

# REFLECTION OF AND ABOUT HUNGARY IN THE ENGLISH-SPEAKING WORLD IN THE INTERWAR YEARS<sup>1</sup>

ZOLTÁN PETERECZ

Esterházy Károly University, Eger

[zpeterecz@yahoo.com](mailto:zpeterecz@yahoo.com)

This article would like to serve as an addition to the perceived historical picture of Hungary in the Anglo-Saxon world, relying on articles published in British but mainly in American daily newspapers and magazines in the 1920s and 1930s. While some of the articles were by Hungarian authors or authors with Hungarian origins, the majority was not and, so they give a good indication about the impressions that Anglo-Saxon peoples were both having and getting about Interwar Hungary. One can find voices from both the Left and Right of the political spectrum, positive and negative interpretations of Hungary alike in such well-known periodicals as *The New Republic* and *Foreign Affairs*, or lesser known outlets as *The Living Age* or *Current History*. In addition, the study invites the opinion of several American ministers who served in Hungary in the examined period. There unpublished opinions about their host country add further nuances to the picture of Hungary and Hungarians in American minds. These opinions together, ranging from domestic policies to the foreign policy issues that all sprang from the Paris peace treaties, also contributed to the larger understanding of Hungarian political and cultural issues. This picture is a colorful one, spanning from politics to economics, from cultural to psychological aspects.

**Keywords:** 1920s and 1930s, Hungary, United States, Great Britain, media reflection, cultural influence

This essay is not going to deal with economic issues during the discussed period—the interwar years—and especially during the financial reconstruction period. In a short summary, it can be stated that the financial reconstruction of Hungary, which took place in 1924–26, was an important and ongoing event that the British and American newspapers followed, largely because these two countries provided the main bulk of the international loan to Hungary, and the financial controller was an American, Jeremiah Smith, Jr. Although it is an important phase and there were numerous articles written about it, I have dealt with the issue in a detailed version elsewhere.<sup>2</sup> Perhaps it is worth remembering that Smith always spoke in the highest terms of Hungary, its people, and its government, but this opinion was not based alone on his experience but emanated from the highly political nature of his post as well. Years later, however, while briefing a soon-to-be

American minister to Hungary, he unrestrictedly spoke of Hungarian “supernationalism and their sense of inferiority,” highlighted their “energy” and “personal honesty,” but also called attention to their “childishness.”<sup>3</sup>

Instead, I wish to show a broader spectrum of impressions coming from various fields of interest about Hungary. I believe with this short introduction the picture that the Anglo-Saxon world, but especially the people overseas, had about Hungary, and appeared on the columns of the various magazines or periodicals, will be a richer and a more nuanced one. There are two ways of approaching the subject: from a chronological and a subject matter point of view. I will follow the latter, since some topics were in the news for a longer period of time and it is also easier to follow the events and opinions related to such topics in that fashion.

Obviously, the one overarching topic was the peace treaty and its consequences. Although the United States was not part to the Versailles Peace Treaty and concluded separate peace treaties with the defeated countries, Hungary among them, the issue was important nonetheless. This topic presented fresh problems but since Hungary was not a well-known political entity to the large masses of Americans, and they generally did not understand and did not care to learn about the post-war picture of Europe, the issue left many Americans unmoved. The situation was somewhat similar in Great Britain but there was a significant difference. The British were partially architects of the post-war Versailles system, and knew much more about Hungary. Also, the British took strategic interest in Central Europe, at least in the 1920s. Consequently, for them Hungary was an important place from political, financial, and trade aspects for a number of years, only to be neglected as the 1930s unfolded.<sup>4</sup>

Albert Apponyi was one of the best-known Hungarian statesmen of the period. He always vehemently argued against the peace settlement and for the rights of Hungarians who found themselves in newly established foreign countries after the war. In 1928 he published an article in *Current History*, which writing was a passionate outcry against the Treaty of Trianon. Since the article was supposed to inform, perhaps persuade, American readership, it was a significant piece of effort on Hungary's part to swing the sentiment in its favor. Apponyi argued that Hungary's long past should be the automatic guarantee for a peaceful Central European region, but this was possible only if Hungary could reclaim its former lands, typically where Hungarian ethnic blocks were found. He played the theme of the alleged higher status of civilization of the Hungarian nation in the region, an idea that was in vogue in Hungarian foreign policy in the 1920s and 1930s, and was also used as a hoped-for trump card against its neighbors in international political and cultural discourse. According to this argument, the Little Entente countries, that is, Czechoslovakia, Romania, and Yugoslavia, represented “in methods of government, in business morals, in cultural standards, a lower type of civilization.”<sup>5</sup> The grand old man of Hungarian diplomacy also used the

