

PETER CSUNDERLIK

From Criticising ‘NATO History-Writing’ to the Triumph of ‘Comecon History-Writing’: A Change of Attitudes in Hungarian Historiography after 1956*

In order to outline the main ways in which attitudes changed in Hungarian historiography during the Kádár era, I would like to begin with two citations. Both are from Hungarian reviews of monographs on the Habsburg Empire published in the USA. The first comes from Imre Gonda, in his critical review in 1959 of Robert A. Kann’s book *The Habsburg Empire* (1957).¹ He stated that

It has not been a secret at all that NATO does not only have “defence tasks,” but other ones as well. Nor is it a particularly new discovery that NATO will become a more specific “ideological” centre, in the sense that it also transmits the military methods and aims of the Cold War into intellectual space, and transforms the specific spirit of Western citizenship into the spirit of a NATO way of life and a NATO approach. Western ideologues play an important role in the formation of this new NATO approach. But Western historians have a prominent role in this process. Their task is to repaint the nearer and further past in NATO-colour in order to legitimize the aims of NATO.²

* This paper was prepared in the framework of the research project *Western Impacts and Transfers in Hungarian Culture and Social Sciences in the 1970s and 1980s* financed by NKFIH (Nr. 125374.)

¹ Robert A. Kann, *The Habsburg Empire. A Study in Integration and Disintegration*. (New York: F. A. Praeger, 1957)

² Imre Gonda, “Néhány megjegyzés Robert A. Kann ‘The Habsburg Empire’ című könyvéhez [Some Remarks on the Monograph of Robert A. Kann ‘The Habsburg Empire’],” *Történelmi Szemle* 3–4 (1959): 515.

And so the criticism of a “NATO approach” and “NATO historiography” goes on. Imre Gonda mentions the acronym “NATO” eleven times in his review, and only later mentions the name the concrete topic of the monograph, *The Habsburg Empire*. In his review, Gonda criticized Robert Kann for actually creating “NATO propaganda” by appreciating the integrative role of the Habsburg Empire. Imre Gonda’s review was based on the negative Monarchy-image prevalent during the Rákosi era, according to which Hungary was placed in a “colonial” position in the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy, and was thus exploited.

The second citation comes from György Ránki’s 1988 review of John Komlos’s *The Habsburg Monarchy as a Customs Union*,³ published in 1983:

According to Komlos, it is not only about Austria not exploiting Hungary economically—as part of the public opinion assumed and Hungarian historiography claimed for a long time—but also not about Austria and Hungary enjoying the benefits of a “marriage” thanks to comparative advantages, like Hungarian economic historians assume today. According to Komlos, the benefits [of the customs union] were mostly enjoyed by Hungary.

Although György Ránki was not completely satisfied with the method used by Komlos, he still added: “It is true that Hungary enjoyed the benefits of this marriage very much.”⁴

In one of his last writings, György Ránki illustrated his and Iván Berend’s historical approach and the methodology of economic history, arguing for “empirical coexistence” with reference to “comparative advantages,” or, in other words, a reform-oriented attitude that marked representative authors of Kádár-era historiography. In the 1970s and ‘80s, this

³ John Komlos, *The Habsburg Monarchy as a Customs Union. Economic Development in Austria-Hungary in the Nineteenth Century* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1983)

⁴ György Ránki, “John Komlos: A Habsburg Monarchia mint vámunió: gazdasági fejlődés a 19. században [John Komlos: The Habsburg Monarchy as a Custom Union: Economic Development in Austria-Hungary in the Nineteenth Century],” *Századok* 3 (1988): 511.

attitude and methodology was informally known as “Comecon history-writing,” as Gábor Gyáni pointed out in his study on the remembrance of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy in Hungary.⁵ András Kovács had already described the oeuvre of the renowned Berend-Ránki couple in that way for the *Bibó Memorial Book*, which in turn came to be recognized as a key work in the Hungarian historiography of the Kádár era.⁶

I chose these two quotations from reviews in *Történelmi Szemle* and *Századok* because they show the ways in which the Compromise of 1867 and the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy in general were re-evaluated during these periods. On the other hand, the difference between Gonda’s and Ránki’s approach reveals not only changes in historical approaches, but methodological developments too, and most of all the ways in which innovations from the formerly rejected Western, “bourgeois” historical literature became accepted during the Kádár era.

