends under Yougoslav [sic] Occupation” and countless others assure the reader that detachment from Hungary was the worst possible option these nationalities could envision.

Addressed to their fellow workmen or the “civilised world,” appeals and petitions of authors, artists, and workers of Hungary and Transylvania, begged for intervention in almost every issue. Perhaps the best example of such appeals is the Union of the National Minorities of Hungary’s “Plea to the Nations of the World:”

Nations of the World! To you we apply for help! We, the Slovaks, Germans, Ruthenians, Roumanians, Wends and South-Slavs address our plea to you. Guiltless have we been condemned at Paris. We have been convicted to sunderance [sic] from our thousand year-old

home, from Hungary. For a thousand years that country has been our loving mother who has given us a fair treatment, and, though perhaps she did not always treat us quite according to our wish, yet she has been kinder to us than our new step-mothers. [...] They [i.e. the Peace Conference] have joined us to such peoples as are either on a much lower level of culture, or making use of such brutal force as will serve to suppress our national life. [...] With all our devotion and all our might we beg and plead for the Plebiscite!⁶⁸

The plea is not signed, nor does it indicate an author. It does, however, allude to another recurrent argument against the neighbouring peoples, namely, that they were inferior to Hungarians. Apponyi himself pointed out in his speech to the Peace Conference on January 16, 1920 that the cultural level of Hungarians could not be compared to those of the Romanians, Serbs, and Slovaks.⁶⁹ The main argument to support this statement was the destruction of Hungarian statues and memorials in the detached areas.⁷⁰

HN took great pains to reject responsibility for the war and to explain to the public that Hungary (and in particular István Tisza) opposed the war to the very last moment. The late premier was praised as one who “made herculean efforts to save the peoples from the dire disaster that he saw approaching.”⁷¹ The country was driven to war only by the aggression of Germany (Tisza was “taken off his feet by a comminatory message from Berlin”⁷²), and once she was at war, unlike the Romanians, she could not commit treachery and forsake her allies. The very first article of the very first issue, “Appeal,” calls it “more than undeserved fate” that a country which “had never played a major part in the politics of Europe and whose Prime Minister had protested up to the last minute (July 8, 1914) against any intention of conquest and had done everything in his power to prevent the outbreak of the war”⁷³ should be punished so severely. To this, Apponyi added, “had Hungary been able to decide for herself, there would have been no war;”⁷⁴ and considering all these mitigating circumstances, Hungary should not have been punished more severely than any other belligerent state.

Though *The Hungarian Nation* was circulated all over Western Europe and in the USA, we have reason to believe that it was meant for British and American audiences. The journal advertised itself as one “to all in Great Britain and America who desire to keep abreast of events and to be well informed on the trend of popular feeling in Hungary and the newly created States of Central Europe.” A large share of the articles was dedicated to the similarities and traditional friendship of the Hungarians

and the English, sometimes with anti-French overtones. “England and Hungary,”⁷⁵ “The Anglo-Hungarian Club,”⁷⁶ “English Culture and Hungarian Life,”⁷⁷ “The Anglo-Saxon World and Hungary,”⁷⁸ “Hungary’s Thank to Her Advocates in the English Parliament,”⁷⁹ and so on, all praise the English nation as “gentlemanlike, loyal and highspirited [sic],”⁸⁰ a people with an “uncompromising sense of duty, unswerving [sic] loyalty, independence of mind and love of liberty, an unconditional attachment to home and country,”⁸¹ not to mention the “unerring instinct of right and freedom” and the “manly, aristocratic heart”⁸² of the “English race.” According to the authors, the Magyars shared all these qualities and “the common traits of character” had made them “kindred nations” ever since the days of St. Stephen. Richard the Lionheart was Hungary’s national hero, Shakespeare was her national poet, and if the cultural similarities would not be enough to prove that Hungarians had a congenial spirit and mind with the English, *HN* pointed out that their histories had been parallel (e.g. those were the two earliest nations to have a constitution: Magna Charta and the Golden Bull).⁸³ In short, “Hungarian history, national character and national traditions predestined them to come under the influence of the only nation in Europe whose history, national character and national traditions were akin to those of the Magyars.”⁸⁴

To support the notion of the anglophile nation, co-editor Delisle shared with his readers his own experiences as an enemy alien in Hungary. “Our Friends, the Enemy” related in awe how scrupulously Hungarian authorities ensured during the war that English subjects have the freedom of movement, that they be treated with respect and would not feel unwelcome in Hungary.⁸⁵

