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Abstract

This thesis explores nationalist narratives and public memory of Francis Joseph and the Habsburg era in Hungary. In this work, Budapest’s Liberty Bridge serves as a lens and reference point of sorts in my examination of nationalist historical narratives and public memory of Francis Joseph and the era of the Dual Monarchy in Hungary. In particular, this paper will trace the way in which ruling governments have attempted to impose their own versions of history onto the public spaces of Budapest and into the minds of their citizens. Beginning with the years following the 1848 revolution, this thesis looks at changes in the memory of Francis Joseph during the Dual Monarchy, the Horthy era, and the Socialist era, ending with a discussion of Francis Joseph in modern Hungarian society. In Budapest, the reason that the Liberty Bridge never regained its pre-Socialist era name is due to a lack of popular positive memory of Francis Joseph, in contrast to several other important Hungarian historical figures. In the contested field of Hungarian national narrative the memory of Francis Joseph never truly found its place; for while he did gain a significant degree of popularity in the later decades of his reign, Hungary’s longest-ruling monarch never gained a place in the country’s imagination. By turns marginalized, vilified and ignored over the course of the twentieth century, the king who oversaw the creation of modern Budapest is today largely absent from public space and from public discourse.
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Introduction

“WE, FRANCIS JOSEPH THE FIRST, by the grace of God Emperor of Austria, King of Bohemia, etc., and Apostolic King of Hungary, celebrate the glorious memory of the one-thousand year rule of the Hungarian state together with our beloved Hungarian subjects.”

With this pompous, antiquated proclamation, Hungary’s king officially opened the bridge which had been dedicated to him by his gracious subjects. It was October of 1896, during the middle of Hungary’s monumental celebration of its thousandth anniversary, and the Empire was on display in her full glory. Pendants and flags of red, white, and green streamed from the towers of the glittering new bridge, as journalists and photographers rushed to record the grand opening of Budapest’s Francis Joseph Bridge. The King, dressed in his usual military uniform, was surrounded by all of the important men of the kingdom, captains of industry in their tails and top-hats standing alongside

proud Hungarian aristocrats in their wildly embroidered national costume. And yet beneath all of the cheering and music, behind the colossal banners and imperial pomp, what feelings lurked in the heart of the crowd? Did they have any inkling of the colossal changes that the coming century would bring?

Certainly Francis Joseph and the Dual Monarchy he represented were far from universally popular. While he was ruler to his “loyal” Hungarian subjects now, in 1848 it was this same Francis Joseph who crushed Magyar dreams of independence with the combined strength of Austrian and Russian arms. In addition, while many Hungarian nationalists had been placated by the 1867 compromise which officially established Austria-Hungary, other national groups were still unhappy with their second-class status. The fabric of the empire was being tested by the challenges of nationalism, in no small measure by Magyars themselves, who were pushing for increased linguistic and cultural homogeneity in their half of the empire, to the dismay of the Slavic minorities who made up over half of the Hungarian Kingdom’s population. Yet in 1896, in the midst of a colossal celebration that brought massive infrastructural improvements to the posh, rapidly-growing capital of Budapest, the edifice of Austria-Hungary must have seemed as strong as the steel of the bridge that bore its ruler’s name.
But bridges, like empires, can collapse, even when the edifice is grand and the steel sturdy. Half a century later, the glories of Austria-Hungary were but a distant memory, as much of Budapest lay in ruined disarray, and the Francis Joseph bridge sat reduced to a mass of tangled steel, as broken as its namesake’s realm. Following the end of Europe’s second war of annihilation, this bridge would be reopened under very different circumstances. In place of Emperor and Dynasty, of Apostolic Kingdom and historical fatherland, this celebration would feature the Communist Party, its “little Stalin” Mátýás Rákosi, and the Soviet troops who had taken control of the city in the winter of 1945 following a terribly brutal siege that was one of the deadliest of the war. The bridge, rebuilt following its destruction by the retreating German army, would itself be dedicated as a celebration of the victory of the Red Army, of the forces of anti-fascism, freedom, and liberty. Thus Hungary’s Liberty Bridge was born. This was the period of renewal, of reset; fascism was defeated, and crimes of the past could be

![Figure 1](image_url)
forgotten as the country forged a new future. But while many were genuinely happy to see Germany defeated alongside fascism, enthusiasm for the socialist regime would be short-lived. For while immediately following the war Soviet forces were rebuilding bridges in the name of liberty, by 1948 it was quite clear that freedom was not what Stalin had in mind for the countries of Eastern Europe. Backed by the muscle of the “liberating” Red Army, Hungarian Communists seized complete control of the country, banning opposition parties and abandoning any remaining semblances of democracy.

Since the end of the Second World War Hungary has seen much change. In the years since the collapse of the Warsaw Pact, Dimitrov Square, People’s Republic Avenue, Moscow Square and countless other sites have been stripped of the names they received during the socialist era, and have either regained their pre-1945 names or have been newly baptized with suitably ‘Hungarian’ replacements. Despite this almost ceaseless process of rechristening, which renders city maps obsolete on what feels like a weekly basis, the name of Francis Joseph has not returned. The bridge that once again bears the crest and crown of the Hungarian throne continues to bear a name originally intended to honor the memory of the Red Army “liberators” who would later crush the 1956 revolution and ensure Hungary’s loyalty to Moscow for over forty years.

Nor does the old Emperor-King stand much of a chance of seeing the bridge bear his name again any time soon. For while the general historical consensus in Hungary sees the socialist era, and the USSR in particular, in a negative light, Habsburg Austria is also remembered as an old enemy, as yet another outside power that crushed Hungarian hopes of independence. To a certain degree, the refusal to return the bridge’s original Habsburg
name is a function of a lasting sense of Francis Joseph as foreign and thus an enemy, feelings which were emphasized during the socialist era. Heroic national narratives, which conveniently contained a “western,” aristocratic, foreign enemy in the shape of the Austrian Habsburgs, meshed quite well with Cold War rhetoric regarding struggle against the modern forces of western imperialism. At the same time, the cult of Lajos Kossuth, the leader of the 1848 revolution, was likewise amplified during the days of the People’s
Republic, as parallels were drawn between Kossuth’s revolution and the ‘revolutionary’ leadership of the Communist Party a century later. Thanks to their nationalist content, these narratives, that were partially created, stand in direct conflict with memories of the monarchy, despite the fact that the Hapsburg era was in many ways responsible for the creation of modern Budapest.

The name ‘Francis Joseph’ is no more, yet the bridge itself remains. Known today as the Liberty Bridge, it stands in the southern portion of the city’s downtown. Connecting the Buda and Pest sides of the city, the bridge is situated between the city’s Central Market Hall on the eastern bank, and the imposing heights of Gellert Hill to the west. The shortest of Budapest’s Danube crossings, the Liberty Bridge is a steel suspension bridge with two supporting pillars, one at each end. These pillars also serve as a gateway for cars and trams that pass over the bridge, while pedestrian traffic flows along walkways on the outer edges of the bridge. The entire bridge is painted green, and the pillars are decorated with symbols from Hungary’s monarchic past. Statues of the mythic turul bird stand at the corners of the pillars, while the royal coat of arms sits in the center, capped by a huge version of the Holy Crown of St. Stephen. Sitting on the bridge at night, one commands quite the view of much of the city. Looking north along the Danube, one can see both the modern Elizabeth Bridge and the distinguished Chain Bridge. To the east lights blaze from the towers of the Basilica and the dome of the Parliament, while to the west one can look up and see the royal castle, the coronation church, and a host of other buildings that stand atop the hills of Buda.
In this work, Budapest’s Liberty Bridge serves as a lens and reference point of sorts in my examination of nationalist historical narratives and public memory of Francis Joseph and the era of the Dual Monarchy in Hungary. In particular, this paper will trace the way in which ruling governments have attempted to impose their own versions of history onto the public spaces of Budapest and into the minds of their citizens. In Budapest, the reason that the Liberty Bridge never regained its pre-Socialist era name is due to a lack of popular positive memory of Francis Joseph, in contrast to several other
important Hungarian historical figures. In the contested field of Hungarian national narrative the memory of Francis Joseph never truly found its place; for while he did gain a significant degree of popularity in the later decades of his reign, Hungary’s longest-ruling monarch never gained a place in the country’s imagination. By turns marginalized, vilified and ignored over the course of the twentieth century, the king who oversaw the creation of modern Budapest is today largely absent from public space and from public discourse.
Memory and History

For historian Simon Schama, there is a powerful connection between physical spaces and memories. In his work, *Landscape and Memory*, Schama discusses the important role that myth, memory, and place have in national identity and modern life. As Schama shows through the example of the atrocities of the Third Reich, myth can easily enable and encourage the darkest, most base impulses of the human soul. While myth can be uplifting and inspiring, it can also be a heady brew, an intoxicant that grants license to terrible acts. At one point in his book, Schama asks the question, “How much myth is good for us?” For Schama, the great dilemma is “whether it is possible to take myth seriously on its own terms, and to respect its coherence and complexity, without becoming morally blinded by its poetic power.”² All of this is important to my work in that it provides an important context to the simplistic national tales that often lie at the heart of the narratives that drive collective memory. It is not that all who embrace black-and-white heroic nationalist narratives are all blind, mindless sheep. Rather, while this may be true of many people, the reason that these narratives ‘work,’ the reason that they take root and exert such a strong hold on the imagination, is their seductive romantic power, a story that calls upon every countryman to rally around the flag and around the heroes who have waved it, niceties like historical fact be damned.

