

T.C.
ISTANBUL AYDIN UNIVERSITY
SOCIAL SCIENCES INSTITUTE



HUNGARIAN-TURKISH RELATIONS:
AN APPROACH IN POLITICAL HISTORY

THESIS

Asya ALTAN

Political Science and International Relations Department
Political Science and International Relations Program

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ateş USLU

JUNE-2016

**T.C.
İSTANBUL AYDIN ÜNİVERSİTESİ
SOCIAL SCIENCES INSTITUTE**



**HUNGARIAN-TURKISH RELATIONS:
AN APPROACH IN POLITICAL HISTORY**

M.Sc. THESIS

Asya Altan

Y1012.110001

**Political Science and International Relations Department
Political Science and International Relations Program**

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ateş USLU

JUNE-2016



T.C.
İSTANBUL AYDIN ÜNİVERSİTESİ
SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ MÜDÜRLÜĞÜ

Yüksek Lisans Tez Onay Belgesi

Enstitümüz Siyaset Bilimi ve Uluslararası İlişkiler Ana Bilim Dalı Siyaset Bilimi ve Uluslararası İlişkiler İngilizce Tezli Yüksek Lisans Programı Y1012.110001 numaralı öğrencisi ASYA ALTAN'ın "HUNGARIAN-TURKISH RELATIONS: AN APPROACH IN POLITICAL HISTORY" adlı tez çalışması Enstitümüz Yönetim Kurulunca: 22.04.2015 tarih ve 2015/09 sayılı kararıyla oluşturulan jüri tarafından 22/04/2016 ile Tezli Yüksek Lisans tezi olarak *K.A.T.M.* edilmiştir.

Öğretim Üyesi Adı Soyadı

İmzası

Tez Savunma Tarihi :17/06/2016

1)Tez Danışmanı: Doç. Dr. Ateş USLU

2) Jüri Üyesi : Prof. Dr. Celal Nizam İREM

3) Jüri Üyesi : Yrd. Doç. Dr. Filiz KATMAN

Not: Öğrencinin Tez savunmasında **Başarılı** olması halinde bu form **imzalanacaktır**. Aksi halde geçersizdir.



To my family,,





TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
TABLE OF CONTENTS	vii
ABBREVIATIONS	ix
ÖZET	xi
ABSTRACT	xiii
1. INTRODUCTION	1
2. A LEGACY OF IMPERIAL RIVALRY: HUNGARIANS BETWEEN HABSBURGS AND THE OTTOMAN EMPIRE	5
2.1. The Hungarian Battlefield: Military and Diplomatic Relations from the 15 th to the mid-16 th Century.....	5
2.1.1. First clashes between the kingdom of Hungary and the Ottomans.....	5
2.1.2. Beginnings of the Ottoman Conquest of Hungary.....	8
2.2. Hungary in the Habsburg Realm (1568-1918)	24
2.2.1. Habsburgs are compelling the Ottomans	24
2.2.2. Francis Rákóczi II's War of Independence: The Ottoman connection.....	29
2.2.3. Ottoman-Hungarian relations in an age of nationalism	30
3. TURKISH-HUNGARIAN RELATIONS IN A TUMULTUOUS ERA: BILATERAL RELATIONS IN THE TWENTIETH CENTURY AND BEYOND	39
3.1. Hungary and Turkey in the Interwar Period: Establishing Relations Between Two New-Born Nation-States	39
3.1.1. The Turkish-Hungarian relations during the First World War and in the aftermath	39
3.1.2. Turkey-Hungary political relations (1923-1938).....	41
3.1.3. World War II period	49
3.2. Second Half of the Twentieth Century	53
3.2.1. Hungary in the Cold War.....	53
3.2.2. Collapse of the walls.....	57
3.3. Hungary and Turkey at the Beginning of the 21 st Century	60
3.3.1. The EU accession process in Hungary and Turkey	60
3.3.2. Turanism in a new context.....	72
4. CONCLUSION	79
REFERENCES	81
RESUME	85



ABBREVIATIONS

CSO	: Civil Society Organization
EU	: European Union
ECSC	: The European Coal and Steel Community
FIDESZ	: Alliance of Young Democrats
FKGP	: The Independent Smallholders, Agrarian Workers and Civic Party
IMF	: International Monetary Fund
KDNP	: Christian Democratic People's Party
MÁÉRT	: Hungarian Permanent Conference
MDF	: Hungarian Democratic Forum
MDP	: Hungarian working people's party
MIÉP	: The Hungarian Justice and Life Party
MSZP	: The Hungarian Socialist Party
NATO	: North Atlantic Treaty Organization
NMS	: New Member States
SZDSZ	: Alliance Of Free Democrats
WB	: World Bank
WTO	: World Trade Organization

MACAR-TÜRK İLİŞKİLERİ: SİYASİ TARİH AÇISINDAN BİR YAKLAŞIM

ÖZET

Bu tezin temel amacı, Türkiye ve Macaristan arasındaki tarihi, kültürel ve politik ilişki temellerini ortaya koymaktır. Bu bağlamda, tarihsel ve siyasi olaylar cumhuriyetin kuruluşundan itibaren günümüze kadar tartışılmıştır. Türk-Macar insanları arasındaki ilişkilerin hangi dönem geliştiği ve kötü olduğu gerekçeleri ile ayrıntılı şekilde açıklanmıştır. Macaristan ve Türkiye arasında bugünün ilişkisini aydınlatmak ve netleştirmek için, ayrıca Cumhuriyet öncesi dönem ve Osmanlı İmparatorluğu dönemi de incelendi.

İlk bölümde, Osmanlılar ve Macarlar arasındaki ilk çatışmalar ele alındı ve ayrıca aralarındaki anlaşmalar siyasi anlaşmazlıklar da incelenmiştir. Birinci Süleyman dönemi önemlidir. I. Süleyman (Muhteşem 1520-1566) Macaristan'ın anahtarı Belgrad ve diğer birçok önemli Macar kaleleri ele geçirmiştir. Macaristan İmparatorluğu Buda'nın fethi ve devamında Transilvanya'nın işgaliyle çökmüştür.

İkinci bölümde ise, Habsburglar ve Osmanlılar tarafından işgal ve saldırıya uğrayan Macarların durumu incelenmiştir. Macarlar ağırlıklı olarak 16. ve 17. yüzyılda bu saldırılara maruz kalmıştır.

Transilvanya Valisi Sigismund (1586-1597) Osmanlı egemenliğinden kurtulmaya çalışmıştır. Macaristan öncelikle ikiye bölünmüş ve birbirleriyle uzun süre çatışan iki krallık, John Zapolya (1526-1540) ve Ferdinand Habsburg (1527-1540), tarafından yönetildi. 1541 yılında ülke, Buda'nın Türkler tarafından fethi ile üçe bölünmüştür. Aynı zamanda Macaristan üzerinde kontrol kurmaya çalışan diğer bir devlet Avusturya idi.

Üçüncü bölümde, yirminci yüzyıl Türkiye-Macaristan ilişkileri ele alınmıştır. Turancılık hareketi, 20. Yüzyılın başlarında Macaristan'da doğmuştur. Osmanlı İmparatorluğu Almanya ve Avusturya-Macaristan İmparatorluğu'nun yanında yer aldığından Türk-Macar dostluğu I. Dünya Savaşı sırasında güçlendi. Trianon Antlaşması ile topraklarını kaybeden Macaristan yönünü doğuya dönmüştür.

Dördüncü bölümde, AB üyesi olmak için Türkiye ve Macaristan'da hangi süreçlerin takip edildiği belirtiliyor.

Beşinci bölümde, günümüzde Turancılığın anlamı ve amacı tartışılmıştır. Geçmişten günümüze kadar nasıl değiştiği belirtilmektedir.

Macaristan'ın Türkiye için önemli rollere sahip olduğu sonucuna varılmıştır. Macaristan Avrupalılar arasında en Türk dostu ülkedir. Türkiye'nin üniversitelerindeki Macar öğrencilerin sayılarını artırmak için çalışmalar yapılmalıdır. Macaristan'daki Türkler'in tarihi eserlerinin ortaya çıkarılması ve tanımlanması iki ülke arasındaki kültürel bağların güçlendirilmesi açısından önemli bir rol oynar.

Anahtar Kelimeler: *İlişkiler, Türkiye, Macaristan, Osmanlı.*



HUNGARIAN-TURKISH RELATIONS: AN APPROACH IN POLITICAL HISTORY

ABSTRACT

The main purpose of this thesis is to point out the basics of historical, cultural, and political relationship between Turkey and Hungary. In this context, the historical and political events were discussed from the founding of the republic until to the present day. In which period relations between Turkish- Hungarian people is worse and has improved explained in detail with the reasons. To illuminate and clarify today's relationship between Hungary and Turkey, pre-republic era and Ottoman Empire period were also reviewed.

In the first section, first clashes between Ottomans and Hungarians were discussed and agreements and political disagreements between them were also studied.

The period of Suleiman the first was important. Suleiman the first (The Magnificent 1520-1566) captured Belgrade the key of Hungary and many other important Hungarian castles. The conquest of Buda and in the ongoing occupation of the Transylvania Hungarian Empire collapsed.

In the second part, the situation of Hungarians which were occupied and attacked by Habsburgs and Ottomans was examined. Hungarians were heavily exposed to these attacks in 16th and 17th century.

Sigismund the Transylvanian governor (1586-1597) tried to get rid of the dominance of Ottoman. Hungary firstly divided into two and was ruled by two kingdoms, John Zapoly (1526-1540) and Ferdinand Habsburg (1527-1540), who clashed with each other long period. In 1541 the country was divided into three by the Turkish conquest of Buda. At the same time, another state that tries to establish control over Hungary was Austria.

In the third part, twentieth century Turkey-Hungary relations are discussed. In the early 20th century, Turanism movement was born in Hungary. The Turkish-Hungarian friendship has strengthened during World War I as the Ottoman Empire took place next to Germany and the Austro-Hungarian Empire. Hungary, lost its land with the Treaty of Trianon, turned direction to eastward.

In the fourth part, to be member of EU which process is followed by Turkey and Hungary is stated.

In the fifth part, today the meaning and goal of Turanism is discussed. It is stated that how it has changed from the past until today.

It is concluded that Hungary has many important roles for Turkey. Hungary is the most Turkish friendly country among Europeans. Studies should be done to increase the number of Hungarian students in Universities of Turkey. Identifying and unearthing historical monuments of Turks in Hungary plays an unignorable role in terms of strengthening the cultural links between two countries.

Keywords: *Relations, Turkey, Hungary, Ottoman.*

1. INTRODUCTION

Turkey and Hungary have a deep-rooted common history. Turks and Hungarians are two communities seeing each other as a friend with the accumulation and consciousness of a common history. Hungarians are a mixture of Finno-Ugric and Turkic ethnic groups that came and settled in the Carpathian Basin in Central Europe; they differ from their Slavic, German and Latin neighbors by their ethnic origin (Çolak, 2009, p.27). Hungarians and Turks have had a long established acquaintance over one thousand years (Demirkan, 2000, pp.13-18). Although Hungarian and Turkish communities belong to different ethnic groups and language families, they blended with each other even in the early ages of the history, from which a “second degree kinship” has occurred (Namal, 2009, p.16).

According to Laszlo Rasonyi, a famous Hungarian-Turkish historian, “Turks are the father and Finnish-Ugors are the mother of Hungarians” (Demirkan, 2000, pp.18-19). Hungarians had lived in a consistent union with Turks before they invaded their current land. The members of the Arpad dynasty that ruled the Hungarian country in the early medieval period has been raised under the effect of Turkish culture. Many old Hungarian families carried Turkish names. Turkic tribes migrating to the Carpathian Basin during the reign of the Arpad dynasty in the middle Ages mixed with Hungarians, afterwards Cumans and Patzinaks also joined to the Hungarians. During the 10th and 11th centuries, Byzantine historians assumed Hungarians as Turks (Eckhart, 1949, pp.7-8). Many Turkish words passed to Hungarian language.

The existence of Hungarian land names in Anatolia is the result of these relations. There are land carrying Hungarian names around settlements such as Antalya, Balıkesir, Bolu, Niğde, Giresun, and Kastamonu. Danube basin and Carpathian Mountains where Hungary takes place have been the obligatory pathway for the constant tribe migrations from north and south. Hungary having been invaded by the Celts and then by the Dutch entered into the domination of Roman Empire in the 1st century B.C., and this dominance lasted until the 4th century A.D. The country was also captured in the 6th century by Avar Turks who reached up to Danube Basin. The

Avars ruled the Middle Europe for 250 years by forming a powerful empire. Hungarians occurred with the blend of Ugor tribe coming down to the southern lands from Ural Mountains and Volga River; Onogurs one of the Turkish tribes; Huns migrating towards the west; and Avars settled down Carpathian Plain after entering to Transylvania around 896.