Some articles were meant to confirm “the thousand-year-old Hungarian-English friendship” from the English side. “The Treaty of Peace with Hungary in the British Parliament” quoted several “honourable and gallant English MPs,” all undignified about the “great act of injustice” they were about to commit and generally speaking of Hungary very highly. Several MPs expressed their viewpoint that “the Treaty was contrary to the law of nature as well as to the interests and sentiments of the inhabitants.”⁸⁶ The thousand-year-old English-Hungarian friendship was mentioned as a matter of evidence. The fact, however, that for some reason Hungary and Great Britain fought on opposite sides in the Great War would have upset the theory of the “kindred nations;” therefore, the common explanation was that the two countries were enemies only on paper, while they were suffering from being separated. Delisle, Ludwig, and their fellow authors were eager to point out that “the Hungarian people

have not, during any stage of the war, regarded either the British or the Americans as their enemies, even so much as their technical enemies,”⁸⁷ and that the restoration of peace was the return to normal course of life.

Another recurrent argument for the preservation of Hungary's territorial integrity was that a strong and peaceful Hungary and Central Europe was in fact in the interest of western powers, but in the present situation Hungary was everything but strong, stable, and peaceful. “It is not merely in Hungary's interest but in that of all Europe to strengthen her, to restore the sources of [her] strength,” because the only basis for “maintenance of peace in Eastern Europe is... a strong Hungary capable of life,”⁸⁸ Apponyi wrote in early 1921. Some overestimated Hungary's significance and stated that a “free, strong and independent Hungary will be the best guarantee for universal peace and progress, not only for the centre of Europe, but for the entire hemisphere.”⁸⁹

The “From Wilson only a Wilsonian peace!” argument was, of course, inescapable. The Baron Julius Wlassics's series of articles, “The Right to Self-Determination,” ran for almost a year in *HN*, discussing the Wilsonian principles and their practical realization in Central Europe. The former Hungarian consul-general in Cleveland, Ernest Ludwig, blamed Wilson in fiery articles for not acting according to his principles and letting Hungary down. In Ludwig's opinion it was Wilson whom “Hungary owes her dismemberment and her present catastrophe.”⁹⁰ Others, like Transylvanus Viator, blamed also the Peace Conference for the failure of Wilson's principles, which “were conceived in the anaemic brain of an American doctrinaire and brought forth only to die after brief contact with the outer air, and lie forgotten among the archives of a Peace Conference that over-ruled their inspirer.”⁹¹

Evolution

In August 1921, for reasons described above, (official) territorial propaganda came to an end. It might have been for that, or simply the realization that under the given circumstances irredentist demands would not yield results, that in the course of 1921-1922 *HN*'s aggressive and unrealistic rhetoric was gradually replaced by a more moderate tone. The first realistic voices came in the 1921/3-4 issue from Apponyi, who was ready to accept that

it cannot be assumed that any modification of the treaties is to be expected within a short time. [...] Coolly considered it is a psychological impossibility that those who have composed the treaties should now, with the ink not yet quite dry on the paper, start the work of revision. To carry through this revision against the will of those in power [...] is an unreasonable thought. [...] [A] sound Hungarian policy is possible only on the basis of the treaties, [...] and the foremost task of this policy is to give assurance that Hungary does not aim at a forcible modification of the treaties.⁹²

Initially *HN*'s attitude to the peace treaty was total rejection, but a gradual change took place in 1921 and 1922. Demands were gradually being scaled down, and by 1923 the former "everything back!" claims were replaced by more realistic calls for border revision where the peace treaty had not taken railroad lines or other compelling economic factors into consideration.

The logic of reasoning, however, remained the same. The 1923/1-3 issue campaigned for re-attaching the territory that is generally referred to as the Partium (the lands between the trans-Tisza region in Eastern Hungary and Transylvania) to Hungary. When the "Memorandum on the Frontier Rectification Between Hungary and Roumania" summarized the arguments in favor of border modification, the same points were repeated once again that had been present in the columns of the journal since 1920, first and foremost that "1. This territory, in conformity with the immutable laws of nature, belongs to the Hungarian lowland. [...] 2. The Magyars are in an absolute majority in this territory. [...] 4. This territory has never before belonged to Transylvania."⁹³