Any scholarly discussion of memory must address the rich literature that has been written on the topic by a number of important thinkers. Of these, arguably some of the most important work is that of Maurice Halbwachs. A sociologist by trade, Halbwachs was a disciple of Emile Durkheim, chiefly remembered today for his seminal work, *On Collective Memory*. In this piece, Halbwachs proposes the concept of collective memory. Without denying the existence of individual memory, he argues that it:

“is nevertheless a part or an aspect of group memory, since each impression and each fact, even if it apparently concerns a particular person exclusively, leaves a lasting memory only to the extent that one has thought it over-to the extent that it is connected with the thoughts that come to us from the social milieu. One cannot in fact think about the events of one's past without discoursing upon them. But to discourse upon something means to connect within a single system of ideas our opinions as well as those of our circle.”

Halbwachs’ idea of collective memory is rooted in language, as “people living in society use words that they find intelligible: this is the precondition for collective thought. But each word (that is understood) is accompanied by recollections…It is language, and the whole system of social conventions attached to it, that allows us at every moment to

---

reconstruct our past.” These social conventions are themselves collective, just as language itself is.

By way of example, Halbwachs brings up the memoirs of administrators, business professionals, and other important functionaries of large organizations, whose “accounts entail, rather than their own history, the history of a social group, whether professional or mundane,” because their personal life stories become so completely intertwined with the social group that they were involved with. For Halbwachs, memory is always inherently imperfect, especially when it comes to painful memories of a distant past. In his view, “That faraway world where we remember that we suffered nevertheless exercises an incomprehensible attraction on the person who has survived it and who seems to think he has left there the best part of himself, which he tries to recapture. This is why, given a few exceptions, it is the case that the great majority of people more or less frequently are given to what one might call nostalgia for the past.” Ultimately, collective memory does not entail a preservation of the past, but rather a reconstruction of it. “When reflection begins to operate, when instead of letting the past recur, we reconstruct it through an effort of reasoning, what happens is that we distort that past, because we wish to introduce greater coherence.”

---

4 Halbwachs, p. 173.  
5 Halbwachs, p. 82.  
6 Halbwachs, p. 49.  
7 Halbwachs, p. 119.  
8 Halbwachs, p. 185.
Public Memory and Nationalism after the Revolution: 1849-1867

Francis Joseph, Emperor of Austria and future Emperor-King of Hungary, began his reign under rather unsatisfactory circumstances. Following the abdication of his uncle, the Emperor Ferdinand, the eighteen-year-old Archduke assumed the Hapsburg throne in 1848, in the midst of revolutions that seemed poised to destroy the empire he had so recently inherited. The revolution in Hungary would rage on for a year, before the Austrians managed to bring Hungary to heel with the help of Tsarist Russia. There were, of course, Habsburg loyalists even in 1848, who pushed back against those who were agitating for complete independence from Austria.\(^9\) These were few and far between, however; being the man responsible for crushing Hungary’s hopes for democracy and independence, Francis Joseph had a lot to answer for in the minds of most Hungarians.

Undoubtedly, the events of the 1848 Revolution have had huge historical and cultural consequences for Hungary and the Hungarian people. This is the revolution whose trials and upheavals produced the modern Hungarian flag, when many of the symbols and expressions of modern Hungarian national identity took shape. The words of Sándor Petőfi, the young poet-turned-revolutionary whose fiery rhetoric ignited the nationalist sentiments of so many of his fellow countrymen, are still taught in Hungarian schools to this very day: “By the God of the Hungarians/ We swear/ We swear/ That we will be slaves no longer.” At the same time, it is useful to remember that the symbols of 1848, the tricolor and the cockade, were based on those of the French Revolution of a half-century earlier. And as in the French case, these symbols adopted some of the old monarchic motifs while at the same time rejecting the monarchy. Like its Gallic predecessor, the Hungarian revolution was an extremely important cultural touchstone, one that would come to form one of the defining pillars of what it meant to be ‘Hungarian.’ In her essay “The Cult of March 15,” historian Alice Freifeld underlines the colossal cultural significance of this historical event. In her estimation, “To miss the revolutionary aspect of Hungary in 1848-1849 is to obscure the dynamic in Hungarian national politics over the last 150 years. In Hungary the popular understanding of national

12 Significantly, the so-called ‘Kossuth Coat of Arms’ that would become one of the symbols of the revolution was a variation on the traditional Hungarian royal crest that removed the Holy Crown of St. Stephen from the top of the coat of arms, thereby turning a monarchic symbol into a republican one.
identity has revolved around the images of March 15, 1848, and the revolution that began that day.”

Perhaps one of the biggest hurdles the memory of Francis Joseph had to face came in the form of the cult surrounding Lajos Kossuth, leader of the 1848 Hungarian Revolution. As András Gerő describes in his book *Imagined History*, Kossuth has historically held an important place in Hungarian collective memory. As the leader of the revolution, Kossuth was the representative of everything that Francis Joseph was not: populist, republican, Hungarian. Of all the figures of the 1848 revolution, Kossuth was the one around whom a significant cult of personality emerged. In fact, Kossuth himself was actively involved in the process of creating and expanding the cult surrounding his persona. After fleeing the country, Kossuth embarked on a world-wide speaking tour, drumming up sympathy for the Hungarian cause, and building up quite a reputation for himself along the way. Huge crowds followed Kossuth wherever he went; during his visit to the United States, numerous counties, towns, and streets (including one in Columbus, OH) changed their name to “Kossuth” in honor of the famous revolutionary. In addition, in Washington D.C. Kossuth was given the honor of addressing a joint session of Congress; he was only the second foreigner to be accorded this distinction, the first having been the Marquis de Lafayette; as the scholar István Povedák has mentioned,

---

13 Freifeld, p. 256.
14 This was true in a religious sense as well. For while Francis Joseph was Catholic, and in fact exercised considerable control over the ecclesiastical hierarchy within his empire, Kossuth was a member of the Hungarian Reformed Church, which had more strongly Hungarian nationalist bent than the Catholic Church in Hungary did.
Kossuth was a politician with a certain “PR characteristic,” one that helped him become the popular face of democratic revolution all over the western world.\textsuperscript{15}

Figure 5. This Bust of Lajos Kossuth is currently housed in the United States Capitol Building.
Figure 6. A print of Lajos Kossuth upon his arrival in New York City in 1852, from the New York Times
Figure 7. Kossuth as “spiritual king of Hungary,” 19th century. Image from Hősök, Hamis Istenek? By István Povedák
In the face of such a violent, oppressive beginning to his reign, it seemed unlikely that public perception of Francis Joseph would ever improve. Even after the events of 1848 were long over, however, the Emperor-King still faced an additional hurdle, that of his being too ‘foreign’ to be accepted as legitimate by the Hungarian populace. As Simon Schama has shown, even innocuous-seeming items can become controversial once the label of “foreign” has been attached to them. For the nature-lovers of eighteenth-century Britain, it was “Chinese fences and bridges” that were ruining the English countryside, along with the carefully manicured gardens of the wealthy; both of these trends were the result of “foreign” ideas, and both were ruining the country.\textsuperscript{16} Likewise, the fungi that could cause catastrophic rot in warship hulls was seen by some as being due to the use of “foreign and ‘exotic’” lumber, which lacked the strength and constancy of “truly native English oak.”\textsuperscript{17} If pagodas and imported lumber can gain such villainous repute by being viewed as somehow foreign, how much more hatred and distrust would be directed at an Austrian Emperor who had decisively and brutally crushed Hungary’s fight for independence in 1848? Considering these adverse circumstances, it would seem almost a miracle that any positive memories of Francis Joseph could emerge at all.

