

HUNGARY'S HISTORY 895-1945

Chapter One:

Introduction

Magyar, and associated, tribes entered, and began to conquer, the Carpathian Basin in 895, thus, beginning modern Hungarian history. Historians commonly assign the subsequent 1,100-plus years into the following sections:

1. The age of the conquest and the tribal state 895-1000
2. The Middle Ages in Hungary 1000-1526
 - 2.1. The era of the kings of the House of Árpád 1000-1301
 - 2.2. The era the kings from diverse ruling houses 1301-1526
3. The Habsburg era 1526-1918
 - 3.1. A country in three parts 1526-1699
 - 3.2. The era of the Habsburg Empire 1700-1867
 - 3.3. The Austro-Hungarian Dual Monarchy 1867-1918
4. The Horthy era 1919-1945
5. The era of Communist dictatorship 1945-1990
6. The period after the regime change, 1990, to today.

In chapter one of our work, we shall follow this conventional division and relate the more important events of Hungarian history.

1. The Age of the Conquest and the Tribal State 895-1000

The history of the Magyar tribes previous to 895 AD, to which historians refer as 'Magyar ancient history', is not totally known to this day. A significant group of historians - those who primarily do research into ancient history through linguistics - cast their ballots for a common Finnish-Ugric ancestry for the Magyar people. The other group - who base their conclusions on archeological findings and modern genetic tools - vote for a Turkic origin that sprang up in Inner and Central Asia. The arguments still persist today. A compromise theory has also been put forward according to which, of the seven Magyar tribes of the conquest, four were of Finnish-Ugric origin and three were of Turkic origin.

What we know for certain, from written sources mentioning the Magyars, comes from the works of Byzantine historians of the 10th century. They record that, *circa* 830 AD, Magyar tribes lived on the South Russian steppes (meaning the region along the Donets, Dnieper, south Bug and Dniester Rivers, commonly called Levedia by Hungarian historians). According to these written sources, the Magyar people living in Levedia consisted of seven tribes, of which the Megyer tribe was the acknowledged leader. Sometime between 850 and 860 AD, these tribes began to migrate toward the West from Levedia to

escape the conquering thrusts of the Kazar Empire (occupying the area between the Volga and Don Rivers). They resettled in what Hungarian historians call 'Etelköz', the region between the eastern Carpathians and the South Bug River. From here, the Magyars launched a regular series of raiding sorties towards Byzantium and into the Carpathian basin. In fact, by 881 AD, during their wandering raids they penetrated into lands west of the Carpathian basin, into what today is Austria (Erdélyi 1986).

During these peripatetic forays, they appraised that a political vacuum emerged in the Carpathian basin after the collapse of the Avar Empire in the 8th century. Towards the close of the 9th century, three states were sharing control over the Carpathian basin: Trans-Danubia was occupied by the Franks; the Moravians were able to establish a smaller principality, the Moravian Principality, along the Morva River (which flows into the Danube at Bratislava); while the Bulgarian state was able to exercise its power over the eastern and southeastern portions of the basin (today's Transylvania and Slavonia /now eastern Croatia/). At the same time, the lands between the Danube and Tisza Rivers, and those East of the Tisza, were populated only by remnants of the Avars. We apply the words 'political vacuum' to this situation because the centers of the Frank and Bulgarian states were outside the boundaries of the Carpathian basin, hence, for the purposes of these two states, Carpathian basin lands were peripheries, and there was no recognizable state that exerted control over the center. The leaders of the Magyar tribes living in Etelköz - we allude to the tribal sovereign Álmos and his son Árpád - recognized the possibility a successful incursion into this power vacuum and hence, military preparations for this conquest were mindfully made, as an ancillary aspect of the western raids. This plan was hastened when the Bulgarians, in alliance with the Pechenegs living East of Etelköz, attacked the Magyar settlements (in retaliation for Magyar raids). Against the concentrated and powerful attacks, the Magyars, under the leadership of chieftain Árpád, pressed on into the Carpathian Basin; the now-empty Etelköz was then occupied by the Pechenegs. What this means is that, while the conquest was a pre-planned process, the specific start date was inadvertently supplied by the Bulgar-Pechened attack.

Of the exact timetable and progress of the conquest, we can only say that the occupation of the Carpathian basin proceeded in several phases. The first phase, 895-896, saw the Magyars occupy the center of the basin (between the Danube and Tisza Rivers and toward the South-east). In the second phase, over the next four years, the Magyar tribes annihilated the Moravian Principality and occupied what later became Northern Hungary (up to the East-West crescent of the Carpathians), forced the Franks to cede Trans-Danubia and, in a parallel action, began to spread in a South-Southeasterly direction to force the Bulgars out of Transylvania. By 900 AD, the Magyar tribes exercised sole control over the vast Carpathian basin.

That, during the conquest, the Magyars drove out the eastern Franks (aka Bavarians) from Trans-Danubia cut deeply into the interests of the Kingdom of the Eastern Franks. The eastern Franks did not want to yield (the former Roman province of) Pannonia and made attempts to reclaim it. To this

end, they mounted several campaigns against the Magyars. Of these, the Frankish campaign of 907 was the most significant. The deciding battle took place in July of 907 near today's Bratislava (Hung.: Pozsony), during which the Magyars delivered a crushing defeat on the Frank forces. After the rout, the Franks made no new offensive attempts during the 10th century against the Carpathian basin and the Magyar settling-in process. In fact, after 907, the Franks were forced to bear Magyar raiding campaigns to or across their territory. The significance of the 907 victory lies in the fact that the Magyar tribes were able to repel the western attack and were thus able to ensure unimpeded stability for settling on the lands conquered. Put another way, they were able to avoid the fate of previous mounted nomad tribes living in the Carpathian basin - the Huns, Avars - who could exert their power over the basin only for a short period of time.

If we examine the rest of history of the 10th century, we shall see that the chieftain/prince Árpád and his descendants ruled over the Magyars in the Carpathian basin. But, in actual fact, these rulers of the Árpád dynasty exercised absolute power merely over the territory settled by their own tribe - the Megyer tribe - since there existed no unified Magyar state but, rather, a collection of tribal states living in close proximity. (Kristó Gy-Makk F. 2001) The explanation for this state of affairs is that the settlement of the Magyars in the Carpathian basin took place by tribe, meaning that each of the seven tribes took possession of a large tract of land. As an example, the ruling Megyer tribe, Árpád's tribe, settled in one block in central Hungary along the Danube from today's Budapest down to Kalocsa. Within this area, each clan's and extended family's head carried on independently; the ruling chieftains (the princes of the House of Árpád) possessed only nominal power over them.

The Magyar tribes continued to follow their former mounted nomad lifestyle in their new home. This meant primarily the husbandry of large grazing animals (horses) but also extended to their regular venturesome raids to the West (mainly to German and Italian territories) and South (to Byzantium). Between 907 and 970, the Magyars carried out 50 major campaigns. During this time, the prayer: "*From the arrows of the Magyars protect us, O Lord!*" could be heard regularly in churches across Europe. The utter defeat at the hands of German forces at Augsburg, on August 10, 955, spelled the end of westward incursion by Magyar raiding forces. They did, however, continue toward the South, until the Byzantine victory in 970 at the battle of Arkadiopolis.

With the closing of the age of the raids, the Magyars had to assimilate into a Europe with a Christian order. This was all the more important German emperors could easily start a war against the pagan Magyars under the guise of protecting Christianity. It was exactly for this reason that chieftain Taksony (955-970) requested Christian missionaries from Pope John XII in the early 960's. The serious Christian conversion was begun during the reign of chieftain Géza (970-997), when the monk from St. Galen, later appointed bishop, baptized now-prince Géza, his family and vassals. With this act, the wholesale baptism of the Magyars was begun.

2. The Middle Ages in Hungary 1000-1526

2.1. The Golden Age of the House of Árpád 1000-1301

The attempts prince Géza made to position the Magyar people closer to a Christian Europe were continued after his death in 977 by his son Stephen (István). In 977, Stephen had to fight for the title of ruling prince with his brother, Koppány. Koppány wanted to continue the old nomad tradition under which, on the death of the ruling chieftain, the oldest male member of the ruling tribe becomes the chief. It is called the principle of seniority. Stephen, on the other hand, wanted to apply the principle of primogeniture applied by Christian rulers where succession is passed through a direct male line, father to son. The two opposing forces met and fought near the town of Veszprém, where Koppány, too, lost his life. Stephen asked the pope (Sylvester II) for a crown in 1000, which duly arrived [signifying acceptance into the Christian community of nations-*ed.*] and he was crowned as king on January 1, 1001.

During his long reign (1001-1038), King Stephen was victorious over all his enemies, both internal and external. In the years following his coronation, he gradually overcame all internal opposition, disposing of Gyula, prince of Transylvania, in 1003 and Ajtony, ruler of the Maros region, in 1008. When Conrad II, the Holy Roman Emperor, attacked Hungary in 1030 and advanced with his troops deep into the country -- all the way to Esztergom -- Stephen defeated him, too, and chased the retreating Germans all the way to Vienna. In our opinion, beside the very important victories, the true significance and greatness of King Stephen [later to become King Saint Stephen of Hungary] can be summarized in three points.

