

***THE HUNGARIAN QUARTERLY* 1936–1941. HUNGARIAN PROPAGANDA FOR GREAT BRITAIN BEFORE THE SECOND WORLD WAR**

TIBOR ZS. LUKÁCS

Central European University, Budapest, and Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest,
Hungary

1. The Start of *The Hungarian Quarterly*

The Great Depression in the 1930s transformed the European power structure that had been arranged by the peace treaties after the First World War. Germany, which remained intact and potentially the strongest power of Europe both economically and militarily, started to catch up with France and Britain, threatening French continental hegemony and with this the entire post-war settlement. For France safety seemed to lie in the enforcement of the Treaty of Versailles while British policy tended to seek reconciliation with Germany through a mild application or a revision of the treaty.

The main object of Britain's and France's political activity in 1933 and 1934 was an agreement on disarmament. The impulse for this came from Britain, which was reluctant to participate in a renewed arms race, when the revival of militant German policy made this task urgent. Though disarmament negotiations had many disadvantages for France, the existing power structure could no longer be imposed on Germany except by force, which France could not use without British support.

The call for the revision of treaties meant, primarily, territorial readjustment of the Polish–German border and the frontiers of Hungary. The two victorious powers, which offered smaller or greater diplomatic support for Hungary during the interwar period, were Britain and Italy, and for fear of being isolated, France did not refuse to co-operate. Thus, in the spring of 1933 all three victors agreed that a certain improvement in the post-war settlement was desirable, and all were inclined to reconsider it.

Concerning the four power negotiations, Foreign Office documents show a surprising degree of British interest towards Hungary in 1933 and 1934; these sources help to explain the otherwise exaggerated Hungarian propaganda in Britain. At this time even Count István Bethlen himself paid a visit to Britain and gave lectures on the Hungarian question. His speeches were the first detailed, though unofficial, description of Hungarian territorial claims and Hun-

garian plans for the revision of the peace treaties. Bethlen and the Hungarian claims were refused; the Foreign Office did not find any changes to represent a better solution than the status quo established after the First World War.

There were also other reasons for Bethlen's failure. These primarily concerned the changes in international policy and fear of the events in Germany. The British government expected him to declare moderate claims in the question of frontier revision,¹ in accordance with "commonsense," by which they meant demands reflecting the real power conditions of the moment and in agreement with the sense of justice and fairness of the British public.

Aware of the expectations, the Hungarian politician tried to refer to the ethnic principle and the right of self-determination. But he always backed these accepted arguments with unaccepted ones by referring to the historic mission of Hungary in the region, justified by Magyar administrative and cultural superiority. Despite knowing perfectly well that the British would only affirm, a readjustment based on ethnic principle, Bethlen made claims for the restoration of Magyar supremacy, which implied the intention of an integral restoration of the borders of historic Hungary.

After brief hesitation, the Foreign Office decided not to receive Bethlen and not to deal with the question of frontier readjustment in the British Parliament. Austin Chamberlain, former foreign secretary, warned the government in a speech to be careful and not to support ambiguous aspirations.² The pro-Hungarian parliamentary deputies, supported by governmental policy, could not make a commitment to Bethlen's exaggerated claims and they proposed only to return those territories to the Hungarian Kingdom that had a definite Magyar majority.

Bethlen was well aware of the failure of his lecture tour. Despite the "great politeness in personal relations" and except for a few friends "willing to treat Hungary fairly," there were no signs that Britain wanted to pursue a strategic policy aimed at the revision of the treaties. He also affirmed after his return that there was no hope for territorial revision on the basis of the historic right to restore "natural borders."³ Two choices remained after the failure of the lecture tour: to reduce Hungarian claims according to the expectations of British and international policy, or to elaborate new propaganda and intensify its activity. Bethlen chose the latter, and this resulted logically from the political credo of the Magyar ruling elite.

If the neighbouring Czechoslovakia and Romania could gain the support of the victorious great powers for their ambitions within the framework of a non-functioning security structure that would soon collapse, the Magyar ruling elite, possessing a much better geopolitical position and representing 12 million people in the middle of the region, was supposed to have the same, or even better chances of being favoured in the next rearrangement. The claim for supremacy

and historic borders was not only a strategic aim of Hungarian foreign policy. As already mentioned, from tactical considerations it also demarcated itself from readjustment on ethnic principles in order to create a better ground for future negotiations.

Returning from London, Bethlen decided to organize a periodical that would deal constantly with questions of “Hungarian justice” and with the aim of preparing the English speaking public in case British and international policy would renew efforts for the revision of the peace treaties. Judging from the idea of establishing *The Hungarian Quarterly*, Bethlen was convinced that an intensified, better prepared and more widespread propaganda would create a more favourable image of Hungary and sufficiently strong support from public opinion to promote considerably the case of territorial revision in favour of Hungary against her neighbours. With a similar goal the bimonthly *Nouvelle Revue de Hongrie* had been already functioning since 1932; Bethlen was a co-chairman of the editorial board. The authors, who published in the periodical for French speaking readers and later in the new organ for the English speaking ones, were leading conservative intellectuals, centered around the Magyar Szemle Társaság (Hungarian Review Society). The editorial staff of that periodical had been established to a certain extent on the initiative of Bethlen in 1927, at a time when the prime minister was at the peak of his political career and success. *Magyar Szemle* was considered to be a semiofficial organ of the Bethlen administration, representing in the spirit of Hungarian cultural superiority the values of the post-war conservative, rightwing and anti-revolutionary Magyar political elite.⁴

At a meeting organized for the establishment of *The Hungarian Quarterly* in July 1934 Bethlen explained that the new periodical would serve the same aim in the Anglo-Saxon world as the *Nouvelle Revue de Hongrie* in the Latin-French one: the introduction of Hungary and the questions of Hungarian policy. The other duties of the new organ were to win important figures in British public life by soliciting articles and studies (with handsome fees) and to provoke debates in the British press about problems concerning Hungary.⁵

The chairman was Count István Bethlen himself. While the editor and secretary general of The Society of the Hungarian Quarterly was József Balogh, a member of the Hungarian Review Society, acknowledged scholar, philologist and expert on patristic studies with excellent British and American connections. The joint chairmen were Prince György Festetics and Gyula Kornis, Tibor Eckhardt and György Ottlik. Bethlen ensured the financial support of the organ by using his connections with the economic elite and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. He also instructed the editorial staff in political and financial questions.

Each number of the Quarterly opened with two or three studies on important questions of international policy. These were followed by articles on other, less urgent political or economic problems, and in every issue articles on living or

historic figures of public life. Then came items of more general interest, such as tourism, hunting adventures, music, art history and Hungarian literature. Without exception, each number closed with the column called Danubian Chronicle, a chronology of the political events of the last months. Although this produced rather dry reading with uncomfortably small print, it always contained more open and courageous statements, quoted from politicians, than the representative, carefully written studies on the first pages.

The first number appeared in spring 1936. The opening article was written by Bethlen who emphasized that *The Hungarian Quarterly* had "no intention of indulging in propaganda on behalf of anybody or anything; on the contrary, it was resolved to refrain from any activity of that kind, and its main purpose was to promote mutual acquaintance and mutual understanding."⁶ The editor also stressed and demonstrated the editorial independence of the Quarterly by printing a statement in each number that the editorial staff of *The Hungarian Quarterly* took "no responsibility for the views of the contributors" and did not agree with the opinions expressed in their articles.⁷ Anyone who knew Bethlen, the chairman of the editorial staff and the able coordinator of Magyar propaganda, naturally did not believe these declarations. They were no more than necessary gestures in the language of diplomacy and expressed the unofficial character of the periodical.

