

# REVOLUTIONS OF 1848 AND 1956 – PARADIGM OF BUILDING THE NATIONAL IDENTITY OF HUNGARIANS\*

Goran VASIN  
*Faculty of Philosophy  
University of Novi Sad  
Department of History*

---

*The national identity of the Hungarians was built in several stages and several directions during the process of historical longevity. Firstly, it had been profiled through the anti-Ottoman and anti-Habsburg struggle; later on it was formed as unification of the territories under the Crown of St. Stephan, to receive later on anti-Russian and anti-Soviet features. The Revolutions of 1848/1849 and 1956 are particularly characteristic in this respect. The national defeats that followed the aforementioned Revolutions were consolidated by the anti-Habsburg and anti-Turkish tones / 1848 /, and especially anti-Soviet / 1956 /. Thus, the cult of freedom, national sacrifice and tragedy, which was dominant earlier too, has now been upgraded into one of the most important components of the contemporary national identity of Hungarians, particularly highlighted by the reflection of the events of the fall of the Berlin Wall and of Accession to the EU and NATO.*

---

**Key words:** Revolution 1848, Revolution 1956, Hungary, national identity, Habsburg, Austro-Hungary, Trianon, Soviets, Imre Nagy

*T*HERE ARE MANY FACTORS THAT DETERMINED the identity frame and the form of the creation of the Hungarian national political concept in the modern age. Deeply entrenched firstly in the anti-Ottoman, and then anti-Austrian tradition, at the beginning of the 19<sup>th</sup> century the creators of

---

\* This article is written as a part of the Republic Project Territories of Vojvodina in the Context of European History (177002)

the concept of the Hungarian political and stately nation had before them an open space with a look into the past. They took as idiom the tradition of the crown of St. Stephen / St. István, which served as a point of support in their ideas and thoughts. The myth of the painful defeat at Mohacs in 1526, when Hungary was the only obstacle to Ottoman advancing on the Christian Europe, represents a part of one of the points of reference that we referred to. Discords caused by the dissolving of the Hungarian medieval state, anarchy among the aristocracy, mutual intolerance within the ruling class, all this is of secondary importance compared to the courageous last act of the defense of the Christian Europe, symbolically connected to the death of the last medieval monarch, King Lajos (Louis). Painful and tragic defeats such as Mohács in 1526, Világos in 1849, then Trianon in 1920, and finally the Revolution in 1956 give a lasting stamp to the sense of martyrdom in shaping of the Hungarian national identity.

The fierce anti-Ottoman and anti-Habsburg fight, reflected in the battles of the Long War in 1593–1606, followed by the Bochkai's uprising, the movement of Gabriel Bethlen, the war of the kurucs of Imre Thököly, and the uprising of Francis Rákóczi were all eclectically added to the idea of a unique Hungarian political nation and Hungarian state and historical law embodied in the Hungarian Parliament. The end of the Great Turkish War (1683–1699) when the prerogatives of Hungarian independence were handed over to Emperor Leopold. Similar was the case of the status of Ardeal resolved by Diploma Leopoldinum (1691). (Rokai et al. 2002; Kann and Zdenek 1984; Okey 2002)

Discontent with the violent re-catholicizing inspired by Cardinal Leopold Kollonitsch was particularly prominent in the anti-Habsburg ideas, already strong in Aerdel. Hence, we'd like to point out to the the uprising of Francis Rákóczi with the slogan *Cum Deo pro Patria et Libertate*, which became one of the key points of support for creation of the national identity of Hungarians. The first dethroning of the Habsburgs in 1708 at Onod, gave rise to the same route during the Revolution of 1848. In addition, there was the adoption of Hungarian Pragmatic Sanction in 1723, which, together with the large number of laws in the 1751, 1764, and 1790–1791, strengthened and determined the idea of state continuity within the Habsburg Empire<sup>1</sup>. It was the Hungarian Pragmatic Sanction that was the *spiritus*

1 At the Diet meeting 1790–1791, the gradual affirmation of the Hungarian language began. Article 16 stipulated the establishment of a Hungarian language department in gymnasiums, academies and universities. Then, in 1805, the Article 4 of the Law

*movers* of the idea to determine the legal and political position of the Hungarians in Monarchy on the legal grounds, and that idea would become the starting point for the negotiations and agreements of both sides all the way up until the Settlement in 1867. (Kann 1964a; Kann 1964b)