Hungarians converted to Catholicism at the beginning of the 11th century in order to integrate into the Christian Europe like Bulgarians (Özgiray, 1997, p.75). They were the leading people among the peoples that could resist the Turks in Europe (Yusufoğlu, 1995, p.7). After the Ottoman Turks won the Battle of Mohács (1526) triumph, Turks settled in Hungary, and Hungarians were under the sway of Turkish domination (Gökbilgin, 2001, p.11). Throughout 150 years of Turkish domination in Hungary, economic and cultural relations between Turks and Hungarians occurred. This relationship and historical loyalty having occurred in European map would also prepare important approaches in Ottoman Empire era.

Hungary, which was one of the supreme powers of its time until 20th century, lost 2 out of 3 of its lands with 3.3 million Hungarian people when lost the World War I. Trianon Agreement signed in 1920 is known with its severe conditions and accepted as one of the worst events in Hungarian history.

Hungary made an alliance with Nazi Germany during the World War II was captured by Soviet Russia after the war and the country adopted the communist regime between 1947 and 1989. With the demolition of Eastern Block in 1989, the country gained the parliamentary republic title by opening its borders to Austria. Today, the country is holding an economy having huge revenue. Additionally, the country is keeping the monopoly of some regional resources.

This study has the answers to the following questions. What type of process has been followed from the past until today between Turkey and Hungary relationships in terms of political history? How these two countries were affected by political, historical and ideologies events? Past events affect the present or not? Which historical events have effect on today's Turkish Hungarian relationships. Which past event contribute to their present relations? Which historical event has positive and negative effect on their relations? In which period which political, historical and ideological movements affected their approach to each other?

Ottoman history has been examined in detail in the study of H. Uzunçarşılı (1988) within the framework of relations with its neighbors. In the relevant section of Ottoman-Hungary relations, he tells alliances that are occurred against the Ottoman Empire and he is focusing on assault and battles. He also tells Hungarian monarchs' enlargement policies and Ottoman's intervention. Although he tries to be neutral, nationalist feelings such as praise and happiness is remarkable due to the triumph of Ottoman in the battles.

Özgiray (1997), examines Turkey-Hungarian political relations, between 1920s-1930s, and he asserts that the purpose of them is not benefit from the friendship. In the same way, M. Çolak (2005) views the social-cultural aspects of relations.

According to Nizam (2005), the assertion of the unity of the people, which is completely different from one another in terms of religion and culture shows that Turan movement is an extension of the Hungarian imperialism. Basic purpose, in this vast geography, is the development of Hungarian economic interests so cultural and religious differences are not significant. As Hungarian Turan movement sees turanism as a tool to realize its aim, panturanist approaches, revealed during the Ottoman and Republic, aspire to leadership of their own state and their own people (i.e. The Turks of Anatolia).

The aim of this study is to reveal the basics of historical and political relationship between Turkey and Hungary. In this basis, the historical and political events were discussed from the founding of the republic until to the present day. To illuminate and clarify today's relationship between Hungary and Turkey, pre-republic era and Ottoman Empire period were also reviewed.



2. A LEGACY OF IMPERIAL RIVALRY: HUNGARIANS BETWEEN HABSBURGS AND THE OTTOMAN EMPIRE

2.1. The Hungarian Battlefield: Military and Diplomatic Relations from the 15th to the mid-16th Century

2.1.1. First clashes between the kingdom of Hungary and the Ottomans

During the Ottoman period conflicts and wars were seen between Hungarians and Ottomans. In the 1400s Ottoman Emperors such as Murad the second and, Mehmed the second carried out many attacks towards to Hungary to surround it's lands. Strategic territories of Hungary such as Semendire, Belgrade, Galamboc, Transylvania were tried to be surrounded many times by Ottomans. Hungarians tried to defend their territory against to the Ottoman attacks. In 1400s it was not questioned whether Ottomans and Magyars were relative or not. During the Ottoman period a scientific research has not been made on Turks and Hungarian origin. Historical partnership, similarity, hereditary and blood ties were out of question. In this period main problem was territorial expansion.

Sigismund fighting against the Ottomans in 1428 for Güvercinlik (Galamboc) which is the second important strategic territory after Belgrade lost the war and signed a peace agreement with the Ottomans. This failure made the defending of Tuna line become difficult and Hungary became the neighbor of the Ottoman Empire directly. The Ottomans used to have a navy in Güvercinlik and Krusevac (Alacahisar) in order to make the attacks towards Hungary make easier. After Murad II (1421-1451) conquered precisely Serbia, Brankovic the Serbian despot fled to Hungary. Murad II surrounding Belgrade in 1440 did not become successful. János Hunyadi the Transylvanian voivade, the governor of Temes and Sorin (Szöreny) ban, firstly defeated the commander of the Semendire Castle (Szendrö) Ishak Bey in Belgrade region in 1441 and later Mezid Bey entering into Transylvania (Erdel) during his return (March 22, 1442), and after this event, Wallachia and Moldova turned back to the Hungarian liege. After Hunyadi defeated Şehabeddin Pasha on the days of September 2 and 6 of 1442, he started to "Long Campaign" that lasted five months and he won five battles during the time against the Ottomans (1443). Even if the ten

year long Segedin Peace Agreement was signed between the Ottomans and Hungarians, alliance armies under the leadership of the king of Hungary, Ulaszlo I (1440-1444) was heavily defeated in Varna on the November 10th, 1444. The king of Hungary died in this battle. Hunyadi chosen as the regent of the king (1446-1456) was not able to avoid defeat in Kosovo to which he went before the allied forces (The second Kosovo Battle: October 17-19, 1448). Because the troops of Hunyadi were almost terminated there, Hunyadi no longer thought to launch an extended expedition against the Ottomans (Yusufoğlu, 2006, pp.15; Uzunçarşılı, 1988, pp.35-36).

Ceasefire agreement during the following years kept the status quo between Hungarian Kingdom and the Ottoman Empire. That the Hungarians put an end to their actions in the Balkans provided an advantage to the Ottomans. The conquest of Istanbul in 1453 did not affect the military balance of Hungary as Istanbul had not been anything but to be a port for Christian fleets during the battles against the Ottomans. Even Mehmed II (Fatih, 1451-1481) moving to Serbia the following year surrounded Semendire, Hunyadi caused him to leave the surrounding unfinished. Hunyadi captured Firuz Bey and destroyed Vidin. With this action, he made Brankovic the Serbian despot breathe a sigh of relief (1454). However, Mehmed II completed the conquest of Southern Serbia by taking Novo Brdo (July 21st, 1455).

The Belgrade Castle named as “the key of Hungary” was surrounded by Mehmed II in the beginning of June, 1456, however, Hunyadi defeated Mehmed II heavily on June 22nd, 1456. Hunyadi died after three days of the end of the surrounding. The triumph of Hungarians did not bring any consequence, but to save the Hungarian Castle. Thus, raid troops passing by the Wallachia went into Transylvania. Mehmed the second sent Mahmud Pasha for the conquest of Serbia in autumn of 1458. Mahmud Pasha capturing the Serbian castles completed the second, but the ultimate conquest of the Serbia by capturing Semendire (June 29th, 1459). So, there was only Belgrade left from the most powerful and largest country of the Balkans once upon a time. The southern cities of Hungary were opened to Ottomans again. We see few limited actions from the Hungarian side. Even if King Matyas having heard of the fall of Güvercinlik (1458-1490) declared mobilization and crusade, the Hungarian army was content with the defense of Sirem Island against Ottoman raiders (Yusufoğlu, 2006, pp.15; Uzunçarşılı, 1988, pp.36-41).

Mehmed II fronted towards Bosnia after the conquest of Serbia. He captured 70 Bosnian castles among which Yayça was found, without not much resistance in May and June of 1463. However, Matyas captured 60 castles back among which the Yayça and the Banja Luka Castles were found (October-December 1463). In the following year, Mehmed the second surrounded Yayça (July 12th-August 22nd, 1464), but he resigned the surroundings when the Hungarian army started to move. Matyas was not able to Capture Izvornik even he surrounded the castle (October 8th-November 9) and removed the siege upon the intelligence of an Ottoman attack. During the Bosnia battles, a lot of opportunities to clash between Matyas armies and Fatih armies occurred, however, both sides avoided to use this opportunity. Although Mehmed the second had superior power, it is obvious that he did not desire to come across Mátyás, the son of János Hunyadi who is the winner of the 1456 Belgrade Battle, and Mátyás had a army that was not able to take an open war risk. The fight between Ottomans and Hungarians for the share of the Balkans with the 1463-64 battles ended, and the direct defense of the Hungarian Kingdom started. However, it is seen that Matyas captured Bögürdelen (Szabacs) on February 15th, 1476. Fatih took some books from Corvina Library, known as the second richest library after Vatikan and consisting of 2000-2500 books collection of outdated king Mátyás, to Topkapı Palace, but 35 books staying for 300 years was delivered to Hungary by a council sent by Abdulhamid II in 1877. The periods of Bayezid II (1481-1512) and Selim I (1512-1520) are the peace and ceasefire periods between Hungary and the Ottoman Empire, however, the armies of Semendire governor still reached up to Nagyvárad in 1474 and 1490, and arranged unsuccessful attacks to Transylvania (October 1479; January-February, 1493). On the other hand, the Hungarians attacked to Serbia in 1481 and 1493 and went into Bosnia, Serbia and Bulgaria from three different paths in 1502. The Ottomans surrounded Belgrade, Yayça and Bögürdelen in 1492 and tried to capture Yayça and Sorin 1493, but they failed and also they failed to capture Belgrade in 1494. The Yayça sieges of Ottomans in the years of 1479, 1492 and 1502 were also unsuccessful. Again, during this period, some clashes ending with mutual triumphs took place. Down Danube border rulers made some attempts in 1493. Kinizsi the Hungarian commander tried to stop the Ottomans with the attacks towards the Ottoman regions. Soon after, a third year 1495 peace agreement and again another third year 1498 peace agreement and a seven year 1503 peace agreement were signed between the Hungarian Kingdom and the Ottoman

Empire. The Hungarian king Ulaszlo II (1490-1516) got involved in a new Ottoman - Venice battle breaking out in 1499 by joining the Pope-Venice ally, but the war did not go beyond the usual force trial war (Yusufoğlu, 2006, pp.15-16; Uzunçarşılı, 1988, pp.88-98). On the other hand, the Ottomans had been trying to make peace from the most beginning and they stayed mostly defensive. Because Hungary was not able to recruit mobile army due to economic reasons, it was seen that the border region force balance was taking precedence over the Ottoman side. John Zápolya, the Voivode of Transylvania became unsuccessful about the Hungarian acts (1515: Zsarno).

2.1.2. Beginnings of the Ottoman conquest of Hungary

Suleiman I (The Magnificent 1520-1566) captured Belgrade the key of Hungary and many other important Hungarian castles on August 25th, 1521. Military casualties and poverty happening during the Lajos II (1516-1526) period resulted in the decrease of the initiative ability of Hungarian military force. The only Hungarian success was that the armies of Pál Tomori defeated Ferhad Pasha and Bali Pasha the Semendire governor in August, 1523. The Hungarian Kingdom lost the lands that Sigismund acquired in 1427, Matyas acquired between 1463 and 1464 and 1476 expeditions, between the years 1521 and 1524. As for the Ottomans, they easily went into Hungary thanks to the castles located in Down the Danube lately captured by them.

That Charles V captured the majority of the European lands with different methods and grew became to threaten France. The French king Francis I started to fight against Charles V with this reason. The Charles V- Francis I struggle became turned into a war in 1521 (Gombrich, 1997, pp.214-215). By taking advantage of the divided position of Europe, Suleiman the magnificent firstly captured Belgrade, then captured Rhodes (Baysun, 1979, p.407).

When Charles V defeated Francis I in '*Pavia Battle*' in 1525 and took him to Madrid by captivating him (Demireğen, 2006, p. 4), the French asked for help from the Ottoman Empire as the last ditch. Because Francis I was in jail, his mother, Louise de Savoie sent Jean Frangipani with two hurry letters to Suleiman the Magnificent and they were demanding an expedition towards Hungary in order for the rescue of her son (Grammont, 1985, p.93; Hammer, n.d., p.470). The Ottoman Government was seeing the alliance with France as a mean that could hinder the single ruler

power over Europe (Inalcık, 2003, p.40). In 1522, Charles V made his only brother Ferdinand settled in Wien in the capacity of a ruler of Austria and made his sister with Lajos inheriting in the throne of Hungary and gained a significant impact on Hungary were constituting an important problem with respect to the Ottoman Empire (Öztuna, 1983, pp.335-341).