The Quarterly was an organic continuation of the unofficial propaganda activity of the late 1920s and early 1930s represented by Justice for Hungary and Bethlen's lectures in Britain.⁸ Its creators and directors were the best representatives of Hungarian political thought, who, playing by the rules of international politics, always controlled which aspects of their program to promote an official policy, and which to keep for unofficial publications, like *The Hungarian Quarterly*.

2. The Attempt to Keep British Interest Alive for "Hungarian Justice"

In the period from the Rheinland question to the Anschluss and the Munich Agreement in 1938, the British pursued a policy of appeasement towards Germany. Based on the German national minorities beyond Germany's Eastern borders, the British, with the aim of preserving European peace, acknowledged its just claims for rearmament and political influence.

During this time Hungarian propaganda in Britain tried to connect the Magyar endeavour with the precedents achieved by Germany in the revision of some important aspects of the post-war peace treaties. There was "really no reason why the Treaty of Trianon should be regarded as more sacrosanct than the Treaty of Versailles."⁹ By that time the general criticism of the post-war treaties

that "balkanized a great part of Europe"¹⁰ was also accepted in international diplomacy. There was "a general agreement that the peace settlement made at the close of the war was in many ways not only imperfect, but also unjust and vindictive,"¹¹ because the authors of the Treaty of Versailles had been "thinking not in terms of permanent peace, in economic cooperation, and social progress, but rather in war and its prevention."¹² The "Danubian Chronicle" quoted Bethlen on this question in the second number of the Quarterly, stating that the "removal of the injustices" of the Treaty of Versailles would "automatically involve the removal of similar injustices perpetrated by the other treaties."¹³

The most often discussed political subject in this first period of the Quarterly was the possible reformation and reorganization of the League of Nations. The Autumn 1936 issue of the Quarterly had already published replies and reactions to the articles of the previous two numbers on the topic.¹⁴ In the Winter issue three studies dealt with the reformation of the League.¹⁵ The behaviour of Italy in the Ethiopian crisis and particularly that of Germany during the Rhineland crisis demonstrated again the impotence of the international organization. Its failures worked in the interest of Hungary. As if it had been tacitly acknowledged that the post-war settlement was a false one, and the status quo should be changed to achieve greater political stability, and if it could not be rearranged with the help of the League of Nations. As Bethlen had already noted, new ways had to be found.¹⁶

The organization and functioning of the League of Nations were attacked even more harshly. During these three years more than a dozen studies on the League, mostly from British and American experts, enumerated all the arguments that could be listed in the interest of Hungary and were hostile to the League. "Nothing in the history of the previous fifteen years had justified the belief that the League could intervene with success in any matters in which the material interest of the great powers had been involved"; the League provided no protection for the small nations and "no redress for grievances"; it had brought "not collective security but collective insecurity."¹⁷ The openly pro-Hungarian Lord Newton voiced the strongest criticism against the League. He objected that although half of Europe was unsatisfied with the status quo, the articles seeking to promote the necessary changes designed to save the European peace were entirely ignored.¹⁸

By openly focusing on the interests behind the ideals, American professor of international law, Edwin Borchard specified in a comprehensive study the fundamental mistakes of the policy for the preservation of the status quo at any price. His views concerning the background to the conflicts, expressed on the surface in the name of one or another principle, are quite similar to mine. In his opinion the Covenant of the League "took no account of the fitness, propriety, desirability and practicability of the status quo, as a political redistribution of

power," nor of the fact that "it constituted a plan of reinsurance for the annexation and conquest achieved by certain powers."¹⁹ It also ignored the fact that "a political redistribution of territory in Europe, not corresponding to the natural strength of peoples, would cause economic dislocation which, with the political and psychological hostility engendered, would undermine and poison the social structure of all countries and necessarily lead to dangerous Psychosis."²⁰

After a careful, yearlong sampling of other studies on the question, István Bethlen himself published an article on the Hungarian grievances in the summer issue of 1937.²¹ In fact, after emphasizing at the start that the Quarterly was "free from any taint of propaganda," to appear in the same or next number with a study on changing the status quo would obviously have been a tactical error from the leading figure of Hungarian propaganda. In the previous number of the Quarterly, within the "Danubian Chronicle," this study had already been prepared by the publication of another article, written for Hungarian readers, where he expressed himself unambiguously in connection with the League's failures to protect Magyar minorities and the claim of Hungary for reasonable rearmament.²²

He again summarized the faults of the existing practice of the League of Nations, which could not even guarantee the fulfilment of the prescriptions of the peace treaties, since the situation of Hungary was much worse in many respects than the treaties had allowed. The former victors could force anything on the former losers, while the latter could not practise their fundamental rights.²³ Bethlen, sticking with admirable objectivity to the facts, enumerated the failure of all Hungarian claims addressed to the League during the previous eighteen years. In his article he accused the international organization of not only having "failed to serve the cause of healthy evolution, by eliminating the intolerable injustices of the peace treaties," but also of having contributed "passively and sometimes even actively to making these injustices more unbearable and burdensome for the defeated states," whereby it had "failed to defend the victims when the conquering small states perpetrated fait accomplis at the expense of the former."²⁴

Though he mentioned the injuries of Magyar minorities, the emphasis was rather on rearmament. His aim was primarily to convince his readers that under such conditions the League, unable to assist should at least not block Hungary's justified claims concerning a degree of rearmament necessary for her self-defence. Germany was strong enough to realize its will, but the small loser states remained the victims of the small victors. If Germany was allowed to develop its military strength, the same could not be denied Hungary. His argument was later supported by a quotation from the speech of the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Kálmán Kánya in the next issue of the Quarterly.²⁵

György Ottlik, vice-president of the society of the Hungarian Quarterly, turned back to the League of Nations a year later in order to keep the interest in the Hungarian claims against the international organization alive.²⁶ Ottlik's study reflected the changes in international policy. Although he repeated the claim for rearmament, by that time the Sudeten-German question had become more important, further emphasizing the problems of national minorities. He argued that "even professor Seton-Watson freely admitted the League of Nations' mistakes" in connection with minority protection, the organization had "failed to make its minority guarantees a reality and to impose observance of their obligations upon the states which signed minority treaties."²⁷ Another study from a British author in the previous number called attention to the question by stating "the conditions of the larger minority groups [were] probably as bad as they had ever been since 1918."²⁸ To illustrate the dangers following from the unsolved minority problems, in the same issue of the Quarterly, the "Danubian Chronicle" quoted the speech of Tiso given on the twentieth anniversary of the Pittsburg Covenant and promising autonomy for the Slovaks demanding national independence,²⁹ while the next issue published Hennlein's claims for the German minority in Czechoslovakia.³⁰ Writing about all the negative features of the Czech minority policy and the possible solutions of the German-Czechoslovak question,³¹ the Hungarian propaganda was practically preparing the way for the expected dissolution of Czechoslovakia. This was also affirmed by a resolution of the Hungarian Frontier Readjustment League, stating that "the Magyar minority had as much right to self-determination as the Slovaks, Germans, Ruthenians and Poles."³²

