

The Canadian-American

REVIEW

of Hungarian Studies

From the "Goethe of Széphalom" to the "Hungarian Faust": A Half
Century of Goethe Reception in Hungary *DIETER P. LOTZE*

Kossuth and Újházi on Establishing a Colony of Hungarian 48-ers in
America, 1849-1852 *BÉLA VASSADY, JR.*

In Memoriam Miklós Radnóti (1909-1944)
MARIANNA D. BIRNBAUM

EDITOR

Nándor Dreisziger *Royal Military
College of Canada*

EXECUTIVE MANAGER

Michael F. Böröczki *President,
HRS Inc.*

EDITORIAL ADVISERS

Thomas Aczél *University of Massa-
chusetts*

Eva S. Balogh *Yale University*

Enikő Molnár Basa *Library of
Congress*

George Bisztray *University of
Toronto*

Paul Bódy *Ohio State University*

Lee Congdon *Madison College*

L. S. Domonkos *Youngstown State
University*

Louis A. Fischer *McGill University*

Veronika Gervers-Molnar *Royal
Ontario Museum/University of
Toronto*

András B. Göllner *Concordia Uni-
versity*

Peter Gosztony *Swiss East Euro-
pean Library*

I. L. Halász de Béky *University of
Toronto*

Rev. Andrew Harsányi *The Hun-
garian Reformed Church in
America*

Rev. Charles H. Henkey *Loyola
College*

Anna Katona *College of Charleston*

Béla K. Király *City University of
New York*

Rev. Aladár Komjáthy *Hungarian
Reformed Church in America*

Bennett Kovrig *University of
Toronto*

G. C. Kuun *University of New
Brunswick*

Alfonz Lengyel *Northern Kentucky
University*

Zoltán Máté *Public Archives of
Canada*

Peter Pastor *Montclair State
College*

Paul Pilisi *Université du Québec*

B. A. Rác *Eastern Michigan Uni-
versity*

Ivan Sanders *Suffolk County Com-
munity College*

Philip E. Uren *Carleton University*

Ferenc A. Váli *University of
Massachusetts*

S. B. Várdy *Duquesne University*

Gábor Vermes *Rutgers University*

Francis Wagner *Library of
Congress*

Charles Wojatsek *Bishop's Uni-
versity*

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

The *Review* is published by the Hungarian Readers' Service, a non-profit organization incorporated by federal statute in Canada. It is distributed by the University of Toronto Press.

Institutional subscriptions to the *Review* are \$12.00 per annum. Individual subscriptions are \$12.00 for one year and \$20.00 for two years. University students and teachers may obtain personal subscriptions for \$8.00 per annum. Subscribers outside of North America please add \$2.00 for postage. Please direct inquiries to:

University of Toronto Press
Journals Department
5201 Dufferin Street
Downsview, Ontario, Canada M3H 5T8

Sustaining memberships in the Hungarian Readers' Service Inc. are \$100 for organizations and \$50 for individuals. Members receive complimentary copies of the *Review*. All donations in support of the HRS are income tax deductible in Canada. Please direct inquiries to:

Hungarian Readers' Service Inc.
P.O. Box 5493, Station F
Ottawa, Ontario, Canada K2C 3M1

Correspondence regarding the publication of manuscripts, book reviews, etc. should be addressed to the editor:

N. F. Dreisziger
Department of History
Royal Military College of Canada
Kingston, Ontario, Canada K7L 2W3

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

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

Copyright © 1979 by the Hungarian Readers' Service Inc. All rights reserved.

ISSN 0317-204X

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

Editor

Nándor Dreisziger

Executive Manager

Michael F. Böröczki

Corresponding Editors

Eva S. Balogh
Yale University

George Bisztray
University of Toronto

Louis A. Fischer
McGill University

Veronika Gervers-Molnar
Royal Ontario Museum

Bennett Kovrig
University of Toronto

G. C. Kuun
University of New Brunswick

Alfonz Lengyel
*Institute for Mediterranean Art and
Archeology*

Paul Pilisi
Université du Québec

Thomas Spira
University of Prince Edward Island

Philip E. Uren
Carleton University

Charles Wojatsek
Bishop's University

CONTENTS

Articles

- From the "Goethe of Széphalom" to the "Hungarian Faust":
A Half Century of Goethe Reception in Hungary 3
DIETER P. LOTZE
- Kossuth and Újházi on Establishing a Colony of Hungarian 48-ers
in America, 1849–1852 21
BÉLA VASSADY, JR.
- In Memoriam Miklós Radnóti (1909–1944) 47
MARIANNA D. BIRNBAUM

Book Reviews

- Béla K. Király and George Barany (eds.) *East Central European Perceptions of Early America* 59
ANNA KATONA
- Geir Lundestad, *The American Non-Policy Towards Eastern Europe 1943-1947* 62
STEPHEN D. KERTESZ

Obituary

- Ferenc G. Harcsár 1910-1979 64

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

A native of Germany, DIETER P. LOTZE studied English Philology and Comparative Literature at Berlin Free University and at Innsbruck University. His Ph.D. dissertation dealt with Imre Madách and the German world of letters. Dr. Lotze is author of *Wilhelm Busch* (Boston: Twayne, 1979) and of numerous articles in German, Hungarian, Japanese and American journals. Currently he is preparing a book on Imre Madách. He teaches at Allegheny College, Meadville, Pennsylvania.

BÉLA VASSADY, JR. teaches history at Elizabethtown College in Pennsylvania. He received his Ph.D. from Temple University. His general field of interest is trans-Atlantic migrations, and his most recent research centers on Hungarian immigration to America after 1880.

MARIANNA D. BIRNBAUM teaches Hungarian language and literature and comparative Ugric folklore at the University of California, Los Angeles. She is the author of a book on Artur Elek and several articles on Hungarian Renaissance poets. Dr. Birnbaum has recently completed a monograph on Janus Pannonius, has edited a volume of Géza Csáth's short stories, and is writing a book on Miklós Radnóti for the Twayne World Authors Series.

From the “Goethe of Széphalom” to the “Hungarian Faust”: A Half Century of Goethe Reception in Hungary

Dieter P. Lotze

The concluding chapter of Steven Scheer's incisive monograph on Kálmán Mikszáth starts with some reflections on what constitutes “world literature”:

No matter how eminent, there is a sense in which a Hungarian writer has no place in world literature. The school of thought that looks upon world literature from the point of view of Goethe tends to include in it the literatures of the major languages of the Western world, or, better, the literatures of the major nations. According to this school of thought almost nothing written outside of Russia, Germany, France, Italy, Spain, England, and the United States has a secure place in world literature. There is, however, another school of thought usually, though not exclusively, advocated by the scholars of those nations that have been omitted by the above. In this sense world literature is, as the name implies, the literature of the world.¹

The concept of world literature attributed to Goethe in these lines seems unnecessarily restrictive. Goethe's extensive occupation with the literatures of non-Western cultures as well as his interest in the folk poetry of various nations — including Hungary — attest to a far broader view on his part. And while he never systematically defined the meaning of the term “Weltliteratur” which he had coined, numerous statements of his show clearly that he had in mind the active and creative relationship among different national literatures, facilitated, if possible, through personal contacts of their writers.

In 1830, Goethe outlined this idea in his introduction to Carlyle's *Life of Schiller*:

There has for some time been talk of a Universal World Literature, and indeed not without reason: for all the nations that had been flung together by frightful wars and had then settled down again became aware of having imbibed much that was foreign, and conscious of spiritual needs hitherto unknown. Hence arose a sense of their relationship as neighbours, and, instead of shutting themselves up as

heretofore, the desire gradually awoke within them to become associated in a more or less free commerce.²

As he indicated in another context, he foresaw an “honourable part” for German literature — obviously including his own works — in this “more or less free commerce”:

The nations all look to us, they praise, blame, adopt and reject, imitate and distort, understand or misunderstand us, open or close their hearts towards us: We must accept all this with equanimity because the result is of great value to us.³

The reception of Goethe’s works in Hungary reveals both the determined orientation toward Western Europe by a linguistically isolated nation and the role her writers had in shaping her culture. Traditionally, Hungarian poets had seen themselves as leaders and guides to their countrymen not only in the realm of literature but also in the political arena. This was especially true for the authors of the nineteenth century. Most of them could not accept the concept of art for art’s sake and looked upon writing as a means of educating and refining the community at large. This attitude tied in with an almost unparalleled active involvement in politics. The degree to which foreign literary influences — such as those of Goethe’s works — were “adopted” or “rejected” by Magyar writers, then, depended largely on each author’s political stance and on the extent to which he considered them beneficial or harmful for the culture of his nation.

A complete history of the Goethe reception in Hungary would have to start at least as early as 1775 when the “*Werther* Fever” had reached the country: the German *Pressburger Zeitung* of Pozsony (Bratislava) published a “Letter to a Lady Friend” that alerted its readers to the moral dangers of Goethe’s novel. The year before, there had been a German production of *Clavigo* in the city, and *Stella* followed in 1777. In 1788, the German-speaking inhabitants of Pest had a chance to see *Götz von Berlichingen* on stage. Thus, at least as far as Hungary’s ethnic Germans were concerned, Goethe began to have an impact more than two centuries ago.

For the Magyars, the occupation with the works of the German poet started in the late 1780s and early 1790s. József Kármán’s epistolary novel *Fanni hagyományai* (Fanny’s Legacy) of 1794 shows the influence of *The Sufferings of Young Werther*. When twenty years later József Katona wrote his dramatic masterpiece *Bánk bán*, destined to become a milestone in the history of the Hungarian theater, he referred to Schiller and Shakespeare as his models. Yet it was *Götz von Berlichingen*,

Goethe's *Sturm und Drang* play about a noble-minded knight in turbulent times, which had paved his way.

But rather than attempting to trace the changes in the Hungarian Goethe reception from the beginnings all the way to our time, it may be more profitable to focus on the half century from 1811 to 1860. This period may well have been the most significant phase in the development of a Magyar national literature. It coincided with the age of Romanticism in Hungary which, according to István Sötér, spans the time from approximately 1817, when Károly Kisfaludy settled in Pest, to the Romantic revival in the works of Mór Jókai, Zsigmond Kemény, and especially Imre Madách in the 1850s and early 1860s.⁴

It seems appropriate to study Hungarian Romanticism in a European context. The very term "romantikus" was a translation of the German "romantisch," first introduced by the eminent literary historian Ferenc Toldy. But the German Romantic movement actually exerted only little influence on the Magyar writers of the nineteenth century. Certainly the political situation contributed to the fact that particularly the generation emerging in the 1830s and 1840s turned to France rather than to Germany for inspiration. It is remarkable, however, that Goethe continued to have an effect on Hungarian literature during this period. A glance at five outstanding representatives of the Hungarian world of letters may serve to illustrate both the changing image of Goethe during the Romantic age and the Goethean concept of "world literature" as an active process. Others could easily have been added to this list, but in Ferenc Kazinczy, József Bajza, József Eötvös, Sándor Petöfi, and Imre Madách, we have the entire spectrum of reactions to Goethe, ranging from uncritical admiration to violent rejection, from imitation to Magyarization.

Ferenc Kazinczy, the "Goethe of Széphalom" to friend and foe alike, was a gifted translator and linguist, not an inspired poet. His 1811 verse collection, *Tövisek és virágok* (Thorns and Flowers), reads like a translated anthology of poems by Schiller and especially by Goethe. It was the latter — along with Klopstock — whom he embraced as his model when his epigrams of 1811, conceived in the rural seclusion of Széphalom, inaugurated his ultimately successful campaign as a one-man *Sprachgesellschaft* to reform the Magyar language and to create an idiom capable of expressing all nuances of thought and emotion. With this undertaking, Kazinczy ushered in the Romantic age in Hungary.

For him, Goethe was the absolute master of style and structure and the conscious reformer of German literature, striving to elevate the level

of the intellectual life of his nation. Kazinczy's Goethe was the ideal poet and teacher. A letter of 1815 exhorts Sándor Bölöni Farkas:

Above all, I would ask you not to do much reading. Read little, but read good things. . . . Get to know Goethe, and Goethe, and again Goethe. He is my god in everything. And Lessing, Klopstock, Schiller, Herder, and Wieland. All others do not trust completely, but you may have blind trust in Goethe; in him dwells a Greek spirit.⁵

He called *Iphigenie auf Tauris* "divine" and expressed amazement at himself for having ever been able to enjoy other literary works in the past.

In the absence of a Hungarian tradition in literary theory and criticism, Kazinczy relied almost completely on the standards established by the classical writers of Germany. Schiller and Goethe provided the criteria by which he judged any work of literature. In 1807, he wrote to Farkas Cserey, the learned botanist:

A work is all the more perfect the closer it is to the example of the classical writers; it is all the more intolerable the more it deviates from that example.⁶

It is obvious that, given this attitude, Kazinczy could have only very limited interest in or understanding of German Romantics. He detested what little he knew about the "mysticism" of Novalis, and in 1809, he referred to Fichte and Schelling in one of his letters:

I had to confess that, by myself, I see the aestheticians of the new school of thought as "Schönschwätzer," often I do not understand them at all. . . . Lessing, Winckelmann, and Goethe were no "Schönschwätzer," and I understand them.⁷

Kazinczy's repeated linking of Goethe and Lessing is revealing. Imbued with the spirit of European Enlightenment, he approached Goethe from a rationalist's position. It is characteristic of Hungarian Romanticism that it never knew the sharp renunciation of rational thought that was so symptomatic of the Romantic movement in Germany, just as Hungarian Realism was later to grow organically out of this Romanticism and not develop as a countermovement to it.

But Kazinczy's rationalism also prevented him from comprehending Goethe completely. He never understood that the German poet's greatest works had sprung from experiences, not events or reflections. It is no accident that he did not perceive any significant difference between the *Sturm und Drang* writer of Strassburg and Wetzlar and the Goethe who had returned from Italy. Goethe's true genius remained hidden from him who could only appreciate what was serene, clear, humane,

sentimental, melodious, and perfect in form. What was intuitive, irrational, and demonic in Goethe was beyond his reach.⁸ To the aging Kazinczy, who had grown from a revolutionary into a conservative, German classicism of the end of the eighteenth century continued to represent the high point in the development of all literature; more recent phenomena in Germany or elsewhere hardly touched him. Yet, despite his limitations, the “Goethe of Széphalom” had opened new avenues of artistic expression for future generations of Magyar writers, and his own unwavering devotion to the poet of Weimar had contributed greatly to this achievement.

In his monograph on József Bajza, József Szücsi [Bajza] refers to the eminent critic, literary theoretician, poet, and translator as perhaps the greatest admirer of Goethe in Hungary, and as the only one to be enthusiastic about Goethe without any reservations.⁹ While that may be an overstatement in view of Kazinczy’s position and the rather cool attitude which Bajza developed toward Goethe in later years, it accurately describes the young poet who had been introduced to Goethe’s writings by Ferenc Kölcsey. On July 9, 1827, Bajza wrote to his friend Ferenc Toldy:

The first installment of Goethe’s works — the new Stuttgart edition — has already come out. My heart is aching because I cannot buy it. . . . I am grateful to Kölcsey for having brought to my attention the poems of this great man. . . . I do not know anything that could give me greater satisfaction than these creations, produced by wondrous hands.¹⁰

And a few months earlier, he had commented to Toldy about Goethe and his public:

When I read Goethe and remember how small an audience the works of this poet have attracted in comparison to what they should have, I keep telling myself in order to find assurance: this outstanding Greek master is so close to nature, and today’s generation so far from it that — unless they have made a special study of him — they do not know and do not understand what to look for in Goethe.¹¹

Certainly Bajza’s accomplishments as a literary critic and editor far outweigh his importance as a poet. But he did write some significant political and patriotic poems, he achieved success with his lyrical ballads, and he contributed greatly to the establishment of the song as a poetic genre in Hungarian literature. He considered Goethe the undisputed master of this latter form, and he proudly related in a letter of 1829 how he had converted the poet and historian László Szalay, who had initially detested Goethe’s songs, to become one of their ardent admirers.¹² Through his translations in the mid-1830s of some of Goethe’s

poems, Bajza sought to acquaint his compatriots with what he saw as the high point in the development of European literature. His 1837 essay "A fordításokról" (On Translations), published in the periodical *Athenaeum*, is largely a Hungarian version of Goethe's discussion of different approaches to translating as presented in the notes to the *West-Eastern Divan*. Bajza added that Hungarians would never equal the Germans in their mastery of the art of translation, but that Goethe's views on the subject had not remained completely unknown in the country because, above all, Kazinczy had served as his spokesman. It is noteworthy, however, that when Bajza selected the models to follow in his own poetic attempts, he chose the German Romanticist Ludwig Tieck along with Goethe. And as Bajza left the enthusiasm of his youth behind, the lyricist Goethe eventually disappeared from his field of vision.