Firstly, it was King Stephen who organized Hungary's network of public administration and created the county system, having marked out 50 during his reign. The county system [a royal fortress at the center of each, a king's representative, the Royal Constable, appointed to each, royal law and assize courts in each, etc.-*ed.*] impressed its stamp on the internal life of the Hungarian state through a thousand years. Its resiliency and value is clearly shown that, even today -- when the European Union is strongly urging the dissolution of regional structures -- it still plays an important role in Hungarian public administration.

Secondly, through his books of statutes -- during his reign, he published two books of his collected laws -- he created and solidified a feudal social and economic order mirroring western European customs. Hence, he unequivocally allied Hungary to the western European social and economic model. Beginning with King Stephen, up until 1945, the country attempted to follow western European examples and models.

Thirdly, King Stephen laid the basis for Christianity in Hungary. One of his laws directs that Sunday and the Church holidays be observed. He also enshrined in law that every ten villages were to raise a church and make provisions to keep a priest. To impose order over the large number of churches thus built, he created ten dioceses (bishoprics), of which two, Esztergom and

Kalocsa, rose to become archbishoprics. He also endowed a number of monasteries. To enable the Church to carry out its tasks, he granted huge estates to the various establishments.

We must note here that King Stephen, intending to leave the throne to his son, Prince Imre, wrote a book, titled *Admonitions*, summing up his views on kingship and ruling. Alas, the young prince died in 1031 in a hunting accident.

In summary, we can state that the significance of King Stephen's reign lay in his creation of a feudal Christian Magyar state, created its institutions, constraints and passed such laws as to make possible the continued, robust existence of the state.

After his death in 1038, members of his extended family (descendants of the original Árpád dynasty, founded by the tribal chieftain Árpád) ruled as kings of Hungary through two and a half centuries. Hence, history refers to this period (1000-1301) as the era of the kings of the House of Árpád.

The following table lists them:

Table 1: Kings of the House of Árpád

King	Reigned
Stephen I	1001-1038
Peter Orseolo	1038-1041
Aba Sámuel	1041-1044
Peter Orseolo	1044-1046
Andrew I	1046-1060
Béla I	1060-1063
Salamon	1063-1074
Géza I	1074-1077
Ladislav I	1077-1095
Coloman the Bookish	1095-1116
Stephen II	1116-1131
Béla II	1131-1141
Géza II	1141-1162
Stephen III	1162-1172
Ladislav II (anti-king)	1162-1163
Stephen IV (anti-king)	1163-1165
Béla III	1172-1196
Imre	1196-1204
Ladislav III	1204-1205
Andrew II	1205-1235
Béla IV	1235-1270
Stephen V	1270-1272
Ladislav IV	1272-1290
Andrew III	1290-1301

Space considerations prevent us from treating, in detail, each of the kings of the Árpád dynasty in turn. Thus, we will merely skim and mention only

the most important events. During the 11th and 12th centuries, the Magyar state was threatened by two neighboring ‘superpowers.’ On the one hand was the Holy Roman Empire, which had already made vassals of the Czechs and Poles and was looking to do the same to the Magyars and, on the other hand, the Byzantine Empire, which had conquered the Bulgarian state. During these two centuries, both of these great powers attacked Hungary several times but the Árpád dynasty was always successful in defending the country’s independence. In fact, Ladislaus I (1077-1095) had enough forces to enlarge the country. In 1091, he began the conquest of Dalmatia and Croatia -- an initiative completed by his successor Coloman the Bookish (1095-1116). Coloman was crowned King of Croatia in 1102 and the two crowns (Hungary and Croatia) continued to be worn on the same head until 1918.

During these centuries, Hungary rose to the status of a European middle power. It is best demonstrated by the regular military campaigns the kings led outside the country’s borders. They were involved in the fights of succession of the Russian principalities, fought Venice for control of the Adriatic coast of Croatia, and, at the behest of Pope Honorius III, Andrew II (1205-1235) even led a Crusade (the fifth) to the Holy Land in 1217.

Beside defending the independence of the country and integrating into the European political fabric, the Árpád dynasty spent a great deal of energy in maintaining order within the country. King Ladislaus I compiled three books of laws during his reign. In them, he took a stern tone in defence of the feudal order. His draconian law prescribed hanging for theft over the value of a hen. We can state that the feudal economic and social order typical over all of western Europe was completely adapted and entrenched in Hungary by the end of the 12th century. The success of the process can be displayed by two events: one, Béla III (1172-1196) was prosperous enough, in spite of his wars, to build a new royal palace for himself in Esztergom in the newest style sweeping Europe, the gothic; in 1222, the Magyar nobility forced Andrew II to sign the *Golden Bull* (named after the golden seal attached) The *Golden Bull* spelled out the rights of the nobility, even going as far as to state that, if Andrew or his heirs fail to observe the laws, the nobles can legally rise up [even take up arms-*ed.*] without the charge of treason. A document similar to the Golden Bull -- in which a ruler guarantees the rights of the nobility -- was rare in the Europe of the period, only the British nobility was able to force it out of their king in 1215 in the *Magna Charta*.

In spite of the previously mentioned successes, the Hungarian state was unable to withstand the assault from the East by the Mongols, usually called as the Tatar Incursion in Hungarian historiography. Genghis Khan’s Mongol hordes began their unstoppable series of conquests in Inner Asia in the first half of the 13th century, overrunning Central Asia and the countries of Eastern Europe. In December of 1240, the Mongols, under Batu Khan, sacked Kiev; in March of 1241, they breached the Magyar defenses along the Carpathian Mountains and swept into the country. Béla IV (1235-1270), leading the main Magyar army in person, met the invaders and joined battle in the Sajó River valley at Muhi. He suffered a devastating defeat, being himself forced to flee

from the battlefield. [He fled, and was chased, all the way to the Adriatic coast to what today is Trogir in Croatia, where he finally found refuge from his mounted posse by taking to a ship in the harbor-*ed.*] The Mongols wreaked havoc and destruction over eastern Hungary until, with the onset of winter, they were able to cross the frozen Danube River and to continue their trail of devastation in Trans-Danubia. The campaign of destruction suddenly stopped in the spring of 1242 and, as suddenly as it appeared, the Mongols withdrew from the country. The event is explained by our historians that in December of 1241, the Great Khan [khagan-*ed.*] of the Mongols, Ogodei, died in distant Mongolia and Batu Khan, leading the forces in Hungary, swiftly returned to the center of the empire in hopes of becoming the next Great Khan.

The devastation was enormous. There were counties on the southeastern Great Plains of Hungary where fully half of the settlements were obliterated. After the withdrawal of the Mongols, the Magyar state had, for all intents and purposes, to be re-established. As this was accomplished by King Béla IV, he is usually referred to as the second founder of the country. During the reconstruction, the king placed special emphasis on two things: one, grants of landed estates were tied to the building of stone castles and fortifications, i.e., the noble who received title and land was forced to build a stone fort on his land, and second, the depopulated, devastated areas were re-populated by foreign settlers.

As a result of the actions of the king, the country weathered the Mongol destruction in a relatively short time but a new and dangerous trend emerged in the second half of the 13th century, under Béla IV and his heirs. A small group of nobles became extremely wealthy and militarily powerful, giving rise to a baronial class which divided up the country among themselves into semi-independent territories. These barons - also called mini-kings - maintained their own courts, rose in opposition to the king and often carried out an independent foreign policy. The reigns of the last kings of the Árpád dynasty, Stephen V (1270-1272), Ladislaus IV (1272-1290) and Andrew III (1290-1301) can be described as a permanent struggle against the barons.

2.2. The Era of the Kings from Sundry Ruling Houses 1301-1526

With the death of Andrew III in 1301, the House of Árpád died out. The Hungarian kings of the 14th, 15th and early 16th centuries came from a number of dynastic families, the distant offsprings of various ruling houses. Hence the term, era of kings from sundry ruling houses.

Table 2 lists their dates:

Table 2: Sundry ruling houses

King	Reigned
Interregnum	1301-1308
Charles Robert (House of Anjou)	1308-1342
Louis I, the Great (Anjou)	1342-1382
Mary (Anjou)	1382-1385

Charles II (Anjou)	1385-1386
Sigismund I (Luxemburg)	1387-1437
Albert I (Habsburg)	1437-1449
Vladislaus I (Jagiellonian)	1440-1444
Ladislaus V (Habsburg)	1445-1457
Mathias I (Hunyadi)	1457-1490
Vladislaus II (Jagiellonian)	1490-1516
Louis II (Jagiellonian)	1516-1526

The period between 1301 and 1308 is called the Interregnum, as none of the claimants to the throne (the Czech prince Wenceslaus, the Bavarian prince Otto, Charles Robert of Anjou) were able to make solidify their hold on the crown. In the end, Charles Robert overcame his challengers and, in the following years also dealt with the barons who opposed him. The date of 1312 is important in this progression, when the king won a victory over one of the most powerful barons, Amadeus Aba, in the battle of Rozgony. By 1321, the entire country was under his firm rule and he moved his court / capital from Temesvár [today Timisoara in Romania-*ed.*] to Visegrád. Charles Robert distributed the confiscated wealth and estates of the defeated barons among his own followers, creating an aristocracy loyal to him. (Bertényi I. 2000)