Meanwhile the most important event influencing the immediate fate of the Danube Basin was the Anschluss, as a result of which Hungary became the neighbour of militant Germany. Bethlen again himself published a study on Hungary's position after the unification of Austria with Hitler's Germany. "The logic of history had to follow this course,"³³ wrote Bethlen, characterizing the natural process resulting from the fundamental desire of all Germans to unite within the framework of a nation state. Bethlen welcomed the changes and argued that "the history of the past twenty years in the Danube Basin" had been equivalent to the "dictatorship of the Little Entente based on French support," but the rise of German in the region and the union with Austria had "once and for all put an end to this state of affairs."³⁴

The Anschluss, and soon after it the deepening Sudeten-German crisis, offered a good opportunity to attract the attention of the guardians of European peace to the fact that the restoration of Hungarian domination in the region, by occupying territories in the Danube Basin before the Germans would annex them into their empire, would serve not only Magyar interests. As the multinational, neighbouring Czechoslovakia had to fail, Hungary's chances for suprem-

acy increased significantly. The new situation afforded "a great opportunity" for Hungary "to rise from the humiliation of Trianon, and once again to become an important factor in the Danubian Basin," if not "the most important" one.³⁵

Though Regent Horthy tried to calm everyone concerning the consequences of the union of the neighbouring Austria (and the *Quarterly* certainly published his speech for the English speaking pro-Hungarians),³⁶ it was difficult to hide the fact that German expansionism directly threatened Hungary and the desired Magyar supremacy. Though the Magyars had a strong position among the other smaller nations, the power of Germany could not be compared at all with that of Hungary, and any further German expansionism reduced the chances of Magyar supremacy in the Danube Basin. The question of rearrangement, possibly with the arbitration of all the Western powers, became an urging problem.

3. European Rearrangement at the Expense of Czechoslovakia

In order to preserve European peace, the Munich Agreement in September 1938 instructed Czechoslovakia to give its territories, where the Germans constituted the majority, to Germany. The great powers had decided to sacrifice a peaceful, democratic, Entente-associated country. Hungarian propaganda, deeply interested in the shaping and consolidation of the new settlement, thoroughly emphasized all the reasons that could justify this significant rearrangement.

In addition, a month later in Vienna the German-Italian arbitration gave back to Hungary those Czechoslovakian territories that were inhabited by a Magyar majority. Following the important diplomatic meeting in Munich and Vienna, the *Quarterly* dealt exclusively with Czechoslovakia in the Winter issue.

The arguments in *The Hungarian Quarterly* started by arguing for the fairness of Germany's claims, which were designed to redress the completely unfair peace treaties. The joint editor of the *Quarterly* in Britain, Professor Gooch pointed out why it had been evident from the beginning that the post-war arrangement could not be lasting, as it deprived Germany of the whole of her colonial possessions, imposed a crushing burden of reparations, forbade her to rearm, and demilitarised the Rhineland without time limit.³⁷

In comparison with Germany, Hungary had lost even more owing to the unjust Peace treaties, and the "Englishmen fully understood the feelings of Hungarians" who, while admitting that in war the loser had always had to pay, they had to pay "more than was fair."³⁸ With the Munich Agreement and the Vienna Award "the errors of Trianon had been corrected and the Hungarian parts of Hungary had returned to the mother country."³⁹

A much better and convincing study on Czechoslovakia, written by László Ottlik, focused on the inner, structural deficiencies of the multinational small state, owing to which it was doomed to fail.⁴⁰ The basic idea of the article was that democracy could not be squared with the equal rights of national minorities, because democracy by its nature is the rule of majority. The Czechs could "easily oppress all their minorities without injuring democratic laws."⁴¹ He also compared the treatment of liberal pre-war Hungary with the Czech policy towards minorities and emphasized that despite the cultural oppression Magyar liberalism had not made impossible the economic existence of the national minorities, as the Czechs and the other neighbours had.⁴² In order to assure the readers about the Magyar's unquestionable fairness in the future towards minorities, two other articles dealt with the excellent mutual cooperation of different nationalities in Upper Hungary throughout Hungarian history.⁴³

Sharp criticism, openly hostile in spirit, was published against the Czechs by Sir Thomas Cunninghame,⁴⁴ a former British Military representative in Austria and Military Attaché in Prague who had been well acquainted with the conflicts of the successor states since the breakup of Austria-Hungary. He wrote a long essay on how evident the imperialistic motivation of the Czech emigration had been before and during the peace negotiations, and how contrary to common sense the exaggerated support of the Entente towards Czech ambitions was.⁴⁵ He condemned the territorial annexations that had been based on historic and ethnic principles at the same time, as even these two principles had proved to be insufficient to justify the annexations of Magyars and Ruthens. In the view of the author, the Czech policy therefore was guilty of its own failure.⁴⁶

The exclusive responsibility of the Czechs was further emphasized in a later study on Edward Benes, which considered all the misery of the Danube Basin to be the result of the lack of foresight in Czech policy.⁴⁷ Masaryk and Benes did not want "to accept the necessity of a strong Central European power against Germany," and "made all their neighbours enemies owing to conflicts on territory."⁴⁸

The dissolution of Czechoslovakia was the common decision of the British, French and Italian governments in order to appease Germany, and the Vienna Award was considered by them an additional agreement for the sake of greater political stability in the Danube Basin. The British government officially acknowledged the readjustment of the Hungarian border as valid. The Foreign Office was satisfied that the conflict was settled without the participation of Britain and on the basis of mutual agreement between Czechoslovakia and Hungary.⁴⁹ Therefore it was no longer necessary to continue justifying the fairness of the rearrangement concerning the Hungarian-Slovakian borders with the exception of some confederation plans referring to this country as well.⁵⁰

Few months later, while the Germans were creating the Czech-Moravian Protectorate in March 1939, another part of the former Czechoslovak state, Ruthenia, returned to Hungary. This event remained almost without echo in the subsequent issues of the *Quarterly*. It happened so quickly that preparation for reannexation by propaganda was not possible, and after the event it seemed to be more tactical not to mention it. Both the ethnic principle and the right of self-determination were rudely violated, because the annexation of the Sub-Carpathian territory was executed by military force.

Despite the fact that Hungarian policy ignored the basic rules of territorial readjustment prescribed by international law, Hungary's step was accepted after the event by the Western governments, who considered Magyar expansionism more favourably than German.⁵¹ They perceived quite clearly that if Hungary would not have occupied its former sphere of interests, Germany would have done so. Ruthenia therefore was shrouded in silence; it appeared in only two or three studies on economic questions⁵² and tourism,⁵³ and did not figure among the representative articles on important problems of international politics.

4. Territorial Readjustment after the Outbreak of the Second World War

After a significant part of Upper Hungary had been returned, and starting from the Summer issue of 1939, *The Hungarian Quarterly* concentrated on the Transylvanian question. The successful previous annexations increased the self-confidence of the Hungarian propagandists who sharply attacked the Romanians with a surprisingly hostile assault. The method and tactics of reasoning were the same. The violations of the ethnic principle, the right of self-determination, and injuries to minority rights, were supported by data, statistics, facts and maps. The idea of Magyar cultural and administrative superiority increasingly found a place in the articles. As a result the tone became more and more emotional, intolerant and aggressive.

An important endeavour of Magyar propaganda was the refutation of the Romanian theory of Daco-Romanian continuity, the myth of national origin that justified the firstcomers' right for the Romanians.⁵⁴ In order to convince the readers that the Daco-Romanian theory was untrue, the studies emphasized the evidence for later Romanian immigration by analyzing legal traditions, the urban structure created by other nationalities,⁵⁵ and also by stressing the Balkan mentality, culture and traditions, the orthodox religion and Greek writing of the Romanians.⁵⁶

The history of the Transylvanian Principality during the time of the Turkish occupation provided an excellent opportunity for the studies to demonstrate the

viability of the Hungarian state idea. Namely, that the Hungarian State that had been preserved during the partition primarily by the political culture of Transylvania.⁵⁷ A study was also dedicated to English–Transylvanian connections. These in fact had for religious reasons been far more important in the seventeenth century than English political relations with the Hungarian Kingdom.⁵⁸ Protestant Transylvania had not only significant cultural ties based on student peregrinations to English universities, but also diplomatic relations with the Stuarts and Cromwell.