Since Bajza, very much like Kazinczy, admired in Goethe the master of style and form, he emphasized that aspect in his aesthetic and theoretical essays as well. He called the German writer the "founder of the modern novel" but dealt mainly with questions of language and structure when discussing Goethe's prose works without showing much interest in matters other than form. It is only logical, then, that his highest praise was reserved for the poet's accomplishments in a genre in which stylistic precision is essential. In his study of 1828, "Az epigramma theóriája" (The Theory of the Epigram), he lauded Goethe as the most outstanding author of epigrams in modern times:

None of the writers of his nation has mastered to the same degree as he did the unique form of the epigram and its artful phrasing; only Lessing might be compared with him in this respect.¹³

Characteristically, he considered Kazinczy, Goethe's devoted Hungarian disciple, the greatest master of the genre in Magyar literature:

We do not know any poet of our times other than Kazinczy who could stand in such beautiful splendor next to the epigrammatist Goethe; only those two are worthy of comparison with the Greeks. As a poet, Goethe is incomparably superior to him; as a master of form, he is his equal; in the genre of the epigram, those two share with Lessing the leading position among modern authors.¹⁴

The triad Lessing-Goethe-Kazinczy evoked here indicates once more how much young Bajza's image of Goethe paralleled that cultivated by the "Goethe of Széphalom."¹⁵

The opening of the National Theater in 1837 was a most important event in the cultural history of the country. Bajza had been a consistent champion of a Hungarian national theater, and as the director of the

newly established institution in 1837–38 and 1847–48, he had the opportunity to put some of his theories into practice. This practical experience, on the other hand, enriched his dramaturgical writings which today are valued as the most significant part of his legacy. In the famous controversy with Imre Henszlmann, a literary critic and art historian, he strongly favored French drama over that of Germany because he found in French works a moral purpose and felt that they were not contrary to moral teachings. In his writings of 1833 on the novel, he had expressed his concern over “German sentiment” which he called “the lechery of the soul.” He had been worried that “this morbid disease of the soul, German sentimentalism, might be imported too.” What he found “harmful to our national character” in the novel, he fought in the theater as well.¹⁶

Bajza’s criticism of Goethe as a dramatist must be seen against this background. It was Bajza, the fighter for Hungarian concerns in the theater and the practitioner of stagecraft, who judged the playwright Goethe. Moreover, Bajza’s views seem influenced by Tieck’s critical assessment of the poet. On several occasions, Bajza emphasized that Goethe’s plays were unfit for the stage. In an obituary article, he took a look at *Faust* in particular.¹⁷ He called the drama a “wonderful depiction of a wonderful myth of the German people” but expressed regret over the fact that the poet had obviously disregarded the limitations of the stage. Numerous scenes in the play are mere tableaux of Faust’s psychological condition or extensive reflections on the limits of human knowledge and the insufficiency of reason. Other scenes, although excellent in themselves, are not connected with the whole of the play, while again others, although highly dramatic, are too sketchy. In short, *Faust* represents a collection of rhapsodic fragments, not a tragedy written for the theater. Ten years later, Bajza reiterated his position in an *Athenaeum* article on the Hungarian drama.¹⁸ The principal purpose of a drama is its stage production. If a play fails in this respect, it has not fulfilled its primary function. And in this regard, Goethe — great as he otherwise might have been — was not particularly strong.

When Bajza, together with Toldy and Vörösmarty, began editing the new periodical *Athenaeum* in 1837, his youthful devotion to Goethe had long given way to a more sober attitude, and this new stance seems to be reflected in the number of articles critical of Goethe and his works that appeared in the influential journal under his editorship. Vörösmarty had little interest in the German poet and probably shared Bajza’s opinion of him as a playwright. Only Toldy, who had devoted his life to the building of bridges between the cultures of Germany and Hungary,

retained his high regard for Goethe to the end. But Bajza, too, would remember that one of the influences that had shaped him as a writer and critic had emanated from Weimar. As he stressed, Goethe's name represented to him not the life of one individual but an entire era, a phase of development of which he also was a part.¹⁹

Baron József Eötvös, outstanding statesman and creator of the realistic novel in Hungary, was one of the leading figures of the Reform Period. Both in his literary works and in his political activities, he sought to elevate the cultural level of his nation and to bring about some needed changes in his society. A number of the liberal causes he championed as a politician — such as compulsory education, prison reform, and the emancipation of the Jews — indicate that this Romanticist was an heir to the age of Enlightenment, too.

Eötvös was even more familiar with German culture than most of his peers. His mother was German, and young József grew up speaking her language and developing a love for the literature to which she had introduced him. It was his tutor József Pruzsinszky who acquainted him with the Magyar language and who instilled in him the deep feeling of attachment to his native country. When Eötvös entered Pest University at the age of thirteen, he was able to excel in all subjects except Hungarian language and literature. But whatever deficiencies he had in this area soon disappeared, and his literary accomplishments between 1831 and 1835 led to his election to the Academy at the age of twenty-two.

It seems significant that Eötvös's first venture into the realm of literature was with a translation of Goethe's *Götz von Berlichingen* which he completed in 1830 but did not publish. Goethe, however, provided more than mere translating exercises to him. In 1839–41, Eötvös completed his popular novel *A karthausi* (The Carthusian). These memoirs of a young French aristocrat who takes the vows as a Carthusian monk soon became the greatest publishing success in Hungary since András Dugonics's *Etelka* more than fifty years earlier.

The prologue to Eötvös's book addresses the reader "who is not left cold by the sufferings of a soul that was created for good and noble things, and who is more interested in the secret history of a heart than in the skillfully woven plots of novels."²⁰ If this seems like an appeal to the public of Goethe's *The Sufferings of Young Werther*, the novel furnishes additional evidence of the impact of that work. The suicide of young Arthur after he realizes the hopelessness of his love appears inspired by Goethe's tale, and even the structure of *A karthausi* may have been influenced by it.²¹ Werther's tragic love story is revealed to us through his letters to his friend Wilhelm, and the book concludes with

the fictitious “editor” relating to the reader the events immediately preceding Werther’s death, the suicide itself, and the burial of the unfortunate hero of the story. In the Hungarian novel, Gusztáv, the protagonist, starts as the first-person narrator; later we read only his diary entries; and at the end of the work, Gusztáv’s friend Vilmos, to whom he had entrusted his papers, tells of his death. It is hardly by accident that this friend’s name is the Hungarian equivalent of that of Werther’s intimate.

In his discussion of *A karthausi*, D. Mervin Jones stresses the Wertherian quality of Eötvös’s hero:

The action is continually retarded by long reflective passages; but the introspection is not confined to these — it pervades the whole narrative. Gustave knows no state of mind but crushing grief or blissful happiness, and always faithfully records his emotional reactions to events. Like a true Romantic he is continually asserting the claims of the emotions and sees life from an emotional point of view.²²

Sőtér is even more specific in suggesting the relationship between the characters of Gusztáv and Werther when he comments on the impact of French literature on the Hungarian novelist:

We have so far considered the models of the *Carthusian* as romantic, but if either Sainte-Beuve or Sélancour served as examples, they in their turn also go back to Werther, and the figure of Gustavus is chiefly related to him.²³

If *A karthausi* was indeed partly inspired by *Werther*, Eötvös’s novel may be seen as the first mature work for which Goethe’s book had provided a creative stimulus — after Kármán’s sentimental *Fanni* or Kazinczy’s imitative *Bácsmegyeinek gyötrelmei* (The Sufferings of Bács-megyei), whose very subtitle had indicated that it represented an adaptation of a German original. *A karthausi*, however, was not meant merely to provide sentimental entertainment but contained a political message as well. Eötvös offered to his nation, struggling to develop a suitable political system, a look at the France of Louis-Philippe as a model not to emulate. And just as *Werther* was to be followed by *Wilhelm Meister*, Eötvös’s later novels abandon the earlier sentimentality and address in a realistic manner existing social and political problems, as in *A falu jegyzője* (The Village Notary) of 1845, or social inequities of the past, as in *Magyarország 1514-ben* (Hungary in 1514) of 1847–48.

To Eötvös, Goethe offered the highest standard by which to judge literary accomplishments. But he rejected imitation, since Goethe was the product and representative of a different culture — an echo of

Herder's concept of literature. If there were Hungarian novels, dramas, and poems worthy of comparison with Goethe, they would certainly not be similar to the works of the German poet, even though Hungarian criticism had derived its criteria from the analysis of these works. Consequently, he applauded Petőfi's poetry because of its originality.

Eötvös opposed the moralistic condemnation of Goethe as a "man without a heart" which was widespread at the time. He stressed instead that the production of a poet is always more than the poet himself.²⁴ He had read the authors of "Junges Deutschland" and admired Victor Hugo and French Romanticism, but they had little effect on his high esteem for Goethe. As Pukánszky points out, Eötvös was one of the few in Magyar literature to appreciate Goethe as a complete human being, not just as a master of form — as had Kazinczy — or as an abstract intellectual ideal for which one dutifully voices enthusiasm. He belonged to the small but very important community of Hungarians who were "goethereif," who were ready for Goethe.²⁵ And Sötér adds:

The ideas of Eötvös, even in advanced age, were attached to Goethe, Goethean morality supported him in many hours of trial. In the wake of Goethe did Eötvös proceed from poetry to science, and beyond it to the philosophical content of the sciences.²⁶

For Sándor Petőfi, Goethe's image was radically different. When Hungary's most brilliant lyrical poet met his death on the battlefield of Segesvár, he was only twenty-six years old — the same age as the *Sturm und Drang* Goethe when he moved to Weimar. It is not surprising, then, that Petőfi had little use for the serene Olympian. He was neither interested in the formal perfection that Kazinczy and Bajza had admired nor could he grasp the totality of Goethe as Eötvös had done. His concept of Goethe was shaped largely by Börne and other writers of the "Junges Deutschland" movement. It is no coincidence that Petőfi proposed the name "Fiatal Magyarország" ("Young Hungary") for the "Tízek Társasága" ("Society of Ten"), his circle of literary and political friends in Pest.

Kölcsey had complained as early as 1826 that his countrymen were adoring the "pale images" of Schiller at the expense of Goethe's "serenely-smiling Graces."²⁷ In the 1830s and 1840s, in part as the result of the political situation, Hungarian reactions to Goethe were becoming increasingly negative. Imre Vahot, who was to appoint Petőfi assistant editor of his weekly *Pesti Divatlap* in 1844, probably spoke for many when he discussed Goethe and his work in an 1841 *Athenaeum* article entitled "Töredékgondolatok a világgköltészetről" ("Fragmentary Thoughts about World Literature").²⁸ Vahot praised *Götz von Berlichingen* and

especially the first part of *Faust* which had provoked a revolution in the world of ideas. Goethe was a genius who could have led his compatriots in the fight for national unity. But instead, he had become a Philistine, unfaithful to his true vocation and absorbed in the petty concerns of the Weimar court.

Similarly, Petőfi regarded Goethe as the lackey of princes, as a representative of the same detested culture that was manifesting itself politically in the Habsburg domination over his beloved Hungary. The poet, who at the age of twenty had known many of Heine's poems by heart and who had translated Heine as well as Schiller, Claudius, and Matthisson, eventually denied any knowledge of German. On one occasion, he did quote Goethe. When, in a political dispute in 1848, Vörösmarty had accused him of immodesty, Petőfi replied in the *Kossuth Hírlapja*: "Goethe, in his entire long life, only once said something intelligent, and that was when he said: 'Nur die Lumpen sind bescheiden' ('Only rogues are modest')." ²⁹ But it is unlikely that Petőfi was familiar with many of Goethe's works, none of which was among the German books he owned.

One of Petőfi's travel letters of 1847 to Frigyes Kerényi contains his spirited rejection of Goethe as a man and as a writer:

Goethe's *Faust* was in my pocket. What to do . . . swear or faint? You know, my friend . . . that I do not like Goethe, that I do not care for him, that I detest him, that I find him as nauseating as horseradish prepared with sour cream. The head of this man was a diamond, his heart, however, a flint — ah, not even that! A flint gives off sparks! Goethe's heart was clay, miserable clay, nothing else; moist, pliant clay when he wrote his silly *Werther*, but afterwards dry, hard clay. And I don't have any use for a fellow like that. For me, every man is worth as much as his heart is worth. . . . Goethe is one of the greatest Germans. He is a giant, but a giant statue. The present age crowds around him as if around an idol, but the future will knock him down like all idols. As indifferently as he looked down upon the people from the height of his fame, as indifferently will the people look down on the ruins of his fame after it has turned to dust. He who did not love others will not be loved by others, at most he will be admired. And woe to the great man who can only be admired but not loved. Love is eternal like God; admiration is fleeting like the world.³⁰

In the light of Petőfi's political commitment, it is quite consistent that this devastating assessment came after an earlier expression of high praise for Pierre Jean de Béranger, the "greatest apostle of freedom" who was described as the world's most outstanding poet.³¹ And it should be kept in mind that many of Petőfi's German contemporaries — and numerous critics in the decades to come — held similar views of Goethe.

But ironically, Goethe had contributed to Petőfi's development as a poet — at least indirectly. As Sótér states: "From the angle of Hungarian poetry, Goethe was the example of the poet who turned to folk poetry and only in the second place the author of *Faust*."³² His successful incorporation of the folksong into literature had a strong impact on Hungarian Romanticism. It stimulated a trend that reached its highest point in some of Petőfi's best works that blend the heritage of folk poetry with the expression of deep personal feeling.

And a poem like Petőfi's "Homér és Oszián" (Homer and Ossian) could not have been written without Goethe's "silly *Werther*." True, other Magyar authors — such as János Arany — had similarly contrasted the worlds of the Greek poet and the Gaelic bard, and Kölcsey had pointed to Goethe and Schiller as their modern counterparts. But what had perhaps become a commonplace comparison in mid-century Hungary certainly stemmed from Goethe's skillful evocation of the two contrasting moods in his epistolary novel. Throughout the book, Werther's state of mind is indicated by his references to either Homer or Ossian. Homer is the symbol of simplicity and naive enjoyment of nature and life. In his letter of October 12, 1772, Werther tells Wilhelm that Ossian has displaced Homer in his heart, and after that, the Northern atmosphere of gloom and inevitable destruction takes the place of sunny Greece. During their last fateful encounter, Werther reads to Lotte from his translation of Ossian — actually Goethe's own Strassburg rendition of what he had believed to be genuine third-century poetry — and then leaves to take his own life. Thus Petőfi, albeit probably unwittingly and unwillingly, was following in Goethe's footsteps when he wrote in 1847:

Do you hear Homer?
In his song there is the vaulted sky,
The eternal smile of quiet joy,
Whence the dawn's purple
And the gold of the midday light
Flow gently down
On the honey-colored waters of the sea
And on the green islands in it
Where gods are playing
In happy harmony with the human race
Your games, oh wonderful love!
And do you see Ossian over there?
In the country of the eternal fog in the Northern sea,

Above wild rocks his song resounds
As the storm's companion in the shapeless night,
And the moon is rising,
Like a setting sun,
Red as blood,
And sheds a grim light on the vast forests
Where bands of mournful spirits
Of the heroes fallen on the battlefields
Are roaming about.

Petőfi's concluding stanza, urging Homer and Ossian to go on singing and playing the "divine harp," may also serve as a fitting epitaph to Hungary's greatest lyrical poet and Germany's most famous writer:

Years are passing,
By the hundreds and by the thousands; they crush,
Without mercy, everything; but, oh,
You are sacred to them;
They breathe fallow death over everything,
Only the wreaths on your silvery heads remain green.³³

In case of Imre Madách, Goethe's impact was much more direct. When János Arany, then considered the country's leading literary authority, was asked to read and evaluate the manuscript of *Az ember tragédiája* (The Tragedy of Man), penned in 1859–60 by an unknown aspiring amateur playwright, he put it aside after having perused the first act, convinced that the drama was an inferior imitation of *Faust*. Eventually he was persuaded to read the entire work — influenced, perhaps, by Madách's growing reputation as a gifted orator in the Pest parliamentary assembly. Arany quickly changed his mind about the philosophical poem, declared it a masterpiece, and became its most vocal champion. Almost overnight, Imre Madách came to be one of his nation's most celebrated authors. He was soon afterwards elected to the Kisfaludy Society and to the Academy. His play was widely read and admired, even though its first successful stage production at the National Theater did not take place until 1883, almost twenty years after the poet's death. *The Tragedy of Man* has been translated into more than twenty foreign languages and has been staged abroad repeatedly.

But the label "Hungarian *Faust*" has stuck with the work,³⁴ and Arany's initial reaction is quite understandable. Like Goethe, Madách used the confrontation scene between the Lord and Satan from the Book of Job as a prologue. A closer reading, however, reveals signifi-

cant differences. In *The Tragedy of Man*, this scene marks Lucifer's rebellion against God. Adam, the first man, is to be his tool in this insurrection. Lucifer, who appears to have been modeled after Goethe's Mephistopheles but is lacking that "devil's" redeeming sense of humor, succeeds in bringing about the Fall of Man. After the first human beings have been expelled from Eden, he shows Adam the future of his race in a series of dream visions designed to lead him into despair and to a renunciation of God. In a very real sense, Adam experiences "what to all mankind is apportioned," as Faust had desired. Accompanied by Lucifer, the "Spirit of Negation," he travels through history, assuming various historical roles and encountering Eve, the embodiment of "Woman Eternal," in her different reincarnations. From the Egypt of the Pharaohs to Fourier's utopian Phalanstery, he witnesses again and again the corruption of all great ideas.