In the time of national revival, founding of institutions such as the Academy, library, the National Theater, as well as the launch of a whole series of newspapers and the adoption of laws that replaced the Latin language with Hungarian in the state administration, laid the foundations for the National Revolution, which, in the midst of the European Revolution<sup>2</sup> of 1848, became one of the factors of

---

enforced the decision that all the letters of the Hungarian court office and the National Assembly must be written parallelly in Hungarian and Latin. Article no. 8 of the Law from 1830 passed the order that every official, save for those in Croatia, must know the Hungarian. Laws which had as a purpose gradual Hungarianization were all passed by 1832. From January 1, 1834 onwards, only those who knew Hungarian language could become lawyers. Not long afterwards, the proposal was disputed that the laws should be passed only in Hungarian, and the lawsuits on the Royal Council should be conducted also only in Hungarian. According to the article 6 of the Law from 1840, the Latin language was replaced by Hungarian. In the same year, the rule was that in non-German municipalities, all church books should be kept in Hungarian and the transfer should have lasted no more than three years (Article 6, point 7). The Law of 1844 (Article 2, Count 3) stipulated that the members of the Hungarian Parliament could use exclusively Hungarian language. On the other hand, Hungarian politicians considered the session of the councils of 1832–1836 as a reforming one. One of the basic ideas came from Count Miklós Veseleni. According to his idea, the Hungarians were surrounded by the ocean of Slavs and Romanians, so it was necessary to strengthen their own political position and form a new political elite. Regarding the introduction of the Hungarian language, it was considered that the Latin language got obsolete and that there was no possibility of its further use, and that it was necessary to educate people and prepare them for new challenges. From that moment, Hungarian as a language was in the service of legislation, government affairs and especially education. The Law on the Language of 1844 protected the Hungarians from German clerks. German remained the language of correspondence with the imperial authorities. Vasin 2011.

<sup>2</sup> Hungarian national revival began with a greater intensity in the late 18th century. Ferenc Kazinczi is among the reformers of the language. The dialect of the Danube region of Hungary was taken as the basis. The dialect from the area of the upper Tisa was also partially represented. The synthesis of these two dialects made what became contemporary Hungarian. The first standing acting society was founded in 1790 in Pest, while the first permanent theater was founded in 1837 under the name of Pestan Hungarian Theater (since 1840 National Theater). What is considered to be the beginning of the press in Hungary was the publication of *Mercurius Veridicus ex Hungaria* in 1705. The first permanent newspapers were the *Pressburger Zeitung* founded in 1764, and the first newspaper in Hungarian was *Magyar Hirmondo*, which started in 1780. Not long afterwards *Magyar Kurir* came out. Modern press in today's sense of the word begins in the 1930s. The circles close to the Count Szécheni founded *Jelenkor* in 1832. The famous

determining the survival of the Habsburg monarchy, and the permanent determinant of the development of the national identity of the peoples of the Monarchy itself, up until its end in 1918. The fall of the Chancellor Metternich on March 13, 1848, that is the proclamation of the Statute of Freedom in Austria, was a signal and encouragement the youth in Pest to formulate on the following day the Hungarian National Program in 12 points, with the requirements of respect for civil liberties and equality. The first Hungarian government was formed on March 17, led by Lajos Batthyány as president and Lajos Kossuth as the minister of finance<sup>3</sup>. The Hungarian Parliament in Požun very soon (April 11) adopted 31 law (the so-called *April Laws*), which were supposed to completely change the political order of Hungary. The ruling elites in Vienna were left with nothing but to agree on a compromise, since the bulk of the imperial forces was engaged in heavy fighting in Italy, especially since March 1848. However, the peace lasted shortly - until Radezki pacified the situation in Italy, and Windisch-Graetz quenched the Czech Revolution in June 1848. In the meantime, since 1848, Hungarian revolutionary government started its own war with Serbs and Croats who, having the very same Hungarians as the role model, stated their requirements in March and May 1848 (Kann and Zdenek 1984).

Changes on the battlefield, and soon afterwards on the political scene too, prompted the beginning of the war between Austria and Hungary, which began on October 3, 1848. In such a situation, conflicts between imperial and Hungarian Revolutionary Army spurred very quickly. Ban Josip Jelačić became the imperial commissioner, with all military and civil authority. After Radezki's victory in Italy, and the breakdown of the Czech Revolution, the court decided to start the war against the Hungarians as well<sup>4</sup>. Conflicts that lasted for months in which the Hungarian Revolutionary Army recorded great successes gave way to the Hungarian national spirit and, much later, had a considerable influence on creating

---

newspapers, *Pesti Hirlap*, came out the first time in 1841 under the editorial office of Lajos Kossuth. The first Hungarian daily newspaper was *Budapesti Hirado* from 1848.