The outbreak of the Second World War in September 1939 necessarily brought changes to British policy toward Hungarian territorial revision. After the First Vienna Award, the Foreign Office did not in theory oppose the return of Romanian territories inhabited by a Magyar majority and acknowledged Hungary's right to these lands. But all further claims were considered unjust territorial occupation.⁵⁹

The Second Vienna Award in August 1940, which with German–Italian agreement annexed Northern-Transylvania to Hungary, was not accepted by Britain after the start of the war. Although Romania was not an ally of the British, this readjustment was not recognized as valid, because it resulted of belligerent states, hostile to Great Britain, and “His Majesty's Government could not regard to be just any territorial changes executed after September 1939.”⁶⁰

Although the Hungarian government had been following a rather pro-German policy, Prime Minister Pál Teleki, a close friend of István Bethlen and a representative of the same political course, tried to do everything to preserve the good will of Britain. He emphasized geopolitical considerations, and until his death he remained respected as the defender and symbol of democratic values against the pressure of German dictatorship.⁶¹ The tacit understanding of Britain encouraged the Quarterly to intensify its propaganda for the justification of the frontier readjustment, even as official British declarations considered the annexations questionable.

Starting with the Autumn issue in 1940 *The Hungarian Quarterly* began to solicit readers in the United States. Instead of Széchenyi's journeys in England many studies dealt with the Hungarian officers of the American War of Independence, Hungarian travellers in the United States, and Kossuth's popularity with the American public.⁶² The articles about the Transylvanian question were increasingly being directed at American readers.

The Winter number of the periodical was dedicated completely to the re-annexation of Northern-Transylvania. The enthusiastic atmosphere radiating from this issue was much stronger than after the first readjustment of the Czechoslovakian frontier. József Balogh, the editor, felt it necessary to write a foreword to the studies.⁶³ His essay, like other articles, ignored the ethnic principle and the right of self-determination, and in a surprisingly hostile spirit towards Romania strongly emphasized Magyar cultural and administrative superiority.⁶⁴ The

characteristic formulation of this idea could be found in a note by László Pas-suth, which declared "numbers and ethnographic considerations were not the only elements" in the Transylvanian problem. One also had to consider "the mysterious union of historic tradition" that had made Transylvania "the Eastern border stronghold of European civilisation."⁶⁵

An American priest examined the rights of the religious minorities. He surpassed even these emotional essays by stating that Romania, when it had taken over Transylvania, "lacked the solid, intelligent, informed middle class which she so needed," and the Romanians, who had "poured into the territory had the tradition of their own Turkish experiences."⁶⁶ The "great and most difficult task" of combining Western and Balkan cultures was not achieved by the Rumanians, who had had "neither education, nor the experience which the occasion demanded"; "as well might the state of California be given to Mexico!"⁶⁷

The longest article came from a leading expert on the subject, by Zsombor Szász, and dealt with the history of Transylvania in detail. It was filled with similar hostile emotions. The author refuted the theory of Daco-Romanian continuity, denied the latinity of Romanian culture, and criticised the policy of the Romanian national elite by constantly emphasizing the backwardness and Balkan mentality of the nomadic people.⁶⁸ Two other studies repeated the basic ideas of Szász; one by explaining the racial, religious, and linguistic aspects of Balkan Romanian culture,⁶⁹ the other by "tracing the origin and development of the Romanians."⁷⁰ The extraordinarily emotional approach of the Quarterly towards Romanian history was most characteristically expressed by László Pas-suth, who stated that the history of the Romanian Principalities had showed "no likeness to that of the Latin countries which from early medieval times onward had produced a whole array of Christian monarchies and civilisation." Unlike Hungary, "Balkan morals, hideous destitution among the lower classes, and perpetual compromises with the neighbouring Great Powers" had been the principal features in the evolution of Romania.⁷¹

In comparison with the relatively moderate start in 1936, the Quarterly, like the Hungarian press in general, lost its self-control under the influence of the quick successes by Hungarian foreign policy. Instead of facts, reasons and arguments, the greatest values of the Quarterly for British eyes at the start, emotions ruled its spirit. It published such opinions as: "Hungary did not have to demand Transylvania, as it had belonged to the Hungarians for a thousand years, and there was not a single Hungarian who did not know that one day it will return."⁷² This intolerant and aggressive tone was the worst type of propaganda, and could never be successful in Britain. The views expressed in the Quarterly were not only contrary to the intentions and interests of the British policy, and therefore contradictory to the fundamental rule of making propaganda, but also unacceptable to British taste.

5. Culture in Service of Political Propaganda

From 1936 to 1941, *The Hungarian Quarterly* increasingly became an instrument of political propaganda, and the studies on literature, music, art history, and tourism proved to be no more than an attractive wrapping to give a more acceptable form and outlook to the primarily political message.

However, these writings on geography, history, ethnography, or literature also contained, to varying degrees, ideas shared by the propagandist articles on international affairs. The mere intention of emphasizing culture fitted perfectly into the conception of Hungary's cultural superiority. Thus, the studies on Hungarian culture could neither hide, nor counterbalance the propagandistic impression which the Quarterly exercised on the readers. This proved to be especially true when its tone became more and more intolerant and aggressive after the Czechoslovakian crisis in 1938.

Most of the essays on culture were historic studies, focusing on those times and events of Hungarian history, that could contribute to the image of Hungary had enjoyed before the First World War.⁷³ Among the elements of this image most often were the striking similarity of British and Hungarian constitutional development, the traditional affinity to monarchic rule, and Hungary serving as the bulwark of Christianity against the invasions from the East, especially in the Turkish times.

Transylvania was a good example with which to demonstrate the tolerant character of the Magyars and the viability of Hungarian administrative traditions. Széchenyi, who considered the English state an ideal construction and travelled a good deal to learn and collect experiences, was a popular figure of the Quarterly. Kossuth and the 1848–49 Revolution and War of Independence were also commonly treated subjects. Széchenyi was a suitable hero for conservative readers, Kossuth for the liberals and radicals, and the events of 1848–49 fitted into the image of a liberty-loving nation fighting for its freedom against oppression. Like each topic, each study on history had its function in justifying Magyar claims for territorial revision.

One group of the studies on history tried to demonstrate the tradition of warm English–Hungarian relations and friendship.⁷⁴ The Quarterly's expert on the question was Alexander Fest, but some pro-Hungarian British aristocrats also published weak or mediocre essays on the subject.⁷⁵ This was not an easy enterprise at all, as the Magyars, quite naturally, had connections mostly with their neighbours: the Germans, Poles, or Italians.