After having seen the dismal dusk of humanity in a world where the sun has turned cold, Adam awakens again and is now ready to take his own life. In this way, he can stop the course of history before it has even begun. Thus, his reason for contemplating suicide is very different from that of Goethe's hero at the beginning of the play who is painfully aware of his innate limitations and of his inability ever to find the answers he is seeking. But when Eve tells her husband that she is with child, he realizes that his desperate deed would be meaningless. He bows before the Lord who restores his grace to mankind and assigns to Lucifer the same role that had been outlined for Mephistopheles in Goethe's "Prologue in Heaven." As leaven, he is to keep man from becoming complacent and inactive. He is to serve in the divine order as the force which, in the words of Mephistopheles, "would do ever evil, and does ever good."

The general parallels with *Faust* are obvious, and details in numerous scenes of *The Tragedy of Man* attest to Madách's familiarity with Goethe's dramatic poem.³⁵ The Hungarian playwright made no attempt, however, to disguise those parallels, as he was aware of having created a work whose structure and intention are quite different from the German tragedy. It is very likely that Goethe himself would have approved of this use of his play. Much of what he wrote to Karl Ludwig von Knebel about Byron's *Manfred* applies directly to Madách and his drama:

This unusual and gifted poet has absorbed my Faust. . . . He has used every theme in his own fashion, so that none remains as it was; and for this in particular I cannot sufficiently admire his genius. This reconstruction is entirely of a piece; one could give most interesting lectures on its similarity to the original and its departure from it; I do not deny, however, that the dull glow of an unrelieved despair will become

wearisome in the end. Yet one's irritation will always be mingled with admiration and respect.³⁶

In his *Tragedy of Man*, Madách discusses philosophical and theological questions in the tradition of the "poème d'humanité" of European Romanticism.³⁷ He ultimately denounces Hegel's optimistic interpretation of human history as a history of progress. After the events of 1848–49 and the subsequent Bach era, such optimism had become impossible for a Hungarian author. But Madách's play does not end with the "dull glow of an unrelieved despair." The Lord's final admonition to Adam is: "Hark to Me, Man! Strive on, strive on, and trust!"³⁸ God demands man's faith despite the gloomy visions of history that are in no way invalidated. It is this desperate faith, so often demonstrated by the Magyars over the centuries, that gives Madách's drama a uniquely national quality along with its universal message.

With the conversion and "Magyarization" of Goethe's art and thought in *The Tragedy of Man*, the creative influence of Goethe in Hungary had reached its highest point. What came after the "Hungarian *Faust*" was either epigonic reaction or interpretation. With Imre Madách's dramatic poem, the age of Romanticism in Hungary and in Europe had come to an end.

NOTES

(Unless otherwise indicated, all translations are my own.)

1. Steven C. Scheer, *Kálmán Mikszáth* (Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1977), p. 147.
2. Quoted in Fritz Strich, *Goethe and World Literature*, tr. C.A.M. Sym (New York: Hafner Publishing Company, 1949), p. 351.
3. *Ibid.*, p. 349.
4. See István Sötér, "Hungarian Romanticism," *The Dilemma of Literary Science*, tr. Éva Róna (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1973), pp. 212–39.
5. Ferenc Kazinczy, *Összes művei*, Harmadik osztály, Levezetés, ed. János Váczy, 21 vols. (Budapest: Magyar Tudományos Akadémia, 1890–1911), 13: 241.
6. *Ibid.*, 5: 7.
7. *Ibid.*, 6: 486.
8. For almost identical assessments of Goethe's impact on Kazinczy, see Jakob Bleyer, "Goethe in Ungarn," *Jahrbuch der Goethe-Gesellschaft* 18 (1932): 114–33, and Béla von Pukánszky, "Ungarische Goethegegner und -kritiker. 1830–1849," *Ungarische Jahrbücher* 11 (1931): 353–76. The rather one-sided study by Julius von Farkas, *Die ungarische Romantik* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1931), still offers some valuable information about this phase of German-Hungarian cultural relations.
9. József Szücsi [Bajza], *Bajza József* (Budapest: Magyar Tudományos Akadémia, 1914), p. 71.

10. József Bajza, *Összegyűjtött munkái*, ed. Ferenc Badics, 3d ed., 6 vols. (Budapest: Franklin Társulat, 1899–1901), 6: 252.
11. *Ibid.*, p. 227.
12. See *ibid.*, p. 292.
13. *Ibid.*, 4: 54.
14. *Ibid.*, p. 58.
15. József Patai, in his article "Bajza és Lessing," *Egyetemes Philologiai Közöny* 32 (1908): 33–47, 205–23, 354–69, has shown how Lessing's impact was evident throughout Bajza's life.
16. See Sötér, pp. 217 and 227.
17. "Goethe," *Társalkodó* 1 (1832), Nos. 34 and 35.
18. "Valami a magyar dráma felől," *Athenaeum*, 1842, 2, No. 38.
19. See Bleyer, p. 122.
20. József Eötvös, *Összes munkái*, ed. Géza Voinovich, 20 vols. (Budapest: Révai, 1901–1903), 1: 7.
21. On the influence of *Werther* on Eötvös's technique, see Jenő Koltay-Kastner, *A Karthausi helye a szentimentális regényirodalomban* (Budapest: Németh, 1913).
22. D. Mervin Jones, *Five Hungarian Writers* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1966), p. 169.
23. Sötér, p. 232.
24. See Eötvös, 19: 119–20.
25. See Pukánszky, p. 376.
26. Sötér, p. 230.
27. In an article in *Élet és Literatura* 1 (1826): 210–14.
28. "Töredékgondolatok a világgöltészetéről," *Athenaeum*, 1848, 1.
29. Sándor Petőfi, *Művei*, ed. József Kiss (Budapest: Szépirodalmi könyvkiadó, 1976), 2: 594. (The quotation is from Goethe's poem "Rechenschaft.")
30. *Ibid.*, pp. 490–91.
31. *Ibid.*, pp. 483–84.
32. "Hungarian Lyric Poetry and the World," *The Dilemma of Literary Science*, p. 243.
33. Petőfi, 1: 740–41. Certainly Petőfi was unaware of Macpherson's forgeries when he wrote this poem.
34. A rather flagrant recent example can be found in J. W. Smeed's book, *Faust in Literature* (London: Oxford University Press, 1975), which gives the title of Madách's play in German and quotes exclusively from Ludwig Dóczy's 1891 German translation. Smeed states in his preface: "Quotations are given in the original language except in the cases of A. Tolstoi and Imry [sic] Madách. Here since one of the main points made is the link with Goethe's *Faust*, I have quoted from the German translation rather than in English" (p. v).
35. Vilma Pröhle, in her dissertation "*Az ember tragédiája és a Faust* (Budapest: József Kertész, 1929), lists 44 literal correspondences. While some of those are rather superficial, any student of Madách and Goethe could add further to that list.
36. Quoted in Strich, p. 256.
37. For detailed discussions of Madách's position in European Romanticism, see the 1972 dissertation by Enikő Molnár Basa, "*The Tragedy of Man as an Example of the Poème d'Humanité: An Examination of the Poem by Imre Madách with Reference to the Relevant Works of Shelley, Byron, Lamartine and Hugo*" (University of North Carolina), and Dieter P. Lotze, "Madách's *Tragedy of Man* and the Tradition of the 'Poème d'Humanité' in European Literature," *Neohelicon* 6 (1978): 235–54.

38. Imre Madách, *The Tragedy of Man*, tr. Charles Henry Meltzer and Paul Vajda, 4th ed. (Budapest: Corvina, 1960), p. 300.



Kossuth and Újházi on Establishing a Colony of Hungarian 48-ers in America, 1849-1852*

Béla Vassady, Jr.

I

Although much has been written about Lajos Kossuth's motives for going to America in the wake of the unsuccessful Hungarian Revolution of 1848-49, serious scholarly research exploiting sources on both sides of the Atlantic commenced only in the 1940s. Perhaps because it could never be questioned that Kossuth's primary motive for visiting America was to generate aid for Hungary's cause, even this recent scholarship has neglected to assess the degree to which he considered the option of founding a Hungarian colony in America, or to fully assess László Újházi's efforts to bring such a plan to fruition. Thus, for example, Dénes Jánossy's seminal work on the Kossuth emigration and Tivadar Ács's more modest study of Újházi's short-lived colony in Iowa generally ignored the portions of the Kossuth-Újházi correspondence dealing with the colonization scheme and concluded that Kossuth had always opposed the idea.¹ Éva Gál's recent biography of Újházi portrayed this long neglected emigrant more thoroughly, but gave short shrift to Újházi's colonization activities and concurred that Kossuth was against colonization.² John H. Komlos' recent study on the Kossuth emigration excelled in its treatment of Kossuth's position on the settlement question before his American journey, but ignored Kossuth's colonization policy after his arrival, presumably on the assumption that thereafter it no longer played a role in his plans.³ This essay attempts to demonstrate that these assumptions have over-simplified Kossuth's complex, often contradictory, motivations. As the accepted leader of the Revolution and of the subsequent emigration, Kossuth recognized that

*I wish to express my gratitude to Professors S. B. Várdy (Duquesne University), István Deák (Columbia University), and Thomas Spira (University of Prince Edward Island) for their helpful comments in the revision of this study.

an important question to be resolved was how best to regroup the exiles in preparation for resuming the battle for their homeland. Should they be kept in Europe, prepared to invade Hungary whenever political circumstances turned auspicious, or should they be gathered into a closed colony in a country which guaranteed their freedom of action while they established a power base in preparation for a renewed revolution? Kossuth favored the first of these alternatives, but his indecision and vacillation during his first three exile years (1849–52) encouraged one of his followers, László Újházi, to promote the idea of founding a Hungarian colony in the United States. Until early in 1852 Újházi was led to believe that colonization remained a viable option for the Kossuth emigration.

II

The allure of America, with its Utopian image of limitless land in a country of free institutions, did not fail to attract many of the Hungarians exiled from their homeland.⁴ Such a man was László Újházi, government commissioner of the fortress of Komárom at the time of its capitulation in September 1849. Újházi was fifty-four years of age at the time of the revolution. Since the early 1830s, he had been an avid participant in that era of reform, spearheaded by liberal aristocrats and lesser nobility, which had prepared Hungary for the achievements of 1848–49. Steadfastly more leftist in his political sentiments than most of his contemporaries, he had been a leader of the erstwhile radical party which had supported total independence from Austria and the establishment of a republican form of government in 1849. With the capitulation of Komárom, however, a passive, even pessimistic state of mind overcame the old ex-revolutionary. His revulsion with the tenacity of absolutism and with what he perceived to be the ephemeral quality of revolutionary ardor among his associates prepared him for the psychological leap necessary to accept the idea of permanent exile.⁵ Unlike most of his comrades who continued to indulge in romantic dreams about renewing the revolution, he was determined that the United States, whose democratic and republican institutions he admired, should become the goal of the emigration. In a series of meetings during the negotiated evacuation of Komárom, he persuaded 96 officers of the besieged garrison to form an American emigration society with himself as president. The stated purpose of the association was to emigrate to the American republic, to become free citizens thereof, and there to “form a

united agricultural colony.”⁶ In October of 1849, Újházi and the fifty-odd officers who had followed him to Hamburg drew up detailed plans for the American emigration. They were assisted by Dr. Károly Kraitsir, a Hungarian-American physician from Boston, who had successfully aided 235 Polish exiles after the abortive Polish Revolution of 1830-31 to acquire free federal land for a Polish colony in the United States.⁷ Having solicited President Zachary Taylor’s permission to seek asylum in America, Újházi and a small advance party departed with the understanding that they would prepare for the reception of the others, soon to follow.

The Újházi party’s warm welcome in New York City on December 16, 1849, was to be surpassed only by Kossuth’s reception there two years later. As the first exiles to arrive after the news of Hungary’s defeat had become public, they received the full sympathy of a young America which had followed and identified with every event in Hungary’s revolutionary struggle throughout 1849.⁸ One society magazine reported a veritable “Hungarian fever” in New York City during the next two months.⁹ Fund raising dinners, balls, and speeches were the order of the day for weeks, as the Hungarians found themselves lionized wherever they went. Most celebrated were Újházi and Apollonia Jagello, a young Polish woman accompanying the party, who was portrayed by the press as a “Hungarian heroine” of the revolution.¹⁰

In view of this universal sympathy for the Hungarian cause, not surprisingly Újházi was accepted as Kossuth’s surrogate in America. Popular and official opinion considered his widely publicized colonization plans to be that of Kossuth and the rest of the Hungarian exiles. Újházi promoted two goals: the liberation of Kossuth from Turkish captivity and the establishment of a Hungarian colony in the United States. Emphasizing the need to prevent the emigrants from scattering, he advocated a colony to “serve as a haven of refuge to those following us.” To provide for their self-sufficiency, he favored an agricultural settlement as the most suitable alternative for Hungarians accustomed to agrarian pursuits. A compact, closed colony would not only preserve their Hungarian identity and culture, he stressed, but would provide a power base from which to prepare for the eventual liberation of their homeland. Since the United States was a free nation with a republican form of government and possessed limitless empty lands available for settlement, such a plan would best serve their purposes. As Hungarian-American citizens living in their own colony, they would learn to practice America’s democratic processes in order to better exercise them

upon their return to liberated Hungary. As representatives of their own state in the Union, they would keep alive America's sympathy for Hungary.¹¹

Since Újházi had to convince both the American public and his compatriots of the viability of his plans, his emphasis differed, depending on his audience. To the Americans he stressed his compatriots' wish for asylum and self-reliance, and their desire to settle in a land of freedom. To convince the public of their sincerity, the Újházi group immediately filed for American citizenship with much fanfare and publicity.¹² Simultaneously, however, to Kossuth and his companions, Újházi emphasized that only by establishing a compact colony could they expect to receive the necessary financial and military aid from American sympathizers.¹³ Not yet having heard from Kossuth, but knowing full well the younger man's revolutionary zeal, Újházi suspected that the settlement plan had to be made palatable to those whose only motivation was the immediate resumption of revolution.

As Újházi incessantly promoted the dual concepts of Kossuth's liberation and emigration to America together with the permanent settlement of the exiles in America, these two ideas became fused in popular and official minds in the United States. To a proud young America conscious of its self-image as the ultimate asylum of freedom and liberty to which all those who suffered from the burdens of European autocracy aspired, the prospect of the heroic Kossuth and his followers finding a new home on its shores was appealing. Újházi capitalized on this appeal, as he pressed the issue in his numerous speeches and his contacts with friends of the Hungarian cause. He persuaded the future Secretary of State, Daniel Webster, of the exiles' desire for a place of asylum where they might find permanent security and peace.¹⁴ In Washington in January 1850, President Taylor, who in his correspondence with Újházi had repeatedly coupled the concept of an American home for the exiles with Kossuth's release, greeted him with the statement: "here . . . you and they [Kossuth and his companions] will forget much of the hardships and trials you have gone through, in the enjoyment of the liberties and blessings of a new Home."¹⁵ A series of Congressional resolutions conveyed a similar message. Senator Foote's resolution of February 5, 1850, demanded Kossuth's liberation so that he might emigrate to America and requested that the Hungarians be offered land in America.¹⁶ Similarly, Senator Seward's resolution of January 30, 1850, favoring a free grant of land to the Hungarians, corresponded almost simultaneously with Senator Soule's proposal that the United States Government bring Kossuth to America.¹⁷ At the same time, the first

steps were taken toward the liberation of Kossuth from Turkey under American auspices, and Kossuth was queried if he desired a permanent home in America.¹⁸

The Seward resolution advocating a grant of land to the Hungarians and to other European revolutionary exiles drew spirited debate not only in Congress, but also in the public arena. The press, although generally supporting the proposal, strongly advocated the granting of free lands to all landless citizens of America.¹⁹ In fact, the resolution would have established a precedent whereby immigrants would have received privileges not enjoyed by native born Americans. This impediment proved detrimental to its chances of acceptance in Congress. But it was the sectional dispute over the Clay compromise for Californian statehood in 1850 that finally doomed the Hungarian land grant proposal. Notwithstanding Újházi's steady proddings and the support of numerous friends in Washington, no lands were ever granted to the Hungarians.