When the situation became to develop against the Ottoman Empire, Sultan Suleiman decided to make an expedition over Hungary. Sultan Suleiman dismissed the Sage Mehmed Pasha from grand vizier position and replaced him with İbrahim Pasha. The new grand vizier was constantly promoting the Sultan to campaign over Hungary, too (Gökbilgin, 2001, p.17). Hungary was in a weak position in terms of economic reasons during this period.

The depreciation of money in order to provide the necessary financial resources made a catastrophic impact on the economic health of the government (Perjes, 1988, p. 57). In addition, the tackle of Europe with Luther was an effective reason for the campaign.

Sultan Suleiman captured Belgrade, which is an important conjunction, a key for Europe from Rumelia, in 1521 (Atıl, 1986, pp.15-16). With the takeover of Belgrade, the Ottoman Army seized an opportunity to move much more easily (Yurdaydın, 1961, pp.29-32). The campaign of Suleiman the Magnificent towards Central Europe after 5 years of Belgrade campaign made Charles V fussed.

About this time, the messengers of Shah Thamasb were negotiating for an alliance with Charles V. Shah Tahmasb, although he was bewareing from the Ottoman Empire, was not staying away from these alliances. Hungarians also started to take precautions, to demand help from European countries and to send spies to Istanbul in order to be informed of the situation in Istanbul (TSMA, E. 6443).

In the course of developing events, Suleiman the Magnificent left Istanbul with 100.000 people army and 300 field cannon guns on the April, 21st, 1526 (Receb 11th, 932) (Gelibolulu Mustafa Âli). Along the way, pre-charged forces were joined to the army of the governor; land governors and flag officers were kissing the hand of the Sultan. Suleiman the Magnificent made the religious ceremony in Belgrade and passed to Sirem. Sultan Suleiman charged the grand vizier Ibrahim Pasha to take the

Varadin Castle located near the Danube River. After the conquest of Varadin Castle, Iyluk Castle was surrounded.

With the join of the Sultan to the surrounding and that, Hungarians understood they would not endure any more, the castle was conquered. After this, the troops from the land and the navy from the river arrived to Drava River and conquered the Ösek Castle. A bridge was built in order to pass the Drava River. On 22nd of August, after the whole troops had passed the bridge, the bridge was demolished by the order of the Sultan (Celal-zade Mustafa, 1937, pp. 38-42; Demireğen, 2006, p. 6). That the Sultan made the bridge demolished is the obvious indicator of the desire that he definitely wanted to conquer and not to come back.

In there, the Sultan sent the Semendire flag officer Bali Pasha as vanguard. In the report sent by Bali Pasha, that he said they passed to Sirem and the Hungarians were not a remarkable force and the campaign would end with a great victory pleased the Sultan (Demireğen, 2006, p. 6). After the Drava River was passed, a camp was set up in a convenient place. In there, the Ottoman army arranged a torchlight procession. The Ottoman Army now was moving slowly and taking war measures; on the right side, the grand vizier and Rumelia governor Ibrahim Pasha, on the left side Anatolian governor Behram Pasha, in the center the Sultan, Janissary master and the Sultan's household troops took their positions.

The Ottoman Army was in the Hungary plain from now on. Mohács town is located in between the west coast of the Danube and the north east of triangle dividing Drava from Danube. This place constitutes the beginning of the grand Hungarian plain. Mohács is 180 km away from Belgrade in direction to North West and 170 km far away from Budapest in the direction of south. It is closer to Budapest rather than Belgrade. Besides, Sava and Drava rivers are needed to be passed in order to come there from the city Belgrade.

According to the information gained concerning the enemy, Lajos the Hungarian king demanded aid from German states, Russia, Poland, Bohemia, Spain, Sicily, Portugal, Genoa and Ancona to protect its lands from Ottoman threat. He went down to the Mohács plain by merging with these allied forces.

The pass of Ottoman army from Hungary plains took four months. This movement power is enough to demonstrate the difference between the two armies (Öztuna, 1983, pp.331-333; Demireğen, 2006, p.7).

Before the Ottoman army arrived to the battlefield, the war council was founded upon The Sultan Suleiman's request. The governor of Bosnia Hüsrev Bey said that: "I have never seen that the Bosnian defense was frontally penetrated. It is more convenient to maintain the abreast and to leave the attack side open to them and later to attack them from back and sides when they have elapsed" (Celal-zade Mustafa, 1937, p. 36; Demireğen, 2006, p. 7). When Bali Bey also supported the views of Hüsrev Bey, the army took a new battle position.

The rain continuing for months and making the plain become a swamp was finally diminished, but it was drizzling. One side of the Mohács plain was already enclosed with the Karasu swamp. The west and south sides of the plain, and the north were respectively surrounded by a terrace and the Borza River (Demireğen, 2006, p. 7). Sultan Suleiman performed the Morning Prayer with a ceremony on the 29th of August and gave the soldiers an encouraging speech (Peçevi, 1992, p.87). Firstly, the weights of the army were left behind and then it was decided to surround the Hungarian armed forces from the sides and back by sparing the two wings of the army and withdrawing towards the cannon guns. The Janissaries were located in the center with the Sultan, the grand vizier Ibrahim Pasha was on the left and the Anatolian governor Behram Pasha was on the right side. The vanguard force and the rearguard force were respectively given to Bali Bey and Hüsrev Bey. The Sultan wore his armor and took his position in the center by riding a white horse.

From the morning until the mid-afternoon, both of the armies did not attack each other. There were only partly conflicts between the Ottoman vanguard forces and Hungarian horsemen. The Hungarians seeing that the Ottoman army did not move started to charge. Pier Pereney one of the Hungarian commanders and the priest Pál Tomori attacked to the Rumelia soldiers under the responsibility of the grand vizier Ibrahim Pasha. The Ottoman forces withdrew according to the plan; then the Hungarian forces were being brought behind the field guns with the pressure of Anatolian forces.

The constant and simultaneous fire of 300 field guns dispersed heavy armored Hungarian forces. The Hungarian forces continued to fight by dividing into small groups. Sultan Suleiman had the complete army control. However, the situation was not the same for the Hungarian king because his army was consisting of troops from many different nations.

From one side, Bali Bey and from the other side Hüsrev Bey surrounded the enemy from back with the order of Sultan Suleiman. Soldier under the command of King Lajos moved towards Anatolian soldiers. Anatolian soldiers also withdrew (Uzunçarşılı, 1988, p.299). Those forces also walked into the clamp. The soldiers under the command of a man named Markazili who swore to kill the Sultan rained arrows towards the Sultan; even some arrows hit the armor of the Sultan. Three Hungarian soldiers managed to reach the Sultan. However, the Sultan killed them by himself.

On the second stage of the battle, the Janissaries with rifles and the Ottoman artilleries destroyed the Hungarian troops coming in front of them. The Ottoman forces left only the Karasu swamp opens. Troops fleeing from the Ottoman soldiers drowned in the Karasu swamp. King Lajos was also one of the people who drowned (Peçevi, 1992, pp.86-88). There was no left from the Hungarian army after two hours from the start of the battle. In this battle, 600 years of Hungarian Kingdom was destroyed.

The Mohács Battle made such a negative impact on Europeans that after this defeat, the Europeans were attentive not to fight against the Ottoman Empire in a pitched battle until the Hacova Pitched Battle in 1596. Because the movement ability, food and logistic systems of the Ottoman army was so overly powerful and developed that, they could not be compared to European armies. Because of these reasons, Suleiman The Magnificent head for the inside of Europe and invited Ferdinand to a battle, however, neither Ferdinand nor Charles V faced up to a pitched battle against the Ottoman army. Despite the victory, the army waited in battlefield until the morning and in the morning, The Sultan was congratulated with a parade. Sultan Suleiman awarded every soldier, according to their degree (Peçevi, 1992, pp.74-115; Demireğen, 2006, p.8).

Raider forces were sent to the inside of Hungary the day after the Battle of Mohács. There was no obstacle in front of the Ottoman Empire because the whole Hungarian army was destroyed. After waiting for three days on the Mohács field, the army moved towards Budin. The Ottoman army arrived Budin on the 20th of September / 13th of Zilka. However, the Hungarian army had walked this distance within 38 days. The Christian residents of the city fled away from the city and only the Jews stayed. The chief of the Jewish community, Yasef delivered the keys of the Budin castle to Sultan Suleiman (Uzunçarşılı, 1988, p.311). The Sultan stayed there for 14 days. He passed to Pest side by having a bridge constructed on the Danube River. The Sultan accepted some Hungarian nobles in Pest and said that he would designate John Zápolya, the voivode of Transylvania for the king of Hungary (Peçevi, 1992, pp.76-77; Demireğen, 2006, p. 9). By the way, Segedin, Tibtel and Macalina castles were captured by the grand vizier Ibrahim Pasha.

Lajos the last Hungarian king belonging to Yagellon family had no child. Because Hungarians needed to have a king, the voivode of Transylvania, John Zápolya was deemed suitable for the position of being king by some Hungarian governors. Sultan Suleiman had already said to some Hungarian noblemen that he was going to appoint John Zápolya as the king in Pest. However, the realm of John Zápolya was only supported by the Transylvanian rulers and after Lajos the king was buried, they elected John Zápolya as the king (15th of November, 1526). After the new king ascended the throne, the Ottoman army returned to Istanbul (Demireğen, 2006, pp. 10-11).

Some Hungarian rulers elected Ferdinand the brother of Charles V, the king of Bohemia and the archduke of Austria as the king. Ferdinand was both the husband of Lajos the killed king's sister and Lajos the King was also the husband of Mari, the sister of Charles V and Ferdinand. Charles V called the regime council for the meeting. With the decision of the Hungarian Diet in Presburg (Bratislava), Ferdinand and John Zápolya were respectively declared as the king and the enemy.

Hungarian rulers opponent of John Zápolya invited Ferdinand by sending a committee and they made him crown as the king of Hungary taking place in Székesfehérvár (Istolni-Belgrad) (Özgüven, 2001, pp. 10-13). This situation created two kings, one of them was John Zápolya under the control of the Ottoman Empire

and the other was Ferdinand under the control of Charles V (Uzunçarşılı, 1988, p.313).

Ferdinand crown as the Hungarian king in Székesfehérvár attacked to Budin after the return of the Ottoman army. Zápolya wanting to fight against Ferdinand was defeated in Tokay. He firstly fled to Transylvania, then to the king of Poland. John Zápolya seeing that the situation was not good for him sent his wife Jerome Lazcky to Istanbul. Lazcky meeting with the Sultan obtained an aid promise from him. Because Ferdinand knew that the Ottoman Empire would not let him alone, he sent the ambassadors János Hobordansky and Sigismond Weichselberger to Suleiman the Magnificent. The ambassadors having come to Istanbul on the 29th of May 1528 were not accepted by the Sultan and the meetings made with the viziers were also ineffective (Gökbilgin, 2001, p.18).

Suleiman the magnificent promising to help Zápolya set out for the Second Hungary Campaign. When he arrived to the Mohács plain, John Zápolya requested to be given the Budin provided that he would give annual tax. The Sultan affirmed that Budin would be taken back and given to him. Budin was surrendered after a short resistance and was left to John Zápolya with a small tax provision.

After Budin was captured, the Ottoman army surrounded Esztergom and went towards Vienna in which Ferdinand was found (Çerçi & Faris, 2000, pp. 609, 681-684; Akgündüz, 1999, p. 150). The campaign over Vienna had a characteristic of help for Francis I who was in a difficult position against Charles V. It was acknowledged from the hostages on the road that Vienna would be defended with 20.000 troops and 2000 horsemen.

The Vienna siege of the Ottoman army was inappropriate because it coincide in the late September. Apart from that, because the main purpose was to make John Zápolya take the Hungarian throne again and to take the Budin castle back, the huge cannon guns were not brought. After the preparations, surrender of the castle was demanded, but a rejection was received. In response, the army attacked the castle. The attacks were ineffective. In the battle council gathered, it was considered that the siege should not be prolonged due to the inconvenient season, the lack of food, snow and cold (Herold, 1993, pp.26-27). The Ottoman army rescued the Muslims and the

enemy hostages existing in Vienna by negotiation before they left the Vienna (Gökbilgin, 2001, p.18; Uzunçarşılı, 1988, p.318).