Some articles on history dealt with the nationality problem. These argued that historic Hungary had been a peaceful place for all the nationalities for centuries,⁷⁶ and that the "harmonious fusion of so many peoples of distinctly different racial character" had been "disturbed by the French Revolution, which made

nationality the centre of community life, and identified it with language."⁷⁷ The Magyar nobility had contributed significantly to the development of Romanian literacy and alphabetization by having the Bible printed in Romanian and establishing Romanian printing presses. Tolerance, and later liberalism, had characterised the behaviour of Hungarians in Transylvania before the appearance of nationalism.⁷⁸

Together with the frequent declaration of Hungarian cultural and administrative superiority, the historic mission of Hungary was constantly emphasized. Some of these articles represented serious scholarly works,⁷⁹ others were written with a somewhat romantic approach.⁸⁰ A weak, rather low level study on Hungarian national character, focusing on the pride and liberty-loving nature of the Magyars, stated that a basic element of Hungarian mentality was "the conviction of being born to power," that the Magyar was "entitled to rule, and it was due because of the inherent values of his own personality."⁸¹

In 1938, the editor József Balogh introduced King Stephen's conception of state to the readers through a mystic and emotional interpretation in 1938.⁸² It was quite characteristic of the Quarterly when, despite a British warning that the Hungarians "read more into the foundation of their realm than was originally inherent in it," the editor declared an openly imperialistic endeavour: "St. Stephen's conception of state, the Pax Hungarica" was an "imperial idea," which envisaged a wider circle than that which the Treaty of Trianon had assigned to the Hungarian people.⁸³ The historic mission of Hungary was explained in a similar tone which tried to emphasize the traditional understanding and tolerance of the liberty-loving Magyars towards the neighbouring nations.⁸⁴

The claim for Magyar supremacy was formulated not only through the cultural and administrative superiority that unambiguously implied the leading role of Hungary, which possessed a historic mission, but also through some analyses written by the editorial staff of the Quarterly. In a study on the injustices of the post-war settlements, József Balogh had already declared openly in 1937 that the Hungarian Kingdom "had always been, either de facto or virtually, a Danubian Great Power, or at least a power that carried within itself a well-founded potentiality of greatness."⁸⁵ As for the reduced post-war Hungary he expressed his conviction that "mutilated by Trianon, a wreck and a wraith of its former self, ceaselessly clamouring, beggar-wise, for 'Justice', this little Danubian state is yet the kernel and promise of a regenerated Central Europe."⁸⁶

Not only historical but also literary topics were suitable for creating the necessary background for political propaganda. Numerous short stories and novel-extracts concentrated on the human tragedies resulting from Trianon, the Romanian occupation, the terror at the time of the Hungarian Soviet Republic, minority oppression, and nostalgia for the prewar peace.⁸⁷ In general, Hungarian literature was represented by competently translated publications not only from

popular and fashionable writers of that time, like Ferenc Herczeg, Lajos Zilahy and Zsolt Harsányi, but also from classic authors like Mór Jókai, Kálmán Mikszáth, Zsigmond Móricz, Mihály Babits, Frigyes Karinthy and Dezső Kosztolányi. Publishing the best of Hungarian literature in English, the Quarterly naturally did much in the interest of spreading and introducing the general values of Hungarian culture.⁸⁸ The studies on the history of old and modern Hungarian literature, written by Antal Szerb and Dezső Keresztury represented scholarship of the highest level.⁸⁹

A column called “Hungarian Bookshelf” was dedicated to the review of books in English related to Hungary and its culture. Part of the books dealt with political topics, like the Paris Peace Conference, the plebiscites for frontier readjustment, the foreign policy of Czechoslovakia, or racial and national minorities. Others concentrated on history, economics, geography, ethnography, the arts, and most especially on literature. Two publications were analyzed in longer reviews: C. A. Macartney’s work on *Hungary and her Successors* and the two volume edition of *Papers and Documents Relating to the Foreign Relations of Hungary*, published by the Royal Hungarian Ministry for Foreign Affairs.⁹⁰

Beginning with the Spring 1944 issue the latter had already advertised in the Quarterly. The analysis of the document collection by Lindsay Rogers, an American professor of law, together with a survey of the Treaty of Trianon, emphasized that Hungary was the first country to publish its secret diplomatic documents from the time of the peace negotiations.⁹¹ This meant creating a virtue from necessity, as decisions at the peace conference had been made in all cases to the Magyars’ disadvantage. Thus naturally Hungary was interested in the publication of the secret documents more than any other state.

The study by Sándor Körmeny-Ékes on C. A. Macartney’s monograph was far more important because it provided an outstanding opportunity to examine *The Hungarian Quarterly’s* views on territorial readjustment. Macartney, the pro-Hungarian British scholar and Fellow of All Souls College in Oxford at that time, also published articles in the Quarterly on Hungary’s history and economic life.⁹² Although the author of the review did not find Macartney’s criticism of the neighbouring states sufficiently vehement, he acknowledged and praised the British scholar’s objectivity and in general appreciated his knowledge and intentions, as Macartney had even learned the Hungarian language for the sake of his research.⁹³

According to Körmeny-Ékes’s interpretation the British monograph aimed “to draw up a balance sheet” on how far the Treaty of Trianon had “improved the cultural and economic situation and progress of the population living in the territories taken away from Hungary,” and tried to investigate “the justice of Hungary’s demands for revision.”⁹⁴ In the British scholar’s work Körmeny-

Ékes focused on affirming that only one part of the minorities had "really felt oppressed" in pre-war Hungary, while others, such as the Slovaks, the Ruthens, the Germans and the Jews had "assimilated themselves gladly and of their own free will."⁹⁵

It was stressed that according to the monograph "Hungary's economic policy had been in many respects Hungarian rather than Magyar," and there had been "no question of impoverishing the nationalities or of placing them at an economic disadvantage compared with the Magyars." The rehabilitation of the pre-war minority policy of Hungary by Macartney was strongly emphasized, especially because this opinion favourable to the Magyars was based on the one-sidedly anti-Hungarian data collected by Seton-Watson.⁹⁶

The review also focused on Macartney's opinion on the possible solution to the minority problems in the Danube Basin. The British expert did not believe in the defence of minorities by law,⁹⁷ because the Central Europeans disregarded these laws.⁹⁸ Macartney thought revision only necessary "insofar as it serves to unite the Hungarians living beyond the frontiers with the mother-country." Where the ethnic principle had to be modified, he suggested trying "to balance out the numbers of the two minorities both sides of the frontier."⁹⁹ The principle of "measure for measure, an eye for an eye" had already been proposed by Bethlen in 1933. He considered this idea the only effective instrument against the Balkan disrespect for law.

Although the British scholar acknowledged that the nationalities had "supplied a post-dated justification of the Treaty of Trianon" and the dismemberment of Hungary, he considered the ethnic principle as primary in frontier readjustment. Despite his favourable approach toward Hungary, Macartney obviously did not think in terms of the restoration of Hungarian supremacy, and most of Körmendi-Ékes's objections concern this "deficiency." The correspondent of the *Quarterly* criticized the book for omitting references to such advantages of pre-war historic Hungary as personal freedom in the liberal Hungarian state and free economic development of nationalities.¹⁰⁰ The reviewer also disapproved of the author's failure "to distinguish between Magyarization by force and becoming Magyar by free will." Macartney, he argued, had "not sufficiently acknowledged the aggravation in the position of nationalities as compared to pre-war circumstances, the increase of the means of oppression, and the degeneration of fight into brutality." The critic felt a "constant struggle" in the evaluation of the Hungarian past "between the comparatively favourable results of Macartney's own investigation, and the teachings of the school of Professor Seton-Watson."¹⁰¹

Based on the implicit message of the remarks, Körmendi-Ékes and the *Quarterly* would have preferred a version where historic Hungary had been declared the best possible solution among the imperfect solutions for the minority problems of the Danube Basin.