\footnotesize\textsuperscript{16} Schama, pp. 137, 166-168.  
\textsuperscript{17} Schama, p. 172.
But Francis Joseph had time on his side, as he would rule his empire for a total of sixty-seven years, four years longer than his contemporary Queen Victoria. When he took the throne, Napoleon Bonaparte and the Conference of Europe were still fresh memories, Metternich himself had but recently fallen from grace, and Budapest was only just beginning to grow into the great city it would soon become; by the time of his death in 1916, war was being waged with tanks and planes and machine-guns, as the continent’s first subway rolled along below the widened, beautiful boulevards of Hungary’s capital.

With such a lengthy rule, it was only natural that as the decades went by, and as the young freedom fighters of March 1848 grew old and died, a new generation would come to view Francis Joseph in a different light. He was, for many of his subjects, the only King they had ever known, which went a long way toward reducing perception of Francis Joseph as ‘foreign.’ While he would never be fully “Hungarian,” he had certainly come a long way from 1853, when Hungarian tailor János Libényi attempted to assassinate the Emperor in Buda; during his confession, Libényi declared that he felt killing Francis Joseph “would deliver my country from its present enslavement, and added that his attack “was prompted by my love of my country.”

18 Gerő, Imagined History, pp. 69-70.
While public acceptance of his legitimacy was slow in coming, as the decades wore on he eventually gained the respect of many of his subjects. With the creation of Austria-Hungary through the Compromise of 1867, many of the political demands of 1848 were met, without a drop of blood being spilled. The Austrian Empire was now Austria-Hungary, meaning that Buda (and Budapest after the official merger of Buda, Pest, and Óbuda in 1872) would become the capital of a country that was officially an equal partner in governing the Habsburg dominions. Hungarians, particularly those of the upper classes, took a special pride in Francis Joseph’s coronation as King of Hungary, and were quite allergic to any use of the term ‘Emperor’ within the Hungarian context. In his novel *Embers*, author Sándor Márai’s main character asks his father, a member of the royal bodyguard, “‘Are you going to the Emperor?’ ‘To the King,’” replied the father in serious, admonishing tone.”

Thus, thanks in large part to the Compromise of 1867, Francis Joseph went from tyrant to legitimate monarch in the eyes of many Hungarians. It certainly helped that the Compromise brought more than just political autonomy; the roughly fifty years of Austria-Hungary would see Budapest complete its transformation from sleepy provincial town to bustling metropolis.

Over time, as memories of the 1848 Revolution began to fade and as the empire continued to prosper, Francis Joseph’s popularity gradually improved. Certainly there were many nationalist agitators who still wanted nothing to do with anything Austrian,
but in the main the public appreciated the peace and stability of Francis Joseph’s reign. In fact, to a certain extent the emperor-king gained a measure of deep, genuine popularity with people, earning the informal moniker ‘Ferenc Joska,’ which roughly translates to ‘Francis Joe.’ Significantly, the name of ‘Francis Joe’ began to appear in folk songs of the 1848 revolution, with his name replacing that of Lajos Kossuth himself. By the outbreak of the First World War, he was seen by many as the wise old father of the country, a serious, religious man who would guide his people through the tumults of war. This view was reinforced in the propaganda of the day, as can be seen in the poster for the Hungarian film *Imadkozik a Király* (The King is Praying). On this poster, seen here, Francis Joseph is seen praying to God for guidance, while the script above his head reads “I have thought everything through, I have considered everything.” This is a serious king, one who cares deeply for the wellbeing of his subjects.

22 For example, an alternative version of the folk song „Kossuth Lajos Táborában” (“in Lajos Kossuth’s Camp”), simply replaces Kossuth’s name with that of his old enemy, and becomes “Ferenc Jóska Táborában” (“In Ferenc Jóska’s Camp.”)
Figure 8. Poster for the Hungarian propaganda film “Imádkozik a Király” (The King is Praying).
Despite his growing popularity, public perception of Francis Joseph continued to struggle with Hungarians’ memories of the 1848 Revolution. Even after the compromise of 1867 and the formal creation of the Dual Monarchy, Lajos Kossuth continued to be a thorn in the side of Francis Joseph and his imperial functionaries; his followers began publishing weekly journals attacking the Compromise as it was being negotiated, and Kossuth himself attacked those willing to compromise for their lack of patriotism.\(^{23}\) Kossuth’s haunting of Francis Joseph would continue even at the former’s death, as the question of what would be done with the body of Hungary’s most famous revolutionary came to the fore. During his decades of exile, Kossuth had refused to accept the legitimacy of both Habsburg rule and of the compromise itself, and now Francis Joseph officially “forbade the Hungarian government from giving the dead insurrectionist a hero’s burial. But the municipality of Budapest claimed the body and held a ‘private’ funeral.”\(^ {24}\) While it may not officially have been a state funeral, however, it was nevertheless a collosal gathering; according to one historian, “the newspaper reports mentioned several hundreds of thousands present at the funeral march from the National Museum to the cemetery,” making Kossuth’s funeral the largest in Hungarian history.\(^ {25}\)

Certainly Francis Joseph was not particularly pleased by any celebration of Kossuth, and he even wrote a letter to Prime Minister Sándor Werkele directing that the body be transported by rail rather than by sea through Fiume, due to the Emperor-King’s concerns about “the impression created in Croatia, should the deceased be transported


\(^{24}\) Freifeld, p. 266.

across that country.”

Despite Francis Joseph’s old grudge, though, the funeral was ultimately allowed to move forward. Thus, in yet another Austro-Hungarian compromise, millions of Hungarians publicly mourned Kossuth, while at the same time Francis Joseph managed to walk the tightrope of not ‘officially’ condoning the commemoration of a man who had advocated his overthrow on one hand, while avoiding the huge public and political backlash that would have resulted from outright refusing to allow Kossuth’s burial altogether. In fact, with Lajos Kossuth’s death his son Ferenc returned home from exile, and would eventually be made an opposition cabinet minister by his father’s old enemy, Francis Joseph. As Gerő points out, “All this demonstrated that the regime of the Dual Monarchy did not stand in the way of the cult [of Kossuth]; the regime simply handed over the cult to the opposition.” Rather than restricting memory of Kossuth, Francis Joseph and his regime allowed the cult of Kossuth to survive in Hungary, perhaps in this way hoping to bury the hatchet of 1848 along with the revolution’s dead leader.

Naturally, in the face of the Emperor-King’s suppression of the 1848 Revolution and his ‘foreign’ background, the Cult of Francis Joseph was never universally popular, and in fact had its fair share of detractors. What is remarkable, though, is the way in which positive public memory of Francis Joseph and of the 1867 Compromise managed to largely neuter the threat posed by memory of the 1848 Revolution. In Landscape and Memory Simon Schama discusses the way that 18th century British culture embraced the

---

26 Qtd. in Gerő, Imagined History, p. 48. The Croatian Ban Jelacic was allied with the Habsburgs against the 1848 Hungarian Revolution due in part to the exclusively Magyar character of the revolution. As such, Kossuth’s body would not necessarily have been well received in Croatia. In addition, while this is speculative, it is also likely that the emperor feared that the arrival of the body in Fiume might trigger Croatian nationalist sentiment in some way.


28 Ibid.
memory of the heroic Welsh bards who had fought and died in an attempt to prevent union with England half a millennium earlier. While in the past such memories of Welsh separatism and defiance might have been dangerous, by this time the political edge of these memories had passed, and romantic nostalgia was all that remained. In 1857, Hungarian poet János Arany would write a poem entitled “The Bards of Wales,” a thinly-veiled allegory in which the murderous King Edward stands in for Francis Joseph, and issues orders “To send to the stake all the bards of Wales/Who thus against me sing!” While even at the height of his popularity the memory of 1848 still had plenty of political saliency, it is nevertheless remarkable that within mere decades of Arany’s composition of this poem Francis Joseph went from being the man behind the execution of Hungary’s revolutionary leaders to being the accepted, and in some corners even beloved, ruler of a constitutional, dualist state that was a marked step away from the absolutism of the Emperor-King’s early years on the throne.