But when Újházi returned to New York in January 1850, after the flurry of support he received in Washington, he had reason to be optimistic about an imminent grant of lands to the Hungarians. Much to his chagrin, however, he found that his countrymen, augmented by the arrival of the remaining members of the Komárom American association, did not greet his accomplishment with jubilation. Instead, they had quarreled and split among themselves. The majority voted to replace him with Major Imre Hamvassy, leader of the new arrivals, at the head of the 62 member committee. Grievances against Újházi centered around his soft approach to political action. He was found too humble and inflexible in formulating the Hungarian cause to the American people, too modest in his approach to collecting funds, and too acquiescent to what many of them claimed to be a misrepresentation of Apollonia Jagello as a "Hungarian heroine."²⁰ As a gesture of their new radical approach, Újházi's opponents issued a formal proclamation declaring the Habsburgs unlawful usurpers of power in Hungary and presented it to members of Congress and foreign embassies in Washington.²¹ The committee also declared that Újházi's efforts to acquire land for a colony were unsolicited by the Hungarians. Indeed, unmasking ulterior motives for their actions, some members of the committee even told Congressmen that instead of land the Hungarians wanted money, "because the Hungarians, being true gentlemen, would not labor with their hands."²² And when they sensed that some of their number were still tempted by Újházi's colonization plan, they further discredited his efforts by proposing an alternative scheme for a Hungarian colony in

Texas, for which they submitted a formal request for free land to Congressional members.²³

It was Újházi's misfortune to be forced to convince a mixed group of opportunistic and radical elements of the revolution to accept a quiet, sedentary existence in the wilderness. Many of these first arrivals were enterprising men who had risen as a result of the chaos of revolution and, hoping to exploit their newly gained status, perceived Újházi's goals as opposed to their own.²⁴ There were also radical leftist elements among them, especially the two leaders of the movement: Ágost Wimmer, an ex-Lutheran minister who had served as Kossuth's representative to Prussia, and Colonel János Prágay, the ex-adjutant to General György Klapka at Komárom. Wimmer was reputed to believe that all land must be redistributed and the aristocracy destroyed before a true revolution could occur and, according to Újházi, had spent most of his time blaming Kossuth for the failures of the revolution and emigration; Prágay had fallen under similar influences. In the estimation of the more practical leaders of the emigration, both men were counted among the romantics, Jacobins, and "Red Republicans" of the revolution.²⁵ Desiring results instead of dreams, these practical leaders perceived the United States as an expedient place to acquire support and repeatedly warned each other to avoid associating with the Jacobin "Reds."²⁶ Prágay, always the man of action, died in the ill-fated 1851 Cuban Expedition, and Wimmer, finding his influence waning, soon returned to seek more fertile grounds for his activities in Europe. To convince such men to become farmers in the American wilderness was perhaps beyond the realm of the possible.

The committee's gestures to gain attention by issuing radical statements and attacks on Újházi proved counterproductive. American observers deemed its radical political approach as inappropriate as its transparent desire for pocket money. The shabby treatment of Újházi, a man whom New Yorkers had learned to respect and admire, was also deplored. Far from deflecting funds from Újházi's colonial scheme to their own treasury, as the committee had planned, support for the Hungarians ground to an abrupt halt. The committee dissolved, dividing its treasury among its members (\$80 per person), who, until then, had received free care from New Yorkers. Now they were forced to scatter, each seeking his livelihood as best as he could.²⁷

At a time of greatest need for a Hungarian association of some type to help arriving exiles remain together and provide for their transportation to the planned Hungarian colony, the source of aid dissolved virtually at its inception. Later, after settling in the Iowa wilderness, Újházi la-

mented the absence of a central office in a key city to which the exiles might report as they trickled into the United States. As he told a friend, more harm than good was done to new arrivals by the Hungarians who still lived in New York.²⁸ This initial schism would plague the Hungarian cause in America for years to come. As additional groups of exiles arrived during the next two years, a few émigrés supported Újházi's plan and even joined him. But others, who found American sympathies cool due to the recent confrontation, or who were simply disgruntled by unemployment or lack of aid, too readily accepted the condemnations of Újházi's detractors; they accused him of pocketing all of the funds and placed the blame for their plight upon his head.²⁹

For his part, Újházi withdrew from the controversy and endured the attacks of his companions in silence. He hoped to salvage what he might of the emigrants' reputation by avoiding publicity of their quarrels. As before, his humility did not go unappreciated. During a second Washington trip in an attempt to redress the harm, he was assured by American supporters that his objectives had not been jeopardized. But these events, like those that had driven him from his homeland, were taking their toll on the older man. Notwithstanding his radical reform plans and republican sentiments during the Hungarian Revolution, his personal mannerisms were those of a quiet, humble, non-ostentatious man, whose main goal was to achieve personal integrity for himself and his companions by means of self-sufficient hard labor on free soil. These personality traits proved to be his strongest assets in America, as they impressed sympathizers who identified with the image of self-made men seeking asylum in America. But his plans directly contrasted with the motives of Kossuth and most of his other companions. Despite his intimate association with Kossuth and his many years of observing the younger man's meteoric political career in Hungary, Újházi naively believed that Kossuth would come to share his desire to escape to the peace of a quiet haven in America. Thus he went to the extreme of inviting Kossuth to share with him the simplicity and charm of rustic existence in the American wilderness, away from the corruption of European civilization, which offered only "suffering and servitude for mankind." Notwithstanding his protestations that this did not imply his lack of interest in participating in a renewed battle for Hungary, his sentiments were manifest.³⁰ Moreover, by his willingness to isolate himself and his companions in the western wilderness of Iowa, away from important contacts and sources of aid, he further demonstrated that for him the colony took precedence over the revolution, the reverse of Kossuth's approach. When he later suggested to Kossuth that Cali-

fornia might be a better alternative to Iowa, if re-locating the Hungarian colony was to be considered, he further demonstrated these personal priorities.³¹

After silently awaiting Congressional action on his request for land during the early months of 1850, Újházi finally sensed the futility of procrastinating any further. Accompanied by a small band of devoted followers, he left New York in April to seek his promised land. Four months of hard travel brought them to Decatur County, Iowa, where they established the settlement they called New Buda. For the next two years Újházi was to remain here collecting exiles around himself. He thereby managed to keep at least part of the emigration together in anticipation of Kossuth's joining them in America.

III

Since only Kossuth's emigration to America and his willingness to support Újházi's settlement scheme could assure its ultimate success, Kossuth's views on this plan deserve analysis. During the first months of his exile in Turkey, he first conceived the idea of establishing a Hungarian military colony as a means of preventing the Hungarians from drifting apart and of maintaining their martial preparedness for Hungary's liberation. In early 1850 land was purchased and outfitted for this purpose in Smyrna, but the Turkish Government rejected the plan.³² As Austrian pressures continued to diminish his options in Turkey, Kossuth next considered exploiting American sympathies to solicit military and political support.³³ Manifestations of American sympathies were evident in reports about Újházi's successes, as well as in an American offer to Kossuth for a "quiet and tranquil home" in the United States.³⁴ By February 1850 Kossuth publicly implied that he had adopted Újházi's scheme by urging a large group of Hungarians at Sumla about to embark for America to organize an American settlement association.³⁵ In their letter of introduction he stated that ". . . the free land of North America is the place where I too wish to be put to rest, if my bones are not allowed to combine with the dust of my homeland."³⁶

One month later Kossuth received Újházi's letter summarizing his colonization goals as a means of keeping the emigrants together for renewing the revolution. Újházi also requested Kossuth's strong support in order to legitimize his own status and actions in America. Kossuth's immediate response demonstrated his growing belief in the potential of American aid and his growing pessimism about his continued internment in Turkey. It also reflected much about Kossuth's goals and

philosophy in contrast to Újházi's. His main thrust remained strictly political: his every move was motivated by the desire to resume Hungary's liberation. He provided Újházi with credentials to serve as Hungary's and his own representative in the United States. Since the greatest need was for funds to facilitate agitation and the purchase of arms, he urged Újházi to raise or borrow what he could in America. But he also supported the colonization idea. If and when all hope must be relinquished for Hungary's liberation, he wrote, then an extensive Hungarian colony should be founded in America. With American aid, a new Hungarian state would be added to the Union; he would expatriate thousands of his countrymen for that purpose. But, he added, the United States must do its part. One communications agent should be appointed to stay with Kossuth and another one must be placed in Belgrade to provide financial aid and transportation to potential emigrants. Barring this, he concluded, "there cannot be a new Hungary" in the United States.³⁷ A few months later, Kossuth explicitly stipulated that substantial financial support must be forthcoming from the United States before he would consider American colonization. Although he perceived no alternative solution for the émigrés than their settlement in America, he wrote to his Paris representative, he would permit this only if twenty thousand pounds sterling were promised for this purpose. This was to be raised by borrowing it against the expected productive value of the Hungarian colony.³⁸

Kossuth had in fact proposed that the settlement of the exiles in America be considered a contingency plan, to be acted upon if all other efforts to liberate Hungary failed. In the meantime, however, colonization would remain a live option which would be exploited to elicit American financial and political support. Since with variations this remained Kossuth's policy during the succeeding two years, it did much to encourage Újházi and his American sympathizers to assume that Kossuth would ultimately settle in the United States.

The remaining months of 1850 proved even less promising for Kossuth's release from Turkey. When George P. Marsh, the American Minister to Turkey, officially requested Kossuth's release, the Sublime Porte refused and, bowing to Austrian pressure, removed Kossuth and a contingent of his closest followers even further into isolation to Kutahia, in Asia Minor. With growing despair, Kossuth corresponded with Marsh, often raising the colonization question by requesting information about land grants for the Hungarians and about provisions for passage to the United States.³⁹ Among official circles in America the conviction grew that Kossuth did, indeed, desire asylum in the United States. And when

John Brown, the Dragoman of the American Legation on home leave in the fall of 1850, told Secretary of State Daniel Webster and other officials in Washington that Kossuth desired nothing more than "a quiet home on the soil of America," he only added more support for this conviction.⁴⁰

By early 1851 the general American assumption about Kossuth's motives was probably best stated by Daniel Webster, when he wrote to Marsh that Kossuth and his companions

... by their desire to remove so far from the scene of their late conflict, declare, that they entertain no hope, or thought, of other similar attempts, and wish only to be permitted to withdraw themselves altogether from all European association, and seek new homes in the vast interior of the United States.⁴¹

Webster reiterated these assumptions by directing Marsh to request the refugees' release so that they may come "to the uncultivated regions of America, and leave, forever, a continent which to them has become more dreary than the desert."⁴² Almost simultaneously, in March 1851, Congress passed a joint resolution empowering the President to dispatch a vessel for the Hungarians on condition that they express desire to settle in the United States.⁴³ Further corroborating the assumptions about Kossuth's intentions was the announcement by the Sumla group upon its arrival in New York in the fall of 1851 that "our leader Kossuth will, as he said, join us [at New Buda], if he be allowed to come here."⁴⁴ Not surprisingly, public appeals were again made to Congress to grant the Hungarians land, because "Kossuth will probably proceed to the colony of New Buda."⁴⁵

In light of the agreeable response of the Porte in February 1851 to renewed American representations for Kossuth's release, in April H. A. Homes, the Second Dragoman of the Legation, requested the Hungarians at Kutahia to sign a statement accepting the Congressional conditions for their emigration to America. With some difficulty Kossuth persuaded his men to comply, but refused to commit himself to emigration on grounds that it would impede his future activities.⁴⁶ Apparently, this evasiveness was not reported to Webster. Indeed, by late April, when the Porte offered to liberate all of the Hungarians except Kossuth and a handful of officers (who were to be detained until September) without any stipulation as to where they must emigrate, Homes was hard put to persuade the Hungarians to remain committed to America.⁴⁷ In reporting to Webster, Homes explained that the Hungarians had originally agreed to the conditions "when they regarded this course as the means of obtaining their freedom"; since they now re-

ceived it unconditionally, he noted, they seek assurance that "they will come under no obligation to remain any longer in America than they please."⁴⁸ In view of these new circumstances, Homes made renewed efforts in June to obtain "a more explicit and fresh answer" as to the Hungarians' "disposition to avail themselves of the offer of the American Government."⁴⁹ For the official record Kossuth complied, but privately he informed Homes that he intended only to visit America.⁵⁰ Thus, despite Kossuth's forthrightness with Homes, according to official American records he was still expected to arrive as a permanent emigrant in compliance with the Congressional conditions.

With his liberation imminent by mid-1851, Kossuth recognized the danger of having erroneous assumptions circulating about his intentions. In his May 1851 letter to Újházi he used a different tone from that of the previous year. Criticizing Újházi's readiness to find a new home and for having lost hope in Hungary's rebirth, he expressed irritation that this pessimistic approach was "not without influence on weaker individuals." He reiterated his own faith that political changes in European conditions were imminent within the next ten months, three of which he intended to spend in America to gain support. He requested Újházi, as his representative in America, to intensify American sympathies, but for the correct reasons: humanitarian reasons should be deemphasized, and sentiment for defeated Hungary's struggle for independence and democratic principles should be stressed. He expressed disappointment that Webster's directives to Marsh assumed that "I and my companions, having relinquished all efforts for the liberation of our country, desire nothing more than to permanently emigrate to America." Finally, he requested Újházi to communicate with the President and Webster to correct these false views, based upon the suggestions which he [Kossuth] had outlined in his letter.⁵¹

Despite his changed tactics, Kossuth did not entirely abandon his settlement contingency plan. If all else failed, he wrote to Újházi, a "free Hungary" would be founded in America; but a small settlement must be avoided, as it will be swallowed up by the surrounding masses. Having selected 1852 as the year of liberation, he also implied indirectly that the colonization decision would be reached that year.⁵² Shortly thereafter, in a letter to Ferenc Pulszky, his London representative, Kossuth reiterated his willingness to colonize should his new attempt to liberate Hungary fail in 1852, though on this occasion he again suggested that the scheme be utilized as a fund raising device. Tell the American minister in London, he instructed, that "I will either liberate Hungary, or, if I am unable to accomplish this in 1852, then with 2 to 300

thousand Hungarians I will begin a settlement. If I get the opportunity to do so, I would like to increase the United States by a new state." Stressing the need for raising funds to purchase ships and military supplies for the revolution, he further instructed Pulszky to query the minister whether two million dollars might be borrowed from American banks on condition that, "if we liberate Hungary, naturally our country will repay the debt; if we don't succeed, it will become the debt of our new state in the Union."⁵³

IV

In 1850 much of the United States comprised empty, unoccupied land. In Iowa alone, where statehood had recently been proclaimed, six million acres stood at the disposal of homesteaders. Congress annually auctioned off parcels of this federal land at \$1.25 per acre. Most of these lands, however, found no buyers. The unsold lands could be freely cultivated by squatters with preemptive rights to purchase these lands for \$1.25 per acre, should they again come up for auction. In the meantime, the squatter could hold the lands he occupied free of taxes, rental fees, or any other form of encumbrance.

Since in 1850, the new state of Iowa became the focus of settlement interest, Washington officials naturally recommended it for Újházi's planned colony. The Hungarians hoped to acquire the land as a free gift. At the very least, they assumed that since their Iowa lands had only recently been up for auction, they would be left alone to work these lands until they had earned enough to pay for them. Of the 75,000 acres assumed necessary for the extensive colony planned, Újházi staked out twelve sections of land (or 7,680 acres)⁵⁴ in Decatur County, located near the Missouri border in southern Iowa. His companions settled on lands adjacent to his. By the spring of 1851, as news of the colony spread, other Hungarians arrived, and as they did, they settled more of the surrounding empty lands, sometimes as much as several hours of travel from each other. They came in groups or as individuals, some seeking Hungarian company in a strange land, others merely looking for a source of livelihood. But nearly all arrived in the hope that this would become the headquarters of the emigration which Kossuth would soon join. Although many departed after a short time, mostly because they could not bear the hard life of the homesteader, sufficient replacements kept arriving for a core colony to prevail, with much planning and hoping for the future.

In letters and circulars to his oppressed countrymen in Hungary,

Újházi planned to entice hundreds of families to come to his colony.⁵⁵ In veritable real estate prospectuses, he advertised it as an extensive, closed community in which the social and domestic life would remain that of the Magyar landed gentry.⁵⁶ He also provided detailed lists of the types of professionals and craftsmen required to complete his colony.⁵⁷ Somehow evading Austrian censorship, optimistic descriptions of the colony regularly appeared in the Hungarian press.⁵⁸ The symbolic impact of New Buda in Hungary is best illustrated by the abrupt arrest and interrogation of an American citizen in Hungary during 1850, when he expressed sympathy for Újházi's colony.⁵⁹

Újházi's letters to fellow exiles in England and Turkey were no less enticing. The departure of the Sumla group from Turkey in early 1850 with the expressed purpose of joining Újházi was one result. An American Society and a Hungarian Committee were also founded in London to encourage and aid Hungarians about to settle in America. The Hungarians in London were informed that Kossuth was expected to settle in America.⁶⁰

In the United States the colony's existence was a matter of common knowledge. On the road to New Buda in the fall of 1850, Sándor Lukács discovered that everywhere the Hungarians and their settlement were spoken of with respect.⁶¹ In September 1850 New Buda was designated as the site for a post office, with Újházi as its postmaster. This not only facilitated correspondence with the outside world, but provided official recognition of the settlement. The new colony's prominence on the nearly empty map of Iowa was described by Ferenc Varga. The map he used to find the colony in 1851 "pointed out with large letters 'Hungarian Colony — post office New Buda'" (though few people could direct him to its exact location in the wilderness once he reached its vicinity).⁶² A steady stream of national sympathy and publicity for the colony continued to keep it before the public eye at least until 1852, when Kossuth made his tour through midwestern United States.