Epilogue

After Hungary's strong and apparently one-sided commitment to Germany (following the Second Vienna Award she had joined the Three Power pact in November 1940 and declared war on the Soviet Union in June 1941), the Hungarian political elite could not expect any further support from British policy. In 1941 the Quarterly could appear only twice, and these became the last two pre-war publications of the periodical.

Prime Minister Pál Teleki, who symbolized the reduced influence of the pro-Anglo-Saxon lobby of the Hungarian national elite, disappeared from the political scene. Unable to accept the declaration of war on Yugoslavia, the only friendly ally against German pressure, he committed suicide in April 1941. Joining the German invasion against Yugoslavia meant the loss of Hungarian supremacy once and for all, and also all hope of restoring it, because the price of territorial revision became unconditional subordination to Hitler's Germany. Regardless of its territorial aggrandisement, Hungary ceased to function as an independent power.

The Second World War did not significantly change those geographic, economic, cultural conditions on which interwar Hungarian propaganda had relied as fundamental arguments to justify its endeavour for supremacy in the Carpathian Basin, and possibly in the Danube Basin, as well. Defeated once more, Hungary could not make just claims against the neighbours, who could again be found on the victors' side at the end of the war.¹⁰²

However, a half century later, the dissolution of Yugoslavia and Czechoslovakia has provided further evidence that the exaggerated support of the Czech, Serb, and Romanian elites by the victorious Western powers, at the expense of dismembering Austria-Hungary, was an irretrievable mistake in 1918. They had presented these small, peripheric political forces with disproportionately greater power than their real weight and influence would have justified. Thus they became inflated as political factors. Today, after their consolidation as independent units, the chance of a lasting agreement between the centrally-positioned, artificially reduced Hungary, and its small, but numerous rivals for primacy in East-Central Europe has only decreased.

Notes

1. Romsics, Ignác *Bethlen István* (Budapest 1991) 249.
2. Romsics, 249.
3. Romsics, 250.
4. Romsics, 251.
5. Némédi, Dénes "A Magyar Szemle revíziós nacionalizmusának szerkezetéről" *Történelmi Szemle* (1972/1–2) 75.

6. Romsics, 252.
7. Count István Bethlen "The Hungarian Quarterly. Its Aim and Scope" *The Hungarian Quarterly* (Spring 1936) 5.
8. Bethlen "The Hungarian Quarterly. Its Aim and Scope," 6.
9. "The Hungarian Quarterly sets itself the task of supplying the English speaking public with reliable information... This periodical will also attempt a faithful sketch of the Hungarians views regarding their own as well as their neighbours' duty, task, and the great international problems awaiting urgent solutions." Bethlen "*The Hungarian Quarterly*. Its Aim and Scope" 7.
10. Sir John Marriott "England and the Eastern Question" *The Hungarian Quarterly* (Winter 1936) 231.
11. Cecil Malone "The Outlook for Minorities" *The Hungarian Quarterly* (Winter 1937) 607.
12. Lord Davies "Hungary and the New Commonwealth" *The Hungarian Quarterly* (Spring 1938) 45.
13. Nicholas Murray Butler "The United States of Europe" *The Hungarian Quarterly* (Spring 1936) 15.
14. Andrew Frey "A Danubian Chronicle" *The Hungarian Quarterly* (Summer 1936) 375.
15. The Duchess of Atholl "British Opinion and the League" Harold J. Tobin "The Small States and the League" *The Hungarian Quarterly* (Autumn 1936) 26–27.
16. Sir John Fischer Williams "The Reform of the Covenant of the League," Charles Cheney Hyde "The Revision of Treaties and of Settlements Registered in Treaties," Without name "Justice, Security & the League of Nations" *The Hungarian Quarterly* (Winter 1936) 195–202
17. "The less Rumania respects the rights of the Hungarian minorites, guaranteed by the peace treaties, the more Hungary is entitled, both politically and legally, to assert its revisionist claims." Quoted from Bethlen by Andrew Frey "A Danubian Chronicle" *The Hungarian Quarterly* (Summer 1937) 377.
18. Sir Arthur Wilson "The Future of the Society of Nations" *The Hungarian Quarterly* (Spring 1936) 23–24, 31.
19. Newton, Lord "The Present European Situation" *The Hungarian Quarterly* (Summer 1936) 231.
20. Edwin Borchard, "Sanctions Versus Neutrality. The Psychology of Enforcing Peace" *The Hungarian Quarterly* (Summer 1936) 254.
21. Borchard "Sanction Versus Neutrality" 255.
22. Count István Bethlen "Hungary and the Reforms of the League of Nations" *The Hungarian Quarterly* (Summer 1937) 215–234.
23. "In a military way we are still utterly defenceless, our minorities living in the neighbouring countries has never before experienced such persecutions as in these days, and the Hungarian government has not been able to take any steps to remedy this state of affairs. Rearmament has become Hungary's task and duty towards its people and its future." ... "The Hungarian government ought to make a last trial of the league, and forget that the petitions of minorities have up till now been thrown into the waste paper basket. Should the League again fail to do its duty, we ought to re-

sign our membership and leave an institution which is unable to observe even the most solemnly undertaken obligations." Quoted from Bethlen by Frey "Danubian Chronicle" (Spring 1937) 182, 184.

24. Bethlen "Hungary and the Reforms of the League..." 218.
25. Bethlen "Hungary and the Reforms of the League..." 211.
26. "The prestige of the League of Nations is on decline. In the handling of the minority question it can hardly be said to have fulfilled the hopes placed in it" ... "Every country is rearming, even the neutral states. There is only one small country in the wide world whose rearming would, apparently, endanger the holy cause of peace, and that is Hungary." Quoted from Kánya by Andrew Frey "A Danubian Chronicle" *The Hungarian Quarterly* (Autumn 1937) 568.
27. György Ottlik "Hungary's Foreign Relations" *The Hungarian Quarterly* (Spring 1938) 18–32.
28. Ottlik "Hungary's Foreign Relations" 22.
29. Cecil Malone "The Outlook for Minorities" *The Hungarian Quarterly* (Winter 1937) 605.
30. "The Slovak Party definitely rejected the fiction of a Czechoslovak nation, history and racial lore knew only two separate nations, a Czech and a Slovak... Father Hlinka said, the Germans could be only the third nation in the state, for Czechs and Slovaks had never formed one nation." Frey "A Danubian Chronicle" *The Hungarian Quarterly* (Spring 1938) 191.
31. Frey "A Danubian Chronicle" *The Hungarian Quarterly* (Summer 1938) 374.
32. Frey "A Danubian Chronicle" The German–Czechoslovak Question *The Hungarian Quarterly* (Autumn 1938) 557.
33. Frey "A Danubian Chronicle" *The Hungarian Quarterly* (Summer 1938) 374.
34. Count István Bethlen "Hungary's Position after the Austrian Anschluss" *The Hungarian Quarterly* (Summer 1938) 201.
35. Bethlen "Hungary's Position..." 206.
36. Bethlen "Hungary's Position..." 205.
37. Frey "A Danubian Chronicle" *The Hungarian Quarterly* (Summer 1938) 380.
38. Gooch, G. P. "England and Europe: A Retrospect" *The Hungarian Quarterly* (Winter 1938) 577.
39. Gooch "England and Europe" 578.
40. Andrew Moravek "The Hungarian Minority in Czechoslovakia" *The Hungarian Quarterly* 722.
41. László Ottlik "Democracy and the Multi-National State" *The Hungarian Quarterly* (Winter 1938) 586–594.
42. Ottlik "Democracy..." 588.
43. Ottlik "Democracy..." 592.
44. Lajos Gogolák "The Hungarian Spirit in Northern Hungary" *The Hungarian Quarterly* (Winter 1938), Árpád Markó "Upper Hungary and Prince Francis Rákóczi" *The Hungarian Quarterly* (Winter 1938) 674, 689.
45. "The Czechs themselves had welcomed the principle of self-determination when first enunciated it by President Wilson, because they intended to benefit from it. They named a railway station in Prague after the coiner of this useful slogan... Had