Denying responsibility for the war, claiming "unprecedented barbarism"⁹⁴ directed against the "Magyar" population in their new countries, and asserting that "the Succession [*sic*] States aiming at the economic ruin of Hungary,"⁹⁵ and all the rest of the well-known arguments were also recycled to the very end. Above all, instead of openly demanding to annul the Peace Treaty, *HN* started to focus on articles that were designed to prove how aggressive, cruel, and, in terms of culture and civilization, inferior compared to Hungary the newly formed Successor States were. Typical headlines included "Czech Antagonism to Hungarian and Ruthenian Civilisation," "Struggle for Autonomy in the Territories Severed from Hungary," "Destruction of Monuments of Hungarian Art," "Renewed Czech Persecution of the Magyars," "The People of Burgenland Seek to Escape from Austrian Rule," or "The Future Czecho-Polish War!"

Frontier Regulation Commissions

The people of Hungary [...] hailed with joy the arrival of the frontier regulation commissions, while the Hungarian Government, though struggling with a constantly depleted treasury, willingly defrayed the expenses running into millions of crowns, required for the support of these commissions, in the confident belief that the Areopagus at Paris would honour its promise in due time.⁹⁶

Such were the hopes of Hungarian society after Millerand's letter and upon receiving the frontier regulation commissions, which came to Hungary in order to review the Trianon borders and suggest adjustments. Hopeful expectations, however, soon gave place to disappointment. Nothing was reported about the actual work done by the commissions, but since it had no evident result within a short period of time, by mid-1922 the general opinion was that the commissions had "discovered a means of fulfilling their tasks by carrying out only those provisions of the Treaty and appendices which were disadvantageous for Hungary and ignoring the rest."⁹⁷ The commissions were accused of being biased, superficial, "parasitic," exceedingly expensive to maintain, and they were held responsible for "preventing the population from doing anything to better its condition."⁹⁸ Besides the commissions not doing their job, Romanian, Czech, and Serbian authorities were said to have intimidated their Hungarian populations before the commissions' arrival, threatening them with death if they revealed any preference for Hungary.

Image construction

One strategy *HN* deployed to construct a positive image of Hungary abroad (above all in Britain) was publishing letters from notable English lords such as Lord Newton, war-time Assistant Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, head of the departments for foreign propaganda and prisoners of war, and from anonymous English MPs, noblemen or businessmen.

These writers usually started by thanking Delisle for the copies of *HN* and went on to ensure him that the writer of the letter held Hungary by no means responsible for the outbreak of the war, or to acknowledge that British subjects were indeed treated fairly in Hungary during the war. Besides, *HN* regularly reported the stances and appeals of the Oxford League for Hungarian Self-determination (OLHSD).

As part of a comprehensive image construction campaign, in spring 1922 *HN* started to advertise the University of Budapest Summer Vacation Courses. The courses covered Hungarian language, literature, history, geographical and economical conditions of Central Europe, French and German literature, Central European Politics, all held in English (a major gesture in an age when the European *lingua franca* was mostly French). The 1922/8-9 issue then gave a detailed account of the opening ceremony of the Summer Courses which was an event of the highest profile; the English students, Oxford professors and members of the OLHSD, who had “come to this country for the purpose of studying Hungarian conditions and gaining personal experience on the spot,”⁹⁹ were greeted with hussars and *hajdus* in “gorgeously picturesque uniforms,” crimson carpet, flaunting flags, Dean Siegiescu’s speech delivered in Latin, and all the pompous formalities and show that the interwar regime could put on. A great deal of the same issue was dedicated to the petitions and appeals of the University of Oxford and the OLHSD to the League of Nations and the civilized world in general.

Conclusions

The Hungarian Nation was an unprecedented attempt at justifying Hungary’s claims on her territories. The journal, published in Western Europe and the US, was the first serious propaganda effort since the beginning of the war that targeted an international audience, and as such, it was of surprisingly good standard. The background organization of the journal, the Territorial Integrity League, was perhaps the most influential organization of its kind, involving Hungary’s social elite and intelligentsia. The editorial board consisted of renowned scholars, politicians, and aristocrats, who had all joined forces to prevent Hungary’s dismemberment.

The journal, however, was doomed to failure. By the time the first issue was published, Hungary’s fate had been sealed. Besides, the reasoning of *HN*, which was a distant (and belated) response to wartime anti-Austria-Hungary propaganda, was too overheated, dramatic, and redundant, for it repeated the same arguments over and over again. Though written in excellent English and deploying innumerable historical and statistical facts, the political climate of the early 1920s rendered the journal’s ambitions unrealistic. Even after August 1921, when the former aggressive irredentist tone softened a bit, the objectives of *The Hungarian Nation* were well beyond reality.