---

29 Schama, pp. 469-471.
Figure 9. A postcard of the Francis Joseph Bridge in the early 1900s.
Figure 10. Opening of the 1896 Millennium Celebration in front of the Parliament Building in Budapest.
The 1896 Millennium Exhibition and the Modernization of Budapest

Construction of what would become the Francis Joseph Bridge began in 1894, and came to completion, as has been mentioned, in time for the Millennium Exhibition of 1896. In its planning stages, the bridge was referred to as the Fővámtér Bridge, before the decision was ultimately made to christen the Danube’s newest crossing point in honor of the Dual-Monarchy’s Emperor-King. The entire project cost 5,813,953 pengoes, which in context meant that it was built at less than half the cost of the Margit Bridge (completed in 1876, total cost 11,627,907 pengoes), and at slightly over a third of the cost of the capital’s first permanent crossing, the Széchényi-Chain Bridge (completed in 1849, total cost 14,534,884 pengoes). Designed in eclectic style by architect János Feketeházy, at 334 meters in length the Francis Joseph Bridge would be the shortest of all of Budapest’s bridges, a title it holds to this day. The construction of the bridge was begun following the passage in the Hungarian Parliament of Law XIV of 1893, which provided funding for the creation of two new bridges over the Danube. In 1896, these bridges would be opened, one bearing the name of the Emperor-King, the other that of his widely beloved wife, Elizabeth.

---

32 Ibid.
The process of building itself, as well as the funds appropriated for the erection of these two bridges, was overseen by the Budapest Commission of Public Works. This commission, whose members “were delegated by both the government and the cities of Pest and Buda on the basis of their expertise,” was led by the Prime Minister, who was the ex officio chair. By this time the Commission had already overseen the establishment of the City Park in 1870, of Budapest’s Champs Elysee, Andrássy Avenue between 1871 and 1870, as well as numerous other projects, both large and small. And this same Commission would oversee the myriad public projects of the 1896 Millennium Exhibition.

A celebration of the thousandth anniversary of the Magyars’ invasion of the Carpathian basin, the Millennium would be ceremonially opened by Emperor-King Francis Joseph amid great fanfare and ceremony. And the 1896 Millennium Exhibition was a colossal event for Hungary’s capital. Planned in large part by the afore-mentioned Municipal Commission of Public Works, this event would show the world that Hungary was no longer an ‘oriental,’ backward land of poor, superstitious peasants, but rather a modern, rapidly developing nation ready to take her place among the powers of Europe. And the greatest example of this transformation would be the one provided by Budapest herself, the country’s sophisticated, beautiful and rapidly expanding capital.
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36 Enyedi & Szirmai, pp. 138-139.
In general, this was a period of huge growth for both Budapest and for Hungary as a whole. Following the 1867 Compromise, Budapest’s population ballooned; while in 1851 the combined population of Pest, Buda, and Óbuda was a mere 143,289, by 1900 the city had grown into a metropolis of 733,358.  

1896 also saw the opening of the subway (the first underground rail on the European continent), two bridges, the grand boulevard, two new museums, a new theater, 400 new elementary schools, as well as the establishment of the Fine Arts Museum. This was the period that some have described as “the age of the Hungarian industrial revolution,” and Budapest would reap the benefits of this explosion of growth and modernization.  

1873 saw the arrival of electric lighting to the capital, followed by telephones in 1885; by 1900, Budapest would even be home to the “Royal Hungarian Automobile Club.” The celebrations saw the opening of the colossal Millennium Monument, a Hungarian Brandenburg Gate of sorts that would hold numerous statues of important Hungarian historical figures, including Francis Joseph.  

The Millennium Exhibition also included a world’s fair in Budapest’s City Park, an event meant to showcase the modernity and achievements of Hungary. Overall, things seemed to be looking good. The economy was in great shape, Budapest had seemingly realized its dreams of becoming a truly European capital, and the Hungarian half of the empire was finally receiving the attention that Hungarians felt it deserved. According to historian László Katus, “Francis Joseph, the Imperial Court, and a large part of the Viennese

---

38 Budapest Szatalsztk Hivatal, Budapest Statistics, p. 29.  
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41 Enyedi & Szirmai, pp. 7-8.  
43 Lukács, p. 72.
diplomatic corps spent most of the year in Budapest...Budapest seemed almost to have become the Monarchy’s capital, and this greatly enhanced the national consciousness of the Hungarian political elite.”44

And, of course, the 1896 Millennium saw the opening of two new bridges across the Danube, further connecting the two sides of the city. The Danube is perhaps the defining feature of Budapest. The river itself, flowing from its source in the Black Forest of Germany all the way to the Black Sea, is the second-longest in Europe. Logistically the river had always represented a challenge to the inhabitants of Buda and Pest; not only did the river divide the city, its unpredictable floods would occasionally wreak havoc, most notably in 1838, when a flood led to the deaths of 151 people, and forced 50,000 out of their homes.45 In this context, building bridges and regulating the flow of this wild and powerful river were signal achievements on the path to the modernization of Hungary, so much so that the great reformer Count István Széchényi spent a great deal of energy bringing these improvements about; his success would greatly contribute to his being seen as “the greatest Hungarian” by both his contemporaries and by later generations.46 In addition, great rivers such as the Danube have always had a symbolic quality. As Simon Schama points out, “Since the ancient metaphor that rivers were the arterial bloodstream of a people remained very much alive, it was natural for nationalist propaganda to project its obsessions onto their waters. The sheer length of the Danube, for example, rising in Germany and flowing through Slav and Magyar lands, was a gift to

46 Povedák, pp. 61-63.
the apologists of the polyglot Habsburg Empire since they could pretend that it bound the several nations together like an imperial ribbon.\textsuperscript{47} In addition to the practical and infrastructural benefits of two new crossings that would better connect Budapest, Francis Joseph’s inauguration of two new bridges had a symbolic value as well. Here was the ruler of hyphenated Austria-Hungary, being lauded by a people who had decades earlier rebelled against him, connecting his realms in a very literal way. This was an empire united by the person of the Emperor-King, the one man who, in his dual role, bridged the divide between Austria and Hungary. And here he was, bridging a physical divide over the greatest river of his empire, with bridges named after himself and his wife Elizabeth.

\textsuperscript{47} Schama, p. 363.
Figure 11. Plans for the opening decorations of the Francis Joseph Bridge, 1896.

Figure 12. The Francis Joseph Bridge under construction, 1895.
Figure 13. Competitions in the City Park during the Millennium Exhibition, 1896.
Figure 14. Parts of the Millennium Exhibition in the Hall of Industry, 1896.
The Horthy Era

Perhaps part of the reason that public memory of Francis Joseph receded after the fall of Austria-Hungary was the ambiguity that some in Hungary felt towards the Compromise of 1867 in the first place. The famous Hungarian poet János Arany, contrasting the post-Compromise era with that of the Revolution, missed the confidence, the enthusiasm, and the bold thinking that gave people hope and confidence. For Arany, the Dual Monarchy was a return to old, banal ways of thinking and doing: “After the Compromise of 1867, there remained an almost dissatisfaction within the hearts and minds. The old manifestations are repeated: one party is continuing with the monotonous murmurs of complaints, and the other mocks the bombastic pronouncements and the trite phrases of patriotism.”48 Many of these feelings survived into the inter-war era, a time when Hungary was ruled by Admiral Miklós Horthy, a Habsburg military leader who had come to power by crushing the 133-day-long “Soviet Republic” that had been proclaimed in Budapest by Communist leader Béla Kun. Writing in 1924, Jenő Lechner saw the 1800s largely as a century of dissapointment and defeat, despite the accomplishments of the decades following the 1867 Compromise. While this century may have been one of great progress for others, “for our homeland this was a period of painful dissapointments,

48 János Arany, ’A Magyar Politikai Költészetről,’ qtd. in Gerő, Imagined History, p. 49.
of agony and of humiliation, when even momentary joys were barely compounded and hope for the future was barely kept alive."\(^{49}\)

These views were all expressed in the 1920s, after Hungary had lost 71 percent of its territory and 64 percent of its population in the Treaty of Trianon.\(^ {50}\) While admittedly only 48 percent of those living within the borders of Hungary had been Hungarian speakers (that is to say, ethnically Magyar), the results of the Trianon agreement nevertheless left millions of ethnic Hungarians living in countries where they now constituted an ethnic minority; often, these same states, such as Slovakia and Romania, viewed their new minorities with hostility and distrust.\(^ {51}\) From this vantagepoint, it is perhaps not surprising that these writers held such negative views of the Austro-Hungarian past; for them, if the era of the monarchy led to Trianon, there must have been something very wrong to begin with.