The Sultan came to Budin and while leaving there, he left the Venetian Luigi Gritti in order to be able to check the situation the king and also some other soldiers from other forces along with the Janissaries to protect the king (Demireğen, 2006, p.11; Çerçi & Faris, 2000, pp.609-614).

After the Ottoman army withdrew, huge attacks were arranged by the raiders into the Europe. The raiders of Malkoçoğlu Kasım Bey proceeded into the Austria. Another raider section proceeded till Graz, which is the center of Stirya state. Another raider section also proceeded till Croatia and Slovenia and raided many places (Hammer, n.d.pp.483-484; Demireğen, 2006, p.11).

The purpose of Suleiman the Magnificent with this campaign was to make a pitched battle and quell the most powerful enemy, Charles V. When having set up for the campaign, the siege of Vienna had not been thought, so the huge cannon guns were not brought. However, Charles V did not come across with Suleiman the Magnificent in this situation. Because the powerful Hungarian army was defeated within 2 hours on the Mohács Battle. He avoided ending up like the same.

Charles V had raided Rome in 1527 and had made the Pope confirm the high dominance of him over Italy with the Barcelona contract. He was about to crush France, but the Ottoman army surrounded Vienna. This situation saved France (Uzunçarşılı, 1988, p.315).

Charles V signed the Cambria Agreement with Francis I, and Francis I had to leave Burgundy to Charles V.

After the Second Hungary Campaign, the German ambassadors Nicolas Jurischitz and Von Schneeberg came to Istanbul for peace on 17th of October 1530. The ambassadors that they wanted the discharge of John Zápolya by the Sultan and the crown of Ferdinand from the Sultan and they also said that Ferdinand was also accepting the terms of the Zápolya subject to the Ottoman Empire.

The sayings of the grand vizier Ibrahim Pasha was important to show the power of foreign affairs of the Ottoman Empire during these periods: “If Charles V make peace and complies our terms, then he will only be a real emperor; because we make the kings of England and France, Pope and protestants confirm Charles V as in the

capacity of an emperor” (Gökbilgin, 2001, p.10). Ibrahim Pasha said that the Supreme Court in the Empire would recognize Ferdinand as the King of Bohemia and Austrian archduke providing that he resigns from the Hungarian affairs.

The requests of the Ferdinand’s ambassadors were seeming as positive in terms of the Ottoman Empire. However, the claimant of the Hungarian throne was Ferdinand. In other words, the brother of Charles V was the vassal of him at the same time. The settlement of Ferdinand in Budin was meant to leave the castle to the Charles V’s control. Due to this reason, it was impossible for Ferdinand to take the Hungarian throne in terms of the Ottoman Empire.

In this way, the German ambassadors returned with nothing. However, Charles V and Ferdinand could not stand to leave such an important place to the Ottoman Empire. For this reason, Ferdinand was preparing to step in Hungary again.

Towards the late autumn of 1530, Ferdinand an ambassador council to Istanbul. The Duty of the ambassadors Nicolas Jurics and Joseph de Lamberg was to make a peace agreement with the Ottoman Empire. The ambassadors demanded that Hungary would be given to Ferdinand but they would give tax in return (Gökbilgin, 1992, pp. 52-53). Suleiman the Magnificent requested Ferdinand to give up Hungary, deliver the castles and not to interfere with the Hungarian kingdom given to Zápolya and also he requested Charles V not to intervene these events. The situation in Hungary turned against Zápolya while these negotiations were going on in Istanbul.

Zápolya the Hungarian king had not totally established his ruling and effect. Most of the Hungarian governors were supporting Ferdinand. Moreover, Sigetvar governor who was not pleased with Zápolya revolted against as an initiative for the other Hungarian governors.

At the moment, Zápolya sent his ten thousand Hungarian soldiers and three thousand Janissaries and the other Ottoman troops appointed to protect him in Budin, he learnt that Ferdinand was coming towards Budin and requested help from the flag officer Bali Mehmed Bey immediately.

Ferdinand firstly captured Esztergom, Visegrád and Vác castles, then he also captured Budin Castle (Gökbilgin, 1992, p.60). Forces going towards Sigetvar came to Budin and they found that Budin was surrounded, so they went to Székesfehérvár and broke into the Budin castle by agreeing the guards of the castle. By the way,

Ferdinand hearing that Mehmed Bey the grandson of Yahya Pasha and the raiders and horsemen forces under the command of Gazhi Hüsrev Bey, withdrew by fearing to be found between crossfire. This siege lasted for fifty days.

As soon as that Ferdinand surrounded Budin was heard, Suleiman the Magnificent set out for campaign towards Hungary. Historians describe this campaign as the German Campaign intended for the Spanish king (Gökbilgin, 1992; pp.63-66 Hammer, n.d., pp.486-489; Peçevi, 1992, p.76).

The Ottoman army left Istanbul with over 100.000 soldiers. When the Ottoman army arrived at Nis, the ambassadors of Ferdinand repeated their offers by coming to the camp and they offered to give a hundred thousands of Dukas providing that Hungary was given to Ferdinand. However, this offer was rejected and the Ottoman army started to move towards the lands of Ferdinand.

After the army entered the Ferdinand's country, Egersizek and Siklos Castles respectively presented their obedience to the Sultan, Belover, Berzence and many more castles were captured (Demireğen, 2006, p. 14). At this moment, Mehmed Bey the grandson of Yahya Bey appointed as vanguard for the army was ambushed while passing by the Köszeg Castle by the castle guards and a huge clash happened between them. Again no importance was given on the castle conquest, the main aim was to damage, to raid and to procure the recognition of Zápolya by him, so castle beating cannon guns were again not brought, however, it was needed to take precautions against this obvious invasion and threat, thus the siege of Köszeg Castle was started (Peçevi, 1992, pp.147-149).

After two days Serdar arrived, Suleiman the Magnificent also caught the siege of this castle. A siege order was taken. The castle was being defended by Nicolas Juricics who had come to Istanbul as an ambassador before. The siege continued as of the August with all of its severity. Juricics who was wounded and lost half of its soldiers had to deliver the castle (Hammer, n.d., pp.571-573). Meanwhile, Ferdinand was invited for war by giving his ambassadors a letter. However, Ferdinand and Charles V was avoiding getting into a pitched battle with the Ottomans and pursuing a distraction and attrition strategy.

The Ottoman army captured Sopron by going forward. While the Austrians were thinking that the Ottomans would surround Vienna, the Ottoman Army came to the

front Graz. The city was not surrounded, only the surrounding areas were demolished and burned. From there, the army reached to Drava valley around Maribor. On the other hand, they requested the obedience of some cities and castles found in the Slovenian territory, which included the Podgogonce and Zagreb (Gökbilgin, 1992, p. 17). Meanwhile, Kasım Bey moved till Baden, but he was martyred with an ambush. Suleiman the Magnificent moved towards Belgrade by using the Ösek road. Thus, the Ottoman Armies moved over the lands of Ferdinand in Hungary and captured many cities and towns along with the impossibility of a pitched battle with Ferdinand and Charles V. Additionally, at the end of this campaign, Ferdinand had to demand an agreement according to the Sultan's wishes.

Meanwhile, the fleet under the command of Andrea Doria joining Charles V captured Koron existing in Mora peninsula, and after this, they captured Patras and Inebahtı, and withdrew by placing soldiers in them. Even Cornelliuss the Austrian Ambassador coming to Istanbul after the German Campaign asserted these areas as trump. However, these places were regained as the result of an action in the March of 1534 by Mehmed Bey the flag officer of Semendire.

John Zápolya passed away in 1540. Because his wife, Izabella gave birth a boy, the solution of the Hungarian issue became an obligation and at this moment, the ambassadors of the Queen Izabella came to Istanbul. The Queen wanted her son, Sigismund to be the king of Hungary via the council she sent and insurance was given to her in this respect. Ferdinand Charles V hearing the death of Zápolya was not successful even they surrounded the Budin.

Upon the negative effects of the situation on the Ottoman Empire, a new campaign was set out towards Hungary. Before the act, Sultan sent Sokullu Mehmed Pasha, 3000 Janissaries and horsemen as vanguard in order not to give the castle hands of Ferdinand. After this, he himself participated to the campaign. Sokullu Mehmed Pasha going for the rescue of Budin was not able to handle with the Ferdinand's forces, but they prevented Ferdinand to capture the Budin. The forces of Ferdinand giving up to capture the Budin and hearing that the real army was approaching were almost destroyed even they tried to escape. Their camps were passed into the hands of Ottomans and Rokendorf the supreme commander was caught and killed in Kamaron.

Suleiman the Magnificent came to the front of Budin and sent precious gifts to the Queen and her son. The mother of one year old little son of the king and the Bishop Martinuzzi presented obedience by coming to Ottoman Campsite. After this, Suleiman the Magnificent said that Budin would be under the control of the Ottoman Empire until the little king Sigismund grew up. So, Sigismund and his mother with golden and blue stamped treaty were sent to Transylvania (Akgündüz, 1990, pp.14-17; Inalcık, 2003, pp.40-42; Kaldy-Nagy, 1971, pp.2-4).

By this means, Hungary in the hands of Zápolya was directly annexed to the Ottoman territories and 12 flags were formed as Budin chiefdom and Suleiman Pasha who was normally Hungarian and the exarch of Bagdad appointed as the governor by performing a territory composition in Hungary.

When Suleiman the Magnificent having returned from Budin and passing the winter in Edirne came Istanbul, the ambassadors of Ferdinand insisted on their previous wishes again. Austrian ambassador again revived the offer that 50.000 dukas would be given as a tax, if it was not enough 100.000 dukas; providing that the army completely left Hungary. However, this request was rejected. The ambassador returned with nothing in 1542. Meanwhile, Ferdinand gathered a huge army from different nations. The Ottomans having heard this huge movement of Ferdinand started preparations to help Budin. The huge army under the command of Joachim the second came to the front of the Castle of Pest and surrounded the castle, but they was defeated and had to withdraw after seven days of siege.

Suleiman the Magnificent having completed the necessary preparation with the hearing of the siege of Pest set out from Istanbul on 23rd of April 1543 (İpçioğlu, 1989, p.149). Meanwhile, the Ottoman forces and border governors captured some castles along with Nana and Valpo Castles, which were very important, and they surrounded Siklos. Suleiman the Magnificent went to help for the siege of Siklos and this castle was taken on 8th of July, 1543. The city, Peç surrendered at the same time.

Suleiman the Magnificent later came to Budin and the Ottoman army went further towards Esztergom when the necessary materials were brought. This city located near the Danube River had been captured before but it was taken aback by the Hungarians. Defenders in the surrounded castle did not accept the surrender offer.

After a severe battle, defenders of the castle surrendered by sending a council (10th of August, 1543).

After the conquest of this place, Suleiman and his army went towards Székesfehérvár, which was very important place with respect to Hungary to be controlled under the dominance of the Ottoman Empire. Suleiman the Magnificent conquered Székesfehérvár and went towards the north from Esztergom in order to unite Hungary under the command of the Ottoman Empire. The Ottoman army surrounded the castle shortly after their arrival. In the third public attack, the castle fell on September 4. The castle was later attached to Budin as a flag center and Ahmet Bey was appointed for the position of flag officer (Peçevi, 1992, pp.185-188).

After Suleiman the Magnificent returned to Istanbul, Budin and Bosnian governors were appointed for the siege of Visegrad, which was an important castle to be captured. They started to move and captured this politically important castle in the late autumn of 1544. After, Mehmed Pasha the son of Yahya Pasha, the governor of Budin conquered Novigrad and Hatvan. Meanwhile, Olama Pasha captured some castles in Croatia by making some conquests. With the 1544 campaign, the dominance of the Ottoman Government over Hungary was clinched.

Ferdinand understanding that he would no longer be able to deal with the Ottoman government and was losing important cities and castles each time immediately offered a peace agreement by sending an ambassador council to Istanbul. By considering the war possibility with Iran, the request of Austria was accepted and signed on 10th of November, 1545. After the ambassador council had returned to Austria, the ambassador of Charles V came to Istanbul through the late summer time of 1546. The Ottoman viziers requested that the French should attend the negotiation with the ambassadors. Finally, Suleiman the Magnificent accepting the ambassador of Charles V, Veltwick on 14th of January 1546 signed the agreement after the negotiations lasting for months (Gökbilgin, 1992, pp.126-130; Gökbilgin, 2001, pp.32-33). This five year-long agreement decreed that the territories taken by the Ottomans would stay under the ruling of the Ottomans and Austria would give tax about 30.000 gold coins for the Hungarian kingdom areas that Austria was holding (Demireğen, 2006, p.16).