Indeed, one of the main inspirations behind Berend and Ránki’s oeuvre was Walt Whitman Rostow’s book *The Stages of Economic Growth*, published in 1960.⁷ Berend and Ránki had become familiar with further American literature during their Ford Scholarships to the USA in the mid-1960s. They were among the first to receive it after 1965, the year it became possible. Ránki got the opportunity in 1965; Berend in 1966. Berend wrote the following in his memoir about his year at Columbia University, which he considered to be his “second university”:

I rushed in euphoric happiness from my tiny hotel room to the university through Broadway every morning. I was

⁵ Gábor Gyáni, A Habsburg-múlt emlékezeti kánonjai [The Canons of the Remembrance of the Habsburg Past] In: Gábor Gyáni, *Relatív történelem*, [Relative History], (Budapest: Typotex, 2007), 121–122.

⁶ András Kovács, Két kiegyezés [Two Compromises], In: *Bibó Emlékkönyv* 2., [Bibó Memorial Book] (Bern: Európai Protestáns Magyar Szabadegyetem, 1979), 118–139.

⁷ W. W. Rostow, *The Stages of Economic Growth. A Non-Communist Manifesto*, (London: Cambridge University Press, 1960)

almost dizzy from the open-shelf system of American libraries while I was walking among the bookshelves of the library room, and I took every book from the shelves I wanted. Most of them were unfamiliar to me, or I had only heard about them from “critical” reviews before. [...] Contemporary American economic and economic historical research showed me new ways, and the studies of Alexander Gerschenkron shed new light on what I had known about the history of Hungarian economy.⁸

Ten years had passed between Berend’s year in the United States and when the first collection of studies by Alexander Gerschenkron were published in Hungary at the Karl Marx University of Economic Sciences,⁹ where Iván T. Berend was the rector at the time (and the head of the Department of Economic History, too). The work of Walt Whitman Rostow had already been published in 1968 in Hungary by the Kossuth Publishing Company, the party publisher, however the subtitle of the work was left out from the Hungarian translation: “A Non-Communist Manifesto.”¹⁰ And this reveals how the wall between Western and Eastern historical science was—using a biological term—“semipermeable,” like a membrane, from the 1960s onward.

In the following, I would like to outline the main directions and characteristics of the relations between Hungarian and Western historiography in the 1970s and 1980s, as the limits of this study do not make it possible to give a broader panorama. My information on this topic was drawn mostly from my own interviews in May and June 2019 with Márta Lázár, the former editor of social sciences at Akadémiai Kiadó, the publishing company of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, and with András Gerő, Gábor Gyáni, Tibor Hajdu, Géza Jeszenszky, Gábor Klaniczay, György Kövér, György Németh, Attila Pók

⁸ Iván Berend T., *A történelem – ahogyan megéltem*. [History – How I Lived It], (Budapest: Kulturtrade, 1997), 78–79.

⁹ *Válogatás Alexander Gerschenkron gazdaságtörténeti munkáiból*. [Selected Works of Alexander Gerschenkron on Economic History] (Budapest: Marx Károly Közgazdaságtudományi Egyetem, 1976)

¹⁰ W. W. Rostow: *A gazdasági növekedés szakaszai*. [*The Stages of Economic Growth*], (Budapest: Kossuth Könyvkiadó, 1968)

and István Rév, all of whom are notable historians who were active in the 1970s and 1980s. Furthermore, I corresponded with Hungarian historians living in the USA, namely Iván T. Berend, István Deák, and Peter Pastor. Their aid was simply priceless for me. In addition, I checked book reviews in the main historical and social scientific journals of the period, *Századok*, *Történelmi Szemle*, *Valóság*, *Világosság*, as well as issues of *Világtörténet*.