This does not lessen the journal's merits though. It was, and remains, an interesting and impressive experiment, and a valuable source of information for us, reflecting the picture of the Hungarian nation the new-born, independent Hungary wanted the West to see.

Appendix

Major contributors of *The Hungarian Nation*

Dávid Angyal (1857-1943), born Engel, started out as a literary historian, and ended up as professor of modern history at the University of Budapest and an honorary member of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences. He published a number of essays, studies, books on modern Hungarian history and was editor of several historical journals.¹⁰⁰

Count Albert Apponyi, (1846-1933), Hungary's „grand old man”, needs no introduction. After World War I he turned legitimist, headed the Hungarian peace delegation in Paris, where he tried to fight against Hungary's dismemberment with all possible means. From 1923 he represented Hungary in the League of Nations until his death. His eloquence, dedication, insight and realistic assessment of the situation make him stand high above his contemporaries.¹⁰¹

Not much is known about **Delisle, Arthur L., Esq.**, the co-editor of *The Hungarian Nation*, an English journalist who settled in Hungary. He was co-author of a book entitled *Austria of the Austrians and Hungary of the Hungarians* (Pitman: London, 1914, reprinted in 2009 by Kessinger Pub) and secretary of the Anglo-American Literary Society of Budapest. In 1914 he returned to England and offered his services in turning Hungary against the Central Powers.¹⁰²

Ferenc Fodor (1887-1962) was a renowned geographer, cartographer and historian. Between 1911-1919 he taught at the secondary grammar school of Karánsebes, but when the town came under Romanian rule, he refused to give his oath to the Romanian government and left for Budapest. In the capital he worked at the University of Economics as a close associate of Teleki.¹⁰³

Baron Albert Kaas (1885-1961) held a doctorate in law and political science from the University of Budapest. His Danish origins did not prevent him from becoming an MP for *Nemzeti Munkapárt*, and in the 1920s a representative in the National Assembly. A lecturer of the Faculty of Economics and member of the Order of Saint John, he was appointed Teleki's successor in the upper house after the Premier's suicide.¹⁰⁴

János Karácsonyi (1858-1929) completed his theological studies in Budapest before he was ordained in 1882. Historian, professor of theology and bishop, he became a full member of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences.¹⁰⁵

Sándor Krisztics (1890-1966), the editor of *The Hungarian Nation*,

former editor of *The Hungarian Review*, was a lecturer of international law, foreign policy and political science at the University of Budapest from 1920. From 1926 he taught law and political science at the University of Pécs, where he was appointed rector in the 1940s. Besides being director of the Hungarian Sociographical Institute, he also served as secretary general of the T.I.L.¹⁰⁶

Ernő Ludwig, Austria-Hungary's consul general in Cleveland during WW I, author of *Austria-Hungary and the War*, disappeared from public life after the war.

Alajos Paikert (1866-1948) studied law and agriculture at the University of Budapest. A founding member of the Hungarian Royal Museum of Agriculture, he became the Museum's director in 1923. He retired as under-secretary of state in 1930. A promoter of Turanism, he also founded the Turan Society and its journal in the 1910s.¹⁰⁷

Baron Gyula Wlassics (1852-1937) was an extraordinary man of his day; professor of criminal justice, deputy public prosecutor, MP, later Minister for Religion and Public Education, chair of the upper house, vice president of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, member of The Hague Court of Justice. As a token of recognition he was granted nobility in 1916. During his long career he always stood up for civic reforms, such as civil marriage and women's admission to universities.¹⁰⁸

Arthur B. Yolland (1874-1956), a graduate of Cambridge and Oxford, moved to Budapest in 1898 (according to Jeszenszky in 1896¹⁰⁹) and became a Hungarian citizen in 1908. He was appointed professor of English Language and Literature at what is known today as Eötvös Lóránd University. Besides editing *The Hungarian Spectator* and compiling Hungarian-English and English-Hungarian dictionaries, he translated a great deal of Hungarian literature to English and wrote a number of studies about Hungarian culture and history in English. Incidentally, he is regarded as a founder of Hungarian football (soccer), having been a member of the first ever Hungarian football team (Budapesti Torna-Club Első Magyar Futball Teamje, First Hungarian Football Team of Budapest Sports Club).¹¹⁰

NOTES

I would like to thank my thesis supervisor, Dr. Tibor Glant for calling *The Hungarian Nation* to my attention and for his insights and guidance without which I would not have been able to complete this article.