Charles Robert not only re-ordered the political life of the country, but also brought order in the economic area, as well. Based on the so-called 'regal rights' - duties, taxes, gold and silver mining - he increased the income of the crown. Hungary was rich in gold and silver deposits; European commerce had a great need of them. It was the custom under the Árpád dynasty kings that, wherever miners found a deposit of silver or gold, the king immediately declared it as crown property and brought it under his direct control. Hence, the landowners were not motivated to invest in mining activities. Charles Robert addressed this in 1327 by leaving the property in the hands of the landowners and, what's more, they could also retain one-third of the extracted minerals. In one stroke, he significantly increased the amount of both gold and silver being dug up. The mining towns (Besztercebánya / Banská Bystrica today, Körmöcbánya / Kremnica, Nagybánya / Baia Mare, Selmecebánya / Banská Štiavnica) annually produced 2,000 to 2,500 kg. of gold -- or about three quarters of the amount extracted in Europe. It was due to the increase in mineral extraction that, in 1336, Charles Robert ordered the minting of the Magyar golden forint, which became one of the most trusted coins in Europe for centuries. He encouraged trade and the development of towns through certain exemptions and rights. In the interest of increased trade -- foreign trade in particular -- Charles Robert carried out an active foreign diplomacy. Since trade from Central Europe toward the West was impeded by Vienna's right to halt [and tax-*ed.*] all shipments, in 1335 Charles Robert convened a meeting of kings at his court in Visegrád -- attended by the Czech and Polish rulers -- and agreed on a new trade artery (Buda-Nagyszombat / Trnava -Brünn / Brno). On the whole, we can state that the reforms of Charles Robert were successful, leaving

a strong, stable country to his successor on his death in 1342. (Draskóczy I. 1992)

The oldest son of Charles Robert, Louis I (1342-1382), continued his father's activities in increasing commerce and trade. However, his real actions revolved around his foreign wars. In his reign, he waged the following wars: three with Venice over possession of Dalmatia (1345-1346, 1356-1358, 1378-1381), the South Italian wars for the throne of Naples (1347-1350), the Bulgarian campaigns (1365, 1368), and a war against Muntenia (1375). On top of it all, in 1370, he was also crowned as King of Poland -- reigning until 1382. For all his military glories, posterity has endowed him with the name Louis the Great.

Louis died without a male heir, leading to a period of conflict between the potential successors until, finally, in 1387, Sigismund of Luxemburg (1387-1437) emerged victorious. Under his lengthy rule, the almost three century-long Turkish-Magyar conflict commenced. In the second half of the 14th century, the Turkish Empire had begun an increasingly aggressive expansion in the Balkans. The Turks dealt a defeat to the Serbian army in 1389, at the Battle of Kosovo Polje (Hung: Rigómező), which resulted in the Serb state becoming a vassal of the Empire. Sigismund attempted to halt the Turkish extension but the Crusade force he instituted -- which consisted of Magyar, French, German, Italian and Polish soldiers -- suffered a serious defeat at Nikápoly [today Nikopol in Bulgaria-*ed.*] in 1396. Hereafter, Sigismund did not start a major campaign directly against the Turks but rather tried to organize the balkan states lying South of Hungary (Bosnia, Serbia, Muntenia) into a buffer zone.

Sigismund's foreign policy interests were increasingly drawn toward western Europe, where he tried to secure additional posts, rather than the looming fight with the Turks. His western endeavors brought numerous successes as he was crowned German king in 1410, Czech king in 1420 and Holy Roman Emperor in 1433. These posts, however, came with serious obligations and Sigismund got completely embroiled in European politics (synod in Constanta, the struggle between Pope and anti-Pope, the Hussite wars). These resulted in Sigismund being away from Hungary for several years at a time, leaving the running of the country and its problems -- such as the anti-Turkish war -- to the nobles.

After Sigismund's death, the crown was inherited by his son-in-law, Albert of Habsburg (1437-1439) but the young king died of dysentery while on a campaign against the Turks. Again, a war of succession broke out until, finally, Vladislaus I (1440-1444) secured the throne. Yet, the real politician who personified the age was János (John) Hunyadi.

Hunyadi was born around 1407, to a father who migrated from Muntenia and settled in Transylvania where he received the castle of Vajdahunyad from king Sigismund in 1409. The family began to use the Hunyadi name from that point. János spent his childhood in the court of Sigismund where he gained knowledge of western and Hussite forms of warfare. During the reign of king Albert, he is given the position of Voivode [*viceroys-ed.*] of Transylvania. Parallel to Hunyadi's rise, Turkish forces make ever more

determined attempts on Hungary's borders, including increasingly frequent raids into the country. The first significant battlefield victory of Hunyadi's was against one of these raiding parties in 1442 in southern Transylvania. In 1443, he launched a successful offensive against the Turks in the Balkans. Alas, in 1444, he suffered a defeat at Varna; king Vladislaus I himself perished on the battlefield.

On the death of Vladislaus, the estates elected the four year old son of Albert I as king Ladislaus V but, while he was a minor, appointed Hunyadi as Regent. He used his period of regency to try and make his grand plan into reality: to drive out the Turks from Europe. However, at the second battle of Kosovo Polje in 1448, he suffered a crushing defeat. To add to his troubles, a group of nobles hostile to him -- led by count Cillei -- convinced the king to declare himself 'of age', forcing Hunyadi to relinquish the Regency. The Turks conquered Constantinople in 1453 and, in 1456, laid siege to the keystone of the southern Hungarian defensive system, Nándorfehérvár [today Belgrade in Serbia-*ed.*]. The fortress was held by Hunyadi's brother-in-law, Mihály (Michael) Szilágyi. Hunyadi hurried with mercenaries hired from his own purse, volunteers from the nobility and serfs and broke the siege. Shortly thereafter, the plague broke out in the camp and Hunyadi perished. However, the victory under Belgrade ensured that the Turks made no attempts to attack Hungary for the next 70 years. In memory of Hunyadi's victory, and as encouragement for future battles, the pope, Callixtus III, ordered that church bells be rung at noon, every day, in all of Christendom.

After Hunyadi's death, the struggle between competing groups of nobles revived, resulting in the beheading of Hunyadi's older son, László; the king, Ladislaus V also died suddenly. In the end, the mass of the lesser nobility, siding with the Hunyadi family, forced the upper nobility in 1458 to elect Hunyadi's younger son, Mátyás (Mathias), as king.

During his reign, Mathias (1457-1490) strove to strengthen the central authority and power of the crown. (Draskóczy I. 2000) In practical terms, this meant a significant trimming of the powers of the nobles. To this end, he introduced a number of edict: instead of the higher nobility, he selected members of the lower estates -- and even commoners -- to fill the positions in his administration / council; secondly, he raised the much-feared Black Army [named after the color of their armor-*ed.*], the core of a mercenary, standing army loyal to himself; thirdly, he introduced a new taxation system with which his revenues increased significantly. In 1476, Mathias married Beatrix, the daughter of the king of Naples, who brought with her the Renaissance to Hungary. A regal palace was built in Buda and Visegrád in the Renaissance style and Italian intellectuals and artist were frequent visitors to his court. His fabled library held 2,500 volumes, the Corvinas.

Mathias waged war twice against the Turks retaking the fortress of Jajce in central Bosnia in 1464 and the stronghold of Szabács [Šabac, today in Serbia-*ed.*] in 1476. It is a logical question to ask why Mathias waged only these two minor campaigns against the Turks when he was embroiled in almost permanent warfare in the West? According to Hungarian historians, Mathias

came to the conclusion that the strength of Hungary, standing by itself, was insufficient for a large-scale and successful offensive against the Turks. To be able to defeat the Turks, a large and powerful Danubian empire had to be created. This was the reason Mathias waged serious wars in the West. In 1468, he declared war on Bohemia. In 1469, a segment of the Czech estates elected him as their king, the remainder of the noble estates opted to elect Vladislav Jagiello, then king of Poland, as the king of Bohemia. Thus, in this Magyar-Czech war, the Poles joined on the side of the Czechs. Peace between the warring parties was signed in 1478; Mathias retained title to the Czech crown, along with the territories of Silesia, Moravia and Lausitz. Mathias began a war against Friedrich III, the Holy Roman Emperor, in 1482, during which his Black Army overran a large part of Austria, even occupying Vienna in 1485. Mathias even relocated his court there. He was endeavoring to have his conquests recognized by other rulers when he suddenly died in 1490.

Hungarian history remembers Mathias as one of the greatest of the Hungarian kings, for it was under his reign that medieval Hungary reached the zenith of its development, making the Kingdom of Hungary one of the most powerful force in Europe.

After the death of Mathias, the nobles, forced out of power during his reign, strove to elect a king who would be able to create a much weaker central authority than Mathias. Hence, their ballots were cast for a member of the Jagiellonian dynasty. During the reigns of Vladislaus I (1490-1516), and his son Louis II (1516-1526), central authority continued to decline. As but one example, unable to pay their salary, the famous Black Army had to be disbanded as early as 1492. In fact, during the reign of the Jagiellonian kings, the crown revenues were only half of what the treasury collected under Mathias. While the upper nobility and high clerics waged an intense war against the order of the lower nobility for political power and wealth, the Turkish forces again appeared on the country's border. In 1521, the key center of Hungary's southern defence chain, Nándorfehérvár/Belgrade, fell. This foreshadowed the fall of the medieval Kingdom of Hungary.