It is important to stress that my starting point is that the so-called Erik Molnár Debate (*Molnár Erik-vita*) of the early 1960s, which generated the opportunity for Hungarian historiography to integrate itself conceptually into Western historiography. László Péter, a historian who left Hungary in 1956 and then graduated from Oxford as a disciple of C. A. Macartney, had already drawn attention to the importance of the Erik Molnár Debate in his 1965 study *Hungarian Nationalism*.¹¹

The fact that the “national-independence fighter” approach of the Rákosi era was replaced by “class struggle” after 1956 led to the denationalization of Hungarian historiography in the 1960s, and this increased the importance of social and economic history, the latter being internationalist by its very nature. Of course, the growth of the importance of economic history in the era was also due to the fact that the most influential historians of the 1960s and 1980s, Zsigmond Pál Pach, Iván T. Berend, and György Ránki were all economic historians. They filled significant international roles: Zsigmond Pál Pach was elected vice-president of the International Economic History Association (founded in 1960 at the International Historical Congress in Stockholm) in 1965, and he became its president in 1978.¹² Iván T. Berend was the president of the association from 1986 until 1994.

¹¹ László Péter, “A magyar nacionalizmus [Hungarian Nationalism],” in *Elbától keletre. Tanulmányok a magyar és kelet-európai történelemről* [East of the Elbe. Studies on Hungarian and East European History], edited by László Péter (Budapest: Osiris Kiadó, 1998), 80–84.

¹² Iván T. Berend, “Pach Zsigmond Pál (1919–2001). Egy nagyszabású tudományos életmű, [Zsigmond Pál Pach. A Monumental Oeuvre],” *Történelmi Szemle* 3–4 (2001): 145–157.

When the 1987 World Congress of the International Economic History Association was held in Hungary—perhaps the most significant event in Hungarian historiography of the era—this was due in no small part to their own authority and pursuits. It was also because of Pach, Berend, and Ránki that the Department for Economic History of the Karl Marx University of Economic Sciences could welcome special guests from the West like Michael Postan, Peter Mathias, Rondo Cameron or Bo Gustaffson, who already gave lectures in Budapest in English in the 1970s.¹³ It can be said about foreign guests generally that Western historians were relatively free to visit Hungary. A. J. P. Taylor, Eric Hobsbawm, Fernand Braudel, and Immanuel Wallerstein also visited Hungary in this period, just to mention a few “stars” of the field. Michel Foucault would have come too, but he was embroiled in a scandal because of his support for the 1979 Iranian Revolution.¹⁴

Nevertheless, international visits were not exempt from Cold War tensions. It mostly affected relations toward Hungarian emigrant historians. Several expulsion scandals and bans affected Hungarian emigrant researchers returning from the West. Just to mention a few cases, Rudolf Tőkés, who was invited to the International Conference on the Hungarian Soviet Republic in 1969 on its fiftieth anniversary—because he was the author of Béla Kun’s biography published in the USA in 1967—was expelled from Hungary during the conference (and he could not get a visa until 1976).¹⁵ László Péter was not allowed to enter the country in 1970 (so he was forced to collect

¹³ “Egy történésznek nem lehetnek illúziói – Kövér György [A Historian Cannot Have Illusions – György Kövér],” in *Történészek története. Kutatók hivatásukról, pályájukról, eredményeikről* [History of Historians. Researchers on Their Profession, Career and Achievements], edited by Dóra Czeferner, Zoltán Szóts, Kinga Szóts-Rajkó (Budapest: Fakultás Kiadó–Újkor Alapítvány, 2018), 143.

¹⁴ Gábor Klaniczay, “Michel Foucault,” in *Ellenkultúra a hetvenes-nyolcvanas években*. [Counter-Culture in the ‘70s and ‘80s], edited by Gábor Klaniczay (Budapest: Noran Libro, 2004), 152–153.

¹⁵ Rudolf Tőkés, “Kun Béla [Béla Kun],” in *Újragondolt történelem. Válogatott tanulmányok, 1967–2017* [History Rethought. Selected Studies, 1967–2017] (Budapest: Kossuth Kiadó, 2018), 17.

sources on the history of Hungary in the era of dualism in Zagreb). István Deák, who was working on his Kossuth book at that time, was expelled from the country in 1974, only to return to Hungary triumphantly in 1978 as a member of the US delegation bringing home the Holy Crown. Peter Pastor, who wrote an important monograph on the foreign policy of the Károlyi government, was expelled in 1978 as well.¹⁶