Hungarian myth that was so typical especially at this time: Hungary as a historic bulwark against barbaric hordes from the east and a bastion of Western Europe and Christianity. But as a result of the peace treaty, “now Eastern semi-barbarism floods part of the West,” informed Apponyi his American readers.<sup>6</sup> In the same issue of *Current History*, right after Apponyi’s piece appeared H. Wickham Steed’s answer to the claims that Hungary had been done wrong. Steed, who fashioned a well-known dislike for Hungary, actually accused Apponyi and his generation of forceful measures of Magyarization before the First World War, and he stated that this was the cause for the calamities of post-World War I Hungary. He blamed Hungarians for their political “blindness” and found in their views “certain realities that were Asiatic rather than European or even Balkan.”<sup>7</sup> So, basically two worldviews about Hungary and its historical role clashed on these pages. One was the story of a proud nation that had stood up for the sake of Christianity and saved Western Europe by the cost of its own blood, while the other emphasized the “easternness” of Hungary, implying that it was not really a state to be integrated into the main European currents.

Interestingly, there were Anglo-Saxon voices that shared the claim that Hungary stood out as the most developed country in the region, both politically and culturally. The banker Otto Khan, for example, found that the peacemakers had dealt “outrageously with the Hungarians,” which was “a fine virile race to which the world owes much for services rendered in the past.”<sup>8</sup> One other such voice said that the “inhabitants of the Little Entente States, including the Czechoslovaks, have not the culture of the Hungarians.”<sup>9</sup> Another author characterized Hungarians as “a refined and cultivated people.”<sup>10</sup> William Castle, Jr., who at this time was the assistant chief of the division of Western European affairs at the State Department, went so far that the postwar Hungarian government seemed to him “of a higher average of intelligence and integrity than the members of any other government in Central Europe.”<sup>11</sup> But before one thinks that this was the overall tone, the very same author who had praised the Hungarians above altered the picture later when he wrote that Hungary represented an “incontestable danger to Europe,” and that Hungarians are not real Europeans, and, to make things worse, “no country has remained more attached to feudalism.”<sup>12</sup> The notion that Hungary remained a “feudal” country and, therefore, represented backwardness, was a recurring charge against interwar Hungary. Future American minister to Hungary Nicholas Roosevelt, for example, wrote of the Hungarian aristocracy that they lived “politically in the Middle Ages. They were, and many of them still are, completely impervious to modern ideas of democracy and liberalism.”<sup>13</sup> But the first American diplomat in Hungary after World War I, Ulysses Grant-Smith, who was really an active Commissioner during his stay in the country, often formed negative opinions about his hosts. He put forward his analysis that “Hungary is not an European but an Asiatic nation, and that in consequence the structure

of her society resembles that of Turkey more than that of any of the western nations of Europe.”<sup>14</sup> But this was only one of many reports in which Grant-Smith spoke lowly about Hungarians. He accused them of shortsightedness, on occasions compared them to Latin Americans with its obvious negative connotation, and although he wrote of their “personal charm,” the outcome of his reports was always pejorative: they possessed an eastern mentality and after crossing the Austrian-Hungarian border, “Europe was left behind,” and the country was more similar to “the Balkans and Asiatic Turkey.”<sup>15</sup> Later ministers working in Hungary professed opinion in a similar vein. A good example for this is Joshua Butler Wright, who thought that Hungarians were incapable of creating real democratic institutions and life, and he “discovered” several flaws in Hungarians: “as a nation she is uncompromisingly proud, and possesses that intolerance and conceit which springs from pride; almost all her people are given to that exuberance in the expression of patriotism which frequently transgresses the bounds of reason and wisdom.”<sup>16</sup> As a consequence for Butler, “the Hungarians, while very likeable, occasionally must be guided or restrained like children.”<sup>17</sup>

Malbone W. Graham, Jr. was a young political commentator in the 1920s, who regularly wrote about European issues Hungary included. For instance, he published a book on the governments of Central Europe in 1924.<sup>18</sup> What he said about Hungary did not contain much positive feedback about post-Trianon Hungary. In one of his pieces he wrote, in a largely critical way, about the Hungarian Parliament after the war, especially of the reestablished upper chamber. He criticized the, to him, often seemingly inactive national assembly, the electoral law of 1925 (which sanctified the executive order of 1922), which he found extremely conservative, and which, in return, produced “two doubly conservative chambers.”<sup>19</sup> An interesting aspect of the article is that the author quoted Prime Minister István Bethlen, Apponyi, and many Hungarian newspapers, which means either that he spoke and understood Hungarian or someone was working for him who did, the latter case being the more probable. Graham a year later analyzed the election results and stated that Bethlen, despite his outstanding victory, would have to steer his ship between “the remnants of the old feudal aristocracy of Hungary in power” and “the pressure of the lower classes.”<sup>20</sup> This is more proof that Hungary was labelled as a “feudal” country.