- President Wilson gone a little deeper and said then, what Hitler says now, that the Germans within the new state of Czechoslovakia had the same right of self-determination that the Czech had had within the realm of Austria, the railway station would presumably have been hastily renamed." Sir Thomas Bart Cunninghame "Vain Triumph" *The Hungarian Quarterly* (Winter 1938) 59–611.
46. Cunninghame "Vain Triumph" 596.
 47. Cunninghame "Vain Triumph" 597.
 48. Lajos Gogolák "Edward Benes" *The Hungarian Quarterly* (Spring 1940) 24–35.
 49. Gogolák "Edward Benes" 27.
 50. "The Munich Agreement did not make any stipulations in regard of the settlement of problems of the Polish and Hungarian minorities in Czechoslovakia, and it was only in the event of these problems not being settled in agreement with the respective Governments within three months that they would have formed the subject of another meeting of the Munich powers. Agreement was in fact reached between the Czechoslovak and Hungarian Government when they agreed to accept as final the arbitral award of the German and Italian Governments and in consequence no question of action by His Majesty's Government arises." Barcza, György, *Diplomataemlékeim 1915–1945* (Memories of My Diplomatic Service 1915–1945), (Vol. 1, Budapest 1994) 405.
 51. István Borsody "The Slovaks in the Carpathian Basin" *The Hungarian Quarterly* (Autumn 1941) 215–227.
 52. Barcza *Diplomataemlékeim...* 407.
 53. László Tarnóy "The Economic Significance of Sub-Carpathia" *The Hungarian Quarterly* (Summer 1939) 339–343.
 54. Henry Albert Philips "Magyar Will to Survive" *The Hungarian Quarterly* (Spring 1940) 36–41.
 55. "It is no exaggeration to say that the Daco-Rumanian theory, still firmly held as a dogma by Transylvanian historians, is fundamentally nothing but a projection of eighteenth-century Hungarian humanism. It is not a scientifically proved fact, but a belief, a myth to which Chauvinist Rumanians cling obstinately, because in it they see historic motivation of Great-Rumania." László Gáldi "Two Minds in the Rumanian Past" *The Hungarian Quarterly* (Autumn 1939) 445.
 56. Andrew Rónai "The Peoples of Transylvania" *The Hungarian Quarterly* (Summer 1939) 229–242.
 57. Gáldi "Two Minds in the Rumanian Past" 439–440.
 58. Rónai "The Peoples of Transylvania" 233–235.
 59. István Gál "England and Transylvania" *The Hungarian Quarterly* (Summer 1939) 243–255.
 60. Barcza *Diplomataemlékeim...* 409.
 61. Barcza *Diplomataemlékeim...* 476.
 62. Barcza *Diplomataemlékeim...* 454–455.
 63. Lindsay Rogers "Papers and Documents. Comments by an American Professor" *The Hungarian Quarterly* (Autumn 1940), Caroline J. Porter "An American Appreciation. Hungary through the Ages" *The Hungarian Quarterly* (Autumn 1940) 385–409. Alexis Máthé "Impressions of the United States" *The Hungarian Quarterly*

- (Autumn 1940) 410–416, István Gál “Kossuth, America and the Danubian Confederation” *The Hungarian Quarterly* (Autumn 1940), András Rónai “Notes and Letters. America and the Transylvanian Question” *The Hungarian Quarterly* (Autumn 1940), Rev. L. C. Cornish “Part of Transylvania Comes Back” *The Hungarian Quarterly* (Winter 1940) 417, 577. Madden, Henry M. “Transylvania: a Sub-Nation” *The Hungarian Quarterly* (Winter 1940).
64. Joseph Balogh “Foreword” *The Hungarian Quarterly* (Winter 1940) 575–576.
 65. “The higher elements are sacrificed to the lower, and the whole country suffers by having those elements from which progress would proceed being subjected to an alien rule which is likely to leave them lower than they were under Hungarian rule.” Balogh “Foreword” 575.
 66. Passuth, László “Notes and Letters. Hungary and Rumania” *The Hungarian Quarterly* (Autumn 1940) 546.
 67. Rev. Louis C. Cornish, “A Part of Transylvania Comes Back” *The Hungarian Quarterly* (Winter 1940) 578.
 68. Cornish “A Part of Transylvania...” 579.
 69. Zsombor Szász “Hungarians–Rumanians” *The Hungarian Quarterly* (Winter 1940) 589–610.
 70. Ferenc Kászonyi “Racial Problems in Transylvania” *The Hungarian Quarterly* (Winter 1940) 619.
 71. Lajos Elekes “The Development of the Rumanian People” *The Hungarian Quarterly* (Winter 1940) 678–688.
 72. Passuth “Hungary and Rumania” 545.
 73. András Rónai “Notes and Letters. America and the Transylvanian Question” *The Hungarian Quarterly* (Autumn 1940) 549.
 74. Géza Jeszenszky *Az elveszett presztízs* (The Lost Prestige) (Budapest 1986) 23–26.
 75. Christopher Dawson “Hungarian Middle Ages” *The Hungarian Quarterly* (Winter 1939) 585–590. Alexander Fest “Political and Spiritual Links Between England and Hungary” *The Hungarian Quarterly* (Spring 1936) 72., Fest “Links Between England and Hungary” *The Hungarian Quarterly* (Autumn 1936) 106., Fest “The Earliest Traces of Magyars in the West” *The Hungarian Quarterly* (Winter 1937) 649., Fest “Medieval Contacts Between England and Hungary” *The Hungarian Quarterly* (Summer 1940) 252., István Gál “England and Transylvania” *The Hungarian Quarterly* (Summer 1939) 243.
 76. The Marquess of Londonderry “Hungary and Great Britain” *The Hungarian Quarterly* (Spring 1936), The Viscountess Snowden “Impressions of a Visit to Hungary” *The Hungarian Quarterly* (Winter 1939) 579–584.
 77. Lajos Gogolák “The Hungarian Spirit in Northern Hungary” *The Hungarian Quarterly* (Winter 1938) 674–688. Árpád Markó “Upper Hungary and Francis Rákóczi II” *The Hungarian Quarterly* (Winter 1938) 689–695.
 78. László Ottlik “A Period of National Peace in Hungary 1526–1790” *The Hungarian Quarterly* (Summer 1936) 226.
 79. László Ottlik “National Peace in Transylvania 1526–1790” *The Hungarian Quarterly* (Summer 1937) 294–302.