It is important to mention that while these historians were expelled from Hungary—sometimes because of ridiculous accusations like “espionage,” as in the case of István Deák—their American books were reviewed and widely recognized in Hungarian historical journals. From these American books, the 1979 monograph by István Deák, *The Lawful Revolution – Louis Kossuth and the Hungarians, 1848–1849*, was even published in 1983 in Hungary, however in this case the title itself was censored to erase the notion of “lawful revolution.” Thus, the Hungarian title of the book simply became *Lajos Kossuth and the Hungarians, 1848–1849*. The book’s importance was even greater than usual, since Deák’s book was the first monograph by an emigrant, non-Marxist author that was allowed to be published in Hungary. In fact, the Hungarian edition was authorized at the “highest party-level,” according to Deák. However, Ervin Pamlényi, who worked at Gondolat Publishing Company, indicated to Deák at the time that the original title could not be kept. So, only the second Hungarian edition of Deák’s book, published in 1994, had its original title, *A törvényes forradalom (The Lawful Revolution)*.¹⁷

The “semipermeable” nature of the wall between Western and Hungarian historiography can also be demonstrated not

¹⁶ Peter Pastor, *Hungary between Wilson and Lenin. The Hungarian Revolution of 1918–1919 and the Big Three* (Boulder: East European Quarterly, 1976).

¹⁷ István Deák, *The Lawful Revolution. Lajos Kossuth and the Hungarians, 1848–1849* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1979); István Deák, *Kossuth Lajos és a magyarok 1848–49-ben* [Lajos Kossuth and the Hungarians, 1848–1849] (Budapest: Gondolat, 1983); István Deák, *A törvényes forradalom. Kossuth Lajos és a magyarok 1848–49-ben* [The Lawful Revolution. Lajos Kossuth and the Hungarians, 1848–1849], (Budapest: Gondolat, 1994).

only through publishing, but also through exchanges and professional travel from Hungary to the West and vice-versa. However, the opportunity for Hungarian historians to leave the country was limited not only by political but also financial reasons. Traveling abroad was put under administrative restrictions due to the limited amount of foreign currency in Hungary.¹⁸ Professional travels could offer more opportunities than plain tourism, but scholarship funding—based on the Hungarian budget or bilateral agreements—and conference invitations were also financially restricted. If there was not a foreign host who paid for everything, it was hard to secure the foreign currency to the historians who wanted to travel abroad.

This was also true for book publishing. Limited amounts of foreign currency affected the volume of cultural transfer. Publishing companies had different amounts of foreign currency to spend on the rights of books from abroad. Európa Publishing House had the biggest amount of foreign currency in order to buy foreign literature—through the Hungarian Copyright Office (*Szerzői Jogvédő Hivatal*)—but Gondolat also had enough foreign currency for the same reason because its director, Margit Siklós, had excellent connections within the party. This explains why the Gondolat Publishing House could publish the *Társadalomtudományi Könyvtár* (Social Science Collection) series,¹⁹ which in turn contained the works that had a great

¹⁸ This was the case generally: Hungarians could travel relatively freely compared to other state socialist citizens, however the narrow dollar “budget frame” allowed for only a limited number of trips. For a study on Hungarian travel regulations throughout the Cold War, see Péter Bencsik, *Kelet és Nyugat között. Államhatárok, úti dokumentumok, határátlépés Magyarországon és Csehszlovákiában (1945–1989)* [Between East and West. State Borders, Travel Documents, Border Crossing in Hungary and Czechoslovakia (1945–1989)] (Budapest: MTA Bölcsészettudományi Kutatóközpont TTI, 2019).