While the Horthy regime itself still held a generally positive view of the Habsburg era, the realities of the era helped to push memories of the monarchy into the background. The Regent Miklós Horthy de Nagybánya, commander of Austro-Hungarian naval forces during World War I and son of a wealthy aristocratic family, had known Francis Joseph personally, and seems to have felt some affinity for the Habsburg dynasty. According to the American journalist Robert Parker, who would interview Horthy in 1937, “there was


an enormous portrait of the Emperor [Francis Joseph] on the wall behind the admiral’s mahogany desk, painted by the admiral himself.”52 This apparent personal affection for Francis Joseph, however, did not prevent Admiral Horthy from seizing power for himself as Regent. Nor did it prevent him from refusing to allow the young King Charles, Francis Joseph’s heir, to assume the throne following the Empire’s collapse; when Charles arrived by train in Hungary, he was promptly turned around and sent into exile.53 In the wake of the trauma of war, memory of Francis Joseph faded into the background. Like so many other memories and perceptions that lose their political and cultural salience, positive memories of old ‘Ferenc Joska’ “departed from the horizon of people in the periods that followed.”54

53 Katus, p. 257.
54 Halbwachs, p. 104.
Figure 15. Admiral Miklós Horthy, in his role as Francis Joseph’s aide-de-camp, riding with the King in the Vienna Burg.

Contributing to Francis Joseph’s retreat from public memory was his unsuitability as a hero for post-Trianon Hungary. Miklós Horthy’s Hungary was a deeply irredentist country, and was therefore also very much in need of Hungarian historical heroes. While Francis Joseph was certainly still in the public’s mind, he was too closely connected to the events of the disastrous World War, and not truly ‘Hungarian’ enough to serve as an
effective bearer of Hungarian nationalist sentiment. After all, while he was respected as having cared for his subjects’ well-being, this was still the same king who was also famous for having “had his drinking water brought straight from Vienna to a city famous for its mineral springs.” This was a period when Hungarian nationalist chauvinism was in full swing, when “nem, nem, soha!” (no, no, never), in reference to accepting the territorial losses brought by the Treaty of Trianon, was a slogan taught to young children; when the school-day usually began with the recital of the following pledge: “I believe in One God, I believe in One Homeland, I believe in the Resurrection of Hungary, Amen.”

57 In this kind of atmosphere, a different set of nationalist heroes would be needed, historical figures without ties to the royal house that had led Hungarians into the catastrophe of World War I; in other words, heroes who could inspire them as they continued to pray for the restoration of the territorial integrity of the Kingdom of Hungary, and for the return of all the lands of the Crown of St. Stephen.

In this context, the cult of Count István Széchényi, a famed reformer from the first half of the nineteenth century, renowned as the father of the famous Chain Bridge, was promoted by the government. It certainly helped that Széchényi, “described as a conservative reformer,” was a political opponent of the hot-tempered, republican,

---

57 Parker, p. 64., & Miklós Zeidler, A Magyar Irredenta Kultusz A Két Világháború Között, Budapest: Teleki László Alapítvány, 2002, p. 11. This same pledge would later be taken up by Hungarian émigrés during the Communist era, in the context of “resurrection” from Soviet domination.
revolutionary Kossuth.\textsuperscript{58} After all, the deeply conservative Horthy regime was one that had come to power by suppressing revolution, and retained its hold on power partially through its promises to attempt to return all of the positive aspects of the pre-war status-quo. But despite the fact that the revolutionary and liberal aspects of Kossuth would obviously need to be de-emphasized, the Horthy regime, and the Hungarian public as a whole, still needed the memory of 1848. As Freifeld points out, “With Hungary defeated and constricted into its new borders, celebrating Kossuth, the dictator of a nation at war, took on added resonance, reviving a nationalist cult of Kossuth.”\textsuperscript{59} In addition, Admiral Horthy ruled as “Kormányzó,” a term which translates to ‘regent’ or ‘governor.’ Kossuth himself was the last person to employ this very title, and thus Horthy’s own “legitimacy was enhanced by the former governor who had become a national symbol.”\textsuperscript{60}

While it did not occur in Hungary until after the end of the Second World War, elsewhere in the old imperial lands the memory of the Habsburgs was deliberately swept away as soon as the empire itself collapsed. For Hungarians, Austria-Hungary was an empire that, as the name suggested, included Hungarians in many of the highest positions of power, and gave the Hungarian half of the empire equal standing with Austria. As has been mentioned, this meant that Hungary was, during the dualist period, a relatively independent partner in the monarchy, with its own parliament and its own defense force. In addition, Hungary was a ruling partner in one of the great European empires.

\textsuperscript{58} Gerő, \textit{Imagined History}, p. 52.  
\textsuperscript{59} Freifeld, p. 272.  
\textsuperscript{60} Gerő, \textit{Imagined History}, pp. 52-53.
Naturally, then, Hungarians could not view the Dualist era as one of complete disaster, despite their own misgivings about the 1867 Compromise.

In the Slavic parts of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, the picture was quite different. For while the 1867 Compromise granted full political equality to Hungary, many of the empire’s Slavic subjects felt that they were being treated as second-class citizens, and this eventually led to hatred of the Dual Monarchy as a whole. In the Bohemian town of Budejovice (Budweis in German), for example, the main square had for decades been rather uncreatively named after Francis Joseph, just as the bridge in Budapest and countless other streets, squares, and monuments throughout the empire had. In 1918, as soon as Habsburg rule ended, the square was given the familiar name of ‘Freedom Square,’ before finally being renamed again after Czechoslovak president Tomas Masaryk in 1924. For the Czechs, ‘freedom’ from Austria-Hungary meant the freedom to erase the Habsburg past, to employ public spaces in order to reinforce a new, nationally-oriented identity. Renaming also occurred very briefly in Hungary at this time, as a part of Kun Béla’s short-lived Hungarian Soviet that took control of Budapest from March to August 1919. During the Kun regime, the kings and chieftains of Heroes’ Square were hidden behind massive amounts of red drapery, as Communist symbols replaced those of dynasty and nation. All of this would be very short-lived, however, and once the counter-revolutionary forces took control of the country from the unpopular communist regime, the nation and the Habsburgs returned to the official historical
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narrative, along with many of the place names from the monarchical era. It would remain up to a new group of communist leaders, in the aftermath of yet another world war, to initiate a thorough erasure of the Habsburg past.

During the years of Horthy’s rule, Budapest itself took on an irredentist, conservative, and altogether less cheerful aspect than the city which had just a few decades earlier been one of the Crown Jewels of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, capital of half of an enormous multi-ethnic, multi-lingual empire. With Hungary’s defeat in the First World War and the subsequent upheavals both Budapest and the country as a whole would undergo, all of that changed. Before the war Budapest had been a city of innovation, artistic brilliance, and a certain level of disregard for provincial moralizing. This city had been the birthplace of some of the twentieth century’s greatest luminaries: Leo Szilárd; Eugene Wigner; John Neumann; Arthur Koestler; Theodor Herzl; László Moholy-Nagy; and many other brilliant scientists, thinkers, and artists would call this Budapest their home.62
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62 Lukács, pp. 140-141.
Figure 16. Poster from the Horthy era depicting the Hungarian people being ‘crucified’ by the Treaty of Trianon.
The Budapest that emerged from the war was a quite different place altogether. While the city did not suffer extensive physical damage over the course of the war and subsequent revolutionary upheavals, the culture of the city was drastically altered. Entering Budapest following the collapse of Béla Kun’s communist government, Miklós Horthy declared Budapest to be a “guilty city,” both for the capital’s prominent role in the rise of Kun as well as for the supposed depravity, immorality, and generally ‘un-Christian,’ ‘un-Hungarian’ culture of the city.63 In the climate of fear, violence, and anti-Semitism that followed, many of the above-mentioned Hungarians, Budapest’s best and brightest, fled the country, if they hadn’t left already. Laws were passed limiting Jewish participation in public and intellectual life, leading to the emigration of roughly 25,000 Hungarian Jews, most of who had been residents of Budapest.64 Writing of his experiences as a reporter in Budapest in the years leading up to the Second World War, Robert Parker described returning to the city in early 1937 and casually observing that “antiaircraft guns were back on the Danube bridges.”65 A war was looming, one whose catastrophic consequences would irreversibly alter Hungarian public memory.
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The Socialist Era