Queen Isabella and her son, János Sigismund were sent to Lipva with Transylvania principality. Additionally, there was a council named Turda charged within the management also. Martinuzzi who was the guard of crown prince of Hungary and took a part in the council also made himself be chosen as the regent of the king and became an influential person in ruling. His aim was to take Transylvania out of the Ottoman custody. On the one hand, he made good connections with the Ottomans and on the other hand, he agreed with Ferdinand. However, the treachery of Martinuzzi had been constantly reported to Istanbul by the Budin governor. The Rumelian governor, Sokollu Mehmed Pasha was charged to move towards Transylvania with respect to this situation.

Sokollu Mehmed Pasha starting to move from Sofia on July 10, 1551 captured Beçe on September 7. Besides, he moved to Lipva by conquering twelve other castles in addition to Bečkerek Çanad. After occupying this place easily, he surrounded Temesvar. However, he was not able to capture the place due to seasonal situations. Martinuzzi thought to redeem himself by seeing that the situations were going bad for him. However, Austrians being informed about his act get rid of him. Austrian forces firstly surrounded Lipva, but they were unsuccessful. Later, they attacked to Segedin, but they were pushed back by the Ottoman forces (Peçevi, 1992, pp.203-204).

Suleiman the Magnificent appointed the secondary vizier Kara Ahmed Pasha as commander-in-chief of Hungary in order to solve the Transylvania issue. Ahmed Pasha meeting with Sokollu Mehmed Pasha in Belgrade surrounded Temesvar on June 27, 1552. The Ottoman forces finally conquered the castle despite a lot of casualties in the end of very severe clashes. With the conquest of this place, Banat territory was captured by the Ottomans. Temesvar seigniory was founded in the conquered areas. After the Transylvania campaign, Ferdinand took diplomatic actions and sent ambassadors to Istanbul. Meanwhile, Suleiman the Magnificent busy with Iran campaign accepted a six-month long truce by accepting the Austrian ambassador, Busbecq in Amasya. (June 2, 1555) (Busbecq, 1950, pp.25-78).

However, this truce did not prevent the events existing around the border. The border battles between Baron Ungnad, the supreme commander of Croatia from the Austrian side and Toygun Pasha and Hadım Ali Pasha, the Budin governors and the other flag officers were keeping going on. The Ottoman Forces recaptured the Tata

Castle for the second time during these battles and again the Siklos which had been captured before but then it was captured by Austrians was damaged (Peçevi, 1992, p.207).

During these times, Szigetvar Castle that Austrians put a huge emphasis on and made it a store as a strategic place was unsuccessfully surrounded by Hadım Ali Pasha the governor of Budin in 1556. On the other hand, Pallavicini, one of the Austrian commanders captured some small redoubts. On another hand, Malkoçoğlu Ali Bey, the Bosnian Flag Officer started to move towards Kruppa and other surrounding castles. The territories between Unna and Kulpa, and Kostanicza were conquered.

While this situation was taking place around borderlines, Ferdinand the emperor was exerting effort before Suleiman the Magnificent with regard to giving Transylvania to him by sending ambassadors constantly. In return, Suleiman the Magnificent, after the return of Busbecq from Amasya, requested Szigetvar to be given by sending a new imperial letter and an ambassador to Vienna. On the other hand, Transylvanian diet council invited the queen and her son, who ran to Poland in order to end the confusion in the territory, to take the potency in Transylvania in 1556. The governors of Wallachia and Moldova accepted the offer and brought Queen Isabella and her son János Sigismund obeying the command of the Sultan by taking them from Poland with the order of the Sultan. After this date, Queen Isabella and her son János Sigismund ruled this territory under the protection of Suleiman.

In the meantime, the ambassador of Queen Isabella, Bebek was demanding the Lipva and Temesvar Castles and also prompting a new battle against Austria by trying to make the Austrian ambassadors' effects ineffective (Demireğen, 2006, p.20). It was notified that the requested castles would not be left to the queen. Busbecq staying at Istanbul when his friends went to Vienna stated that Austria would not be able to leave Szigetvar in compliance with a new direction (Demireğen, 2006, p.19), but a new truce was signed for seven months in Edirne (1558).

However, the negotiations were cut down when the duration of this truce finished in 1559 and the border struggles that were never over continued by increasing. Although there was a pending truce, in the orders sent by the Ottoman side to borderlines, it was persistently informed that there would not be any intervention if there was no offense coming from Austrian side, but providence would not be left to

background (Demiregen, 2006, p. 20). Suleiman the Magnificent clearly stated while sending these order to borderlines that there would be no agreement if the Szigetvar Castle were not given to the Ottoman Empire.

During these times, the ambassadors of Venice, France and Spain came before the Sultan. Also Suleiman the Magnificent referred the Russian ruler as Tsar and it was demanded to improve the trade between the Ottoman Empire and Russia by reminding the development of friendly relations.

Ottomans captured many lands from Hungary till 1556 after many wars fought on the southern lands of the country in different times. The country was divided into three after the Ottomans conquered Buda in 1541. The eastern lands and the Principality of Transylvania of the country recognized the superiority of the Ottoman Empire by accepting giving tax, the capital Buda and the rest of the middle Hungarian lands were made a state of the Ottoman Empire.

By the sixteenth century, the power of the Ottoman Empire had increased gradually. Balkan territories controlled by them. The Kingdom of Hungary was weakened. Due to the Ottoman occupation of the central and southern territories in the 16th century, the monarchy split into three parts: the Habsburg Royal Hungary, Ottoman Hungary and the semi-independent Principality of Transylvania. The impact of Ottoman rule upon all sectors of Balkan society was profound. Most of its aristocracy were killed though a minority was absorbed into the ruling class when, in keeping with Ottoman practice, the sultan took over their lands. Thirteen-year Ottoman-Austria war made the Hungary land the start of the war. The Holy Alliance, prepared by the Pope. With the participation of Transylvania, Wallachia, and Moldovia the purpose was to end the domination of the Ottomans. In 1500s, although struggle continued towards Ottoman, treaties made with Ottoman for the avoidance of land losses. Five year long Ottoman-Austria agreement signed when Ferdinand understood he would not deal with the Ottoman government. Maximillien the first signed the Edirne peace agreement with Ottoman. Fifteen year battles made more impact on Hungary, and the Vienna peace agreement signed with Ottoman.

2.2. Hungary in the Habsburg Realm (1568-1918)

2.2.1. Habsburgs are compelling the Ottomans

The hundred years spanning from the mid-15th to the mid-16th century saw not only the long battles between Hungarians and Ottomans, but also a considerable extension of the Ottoman Empire. The surface of the Ottoman territory was 850.000 km² during the period of Mehmed II in third quarter of the 15th century, 1,5 million km² during the period of Selim I at the beginning of the 16th century, and 2,5 million km² under the reign of Suleiman I in the mid-sixteenth century. The Ottoman sultans reigned over a vast territory between the Persian Gulf and the Hungarian Plain. The population was between 12 and 13 million in the beginning of 16th century, and reached up to 15 to 20 million in the second half of the 16th century. The annual income of the government was between 4 to 5 million gold coins (Yusufoğlu, 2006, p.18).

The territorial extension of the Ottoman Empire was a main advantage for the shaping of an extended imperial Ottoman hegemony, however, it was also a reason of weakness. The wide area on which Ottomans implemented their domination made it difficult for the Ottomans to maintain their military and hegemonic power. For instance, the Hungarian battlefield was 1500 km far away from Istanbul and the regions where Ottoman and Iranian armies clashed were even more far away. Moreover, the costs for maintaining castles in Hungary required considerable additional budget for the Ottoman State. Selim II (1566-1574) and Murad III (1574-1595) were not as good conquerors as Selim I and Suleiman the Magnificent. The Ottoman Empire reached the ultimate point that the country would no longer sustain good results in the east and the west (Inalcık, 2003, p.40). Another factor is that Sultans were no longer participating in the battles after the reign of Selim II (1566). The command of the Ottoman Army now was taken by the commander-in-chiefs equipped with broad authority (Yusufoğlu, 2006, pp.16-17).

In this context of political change and economic transformations of the Ottoman Empire, the long period of wars over Hungary came to an end when the Holy Roman Empire and the Ottoman Empire signed the Treaty of Adrianople (Edirne) on February 17, 1568. The Holy Roman Emperor Maximilian I (1564-1576) recognized the Ottoman territorial acquisitions of 1552-1556, and the Ottoman Empire was

granted authority over Transylvania, as well as in Wallachia and Moldova. The border between the Kingdom of Hungary (now part of the Habsburg sphere of influence) and the Ottoman Empire became fixed, and remained unchanged until the late 17th century.

After this peace agreement, John Sigismund Zápolya, formerly crowned as king of Hungary, recognized Maximilian I as the head of the Christian World and as the sovereign of greater Hungary and resigned from his kingdom. A Principality of Transylvania was created in the same period; Zápolya became the first Prince of Transylvania, and, also he accepted the transfer of Transylvania to the Kingdom of Hungary in case of the extinction of the Zápolya dynasty. However, the Ottomans considered Transylvania as a property of the Ottoman Empire. In fact, the country paid an annual tribute, and was bound to the Ottoman Empire about the foreign affairs. Thus, Transylvania remained in an interim situation, between the spheres of influence of Ottomans and Habsburgs. Transylvania continued to pay an annual tribute to the Ottoman Empire, but the successors of Sigismund accepted themselves as the lieges of the king of Hungary and their country as the inseparable state of “Holy Crown” (*Szent Korona*) (Gökbilgin, 1956, pp.35-36).

Besides the Kingdom of Hungary, which was under the Habsburg influence, and the Principality of Transylvania, which occupied an intermediary position between the Ottoman and Habsburg realms, a part of Hungary remained under direct Ottoman domination. This territory was administered by the pasha of Budin. In the case of necessity, Ottoman soldiers of Temesvár and Bosnia were put under his command (Hammer, n.d., pp.558-562).

The situation of peace had been established between Hungary and the Ottoman Empire with the Treaty of Adrianople. The peace lasted for a quarter century, from 1569 to 1591. The peace was broken with the attacks to Sisak (Sziget) led by the governor of Bosnia, Hasan Pasha in the years 1591 and 1592. He was defeated by the Habsburg army in the summer of 1593 and Murad III declared war to Emperor Rudolph I. The Ottoman army under the command of Sinan Pasha captured Veszprém and Várpalota after conquering Sisak in 1593; however, he was defeated on November 3, 1593. Further battles were lost by the Ottomans in November 1593. The battles of the winter 1593-1594 created a turning-point in the Habsburg-Ottoman battles: The Kingdom of Hungary left its previous defensive position, and started an

offensive. The Pasha of Budin was defeated on May 1, 1594 on the bank of the Danube River. Pope Clement VII (1592-1605) established the Holy Alliance in 1594. The eastern flank of the Holy Alliance was formed by Transylvania, Wallachia and Moldavia. Sigismund, the Prince of Transylvania (1586-1597) started to move in order to get rid of the dominance of Ottoman and to join the Christian alliance and he got the title of “The Ruler of Transylvania, Wallachia and Moldova” after putting aside the voivodes (Yusufoğlu, 2006, p.18).

“Fifteen Year Battles” (1593-1606) demonstrated that Ottomans could be defeated but the Ottoman Empire still found ways to counter-attack the Holy Alliance. The armies of the alliance could only capture Esztergom in Hungary. The three sieges of Budin starting in 1598, 1602 and 1603 resulted in the failure of the armies of the Holy Alliance, but they managed to go into Pest in 1602 for some years (Yusufoğlu, 2006, p.18; Echart, 2011, pp.126-129).

The situation was not different in the Transylvanian front. The Ottomans lost several battles in the mid-1590s, but maintained strongholds such as the Temesköz region (today partitioned between Hungary, Romania and Serbia) continued to belong to Ottomans. After the Eger Castle was captured by the Ottomans, Mehmed III (1595-1603) defeated the alliance armies in Mezökeresztes. Nagykanizsa was surrendered by Ibrahim Pasha in 1600. In the first variant of the Vienna Peace Agreement, in 1606, Rudolph I (1576-1608) promised mercy in Transylvania and freedom for protestant belief (Yusufoğlu, 2006, p.18). Transylvania would stay in the hands of the Prince István Bocskai (1557-1606). The new variant of Vienna Peace Agreement on 23rd June 1606 recognized the autonomy of Transylvania and Bocskai’s sovereignty. Rudolph I, Bocskai and the officers of the Sultan signed the Zsitvatorok Peace Agreement on November 11, 1606 and the fifteen year battles ended with this agreement. Istvan Bocskai passed away on December 29 1606 (Uzunçarşılı, 1988, pp.109-112; Echart, 2011, pp.130-131).