3. The Habsburg Era 1526-1918

3.1. A country in three parts 1526-1699

August 29, 1526 is one of the darkest days in Hungarian history. In the course of a day, a Hungarian army of 20,000 suffered a crushing defeat by the Turks in a matter of two hours: seven bishops, 28 members of the high nobility and 14,000 soldiers lost their lives. The king himself drowned in a creek [in full armor-*ed.*] while attempting to escape.

After the defeat at Mohács, the estates convened and a group voted to elect János (John) Szapolyai, voivode of Transylvania, as king, while the opposing faction voted for an Austrian grand duke, Ferdinand of the House of Habsburg. The following decade and a half was consumed with the conflict between the two claimants to the throne. In the fighting, Ferdinand I (1526-

1564) was supported by his brother Charles V, Holy Roman Emperor, while John I (1526-1540) was backed by the Turkish Sultan, Suleiman II. The situation was further complicated when John married the daughter of the Polish king from whom a son -- John Sigismund -- was born and who was elected king after John's death by his supporters. The Turks, grasping the opportunity, seized the capital of Hungary, Buda, in 1541. Thus the partition of Hungary into three became permanent for a century and a half.

The situation must be envisaged as the western and northern parts of Hungary (the remaining Kingdom of Hungary) came under the control of the Habsburg ruler; the center of the country became a province of the Turkish Empire (the part usually called 'vanquished'), while the eastern part of the country -- a portion of the Great Plains (the Partium) and Transylvania -- became the realm of prince John Sigismund. In 1570, John Sigismund signed a peace treaty with the Habsburgs, ensuring for a long time the independence of the Transylvanian Principality. In fact, the next ruling prince of Transylvania, István Báthory (1571-1586), had enough excess energy to secure the Polish crown in 1575.

The common border between the Kingdom of Hungary and the Turkish Empire, dotted with border fortifications, -- but actually deep inside Hungary -- was the scene of a century-and-a-half struggle between the Magyar and Turkish forces. During these decades, Hungary was the "protecting bastion of Christendom." This era is one of the shining periods of Magyar military history, the soldiers manning the border forts giving ample evidence of bravery. Of these, the most important: in 1532, the few defenders of the tiny fortress of Kőszeg halted the vast Turkish army on its way to lay siege to Vienna [~800 vs. 44-50,000-*ed.*], in 1552, the defenders of Eger successfully repelled the Turkish siege [2,000 vs. 200,000-*ed.*], and in 1566, Miklós (Nicholas) Zrínyi halted the Turks under the fort of Szigetvár [3,000 soldiers plus ~2,000 other men vs. ~72,000. The 75-year old Suleiman the Magnificent, leading the army, died toward the end of the siege-*ed.*]. (Kalmár J. 1990).

In 1591, the so-called Fifteen Years' War (1591-1606) broke out during which neither the Habsburgs nor the Turkish Empire were unable to claim victory. The Transylvanian Principality was also drawn into this Habsburg-Turkish war. This resulted in the sacking and burning of Transylvania by Austrian General Giovanni Basta (1601-1603). In retaliation, the Heyduks of Stephen Bocskai drove out the Habsburg imperial forces from the Northern Hungary part of the Kingdom of Hungary. Although the Sultan offered a king's crown to Bocskai, he signed a peace treaty with the Habsburgs -- the Treaty of Vienna, 1606 -- and was content to remain as the ruling prince of Transylvania (1605-1606). His successor, Gábor (Gabriel) Báthory (1608-1613), was better known for his scandals.

The next ruling prince, Gábor (Gabriel) Bethlen (1613-1629) was again of that line of Magyar rulers who politicked in European matters. In 1619, he became embroiled in the Thirty Years' War (1618-1648), on the side of the Czech protestants [Transylvania was staunch Protestant territory-*ed.*], in what was to become the struggle between European Catholics (mainly the Habsburgs)

and European Protestants. Bethlen was allied with the German Protestants in 1623, and fights successfully against the Catholic Habsburgs in 1626 as part of an England-Denmark-Holland alliance. Bethlen fought for the reunification of the Magyar state, starting from the south-east, from Transylvania.

His successor, György (George) Rákóczi I (1630-1648), continued Bethlen's European policies, signing an alliance with Sweden in 1643, leading a campaign into Moravia but, under pressure from the Turks, had to make peace with the Habsburgs. As part of this treaty, he was able to retain Transylvanian independence and the freedom of religious practice for the population of the Kingdom of Hungary.

His son and heir, György (George) Rákóczi II (1648-1660), did not calculate that, with the end of the Thirty Years' War in 1648, Transylvania's international position would decline. In 1657, he tried to secure the Polish crown -- without Turkish permission. His attempt failed; the Sultan deposed him from his throne; he died on the battlefield attempting to recapture the throne of Transylvania.

With the death of Rákóczi II, Transylvania's role as an important power came to an end, that role transferred to Hungary where the leading Hungarian political personage of the age, the poet and military leader Miklós (Nicholas) Zrínyi (1620-1664), grandson of the hero of Szigetvár in 1566, set as his goal the expulsion of the Turks. During his campaign of 1663-1664, he defeated the Turkish armies in several battles but the Habsburg ruler, instead of continuing the war, signed a disadvantageous peace treaty with the Turks in August of 1664. Subsequently, Zrínyi puts out feelers to the anti-Habsburg king of France, Louis XIV but his further actions are cut short when a wounded boar fatally gored him in a hunting accident in November of 1664. His younger brother, Péter Zrínyi, and several magnates -- the Palatine, Miklós (Nicholas) Wesselényi, Ferenc (Francis) Frangepán, Ferenc Rákóczi I -- continued the anti-Habsburg intrigue. The plot was unmasked by the Habsburgs and harsh countermeasures enacted. The majority of the leaders were executed (1670), the Protestant ministers sentenced to be galley slaves and the Hungarian soldiers manning the border forts -- although they took no active part in the plot -- were discharged. Imre (Emeric) Thököly organized a revolutionary army in 1678 from these discharged border fighters. Thököly's anti-Habsburg uprising brought success, enabling him to bring into being the independent Principality of Northern Hungary. With it, the country was torn into four.

In 1683, the Turks began a battle to lay siege to, and take, Vienna, which ended in failure. In fact, the Habsburg forces and their allies -- the Holy League [Austria, Poland, Venice and Russia-*ed.*] -- went on the counteroffensive. This was the beginning of the War from Turkish Liberation (1683-1699) during which the Habsburg forces gradually drove the Turks out of Hungary (retaking of Buda in 1688, battle of Zenta in 1697). As part of the same extended war of expelling the Turks, the Habsburgs eliminated Thököly's Principality of Northern Hungary and the Principality of Transylvania, as well. When the Habsburgs signed the Treaty of Kalovac in 1699 with the Turks, except for one region, all of Hungary was now securely under their rule.

In closing our sub-chapter, we must make note of the negative effects of the Turkish period (1526-1699), which exerted long-term effects on Hungary's history. The most serious consequence was the vast destruction effected to the network of settlements and the concomitant significant reduction in the population. Also, this population decimation affected the Magyars living along the main roads and campaign routes than the South-Slav and Romanian populations living around the periphery. To state it in other terms, as a result of the Turkish occupation, the reduced Magyar population, vis-à-vis the South-Slav and Romanian populations, began the march on the long road toward minority status.

3.2. The Era of the Habsburg Empire 1700-1867

Innentől írja Szávai prof.

00 3,2 Szávai

3.2. The Era of the Habsburg Empire 1700-1867

3.2.1. The Rákóczi Freedom Fight

During the War of the Spanish Succession, the Magyars could count of French assistance. Personal affronts and his feelings towards the peasantry helped Rákóczi to make the decision to step to the head of the uprising. The time was also auspicious. From a military perspective, the Rákóczi freedom fight was seemingly an adjunct of the War of the Spanish Succession. Rákóczi was elected as the ruling prince and, at the Diet of Ónod on June 14, 1707, the Habsburgs were stripped of the Hungarian crown. Rákóczi carried out widely dispersed diplomatic activities. After the disastrous Battle of Romhány (January 22, 1710), He was hoping to secure assistance from Czar Peter the Great. He traveled to Poland to convince the czar. In the meantime, on of his generals, Károlyi, began negotiations and, on May 1, 1711, on the plain of Majtény 12,000 soldiers laid down their arms and swore allegiance to the king. The prince did not accept the peace and, instead, chose a life of exile in Turkey. In any case, it became eminently clear that Hungary could neither be assimilated, nor was separation an option. Reorganization would have to make use of other principles, other practices.

For the Habsburgs, this is a significant turn of events. They were forced to recognize that the absolutist empire was no more. The shift in the center of gravity meant that the formerly minor holding, the empire up and down along the Danube, had become the major family estate. Charles VI, on behalf of the Holy Roman Empire, signed the 1713 Treaty of Utrecht on March 7, 1714 in Rastatt, accepting all its terms. (Gonda-Niederhauser, 1978).