3 First Hungarian Government form 1848 was comprised of President Lajos Batthyáni, Count István Szécheni as Minister of Transport, Lajos Kossuth as Minister of Finances, Ferenc Deák, Minister of Law, József Eötvös, Minister of Education and Religion, Gábor Clausul, Minister of Economy, Bertalan Szemere, Minister of Internal Affairs, Lazar Mesaroš, Minister of Defence, and Prince Paul Esterhazy, Minister of Foreign Affairs.

4 Ban Jelačić began his campaign to Hungary on September 11, 1848. As early as September 14, Bacani decided to form the home-guard troops, and Hungarians were stopped on October 30 in a battle near Schwechat.

an idealistic and romantic picture of the heroic struggle for freedom. Since the beginning of 1849, the Hungarian army was leading the offensive. General Bem defeated imperial troops in Aerdel. The influence of the radical current, led by Count Tokay, general Mór Perczel, and László Madaras was on the rise among the Hungarians. Their main idea was to establish the republic and overthrow of the Habsburgs. The peak of the Hungarian Revolution took place on April 14, 1849, when the Habsburgs were dethroned and when Hungary declared its independence, with Lajos Kossuth as the regent. Strong anti-Habsburg tradition culminated in Debrecen, as a continuation of strong and perceived ideology that that stemmed from the uprising of Ferenc Rákóczi. On August 9, the Russian and Austrian troops defeated the Hungarian army in Timisoara. Kossuth abdicated on August 10th and fled to Turkey. General Artur Gergei surrendered to the Russian army near Világos on August 13, 1849. On October 6, 1849, thirteen Hungarian generals were executed in Arad. The scenes of execution from Arad were permanently incised in the culture of memory as one of the most significant events in the tragic history, a symbol of destruction of the ideal of freedom, the aspirations for respecting the rights and legality, and indication of continuing the persistent and constant struggle of Hungarian elites for their national state within the state of the Habsburgs. In this respect, the Revolution of 1848–1849 represented another important identity link, a thread that connected traditions, which carefully kept the memory of the revolutionary and most beloved politician of the 19<sup>th</sup> century – Lajos Kossuth. In the communist historiography of the Second World War, the cult and spirit of the revolutionary Kossuth was especially well-nurtured and exemplified as an illustration of demolition of the old order and awakening of the new social justice, the republican ideas out of which the grew the ubiquitous and nationalist-romantic image of injustice and the breakdown of the Revolution, reflected in the czar-russian army near Világos. (Микавица et al. 2016)

Since the renewal of the system of limited parliamentarianism / the end of Bach's Absolutism / the passing of the October Diploma (1860) and the February Patent (1861), the idea of a compromise between the Habsburgs and the Hungarian political elites had begun to be implemented and was finally realized with the Settlement in 1867. The core of the politicians gathered around Gyula Andrassy and Deák Ferenc, accepted the dynasty and Austria, but on the foundations of the

so-called Hungarian pragmatic sanctions of 1723<sup>5</sup>. From that moment on, until