Another and more famous commentator of politics and history was Frederic Austin Ogg. The professor at the University of Wisconsin produced many volumes on European issues. His opinion already before World War I was that “the Hungarian franchise remains the most illiberal and the most antiquated in Europe.”<sup>21</sup> Despite this view, for example, taking his cue from the freshly signed treaty between Italy and Hungary in 1927, he gave a concise and balanced analysis of the effects of the pact and the larger picture in Central and Southeastern Europe.<sup>22</sup> Ogg also commented briefly on the St. Gotthárd incident, but only as an outsider

and his observations were based upon various official sources.<sup>23</sup> In January 1928, at the border town of Szentgotthárd the Austrian customs officers stopped a train going from Italy allegedly to Poland. In five of the wagons weapons were found which were listed in the official customs documents as machine components. Soon it was clear that the shipment was for Hungary, a clear violation of the Treaty of Trianon, which forbade any arming of the reduced Hungarian army. The shipment actually was a manifestation of the much-improved and friendly relations between Italy and Hungary to the detriment and at the expense of Yugoslavia. Somewhat thanks to French backing, the Little Entente countries began a mainly propaganda outcry against Hungary. Amid such voices, the League of Nations initiated an investigation and discussed the affair during the March Assembly. The Hungarian government had auctioned the now disabled weapons in February, hoping to defuse the scandal. The League set up a Committee of Three, which suggested a strictly technical investigation in Hungary. Based upon the report of a seven-member League delegation that carried out the investigation in April in Hungary, the League Assembly in June deemed the affair closed without finding Hungary at fault.<sup>24</sup> Americans could read about this episode not only from the pen of their compatriots but also from authors of Hungarian origin.

Imre Déri, a regular contributor to *Világ* and *Az Est*, both well-known Hungarian dailies, also wrote about the incident that had taken place at the Austrian-Hungarian border. Although he saw Eduard Beneš, the Czechoslovak foreign minister, and the French as instigators behind the scenes and their trying to punish Hungary for its Italian friendship, he realistically concluded that no matter which party got out of the diplomatic debacle with flying colors, “the world will applaud ‘those who saved the peace of Europe,’ and the underground battle for the hegemony in Central Europe will go on.”<sup>25</sup> A few weeks later Oszkár Jászi, the former liberal comrade of Mihály Károlyi, the president of the Hungarian People’s Republic in 1918–1919, who since then had emigrated to and started to teach in the United States, also entered the fray. He, on account of the machine gun issue, accused his former country in scathing words: “the whole population of the country is transformed into a military camp, secret irredentistic organizations embrace big strata of the intelligentsia, and from the elementary schools to the universities the bloodiest type of Jingo patriotism is taught.”<sup>26</sup> Déri in his refutation of Jászi’s attack defended Hungary and the Hungarian wish for revision, because Hungary, as he phrased it, had been “robbed of his rightful property.”<sup>27</sup> The duel of words was an interesting episode in the sense that, not for the first time, American readers had learned about Hungary, or tried to find a certain truth about it, in the opinions of Hungarians publishing in the United States.<sup>28</sup>

Another former Hungarian diplomat also defended Hungary’s aim as to revision. Ernő Ludwig had been Austro-Hungarian Consul General and a member of the Hungarian Delegation to the Paris Peace Conference, so he had firsthand expe-

rience concerning the peace conference and post-war diplomacy. In his view, the Trianon Treaty “was a tragic mistake,” and it should be changed peacefully, in an arbitrated fashion.<sup>29</sup> He saw Hungary as the food basket of Europe and also claimed natural and higher law supporting Hungary’s entitlement to its former territories: “The boundaries of former old Hungary were really made by God and nature themselves, as the chain ridge of the Carpathians and the river system encircling Hungary afforded her the most natural boundaries of any country in Europe. It was a downright crime for man’s clumsy hands to bungle this masterpiece of creation.”<sup>30</sup> This observation was directly opposed by an American formerly also serving at the Paris Peace Conference. David Hunter Miller was legal advisor to the American Peace Commission in 1919, and as such he was a fervent believer in self-determination as the path leading to a lasting peace. As he wrote, “the political and ethnographical maps of Europe more nearly correspond now than at any previous time in modern history.”<sup>31</sup> He thought that any minor rectification of the new borders might be carried out only after Hungary had acquiesced the *status quo*, which opinion largely summarized western thought concerning Hungarian possibilities. There were other commentators who saw the solution in a federalized Central Europe.<sup>32</sup> The overall revision propaganda was a feature that every visitor here noted during the interwar years. As one diplomat put it, the “Hungarian mind may be said to have been inoculated with the idea of revision the day after the signature of the Treaty of Trianon. This idea germinated and fermented in the blood stream until it developed into a well-defined disease whose first symptom was the passionate ‘Nem, Nem, Soha’ so familiar in the early years after the war.”<sup>33</sup> It was easy to detect that this was the single most important notion for Hungarians, “a theme whose variations are endless, whose melody is sweet to the Hungarian ear.”<sup>34</sup>