3.2.2. The Outstanding Events in 18th Century Hungarian History

The dreams of Empire were replaced under Charles III with the reality of a Danubian empire, a Danubian monarchy. The members of the House of Habsburgs, Emperor Charles I and Grand Dukes Joseph and Ludwig, come to an agreement among themselves regarding the empire's constitution and extending the right of succession to the female line. The secret family compact was accepted in 1703 and came to be commonly known as the *Pragmatica Sanctio*. The monarchic union acquires a basic constitutional law in 1713 which, for its internal and external security, states its non-divisibility and the unified order of succession based on primogeniture; succession is based on inheritance by the first born male, female heirs (daughter of the last male ruler) and her offspring's subsidiary right of inheritance. This is the most important basic constitutional law until 1918; Ferenc (Francis) Deák uses it as the legal basis for his argument for the Compromise [which ended with the creation of the Dual Monarchy, Austria-Hungary-*ed.*] Charles VI, Holy Roman Emperor, was able to have the *Pragmatica Sanctio* recognized not only in the countries within his realm but around Europe, as well. Having accomplished his life's goal, he ensured the throne for his daughter, Maria Theresa.

Maria Theresa had hardly begun her reign when the Elector of Bavaria announced his claim to the throne. Thus began the war for the Austrian succession, during which Maria Theresa had to cede control of Silesia, Parma, Piacenza and Guastalla but was able to retain the Low Countries, occupied by the French during the war. In 1742, Maria Theresa creates the house, court and state chancelleries [meaning the Habsburg family's, the court's and the country's-*ed.*]; has Count von Haugwitz modernize the state's activities in the spirit of modern laws; under the tutelage of von Justi, trade is modernized; establishes a standing army with a military academies in Wiener Neustadt and the *Theresianum* in Vienna. In foreign diplomacy, an outstanding role was played by Chancellor Kaunitz, whose primary goal was the weakening of Prussia. The period of Maria Theresa represents an era of ascendancy; in 1777, the *Ratio Educationis* is published, the law regulating educational matters. Her son, Joseph II, the oldest of her sixteen children, becomes King of the Romans in 1763, then Holy Roman Emperor and co-regent of Austria in 1765, on the death of her husband [although Holy Roman Emperor but, in reality a mere prince consort-*ed.*] but the real decisions continued to be made by Maria Theresa until her death in 1780. [Joseph II went on to rule in his own right until his death in 1790-*ed.*]

The reforms of Joseph II, referred to as an 'impatient mind' by historians, were typical of an enlightened ruler. Such were his decrees of toleration, and tolerance evinced towards other religions; he blended his mercantilist economic doctrine with physiocracy, granting the peasantry personal freedom in the crown provinces of Austria. To him, the most important goal was the state, and the aim of his educational policies was the educating of reliable citizens. Concomitant to these, he issued a dictate for reforming public administration and published collected statutes covering civil rights and criminal law. The internal reforms of Maria Theresa and Joseph II helped the emergence of a unified Danubian monarchy. At the top of the house, they believed in unity

yet, at the time of Maria Theresa's death, those forces had already made their presence known which later made the continued existence of the edifice impossible. (Gonda-Niederhauser, 1978).

In the division of labor within the empire, Hungary's role was seen as becoming integrated into the framework of the Empire, which closely agrees with Leopold Kollonich's concept that he published in 1687. In his often criticized concept, he suggested establishing a manufacturing base, a well thought out taxation system and recommended the transportation and settling of German serfs in Hungary. As well, he envisioned Hungary's role as the 'bread basket' of the Empire.

External demand for Hungarian agricultural products was mainly identified by the cameralists. [Cameralism: an econo-political theory in which the public revenue was seen as the sole measure of prosperity-*ed.*] Presciently, the Empire sensed a certain slowdown and its need was, besides unification, for soldiers for future wars and adequate revenues. It is to the credit of the cameralists for recognizing the necessity of development of the Habsburg Empire and for making suggestions appropriate for their era. The main areas of activity were:

1. Creating a unified economic whole of the country. Maria Theresa, in her customs regulation of 1754, wiped out duties between Bohemia, Moravia and the Austrian provinces. There still remained a so-called 'preferential relationship' where both parties paid lower fees for goods coming from that source. Colbert introduced it in France and Turgot continued it until its totality in 1789; in 1753 in Russia; in 1834 in Prussia, with the introduction of the Zollverein. All these advocated markets for Hungarian products in the Austrian crown provinces.

2. A unified system of coinage.

3. A harmonized system of weights and measures.

Internal demand also began a slow development. Hungary at the time professed to have 750 settlements that called themselves towns -- of those, 284 were market towns which the surrounding peasantry regularly used to sell produce and make purchases. Of those, 138 filled the unique function of being the sole regional marketplace.

The cameralists did not express a great deal of interest towards agriculture but they did shine a light on it. Enlightened absolutist rulers realized the significance of state protection of the serfs, which had implications for agricultural production. Legislation governing the services expected of the peasantry were made on January 23, 1767. Its applicability extended to Hungary proper. The law unequivocally defined the 'serf lot' [granted for service or in lieu of payment for sharecropper usage-*ed.*] as the basis for the clarified suite of services and taxes. It provided legal basis for the system of land subdivision and ownership, while making services proportional to holdings; stabilized the sharecropper's labor due to a landowner and returned remuneration in-kind; laid the foundation for state taxation. The language of the legislation was unified, the publications identical in every settlement and in the language of the inhabitants of those settlement. (Gyimesi, 2006).

3.2.3. The Opening Decades of the 19th Century and the Age of Reform

The opening decades of the 19th century ended with the events and coda of the Napoleonic era. European accord and several alliances were unable to defeat Napoleon; for Central and Eastern Europe, it meant a prosperity fuelled by grains. Napoleon defeated the Magyar insurgents on June 14, 1809 outside Győr, crossed the Danube to his next victory at Wagram. His ambitions were ended at Waterloo, defeated by the coalition which imposed a peace and order that governed world politics for decades.

The Congress of Vienna, in 1815, re-drew the map of Europe based on dynastic politics and the concerted reciprocity of the five big powers. (Kleinschmidt, 2000) In this network of European alliances, the Habsburg Empire became a member of the ruling pentarchy, while its substantial component, Hungary, became one of its constituents. The position of the Habsburg Empire is demonstrated that, out of Napoleon's empire, it received as spoils Milan, Lombardy and Venice. (Pounds, 2003) On the other hand, the Austrian half of the Empire was omitted from the German customs union (1834), and Austrian reform attempts to enlarge the union met with failure at the meeting of rulers in Frankfurt in 1863 due to Prussian opposition.

The age of reform in Hungary is the decades that preceded the revolution and freedom fight of 1848-49, which recognized the necessity of change and need for social reform. Its most important personages were: István (Stephen) Széchenyi, János Kossuth, Miklós (Nicholas) Wesselényi, Ferenc (Francis) Deák, Mihály (Michael) Táncsics, László (Leslie) Lovassy and the youthful representatives of the Diet. Here we witnessed the birth of nationalism, marching along in lock-step towards a modern economy. Count István (Stephen) Széchenyi dedicated his *magnum opus*, Hítel (Credit), "to the more congenial ladies of our Country." In his work, in the chapter headed "What must be done," he points to credit [really, the lack of it-*ed.*] as the chief reason why the Hungarian landowner is poorer than he ought to be, given the size of his holdings. The laws of April 1848, freeing the serfs, codified the end of personal indenture, which came to be with legalized equality before the law and the abolition of the landowner's court (this last extended not only sharecroppers and indentured servants but estate domestics, as well). The majority of Hungarian population at this time were small time artisans and craftsmen: weaving and textile manufacture were the most important branches, as were sewing, embroidery, decorating ceramics, etc. Article 9, law 1836:VII began to weaken feudalism in the area of manufacture. Imperial and royal patents, especially law 1840:XVII, further lessened the basis of the guild system. Thus, Hungarian capital-dependent industrial development could not emerge out of neither the guild system nor the artisan model, having to look for a different model than those used elsewhere in the West or East-Central Europe. Hungarian industry requiring capital was aided in its development by armament production associated with the wars with France and with industrial growth in the Austrian crown provinces. (Széchenyi, 1991)

In the spring of 1848, Europe was in flames, Budapest was the same. It was the region's national awakening, then struggle, for independence through peaceful, later armed, means. The nationalistic, economic and social tensions rose to the surface -- initially peacefully -- culminating in the April laws of 1848. It was significant in Hungary's potential evolution into a country. The first independent Hungarian government was organized under Count Lajos (Louis) Batthyány. With regard to common law, the *Pragmatica Sanctio* remained in effect in Hungary. But, a whole string of questions remained unanswered.

The Magyar government had to organize armed resistance as the Ban of Croatia [viceroy or governor-*ed.*], Jellasics, crossed the Drava River on September 11, 1848 and urged the populace to take up arms. The National Defence Committee was formed. The self-defence battles, initially against Jellasics in the South, then Windischgrätz from the West, were undertaken by the government yielding outstanding victories in the spring campaign. The motion to strip the Habsburgs of their claims to the throne was accepted on April 13, 1849; Kossuth becomes Governor-President, Bertalan Szemere becomes Prime Minister. In the end, in the spirit of the Holy Alliance, Czar Nicholas I comes to the aid of Emperor Francis Joseph in July of 1849. Outnumbered, the Magyar forces, under Arthur Görgey, lay down their arms in front of the czarist forces at Világos on August 13, 1849. Retribution was swift: Batthyány was executed by firing squad in Budapest and 13 generals were shot or hung in Arad. Masses of high ranking officers and civil servants were sentenced and incarcerated in Austrian jails. Kossuth chose emigration. (Gonda- Niederhauser, 1978)

Without question, the two most important aspects of economic reform were the freeing of the serfs and the ending of the internal customs barrier between Austria and Hungary. The customs barricade existed, separating the countries of the Kingdom of Hungary, from the Middle Ages until October 1, 1850. Free trade began after October 1 and the research of John Komlos and László (Leslie) Katus seem to suggest that the customs union benefitted both sides. (Komlos, 1990).