5 The issue of reorganizing the Empire began with the October Diploma. The Hungarian part got back the administrative bodies. The Hungarian Royal Regent Council was established in Budim and Hungarian Royal Courtroom was centered in Vienna. The territory of Hungary was reunited. This situation did not last long. The adoption of the February Patent brought new regulations in terms of national centralism. In April 1861, the Hungarian National Assembly was convened. At the session, two currents were formed. The first was led by Ferenc Deák, who is in his *Address* (his option was called the Address Party) insisted on a common state with Austria on the basis of the Pragmatic Sanction. The second current led by count László Teleki (Party of Decrees) considered that the future state must rest on a personal union like the one in 1848. Deák's idea was more dominant. Demands were that Francis Joseph must be crowned as Hungarian king and that the Hungarian government must be formed. Immediately after the submission of the Address, the Parliament was dissolved, because of the refusal of the Hungarian Parliament to send its deputies to the Reichsrat, as a common imperial council. Dissatisfaction of Hungarians was great. In the period 1861–1865 the county system did not work, Aerdel, Croatia and Slavonia were out of Hungarian territories. The entire state apparatus was managed from Vienna. Hungarian politicians led by Deák, József Eötvös, Lajos Moczary and Ágoston Trefort were of the opinion that Hungary must remain part of the Monarchy, but as an equal partner. Aristocracy brought its memorandum in 1863. The writer was Count Apponyi György. An independent Hungarian government with some joint affairs was proposed as a solution. Ever since 1864, negotiations between representatives of the court and Hungarian politicians had been intensified. In April 1865, Deák published his Easter article in which he wrote that Hungarians were ready to pass their laws in line with the needs of the survival of the Empire. Since August 1865, the session of the Hungarian Parliament began, where the preparation and adoption of the Settlement was planned. On February 17, 1870, the Emperor Francis Joseph appointed Gyula Andrassy as Prime Minister. On May 29, 1867, the Parliament voted the 12th article of Law and thus legalized the Settlement (the emperor Franz Jozepf was crowned on June 8, 1867 for the apostolic king of Hungary, while the crown was placed on his head by Gyula Andrassy, the prime minister, former Huszar colonel who had been sentenced to death by the kangaroo court during the Revolution of 1848–1849). The two parts of the monarchy were united in the person of the ruler. Common affairs were: foreign policy, military and finance (for financing the army and foreign policy). In all other matters, member states were completely independent and accountable to parliaments and governments. The common ministers were appointed by the ruler, without agreement with the members of the governments of Austria and Hungary. There was a Collegium comprised of common wealth ministers, while some of the other ministers of the member states were invited to attend some sessions. Above this collegium there were two delegations of the member states, with 60 delegates each. Very important person for the functioning of the newly created state was a joint minister of finance. Out of the eleven ministers of finance appointed by the First World War, only four were Hungarians. As regards the political scene in Hungary, it gradually grew stratified after the Settlement. Deák's party was formed before the adoption of the Settlement in 1866. It was comprised by those who were for settlement with the monarch. There were aristocrats, conservatives, liberals, members of the nobility, citizens, while other than Deák, the leading figures were Eötvös and Andrassy. The supreme opposition party was the Moderate Left led by Kalman Tisa. They

the end of the Monarchy, the anti-Habsburg emotions frequently appeared when the Parliament was discussing financial questions, or those military or foreign affairs interest, mainly as a political platform in terms of pressure on the Viennese court. (Микавица 2011) By gaining their part of the Double Monarchy with wide powers in the internal administration, the Hungarian elites tried to find their model for resolving the national question. The transfer of the Kossuth Lajos's body in 1894 was a manifestation that put the relationship between the Hungarians and the Habsburgs to a test, but did not endanger the state order. Nevertheless, identities-wise, the events from the Revolution lived in the consciousness of the Hungarian elites, and very often the speeches of the Hungarian deputies in the Hungarian Parliament mentioned Hungarian conflicts with the Habsburgs and the necessity of preserving and respecting the Pragmatic sanctions. Often, one could have read about the events in Világos and Arad. In this respect, the assessment of the Russian politics was very often twofold. Depending on the relations of the Austro-Hungarian Empire with Russia, the danger of a new attack of the Russian Empire was kept being mentioned together with the way in which the Revolution had been suppressed. Ever since the time of formation of the Entente Cordiale and the further break between Russia and Austria, insisting on Russian domination in the Slavic world and pointing to the need to connect the Slavs from Monarchy, especially the Serbs with Russia, was becoming more and more intense. Svetozar Miletić, for example, even though he was a critic of the Tsarist regime, called very often on Slavic unity and closer connection with Russia. The same was the case of Laza Kostić and Mihailo Polit Desančić, leader of the Liberals in Hungary. During the Russian-Turkish war of 1876–1877, the Serbian public was daily reported on Russian successes and failures with very often panegyric texts about the Russian army and criticism of the Hungarian elites who celebrated Turkish military success. Mihailo Polit Desančić, especially in his later years, predicted and insisted on the collapse of the Double Monarchy in the potential war with Russia. Very similar ideas were often also made by radical leader Jaša Tomić, which certainly caused