The Fifteen Year Battles made much more impact on Hungary than the other Ottoman-Hungarian battles. While it was possible to eliminate the Ottomans till the late 16th century, the Long Battle removed this opportunity.

Even though Mehmed IV (1648-1687) and Ferdinand I (1637-1657) had prolonged the Treaty of Zsitvatorok for an additional 22 years in 1649, Miklós Zrínyi in

Kosztajnica; Hasan Kiskomar the Kanizsa Pasha in Zrínyi and Segesd tested each other. Besides, on August 25, 1652, the Ottoman forces and the forces of the king made a vain clash in Vezekeny and in this clash, Esterhazy died (Yusufoğlu, 2006, p. 19; Demireğen, 2006). Again, The Commander-in-chief Ali Pasha and the Pasha of Budin, Seydi Ahmed Pasha surrounded Nagyvarad on 14th July. After 45 day-long siege, the castle surrendered on 27th August, 1660. The Ottomans established their fifth state in Hungary in this way. The Governor of Jeno, Küçük Mehmed going for the help of Mihaly Apafi chosen as the new Transylvanian prince with the confirmation of the Ottoman Empire defeated the armies of Kingdom of Hungary in Nagyszollos on 22nd January, 1662. Apafi reigned till 1690 after four and a half year of struggle and paid 40.000 gold coins to the Ottomans for tax. Köprülü Ahmed Pasha defeated and destroyed the army of kingdom in Parkany in front of the Esztergom Castle on 7th September, 1663 and started to surround Ersekujvar (Yusufoğlu, 2006, p.19; Demireğen, 2006). After the surrendered Castle, Ersekujvar within 39 days, many edge castles between Vag and Garam, including Leva and Nyitra, and the sixth and the last state in Hungary was founded by making Ersekujvar the center. Zrínyi charged as the commander of the Hungarian armies entered into the Ottoman territory with the all of the Hungarian Cavalries and the half of horsemen of “Ren Alliance” and destroyed Drava Bridge in Eszek, by doing so, he temporarily cut down the connection of Ottomans with Szeremseg and beyond the Danube River. This rapidly carried out campaign caused an excitement all over the Europe and not only did it make the Ren Alliance start to move, but also the French king let the voluntaries to compete with the Ottomans. Új-Zrínyivár built for the defense of Muraköz by Zrínyi was captured by Koprulu Ahmed Pasha on 30th June, 1664; however, the alliance forces under the command of Montecuccoli defeated the Turks near Szentgotthard. The Ottomans lost 16 thousand warriors. The loss of alliance was less. Still the Place of Vienna accepted to abandon its previous acquisitions and withdraw the German soldiers in the castles of Transylvania with the peace agreement signed for 20 year-long periods on 10th August, 1664 (Yusufoğlu, 2006, p.19; Demireğen, 2006).

Vienna wanted to follow up a traditional peace policy with Ottomans and with this reason; they sent an ambassador council for the extension of the Vasvar Peace Agreement in 1682, which would end soon. The ambassador of Leopold I, Alberto

Caprara warned the place by realizing the preparations of Ottomans to capture the Palace even while on the road. Also the intention of Turks was understood from the 1681-82 Hungary campaigns of Kara Mustafa Pasha and the exaggerated report of Thököly (Yusufoğlu, 2006, p.19; Peçevi, 1992). Hence, the Emperor, Leopold I (1655-170) and the king of Poland, John III (Sobieski) sealed an alliance against the Ottomans on March 31, 1683. The Ottomans surrounding Vienna as of 14th July were defeated by the United Empire Armies on September 12, 1683. So, the second Vienna defeat occurred (Eckhart, 1949, p.141). Habsburg Empire sealed a “Holy Alliance” against the Ottomans between March and April, 1684 with the join of Poland and Venice with the attempt of Pope Innocent the eleventh (1676-1689), the alliance armies keeping the Budin under siege for more than three months released the siege (3rd November, 1684). Finally, the allied forces captured Budin after a 145 year-long dominance with the third general attack on September 2, 1686 (Eckhart, 1949, p.141). The Empire Armies heavily defeated the Ottomans in Nagyharsany on August 12, 1687. The Alliance Forces took Belgrade back from the Turks on September 6, 1688; however Belgrade was recaptured by the Turks on October 8, 1690. Imre Thököly, the commander of Ottoman and Tatar forces defeated empire and Transylvania armies in Zernyes. However, Louis, the Count of Baden gained a bright victory against the Turks in the Szalankemen clash known as the “bloodiest war of the century” on 19th September, 1691. The Ottoman army defeated the empire forces sent to the Transylvanian defense in Lugos on 21st September, 1695 (Uzunçarşılı, 1988, p.530; Gökbilgin, 1976, pp.4-8). On the 11th September, 1697, Eugene the Count of Savoie along with Zenta defeated the Turks. Finally, the Holy Alliance and the Ottoman Empire signed the 25 year-long Karlowitz Treaty in Karlowitz, Szeremseg on 24th January, 1699. A part of Temeskoz and Szeremseg was left to Ottoman reign. After the salvation battle started against the ottomans in 1683 and ending with Karlowitz Treaty in 1699, the board lines between the Ottomans and Habsburgs withdrew to Sava, Danube, Maros (Uzunçarşılı, 1988, p.533).

The most important dark incidents of the 500 year-long encounters between Europe and the Ottoman Empire occurred in the Hungarian battlefield and Hungary was one of the most important lines defending Europe against the Ottoman conquests.

Rasonyi (1983, p. 117) explains the situation as this:

Along with that no ingathering system exists in Hungary; many Hungarians, sometimes the whole village people used to be sent to Anatolia. They used to be set free after approximately 15 to 20 years or they would accept Islam and become Turkish. There is still a cave named Macar among Sivas Yuruks, a village name as Macarlı near Giresun and Macarlar Village in Balıkesir.

F. Eckhart (1949) uses a harsher tone;

“Ottomans used to send thousands of Hungarians to slavery markets. According to the records from this era, Anatolia was filled with male and female Hungarian slaves. They were not only war prisoners, the Ottomans were exiling villagers and children in mass”.

After the failure of the Ottoman Army during the second Vienna Siege in 1683, land losses from Hungary began, and with the Passarowitz Agreement signed in 1718, Hungary wholly departed from the Ottoman Empire.

2.2.2. Francis Rákóczi II's war of independence: The Ottoman connection

So, “The Stage of Refugees” started with the asylum of three freedom battle leaders to the Ottoman Government fighting against Habsburg with courage but defeated during the Freedom Battles that they started against the Habsburg dominance of the Hungarians after 300 year-long close contacts with the Ottomans and Hungarians in European battlefields. Imre Thököly, to whom Ottomans gave the title “the King of Central Hungary” adopted a positive approach towards the Ottomans and defeated in the freedom battle performed by the Hungarians against Habsburgs took sanctuary from The Ottomans (Gökbilgin, 1976, pp.1-17). Thököly settled down to Izmit in 1701 after going to Istanbul was with Ilona Zrínyi, the widow of Zrínyi family and wife of Zrínyi spending his life by fighting against Habsburgs for the freedom of Hungary. (After the death of her husband, the Prince of Transylvania, Francis I Rákóczi, she got married with Thököly at 38 years old). Ilona Zrínyi died in Izmit on 18th February, 1703. Thököly died in Izmit at the age of 47 on September 13, 1705 with loneliness.¹

¹ Today, her ashes are in Kassa. Because Kesmark was in Romania and Kassa was in Czechoslovakia according to Trianon Agreement (1920), Thököly and Ilona Zrínyi have been sleeping their eternal

The Prince, Francis Rákóczi II taking the lead of the Freedom Battle against Habsburgs between the years 1703 and 1711 took sanctuary from the Ottomans in Gallipoli on 10th October, 1717, stayed in Yeniköy, Istanbul for a while, but he was transferred to Tekirdağ upon the protest of the Austrian ambassador. There were secret passages between 23 houses bought for the Hungarian refugees in today's Hungary Street and the refugees used to eat in soup kitchens on the seaside of the street and to worship in the Latin Church built by Francis II Rákóczi. Rákóczi used to be accepted by the Sultan and to meet with grand vizier. His interpreter was Ibrahim Müteferrika, a convert Hungarian who was the builder of the Turkish-language printing press in the Ottoman Empire. Rákóczi desired to go on the Freedom Battle, however, all the hopes withered with the Passarowitz Agreement in 1718. We are learning the life of Rákóczi in Tekirdağ from the production of Kelemen Mikes named as *Letters from Turkey*, consisting of 207 letters. This work is the first important piece of the Hungarian prose and at the same time is an important source. Rákóczi passed away in 1735. He was inhumed near his mother, Ilona Zrinyi in Saint Benoît Church in Istanbul. Mikes undertaking the leadership after the death of Rákóczi lived in Tekirdağ for 40 years and died there on 2nd October, 1761. The ashes of Rákóczi in company with Bercsenyi and Csaki were brought to Kassa with a huge ceremony along with the ashes of Ilona Zrinyi in 1906 and the ashes of Thököly were place into the church in Kesmark (Gökbilgin, 1976, pp.1-17).

2.2.3. Ottoman-Hungarian relations in an age of nationalism

Additionally that Hungarian insurgents sought asylum from the Ottoman Empire is another dimension of the subject. Hungarian nationalists who were among the nationalists revolving against Russians between 1830 and 1831 with the event that Poland was captured by Russia and Prussia in 1768 took sanctuary with Polish nationalists from the Ottoman Empire (Okay, 2012, p.139). After the Hungarians entered into the domination of Habsburg, Hungarian highbrows started liberation movements as of the late 17th century (Oba, 1995, pp.54-55). After the 1848 revolution occurred as a nationalist movement in Hungary, Thököly Imre, Francis II Rákóczi (Gökbilgin, 1976, p.3; Çolak, 2000, p.61) were quashed by Austria in a very

rest away from their homeland (Özgiray, 1997, p. 80). Thököly was brought to Evangelist Church in Kesmark by taking him from the Armenian Graveyard of Izmit in 1906.

bloody way, the leaders such as Lajos Kossuth found asylum in Ottoman Empire (Armaoğlu, 1997, p.151).

Lajos Kossuth undertook the leadership of Freedom Battles between 1848 and 1849 carried out by Hungarians against Habsburgs during the Revolution affecting the whole Europe; defended his country against Austria and Russia with courage; however he took sanctuary from the Ottomans after the defeat against superior forces. Kossuth that Sultan Abdulmecid provided a right of asylum to him was firstly transferred to Şumnu, then to Anatolia, Kütahya in terms of his safety (Yusufoğlu, 2006, p.20; Kütahya, 2002, p.30). Kossuth learned Turkish in there and wrote according to Turkish grammar. He was not remanded despite all the pressures of Austria, even Sultan Abdülmecid said that “I would sacrifice 50 thousand Ottomans for each Hungarian, but I would still not resign them.” Kossuth living in Kütahya for about one and a half year between 1850 and 1851 did not abandon the idea of Freedom Battle, he sought for help from the different capitals of Europe by stepping out of Kutahya (Yusufoğlu, 2006, p.20).

After the cultural relations happening during the period of Ottoman dominance in Hungary over the two hundred years, the researches starting around the scientific environments in the second half of the 19th century reinforced the relations between the two countries culturally. Hungarians researching for their roots provided turcology to be born in Hungary; Turcology was turned into a discipline for the first time in University of Budapest in 1870 (Oba, 1995, pp.134-135). The findings of Hungarian turcologists were effective about the awakening of nationalism and Turkism among the Turkish highbrows (Demirkan, 2000, p.10).