3.3. The Era of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy 1867-1918

3.3.1. The Birth of Dualism

The period after the revolution and fight for freedom was followed by the Bach regime, which carried out strong repressive and centralizing actions. There were debates over the future organization of the empire. For Interior Minister Bach, the ideal state was a central bureaucracy supported by the military. The new constitution, enacted on December 20, 1851, defined the Emperor's powers as absolute. After Bach's dismissal, a string of neo-absolutist reforms saw the light of day, one of the most significant of which was the Imperial Diploma of October 1860. It introduced, in place of the former absolutism, a constitutional system, in form at least. It restored the regional boundaries and the Hungarian, Transylvanian and Croatian Diets. The

arrangement was a step on the road toward dualism. The immediate rejection of the diploma persuaded Francis Joseph to name Baron Anton Schmerling as head of the government in December of 1860. In the end, the opposition forces publish the February Patent on February 26, 1861 as a solution of necessity. The document can not be seen as a continuation on the road to dualism. Its goal was the restoration of the ancient constitutions of Hungary, Transylvania and Croatia.

It is to Deák's eternal credit that, in his speech replying to the Emperor's regulation, he again stakes out Hungary's position in the Habsburg Empire. Basing his reasoning on the validity of the *Pragmatica Sanctio*, he reasoned that Hungary, in the form as recognized by the House of Habsburg, is an equal entity with Austria. This he was finally able to get the Emperor to accept, after numerous political articles and through diplomatic channels after initial setbacks. On February 16, 1867, the Emperor reinstated the Hungarian constitution and named an accountable Hungarian ministry. The preparations for the compromise were over.

Statute XII of 1867 stated that the Habsburg Empire is constituted of two states, the Kingdom of Hungary and the Austrian Empire, both countries have their own parliaments, government and public administration. Only insofar as the ministries of war, foreign affairs and finance is the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy deemed to be a single monolith. The ministers of these common ministers were designated as 'Imperial and Royal' to differentiate them from their Austrian and Hungarian colleagues. The Foreign Ministry filled an important role, directing foreign policy, the diplomatic corps, also exercising jurisdiction over the consular academy in Vienna and the house, court and state archives, too. The area of responsibility of the shared Ministry of War only extended to matters relating to the military. The joint Finance Ministry was initially restricted to formulating the budget for shared items. Beginning in 1878, subsequent to the occupation of Bosnia-Herzegovina, the running of its public administration also came into its jurisdiction. (Szávai, 2004)

In practice, foreign affairs was called the Ministry of the Imperial House, whose task was the running of the Austro-Hungarian Lloyd and advocacy of the rights and representation of the German knightly order. The finance ministry contained the Chief Audit Office, which oversaw certain of the purchases and expenditures of the joint budget items of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy and prepared the balance sheets. (Konek, 1878)

The prerogatives of the [Imperial] Crown diminished with the compromise, yet the rights of the countries of Cisleithania [i.e., the countries of the Empire West of the River Leitha, forming the border between Lower Austria and Hungary-ed.] that remained were:

- 3 high command of the military,
- 4 the right to make international agreements,
- 5 the right to convene and prorogue representative bodies,
- 6 the right of assent to, and proclamation of, laws,
- 7 the right to enact emergency decrees, and
- 8 the right to appoint ministers, members of the Upper House and

viceroys.
(Brauneder, 1994).

3.3.2. The Problems of Dualism

Looking at the centrifugal and centripetal forces in action, it was clear that the nationality issue would remain unsolved. In 1880, the proportion of Hungarians whose mother tongue was Magyar was below 50%, by 1900 it rises to 51.4% and in 1910 it is 54.4%. Of the joint Austro-Hungarian statistics of this census, it became evident that the Monarchy encompassed 49 million people, of which a mere 23.4% were German, 19.6% Magyar and the remaining 57% was split among nine nationalities; only the Czechs achieved more than 10%. Subsequent shifts in proportion can partially be explained by differing birth rates, assimilation and emigration to explain changes to benefit the Magyars. In 1910 Hungary, the largest minority groups were the Romanians with 16.1%, the Slovaks with 10.7% and the Germans with 10.4%.

One of the most significant internal rifts was caused by stirring national consciousness and a desire for the creation of national equality. (Jászy, 1983) The continued existence of a country is ensured by the objective alignment of nationality and state interests, as well as the effectiveness of a country's external manifestations. For the eleven constituent nationalities of the Monarchy, this objective alignment was lacking; the relationship of nationality and country a subjective actuality: a function of acquiescence and experience.

In judging the external situation, the sense of danger was in the forefront. Within the Monarchy, the success of a nationality was based on certain power criteria. Of the eleven nationalities within the Monarchy, none possessed a significant majority: the proportion of the Austrian-Germans was barely above 20% and, combined with the almost same proportion of Magyars, together barely exceeded 40%. While there were symptoms of isolation among the Austrian and Magyar circles, the others took a wait-and-see attitude and saw their future aspirations unchanged within the confines of the Monarchy. All this they did not do without reciprocity: there were definite and strict terms attached to their "allegiance" and they worked out various sized autonomy plans. These autonomy plans did not find a receptive audience in Vienna or Budapest. The Austrians acknowledged Dualism out of necessity and refused to hear of any federalization of Cisleithania. The Magyars, on the theory of "one political nation," rejected any suggestion of territorial dismemberment through regional autonomies -- the sole exception made for Croatia. (Diószegi, 2000).

3.3.3. Hungary in the First World War

The forces of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy were committed on several fronts, not only the major ones. The armies were especially engaged in the Italian and Balkan theaters. Already in the first year, there were signs of fatigue. One of the greatest economic problem was the extremely high manpower losses and its attendant lack of manpower in the workforce, both in

agriculture and industry alike. The peace-time manpower of the Imperial and Royal army was 450,000; 1916 saw 4.9 million in uniform, rising to 5.1 million by 1917. Hungary provided 46.6% of the joint army, meaning that circa 2.5 million men were drafted.

According to some estimates, the four years of war cost Hungary 32bn. Koronas as opposed to peacetime expenditures of 18bn. Koronas and is equivalent to 43.3% of government revenues. The war expenditures consumed two and a half years' worth of national revenue. This means no more or less -- if we take into consideration the reduced industrial and agricultural output during the hostilities -- than that, at the very least, three quarters of the national revenues were consumed by the pointless and bloody sacrifice. That said, the Hungarian soldier showed his mettle, acquitting himself in battle under difficult circumstances. (Szávai, 2004)

4. The Horthy Era 1919-1945

4.1. Internal Political Traits of the Horthy Era

After the fall of the Hungarian Soviet Socialist Republic (August, 1919), of the groups competing for power, Admiral Miklós (Nicholas) Horthy received the confidence and backing, contingent on the preservation of democratic voting rights. (Juhász, 1988) according to the general tendency of the age, dictatorships appeared in Europe, whose operating practices differed widely from each other. The Horthy regime is usually held to be similar to the Portuguese and Polish regimes, operating in a sharply different manner from the German and Italian models. In its internal policies, after a period of consolidation, it successfully restored the economy; Kunó Klebelsberg, Minister of Education, instituted serious cultural reforms, spending significant amounts from the GDP on education.

With regard to the political institutions of the regime and their performance, the form of the Horthy era can be described as a limited, civil parliamentarian system containing autocratic elements. In a certain sense, the Liberal institutions, multi-party system, a parliament and a government accountable to parliament, sovereignty of the judicial and a pluralist intellectual and religious life are all carry-overs from the forms developed in the Dualism period. Historiography has more and more turned away from the categorical opinion that the Horthy regime was a neo-Fascist system. After 1945, the regime was branded as Fascist and semi-Fascist and a dictatorship but these labels were applied for other reasons.

If, however, we take a look at the options and freedom of action that the country had available at the time, perhaps we arrive at a different interpretation. Above all else was the exemplary educational policy, and the proportion of revenues directed at it, followed by the economic policies under Bethlen. Fundamentally, the regime can be interpreted in different time periods, phases and circumstances, whose important international goals were the consolidation

of the infrastructure and the reclaiming of international recognition and acceptance. In this instance, the idea of revisionism [restoration of the borders to pre-WWI-*ed.*] posed as a serious problem, which we can only judge from a contemporary perspective. (Romsics, 1999) Economic historical research prove the results shown by developments in the Hungarian military industries, the drop in unemployment and the beginnings of industrial growth in the years leading up to WWII.