---

avored a civil state and rejected the Settlement because of the fear that the Hungarian part would become dependent entirely on the Austrian one. As a main task, the party had the preservation of the independence of Hungary, through a peaceful parliamentary ways. The third important group was the Extreme Left Party (Forty-one-Party) led by Joseph Madarash, whose actual leader was Lajos Kossuth. It demanded a complete separation from Habsburg by peaceful means. (Пал 2001; Kann and Zdenek 1980; Okey 2002; Sked 1989)

suspicion of the Hungarian political public. The Russo-Japanese War of 1903–1905 caused a real flood of negative emotions and mutual debates on both sides. The Serbian liberal press mostly lamented Russian defeats, while the Hungarian press celebrated Japanese victories. Mutual accusations in this regard were expressed at the sessions of the Hungarian Parliament. Serbs and Slovaks, less often Romanians, were portrayed as part of the Russian Pan-Slavic outpost and were characterized as peoples who would be among the first to betray Monarchy and, in the first place, Hungarians. In this particular case, the anti-Russian sentiments were essentially aimed at Pan-Slavism, which especially disturbed the Hungarian elites because of the frequent voices that Monarchy itself should be reorganized in the fashion of Trialism/ especially since 1906. (Vasin 2015)

Regarding the famous events of 1956, the continuity in identity creation is unambiguous and has an important role. The collapse of Hungary (Trianon 1920), then very often the justification of the regime of Horthy (the establishment and return of the old territories seized in 1920, rebuilding of the St. István state). In the interwar Hungary, learning about the loss of historical territories was one of the boiling points of the national tensions. The former Hungary was reduced to a third of its territory, and therefore approaching Mussolini, and then Hitler, was explained by political pragmatism and national (justified) revisionism for the injustices suffered by the winning forces. Within the policy of Horthy's approaching to Italy and Germany, anti-Communist and anti-Soviet ideological concepts had considerable significance. Thus, already from the beginning of the 1930s, the climate of the mixture of revanchism and anti-communism, was flourishing. This was conducive to the strengthening of national frustration, which would also be reflected in the events of Hungarian occupation / liberation of a part of Slovakia in autumn 1940, and the occupation of a part of Yugoslavia in April 1941 / repression of the civilians in Bačka which culminated in January 1942, expulsion of colonists settled after 1918, and settlement of 15,000 Hungarians from Bukovina /

A significant number of Hungarian units, actively participated in the Eastern Front since 1941, with the ideological matrix of anti-Communism and anti-Sovietism. The defects that Horthy's units experienced with high death toll increased the fear of the Soviet breakthrough in Hungary. The balance was the following: out of 45,000 soldiers every tenth was killed, every third wounded, and three quarters of military equipment was destroyed so the division was returned to Hungary in 16 December 1941. The catastrophic defeat of the Hungarian army of 200,000 people

it the battle of Voronezh in January 1943 / one third of the soldiers were killed, one third captured, was the prelude to the dismantling of Horthy's Hungary. Ever since the second half of 1943, the public was daily informed of the crimes that the Soviet army was committing in the occupied territories. Images of the war with the Soviets in the autumn of 1944, were added to the already existing image, which we already addressed. National tragedies, awareness of defeat, but also the constant return to their own image of values, were an important part of the events of 1956. Deportations, arrests and murders of the Jewish (about 400,000 of them) and persecutions in March 1944, were put in the context of the pressure of Hitler's Nazi Germany. Abdication of Miklós Horthy on October 15–16, 1944, arrival of Ferenc Szálasi and the Arrow Cross Party only accelerated the process of liquidating the Jewish population and destroying of their property, more than it raised resistance to the Soviets. From January 20, 1945 onwards, Hungary effectively ended its active military participation in the war, when the truce was signed in Moscow between the representatives of the USSR, the United States and the United Kingdom. Slowly but surely, since the fall of 1945, the Soviet influence in Hungary was becoming predominant and more permanent. During the second half of 1945 and the first half of 1946, this time 160,000 Germans were deported.