As a geographical and an ethno cultural concept, the concept of Turan started to penetrate into the Hungarian political and intellectual consciousness at the initiative of the Hungarian upper classes, as an opposite ideology against Western focused depictions of Hungarian historiography. In 1869, the orientalist Ármín Vámbéry published an article that suggested that Hungarian was a language close to Turkish through the Ural-Altaic link. Vámbéry, who was described by Hamid Dabashi as a self-confessed intelligencer working on behalf of British colonialism in general and European Zionism in particular, defended a close Turkish-Hungarian linguistic relationship provoked a fierce scientific and political debate in Hungary that came to be known as the [academic] Ugric-Turkish War. In this context, the official academic

doctrines categorically rejected the theory of Scythian-Hun-Turkic-Hungarian. Vámbéry believed in the existence of a close connection between the Turks and Hungarians, and he also claimed that Chinese, and northeastern European nations all had the same ethnic origin. A year after the publication of his work, Vámbéry also founded Europe's first Turcology department at the University of Budapest. The discussion about the roots of the Hungarian language and the ethnic origins of the Hungarian people continued with fervor during much of the 19th century. The prominent linguist and politician Pál Hunfálvy (1810–1891) suggested that the Hungarian language contained both Finno-Ugrian and Ural-Altaic elements. In 1880, his assistant József Budenz (1836-1892) critically challenged the Turanian hypothesis via an investigation of Eurasian languages and argued that Finno- Ugrian connection of the Hungarian language was overwhelmingly more convincing than the Turkic link. The advocates of Finno-Ugrian linguistic school were champions in the linguistic war, after long and warm-blooded debate between the two groups. However, because those who defended the Ural–Altaic thesis were politically influential, their arguments were still widely accepted in Hungarian academic circles and by the Hungarian public. Géza Nagy, a pupil of Vámbéry, wrote a series of articles about the political and academic situation of the Ural-Altaic people in 1890 including the Koreans and Japanese in the mythic geographical sphere of Turán. In order to escape from the turmoil in Europe, he also warned Hungarians to be wary of the political developments in Western Europe, be more critical, and consider unification with Ural-Altaic, namely the Turanic people (Akçalı & Korkut, 2012, pp.602-603).

The exclusivist approaches of Germans against Hungarians pushed Hungarians who were insulated between Slavic and German communities to search for their own history; and language and history studies, the attempts for the search for the Hungarian mainland caused a new movement in Hungary: Pan-turanism (Oba, 1995, p.129; Özgiray, 1997, p.75).

In the beginning of 20th century, pan-turanism supporters describing Finland, Bulgaria, Turkey, Japan, China and Siam as Turan countries and thinking to be the intellectual and economic leader of these nations as a historical duty for Hungarians founded the Turan Association and provided education opportunity for hundreds of

Turkish young men. They sent trip and research teams to Turkey (Çolak, 2009, p.28; Demirkan, 2000, pp.26-27; Oba, 1995, pp.129-131).

The birth of Turanist pan-ideas in Hungary occurred contemporaneously with the emergence of related but lesser pan-ideas such as Pan-Finnism and Pan-Turkism. Because Turkic intellectuals considered “Turanian” as a poetic equivalent of “Turkish” and used them as interchangeable terms, Pan-Turanism has been often viewed as a movement that was identical with Pan-Turkism. From the ideological standpoint of the Turanists, however, Pan-Turkism was a subsidiary movement of all-inclusive Pan-Turanism (Kessler, 1967, pp.67-75).

The word of Turanism is usually known as a political ideology while it has not every time been so. According to Hungarian Turanism it is defined as peoples are united in blood or cultural kinship and a sort of fellowship in fate.

Hungarian scholars used the word “Turan” as a collector thought for Turkish, Hungarian, Mongolian, Finnish, and various other public and languages. The consciousness of common Turan was rooted in broad layers of the both country. Turanism trend, first appeared in Hungary, and Turcology has been an important factor in the formation of Turkish nationalism in the Ottoman Empire. In the earlier of XX. century, formation of a new balance of power in Europe, the Austro-Hungarian monarchy and political movements such as panslavism and pangermanism started to rise. Due to activities of “Turan Association”, which was set up by Hungarian Turanists, social, cultural and economic relations between the Ottoman Empire and Hungary were much improved (Çolak, 2010, p.374; Kessler, 1967, pp.67-75).

Count Teleki, the first president of Magyar Turanian Society (1910-1918), defined Turan as a geographical and ethno cultural concept and there is no scientific proof to the common roots of the so called Turanian peoples, regarding political Turanism claimed the irrelevance of a scientific justification. Stoddard gave point to that the basis of Turanism was in fact irrelevant when it comes to the sociopolitical necessities that brought it into existence. When political ambitions brought ethno cultural entities into opposing blocks Hungarian Turanism founded on ideals national pride in less glorious times (Csernyei, 2013, p.9).

In nineteenth century ideological discussions were carried out for the recovering of Ottomans and Hungarians. Turkish nationalism was seen as a rescuer ideology in the second half of the nineteenth century when a new European map had been created with regard to national identities. The developments that reshaped the borders of European countries were perceived as a threat by the Ottoman intellectuals and state bureaucrats because of the multi-ethnic structure of the empire. Likewise, the Hungarians were included in ideological debates to solve ethnic problems due to Slavic minorities. Hungarians were searching for alternative allies in Asia towards the distress of the European powers. The Turan Association started to act in 1910 and Pál Teleki, one of the most dominant politicians among the Turanists, started to publish the journal *Turan* in 1913 (Oğuz, 2005, p.4).

The Ural-Altai thesis and the aspirations of Turanic theory survived to remain in the mainstream discourse at the turn of the 20th century and onward, in spite of its scientific bankruptcy. This was basically because of the Hungarian nobles continuous monopoly over cultural and political matters, despite rapid urbanization and development of the bourgeois class in 19th-century Hungary. The nobles found it useful to build up a Hungarian nationalism based on a legendary history and political independence, and tried to protect their traditional effect in the political and cultural fields by remaining the spokesmen for Hungarian national identity. Turanism vested not only an anti-Western, but an anti-liberal dimension (Akçalı & Korkut, 2012, pp.599-600)

Turanism reached its climax in Hungary in 1910, first with the publication of a poetry book *A Turani Dalok (Turanian Songs)* by Arpad Zempleni (1910). This was an expression of disappointment with Europe and a glance toward the East as the real location of brotherhood (Akçalı & Korkut, 2012, p.603).

The Turan motion got a boost during World War I as the Hungarian government was looking for alliance in the East with Turkey and Bulgaria. Although the result of the so called Turkish-Ugric War had ended with the victory of the Ugric side, the public opinion holds on the nobiliary traditions of the Huns oriental steppe origins (Csernyei, 2013, p.5; Özgiray, 1997, p.77). The common international interests and competitors only deepened Hungarian's solidarity with the Turks, Bulgarians and Japanese. Turanism's potential political significance was becoming a veritable symbol of wartime. However, the ideologists of Turkish Turanism and the English

foreign policy reports all agreed that the goal of Turanism could only carry out within the Turkish world.

The feeling of being surrounded by enemies, but lacking allies brought about a new Turanism movement was created to bring cultures together. It was supposed that Turanism arose to seize economic possibilities and serve as a bridge between continents for segregation and ostracism. Hungarian conservative Turanists stated their ideal being as the solidarity of the “Turanian” peoples and serving as a bridge between East and West.

According to Ablonczy, the Turanist movement also sought in enhancing Hungary’s relations with the Balkans, Middle East, and other territories of the Ottoman Empire for economic advantages. Turanism pragmatically was seen as new markets in its competition with Germany and Austria, and offered a political counter weight to Pan-Germanism and Pan-Slavism by Hungary. Vice-president Alajos Paikert, following the meeting of the Turan Society on January 31, 1914, stated that Hungary does not have colonies and does not endeavor to possess any. However, there was a need for economic expansion, to encourage the other brotherly nations of Turan, and to build feelings of reciprocity and unity. As such, the Hungarian elite followed Turanism as a task to seek political and economic benefits beyond their borders. The Turanic symbols, pagan warriors on horseback, roaming the Asian steppes, became constant elements of the rhetoric that Turanists inspired (Akçalı & Korkut, 2012, p.604).

That the Ottoman Empire was on Germany and Austria- Hungary side strengthen the Turkish-Hungarian friendship by increasing the political and economic relations between Turkish and Hungarian governments. For example, the Hungarian government named the Museum Körüt Street one of the biggest streets of Budapest as Mehmed Reşad V as an indicator for this friendship (1915), in return the Ottoman Government named the 30 meter long street in Çırçık Harik neighborhood as Hungarian Brothers (1916) (Çolak, 2000, p.63). The Hungarian Prime Minister Count Tisza sent a letter of thanks. The earth from the grave of Francis II Rákóczi was brought to be mixed with the earth of the monument erected in memory of Francis II Rákóczi in Szeged city of Hungary (Çolak, 2000, pp.63-64). The Ottoman Government provided every possible convenience for its allies, Hungarians; at the same time, Hungarian National Assembly officially recognized the Islam. The costs

of Gül Baba mausoleum were totally covered by the Hungarian Ministry of Education. Especially Ahmet Hikmet appointed as the chief consul of Budapest by the Ottoman Government in 1912 (Müftüoğlu, 1987, p.VIII) performed important studies vitalizing the Turkish-Hungarian brotherhood (Akyüz, 1994, p. 150). Additionally, the Hungarian-Turkish Friendship Association (Demirkan, 2000, p. 36) was established in Istanbul during the battle years and the Austria-Hungary Club (Çolak, 2000, p.64) was established in Damascus. The Hungarian Red Cross sent help to Turkey to be used in Topkapı and Maltepe Hospitals (Müftüoğlu, 1987, p.VIII).

Turkish-Hungarian friendship also revived the trade; draught animals were bought for the needs of the Ottoman Army, small cattle, cotton and copper were exported (Çolak, 2000, p.64). In this way, good relationships were constructed related to culture, policy, health and economy prior to The Independence War.

Since the middle ages Hungary was the only place in Europe apart from Sicilia and the Iberian peninsula with a Turkish Muslim minority for several centuries that a number of Polish Tatars became great patriots; that Ismail Gasprinsky, the prominent ideologue of pan-Turkism, used the Polish Tatar's integration into Western society as an example for all Turkic communities; and member of the Tatar minority have played an important role in the modernization of Turkic nations (Zalewski & Piotr 2010, p.39). Turkish-Ottoman culture and language have left a long-term mark on Polish and Hungarian people.

According to István Flesch, turcology in Hungary was initially based on the idea that the origin of Hungarian and Turkish people was common.

At the end of the 19th century it seems that it's pretty ripe. Because continuous excluded by the Europeans, between Slavs and Germans remaining Hungarians, of needing to research their origin; to undertake intensive research on the Hungarian language and history, the discovery of the Turanism and also of common ethno-cultural properties led to Turcology (Çolak, 2010, p.374).

Németh emphasizes that in the formation of the Turkish-Hungarian friendship and the Turanianism slogan the old kinship have large share of the sense of cultural connection (Çolak, 2010, p.373).

The ideology of Turanism emerged during the 19th century as part of Hungarian nationalism opposing the Habsburg rule. It rejected the linguistic theory of a Finno-Ugric origin, in support of a Turkic allegiance in the intellectual debate which came to be known as the 'Ugric-Turkic battle. Introduced as a linguistic concept, the term 'Turan' or 'Turanian' had soon reacquired its putative original geographical and ethnonymic Sanskrit meaning, denoting the Central-Asian territories north of Iran, inhabited by nomadic tribes hostile to the Persians (Moreh, 2013).

The quest for the ancestral motherland had driven many explorers to Eastern countries in the end of the nineteenth century, and lot branches of Hungarian oriental studies have been formed by the Turanian vision. In popular understanding the Turan stretched to include all the territories nominally inhabited by kin-nations. In the general meaning, it referred to Altaic-Uralian peoples like the Finns, Estonians, Turks, Mongols, Japanese or Koreans. More broader sense incorporated the Chinese, the Tibetans and the Indians, and according to the most extreme vision, such ancient empires as the Sumerian, Aryan, Iranian, Scythian, Hittite, Assyrian or Etruscan. It has been argued that this sense of kinship is still alive in many Asian countries, being one of the few things that Japanese or Korean 'average intellectuals' statement when asked about Hungary (Moreh, 2013).

The stage of refugees started during the freedom battle that started against Habsburg dominance. Imre Thököly, the middle Hungary king, presented positive approaches towards the Turks and defeated in the freedom battle took sanctuary from the Ottomans. The Prince, Ferenc Rakoczi the second taking the lead of the Freedom Battle against Habsburg between the years 1703-1711 took sanctuary from the Ottomans. After the 1848 revolution, the leader Lajos Kossuth took the sanctuary from the Ottomans.

Armin Vambery was a key figure in the development of Turanism and, scientific consciousness of the general public. He (1832-1913) was the founding father of Hungarian Turcology. After 1870 many writers, historians, archaeologist supported Armin Vambery.



3. TURKISH-HUNGARIAN RELATIONS IN A TUMULTUOUS ERA: BILATERAL RELATIONS IN THE TWENTIETH CENTURY AND BEYOND

3.1. Hungary and Turkey in the Interwar Period: Establishing Relations Between Two New-Born Nation-States

3.1.1. The Turkish-Hungarian relations during the First World War and in the aftermath

Austro-Hungarian Empire collapsed at the end of the World War I, and its former territories were partitioned between Austria, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, and Romania. The domestic policy in Hungary became complicated after the truce. The count Mihály Károlyi became the prime minister of new Republic of Hungary. With the pressures of his allies, Károlyi resigned in 1919 when he had to give up Transylvania to Romania. Along with the incitement of Bolsheviks of Russia, the situation became to be controlled by Hungarian communists. The Hungarian communist Béla Kun, a close friend of Lenin and Kerensky, declared Hungary a “Soviet Republic”. During the period known as the “proletarian dictatorship”, the studies of Turan Association (1919) became difficult and were suppressed by the communists (Demirkan, 2000, p.34).