A British observer, revisiting Hungary after ten years, found the government autocratic, Bethlen a dictator, but his overall fair and coherent picture about Hungary gave voice to optimism concerning the future of the nation.<sup>35</sup> An American author also agreed that, to a certain degree, there was indeed dictatorship in Hungary, but he judged the outcome as a favorable one. Summarizing Bethlen’s ten years at the helm, he opined that “at home, a combination of democracy and dictatorship; abroad, a combination of collaboration and complaint. Who dares assert that any other policy is possible, or, at any rate, preferable?”<sup>36</sup> Professor Ogg too commented on Bethlen’s resignation after his longest tenure as a European premier. He recognized Hungary’s difficulties and admitted that Bethlen had been able to produce results, whom he characterized “the supreme political tactician of post-war Europe.”<sup>37</sup> He also thought that democracy in the western sense would be the task and hope of future generations of Hungarians.

Regent Miklós Horthy received special attention from American visitors, and he was written of in typically mixed terms. Harry Hill Bandholtz, the American member of the Inter-Allied Military Mission to Hungary, for example, character-

ized him as “a fine-appearing, intelligent-looking officer,” and believed he was “sincere in his desire and intention to do everything for the best,” and he had “great confidence in his ability and good sense.”<sup>38</sup> Grant-Smith, who often met with Horthy, liked him as a person, but was very disappointed and critical about Horthy’s responsibility on account of the ruling “White terror,” and thought that Horthy was lacking certain abilities.<sup>39</sup> A few years later, the British Consul General in Budapest described him as follows: “Admiral Horthy is a man of sterling honesty but of no great cleverness: he has no suppleness of mind, and when he gets hold of an idea, it crystallizes within him into a principle. He has [...] the views of an English country squire or naval officer of the sixties or seventies, and change and innovation are abhorrent to him. [...] I would limit myself to saying that he is incapable of adjusting himself to the new conditions in which the world finds itself today.”<sup>40</sup> Horthy also struck Butler Wright as looking like an Englishman, “extremely well groomed and full of energy,” and who freely talked but was “not a very good listener”.<sup>41</sup>

Gergely Romsics has analyzed the contents of seven articles dealing with Hungary in *Foreign Affairs* between 1922 and 1939. Perhaps the most outstanding such article was that of Oszkár Jászi’s in 1923, if for nothing else, for its harsh criticism. Obviously, Jászi sentenced Hungary under Horthy as “neofuedal,” “authoritarian,” and “dictatorial.”<sup>42</sup> But Jászi was not American, his opinion and voice carried that of a disillusioned semi-revolutionary émigré who felt his original home country provided no place for him. Jászi authored two more attacks on Hungary in *Foreign Affairs* in the 1930s. Similarly and not surprisingly, Eduard Beneš also criticized Hungary in his respective articles appearing in *Foreign Affairs*.<sup>43</sup> Voices from Anglo-Saxon authors, such as Arthur Salter or Royall Tyler, who were closely related to the financial reconstruction launched in 1924, were on the aggregate positive toward Hungary and its political leadership up until 1931, which is a tangible sign of the achievements of the Bethlen-era and also its successful propaganda.<sup>44</sup>

One of the most fascinating and intriguing topics concerning Hungary was what was usually referred to as the king question. This was naturally in close correlation with the issue of the peace treaties, but it was also a problem on its own. For overseas readers European royal courts always held a certain charm and the promise of an Old World fable. And Hungary’s case was not typical in the sense that it was a kingdom without a king. Although the country defined itself as the Kingdom of Hungary, after the death of Charles I in 1922, there was nobody to take the throne legally since the National Assembly declared the dethronement act in 1922, mainly on account of foreign exertion. There were quite a few articles dealing with the question and the personalities involved. The American readers could read about the failed attempts of Charles to reclaim the throne shortly before his death, or ex-empress Zita’s struggles to bring up her many children after Charles’s premature death.<sup>45</sup> The famed British historian, C. A. Macartney, who knew Hungary excep-

tionally well, informed his readers about the history and the state of present-day calamities and situation in this country. In his analysis concerning the king question, he argued that the unaltered Hungarian oligarchy is actually contended with not having a ruler above their heads. With certain irony he stressed, “the Magyars have not really liked any of their rulers since St. Stephen, so well as they do the present one, who does not exist.”<sup>46</sup> Béla Menczer was a left-leaning intellectual who left Hungary in 1923 and lived in Western Europe. He correctly argued in a British quarterly that the historical possibility of a Habsburg restoration is gone, and Hungary should focus on establishing much better relations with its neighbors.<sup>47</sup>