At the end of the Second World War Budapest was in ruins. It had suffered through a brutal two-month-long siege, during which tens of thousands died, as the city transformed into a battlefield. After the siege the city’s public infrastructure was in shambles; gas, electricity, water, transportation, and even food were all in dangerously short supply. Unhappy with Hungary’s clumsy attempts to negotiate peace with the Allies, Hitler ordered the ouster of the Horthy government, which would be replaced by the Fascist Arrow Cross Party led by Ferenc Szállasi.66 The city’s Jewish community, once one of the most vibrant and cosmopolitan in all of Europe, had been decimated in one of the last and most horrific phases of the Holocaust; while the majority of the nearly 500,000 Hungarian Jews deported during the last year or so of the war, close to 37 percent of Budapest’s Jewish population (roughly 350,000 before the war) were killed.67 At the height of the siege, the death rate of Budapest inhabitants rose to 172.8 people per million (for context, the death rate was 17 per million in the first half of 1944); in total, around 900,000 Hungarians would be killed over the course of the war.68

Nor did the capital’s bridges, symbols of her beauty and sophistication for a century, escape the destruction that befell the rest of the city. As the Germans retreated
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west across the Danube into Buda, they blew up every single one of the city’s bridges, purportedly in order to stem the tide of the advancing Red Army.\(^69\) At any rate, Soviet troops did make it over the river, and would capture the western half of the city in an extremely bloody fight through the hills of Buda, gaining control of the entire city in February 1945.\(^70\) But while both the battle and the war had now come to a close, the damage had already been done. In their analysis of the state of the capital city during the winter of 1945-1946, the Budapest Municipal Statistical Bureau aptly summarized the significance of the bridges’ destruction: “The blowing up of the bridges not only caused the destruction of great material values and of creations of some artistic beauty; it also paralyzed completely the life of the two sides of the city, cut off from each other by an unbridged river.”\(^71\)

\(^69\) Budapest Sztatisztikai Hivatal, *Budapest on the Threshold of the Winter 1945-1946; Report on General Conditions in the City issued by Joseph Kövágó, Mayor of Budapest; Compiled by the Municipal Statistical Bureau*, Budapest: Institute of Letters, Arts and Sciences, 1946, p. 77. In their description of the state of the city at the war’s end, the Budapest Municipal Statistical Bureau described the Germans as destroying the bridges “with a ruthlessness which can only be called criminal. In addition, they claimed that “the German authorities have blown up every single one without any compelling military necessity.”


The end of the war brought with it the prospect of rebuilding, of creating a new and better world in the wake of the unprecedented horrors Europe had inflicted upon herself. Following the end of the war, Hungary experienced extreme inflation, while at

Figure 17. The Bridge following its destruction in 1945. Note the Stalin portrait covering the royal crest at the center of the bridge’s entrance.
same time the citizens of Budapest underwent a severe food shortage.\textsuperscript{72} As a result, “the badly damaged city was threatened with imminent famine,” a crisis that would only be resolved by the forced confiscation of produce from the countryside.\textsuperscript{73} The poet and novelist Sándor Márai wrote in his memoirs that during this time, “most Budapest inhabitants became as skeletally thin as the sketches of the human structure found in anatomy books, without any flesh and fat.”\textsuperscript{74}

Due to the horrendous conditions in the city, as well as the horrors of the war, there were many in Budapest who greeted the Red Army as liberators. The long years of conflict had taken their toll; by 1944 newspapers in Budapest were filled with accounts of disgruntled people being arrested “for inciting against the upper classes.”\textsuperscript{75} And things would only get worse; political crackdowns and civil unrest would be followed by fascist rule, mass deportations of the country’s Jewish population, and a deadly siege that left Budapest in ruins. By the time the dust had settled, the people of Budapest were desperate for anything but prolonged conflict, and as a result many initially welcomed the Red Army as liberators. Discussing the end of the war, Jenő Széll remembered that “we felt that we were liberated…and not only did we feel like this, sitting there in the basement, weeping and holding one another’s hands: everyone there had the same

\textsuperscript{72} Buruma, pp. 59-60, and Budapest Sztatisztikai Hivatal, \textit{Budapest on the Threshold of Winter, 1945-46}, pp. 31-36.  
\textsuperscript{73} Budapest Sztatisztikai Hivatal, \textit{Budapest on the Threshold of Winter, 1945-1946}, pp.33-34.  
\textsuperscript{74} Qtd. in Buruma, p. 59.  
\textsuperscript{75} Parker, pp. 314-315.
feeling, that the world would finally turn into a different one, and that it really had been worthwhile for us to be born.”

The citizens of Budapest were not alone in these feelings; as Ian Buruma has pointed out, there was a general feeling throughout Europe that “the year 1945 would be a blank slate; history would be happily discarded; anything was possible,” even if in reality “anything was not possible.” In the aftermath of so much destruction, so much death, it is unsurprising that many people would want to simply forget the past, to create a new future both for themselves and for their country as a whole. After the horrors of yet another world war, all of the nationalist historical rhetoric about the glories of the thousand-year Hungarian Kingdom rang hollow. As Budapest lay in ruins, Hungary, along with the rest of Eastern Europe, was a fertile breeding ground for the kind of historical forgetting that the Socialist regime would impose on its citizens.

Initially, Hungary was governed by a coalition, dominated by the relatively conservative Small Holders’ Party. In 1946, the Francis Joseph Bridge would be the first of Budapest’s pre-war bridges to reopen, now rechristened as the “Liberty Bridge” in honor of the freedom and liberation brought by the Soviet Red Army. Due to the fact that supplies in the city were still extremely limited, the bridge would be repainted in a blue-grey color, as green paint was not currently available. As the photograph below shows, the royal crest and crown were also removed from the bridge. Like the bridge, Hungary itself would take a turn for the grey, as democratic parties disappeared one by one. By
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77 Buruma, pp. 241-242.
1949, Hungary would be fully under the rule of the Hungarian Workers’ Party, as one opposition group after another was banned for containing supposedly ‘reactionary’ or ‘subversive’ elements. All of the democratic hopes of 1945 had been replaced by the monolith of Socialism. Instead of multiple political parties, there was only The Party.

Figure 18. The Liberty Bridge, painted gray and without the ‘large crest’ and crown, ca. 1980.
As Halbwachs explained, collective memory operates on the basis of the majority. This is why, although positive memories of Francis Joseph and of the Habsburg era were certainly kept alive by small pockets of hardcore monarchists, the rest of society moved on. The exceptions were akin to “a person who alone remembers what others do not...someone who sees what others do not see. He is in certain respects like a person suffering from hallucinations who leaves the disagreeable impression among those around him. As his society becomes impatient he keeps quiet, and because he cannot express himself freely, he forgets the names that are no longer used by those around him.” In order to move forward into a new era of glorious socialism, the past had to be left behind, and a new history had to be created. In its attempt to erase positive memories of the Habsburg or pre-war past, the Socialist government was perhaps unconsciously heeding the observations of the nineteenth century French philosopher Ernest Renan, who wrote that “Forgetting, and I would say, historical error are an essential factor in the creation of a nation.”78 To transform Hungary into a new nation of the people, this type of misremembering would be essential.

To this end, the Communist Party would fully exploit the memory of 1848, and would come to connect the fight against the Habsburgs of the past century to their current struggle against the ‘decadent,’ imperialist’ West. As Hungarian historian András Gerő has written, it is well-known that the Communist party was strongly internationalist in orientation, employing rhetoric about international proletarian revolution and elevating a

communist pantheon of sorts (Marx, Lenin, Stalin, etc.) that all citizens were to respect and emulate. What is less well-known, however, is the fact that “it resorted to strong nationalist rhetoric at the same time. In a sense, Communism became a new form of nationalism.” This embrace of Hungarian nationalism had begun even before the war, as can be seen in the example of Kossuth Radio, which began as a propaganda broadcast from the Soviet Union (interestingly, ‘Kossuth Radio remains the name of one of Hungary’s state radio stations to this very day). It also had roots in the short-lived Soviet Republic of 1919, where, according to one reporter, in the context of repelling a Romanian invasion, “in the goal of not giving up our ancestral soil, the communist and the nationalist can find common cause.”