Nor did Újházi slacken in his determination to keep the land grant question and Kossuth's liberation before Washington officials. Upon learning of President Taylor's death, he immediately wrote to Millard Fillmore, his successor, describing New Buda and soliciting his aid. Although Fillmore refused to recognize Újházi's appointment as Hungary's representative, he was warmly encouraging on the land grant issue. Similarly, in response to Újházi's letters, Senators Seward, Cass and Buel expressed confidence that both of his projected goals would soon be satisfied by Congress.⁶³ Újházi was undoubtedly greatly buoyed by the passage of the March 1851 bill in Congress approving Kossuth's

emigration to America on condition that he settle there. Coupled with this came the favorable news that by the President's orders the lands they occupied in Iowa would be exempted from auction to provide more time for Congress to act on the land grant bill.⁶⁴ Those at New Buda had much reason for optimism: they would get their land, and their leader was on his way, too.

Indeed, the expectation that Kossuth was arriving to join them at New Buda, perhaps as their permanent governor, was common among the settlers.⁶⁵ Újházi's appointment as Kossuth's representative convinced many that Kossuth shared Újházi's views and plans. With confidence, Újházi told the surveyor dispatched by the Land Office to New Buda in the summer of 1851 that he had letters from Kossuth stating that the latter was "determined on coming to that settlement there to make his permanent home," and that "a large colony of Hungarians would be formed."⁶⁶ In his last message to Kossuth in Turkey, at a time when the latter's liberation appeared to be a certainty, Újházi alluded to a time soon when the two of them would "embrace each other as republicans on this free soil," and he rationalized the continued Congressional procrastination on the land grant question by surmising that the Americans were awaiting Kossuth's arrival to surprise him with it. He also implored Kossuth to "chase out" the large number of Hungarians from England and bring them with himself,⁶⁷ so as to enable them to remain together cultivating the free soil of democratic America. Finally, he repeated his desire to establish a "compact colony" of Hungarians, and assured Kossuth that if he were to prefer another location for a colony, "we are prepared to follow you."⁶⁸

It is not clear when, if ever, Újházi received Kossuth's 1851 letter in which the latter denounced Újházi's settlement activities. What is clear is that, despite the untimely death of his wife in October 1851 which shook him deeply, Újházi remained convinced that his friend and leader would soon join him in Iowa. This alone drove him on. Anticipating Kossuth's arrival, in November 1851 Újházi sent several letters addressed to him in New York, in which he outlined the methods by which Kossuth should divide the Congressional lands among the Hungarians.⁶⁹ He also urged Kossuth to pressure Washington officials to grant the required lands, and asked him to support the Sumla group of emigrants currently awaiting financial aid to defray their transportation expenses from Chicago to New Buda.⁷⁰

Almost to the moment of Kossuth's arrival in America, the United States Government remained persuaded that the exiled leader was seeking no other purpose than to accept its offer of asylum. Most revealing in this respect was President Fillmore's happy announcement to Újházi in October 1851 that Kossuth and his men were coming to enjoy life in America, "for the remainder of their lives, and [to] leave their posterity in a land of freedom and equal rights."⁷¹ However, several incidents occurred while Kossuth was in transit to America, such as his attempts to agitate in France and in England, which raised suspicions about his real motives. Kossuth's statement to the American people on the day after his arrival in New York on December 5, 1851, erased all remaining doubts. He openly declared that he had not come to settle in comfort but to continue the battle for Hungary's liberation. Thereupon he embarked upon one of the most brilliant tours of political agitation that America had ever witnessed. Despite the enormous popular acclaim for Kossuth's revolutionary purpose, however, the Whig Government was shaken by Kossuth's policy which it considered

at variance with the understanding under which the intervention of the United States government was offered for his release . . . It was intended and clearly stated that the intention of the United States government was to offer him an asylum in this country but not to afford him the means of carrying out the objectives of a political mission.⁷²

Thus the Government remained cool toward him, and Congress spent several weeks debating whether or not to offer him an official welcome.

The universal acclaim he received as he traveled from New York to Philadelphia deluded Kossuth into assuming that he would encounter similar support in Washington. Not until he met with President Fillmore on December 31 was he shocked to learn that the United States' official policy of strict neutrality in European affairs varied widely from that suggested by popular demonstrations. "From that hour," wrote Fillmore's chronicler, "Kossuth's mission as a propagandist of his wild opinions was a failure. . . ."⁷³ Chagrined over this turn of affairs, Kossuth remained sulky and broody throughout the rest of his two-week Washington stay, a crucial time, during which he was to decide his future strategy in light of these new circumstances.

Given his temporary mood of pessimism about the possibility of renewing European revolutions or of receiving American aid, Kossuth evidently turned to a serious consideration of the option of pursuing his

settlement contingency plan. In a meeting with the Secretary of Interior during the first week of January, he was quoted as saying that

the opposition which he met at the hands of Congress and the Executive, convinced him that his mission to this country had completely failed.

He therefore inquired of the Secretary whether land would be provided for a body of Hungarian settlers, "so located that the Hungarians would live together in a separate community." Unfortunately, his conversation with the Secretary was not wholly amicable. An embarrassing misunderstanding occurred over the question as to whether Kossuth would have to pay for the requested land or would receive it as a free gift.⁷⁴ A few days later Kossuth also met with the Iowa Congressional delegation concerning the potential for land at New Buda. The senators informed him that at most 160 acres per person could be hoped for.⁷⁵ According to one interpretation, "The details pleased him and he decided to ask Congress to approve an act of free land;" but another source has suggested that he was disappointed with the information and may have decided that the potential for the sizable colony he envisioned was not promising.⁷⁶ Whatever his response, during the first days of January 1852, Kossuth carefully investigated the potentials for a Hungarian colony in America.

Soon thereafter, however, Kossuth again reversed himself — this time permanently. Kossuth the revolutionary could not become a farmer, nor could he consider terminating his perennial battle with the Habsburgs for long. Recognizing that the recent publication of his statement suggesting his willingness to settle implied a despair on his part which was proving counterproductive to his purpose, he repudiated it, claiming to have been misquoted.⁷⁷ Under these circumstances, further efforts on behalf of a Hungarian colony had to be abandoned. Thereafter, Kossuth turned to the alternative tactic of touring the remaining populated regions of the United States, gathering financial support for the revolution which he declared with renewed vigor to be imminent in 1852.

Although this explains Kossuth's decision against forming a large Hungarian colony, it may not fully account for his refusal to support payment of the Sumla group's transportation costs from Chicago to New Buda. Financial aid for this purpose was available from a millionaire on condition that Kossuth approved it. Since Kossuth himself had specifically dispatched the Sumla group to America in order to settle them at New Buda,⁷⁸ and since earlier he had accepted the humanitarian argument that those exiles who found themselves destitute owing to lack of language or occupational skills should be settled on farms,⁷⁹ his

refusal to approve it appears contradictory. Certainly the Sumla group, consisting mostly of common soldiers, fit the humanitarian argument, and their settlement could have been justified on those grounds alone before the American public. The alternative, already too obvious, was their scattering in destitution throughout the United States. Moreover, if Iowa was not to his liking, Kossuth had a wide choice of other locations for settlement purposes. He had land offers from private sources in New York, Missouri, Virginia, Tennessee, and Texas.

There is reason to suspect that the culmination of the so-called Tochman affair, in which Kossuth found himself directly embroiled during his stay in Washington, and which was closely associated in the public mind with the settlement scheme and especially with the Sumla group's plan to reach New Buda, contributed to Kossuth's negative decision, at a time when he was known to have been irritated and despondent.

The Tochman affair had its beginnings in the disturbance occasioned among the Hungarian emigrants over the attentions paid to Apollonia Jagello. Miss Jagello later married Major Gaspar Tochman, a Washington lawyer of Polish descent, and together the couple remained influential supporters of the Hungarian cause in America. Irritated by her continued prominence, a Bavarian officer by the name of De Ahna, who had accompanied the Hungarians to America, published a slanderous tract attacking the Tochmans.⁸⁰ In response, the Tochmans brought suit against De Ahna, thereby providing further fuel for the already festering feud among the Hungarians.

Since Tochman had been his most effective agent in Washington, Újházi became one of his strongest advocates. Among other things, Tochman had effectively worked behind the scenes for Kossuth's liberation and had distributed Kossuth's address to the American people; Mrs. Tochman had actively lobbied on behalf of the successful bill to liberate Kossuth; and Tochman had persuaded the President to withdraw the settlers' land from auction.⁸¹ Újházi often expressed his gratitude to the Tochmans, promising that when Kossuth arrived, "he will, in more energetic language, express our thanks, than I am able to do in writing."⁸² József Prick and his Sumla group, whose trip to Chicago (with the expectation of continuing to New Buda after Kossuth approved it) had been financed with the Tochmans' help, also strongly favored the Polish couple. In an appeal to the American people signed by 67 members (23 of whom were members of the Komárom garrison whence Apollonia had emigrated), this group defended Apollonia's character as "in all respects above impeachment."⁸³

Upon his arrival in Washington, Kossuth, like many of the quarreling Hungarians, attempted to appear neutral, "being anxious to prevent exposure of the private affairs of the exiles, because the trial is likely to give an insight into matters not known to the public."⁸⁴ Already disturbed over his political failure, he managed to excuse himself from a court summons in the case and attempted completely to ignore the Tochmans while in the capital. That his public image was not enhanced by this action was illustrated by an editorial accusing him of anti-Slavic racism for having refused publicly to vindicate the Tochmans.⁸⁵ Then, in early February, what had now become the Kossuth-Tochman feud broke into the open. In an effort to vindicate themselves, the Tochmans published a series of letters they had exchanged with Kossuth. In introducing the correspondence, the *National Era's* editor reflected the dismay felt by many Hungarian and Tochman supporters when he conjectured that Kossuth must have acted under great pressures in perpetrating "this unintentional injustice," because

No two private individuals in this country have labored so earnestly, disinterestedly, and successfully, to promote the welfare of the Hungarian exiles, as Major Tochman and his estimable wife.⁸⁶

The letters revealed that at a Kossuth reception on New Year's Day, Mrs. Tochman had been treated with "coldness and reserve" by the Kossuth party, which was "misconstrued to her injury" by Washington society. Learning that Kossuth believed the charges laid against his wife⁸⁷ and finding himself unable to gain access to the Hungarian leader, Tochman attempted to vindicate his wife's reputation by mail. Kossuth responded impersonally through his secretary that Mrs. Tochman "could not of course expect to be received otherwise than with the normal civility one meets thousands of unknown persons," and made no further reference to Tochman's defense of his wife. Thoroughly aroused now, Tochman reminded Kossuth of his friendship with Újházi and listed his many services to the Hungarian cause, including his role in financing the Sumla group, and asked whether Kossuth thought that the 67 Hungarians who had testified to Mrs. Tochman's good character had given false testimony.⁸⁸ Kossuth made no further response. By the time this exchange appeared in the newspapers he had left Washington and embarked on his tour. That his feud with the Tochmans did no good for his political cause can be safely assumed. Accepting (or expecting) further help for the Hungarians waiting to be transferred from Chicago to New Buda now was obviously out of the question, and the Sumla group was permitted to scatter.

Meanwhile, for six weeks Újházi's anxious requests for information about Kossuth's plans had been avoided by short, uninformative, almost flippant letters from Kossuth's closest aid, Pulszky, greatly exasperating the old and loyal supporter of the revolutionary leader.⁸⁹ Since Újházi expected nothing from what he cynically labeled the "messianic" year of 1852, or from any other year in the near future, he predicted that the Hungarian exiles lingering in Europe would soon tire of waiting for non-existent opportunities to renew the revolution and would join him in America.⁹⁰ As Kossuth himself had set 1852 as the year of decision, Újházi had reason to hope that his colonization scheme might yet achieve the support of the émigrés.

Kossuth finally replied in mid-January. He informed Újházi that he still disagreed with the colonization scheme because it was tantamount to an admission of failure and lack of confidence in Hungary's future. Surprisingly, however, even at this late date, he hinted that he would support the creation of a new Hungary in America if liberating the old one proved to be hopeless. But he reiterated that the time for such a decision had not yet arrived.⁹¹ The Sumla group, anxiously awaiting Kossuth's support for its journey to New Buda, received a similar message, but couched in even stronger language.⁹² Thus the final opportunity for founding a sizable Hungarian settlement in America was lost forever.

Precisely what transpired between Újházi and Kossuth when the two men finally met in St. Louis during March 1852 remains unrecorded. Presumably, Újházi informed the leader of his decision to settle in a warmer southern climate, but probably repeated his willingness to remain at New Buda or anywhere else upon Kossuth's orders. Convinced that new opportunities for Hungary's liberation were imminent, Kossuth reiterated his opinion that the emigrants would be too isolated in America's wilderness to exploit European opportunities.⁹³ Yet, in view of Kossuth's consistent espousal of his settlement contingency plan, it is not inconceivable that he again repeated it at this time. Perhaps partly for this reason, when he asked Újházi if he would take possession of a gift of land that had been offered to him (Kossuth) in Texas, the older man jumped at the opportunity.⁹⁴ Not only could he seek land for himself in Texas while remaining in Kossuth's service, but there remained the hope that at some later time Kossuth would support a Hungarian colony there. Újházi managed to attract as many as twenty Hungarian exiles to his San Antonio settlement, where he remained for the rest of his days, a broken and frustrated man.

Did Kossuth commit an error by not remaining in America to keep

the émigrés together? There are those who believe he did.⁹⁵ However, disregarding the totally impractical plan of exploiting the colony as a base for fomenting revolution, even Újházi's simpler goal of keeping the emigrants together in one colony was probably an impossible task. Certainly, with Kossuth's support a large number of exiles could have been gathered. But even while optimism prevailed about Kossuth's support for a permanent colony, most of the settlers had departed from New Buda soon after their arrival. They were politicians, soldiers, aristocrats, who could not accept the hard labor or isolation required of the pioneer farmer in the wilderness.

Even less likely was the feasibility of maintaining a compact, closed Hungarian community. As Kossuth himself suspected, unless the colony was very large, assimilation was inevitable.⁹⁶ There was also the problem of continuous dissension. As Pulszky phrased it, "the Hungarian's nature is such that they can't keep together, but instead quarrel among each other; therefore, there could be no talk about a Hungarian colony."⁹⁷ Besides the quarreling in the cities, there is ample evidence to suggest land divisions and speculation at New Buda caused similar disagreements.⁹⁸ Finally, continuing Congressional inaction on the land grant question produced insecurity at first, and eventually the realization that free soil would never be forthcoming. By 1852, everywhere they went the disillusioned settlers who left New Buda carried negative news. One emigrant arriving in New Orleans with intentions of settling there was told that the colony was down to nineteen settlers and in the process of dissolution (in fact, there were thirty settlers in March 1852).⁹⁹ Another émigré reflected the general consensus in 1852 by comparing New Buda to a "Siberian exile."¹⁰⁰ Although a short time after Újházi's departure a renewed effort to promote the colony met with some success, within a few years the colony disappeared altogether.

After departing from the United States in June 1852, Kossuth relinquished all further hope for American political or financial aid. He spent the remainder of his long life in perpetual efforts to renew the battle for Hungary in Europe. In the process, he often reconsidered the colonization scheme as a means of achieving his ultimate goal. Even before leaving the United States he became involved in an unsuccessful plan to establish a combined Hungarian-American colony in the Dominican Republic to serve as a base for invading Hungary.¹⁰¹ Rumors of other American locations selected for this purpose continued to circulate. But his most preferred location for colonization had always been, and continued to be, in Turkey, thanks to its proximity to Austria and Hungary, and owing to its natural enmity with the Habsburgs and

Romanovs.¹⁰² On different occasions, Italy and Crete were also considered. However, all of Kossuth's settlement dreams, like his myriad of other plans for liberating his homeland, remained just that — the unfulfilled dreams of one of the most dedicated and persistent nationalist revolutionaries of the nineteenth century.