The Hungarian-Romanian optants dispute was another issue that demanded some attention in and out of Europe. The question proved to be a long-lasting and thorny issue for the League of Nations as well. The Romanian government promulgated a law in 1921, in which they basically confiscated Hungarians’ lands there (these people were called optants). Hungary claimed that this Romanian piece of legislation was violating certain aspects of the Treaty of Trianon, whereas the Romanians argued that their state’s sovereignty came first before the protection of another treaty. In 1923 Hungary turned to the League for help in establishing which party was right. A long and arduous but largely fruitless legal process began that refused to go away for seven years. The League tried to mediate but it was futile, and the Romanian government disputed the jurisdiction of the Rumanian-Hungarian Mixed Arbitral Tribunal in the question. Romania wanted to connect the optants question with that of reparations. The issue was problematic from a domestic point of view in both countries, and the League did not wish to intervene on either party’s behalf. In the end, a solution was reached between the two governments in April 1930 but it was only a mixed success.<sup>48</sup> The dispute was presented to American readers as a “very complex and apparently an inextricable affair” and “a paradoxical situation,” which it really was.<sup>49</sup> In a popular English magazine an expert author on East Central issues came forward and defended the Hungarian party not only in the particular debate of the optants, but concerning the peace treaty as well. He warned that “a treaty of unexampled spoliation and vindictive penalties” would be only further aggravated by not giving justice to the Hungarians in this case, and that might lead to active Hungarian irredentism.<sup>50</sup> The recently arrived American minister of the day examined the situation from a different angle. According to Butler Wright, the international imbroglio had sprung from the fact that, at least partially, the Hungarians possessed too fervent national attitude, and besides they thought they and their cases mattered in Europe. As he put it, “one gains the impression that these people are convinced that Hungary is an important factor in the general European policy of England and other great Powers.”<sup>51</sup>

Mention also must be made about articles concerning Hungarian culture. Hungary was deemed as a faraway country in Europe that was exotic to the general American reader. Literature, music, metropolitan and country life, and other aspects of contemporary Hungarian culture regularly featured on the columns of



various outlets of the British and American press. For example, one was to learn about Hungarian theater life, especially the National Theater (Nemzeti Színház) and the work of its director, Sándor Hevesi. Actually, Hevesi himself wrote a piece about Imre Madách and his *Tragedy of Man*, one of the most popular Hungarian dramas, in which he analyzed the play, and compared it with, and defended against, the comparisons with Goethe's *Faust*.<sup>52</sup> Further effort was made to introduce the play itself to English-speaking readers, since in the same issue English translation of various scenes from Madách's play were printed. Hungarian literature received a wider audience when a lecture was delivered at King's College, London, in May 1931. The presenter praised especially Endre Ady, but also Mihály Babits, Dezső Kosztolányi, Ferenc Molnár, Zsigmond Móricz, Dezső Szabó, Gyula Krúdy, and Cecile Tormay for their use of new and modern concepts and language.<sup>53</sup> Music also got somewhat into the limelight when Béla Bartók coauthored a piece on Hungarian folk songs and proved that the peasant songs were not derived from Slavic songs.<sup>54</sup> Even science was among the subjects about which Americans could read in relation to Hungary. As a newcomer and a teacher at Ohio State University, Tibor Rado wrote about the history of the Eötvös-prize, launched in 1894 to honor outstanding students, and what it had done to create future mathematicians of a creative nature.<sup>55</sup>

The Hungarian countryside and its lifestyle were introduced in various pieces as well, and the exotic nature of both was stressed. A dinner experience in Kaposvár led to the hyperbolic statement that drinking Hungarian brandy (*pálinka*) was "like sipping sunshine," while in another piece that was devoted to a short tour in and around Debrecen one author found that the Puszta, over centuries of time, had tamed a once fierce and warlike race.<sup>56</sup> But the same writer also observed the contrast between "the blatant poverty of the country with the lavish expenditure in the capital."<sup>57</sup> Budapest indeed without exception fascinated foreign visitors, British and Americans alike. They found in it a true metropolis and striking luxury in many cases. As one writer put it in *National Geographic*, it was "very much like going to some magic island".<sup>58</sup>

But the most interesting and telling passages were always those that described the perceptions that American or British visitors held about Hungary and Hungarians. Aside from the concrete subject matter of any article, these authors often passed commentary on the Hungarian nation at large, strictly based upon their earlier readings, their impressions gathered in a few days and perhaps on account of previous visits as well. Therefore, their opinion is really only an imprint of what certain Americans felt about Hungary after a very short acquaintance. Still, their take on Hungary is important for the reason that they shared this with a large number of readers who formed their own picture about Hungary mainly based upon such articles.<sup>59</sup> One author observed that in Hungary there was "at least as much East as West," not a rare observation from Anglo-Saxon observers, and something that Hungarians would have vehemently disagreed with.<sup>60</sup>