¹ Paul Hanebrink, "Transnational Culture War: Christianity, Nation, and the Judeo-Bolshevik Myth in Hungary, 1890-1920," *The Journal of Modern History* 80, 1 (March 2008): 59. Hereafter cited as Hanebrink, "Transnational Culture War".

² Béla Bodó, “White Terror, the Hungarian Press, and the Evolution of Hungarian Anti-Semitism after World War I,” *Yad Vashem Studies*, 34 (2006): 53. Hereafter cited as Bodó, “White Terror”.

³ Hanebrink, “Transnational Culture War,” p. 67.

⁴ Paul Hanebrink, *In Defense of Christian Hungary: Religion, Nationalism, and Antisemitism, 1890-1944* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2006), 60. Hereafter cited as Hanebrink, *In Defense of Christian Hungary*.

⁵ Had the Hungarian government not closed the borders at the end of 1920, the number of refugees would have continued to increase. Ignác Romsics, *István Bethlen: A Great Conservative Statesman of Hungary, 1874-1946* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1995), 145. Hereafter cited as Romsics.

⁶ Hanebrink, *In Defense of Christian Hungary*, p. 60. and Romsics 145.

⁷ Hanebrink, “Transnational Culture War,” p. 68.

⁸ Hanebrink, “Transnational Culture War,” p. 75.

⁹ Eliza Johnson Ablovatski. “‘Cleansing the Red Nest’: Counter-revolution and White Terror in Munich and Budapest, 1919.” Doctoral dissertation, Columbia University, 2004. UMI Microfilm 3159719, pp. 76-98. According to Ablovatski, the White Terror claimed 1,500 to 2,000 victims, three or four times the estimated number of victims of the Red Terror.

¹⁰ Bodó, “White Terror”, p. 47.

¹¹ Bodó, “White Terror”, pp. 52 and 70.

¹² Tibor Glant, “Roosevelt, Apponyi és a Habsburg Monarchia,” *Századok* 1997/6. pp. 1386-1401. Apponyi did publish some articles in *The Outlook* before the outbreak of the war to familiarize the US public with Hungarian conditions. Similar attempts were Jenő Golonya’s journal simply titled *Hungary*, published twice a month between 1903-1917 with the aim of making Hungary’s political and economic situation, natural beauties and history known to the upper layers of British and American society; *The Hungarian Spectator*, a journal edited by A. Yolland in 1913-1914; *The Hungarian Review*, a journal edited by Alexander Krisztics, published in 1916. See Géza Jeszenszky, “A ‘Hungary’, az első angol nyelvű magyar újság.” [*Hungary*, the First English Language Hungarian Journal] *Az Országos Széchenyi Könyvtár Évkönyve* 1976-77, pp. 471-499. Cited hereafter as Jeszenszky, ‘Hungary.’

¹³ Tibor Glant, *Through the Prism of the Habsburg Monarchy: Hungary in American Diplomacy and Public Opinion During World War I* (Boulder, Colo.: Social Science Monographs; Highland Lakes, N.J.: Atlantic Research and Publications; New York: Distributed by Columbia University Press, 1998) pp. 83-115. Hereafter cited as Glant, *Through the Prism*.

¹⁴ Glant, *Through the Prism*, pp. 170-179

¹⁵ For details see Lajos Pallos, “Területvédő propaganda Magyarországon 1918-1920” [Propaganda for Territorial Integrity in Hungary 1918-1920], *Folia Historica XXIV* (Budapest: Magyar Nemzeti Múzeum, 2006), p. 38. Hereafter cited as Pallos, “Területvédő propaganda.”

¹⁶ Glant, *Through the Prism*, pp. 141-163.

¹⁷ Pallos, "Területvédő propaganda," p. 38.

¹⁸ Anikó Kovács-Bertrand. *Der Ungarische Revisionismus nach dem Ersten Weltkrieg* [Hungarian Revisionism after World War I] München: Oldenbourg, 1997. Hereafter cited as Kovács-Bertrand, *Ungarische Revisionismus*.

¹⁹ Miklós Zeidler, *Ideas on Territorial Revision in Hungary 1920-1945* (Boulder, Colorado: Social Science Monographs; Wayne, NJ: Center for Hungarian Studies and Publications, Inc.; distributed by Columbia University Press, NY, 2007) Hereafter cited as Zeidler, *Territorial Revision*.