NOTES

1. Dénes Jánossy, *A Kossuth emigráció Angliában és Amerikában* (Budapest, 1940-48); Tivadar Ács, *New Buda* (Budapest, 1941).
2. Éva Gál, *Újházi László, a szabadságharc utolsó kormánybiztosa* (Budapest, 1971).
3. John H. Komlos, *Kossuth in America, 1851-1852* (New York, 1973).
4. Aladár Urbán, "A Lesson for the Old Continent: The Image of America in the Hungarian Revolution of 1848/49," *The New Hungarian Quarterly* 17 (Autumn 1976): 85-97.
5. Gál, *Újházi*, p. 64; see also Újházi's similar sentiments in Újházi to Vukovics, New Buda, Sept. 12, 1851, Vukovics Papers, R section 216, Magyar Országos Levéltár, hereafter cited as O.L.
6. Ladislaus Újházy, *A Brief Explanatory Report, as to the Termination of the Hungarian Struggle . . . and . . . Circumstances of the Hungarian Emigration* (New York, 1850), pp. 16-17. See also Zsigmond Thaly, *The Fortress of Komárom* (London, 1852), pp. 233-234.
7. The 1834 Congressional act granting 36 sections of land to the Poles at the minimum price of \$1.25 per acre on condition that they continuously cultivate their lands for ten years became a model for the Hungarians as well. The Polish venture failed, due to misuse of funds collected for that purpose. See Charles Kraitsir, *The Poles in the United States* (Philadelphia, 1837), pp. 193-196. The Polish precedent remained alive in the minds of Americans and was often used to argue for or against the proposed grant to the Hungarians during 1850.
8. Arthur J. May, *Contemporary American Opinion of the Mid-Century Revolutions in Central Europe* (Philadelphia, 1927), pp. 41-50.
9. *The Lorgnette*, Jan. 23, 1850, pp. 50-54.
10. *New York Herald*, Dec. 19, 1849.
11. *New York Tribune*, Dec. 10, 1849, Suppl.; *Ibid.*, Dec. 11, 1849; *Ibid.*, Dec. 17, 1849; *Ibid.*, Dec. 22, 1849, Suppl.; *Ibid.*, Dec. 24, 1849; *Ibid.*, Jan. 4, 1850; *Ibid.*, Jan. 19, 1850; Újházi, *Explanatory Report*, pp. 16-17. See also Jánossy, *Emigráció*, pp. 192-193.
12. *New York Tribune*, Jan. 4, 1850.
13. Újházi to Kossuth, Washington, Jan. 19, 1850, Kossuth Collection, R. Section 90, Chronological Series I.688, O.L. (in all Kossuth correspondence hereafter cited assume R. Section 90; only series number will be noted).
14. *New York Herald*, Dec. 19, 1849; *The Daily Union* (Washington), Dec. 21, 1849.
15. *New York Herald*, Jan. 18, 1850; for Taylor's previous correspondence with Újházi, see *Ibid.*, Dec. 22, 1849.
16. *Congressional Globe*, 31st Congress, 1st Session, Feb. 5, 1850, p. 244.
17. *Ibid.*, Jan. 9, 1850, p. 128; *Ibid.*, Jan. 30, 1850, pp. 289-296; *Ibid.*, Feb. 5, 1850, p. 293; *Ibid.*, Appendix, pp. 143-148; *Ibid.*, Miscellaneous, No. 13. See also R.

- Section 90, I.698, O.L. It was proposed that these lands be granted, "on condition of their [the Hungarians] permanent settlement . . . , and their eventual naturalization, in conformity with existing laws."
18. Komlos, *Kossuth*, pp. 38-40.
 19. *Congressional Globe*, 31st Congress, 1st Session, Jan. 30, 1850, pp. 262-264; *New York Tribune*, Jan. 11, 22, 25, 29, 31, Feb. 1, 2, 1850. As attested by the flow of petitions into succeeding sessions of Congress, support in favor of granting free land to the Hungarians remained spirited throughout 1850-51.
 20. Újházi to Kossuth, New York, April 10, 1850, I.736, O.L.; Henri De Ahna, *The Greatest Humbug of the Day* (Washington, Sept. 14, 1851), pp. 2-4.
 21. Large posters entitled "In the Name of the Hungarian Nation," dated February 28, 1850, were printed and distributed in four languages. They were signed by Prágay, Wimmer, Hamvassy, Szalay, Fonet, Radnich, and Damburghy. Copies sent to Kossuth can be found in the Hungarian National Archives (I.716, O.L.). Wimmer and the committee kept Kossuth apprised of their activities in an attempt to win the latter's support away from Újházi and other key leaders of the emigration. See Wimmer to Kossuth, New York, Feb. 9, 1850, I.705, O.L.; Wimmer to Kossuth, Washington, March 12, 1850, I.723, O.L.; Wimmer and other committee members to Kossuth, New York, April 16, 1850, I.737, O.L.; Wimmer to Kossuth, Kingston, June 15, 1850, I.794, O.L.
 22. Újházi to Kossuth, New York, April 10, 1850, I.736, O.L. "Surely no people will support emigrants who can labor but will not," wrote the U.S. representative in Turkey to Kossuth, in reference to Wimmer's complaints. Homes to Kossuth, Constantinople, Aug. 17, 1850, I.878, O.L.
 23. *Pesti Napló*, Feb. 15, 1851. Col. János Prágay, ex-adjutant to General György Klapka at Komárom, led this movement for a competing colony. The distribution of the land was planned along military rank lines, as in the case of the earlier proposed colony in Turkey. Prágay requested for each ex-soldier half a section of land; for each officer one section (one section = 320 acres); and for Kossuth six sections, with the guarantee that payment for the land would not have to be made for ten years.
 24. *Ibid.*; Újházi to Kossuth, Apr. 10, 1850, I.736, O.L. In a similar case, the U.S. representative in Turkey complained in 1851 that many who had exploited the opportunity for a free passage to America were "the dregs of the emigration," and not *bona fide* Hungarians. Homes to Webster, July 5, 1851, Correspondence from Turkey to the Department of State, Book G. No. 3, Record Group 84, National Archives (hereafter cited as N.A.; unless otherwise noted, hereafter assume R.G. 84 in all N.A. citations).
 25. Jánossy, *Emigráció*, I: 58-60; Ádám Anderle, "A 48-as magyar emigráció és Narciso López 1851-es kubai expedíciója," *Századok* 107 (1973): 700-701. It should be noted that Újházi himself had counted among the radicals of the revolution. See Gál, *Újházi*, pp. 46-47; Újházi, *Explanatory Report*, pp. 5-6; Thaly, *Komárom*, p. 132. However, Újházi's radicalism focused on republicanism, not socialism. He was also an older, more practical man, whose disappointments may in any case have cooled his radical zeal. His cautious approach apparently brought about his break with his younger, more romantically oriented colleagues.
 26. Teleki to Kossuth, Paris, Dec. 27, 1849, in István Hajnal, *A Kossuth emigráció Törökországban* (Budapest, 1927) I: 598.
 27. *Pesti Napló*, Feb. 15, 1851.
 28. Újházi to Vukovics, New Buda, Sept. 12, 1851, Vukovics Papers, R. section 216, O.L.
 29. Csapkay brothers to Pulszky, New York, July 2, 1850, in Acs, *New Buda*,

- pp. 106–108. Destitution among the Hungarians remained so acute that by early 1852 Congress was debating how it could save them from starvation. That this destitution played no small part in the exiles' attacks on Újházi and later on Kossuth, when it became apparent that both were collecting for special purposes and would not share the funds with them, can be safely assumed.
30. Újházi to Kossuth, New York, Apr. 10, 1850, I.736, O.L.
 31. Újházi to Kossuth, New Buda, Apr. 29, 1851, I.1200, O.L.
 32. Károly László, *Napló-töredékek az 1848/49-i menekülteket, internáltakat, különösen Kossuthot és környezetét illetőleg, Törökországban és az Egyesült Államokban* (Budapest, 1887), pp. 58–59. The colony was to be under military orders, with all those willing to train for military service drawing sustenance from it. The idea of establishing a Hungarian colony in Turkey was reconsidered in December 1850. See I.971, O.L.
 33. Kossuth's representative in Paris, László Teleki, was first to suggest the potentials for exploiting American sympathies for Hungary's cause. See Hajnal, *Törökországban*, pp. 518, 596–98.
 34. Komlos, *Kossuth*, p. 40.
 35. *National Era* (Washington), Sept. 18, 1851.
 36. Letter of introduction for emigrants about to depart to America, Sumla, Feb. 14, 1850, in Hajnal, *Törökországban*, p. 695. See also I.706, O.L.
 37. Kossuth to Újházi, Broussa, March 27, 1850, Manuscripts Division, Magyar Országos Széchényi Könyvtár, hereafter cited as O.Sz.K.
 38. Kossuth to Teleki, Kutahia, July 23, 1850, I.844, O.L. Kossuth made it clear that the administration of the colony would be based on the assumption that the Hungarian colonists would eventually return to their homeland.
 39. Marsh to Kossuth, Constantinople, June 2, 1850, Miscellaneous Correspondence of the U.S. Legation, Vol. J-5, N.A.
 40. Brown to Webster, Sept. 26, 1850, Miscellaneous Correspondence Received, 1850, N.A.; Brown also wrote to Újházi to persuade him to go to Washington in Kossuth's behalf. See Brown to Újházi, Detroit, Nov. 17, 1850, Mss. Division, O.Sz.K.
 41. Webster to Marsh, Washington, Feb. 28, 1851. Dispatches from the Department of State, Vol. 14, N.A.
 42. *Ibid.* These were, of course, very erroneous views of Kossuth's objectives. Újházi, whose personal sentiments were perhaps better reflected by these statements, suspected that Kossuth would be upset by them: "Webster — I believe — could have spoken otherwise . . . he made unnecessary declarations about our future and our convictions," he wrote to Kossuth in 1851. Újházi to Kossuth, New Buda, Apr. 29, 1851, I.1200, O.L.
 43. *Congressional Globe*, 31st Congress, 2nd Session, pp. 710, 778, 816.
 44. *National Era* (Washington), Sept. 18, 1851.
 45. *Ibid.*, Oct. 9, 1851.
 46. László, *Napló*, pp. 63–64. This exchange of correspondence between Homes and Kossuth is cited in Komlos, *Kossuth*, pp. 44–45.
 47. Homes to Kossuth, Constantinople, Apr. 29, 1851, Miscellaneous Correspondence of the Legation, Vol. J-5, N.A.
 48. Homes to Webster, Constantinople, May 5, 1851, Correspondence from Turkey with the Department of State, Book G, No. 3, N.A.
 49. Homes to Morgan, Constantinople, May 15, 1851, Miscellaneous Correspondence of the Legation, Vol. J-5, N.A.
 50. Komlos, *Kossuth*, p. 46. Homes suggested to Kossuth the probability that Austria will insist he emigrate to America as a condition of his release if he does not elect to do so voluntarily. See Homes to Kossuth, Constantinople, June 16, 1851, Miscellaneous Correspondence of the Legation, Vol. J-5, N.A.

51. Kossuth to Újházi, Kutahia, May 21, 1851, I.1222, O.L. This letter is part of a group of letters entitled, "Kossuth's letter book, May 21–June 18, 1851," located in I.1222, O.L. All of the letters appear to be carbon copies, written in Kossuth's hand on very fine paper. Since the letter to Újházi suddenly ends in mid-sentence on the second page, there is some reason to suspect that it may never have been sent.
52. *Ibid.*
53. Kossuth to Pulszky, Kutahia, May 31, 1851, I.1222, O.L. Pulszky, one of the closest confidants of Kossuth and his representative in London, seemed to be under the impression in early 1851 that Kossuth intended to establish a Hungarian colony in America. See Maythényi to his wife, London, Jan. 18, 1851, in Ács, *New Buda*, pp. 154–159.
54. Ferenc Varga, *Varga Ferenc följegyzései* (n.p., n.d.), p. 3, Quart. Hung. 2359, O.Sz.K. For other estimates of the size of Újházi's claim, see *Pesti Napló*, Dec. 14, 1850 and Jan. 7, 1851, in Ács, *New Buda*, pp. 128–135, 143–151, and János Xántus, *Xántus János levelei Északamerikából* (Pest, 1858), p. 45. In the final analysis, only the few acres Újházi worked were effectively occupied. The rest remained part of future dreams never realized.
55. His plans attracted many who said that due to oppression in Hungary they would soon join him in his new colony. See Újházi to Kossuth, New York, Apr. 10, 1850, I.736, O.L.
56. Jenő Pivány, "A New Budai magyar colonia," *Magyar Történelmi Szemle* 3 (1914): 142. Újházi apparently expected to entice landed gentry to join him by promising the life-style they were accustomed to in Hungary. He was criticized for this by some of the exiles. For example, János Fiala reported prevailing negative opinion of Újházi's colony in the spring of 1852: "Újházi assumes a Dionysius role there [at New Buda]. He wants to transplant the Hungarian aristocratic manner of behavior to the West." See Tivadar Ács, *A száműzöttek. Fiala János 1848–49-i honvédelezredes emlékiratai az emigrációból* (n.p., n.d.), p. 214.
57. Rác Rónay to Feleki, Budapest, Jan. 25, 1923, Charles Feleky Papers, Miscellaneous Mss Collection #63, Library of Congress. Rác Rónay claimed to have in his possession several copies of what he called Újházi's real estate prospectuses sent to Hungary.
58. *Pesti Napló*, Dec. 14, 1850, and Jan. 17, 1851, in Ács, *New Buda*, pp. 128–135, 147–151; *Pesti Napló*, Feb. 15, 1851; *Magyar Hírlap*, Dec. 22, 1850. All of these consisted of letters from exiles at New Buda.
59. Charles L. Brace, *Hungary in 1851* (New York, 1852), pp. 274–277.
60. Maythényi to his wife, London, Jan. 18, 1851 in Ács, *New Buda*, pp. 154–159.
61. *Pesti Napló*, Jan. 7, 1851 in Ács, *New Buda*, pp. 147–151.
62. Varga, *Följegyzései*, p. 6. Another of the emigrants with Újházi stated that most Americans he met knew of the "Hungarian Colony." *Magyar Hírlap*, Dec. 22, 1850.
63. Most of the originals of this correspondence are found in the Mss. Division, O.Sz.K. Some are reproduced in Lillian M. Wilson, "Some Hungarian Patriots in Iowa," *Iowa Journal of History and Politics* 11 (1913), and in Ács, *New Buda*.
64. Order of General Land Office, Washington, D.C. to Registrar and Receiver, Fairfield, Iowa, April 7, 1851. *The National Era* (Washington), Apr. 24, 1851.
65. Klára Újházi to her family, New Buda, May 22, 1851, Újházi Papers, P section 1539, O.L.
66. *The Boston Daily Advertiser*, Feb. 4, 1852; also excerpts in *Albany Evening Journal*, Feb. 9, 1852.

67. During his October 1851 visit to London on his way to America, Kossuth did just the opposite by ordering the exiles to remain in Europe in preparation for renewing the revolution. A Kossuth Fund was formed under his encouragement with war-like objectives, distracting moneys and sympathies from the previously successful Hungarian Relief Committee which had financed the emigration of large numbers of Hungarians to America for settlement purposes. The Committee was forced to dissolve, thus terminating its aid to potential settlers at New Buda. See Esterházy to Kossuth, in Jánossy, *Emigráció*, 1: 581-585.
68. Újházi to Kossuth, New Buda, Apr. 29, 1851, I.1200, O.L.
69. Újházi recommended that previous status or rank of individuals be ignored and that instead of attempting to divide the land among them, Kossuth would avoid quarreling if the American method of distributing Congressional lands were followed. Újházi to Kossuth, New Buda, Nov. 22, 1851, in Vasváry Collection, Hungarian-American Foundation, New Brunswick, N.J., and cited in Jánossy, *Emigráció* 1: 226.
70. *Ibid.*; see also Újházi to Mrs. Tochman, New Buda, Dec. 4, 1851, *National Era* (Washington), Feb. 5, 1852.
71. Fillmore to Újházi, Washington, Oct. 10, 1851, Mss. Division, O.Sz.K.
72. Crampton to Palmerston, Washington, Dec. 15, 1851, Jánossy, *Emigráció* 2, part 1: 204-206.
73. Frank H. Severance, ed., *Millard Fillmore Papers* (Buffalo, 1907), 11: 138, 467-468.
74. *New York Herald*, Jan. 6, 1852; *New York Times*, Jan. 8, 1852.
75. *Washington Union*, Jan. 13, 1852.
76. May, *Mid-Century Revolutions*, p. 72; Jánossy, *Emigráció* 1: 336-337.
77. *New York Herald*, Jan. 9, 1852, reporting Kossuth's disclaimer of January 7.
78. Brick to the Tochmans, Sept. 16, 1851, in *National Era* (Washington), Sept. 18, 1851. Since no written directive by Kossuth to this effect was produced by the Sumla group to document its claims, it is possible that in its desperate state of destitution the group misrepresented or exaggerated Kossuth's orders. It should also be recalled that in early 1850, when Kossuth sent this group to America, his plans on permanent settlement in America were as yet undecided.
79. Jánossy, *Emigráció* 1: 225-226.
80. De Ahna, *Greatest Humbug*. That the Tochmans enjoyed strong support among top official circles in Washington, from the President down, is attested by the fact that after De Ahna's attacks on the Tochmans, he was fired from his job at the Public Land Office, and the entire Executive Branch of the Government was thereafter directed not to employ him.
81. Újházi to Tochman, New Buda, Jan. 24, 1851, I.1070, O.L.; Tochman to Újházi, Washington, Mar. 24, 1851, Mss. Division, O.Sz.K.
82. Újházi to Mrs. Tochman, New Buda, Dec. 4, 1851, *National Era* (Washington), Feb. 5, 1852.
83. *National Era* (Washington), Oct. 9, 1851. In their appeal, dated September 26, 1851, the Hungarians declared De Ahna a "tool" hired by European despots to foment divisions among the exiles.
84. *New York Herald*, Jan. 14, 1852.
85. *Ibid.*
86. *National Era* (Washington), Feb. 5, 1852.
87. Apollonia Jagello was an adventuress whose penchant for publicity had gotten her into trouble. The contemporary press often described her dressed in a military uniform during her first weeks in New York. Sources also agree that the Jagello name, implying noble roots, had been adopted by her. Most debatable remains