This seemed to be the dividing line, both geographically and psychologically: where did Western Europe and its culture and influence end, and where did Eastern Europe begin? Hamilton Fish Armstrong, the editor of *Foreign Affairs* based upon his experience in Hungary, thought that “arriving in Budapest is like coming back to yesterday from tomorrow.”<sup>61</sup> But he also added that “Hungarian psychology is something entirely special and different from any other, in Europe or elsewhere. It is difficult for a visitor to understand it.”<sup>62</sup> A prominent writer from Pennsylvania, who a quarter of a century earlier had visited Europe and Hungary, had a nuanced picture to paint made upon his impressions. He thought he could see signs of Hungary belonging more to the East than to the West. “The East had been faintly perceptible in Vienna; in Budapest it was apparent”, he said.<sup>63</sup> Still he found Hungarians vigorous and cheerful, just like Americans, also “vital and young and simple,” where he did not use the word “simple” in a pejorative sense.<sup>64</sup> But to him Budapest was “emotionally old-fashioned; a city where a formal code of honor was still an actuality,” and Hungarians exhibited an “air of a primitive and pastoral life touched the narrow paved ways with the influences of a lost free and nomadic time.”<sup>65</sup> As a lighter side of his observations, he commented that the women in Budapest “were the most enchanting in the world. Potential with danger.”<sup>66</sup> Many people thus writing about Hungary found it “feudal” in its outlook and nature. This was mentioned so frequently that it must be considered a stigma that the country was labeled with. But compared to American or British standards, these observers were really startled by the, to them, seemingly backward state of things in politics and especially the lifestyle in the country. Hungary did not strike them as a flourishing democracy. And this was the general impression not only in the beginning but toward the very end of the examined period. The last American minister, for instance, already during World War II said after he was forced to leave the country that, although he was very sympathetic to Hungarians, he found the country was still feudal.<sup>67</sup>

As a conclusion, one can state that the Anglo-Saxon observers who expressed their impressions of Hungary in the Interwar period provided a multifaceted picture that was, however, tainted with certain stereotypes. Whether these stereotypes were obvious and palpable to them at the time of their visit or were biases that they brought with them would be the subject of further research. As a tentative answer, however, it is likely that most of these stereotypes came from 19<sup>th</sup>-century travelogues that appeared in Great Britain and the United States in which Hungary was typically described as a country between Europe and Asia and a feudal nation. In light of printed articles that were cited in this essay, one can safely state that Hungary was a country that to Anglo-Saxons seemed exotic, in many ways feudal, a contrast between east and west, still rich in culture, and very problematic concerning politics.

## Notes

- 1 This article is an expanded version of a talk I gave at the 11th Biennial Conference of HAAS (Hungarian Association for American Studies) conference at the University of Pécs, Hungary, May 12, 2016.
- 2 See Zoltán Peterecz, *Jeremiah Smith, Jr. and Hungary, 1924–1926: the United States, the League of Nations, and the Financial Reconstruction of Hungary*, (London: Versita, 2013).
- 3 Nicholas Roosevelt's diary entry, October 15, 1930, Hungary 1930–1933, Box 19, Nicholas Roosevelt Papers, Syracuse, USA.
- 4 Concerning British-Hungarian relations see Gábor Bátonyi, *Britain and Central Europe, 1918–1933*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999); Miklós Lojkó, *Meddling in Middle Europe*, (Budapest: Central European University Press, 2006; Géza Jeszenszky, "Magyarország a brit gondolkodásban és külpolitikában, 1848-tól 1945-ig" [Hungary in British Thinking and Foreign policy, 1848–945] *Külügyi Szemle*, vol. 13. no. 6 (Summer 2014), 159–165.
- 5 Albert Apponyi, "Was Hungary Strangled by the Peace Treaty? Yes", *Current History* 27, no. 6 (March 1, 1928), 807.
- 6 *Ibid.*, 810.
- 7 H. Wickham Steed, "Was Hungary Strangled by the Peace Treaty? No", *Current History* 27, no. 6 (March 1, 1928), 814, 811.
- 8 Otto H. Kahn to Sir William Goode, January 3, 1923, Box 100, Folder 4, Goode, Sir William, 1922–1923, Series 1: Correspondence, 1908–1934, Otto H. Kahn Papers, Princeton University.
- 9 "Comment on the Hungarian Forgeries", *The Living Age*, vol. 328, no. 4259, (February 20, 1926), 393.
- 10 G. De Villemus, "Hungary To-day", *The Living Age* vol. 332, no. 4305 (May 1, 1927), 785.
- 11 W. R. Castle, Jr. to Bainbridge Colby, November 3, 1920, 864.00/564, Affairs of Austria-Hungary and Hungary, 1912–1929, Microcopy No. 708, Roll 6, NARA.
- 12 *Ibid.*, 787.
- 13 Nicholas Roosevelt, "Count Karolyi Begins His Memoirs", *New York Times*, March 29, 1925.
- 14 Grant-Smith to Bainbridge Colby, June 9, 1920, 864.4016/16, Records of the Department of State Relating to Internal Affairs of Austria-Hungary and Hungary, 1912–1929, Microcopy No. 708, Roll 20, NARA
- 15 Grant-Smith to Bainbridge Colby, December 13, 1920, 864.00/363; Grant-Smith to Charles Evans Hughes, November 17, 1921, 864.00/464, Microcopy No. 708, Roll 5; Grant-Smith to Charles Evans Hughes, December 23, 1921, 864.00/485, Microcopy No. 708, Roll 6; Grant-Smith to Bainbridge Colby, January 28, 1921, 711.64/1; Grant-Smith to Henry P. Fletcher, August 30, 1921, 711.64/19/41, Microcopy No. 709, Roll 1, Records of the Department of State Relating to Internal Affairs of Austria-Hungary and Hungary, 1912–1929, NARA.
- 16 J. Butler Wright to Frank B. Kellogg, March 9, 1928, 864.00 PR/4, Microcopy No. 708, Roll 10, NARA.
- 17 *Ibid.*
- 18 Malbone W. Graham, Jr., *New Governments of Central Europe*, (London: Sir Isaac Pitman & Sons Ltd., 1924).
- 19 Malbone W. Graham, Jr., "Reconstruction of the Hungarian Parliament", *The American Political Science Review*, vol. 20, No. 2 (May, 1926), 392.
- 20 Malbone W. Graham, Jr., "The Elections to the New Hungarian Parliament", *The American Political Science Review*, vol. 21, No. 2 (May, 1927), 388.
- 21 Frederic Austin Ogg, *The Governments of Europe*, (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1913), 496–497.