²⁰ Tibor Glant, "Some Facts about Hungarian Propaganda for Territorial Integrity Abroad, 1918-20," *Hungarian Journal of English and American Studies* 2 (1) (1996): 43-55.

²¹ The full name of the TIL was Defense League for the Territorial Integrity of Hungary (Magyarország Területi Épségének Védelmi Ligája, generally known as TEVÉL in Hungarian).

²² Anikó Kovács-Bertrand, *Ungarische Revisionismus*, p. 50.

²³ Magyarország területi épségének védelmi ligája [Defense League for the Territorial Integrity of Hungary]. In: *Budapesti Hírlap*. Dec 3, 1918, p. 7.

²⁴ Balázs Ablonczy, *Teleki Pál* (Budapest: Osiris, 2005), 132.

²⁵ *Pesti Hírlap*, Dec 15, 1918.

²⁶ "A Területi Védelmi Liga megalakulása," *Budapesti Hírlap*, Dec 15, 1918, p. 7.

²⁷ Pallós, "Területvédő propaganda," p. 54. The reference for the one million members appeared only in *Pesti Hírlap* (Dec 17, 1918, p. 2). This high number might not be far from reality though, since entire civil associations and even religious communities such as the Israelite Community of Buda joined the association.

²⁸ Miklós Zeidler, "A Magyar Revíziós Liga" [The Hungarian Revisionist League], *Századok* 1997/2, p. 303; Pallós, "Területvédő propaganda," p. 54; and in more detail Zeidler, *Territorial Revision*, pp. 93-97.

²⁹ Pallós, "Területvédő propaganda," p. 53.

³⁰ In 1920 TIL was donated an impressive amount of 4 million crown. Kovács-Bertrand, *Ungarische Revisionismus*, p. 51.

³¹ Pallos, "Területvédő propaganda," p. 69. The organization was granted 1 million crowns by the Cabinet on December 2, 1919, but possibly because of disagreement between TIL and the government, the money might never have arrived. In the summer of 1921 József Ajtay, chief accountant of the League, complained about the arrears of the 250,000 crowns monthly payment and the 1 million crowns TIL was supposed to receive from the government. Kovács-Bertrand, *Ungarische Revisionismus*, p. 51.

³² Hungary had been invited to the Conference earlier in May 1919, but the invitation was withdrawn.

³³ Zeidler, *Territorial Revision*, p. 95.

³⁴ Pallós, "Területvédő propaganda," p. 83.

³⁵ Pallós, "Területvédő propaganda," p. 87.

³⁶ *Uj Nemzedék*, July 3, 1920, p. 3.

³⁷ Pallós, "Területvédő propaganda," pp. 85 and 87.

³⁸ Pallós, "Területvédő propaganda," p. 88.

³⁹ Pallós, "Területvédő propaganda," p. 92.

⁴⁰ Romsics, pp. 217-218.

⁴¹ Pfeifer's bookstore, located downtown Budapest, in the building of the National Casino, offered an incredibly wide choice of propaganda materials, written and musical, scientific and poetical. Miklós Zeidler, *A magyar iredenta kultusz a két világháború között* [Hungarian Irredentist Cult in the Interwar Years] (Budapest: Teleki László Alapítvány, 2002), 69.

⁴² Kovács-Bertrand, *Ungarische Revisionismus*, p. 105.

⁴³ Kovács-Bertrand, *Ungarische Revisionismus*, p. 105.

⁴⁴ In HN, first names were translated to English. In the present study I will consistently use Hungarian first names.

⁴⁵ Jeszenszky, 'Hungary,' p. 471.

⁴⁶ Jeszenszky, 'Hungary,' p. 481.

⁴⁷ For a list of major contributors see Appendix.

⁴⁸ The *Numerus Clausus* Act was the common name of the 1920/XXV Act setting up racial quotas for Jews. The Act limited the number of Jewish students who could win admission to universities in relation to the proportion they represented in the Hungarian population.

⁴⁹ *HN*, 1921/1, p. 17.

⁵⁰ *HN*, 1921/1, p. 18.

⁵¹ *HN*, 1921/1, p. 18.

⁵² *HN*, 1922/6, p. 61.

⁵³ *HN*, 1922/7, p. III.