¹⁹ See the study of Erzsébet Takács in this volume: Erzsébet Takács, In the Mantle of Professionalization. The Openness and Confinement of Family Sociology in Hungary During the 1970s and 1980s, *Múltunk* 2019 Special Issue, 155–191.

effect on the modernization of Hungarian historiography during the 1970s and ‘80s.²⁰

The publishing companies did not even receive income for their books sold abroad, since everything was managed by the Hungarian Copyright Office. No matter how small the amount was, Akadémiai Kiadó, the publishing company of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, also sold a small number of books abroad, the publications of the *Studia Historica* series in English, edited by Ferenc Mucsi. For example, Tibor Hajdu’s monograph on the Hungarian Soviet Republic was published in English in an abbreviated form in this series, just like the 1982 book by Julianna Puskás, *From Hungary to the United States, 1880–1914*.²¹ The work of Puskás was one that was also counted in the West from the basically provincial Hungarian historiography.²² Another big bestseller was the study of Jenő Szűcs, *Vázlat Európa három történelmi régiójáról (Three Historical Regions of Europe: An Outline)*—originally published in the Bibó Memorial Book—whose French edition was introduced by Fernand Braudel.²³

The lack of foreign currency also hindered the acquisition of foreign publications in Hungary, therefore the historical journals rather reviewed works that were sent for free from abroad. That explains why many Romanian books were reviewed. However, the supply of foreign journals was excellent: the libraries of the Institute of History of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences (MTA), the Karl Marx University of Economic Sciences’s Department

²⁰ See “Izgalmas sorozatok – több egyedi könyv. Beszélgetés a Gondolat Kiadó igazgatójával [Interesting Series – More Unique Books. Interview with the director of Gondolat Publishing House],” *Népszava*, August 11, 1978.

²¹ Julianna Puskás, *From Hungary to the United States, 1880–1914* (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1982).

²² Gábor Gyáni, “Kivándorlás és az amerikai magyarság sorsa [Emigration and the Fate of American Hungarians],” in *Történešzdiskurzusok [Historians Discourses]* (Budapest: L’Harmattan, 2002), 276–284.

²³ Gábor Gyáni, “Szűcs Jenő, a magányos történetíró [Jenő Szűcs, the Lonely Historian],” in *Nemzeti vagy transznacionális történelem [National Or Transnational History]* (Budapest: Kalligram, 2018), 188–212; For the French edition of Jenő Szűcs’s essay, see Jenő Szűcs, *Les trois Europes* (Paris: L’Harmattan, 1985). For an English translation, see Jenő Szűcs, “The Three Historical Regions of Europe: An Outline,” *Acta Historica Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 29, no. 2–4 (1983): 131–184.

for Economic History, and the library of the Lajos Kossuth University in Debrecen received exchange copies from almost everywhere. This explains why the journal of the Hungarian Historical Society, *Századok*, included not only reviews of monographs, but also of foreign journals during the editorship of Ervin Pamlényi (1957–1975).²⁴

The journal *Világtörténet* was created specifically for the presentation of foreign literature in 1979, with László Makkai as editor-in-chief, who had very good foreign relations, mainly French. When Makkai fell ill, Miklós Incze replaced him in 1986. Although it also published Soviet studies in Hungarian, the main purpose of *Világtörténet* was to present the scientific results of Western historiography. The researchers of the institute were obliged to write reviews for *Világtörténet*, which also published translations of books and parts of books published abroad.²⁵

The international relations of the Institute of History at MTA were prominent in that period. Its researchers regularly attended foreign conferences—especially the five-year International Historical Congress.²⁶ Getting a scholarship was almost exclusively possible (that is, informally) for historians who were backed by the Institute of History, but essentially with the aid of György Ránki. Although Ránki only became the director of the Institute of History in 1986 formally, he had already directed the institute informally during the directorship of Zsigmond Pál Pach.²⁷

²⁴ Ferenc Glatz, “Szerkesztői életpálya. Pamlényi Ervin (1919–1984) [The Career of an Editor. Ervin Pamlényi (1919–1984)],” in *Történetírás – korszakváltásban. Tanulmányok* [History Writing in a Shifting Age. Studies], (Budapest: Gondolat, 1990), 262–272.

²⁵ Ignác Romsics, *Clio bűvöletében – Magyar történetírás a 19–20. században – nemzetközi kitekintéssel* [Under the Spell of Clío: Hungarian History Writing in the 19th and 20th Centuries, with an International Outlook] (Budapest: Osiris Kiadó, 2011), 402–403.

²⁶ Karl Dietrich Erdmann, *Toward a Global Community of Historians. The International Historical Congresses and the International Committee of Historical Sciences, 1898–2000* (New York–Oxford: Berghahn Books, 2005).