- 22 Frederic A. Ogg, "Balkan Aspect of Italo-Hungarian Pact", *CurrentHistory* 26, no. 3 (June 1, 1927), 489–492.
- 23 Frederic A. Ogg, "Hungary and the Arms Question", *CurrentHistory* 28, no. 1 (April 1, 1928), 143–144.
- 24 On the Szentgotthárd incident, see Tibor Zsiga, *A szentgotthárdi fegyverbotrány*, [The Szentgotthárd Arms Scandal] (Szombathely: Pannon Műhely Kft., 1990); Tibor Zsiga, „A szentgotthárdi fegyverbotrány”, [The Szentgotthárd Arms Scandal] vol. 35, no. 1, (2008), 14–23; Ildikó Császár, "A szentgotthárdi fegyverszállítási botrány sajtóvisszhangja”, [The Press Echo of the Szentgotthárd Arms Scandal] *Vasi Szemle*, vol. 68, no. 6 (2013), 579–591.
- 25 Emery Deri, "M. Benes Pulls the Strings", *New Republic* vol. 54, no. 694 (March 21, 1928), 150.
- 26 "Hungary and the Peace of Europe", *New Republic* vol. 54, no. 698 (April 18, 1928), 274.
- 27 *Ibid.*
- 28 See, for example, Glant, Tibor, "Apponyi Albert és Jászi Oszkár amerikai vitája a népszövetségi kölcsönről 1923 őszén”, [The American Debate of Albert Apponyi and Oszkár Jászi over the League Loan in the Fall of 1923] *Vasváry Collection Newsletter*, vol. 17, no. 1 (1997), 3–5.
- 29 Ernest Ludwig, "Mutilated Hungary", *Current History* 28, no. 6 (September 1, 1928), 927.
- 30 *Ibid.*, 931.
- 31 David Hunter Miller, "The Execution of the Peace Treaties", *Current History* 29, no. 2 (November 1, 1928), 188.
- 32 See, for example, Heinrich Kanner, "A Central European Federation", *The Contemporary Review*, vol. 128 (July 1, 1925), 614–620.
- 33 J. Butler Wright to Henry L. Stimson, May 10, 1929, 864.00 PR/18, Microcopy No. 708, Roll 10, NARA.
- 34 J. Butler Wright to Frank B. Kellogg, December 6, 1928, 864.00 PR/13, Microcopy No. 708, Roll 10, NARA.
- 35 H. Charles Woods, "Hungary after Ten Years", *The Contemporary Review* 135 (January 1, 1929), 448–455.
- 36 William Martin, "Ten Years of Bethlen", *The Living Age*, vol. 340, no. 4378 (July 1931), 477.
- 37 Frederic A. Ogg, "Bethlen's Ten Years As Hungarian Premier", *CurrentHistory* 35, no. 1 (October 1, 1931), 49.
- 38 Harry Hill Bandholtz, *An Undiplomatic Diary*, (Safety Harbor, FL: Simon Publications, 2000), 172; General Bandholtz to the Commission to Negotiate Peace, November 19, 1919, *Foreign Relations of the United States. The Paris Peace Conference*, Vol. 12, (Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1920), 724.
- 39 Quoted in Zsuzsa L. Nagy, "Amerikai diplomaták Horthy Miklósról, 1920–1944”, [American Diplomats on Miklós Horthy, 1920–1944] *Történelmi Szemle*, vol. 33, no. 3–4 (1990), 175–177.
- 40 Hohler to Curzon, January 3, 1924, *Documents on British Foreign Policy*, First Series, Medlicott, W. W. and Dakin, Douglas, eds. (London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1985), vol. 26, 9. Also on the American opinion regarding Horthy see Tibor Frank, "Diplomatic Images of Admiral Horthy: The American Perception of Interwar Hungary, 1919–1941”, In: Tibor Frank (editor): *Ethnicity, Propaganda, Myth-Making. Studies on Hungarian Connections to Britain and America 1848–1945* (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1999. 233–251.
- 41 Butler Wright diary entries, June 18, 1927, and August 16, 1927, Series 4: Diaries, Minister to Hungary, 23 May–25 Dec 1927, Box 2, Joshua Butler Wright Papers, 1909–1938, Seeley G. Mudd Manuscript Library, Princeton.
- 42 Gergely Romsics, "Hungary in the Journal *Foreign Affairs*, 1922–1939”, *Hungarian Studies Review*, vol. 32, nos. 1–2 (2005), 19.
- 43 *Ibid.*, 19–25.