⁵⁴ Ernest Ludwig, "Some Economic Aspects of the Hungarian Peace Treaty," *HN* 1922/3-5, p. 35.

⁵⁵ Dr. Baron Albert Kaas. Appeal. *HN* 1920/1. pp. 1-2. It is worth noting that the word "death" turns up four times in a single paragraph.

⁵⁶ "A Nation's Obsequies," *HN* 1921/1-2 pp.1-2

⁵⁷ "Appeal from the workers of Transylvania to their fellow-workmen throughout the world," *HN* 1922/1, p. 16.

⁵⁸ Glant, *Through the Prism*, p. 147.

⁵⁹ Glant, *Through the Prism*, pp. 141-163.

⁶⁰ Zoltán Hajdú, "A magyar földrajztudomány és a trianoni békeszerződés. 1918-1920" [Hungarian Geography and the Peace Treaty of Trianon. 1918-1920], *Kisebbségkutatás* 2000/2. p. 228. http://www.hhrf.org/kisebbségkutatás/kk_2000_02/cikk.php?id=244 (date of access: Jan 25, 2010). Hereafter cited as Hajdú, "A magyar földrajztudomány."

⁶¹ Albert Apponyi, *The Peace Treaty Proposed to Hungary*. *HN* 1920/2, p. 22. Italics in the original.

⁶² Francis Fodor, "Hungarian the Land, Hungarian the Race," *HN* 1920/1, pp. 5-6. The idea of Hungary being a prefect geographical unity that must not be dismembered originated from French scientists Paul Vidal de la Blache and Elisée Reclus in the 19th century. See Hajdú, "A magyar földrajztudomány," p. 228.

⁶³ Apponyi., "The Peace Treaty," *HN* 1920/2, p. 22.

⁶⁴ "The Foreign Policy of Hungary (1918-1920)," *HN* 1922/2 pp. 23-27. Italics mine.

⁶⁵ "The Memorial of the Hungarian Territorial Integrity League to President Harding," *HN*, 1921/3-4, p. 26.

⁶⁶ John Karácsonyi, "The Historical Right of the Hungarian Nation to its Territorial Integrity," *HN*, 1921/1-2, pp. 8-12

⁶⁷ "Struggle for Autonomy in the Territories Severed from Hungary," *HN*, 1922/3-5, p. 27.

⁶⁸ "The Union of the National Minorities of Hungary and their Plea to the Nations of the World," *HN*, 1920/1 p. 11.

⁶⁹ According to Apponyi, the literacy rate of ethnic Hungarians in 1919 was 80% and 84% of the Magyar population was educated to at least baccalaureat level. The corresponding numbers for Romanians, Slovaks and Serbians were very small.

⁷⁰ An article in the February 1922 issue ("Destruction of Monuments of Hungarian Art," *HN*, 1922/2 pp. 21-23.) enumerated countless works of art from all over Greater Hungary that were mutilated, removed or blown up; Millennium memorials, the statues of Árpád, Kossuth, Petöfi, Arany, Bem, and Rákóczi from Marosvásárhely to Dévény fell victim to ethnic aggression. These reports were meant to illustrate how "barbaric" Hungary's neighbouring countries were. These appeals had some (formal) effect, an example being the "Petition of the University of Oxford to the League of Nations concerning the destruction of art treasures in Central and Eastern Europe" (*HN*, 1922/8-9 p. 84.), signed by numerous Oxford professors and college presidents.

⁷¹ Coloman Mikszáth, "Count Stephen Tisza and the World-War," *HN*, 1923/1-3, p. 5.

⁷² Albert Apponyi, "The Peace Traty Proposed to Hungary," *HN*, 1920/2, p. 22. Hereafter Apponyi, *HN* 1920/2.

⁷³ Dr. Baron Albert Kaas, "Appeal," *HN* 1920/1. pp. 1-2.

⁷⁴ Apponyi, *HN* 1920/2, p. 22.

⁷⁵ David Angyal, "England and Hungary," *HN* 1920/1. pp. 7-9.

⁷⁶ Rev.Dr. P. G. Nally, "The Anglo-Hungarian Club," *HN* 1920/1. p. 13.

⁷⁷ Arthur Yolland, "English Culture and Hungarian Life," *HN* 1920/3. pp. 37-39.

⁷⁸ Alajos Paikert, "The Anglo-Saxon World and Hungary," *HN* 1920/5 pp. 70-72. Hereafter cited as Paikert, *HN* 1920/5

⁷⁹ "Hungary's Thank to Her Advocates in the English Parliament," *HN* 1920/3, p. 37.