²⁷ Gábor Gyáni, “Történetíró a diktatúra korában. Ránki György élete és munkássága [A Historian in the Age of Dictatorship. The Life and Career of György Ránki],” in *Nemzeti vagy transznacionális történelem*, 213–233.

Looking at scholarships, the most important relationship of the Institute of History was with the Institut für Europäische Geschichte in Mainz, whose director was Karl Otmar von Aretin between 1968 and 1994. Aretin was the initiator of the creation of joint committees of Western historians with the Soviets (bilateral joint committees were the official linkages between different countries in historical science). Aretin built a good relationship with Ránki, and thanks to this Hungarian researchers could receive one-year scholarships to Mainz, where 8–12 scholars were guests of the institute at the same time. Ferenc Glatz, Lóránt Tilkovszky, Judit Fejes, Dániel Szabó, János Pótó, and Attila Pók also had the opportunity to spend a year in Mainz.²⁸ However, it is important to notice that only researchers of the Institute of History could get these scholarships, so they were in a privileged position in this regard.

There is no place for presenting all the international relationships with Hungary, from Britain to Israel, in the 1970s and 1980s, so let me just mention France and the *Annales* school, with whom Éva H. Balázs, Domokos Kosáry, and László Makkai had excellent relationships. (As a case in point, Fernand Braudel was elected an honorary member of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences in 1982.²⁹) From the middle generation, Gyula Benda and György Granasztói, and from the younger, the medievalist Gábor Klaniczay, played an outstanding role in adapting the history of *mentalités à la Annales* to the Hungarian historiographic context.³⁰ The importers finally gathered in the István Hajnal Circle, founded in 1987, and centred around the

²⁸ Mária Ormos, *Remények és csalódások* [Hopes and Disappointments] (Budapest: Kossuth Kiadó, 2017), 171–172.

²⁹ Éva H. Balázs, “Fernand Braudellel Fernand Braudelről. Beszélgetés a világhírű történésszel [About Fernand Braudel with Fernand Braudel. Interview with the World-Famous Historian],” in *Életek és korok. Válogatott írások*, [Lives and Ages. Selected Works], edited by Lilla Krász, (Budapest: MTA Történettudományi Intézete, 2005), 169–173.

³⁰ On the Hungarian reception of the *Annales* school, see Gábor Klaniczay, “Találkozások az Annales-iskolával Magyarországon [Encounters with the Annales School in Hungary],” in *Redite ad Cor. Tanulmányok Sahin-Tóth Péter emlékére* [Redite ad Cor. Studies in the Memory of Péter Sahin-Tóth], edited by Lilla Krász and Teréz Oborni (Budapest: Eötvös Kiadó, 2008), 647–658.

review journal *BUKSZ*, launched in 1989.³¹ Of course, there were also opponents of methodological innovations. In an interview in 2000, one of the “conservative” medievalists, Gyula Kristó, claimed that the approach of the *Annales* school was not applicable for Hungarian historical publications.³²

I would like now to focus on descriptions of the American relations, and since they were closely connected to research on the history of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy, let me return to the works of Robert Kann and John Komlos. The first American grants were given by the Ford Foundation in 1965, but intensive professional relationships began in 1967, when a major conference was held on the centennial anniversary of the *Ausgleich* in Bloomington. It was this year when Péter Hanák published a study that re-evaluated the Compromise in the *Austrian History Yearbook*.³³ Dénes Sinor, a professor at the University of Indiana-Bloomington, played an important role in paving the way for these connections, and it is also his merit that a Hungarian Department was established there in 1971. The result of this American-Hungarian cooperation was the *History of Hungary* published in English, written by Peter F. Sugar, Péter Hanák, and Tibor Frank—a book published by the Indiana University Press, too.³⁴ In addition to the Ford Foundation’s scholarships, later scholarships funded through the International Research and Exchanges Board (IREX), the

³¹ Gábor Gyáni, “Miért és hogyan született meg a Hajnal István Kör? [Why and How was the István Hajnal Circle Born?],” in *Nemzeti vagy transznacionális történelem*, 234–256.