- 44 Ibid., 26–30.
- 45 Emil Lengyel, “Ex-Empress Zita’s Plans to Restore Habsburg Monarchy”, *Current History* 28, no. 3 (June 1, 1928), 386–389; Dorothy Thompson, “Water under Bridges”, *Saturday Evening Post*, vol. 204, no. 41, (April 9, 1932), 20–21, 120–123.
- 46 C. A. Macartney, “Hungary since 1918”, *The Slavonic and East European Review*, vol. 7, no. 21 (March, 1929), 583.
- 47 Béla Menczer, “Should the Habsburgs Be Restored?” *The Contemporary Review*, vol. 146 (July 1, 1934), 44–48.
- 48 On the optants question, see Francis Deák, *The Hungarian–Rumanian Land Dispute*, (New York: Columbia University Press, 1928); Ferenc Matheovics, *A magyar–román birtokper* [The Hungarian-Romanian Optants Case] (Budapest, 1929); Elek Nagy, *Magyarország és a Népszövetség* [Hungary and the League of Nations] (Budapest: Franklin Társulat, 1930), 57–82; Gábor Aradi, “A San Remo-i tárgyalások magyarországi előkészülete”, [The Hungarian Preparations for the San Remo Talks] *Levéltári Szemle*, vol. 52, no. 3, (2002), 24–38; Holly Case, *Between States: The Transylvanian Question and the European Idea during the Second World War*, (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2009) 27–30.
- 49 William Martin, “Hungary versus Roumania,” *The Living Age*, vol. 333, no. 4318, November 15, 1927, 858.
- 50 Dudley Heathcote, “The Hungarian-Roumanian Dispute”, *Fortnightly Review* 123, no. 734 (February 1928), 256.
- 51 J. Butler Wright to Frank B. Kellogg, September 30, 1927, 864.00/708, Microcopy No. 708, Roll 8, NARA.
- 52 Alexander Hevesi, “Madách and ‘The Tragedy of Man’,” *The Slavonic and East European Review*, vol. 9, no. 26 (December, 1930), 391–402.
- 53 Adam Hegedüs, “Studies in Modern Hungarian Literature”, *The Slavonic and East European Review*, vol. 10, no. 29 (December, 1931), 293–300.
- 54 Béla Bartók and Theodore Baker, “Hungarian Peasant Music”, *The Musical Quarterly*, vol. 19, No. 3 (July, 1933), 267–287.
- 55 Tibor Rado, “On Mathematical Life in Hungary”, *The American Mathematical Monthly*, vol. 39, No. 2 (February, 1932), 85–90.
- 56 Jerrard Tickell, “A Night in Hungary”, *The Living Age* 333, no. 4319 (December 1, 1927), 1015; Cicely C. Sharp, “The Riders of the Plain”, *Fortnightly Review* 129 (January 1931), 24.
- 57 Sharp, “The Riders of the Plain”, 24.
- 58 Jesse Richardson Hildebrand, “Budapest, Twin City of the Danube”, *National Geographic Magazine*, vol. 61, no. 6 (June 1932), 729.
- 59 For this topic and the Hungarian effort to change this image see, Zsolt Nagy, *Great Expectations and Interwar Realities. Hungarian Cultural Diplomacy, 1918–1941*, Budapest, Central European University Press, 2017.
- 60 F. W. “Hungary’s Old Vic”, *The Living Age* 327, no. 4249 (December 12, 1925), 591.
- 61 Hamilton Fish Armstrong, “Hungary Awaits ‘Der Tag’,” *Our World*, vol. 1, no. 6 (September 1922), 76.
- 62 Ibid., 77.
- 63 Joseph Hergesheimer, “Metropolitan Passage”, *Saturday Evening Post*. 204, no. 44 (29.
- 64 Ibid., 110.
- 65 Ibid., 108, 109.
- 66 Ibid., 109.
- 67 Pell to Cordell Hull, February 26, 1942, 864.00/1037, Records of the Department of State Relating to Internal, Affairs of Hungary, 1930–1944, Microcopy No. 1206, Roll 13, NARA.