80. Elemér Mályusz "The State in Medieval Hungary" *The Hungarian Quarterly* (Autumn 1931) 495.
81. Gyula Kornis "Hungary's Place in History" *The Hungarian Quarterly* (Autumn 1936) 45–60., Gyula Miskolczy "The Recapture of Buda" *The Hungarian Quarterly* (Autumn 1936) 60–73., Alexis Máthé "Hungary, the Land and the People After the Turkish Occupation" *The Hungarian Quarterly* (Spring 1937) 117–124.
82. György Trócsányi "The Hungarian National Character" *The Hungarian Quarterly* (Summer 1939) 197.
83. József Balogh "The Political Testament of St. Stephen, King of Hungary" *The Hungarian Quarterly* (Autumn 1938) 389–398.
84. Balogh "The Political Testament..." 396–397.
85. "Today, as then, the Hungarians profess that there is weakness in a kingdom that is uniform in language and customs; in accordance with this creed, Hungary has always been a land of many nations, a land of tolerance, where there was a liberty and independence for all who gave their allegiance to the Hungarian state. The Magyar people still feel themselves to be a bridge between East and West as in the days of St. Stephen; and they draw the strength for further struggles from that Christian humanism which the Admonitions derived from St. Augustine's state ideal through the medium of the Carolingian proto-renaissance; and have left as a legacy to the Hungarian nation." Balogh "The Political Testament..." 398.
86. József Balogh "Recent Tendencies in the Danubian Basin" *The Hungarian Quarterly* (Spring 1937) 39.
87. Balogh "Recent Tendencies..." 39.
88. Bánffy "Count Nicholas Wolves" *The Hungarian Quarterly* (Autumn 1940), Károly Kós "1919" *The Hungarian Quarterly* (Winter 1936), Sándor Makkai "First Furrows" *The Hungarian Quarterly* (Winter 1936), Kálmán Mikszáth "The Family Nest" *The Hungarian Quarterly* (Summer 1937), József Nyírő "The Sacrifice", *The Hungarian Quarterly* (Spring 1939), Count Albert Wass "Three in the Snow" *The Hungarian Quarterly* (Summer 1938), Count Albert Wass "The New Frontier", *The Hungarian Quarterly* (Autumn 1941), Áron Tamási "Bimbo the Mechanic" *The Hungarian Quarterly* (Summer 1940).
89. Tibor Frank "A Hungarian Quarterly irodalompolitikája" (The Literary Policy of the Hungarian Quarterly) *Filológiai Közlöny* (1978/1).
90. Dezső Keresztury "Hungary – Past and Present" *The Hungarian Quarterly* (Spring 1938), Antal Szerb "Count Nicolas Bethlen's Autobiography" *The Hungarian Quarterly* (Winter 1937)
91. Sándor Körmendy-Ékes "A Great Book on Hungary" *The Hungarian Quarterly* (Summer 1938) 332–342., Lindsay Rogers "Variations on a Diplomatic Theme" *The Hungarian Quarterly* (Autumn 1940) 385–397.
92. Rogers "Variations on a Diplomatic Theme" 385–386.
93. C. A. Macartney "Hungaria Aeterna" *The Hungarian Quarterly* (Spring 1936) 48–55., Macartney, C. A. "The First Historians of Hungary" *The Hungarian Quarterly* (Winter 1938) 630–641.

94. "Mr. Macartney's work gives an unparalleled, extensive and complete picture of the situation of Hungarian minorities in the succession states, a matter which hitherto has never been elaborated so objectively and with such thorough criticism."
"I would only emphasize that this book has enriched English literature on the Hungarian question by an objective, extensive and complete standard work, which, in the future must be read by everybody who wants to study the problems resulting from Hungary's dismemberment and the causes of the present Central European situation." Körmندی-Ékes "A Great Book on Hungary" 338., 341.
95. Körmندی-Ékes "A Great Book on Hungary" 332.
96. Körmندی-Ékes "A Great Book on Hungary" 333.
97. Körmندی-Ékes "A Great Book on Hungary" 334.
98. Körmندی-Ékes "A Great Book on Hungary" 339.
99. "While the Britons does not usually enact a law unless he means to keep it in the letter and in the spirit, and the Czechs unless, while evading its spirit he can yet prove that he has kept its letter, to the Rumanian the law and its execution stand in no discernible relationship." (Quoted from Macartney) Körmندی-Ékes "A Great Book on Hungary" 338.
100. Körmندی-Ékes "A Great Book on Hungary" 340.
101. Körmندی-Ékes "A Great Book on Hungary" 338–339.
102. Körmندی-Ékes "A Great Book on Hungary" 341.

Bibliography

Books

- Arday, Lajos *Térkép, csata után. Magyarország a brit külpolitikában, 1918–1919*. Budapest, 1990.
- Ádám, Magda *Magyarország és a Kisantant a harmincas években*. Budapest, 1968.
- Berend, T. Iván and György Ránki *Economic Development in East-Central Europe in the 19th and 20th Centuries*. London–New York, 1914.
- Diószegi, István *Hungarians in the Ballhausplatz*. Budapest, 1983.
- Fejtő, Ferenc *Rekviem egy hajdanvolt birodalomért*. Budapest, 1990.
- Jeszenszky, Géza *Az elveszett presztízs*. Budapest, 1986.
- Joel, James *The Origins of the First World War*. London, New York, 1992.
- Juhász, Gyula *Magyarország külpolitikája 1919–1945*. Budapest, 1988. (Third edition)
- Koch, H. W. (ed.), *The Origins of the First World War*. London, 1991.
- Laczkó, Miklós *Korszellem és tudomány*. Budapest, 1988.
- Laczkó, Miklós *Szerep és Mű*. Budapest, 1980.
- Macartney, C. A. *Hungary and her Successors*. Oxford, 1937.
- Pritz, Pál *Magyarország külpolitikája Gömbös Gyula miniszterelnöksége idején 1932–1936*. Budapest, 1982.
- Romsics, Ignác *Bethlen István*. Budapest, 1991.

- Steiner, Zara S. *Britain and the Origins of the First World War*. London, 1991.
- Tilkovszky, Lóránt *Revíziós és nemzetiségpolitika Magyarországon 1938–1941*. Budapest, 1967.
- Vásárhelyi, Miklós *A lord és a korona*. Budapest, 1977.
- Zeman, Zdenek *The Break-up of the Habsburg Empire 1914–1918*. London, 1961.

Articles

1. Bán, D. András "Radomir király. Széphistória a Rothermere-akcióról" *2000* 1990. október.
2. Bán, D. András "Egy sajtómágnás sikertelen magándiplomáciája" *Jelenkor* 1993. február.
3. Frank, Tibor "A Hungarian Quarterly irodalompolitikája" *Magyar Filológiai Közlemények* 1978/2.
4. Frank, Tibor "A revíziós politika «elméleti alapvetése», az angol nyelvű Magyar Történet terve" *Magyar Filozófiai Szemle* 1980/6.
5. Frank, Tibor "Luring the English-Speaking World; Hungarian History Diverted" *The Slavonic and East European Review* 1991/1.
6. Frank, Tibor "Editing as Politics; József Balogh and the Hungarian Quarterly" *The Hungarian Quarterly* 1993/1.
7. Némedi, Dénes "A Magyar Szemle revíziós nacionalizmusának szerkezetéről" *Történelmi Szemle* 1972/1–2.
8. Pritz, Pál "A magyar külügyi szolgálat története a harmincas évek első felében" *Történelmi Szemle* 1989/3–4.
9. Pritz, Pál "Revíziós törekvések a magyar külpolitikában" *Magyar Tudomány* 1979/4.
10. Romsics, Ignác "The Danube Region. A Troubled Past and Options for the Future" *The Hungarian Quarterly* 1992/1.
11. Szőke, Domokos "Az agrárkérdés a Magyar Szemlelben" *Történelmi Szemle* 1987–88/3.
12. Szőke, Domokos "Konzervativizmus és liberalizmus válaszutján. Bethlen István és a Magyar Szemle kapcsolatának történetéhez" *Századok* 1993/5–6.