⁸⁰ Paikert, *HN* 1920/5, p. 70.

⁸¹ Yolland, *HN* 1920/3, p. 38.

⁸² Paikert, *HN* 1920/5, p. 70.

⁸³ Common features in British and Hungarian literature and history had been researched by Sándor Fest who wrote extensively about medieval and renaissance English-Hungarian literary and historical connections.

⁸⁴ Yolland, *HN* 1920/3, p. 37.

⁸⁵ Arthur L. Delisle, "Our Friends, the Enemy. How English People Fared in Hungary During the Great War," *HN* 1921/5, pp. 48-50.

⁸⁶ Ladislaus Okolicsányi, "The Treaty of Peace with Hungary in the British Parliament," *HN*, 1921/5-6, p. 46.

⁸⁷ Ernest Ludwig, "Some Economic Aspects of the Hungarian Peace Treaty," *HN*, 1922/3-5, p. 35.

⁸⁸ Albert Apponyi, "Hungarian Foreign Policy," *HN* 1921/3-4, p. 27.

⁸⁹ Paikert, *HN* 1920/5, p. 71.

⁹⁰ Ernest Ludwig, "The United States and the Hungarian Peace Problem," *HN*, 1921/8, p.86.

⁹¹ Transyvanus Viator, "In Transylvania," *HN* 1921/8, p. 88.

⁹² Apponyi, "Hungarian Foreign Policy," *HN* 1921/3-4, p. 27.

⁹³ "Memorandum on the Frontier Rectification Between Hungary and Roumania," *HN* 1923/13, pp. 25-27.

⁹⁴ "The United Hungarian Party of Roumania," *HN* 1923/4-5 p. 54.

⁹⁵ E. Sipőcz, "The Jubilee of Budapest," *HN* 1923/4-5, p. 35.

⁹⁶ Ibid.

⁹⁷ Ibid.

⁹⁸ "The Appeal of the Oxford League for the Hungarian Self-Determination," *HN* 1922/7 p. 83.

⁹⁹ "The Summer Vacation Courses at Budapest University," *HN* 1922/8-9, p. 81.

¹⁰⁰ László Markó, ed., *Új magyar életrajzi lexikon* I (Budapest: Magyar Könyvklub; Helikon, 2001-), pp. 144-145. Cited hereafter as *Új magyar életrajzi lexikon*; see also www.mult-kor.hu.

¹⁰¹ *Új magyar életrajzi lexikon* I. pp. 179-180.

¹⁰² Jeszenszky, 1979, p. 481; Mark Cornwall, "Great Britain and the Splintering of Greater Hungary 1914-1918," a presentation held at the conference "British-Hungarian Relations since 1848", April 16-17, 2004, at University College, London. The presentation is available online at <http://194.66.92.239/confhung/cornwall.pdf>. (date of access: Jan 26, 2010)

¹⁰³ *Új magyar életrajzi lexikon* online, <http://mek.niif.hu/00300/00355/html/index.html> (date of access: Jan 26, 2010).

¹⁰⁴ *Új magyar életrajzi lexikon* online, <http://mek.niif.hu/00300/00355/html/ABC07165/07172.htm> (date of access: Jan 25, 2010)

¹⁰⁵ *Új magyar életrajzi lexikon* online, <http://mek.niif.hu/00300/00355/html/ABC07165/07395.htm> (date of access June 18, 2010)

¹⁰⁶ *Magyar Katolikus Lexikon*, volume XIII (Budapest: Szent István Társulat, 2004-), p. 901; *Politikatudományi Szemle* (14), 2005/3-4, p 227; *Új magyar életrajzi lexikon* III, pp. 1221-22

¹⁰⁷ Alajos Paikert, "Életem és korom," in: *A Magyar Mezőgazdasági Múzeum közleményei 1998-2000* (Budapest: Magyar Mezőgazdasági Múzeum, 2001), 159-218. Available online at <http://teroses.uw.hu/Paikert-Alajos-Naploi.html> (date of access: Jan 25, 2010).

¹⁰⁸ *Új magyar életrajzi lexikon* VI., pp.1383-1385.

¹⁰⁹ See Jeszenszky 1979.

¹¹⁰ *Új magyar életrajzi lexikon*, VI (Budapest: Helikon, 2007), p. 1400. See also Jeszenszky 1979.