4.2. External Political Traits of the Horthy Era

Subsequent to the dissolution of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy, the first foreign diplomacy success came from the execution of the plebiscite in Sopron and vicinity, ordered by the arbitrators of the Austrian Republic. The resultant vote indicated that a majority of residents opted to stay with Hungary, rather than be annexed to Austria. Austria respected the outcome.

Hungary was accepted into the League of Nations on September 18, 1922. Obviously, one condition of acceptance was recognition of the terms of the Treaty of Trianon. Since the actions of the League regarding minorities and the guarantees given them did not operate all that well -- if at all -- the economic and political plans proposed did not find resonance, rather, they raised objections from one or other Great Power. For Hungary, there was no possible alternative to revision. Initially, foreign diplomatic ties drew Hungarian towards Britain, Italy, finally Germany. One option was cooperation with the victors, the other was alliance with the defeated countries. This second was especially successful under the premiership of Gyula (Julius) Gömbös, culminating in joining the Tripartite Pact [Germany, Italy, Japan-*ed.*] Gömbös stood for a program of modernization, which, understandably, gave hope to the majority of the populace as it offered something to everyone, promised some concrete improvements. It did achieve a positive improvement towards the government. In the meantime, Hungary also withdrew from the League of Nations.

Territorial changes often bring up thoughts of the disappearance of countries and the concept of continuity. Of utmost importance is the acceptance of the new borders by other countries. This is not the case with territory acquired by revision.

The Munich Pact was signed on September 29, 1938 between Germany, the United Kingdom, France and Italy. Its essence was the annexation of the Sudetenland to Germany and a common, precise agreement on the expatriation of non-Germans [ethnic cleansing in our times-*ed.*]. This territorial granting, or ceding, happened with the co-operation of Great Britain and France and later brought grave consequences. Hitler made use of the territorial demands and counter demands of the small countries of East-Central Europe to wring an increasing number of political and economic, later military, concessions from them. This weapon turned out to be effective: both Slovakia and Romania had counter-claims against the first and second Vienna Arbitral Awards, which, for Hitler, was a threatening weapon against Hungary. (Halmosy, 1966). In a supplemental note, Hungary was able to secure a possible review of the Magyar

minority in Czechoslovakia at a new four-power conference, if it had not been adequately addressed within three months.

In a matter of months, Germany broke the terms of the Munich agreement, rendering it null and void. On March 15, 1939, its armed forces entered Moravia and Bohemia and annexed it to the Reich as the Czech and Moravian Protectorate; Slovakia voluntarily becomes, through a treaty signed on March 18, a protectorate of Germany. In her book, Maria Ormos points out that the Slovaks proclaimed an independent state on March 14. Ormos called the occupation by Germany a turning point in international relations, since the unilateral German move reflected a German thinking that was no longer concerned with revision of borders but much, much more. It condemned British diplomatic appeasement attempts to failure. (Ormos-Majoros, 1998) In his book, Paul Pritz draws attention to Ernst von Weizsäcker -- Under-secretary in the German Foreign Ministry between 1938 and 1943 -- who suggested in December of 1939, after the German-Soviet non-aggression treaty, that Europe should be divided into German and Soviet spheres of interest. (Pritz, 1997) In early 1940, the Phony War ended and German forces were victorious on the field of battle in May and June of 1940. Germany exercised control over the European economy all the way to the Soviet border. (Fülöp-Sipos, 1998).

With the inclusion of the occupied territories, an expanded German economic market was created, which was directed according to military-strategic needs. German strategy changed significantly during 1942 with regard to the method of exploitation of the captured territories; these now became parts of the 'European military economy.' At Hitler's repeated insistence, Foreign Minister István (Stephen) Csáky presented a letter to the Secretary General of the League of Nations on April 11, 1939, announcing that Hungary was withdrawing from its membership.

Since France and Great Britain acceded to the Polish and Hungarian demands contained in the Munich Agreement, Hungary did not object to the terms of the First Vienna Arbitral Award. Nothing was raised after reclaiming Sub-Carpathia because that made a common Polish-Hungarian border possible - - something vigorously urged by the Polish government. In any event, through an independent military action and within the framework of the dismemberment of Czechoslovakia by Germany and Slovakia, Hungary acquired territory populated mostly by Ukrainians.

At the time of the Second Vienna Arbitral Award, Great Britain was at war with Germany. The British government saw no reason in providing aid to any potential ally of Hitler. (Ormos-Majoros, 1998) Discussions between Romania and Hungary regarding territory to be handed back began on August 16, 1940 in Turnu-Severin but quickly broke down by August 24. The second Vienna decision took place on August 30, 1940 under whose terms Hungary was restored the territories of Northern Transylvania and Szeklerland. The League of Nations did not recognize the second Vienna arbitral action, either. During the process of the Second Vienna Arbitral Award, because of the proceedings of the German and Italian arbitration judges, Prime Minister Teleki was confronted with the failure of his foreign policy. (Fülöp-Sipos, 1998)

The final territorial gain took place in the spring of 1941 -- under the proclamation and battle order of Governor Horthy, dated April 10, 1941 -- when, in cooperation with German military forces (between April 11 and 16) in the occupation of Yugoslavia, Hungary repossessed its former territories of Bacska and the Mura region. According to Hungarian data, the reclaimed land represented 55.2% of lands given to the South Slav country in 1918. (Tilkovszky, 1982).

5. The Period of the Communist Dictatorship 1945-1990

5.1. An Attempt at a People's Democracy 1945-1948

The initial period of the era of people's democracy in Hungary still held out the possibility of an independent development. Of course, with the presence of the Soviet Army, this option was highly questionable. On January 20, 1945, the temporary government signed the Moscow cease fire agreement. This also covered the topic of borders, recognizing the December 31, 1937 borders. The Allied Control Commission was dominated by Soviet presence, and Hungary was assigned a precise role in Soviet plans. Its position in the 'cordon sanitaire' between East and West sealed Hungary's fate. [Geography is history-*ed.*] The Allies again acknowledged, as they had during the war, the economic, political and strategic right of the Soviet Union over the occupied territories, hence over Hungary. The reward for the Soviet Union's concessions over the occupied Italian and German territories was a free hand to exert Soviet dominance over Hungary within the framework of SZEK [Szövetséges Ellenőrző Bizottságok / Allied Control Commission-*ed.*] This is one reason why, when the November 1945 elections returned a significant majority for the Smallholders Party, a coalition government was formed. Since it wished to exercise power on a proportional basis, the Smallholders Party began to put its proportionality plans into effect; to prevent it, the Leftist Bloc was formed on March 5, 1946, made up of the members of the rest of the coalition. The 10-party coalition was successful against the Smallholders Party in the 1947 elections and, with the help of voting fraud, the MKP [the Hungarian Communist Party-*ed.*] won. At the county level, victorious opposition parties were next to be dealt with, making use of the precept of the 'salami tactic.' The Civil Democratic Party, religious based parties, radical parties, peasant parties were all liquidated one by one. The Hungarian Workers Party emerged from this process in 1948, made up of the membership of the Social-Democrat and Communist parties.

The Hungarian preparations for the Paris Peace Accord turned out to be full of illusions, since there were hopes for the withdrawal of the Red Army and perhaps some territorial readjustments based on the national self-determination of people. Demonstration of sovereignty demanded that the peace treaty be signed before membership in global bodies (United Nations) could be entertained. Hungary's place in this international constellation was only a question of time but it could, and did, immediately become a member of the Soviet alliance. There was no chance for a third way. At the multi-party elections on August 31, 1947, the Communist Party emerged victorious, leading to its merger with the Social-Democratic Party, which eventually led to a one party system. The election did not present an opportunity for a vote to the

Magyars arriving from Czechoslovakia under a population exchange agreement, nor to the Germans of Hungary who were in the process of being deported. The measures taken in the terrible economic circumstances for attempted homogenization and assigned responsibility based on collective guilt were, without a doubt, deleterious. Due to geo-political and organizational characteristics, Hungary was integrated into the eastern bloc in a role as a client state in the Soviet Empire. This dependence in economic, political and cultural spheres became evident as the 'elite' scrambled to ape Soviet successes and examples. The amount of war reparations was, in the meantime, crushing, as was the daunting task of re-organizing and re-starting life after the war's devastation. As a reaction to the Horthy regime, there was a turnover in the 'elite' and insider groups. (Fülöp-Sipos, 1998) The potential for a third way, such as the Danish model, could not emerge.

5.2. The Communist Dictatorship 1948-1990

The one party state, show trials and the actions of the secret police led to countless unlawful acts. The former civil elites were essentially destroyed through deportation and nationalization of assets. The secret police initially searched for war criminals, then began to collect information on those opposed to Sovietization, inventing false accusations, supported by false evidence. The intent was to force a self-incriminating confession. The regime's aim was the expansion of heavy industry, at the expense of agricultural investment. The natural endowments of the country were ignored, expertise was ignored; a new elite emerged based only on political reliability and party loyalty -- such was the cadre, or core, of the new regime.