³² “Akadémikusok nyakkendő nélkül – Kristó Gyula történész [Academics without a Tie – the Historian Gyula Kristó],” April 12, 2000. Source: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=kozz_ocZEJ4. (Retrieved on October 26, 2019) For Gyula Kristó’s memoir, see Gyula Kristó, *Érték és értelem (Önéletírás korrajzzal)* [Value and Sense. (Biography with a Sketch of the Age)] (Szeged: JATE Press, 2016).

³³ Péter Hanák, “Hungary in the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy: Preponderancy or Dependency?” *Austrian History Yearbook* 3 (1967): 260–302.

³⁴ Peter F. Sugar, Péter Hanák, and Tibor Frank, eds., *A History of Hungary* (Bloomington–Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1990); Tibor Frank, “Az amerikai történetírás és Magyarország [American Historiography and Hungary],” in *Amerika világai* [The Worlds of America] (Budapest: Gondolat Kiadó, 2018), 61–62.

American Council of Learned Societies (ACLS), and the Soros Foundation also appeared.³⁵

Just as Hungary could only have become part of nineteenth-century and fin-de-siècle great power politics as part of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy, the results of Hungarian historiography on the “Compromise debate” could also draw attention only as part of the wider sub-field of Habsburg studies. Thus, research into the history of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy played an important role in rebuilding Hungarian relations with Western (and particularly American) historiography, which had been interrupted from 1948–49 until the 1960s. All of this coincided with a trend: writing about the history of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy became popular from the 1960s onward, the most influential creator of this “fashion” being Carl E. Schorske, who published his magnum opus, *Fin-de-Siècle Vienna*, in 1980.³⁶

Schorske had the greatest impact on Péter Hanák in Hungary. Hanák even made an interview with Schorske in Princeton, and he published a Schorskian essay-collection in 1988 under the title *The Garden and the Workshop*.³⁷ The collaboration between Schorske and Hanák also resulted in a joint US-Hungarian conference series that dealt with the urban and cultural histories of New York and Budapest. Later on, the organization of the conferences was taken over by Thomas Bender and Attila Pók, the result of which was a joint volume edited by Schorske and Bender in 1994: *Budapest and New York: Studies in Metropolitan Transformation, 1870–1930*.³⁸ In addition to the New York–Budapest conferences, the Centenary

³⁵ See Iván T. Berend, *A történelem – ahogyan megéltem*, op. cit.; Tamás Ungvári, *Lezáratlan nyomozás* [Unfinished Investigation] (Budapest: Ulpius Ház, 2004), 142–145.

³⁶ Carl E. Schorske, *Fin-de-Siècle Vienna. Politics and Culture* (New York: Knopf, 1980).

³⁷ Péter Hanák, *A Kert és a Műhely* [The Garden and the Workshop] (Budapest: Gondolat Kiadó, 1988); translated into English and published by Princeton University Press in 1998. See Péter Hanák, *The Garden and the Workshop* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1998).

³⁸ Thomas Bender and Carl E. Schorske, eds., *Budapest and New York: Studies in Metropolitan Transformation, 1870–1930* (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1994).

Georg Lukács conferences held in the USA in 1985 should be highlighted, which were organized by Carl E. Schorske and György Ránki.³⁹

The importance of the research of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy in the international relations of Hungarian historiography is illustrated well by Péter Hanák's earlier intention to organize a Habsburg Studies-centred historical department at Central European University, inspired by the institution's original framing at the Inter University Centre in Dubrovnik.⁴⁰ However, the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy has not been seen as a forerunner of Comecon since the 1990s. Rather, the empire stands as a forerunner of the Common Market and the EU.⁴¹ This is how Hungarian historiography has arrived into the era of "EU-history writing" since the 2000s.

³⁹ Miklós Almási, *Pisztoly a könyvtárban. Életinterjú* [Gun in the Library. Life Interview] (Budapest: Kalligram, 1979), 175–176.

⁴⁰ On the history of the CEU, see *Ten Years in Images and Documents. Central European University, 1989–1999*. (Budapest: Central European University, 1999.)

⁴¹ As an example, see András Geró, *Dualizmusok. A Monarchia Magyarországa*. [Dualisms. Hungary in the Monarchy] (Budapest: Új Mandátum, 2010), 178–183.