- the question as to whether she served as a soldier at Komárom. When later forced to defend her reputation, she and her supporters stated that she had never claimed to be any more than a nurse in the Komárom military hospital.
88. Tochman to Kossuth, Washington, Jan. 6, 1852; Nagy to Tochman, Washington, Jan. 11, 1852; Tochman to Kossuth, Jan. 15, 1852. All reproduced in *National Era* (Washington), Feb. 5, 1852.
 89. Újházi to Pulszky, New Buda, Jan. 31, 1851, in Ács, *New Buda*, pp. 220–222.
 90. Újházi to Vukovics, New Buda, Sept. 12, 1851, Vukovics Papers, R section 216, O.L.
 91. Kossuth to Újházi, Harrisburg, Jan. 15, 1852, Mss. Division, O.Sz.K.
 92. Rác Rónay to Feleki, Budapest, Jan. 25, 1923, Charles Feleky Papers, Miscellaneous Mss. Collection #63, Library of Congress. Rác-Rónay was quoting from fragments of Prick's diary in his possession.
 93. Péter Bogáti, "Flamingók New Budán," *Magyar Hírek*, Apr. 14, 1976.
 94. Újházi to Kossuth, Austin City, Texas, Apr. 22, 1852, in Jánossy, *Emigráció*, 2, part 2: 797–800.
 95. For example, Géza Kende, *Magyarok Amerikában* (Cleveland, 1927), 1: 326.
 96. See Kossuth's May 21, 1851 letter to Újházi, I.1222, O.L.
 97. Ferenc Pulszky, *Életem és korom* (Budapest, 1884), 2: 97.
 98. For example, see Varga, *Följegyzései*, p. 6; and Xántus, *Levelei*, p. 45.
 99. Ács, *A száműzöttek*, p. 214; Farkas Újházi to family, New Buda, March 30, 1852, cited in *Magyar Hírek*, Feb. 14, 1976.
 100. Kossuth to Asbóth, London, Sept. 9, 1852, *Adalékok a kényuralom ellenes mozgalmak történetéhez. Az Asbóth család irataiból* (Pest, 1871), p. 71.
 101. Komlos, *Kossuth*, pp. 123–125.
 102. Jánossy, *Emigráció*, 1: 336.

In Memoriam Miklós Radnóti (1909-1944)

Marianna D. Birnbaum

On June 23, 1946 a mass grave was reopened at Abda, a small village in Western Hungary. The event was by no means unique at this stage of Hungarian history. Hardly a day went by that the authorities of one region or another would not receive word that local people had come upon corpses or hastily covered graves in the fields. According to the findings of the preliminary investigations, approximately six hundred feet away from the Rábca, a small river running through the area, inmates of a forced labor camp had been executed. The ensuing exhumation proved to be a rather difficult job: the corpses were partially decomposed and the coroners had to identify the dead and the time and cause of death on the basis of shreds of clothing and disintegrated scraps of paper. On the corpse which they registered as number 12 the following items were found:

A visiting card with the name Dr. Miklós Radnóti printed on it. An ID card stating the mother's name as Ilona Gross. Father's name illegible. Born in Budapest, May 5, 1909. Cause of death: shot in the head. In the back pocket of the trousers a small notebook was found soaked in the juices of the body, and blackened by wet earth. This was cleaned and dried in the sun.¹

On the first page of the notebook there was a short text in Hungarian, Serbian, German, French and English. The latter reads "... contains the poems of the Hungarian poet Miklós Radnóti. . . to Mr. Gyula Ortutay, Budapest, University lecturer . . . Thank you in anticipation."² It is followed by his last poems with a final entry dated October 31, 1944:

I fell beside him; his body turned over
already taut as a string about to snap.
Shot in the back of the neck. That's how you too will end
I whispered to myself: just lie quietly.
Patience now flowers into death.

“Der springt noch auf,” a voice said above me.
On my ear, blood dried, mixed with filth.³

(Trans. by E. George)

The death described was not yet his own, it was the last moment of Miklós Lorsi, a fellow inmate, a formerly celebrated violinist, to which the tragic simile, comparing the dying body to a taut string, alludes.

Radnóti would have been seventy years old this year, but he was shot thirty-five years ago and buried at the mass grave at Abda. In 1959, commemorating his fiftieth birthday, Ortutay said that with his last words — meaning the German quotation — Radnóti acquitted his nation from the opprobrium of his murder.⁴

Miklós Radnóti, one of the most outstanding poets of twentieth-century Hungarian literature, lived merely thirty-five years but already his birth was darkened by tragedy. It cost the lives of his mother and twin brother as told in his only longer prose piece, *Gemini*. Grief and guilt feelings over the double tragedy accompanied Radnóti's entire creative life. In a poem written on his twenty-eighth birthday, he searches for his *raison d'être* by returning to the same event:

An ugly, obstinate infant was I,
my tiny, twin-bearing mother, your death!
Whether my brother was stillborn or had
five minutes of life, I do not know,
but there, amidst blood, pain and screams
I was lifted up toward the light, like
a victorious little beast
who has already shown its worth
by leaving two dead bodies behind.

.....
Little mother — you bleeding sacrifice,
I have reached the age of men.
The burning light is blinding me,
send me a signal with your gentle hand
that you know the truth, that it's all right,
that there is a meaning to my life!⁵

His family's early disintegration is the topic of the “Remembering Poem” (1933) in which he recalls the last minutes of his father.

Nothing would be easier than to show in his poetry that all through his life Radnóti was preparing himself for death. It was not the inevitability of passing that had occupied his mind, but the premonition that he would die a young man. This belief was, however, not the decadent pose

of the Symbolist of the fin-de-siècle, or of the post-Impressionists of the twenties, but the objective analysis of historical realities, their signals turning into a poetic scale of his life. Just as Kafka, Musil or Krleža presented us with a "preview" of alienation present in our world today, so did Radnóti progress in his poems on the road which ultimately came to an end at Abda.

Yet he was not a pessimistic poet; perhaps the most moving in his œuvre is the pride and satisfaction with which he had collected and shaped into poems the rare minutes of happiness, those few moments of carefree joy that were granted him during his short life.

Having finished high school, Radnóti followed his guardian's suggestion and spent a year in Liberec, Czechoslovakia, to learn a trade: textile technology. He tried to learn "something useful," but could not go on with it and finally, in 1930, he enrolled at the University of Szeged as a French and Hungarian major. Szeged had a great influence on Radnóti's literary activities. There he met the closest friends of his future years, among them Gyula Ortutay. At the same time his first volume of poetry was published: *Heathen Greeting Songs*, signaling his identification with the revolutionary young. A year later, his second volume, *Song of the New Shepherds*, was confiscated and the poet had to face a court trial, charged with subversion and with having committed blasphemy.

Radnóti's early poetry was rebellious, but not in a clearcut political sense. He was rebelling against the taste of those critics for whom only conventional literature had an appeal. His poetry, abounding in surrealistic images and written in free verse, was meant to break through the barriers of tepid traditions. Young and open to everything new, Radnóti was deeply affected by the famous Exhibition of the Colonial Peoples which he visited during his first trip to Paris in 1931. The artistic achievements of 'primitive' cultures, so often reflected in the work of Picasso and many of his contemporaries, also found their way into Radnóti's poetry after his journey to France. Simultaneously, social themes, the topic of social protest, make their first appearance in his verse. Radnóti's brief involvement with the Populist Left at Szeged gave impetus to these pieces, which after 1945 were often quoted, their political significance disproportionately emphasized, not the least by his surviving friends.

By the end of the twenties and during the first years of the thirties, the young writers had formed a loose but genuine alliance, to which all on the Left, from the bourgeois liberals to the self-avowed communists, belonged, as long as they opposed traditional, 'academic literature.'

Eclectic as the group was, it was personal style and predilection, or often simply a matter of temperament rather than ideological sophistication, that made one or the other choose a certain political position within that broad spectrum. The year 1933, however, ended this relatively tolerant attitude, and the polarization of ideas began to take on a more serious and consequently dangerous shape. Many abandoned the Left as early as 1931–32, feeling that hopes for social change were futile, while after the takeover of Hitler and his party some moved closer and closer to the Right; by the end of the decade they turned into staunch supporters of National Socialism. Radnóti's withdrawal from open political commitment also began in 1933, with the fast spread of Fascist ideology. He did not take sides, but in his poetry the theme of Socialism disappears and is replaced by a search for a universal humanist ideal which permeates his later poetry and was to culminate in the great anti-fascist, pacifist poems of his last years. Engaged humanism was the only way in which the poet who could not fight otherwise undertook to safeguard the cherished human and cultural values which were suddenly endangered by the New Order. He did not participate in the Spanish Civil War but his poems unequivocally reflect his sympathies about the struggle "down South" in which to him right and wrong were clearly distinguishable. In his "First Eclogue" the fate of Garcia Lorca is related, but at the same time the fear of his own future is foretold in the imaginary conversation between the Shepherd and the Poet.

Shepherd:

He . . . Garcia Lorca is dead! that no one has told me.
News of war travels fast, so fast; and the men who are poets
vanish: like that! Didn't Europe have some memorial observance?

Poet:

No one as much as took note. It's good if the wind pokes the embers,
find some broken lines in the site of the pyre and learns them.
That's how much will be left of the *œuvre*, for the scholarly future.

(Trans. by E. George)

His deep concerns for the fate of the world notwithstanding, Radnóti was primarily the poet of the individual, and thus his private experience gained equal significance in his poetry. In 1935 he married the only love of his life, Fanni, to whom some of the most beautiful love poems of modern Hungarian literature are addressed. Their texture is interlaced with ingenious metaphors whose most generous source is nature. Nature's images are simultaneously the medium in which Radnóti's social

and moral messages are delivered. Colors, too, have a special role in his poetic world; their function, almost exclusively symbolic, is to separate feelings: the joyous from the sad, and ultimately to identify destruction and death. White and silver are Radnóti's colors for death, standing in significant opposition to gold, which consistently symbolizes life and happiness. Life's blessings are frequently portrayed in a 'golden synecdoche,' reducing them to Fanni's golden curls, or the sun's rays falling on her body. In lines, reminiscent of Mayakovsky's language, he writes:

. . . the sunshine yells merrily
down the braids of my lover,
swaying, my shadow grows to the sky,
and tonight, for supper, my brazen twenty-two years
will polish off at least three stars!⁷

Consequently, as the years turn darker, silver and white become his predominant colors, forcing gold into the outer fringes of his imagination, to his occasional description of a cherished but unattainable humane future. In addition to the ones he most frequently used, Radnóti assigned symbolic meanings to practically every color of the spectrum. In his recapitulation of the world, nature is broached and its images transferred into various social and ethnic concepts, appearing in metaphorical metonymies such as "the trees rebel crimson flowers,"⁸ or "two poppies demonstrate loyalty."⁹ Emblematic expressions showing the convertability of images and issues are frequent in his political poetry of the early thirties. Similarly, in a synaesthetic perception, people and objects live, suffer, fear and rejoice together. Their differences washed away by intricately interwoven adjectives and predicates, man and things together create a magic world of pananimism in which their convergence alone is sufficient to prove them isomorphs, as in the "Naive Song to the Wife":

As she enters, the door greets her with a clink
and the flowerpots break into a pat,
a sleepy patch wakes in her blonde hair
like a startled sparrow, chirruping.

The old electric cord utters a scream
hulking its lazy body toward hers, and
all is swirling, so fast, I cannot write it down.

She just arrived, absent the entire day,
a tall cornflower in her hand:
with that she'll drive my death away.¹⁰

For a while, added to marital bliss, professional success brightened his daily existence. Radnóti completed and published his doctoral dissertation in 1934. It was a monograph on Margit Kaffka, an excellent woman poet of the fin-de-siècle. Still, unable to get a teaching position, he was forced to tutoring at the stenography school of his father-in-law, while Fanni added to the common income whatever she earned by giving private lessons. But he began to make a name for himself, and *Nyugat*, the most prestigious literary journal of Hungary, was publishing and reviewing his poems. A year later, Radnóti's next volume, *New Moon*, appeared: poems already written in an atmosphere of foreboding. The quiet, content moments were growing rarer. The earlier carefree idyll became filled with new meaning, and fear was turning prophetic. His collection published in 1936 bore the title *Just Pace Up and Down, You Doomed!*, and while it still contained a few poems of playful charm, the prevailing tone was capsulized in the title poem:

Just pace up and down, you doomed!
Tomcat and wind are hiding in the bush,
the row of dark trees lie tumbled
at your feet — and humping its back
the road turned pale in fear.

Shrink autumn leaf!
Shrink, you horrible world!
Wild geese cast their shadows
on the stiffened, rusty grass . . .¹¹

The next one, *Precipitous Road* (1938), was the last volume of poems still compiled by the poet himself. Prior to it, his receiving the Baumgarten Prize, a coveted literary award, and a short trip with Fanni to France marked Radnóti's last peaceful experiences before his final calvary began. But even in the poems written in Paris his legitimate fear of the future overshadowed the happy discoveries made in museums and small French towns they had not visited before. The delightful "Cartes postales," a mini-genre à la Apollinaire which Radnóti had used so successfully, alternate with poems voicing pessimism and deep anxiety. The "Picture Postcards," will sadly return in the fatal "Razglednica"

series of the labor camp. From 1938 on Radnóti's preparation for death intensifies:

. . . Among my memories I lie prostrated,
a pupil, maturing speedily for death . . .¹²

He is, however, less afraid of biological death than of having to stop working. The fear that he would not be able to complete his poetic work, that he would die and be judged by a "torso" rather than the full *œuvre*, caused him the greatest pain. Writing his own 'epitaph,' he anxiously asks ". . . but tell me, will what I've written, survive? . . ."¹³ The poems focusing on death become more and more numerous, there are only a few pieces in which neither the word nor its symbolic colors appear. He turns to a new genre, the eclogue (a deliberate misnomer), which achieves its greatest evocative power by the sharp conflict between its form and its content. Radnóti soon abandons the bucolic voice and the traditional dialogue of shepherds: the streaming, pounding message demands a change in structure. His defiant rejection of form and rhyme of the earlier years is now replaced by the lucid language and style of neo-classicism. The rebellion of the Modernists had been directed against an overorganized universe, and in the face of a world gone mad, in Radnóti's poetry purified form, tightly composed lines have become the substitute for lost reason. His hexameters do not reach back to the Latin models. He turns to the Hungarian poets of the 18th and 19th centuries instead, to the verse of Dániel Berzsenyi and János Arany. Choosing them at that new juncture of his life, Radnóti sought out the only cultural community in which he could still feel at home.

Amazingly, some of his last are patriotic poems, although of a special kind. Of these the best example is, "I Cannot Know," in which he, the potential victim, identifies himself with his land, its nature, its history and its present guilt as well.

I cannot know what these parts could mean to someone else
to me it's home, this tiny land in the embrace
of flames, since childhood cradling from far-off, my world.
It's out of her I grew, as does from a trunk its tender shoot,
and I hope that one day my body will sink into this soil.
I am at home. And when a bush kneels, once in a while,
at my feet, I know its name and can name its blossom; . . .¹⁴

(Trans. by E. George)

The same sentiment is expressed in his diary,

. . . my nation does not scream at me from the bookshelf, saying, get out of here; the regions of my land open their treasures for me, the thorns on the bushes do not tear at me more than at others, the tree will not stand on tiptoes so that I cannot reach its fruit. Had I experienced this I would kill myself, because I cannot live any other way than the way I do, nor can I think and believe in any other manner. That's how I feel in 1942, after three months of forced labor camp, and a fortnight spent in the special punitive unit.¹⁵

His is not a naive patriotism: Radnóti does not close his eyes to reality, and he is filled with revulsion about the world surrounding him:

I lived on this earth in an age
when honor was to murder and betray,
and heroes were the killers and the thieves
and those who were silent, too lazy to rejoice
were hated as if they had caught the plague.