Persecution and B-listing became the norm. Agricultural collectivization was pushed, assets held collectively became of decisive importance. The show trials were meant to represent the regime's legitimacy in every other socialist country. The first victim in Hungary was László (Leslie) Rajk who was arrested on May 31, 1949 and accused of being an imperialist [American-*ed.*] spy. His 'confession' was aired on public radio. He was executed on October 15, 1949; the case saw 141 people arrested, 14 executed, 11 sentenced to life imprisonment and 38 jailed. The Sovietization of Hungary was complete. (Romsics, 1999)

After Stalin's death (1953), the rejection and unmasking of the cult of personality exerted its influence over Hungary, forcing Party Secretary Mátyás (Mathew) Rákosi to cede his role and power. Imre Nagy tried to effect reforms in the economy and consumer goods but his time was limited. By 1955, the restoration of the previous model was essentially complete. This is what led to the revolutionary events of 1956, which clearly displayed the intent to change the Stalinist forms and formulas. Imre Nagy was again propelled into power. His immediate goals were the introduction of a multi-party system and the removal of the Soviet Army from Hungary. The world's strongest armed force faced off against a handful of revolutionaries. The first skirmish was unsuccessful; there was no infantry support. On a parallel track, the Suez Crisis obviously tied down

a part of the forces of the international blocs. Now, Imre Nagy appealed to the Security Council of the United Nations (November 1, 1956) to have Hungary's neutrality recognized. American diplomacy was now in a delicate position. The United States, up until now the supporter of oppressed nations, retreated and recognized the status quo that has emerged in the region. The US president and heads of France and England would have been amenable to such a decision but the American Minister of State played a waiting game, delaying as long as possible, until the issue never made it on to the Security Council agenda.

On November 4, the Soviet Army made the decision -- the Hungarian Freedom Fight failed. Allegedly at the suggestion of Tito, the Central Bureau's choice fell on János (John) Kádár who, after long convincing arguments, accepted the post -- not realizing that the job would last more than 33 years. The return to orthodoxy claimed many victims: Imre Nagy, Pál (Paul) Maléter and Miklós Gimes were executed on June 16, 1958 and Hungary's mandate in the United Nations was suspended. The process proceeded under the greatest secrecy, at the same time, they were show trials same as pre-1956. József (Joseph) Szilágyi (politician) was executed previously, while Géza Losonczy (Minister of State in the short-lived Nagy government) died in jail while being force fed. We still have no clear information regarding the late and draconian sentences. (Romsics, 1999) Some of the children of the uprising were jailed until they reached the age of majority -- and then were executed.

After 1956, Kádár did not pick up the threads of the Rákosi era. Instead, he created a sort of soft dictatorship. Since the edict of Moscow's amnesty was still a way off, there was nothing else to do but cultivate closer contacts in the third world. Kádár held himself as having no talent for diplomacy but soon learned the craft. He had to walk a tightrope between internationalism and nationalism but it was his dedicated opinion that communism could not be built without the Soviet Union. He had an especially close relationship with Khrushchev and, after 1964, with Brezhnev. It was on the basis of the Brezhnev doctrine that Hungarian forces took part in the united Warsaw Pact action in Czechoslovakia to put down the Prague Spring. To Kádár, this presented a dilemma as he had cordial relations with Dubcek.. It suspended, but did not entirely stop, the economic reforms of 1968. (Magyarország helye a 20. századi Európában, 2002)

Since economic contact with the west was becoming more and more important, after the general amnesty [for the ~220,000 who escaped during or after the revolution and were sentenced *in absentia-ed.*] in the mid-sixties, diplomatic and economic relations were normalized with the leading western countries. Naturally, Hungary had to take part in the eastern economic, political and military integration. During the seventies, Hungary wished to play the role of mediator in any international conflict, although the period is better known for the emergence of peaceful coexistence, the loosening of rigidity by the blocs. Typical behavior was 'bloc neutrality' and the beginning of a movement of **non-aligned nations. ??? Szabi ba, errol ma mar tudjuk, hogy egy Szoviet propaganda front volt Indira Ghandi es masoknak.** The Conference on Security and Co-operation in 1975, held in Helsinki, was the high point of

détente with its Helsinki Declaration. It was also the beginning of Hungary's premeditated, planned road into ruinous debt.

Kádár supported a peaceful coexistence between the two camps. By the eighties, Kádár was seen by western leaders as the venerable old man of the eastern bloc. Then Brezhnev died in 1982, followed by several short-term Soviet leaders. By the time Gorbachev rose to power in March of 1985, the situation had changed significantly. An inexorable course of action had begun, the process of dissolution of the Soviet Union. This, of course, contributed significantly to the eventual independence of Central European countries and their reintegration into the world economy.

In Hungary, Kádár was removed from his party secretary position in May, 1988 and pensioned off to the ceremonial post of president of the Hungarian Communist Party. On June 16, 1989, Imre Nagy and his fellow martyrs were ceremonially re-buried; Kádár himself died shortly after, on July 6. József (Joseph) Antall forms the first democratically elected government on May 23, 1990; the COMECON is disbanded on June 28, 1991 -- followed shortly by the nullification of the Warsaw Pact on July 1. Regime change begins and Hungary gets an opportunity to join the western half of Europe. (Magyar külpolitika a 20. században, 2004).

Bibliography

- Brauneder, Wilhelm: Osztrák alkotmánytörténet napjainkig. 6. kiadás. Fordította: Kajtár István. JPTE Állam- és Jogtudományi Kar. Pécs, 1994.
- Diószegi, István: Az Osztrák-Magyar Monarchia. *História*, 9-10. szám, 2000.
- Diószegi, István: Az Osztrák-Magyar Monarchia külpolitikája 1867-1918. Vince Kiadó, Tudomány – Egyetem sorozat. Budapest, 2001.
- Fülöp, Mihály-Sipos, Péter: Magyarország külpolitikája a XX. században. Aula. Budapest, 1998.
- Gonda, Imre - Niederhauser, Emil: Habsburgok. Budapest, 1978.
- Gyimesi, Sándor: Utunk Európába. A magyar és az európai gazdaság viszonya a honfoglalástól a 20. század elejéig. 5. kiad. Nemzeti Tankönyvkiadó. Budapest, 2006.
- Halmosy, Dénes: Nemzetközi szerződések. Közgazdasági és Jogi Könyvkiadó. Budapest, 1966.
- Jászy, Oszkár: Az Osztrák-Magyar Monarchia felbomlása. Gondolat Kiadó, 1983.
- Juhász, Gyula: Magyarország külpolitikája 1919-1945. Harmadik, átdolgozott kiadás Budapest, 1988.
- Kincses, László: Diplomáciatörténet. Acta Wenzeliana 2. sz. ELTE ÁJK Egyetemes Állam- és Jegtörténeti Tanszék. Budapest, 2005.
- Kleinschmidt, Harald: A nemzetközi kapcsolatok története. Athenaeum. Budapest, 2000.
- Komlos, John: Az Osztrák–Magyar Monarchia mint közös piac. Maecenas Kiadó, Budapest, 1990.
- Konek, Sándor: Magyar Birodalom statisztikai kézikönyve folytonos tekintettel Ausztriára. Franklin Társulat. Budapest, 1878.
- Ormos, Mária-Majoros, István: Európa nemzetközi küzdőtérén. Osiris. Budapest, 1998.
- Magyarország helye a 20. századi Európában: Tanulmányok. Szerk.: Sipos Balázs és Zeidler Miklós közreműködésével – Pritz Pál. Magyar Történelmi Társulat. Budapest, 2002..
- Magyar gazdaságtörténeti szöveggyűjtemény XVIII-XX. század. Szerk.: Czoch Gábor, Pogány Ágnes, Szávai Ferenc, Varga Zsuzsa. Főszerk.: Kövér György, Faragó Tamás. Aula. Budapest, 2003.
- Magyar külpolitika a 20. században: Tanulmányok. Szerk.: Gazdag Ferenc, Kiss J. László. Zrínyi Kiadó. Budapest, 2004.
- Pounds, Norman J. G.: Európa történeti földrajza. Osiris. Budapest, 2003.
- Pritz, Pál: Pax Germanica. Német elképzelések Európa jövőjéről a második világháborúban. In.: Integrációs törekvések Közép- és Kelet-Európában a 19. és 20. században. Szerk.: Romsics Ignác. Teleki László Alapítvány. Budapest, 1997.
- Romsics, Ignác: Magyarország története a XX. században. Osiris. Budapest, 1999.
- Szávai, Ferenc: Az Osztrák-Magyar Monarchia felbomlásának következményei. Az államutódlás vitás kérdései. Pro Pannonia. Pécs, 2004.
- Széchenyi, István: Hitel (reprint). Közgazdasági és Jogi Könyvkiadó. Budapest, 1991.
- Tilkovszky, Loránt: Revíziós sikerek, problémák, csalódások. *História*, 4-5. sz., 1982.

Bibliography

- Bertényi I.: A tizennegyedik század története. Pannonica Kiadó, Budapest, 2000.
Draskóczy I.: A lilium jegyében. Magyarország krónikája 4. Adams Kiadó, 1992.
Draskóczy I.: A tizenötödik század története. Pannonica Kiadó, Budapest, 2000.
Erdélyi I.: A magyar honfoglalás és előzményei. Kossuth Kiadó, Budapest, 1986.
Kalmár J.: Magyarország története a 16-18. században. Ikva Kiadó, Budapest, 1990.
Kristó Gy-Makk F.: A kilencedik és tizedik század története. Pannonica Kiadó, Budapest, 2000.
Tóth István György: Három ország egy haza. Magyarország krónikája 7. Adams Kiadó.