While some members of the Party were not pleased at the idea of mixing Hungarian nationalism with the international orientation of Socialism, the Moscow-trained leadership viewed the embrace of nationalist symbols as an important tool in their attempt to keep the country under control. While the ‘Little-Stalin’ Mátyás Rákosi admitted that “a lot of comrades are afraid that we are deviating from the Marxist track” due to the country’s “patriotic character,” he nevertheless insisted that “it has to be underlined demonstratively that we choose the red banner and the national flag…the national flag is the flag of Hungarian democracy.”
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In perhaps the clearest example of their nationalist orientation, socialist authorities removed the statues of Habsburg rulers from the Millennium Monument on Heroes’ Square. This colossal edifice, the “altar of the nation,” contained statues of important Hungarian rulers from throughout the country’s thousand-year history, as has been described above. In the 1950s, all of the Habsburg rulers on the southern half of the monument were replaced by revolutionary heroes from Hungarian history, including, of course, Lajos Kossuth.\textsuperscript{83} Ironically, Kossuth’s statue would take the place previously held by one of his greatest adversaries, Francis Joseph himself. In the bas-relief below the statue, Kossuth can be seen rallying Hungarian peasants to take up arms against the Habsburgs. In this way, the government of the People’s Republic positioned themselves as the allies of liberty and the common people, the defenders of the Hungarian nation, and enemies of the western powers that had ruled over the country in the past.

\textsuperscript{83} Gerő, \textit{Imagined History}, p. 57.
Figure 19. The Statue and Bas-relief of Lajos Kossuth in the Millennium Monument on Heroes’ Square. This statue replaced one of Francis Joseph, which stood in this spot until the 1950s.
Figure 20. Communist Party Leaders below Images of Lenin, Rákosi, and Stalin. Image from *Iron Curtain*, by Anne Applebaum.
Following their rise to power, the Communist authorities undertook an extensive campaign of ‘de-nazification’ that would lead to a drastic reorientation of Budapest’s political, cultural, and social life. One of the first places this remaking of the city would occur was in the names of public places. Throughout the city, ‘reactionary’ or ‘fascist’ place names were replaced by more ideologically acceptable ones. Certainly, some of these changes were in fact undertaken to replace overtly fascist names, such as Mussolini Square and Adolf Hitler Square. Some changes were intended to remove names given by the anti-Semitic, conservative Horthy era in favor of less controversial Hungarian historical figures, as in the change from Miklós Horthy Bridge to Petőfi Bridge. The vast majority of place names, however, had nothing to do with fascism or even with the Horthy regime directly. Into this last category fell the majority of name changes, as Andrássy Avenue became Stalin Avenue, and later the Avenue of the People’s Republic; Elizabeth Square became Engels Square; Elizabeth Street gave way to Lenin Street; the City Park was renamed after Soviet author Maxim Gorky; the list goes on and on. The Francis Joseph Bridge, then, became the Liberty Bridge not in any sort of isolated phenomenon, but rather as part of a much larger concerted effort to remake Budapest into a city suitable to Socialist tastes, even if the country was not yet officially under Communist rule.

The campaign of removing the statues and names of interwar Hungary from Budapest clearly show that Socialist authorities felt that the memory of past regimes was
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powerful enough that active steps would have to be taken in order to demonize and marginalize it. This use of both the Horthy regime and the Habsburg dynasty as reactionary or even fascist enemies of the revolution was not limited to political rhetoric and public space, however. During his 1949 show trial, Cardinal József Mindszenty, Primate of the Catholic Church in Hungary, was forced to confess to a number of crimes, one of which was a plot to install Otto von Habsburg, heir to the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy and godson of Francis Joseph, as king. Three decades after the collapse of the Empire, then, the memory of the Habsburgs as enemies of the revolution was still strong enough to be included as (admittedly completely fictional) evidence against the head of another ‘reactionary institution,’ the Catholic Church. This time, however, the Habsburgs were not merely the foes of Kossuth and 1848, but of Rákosi, of the Party, of Stalin, and of the entire Communist ‘revolution’ in Hungary as well.

From now on, 1848 would be linked with 1919 as one of the great revolutionary moments in Hungarian history, both of which had been crushed by ‘counter-revolutionary’ forces. This socialist historical narrative would group Horthy’s victory in 1919, the rise of the fascist Arrow Cross Party in 1944, and finally the 1956 uprising into the same category, that of “revisionist chauvinism” and deliberate reactionary plotting. By this logic, the leaders of the 1919 ‘White Terror’ were “the forerunners of German Nazism,” while the revolutionaries of 1956 were the inheritors of this same fascist legacy; according to one socialist-era historian, in 1956 “the lead was taken everywhere
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by extreme right-wingers, and in many cases by officers of the former Horthy regime.”

This attempt to group anyone opposed to Communist rule together into one large category of ‘reactionary’ enemies was a key part of the new regime’s vision of the past. Indeed, when historical works of the socialist period mention these events at all, they employ the same universal vocabulary to discuss all three periods. In this way, the Horthy government is chiefly remembered for being “counter-revolutionary,” while the Independent Smallholder Party that won the 1945 elections was the tool of “the great bourgeoisie, of the former middle classes, the professional class and state employees…joined by all the antisocialist elements, from former supporters of the Arrow-Cross Party and the Christian Party, through the supporters of the pre-war Government parties.”

Throughout much of the Socialist era, official historical narratives would link all revolutionary movements of the past to the inevitable rise of Communism, while forces opposed to the ‘revolution’ are either vilified or simply disappear. In the 1973 edited volume *Budapest: The History of a Capital*, the various authors conjure a thoroughly white-washed version of Hungarian history in which anyone even remotely related to socialism can do no wrong. The reforms achieved at the beginning of the Revolution of 1848 here become “successes achieved against the reactionary forces of the Viennese Court.” Then, in an interesting feat of literary acrobatics, the authors describe the events of the 1848 Revolution without once mentioning the crucial role *Russian* forces
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played in crushing Hungarian resistance; the closest this work comes to mentioning Russia’s ‘counter-revolutionary’ role is a single sentence, wherein it is mentioned in a rather off-hand manner that “in 1849 the combined military power of the Habsburgs and the Romanovs defeated the Hungarian forces in their struggle for independence.”\(^{92}\) And while there is mention of Budapest’s rapid expansion during the years of the Dual Monarchy, it is all couched in terms of Hungary’s “path of capitalist development.”\(^{93}\) There is little mention of the Monarchy itself, and absolutely no mention of Francis Joseph whatsoever, not even in the context of the 1867 Compromise.\(^{94}\) In this version of the history of Budapest, the era of Austria-Hungary seems to disappear behind Marxist-Leninist theory, and Francis Joseph disappears along with it.

As Halbwachs showed, people fear a complete loss of tradition, out of a fear of the vacuum that such a loss would create; “that is why we remain attached to formulas, symbols, and conventions, as well as to rites that must be repeated and reproduced, if we wish to preserve the beliefs which gave them birth. Through this attachment to traditional values, the society of yesterday and the successive periods of social evolution are perpetuated today.”\(^{95}\) The socialist authorities in Hungary knew this well, and so despite the pervasive internationalism of communist propaganda, traditional heroes and myths of the Hungarian national past were drafted to serve in the work of building socialism. Such was the fate of the leaders of the 1848 revolution, from whom the communists would claim revolutionary descent a century later. Thus the nationalist revolt of Kossuth and

\(^{92}\) Sárvári, p. 37.
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Petőfi would come to be described as Hungary’s “bourgeois revolution,” the moment when the country took the next step along Marx’s inevitable path to socialism. This link would be made quite explicit, as party functionaries declared to the people: “We are the heirs of 1848.” The Hungary of 1948 and 1849, a country where socialist ‘revolution’ was triumphant, was witnessing the long-overdue fruition of the 1848 revolution. In this narrative, with the Red Army’s victory, “Petofi and Kossuth’s greatest wish has been accomplished.”