Although on the elections on November 16, 1945 they won 16% of votes, the communists became part of the executive government. The middle class and the small holders who won the election, strongly anti-Soviet-oriented, were suppressed under pressure and eventually marginalized. (Rokai et al. 2002) The methodology of the work of the communist / Bolshevik party that took power in East Europe based on the cult of leaders / dictators was not that much different in Hungary either. During 1945, 620,000 landless people received estates; until 1950, 59,429 persons were trialed before courts (477 were sentenced to death). The Communist Party itself, from several thousand members in the autumn of 1944, reached nearly half a million members by the mid-1945. Leading people were Mátyás Rákosi, Imre Nagy, János Kádár and László Rajk. A special treaty with the USSR was signed on September 25, 1945. On the following in 1947, the Communist Party became the leading political force in the country. A bad foreign policy situation for Hungarian interests that culminated in the expulsion of Hungarians from Slovakia, Zakarpattia and Yugoslavia gave Stalin the opportunity to strengthen the position of the Communist Party which, on the other hand, supported him in his attempts to deal with Broz Yugoslavia. Nationalization of schools, persecution of Catholic priests,

capture of the opponents, were only a part of the coloring that accompanied the strengthening of the power of the Communist Party in Hungary. Stalin's death (March 1953) and the election of Nikita Khrushchev and the re-examination of Stalinist politics influenced also the events in Hungary, firstly hierarchically in the communist party according to the Soviet model by removing Rákosi and his marginalization (July 1953). With the arrival of Imre Nagy, the previous Stalinist policy in Hungary itself started to be questioned. An enormous number of intellectuals gathered around the Petőfi circle (symbolically related to the Revolution of 1848) suggested demands for change, a pronounced anti-Soviet note and a return to certain national traditions forgotten after 1945.

The events of October 1956 begin symbolically on October 6 (the same day when the Hungarian generals, commanders of the Hungarian Revolutionary Army in Arad, were executed in 1849, among which a particularly important place had Serb Janoš Damjanić) when László Rajk, Tibor Senjaji, Andras Salai, György Pálfi (a former Horthy's general who joined the Workers Party), convicted and executed on the mounted process during October 1949, and at the funeral was attended by about 100,000 people. Antal Apró, a member of the Central Committee of the Workers Party, emphasized that it was a matter of rehabilitation of innocent convicts, while the public was looking for the culprit in the Rákosi regime. (Congdon, Kiraly and Nagy 2006)

On October 17, 1956, the association of writers requested for March 15 (1848) to be declared a national holiday as the day of the Revolution / Uprising. Students from the Technical Faculty in Szeged on October 22 requested (in Revolutionary 16 points) for Koshut's coat of arms be returned as the national symbol of Hungary and for the Soviet troops to withdraw from the country. In the meantime, Rakosi withdrew, and the demonstrations were scheduled for October 23. In the following 10 days, until November 4, the political survival of Hungary was being resolved mostly on the streets of Budapest. The rise and fall of Imre Nagy, the formation of the new government on October 25, withdrawal from the Soviet Warsaw Pact on November 1, engaging Cardinal Mindsenti in international political mediation (asylum in the US embassy), together with the famous events in the Yugoslav embassy (November 4–22) and the Soviet tanks on the streets of Budapest, all this gives a sketch for the collective and individual portrait of Hungarian Revolution of 1956. Idea of national and personal freedoms, abolition of a totalitarian regime, struggle for civil rights and freedoms, attempts to bring Hungary

out of the hands of the Soviet authorities were suppressed by Soviet tanks, in street fights and in the final collapse of the Revolution. The epilogue was 2,500 people killed, 20,000 wounded, while in the period from 1956 to 1959, 35,000 people were processed, out of which 22,000 were convicted and 360 executed. In the first weeks after the revolution, 20,000 people left Hungary. The image of the first attempt to overthrow the Soviet authorities remained as a permanent collective identity clue in the minds of Hungarians. (Congdon, Kiraly and Nagy 2006; Kissinger 1994; Calvocoressi 2009; Samardžić 2008)

The Revolutions of 1848 and 1956 represent components in the culture of memory and formation of the national identity that are two of the three points of support for this long process (Rákóczi Uprising). Hundreds of memorials throughout Hungary, symbols and flags from 1956, the constitution of two national holidays in March and October, symbolizing 1848 and 1956, the Museum of Terror and Victims of 1956, but also a constant reminder of the most famous heroes of the nation Koshutt Lajos and the events in Arad 1849, give a picture and a guideline for looking at the idea and creation of contemporary identity in Hungary in today's, turbulent political times. The ideas and images of the two Revolutions that ended in the short-term defeats, in the long-term identity regard gave the possibility to the national elites to upgrade and expand collective consciousness by strengthening the idea of freedom, resistance to foreign violence, as well as the idea of nation's specificity and essential belonging to the Western world. That is why the decision was made in 1989, when a break with the Soviet-Communist politics was decided and succession was made simply and consensually. Hungary's path to the EU and NATO was natural and expected. The Ideas of the Revolutions of 1848 and 1956 are therefore one of the pillars of support of this road, that is in the minds of Hungarians based on the idea of freedom, the struggle for the preservation of Hungary and the wider European and Christian heritage of the old central European state.