I lived on this earth in an age
when a man who spoke out was forced to hide
and could only bite his fists in utter shame
a land got drunk on filth and blood
and grinned madly at its horrible fate.¹⁶

And all along he was sharply aware of his own, unavoidable fall:

Inside myself I live through everything that is still to come.
I don't look back. I know, not even memory, no
magic will save me — there's evil in the sky.
Friend, if you see me, shrug your shoulders and turn away.
Where the angel with the sword stood before,
now, maybe no one's there.¹⁷

(Trans. by S. Polgar, S. Berg and S. J. Marks)

The draft notice came again and in the middle of his *Twelfth Night* translations Radnóti was called to forced labor duty for the third time. He was taken to "Lager Heidenau," to work in the copper mines of nearby Bor, in the German-occupied part of Yugoslavia. By mid-1944, a life spent in human dignity could only appear as an unreachable dream in his poems:

Where are the nights and the taverns, the tables set out under the lindens?
Where, where indeed is the night? that night which shall never return now,
for to whatever is past, death itself lends another perspective.
Here at the table they sit, take shelter in smiles of the women,
and will yet take sips from our glasses, those many unburied
sleeping in forests of foreign, in meadows of faraway places.¹⁸

(Trans. by E. George)

Longing for his wife, the uncertainty about her fate, caused him additional suffering:

When might I see you? I hardly know any longer
you, who were solid, were weighty as the psalter,
beautiful as shadow and beautiful as light,
to whom I would find my way whether deafmute or blind;
now hiding in the landscape from within my eyes . . .

If he had any wish to survive, it was for the sake of his work and for Fanni. The hope of seeing her again lent him courage and strength to go on:

. . . Despite them I am alive,
a prisoner: and all I hoped for, I have
sized up in breadth. I will find my way to you;
for you I have walked the spirit's full length as it grew,
and highways of the land. If need be, I will render
myself, a conjurer, past cardinal embers,
amid nose-diving flames, but I will come back,
if I must be, I shall be resilient as the bark
on trees . . .¹⁹

(Trans. E. George)

Then came the German retreat, the "Forced March" started, and led him within two months, to the mass grave of Abda.

Radnóti never wrote his "Ars poetica," but it is easy to gather from his poems that his work was his reason for living, ". . . For I am worth no more than the value of the word / in my poem . . .," he confessed to his wife in the "Hesitant Ode," in which he also wrote:

. . . And I still can't tell of the full extent
of what it means to me, while I'm working
to feel your protective gaze over my hand.²⁰

In his persistent concern with every detail of his poems, in his constant striving for the best, the most subtle expression of his true thoughts, Radnóti put his entire intellectual and moral responsibility into every word he left behind.

Even when facing immediate death, the paramount, gnawing question on his mind was not how to save himself but how to assure that his poems in the small notebook would not perish with him.

His poems survived and the following generations have been reading them ever since. They know them by heart, they teach them in the high schools and universities of Hungary. Scholars have been analyzing his verse and rediscovering each piece with each new reading. There is still a hitherto unnoticed fine metaphor, a particularly successful harmony between sound and meaning that may surface with another close reading of the text. Additional ties between his work and that of his contemporaries are discovered by scrutinizing his vocabulary and the micro-poetic components of his language. Like all great poets he is as inexhaustible for the interested reader as he is for the scholar. He perished young but he achieved what he had desired most — he has become an inalienable part of Hungarian literature. And as the years pass, he is more and more recognized on a European scale as a significant poetic witness to our time, ranking with the late Paul Celan and with the Polish poet, Zbigniew Herbert.

NOTES

1. Published by A. Kőszegi, *Töredék* (Budapest, 1972), pp. 68–69. Radnóti's final weeks were also investigated by Gábor Tolnai, "A meredek út végső szakasza," *Irodalomtörténet*, (New series) 2: 239–270; 3: 463–497, 763–792; and "Szerbia ormán . . . — Radnóti Miklós nyomában," *Kortárs* 16/1 (January 1972): 86–106; 16/2 (February 1972): 254–269; and 16/3 (March 1972): 416–473.
2. M. Radnóti, *Bori notesz*, facsim. ed. (Budapest, 1970), p. 13.
3. "Picture Postcards, 4," from M. Radnóti, *Subway Stops*, ed. and trans. by E. George (Ann Arbor, 1977), p. 90. Henceforth E. George.
4. *Radnóti Miklós, 1909–1944*, ed. D. Baróti, introd. by Gy. Ortutay (Budapest, 1959). Further inquiry into his final days, however, revealed that Radnóti had indeed been killed by Hungarian soldiers, who when unable to find a hospital that would take in the sick inmates in their custody, decided to get rid of their twenty-two prisoners. The men were forced to dig their own graves into which they all were shot — except for the last, who was first ordered to cover the bodies and was then killed with shovels.
5. From "Huszonnyolc év," M. Radnóti, *Összes versei és műfordításai* (Budapest, 1959), pp. 153–154. Henceforth Radnóti. Unless otherwise indicated, all further translations are mine. They will appear in a monograph on Radnóti to be

published in the Twayne World Authors Series. The page numbers refer to the above-quoted original publication.

6. From "First Eclogue," E. George, pp. 47-48.
7. From "1931 április 19," Radnóti, p. 66.
8. From "Tavaszi vers," *ibid.*, p. 42.
9. From "Pontos vers az alkonyatról," *ibid.*, p. 109.
10. From "Együgyű dal a feleségről," *ibid.*, p. 200.
11. From "Járkálj csak, halálraitélt!," *ibid.*, pp. 149-150.
12. From "Ez volna hát. . .," *ibid.*, p. 155.
13. From "Hajnaltól éjfélíg — S majd így tünődöm," *ibid.*, p. 166.
14. From "I Cannot Know . . .," E. George, p. 74.
15. Quoted from B. Pomogáts, *Radnóti Miklós* (Budapest, 1977), p. 191.
16. From "Töredék," Radnóti, pp. 259-260.
17. From "Not Even Memory, No Magic," M. Radnóti, *Clouded Sky*, tr. by S. Polgár, S. Berg, and S. J. Marks (New York, 1972), p. 83.
18. From "À la recherche . . .," E. George, pp. 84-85.
19. From "Letter to My Wife," *ibid.*, pp. 81-82.
20. From "Hesitant Ode," *ibid.*, p. 67.



BOOK REVIEWS

East Central European Perceptions of Early America. Edited by Béla K. Király and George Barany. Lisse: The Peter de Ridder Press, 1977. Pp. 144.

Since little scholarly attention has been paid in America so far to the East Central European image of the early United States, volume five of the Brooklyn College series: *Studies on Society in Change*, is a most welcome enterprise. It consists of six essays: one on Austria, one on Bohemia, two on Hungary and two on Poland, with a preface, an introduction and a concluding article. The present review will concentrate on the two essays dealing with Hungary: Alfred A. Reisch's "Sándor Bölöni Farkas's Reflections on American Political and Social Institutions" and Béla K. Király's "Béla Széchenyi's American Tour."

The first choice, that of Bölöni's *Utazás Észak-Amerikában*, is an obvious one; the Transylvanian wrote the first Hungarian travelogue ever on the United States. What Reisch does not mention is an equally important fact, namely that published in 1834, Bölöni's work preceded by one year Alexis de Tocqueville's *Democracy in America*. Even its Hungarian translation by Gábor Fábán came out earlier than the second Hungarian travelogue, Ágoston Haraszthy's in 1844. In consequence, Bölöni's is the only Hungarian account of the young republic unaffected by the Frenchman's perceptive remarks. The second choice, Béla Széchenyi's *Amerikai útam*, 1863, is less obvious. Following Bölöni's and Haraszthy's, three travelogues appeared on the U.S. before 1863, two more with chapters on North America and two others belong to the same period though they were published later; some of these books are outstanding. Evidently, Király was prompted in his choice by the fact that Béla Széchenyi belonged to one of the most distinguished and worthiest aristocratic families in Hungary. His tour in America realized a dream that had been denied by Metternich to his father, István Széchenyi, who had so ardently wished to see "das werdende Land."

The radically different approach and emphasis in the two essays contribute an added interest to the whole volume. Király examines Széchenyi's travelogue in the Hungarian historical context, while Reisch's

standpoint is that of self-critical, post-Vietnam War, post-Watergate America. In his learned presentation, Reisch provides a valuable though incomplete bibliography of his author. He calls him Farkas but the author is better known in Hungary as Bölöni, occasionally Bölöni Farkas. Hungarian names can present almost insolvable problems when it comes to a correct English version. Bölöni Farkas is a kind of multiple surname; Farkas is the real surname and Bölöni merely indicates the place where the family came from. However, similarly to other famous Hungarians, like the poet Csokonai (Mihály Vitéz), he came to be known by that name designating a geographical location. Indeed, in the concluding essay of the volume: "The Appeal and the Echo," George Barany correctly refers to him as Bölöni or Bölöni Farkas.

Reisch describes Bölöni's work as "hardly a balanced evaluation of Jacksonian America." That this "Columbus of Democracy," as a biographer so perceptively pointed to his role in Hungarian history, emphasized the positive sides (liberty, equality, free press, education, progress, free enterprise, etc.) is absolutely true, but he did not ignore the negative qualities (slavery, emergence of a moneyed aristocracy) either. If the positive side comes out stronger, this enthusiasm is not due to "youthful Romanticism," but is a consequence of a historical situation. Bölöni desperately needed to find a model; he accomplished a mission. Travelogues in Hungary of the 1830s and 1840s were a kind of political literature trying to awaken the feudal, backward, apathetic country. Indeed, in the opinion of István Széchenyi, the great promoter of progress in Hungary, Bölöni's book had the shattering effect of "thunder and lightning," and in Széchenyi's view no one ever has honored Hungary "with a more useful and more beautiful present." That Bölöni, "like many Americans, . . . believed the U.S. was a pioneer forging a new era for mankind," is a correct assessment. But then most Europeans of the time considered America "the Utopia of the Common Man." As Martin Lipset so accurately stated in his preface to Harriet Martineau's *Society in America*, "the Europeans came to America from societies that retained strong elements of a feudal caste-ridden past." For Hungarians this was even more true. Also, with all their shortcomings, American institutions objectively constituted an attractive alternative to most Europeans. By applying in his essay the point of view of the soul-searching, frustrated, post-Vietnam war, post-Watergate American atmosphere Reisch perfectly matches the spirit of Bölöni's book, which is equally representative of a historical atmosphere.

Király's analysis of Béla Széchenyi's travelogue, on the other hand,

focuses on the relevance of those early travelogues in the old country. As Tocqueville said: "Though I seldom mention France, I do not write a page without thinking of her." Széchenyi too observed everything in America with Hungary in mind. As Király so emphatically points out, the main purpose of his book was "to educate the Hungarians," and thus, to promote progress in all fields of life. In consequence, as Király says, his style had to be "didactic," giving detailed background information before analyzing issues.

When Széchenyi visited, the Civil War was already on. Thus, the slavery issue was much more prominent than in Bölöni's days. Király points out correctly how much Széchenyi blamed the black man's "primitiveness" on the lack of education and how realistic he was in his assessment of the black man's treatment in the North. Nor does Király ignore the fact that Széchenyi showed a great deal of understanding for the Secessionists. Indeed, he was the only Hungarian travelogue-writer to advocate the Southern case out of economic fairness to the white slave-owners. He was trying to strike a just balance. Király is right in claiming that in Széchenyi's view "the South is obliged to proclaim abolition for the sake of mankind." Király also mentions that Széchenyi believed the slave-owners should be compensated. The Hungarian aristocrat certainly tried to weigh carefully the two sides, and Király wants to do justice to this fact. However, occasionally his subtle paraphrase, like, "the emancipation of four million slaves would then ruin the South's six million whites," almost changes Széchenyi's argument. The Hungarian put it in much more aggressive terms: "It is possible to state *à la* Lincoln that there is an end to slavery, but I ask whether anyone has the right to free about four million blacks and ruin by that six million whites?"

Throughout his presentation, Király successfully keeps the emphasis on the Hungary-oriented character of the early travelogues. In consequence, his approach differs radically from Reisch's; indeed, the two essays, following each other in the same volume, successfully complement each other. They demonstrate most vividly how much a writer's emphasis, his priorities influence his presentation of a historical document.

The American Non-Policy Towards Eastern Europe 1943-1947. By Geir Lundestad. Tromsø: Universitetsforlaget, 1978. Pp. 654. Distributed in the United States and Canada by Columbia University Press. \$18.00 paper.

This large book was inspired by the author's desire to probe theories on the origin of the cold war in the context of American policy toward Eastern Europe. The structure of the volume is complicated. After an introductory chapter, Part One discusses American universalism toward Eastern Europe. Part Two examines American policy toward Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Rumania, Bulgaria, Finland, and the Baltic States. A chapter compares policies toward the various East European countries. Another examines the peace treaties with the Danubian Axis satellites, and another scrutinizes the American attitude toward plans for federation in Eastern Europe. Part Three raises the question: what could and what did the United States do against Soviet domination in Eastern Europe? Three possible levers are considered — the atomic bomb, the American conventional military strength, and the power of the immense American economy. An appendix summarizes Soviet policy toward Eastern Europe. The notes, about 150 pages of them, show a Sisyphean research in American archives, manuscript collections and libraries. The result is a very useful book for students of East European affairs.

Throughout the narrative Lundestad emphasized that there was no consistent United States policy toward Eastern Europe. But consistency is not always a virtue or even possible in foreign policy. Eastern Europe — a low priority area on the scale of American interests — had to yield to more important interests, as the author explains on several occasions.

In the opinion of this reviewer the main reason for a contradictory and confused American policy toward Eastern Europe was the lack of a high-level policy-making organ in Washington. A first step was made in this direction only in 1944 with establishment of the State-War-Navy Coordinating Committee. But President Roosevelt remained his own secretary of state throughout the war and made the important foreign policy decisions, sometimes even without informing the Department of State, which played a subdued role during his administration. Special emissaries and representatives of wartime agencies appeared in foreign countries and few people knew who was doing what, when, where, how and why in foreign affairs. The tons of planning and briefing papers available now in official publications, archives, and memoirs are to a large extent expressions of individual or group suggestions and opinions

in government agencies, but few of those papers reached the President's desk or were considered by him. The task he assumed was beyond the capability of any man.

There were other factors at work, ensuring confusion. Policy-makers believed, or their attitude created the impression, that the affairs of Eastern Europe would be settled primarily by Britain and the Soviet Union. The Joint Chiefs of Staff ruled, in the autumn of 1943, that the United States should take no responsibilities "in the area of the Balkans, including Austria."

Gradually the Soviet military occupation of Eastern Europe became the decisive factor in policy. This situation would not have changed without use of force, which was never considered by the English-speaking powers. Keeping Soviet influence out of Greece, Turkey, Iran, and Japan remained a more important and more feasible task. In Eastern Europe the armistice agreements and peace treaties simply confirmed the military status quo established at the close of hostilities.

For the East European nations this turn of events brought traumatic experiences. In view of America's tremendous power in the closing stage of the war, the peoples of Eastern Europe believed that their fate would be settled at the peace table according to the Four Freedoms, the Atlantic Charter, and the Yalta Declaration on Liberated Europe. Alas, these universalist declarations had at best only a tenuous connection with politics, and a foreign tyranny could impose totalitarian systems of government without much ado. The timetable was not the same in each East European country, but eventually the leaders of democratic parties were put in prison, exiled, executed, or otherwise eliminated. Such stark facts, fatal to more than a hundred million people, cannot easily emerge with clarity in a scholarly discussion of the theories of the cold war and the options of American policy.

University of Notre Dame

Stephen D. Kertesz

Ferenc G. Harcsár
1910-1979

Founder of the Hungarian Readers' Service and co-founder of the *Canadian-American Review of Hungarian Studies*, F. G. Harcsár was born in Szatmárnémeti, Hungary (now Satu Mare, Romania). He completed his university education in Budapest. After obtaining a doctorate in chemistry, he embarked on a career in scientific research. The war drove him into exile. Following several years' stay in Venezuela, he immigrated to Canada where he resumed his career as a research scientist. He retired in 1977 as a respected member of Canada's defense research establishment.

F. G. Harcsár was a deeply religious man with an equally strong passion for his Hungarian nation as well as his ancestral Transylvania. Throughout his adult life he had been involved in religious and patriotic organizational efforts. He had been instrumental in the founding and the maintenance of Hungarian Calvinist congregations wherever he stayed for more than a brief period. During the last decade of his life he devoted most of his spare time to the establishment and the directing of the Hungarian Readers' Service, our journal's institutional sponsor. A dedicated and punctual worker, he put in long hours every week, often every day, to attend to the administrative and financial affairs of his organization. Although the apathy and malice he encountered often caused him to despair, he refused to be discouraged and to abandon his plans.

After nearly four years of preparatory work, in 1974 he launched the Readers' Service and published, with the help of N. F. Dreisziger, the first issue of his *Review*. Following his retirement from government service three years later, he devoted even more of his time to the increasing administrative work demanded by the journal. Even during the last months of his life, he expended his rapidly diminishing energy in making arrangements for the periodical's future.

He is survived by his wife, two daughters and two granddaughters. His death is a great loss to his family, his many friends, the Hungarian-Canadian Calvinist community, and to the cause of Hungarian studies in North America and elsewhere.

N.F.D.