The project of rebuilding Hungary, as well as the rest of Eastern Europe, would share these two competing, contradictory impulses; while Communist authorities were trying to build a new society, with a new kind of citizen, they were at the same time clinging to popular historical narratives of the past, albeit in a modified form. These impulses would both be borne out as the countries of the new ‘Eastern Bloc’ began the work of picking themselves up from the rubble. On the one hand, as can be seen in their nationalist rhetoric, Communist authorities felt it very important to establish a firm link with the Hungarian past, to emphasize their rule as being part of the natural, logical continuity of Hungarian history. The other impulse was that of the push towards the future, towards the creation of the homo sovieticus, the perfect socialist citizen. The fruits of this ideology can be seen in the creation of the multiple post-war ‘new’ industrial cities that sprang up seemingly out of nowhere. These included Nowa Huta in Poland,
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Stalinstadt in East Germany, and Sztalinváros in Hungary, among others. As German historian Andreas Ludwig points out, these cities would be, in the view of Communist theorists, “free of historical burdens, where a new human being was to come into existence, the city and the factory were to be a laboratory of a future society, culture, and way of life.”

These cities were meant to create a so-called “urban human,” who in the words of Hungarian historian Sándor Horváth “leads a sober life, visits the cinema and theater or listens to the radio instead of going to the pub, wears modern and comfortable ready-made clothing…In contrast to the villager he furnishes his apartment with urban furniture, preferring furniture from a factory to that designed by carpenters, and he lies on a practical sofa.” All of this was exemplary of Socialist central planning, which even during the more relaxed period of “Goulash Communism” consistently pushed for the amplification of new and existing regional centers as “counter poles” to the hegemony of Budapest. According to one of the architects of this plan, “it was necessary to propose a system of urban centres and their hinterland zones in which every citizen, wherever he lived or worked, would share equally in modern public facilities at all levels, these being at readily accessible distances.” While this ideal would of course never be realized, it is indicative of the utopian streak in Communist ideology that called for the creation of a new, better world, one without ties to the architecture, ideology, and even urban
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settlement patterns of the past. A new, better world would be built, without regard for public opinion, human comfort, or even reality.

Figure 21. Pamphlet from the 1956 Revolution featuring the ‘Kossuth’ coat of arms that had been used in 1848.

Whether in their utopian socialism or in their appropriation of Hungarian nationalism, Communist authorities failed to get the majority of Hungarians to accept their vision of past and future. Unlike memories of the Dual Monarchy or of wise old ‘Francis Joe,’ the nationalist heroes of 1848 would prove to have lasting symbolic power far beyond that which was granted to them by official Party rhetoric. As Simon Schama has pointed out, revolutions are quite often deeply rooted in memory, and the events of
the 1956 Hungarian Revolution would prove to be no exception.\textsuperscript{104} During the events of the ill-fated uprising, the imagery and memory of 1848 was everywhere. From recitations of Petőfi’s poetry to the return of the republican, uncrowned ‘Kossuth Crest,’ the spirit of 1848 was in the air. Petőfi’s “National Song” was recited, just as it had been a century before. Students and workers marched through the city, demanding many of the same things as the March revolutionaries had: democracy, freedom of the press, and freedom from foreign occupation. According to Alice Freifeld, “The myth of 1848 was so ingrained that high police officials turned over weapons to the young men, whom they took to be acting in the spirit of the March Youth. As in 1848 the crowd coalesced, erupted, took decisive action, tackled the giant from without, and only then fell subdued: David again yielded to Goliath. The emphasis would be on fighting the impossible fight rather than simply acquiescing.”\textsuperscript{105}

\textsuperscript{104} Schama, pp. 61-63.
\textsuperscript{105} Freifeld, p. 276.
Figure 22. Revolutionaries painting the “Kossuth” crest onto a captured tank, October 1956.
Figure 23. The ‘large crest’ being reinstalled onto the Liberty Bridge as part of the bridge’s renovation, 1986.
Conclusion:

Hungary since 1989

Francis Joseph is still remembered in Hungary, but in the historical narrative that children learn in school he is chiefly known as the man responsible for the crushing of the 1848 revolution, the enemy of Kossuth and of Hungarian liberty. True, his name is also tied to the compromise of 1867 and the creation of Austria-Hungary, but public memory spares little space for the positive impact his reign had on the country. The decades of industrialization, modernization, and overall improvement that Francis Joseph’s reign brought to Hungary have been forgotten alongside the original name of the bridge that once again wears the symbols of his throne.

The end of the Socialist era brought with it a slew of changes in place names throughout Budapest. Placing this phenomenon in a larger context, historian Robert Nemes observes that:

“After 1989, new regimes in Eastern Europe uniformly purged their cities of communist-era street names…Street names, historian Brian Ladd has concluded, ‘can be ephemeral, rootless, and inoffensive,’ yet they can also ‘contribute to the myths that constitute a collective identity.’ For political activists, few other features of the cityscape provide such obvious, easy targets.”
And so, in the aftermath of the Cold War’s end, many of the place-names throughout Budapest reverted back to their pre-socialist names. Nor was this renaming mania a phenomenon of the early 1990s alone. This process has continued over the course of the past two decades; to give just one example, in 2011 Moscow Square regained its Horthy–era name, Kálmán Széll Square, as part of the beginning of a larger renovation project that is still underway. Nor are all public spaces given old names; Roosevelt Square, rechristened after President Franklin Delano Roosevelt following the end of the Second World War, has, like the Liberty Bridge, not returned to its pre-war name. Nevertheless, it has been renamed, and is has been officially known as István Széchényi Square since 2011.

Beginning in 2007, the Liberty Bridge underwent a thorough renovation, as structural improvements and a new lighting system were installed. Walking across the Liberty Bridge today, one comes face to face with interesting reminders of all that the bridge and Budapest as a whole have gone through over the past century. Looking upriver one can see the Elizabeth Bridge, with its Habsburg name and sleek, modernist architecture, a design implemented following the bridge’s destruction during the Second World War. Glancing up, one can see the ‘Large Crest’ of the Kingdom of Hungary, present at the bridge’s 1896 opening, missing for decades, finally restored amid the slow liberalizations of the 1980s. If it happens to be dark outside, the green, spindly steel of the Liberty Bridge can be seen from quite a great distance, thanks to the recent

renovations of 2007-2009 that included a powerful new LED lighting system. Upon reaching the Pest side, one can see the two customs houses, one of which houses a small museum today. On the front of each of these small stone buildings are names written in golden lettering, with plaques beneath each of them. In gold there are two names: ‘Liberty Bridge’ on the right and ‘Francis Joseph Bridge’ on the left.

![Image of Liberty Bridge illuminated at night]

Figure 24. The Liberty Bridge illuminated at night.

In a section of the whimsical *Subjective Atlas of Hungary*, three Hungarian artists crafted a map of an “Average Village” in Hungary, based on a list of the most common street names in towns and cities throughout the country. The results show in a striking way the dominance of names related to Hungarian national heroes, particularly those of 1848: in a country with 3,154 settlements, with a total of 124,539 streets, there are 2,792 streets named after Sándor Petőfi, and 2,683 named after Lajos Kossuth. In other words, 4.4% of all streets in the entire country are named after one of these two men.

Where other countries have main or high streets, Hungary has the heroes of 1848. Budapest alone has twenty-five streets named after Kossuth, and another twenty named after Petőfi. The word ‘Liberty’ (Szabadság) is also quite popular, with 1172 streets bearing this name. Saint Stephen, founder of the Hungarian state, the ‘greatest Hungarian’ István Széchényi, 18th century revolutionary Ferenc Rákóczi; all of these names figure prominently on street signs in towns and cities across the country, with hundreds, and in the case of the latter two, thousands, for each.

Nowhere on this list, however, will one find the names of any of the members of the Habsburg dynasty who ruled over Hungary for the better part of four centuries. Not Francis Joseph, not Maria Theresa, not even the popular Queen Elizabeth can be found in the top forty. While Francis Joseph’s name once adorned squares, streets, and bridges, today Hungary’s longest reigning monarch is virtually nowhere to be found in public.
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spaces. While Francis Joseph presided over an era of unprecedented growth and modernization, the achievements of his reign have largely been forgotten, as the laurels of history have gone to others, particularly to his great rival Kossuth. Francis Joseph’s reign was one that began, and ended, in the fires of war. And as war and bloodshed returned to Hungary even after the empire’s dissolution, Francis Joseph’s complicated, intriguing legacy lost out in favor of heroes perceived to be more ‘truly’ Hungarian, or who could be better utilized by the political powers of the day. While people certainly still remember Francis Joseph today, he has become a second-tier historical figure, one who is more often than not the German villain to Kossuth the revolutionary hero or Széchényi the brilliant reformer. In a city whose greatest monuments are largely the fruits of Francis Joseph’s reign, the name of the man himself is absent.
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