**REFERENCES:**

- Congdon, Lee, Király, Béla K. and Károly Nagy (Eds.). 2006. *1956: the Hungarian revolution and war for independence*. Boulder: Social Science Monographs.
- Calvocoressi, Peter. 2009. *World politics after 1945*. London: Longman.
- Frank, Tibor. 2005. *Picturing Austria-Hungary, The British Perception of the Habsburg Monarchy*. New York: Boulder, Social Science Monographs; Wayne, Center for Hungarian Studies and Publication.
- Kann, Robert. 1960. *A study in Austrian intellectual history, from late baroque to romanticism*. New York: F. A. Praeger.
- Kann, Robert. 1964a. *The Multinational empire, nationalism and national reform in the Habsburg monarchy 1848–1918, vol 1, Empire and nationalities*. New York: Octagon Books Inc.
- Kann, Robert. 1964b. *The Multinational empire, nationalism and national reform in the Habsburg monarchy 1848–1918, vol 2, Empire reform*. New York: Octagon Books Inc.
- Kann, Robert. 1974. *A history of Habsburg empire 1526–1918*, Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Kann, Robert and David V Zdenek. 1984. *The Peoples of the Eastern Habsburg Lands 1526–1918*. Seattle; London: University of Washington Press.
- Kissinger, Henry. 1994. *Diplomacy*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Микавица, Дејан. 2011. *Српско питање на Угарском сабору 1690–1918*. Нови Сад: Филозофски факултет.
- Микавица, Дејан, Лемајић, Ненад, Васин Горан, Ненад Нинковић. 2016b. *Срби у Хабзбуршкој монархији: 1526–1918. Вол. 2, Од Благовештенског сабора до слома Аустроугарске : 1861-1918*. Нови Сад: Прометеј.
- Пал, Тибор. 2001. *Мађарска политичка јавност и српско питање на Балкану 1860-1878*, Нови Сад: Филозофски факултет
- Rokai, Petar, Đere, Zoltan, Pal, Tibor and Aleksandar Kasaš. 2002. *Istorija Madara*. Beograd: Clio.
- Samardžić, Nikola. 2008. *Drugi dvadeseti vek*. Beograd: Službeni glasnik.
- Sked, Alan. 1989. *The Decline and Fall of the Habsburg Empire 1815–1918*. London: Longman.
- Samardžić, Nikola. 2008. *Drugi dvadesti vek*, Beograd: Službeni glasnik.
- Васин, Горан. 2015. *Сабори раскола*. Београд: Службени гласник.
- Wandruszka, Adam (Ed.). 1980a. *Die Habsburgermonarchie*. Band 3/1. . Wien: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Wandruszka, Adam (Ed.). 1980b. *Die Habsburgermonarchie*. Band 3/2. Wien: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften.

---

## *Revolucije 1848. i 1956 – paradigma izgradnje nacionalnog identiteta Mađara*

Nacionalni identitet Mađara izgrađen je u više etapa i više pravaca tokom procesa istorijskog dugog trajanja. On je profilisan najpre kroz antiosmansku i antihabzburšku borbu, da bi kasnije primio oblik objedinjavanja teritorija Krune Sv Stefana i vremenom antiruska i antisovjetska obeležja. Posebno su Revolucije 1848/1849 i 1956. karakteristične u tom pogledu. Nacionalni porazi koji su usledili posle pomenutih revolucija učvršćeni su antihabzburškim i anti-ruskim tonovima /1848/ i posebno antisovjetskim /1956/. Tako se kult slobode, nacionalnog požrtvovanja i nacionalne tragedije koji je bio dominantan i ranije sada nadgradio u jednu od najvažnijih komponenata savremenog nacionalnog identiteta Mađara, posebno naglašenih kroz refleksiju dešavanja od pada Berlinskog zida pristupanja EU i NATO.

---

*Ključne reči:* Revolucija 1848, Revolucija 1956, Mađarska, nacionalni identitet, Habzburzi, Austrougarska, Trijanon, Sovjeti, Imre Nađ

*Paper received:* 12. IX 2017.

*Paper reviewed:* 26. IX 2017.

*Paper accepted:* 6. X 2017.