However, the Hungarian aristocrats, led, among others, by Count Gyula Károlyi, Count István Bethlen and Admiral Miklós Horthy started countermovement, and they discharged the communist regime by moving upon Béla Kun a national Hungarian army (Armaoğlu, n.d, pp.46-47). The peace agreement between Hungary and the allied powers was signed in Trianon (near the Versailles Palace, France) on June 4, 1920. With this peace treaty, Hungary left Transylvania to Romania, Burgenland to Austria, the Slovak lands to Czechoslovakia, and Croatia to Yugoslavia. While the surface of the territory of Hungarian Kingdom was 330000 km² before the First World War, it decreased to 92000 km² after the peace, and its population also decreased from 22.000.000 to 7.500.000. The country entered into considerable economic and financial obligations with the repair debt (Özgiray, 1997, p.80; Çolak, 2000, p. 64).

As Hungary lost two thirds of his lands to its neighbors, a situation that was confirmed by the West European governments, Hungarian Turanists thought that their orientation towards the East was a right choice (Demirkan, 2000, p. 26). Meanwhile, Turkish national resistance movements were fighting an Independence War against the post-First World War occupations that were undertaken by the Allied Powers and their associates, including, most importantly, Greece. Hungarian Turanists were closely following the Turkish Independence Movement.

With the expression of Béla Horvath (2007, p.1) who was an active member of Turan Association (Demirkan, 2000, p. 34) and published his observations in Hungary in 1928 by getting over 2300 km in the saddle by going on a trip in Anatolia; Istanbul, Ankara, Nevsehir, Niğde, Konya and Karaman:

After the unfortunate end of the World War, what was going on in Anatolia and the independence war of the Turks became, rightfully, the center of interest for the entire world.

Hungarian Turanists were considering Turkey as the example of the resistance and struggle for existence of oppressed nations (Demirkan, 2000, pp. 53-54). Horvath (2007, p.2) says the following about this issue:

The great return of the Turks on the stage of World history with an extraordinary move is like the rise of a shining star in the darkening sky; the rise of an oppressed nation suffering with pains.

These were the reasons why Hungarian Turanists supported the Turkish Independence War. They carried out a press movement to arouse sympathy towards this resistance in Europe. First the Hungarian, then the whole European public opinions were tried to be convinced. To make propaganda, Turan News Agency was established in 1921 (Demirkan, 2000, pp. 49-50). Besides, Turanists being disturbed by the Russian Revolution and the trend to spread in Hungary founded the Turan Federation.

Turanists brought many students from Turkey and Bulgaria in the 1920s. A dormitory, a mosque and a Turan Library consisting of the books of “Turan Countries” were established in Budapest (Demirkan, 2000, p.34). The massacre of Ottoman Armenians was publicly discussed in Hungary in the 1920s; the members of Turan Association told that the claims of the Armenian diaspora were part of a campaign of abuse against Turkey (Demirkan, 2000, pp.51-52). Hungarian Turanists, moreover, ran a counter campaign. Abdullatif, the imam in Budapest and a member

of Turan Association, played an important role for the shaping of the pro-Turkish campaign. Abdullatif had close relations with the government bureaucrats of the Ottoman period and the local people of Anatolia. He supported the Ankara government. A pamphlet published in 1923 in Hungarian by the publishing house of Abdullatif tried to change the negative opinion of European societies towards Turkey. The main thesis of the pamphlet was that the Armenian incidents were the lies of some western enemy governments desiring the loss of the Independence War emerging from Anatolia (Demirkan, 2000, p. 35).

3.1.2. Turkey-Hungary political relations (1923-1938)

Around the middle of October of 1923, Ismet Pasha gave an account of the perspectives of Turkish foreign policy:

Germans are demanding some economical supports to Hungary from us, but this is impossible due to our current poverty and economic trouble. Hungary wants to join us, their intentions are sincere, and we have family likeness. However, the country is a severe enemy of Romania and it will bring about a difficulty. According to the agreement with Romania, Romania will join us in case of any event with Russians. Because, we cannot do anything without Romania, we need to sacrifice Hungary. (Sonyel, 1995, p.344).

Despite this statement, the relations of Turkey with eastern European countries were still alive and various. However, these relations were connected with the economy. In order for Turkey to collaborate widely and make comprehensive agreements, Turkey needed to subject these countries to political supervision (Von Kral, 1938, pp.1-10).

The young Republic of Turkey signed a treaty of friendship with Hungary in 1924. In this respect, the President of the Republic, Mustafa Kemal Pasha, while opening the first gathering year of the Grand National Assembly of Turkey on March 1, 1924, was saying: "The Treaty of friendship with Hungary will also be presented to the council soon" (Demirkan, 2000, pp.51-52). The President was also giving importance on Turkish-Hungarian friendship.

Turkish-Hungarian relations became to develop after the mid-1920s. The relations between the two countries became regular in 1926. Additionally, a commercial treaty between the two countries came into force in 1926. The treaty of commerce was signed on 20th October 1926. However, due to slow progress of bureaucracy in the Grand National Assembly of Turkey, the approval processes of this agreement delayed the entrance into force. This is why it was impossible to put this agreement into force before September, 1927 (Be, know, do: Düstur, 2006, pp.1908-1922). The

signed agreement was hit on the basis of commerce based country. It was presenting a status in accordance with the Lausanne trade agreement (PRO.FO. 371, 1928, cited by Özgiray, 1997, pp.75-76). The improvement of bilateral relations implied also the shaping of new diplomatic relations. For the first time in the history of Turkish-Hungarian relations, Turkey assigned a permanent ambassador to Budapest. The new Turkish ambassador Hüseyin Vasıf (Çınar) was appointed in November 1927 (Ataturk, 1997, p.317).

In August 1928, Tevfik Rüştü (Aras), Turkish minister of foreign affairs, visited Budapest while returning from a visit to Austria. The visit both reinforced and ameliorated the bilateral relations. Tevfik Rüştü (Aras) and Hungarian government officials discussed general issues among them. An Arbitration Pact was added to residential and commercial agreement that had come into force on September 10, 1927 (PRO.FO. 371, 1929, cited by Özgiray, 1997, p.76).

The relation between two countries in 1930 went well. Thus, the president of the republic, while was opening the third stage of the 4th gathering year: “The old and long-lasting friendship between Hungary and we gained an obvious importance and value with the official visit of the respected prime minister”. He also stated that “the good relations by saying that good and sincere relationship between our countries grew is our duty and wish” (Ataturk, 1997, p.309).

Lajos Walko, Hungarian minister of Foreign Affairs, made an official visit to Ankara in April 1930. He was greeted warmly. Seven months later, the Hungarian prime minister Count Bethlen made an official visit to Ankara. During this visit, Turkish-Hungarian trade treaty was discussed in direction of previously culminated agreements between the two countries. The approval of this situation was made on September 27, 1930 and it was put into force fifteen days later. The Hungarian government aimed at improving the economic bounds with Turkey. They were considering Turkey as a good market for their products. The Hungarian minister of Foreign Affairs and Prime Minister had also a series of political purposes. They were trying to draw Turkey to the revisionist camp consisting of Italy, Hungary and Bulgaria that was established against the Little Entente, an alliance between Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, and Czechoslovakia supported by France. They were trying to establish links with Turkish businessmen in order to gain Turkey to their cause (Armaoğlu, 1964, p.478). As Turkey passed to the republic regime, the

principle of creating good relationships based upon mutual benefits for every country without relying on any block and country did not suit the conviction efforts of Hungarian government officials. Besides, at these times, because Turkey determined most of its boundaries with the neighboring countries, the Hungarian policy related to irredentism did not arouse any curiosity (PRO.FO. 371, 1931, cited by Özgiray, 1997, p.76-77).

Turkey did not take offense against the political demands of Hungary. Thus, Mustafa Kemal Pasha, during the speech on the opening of the Grand National Assembly of Turkey on 1st November, 1931 said: “I would especially say the good impressions of visits to Hungary. The friendship acclamation with brother Hungarian nation is of our desired happy incident values” (Ataturk, 1997, p.309). Thus, Turkish-Hungarian relations went on friendly in 1931. About this, the effect of the kinship of language and race between the two countries was huge.

The prime minister of Turkey Ismet Pasha and foreign affairs minister Tevfik Rüştü Aras made an official visit to Budapest in October 1930. This attempt conducted to the visit of Count Bethlen, the prime minister of Hungary and foreign affairs minister Lajos Walko to Ankara in spring. The purpose of these visits was not carrying any meaning but friendship and kindness visits. However, during this visit, rumors that a block consisting of Turkish-Italian-Bulgarian and Hungarian aspects, and also Greece would join this block after Bulgaria solves its issues with the conciliation of the Turkey was walking around. Turkish ministers were greeted very warmly during their visit to Hungary. Budapest was prepared for their honor. Also a premiere was performed in Opera. The Regent gave a lunch and the prime minister a dinner in honor of the guests. During the dinner, very intimate courtesy conversations were made. Count Károlyi and Ismet Pasha talked about their admirations about their countries. The two prime ministers of the countries made opinion exchanges about various topics. However, in the published declaration, stereotypic clichés were talked about. This visit made it obvious that possible agreement revision walking around the two countries as a rumor (PRO.FO. 371, 1932, cited by Özgiray, 1997, p.77).

The political relations between Turkey and Hungary also went on the next years. Thus, the prime minister of Hungary General Gyula Gömbös and Kálmán Kánya, the minister of foreign affairs, also visited Turkey between 19th and 25th October, 1933.

This visit was not carrying any importance but a friendly visit. These visits had been already held regularly for last 4 years and Turkey was feeling proud of them. Because, Turkey was in the ex-master of them due to the previous ruling of the Ottoman Empire between the years 1526 and 1699. On the other hand, Hungarian officials were happy with Turkish hospitality and sympathy. In addition to this, Hungarians were admiring Turks who was defeated in the first Balkan war, but later founded their state with their own weapon force and made Lausanne Peace Agreement. Both of the countries were not aiming to get benefit from this friendship.

The protocol prolonging the arbitration, reconciliation and objectivity agreement signed on 5th January of 1925 in Budapest was signed on 22nd October of 1933 in Ankara. On the official proclamation published during this signification, they were mentioning that both of the governments were sharing the same opinion about Balkan and Central European issues, the representatives of both countries would come together more frequently and they would exchange their opinions about the current political situation and they would vitalize the commerce between the two countries by forming an economic council (PRO.FO. 371, 1934, cited by Özgiray, 1997, pp.77-78).

Hungarian nationalist Francis II Rákóczi during the visit of Hungarian governors to Turkey took asylum from Turkey by escaping from European enemies in 1717 and later settled down Tekirdağ. Turkish-Hungarian blends Friendship Council in his house. General Gömbös and Kálmán Kánya also attended this commemoration. The officials of the two countries finding this as an occasion made intimate speeches praising both of the countries (Gökbilgin, 1976, pp.2-9).

“Clearing” agreement between Turkey and Hungary was signed on August 1st and was put into force after fifteen days for a six month period. With this agreement, the trade volume between the two countries was limited as 2,116,000 pengös or 782,920 Turkish Lira for 6 months.

During the speech of Turkish prime minister of the republic on the visit of the Hungarian prime minister and foreign affairs minister to Turkey on November 1st 1933 when the General Assembly would start its duties, he said that: “We received the visit of the eminent prime minister and foreign affairs minister of Hungary with intimacy and pleasure. The neutrality and Arbitration Agreement was also prolonged.

The brotherly emotion between the communities was intemperately demonstrated with these occasions (Ataturk, 2006, p.308).

In the year 1934, Turkey was not a popular country in the eyes of Hungary. Because, Turkey had signed the Balkan Pact with Yugoslavia, Greece and Romania on February 9th 1934 (Düstur, 2006, pp.1908-1922). In this way, Turkey definitely joined to anti-revisionist camp. Yet foreign affairs minister of Turkey made a friendship visit to Hungary in March due to the negative attitude of Hungary towards Pact. Consequently, Hungary was obliged to absorb the Turkey's presence in a pact with Yugoslavia and Romania. However, the subject about the language and racial kinship of the Turks and Magyars became to be unpopular among Turks.

Under the presidency of the second minister of the Grand National Assembly of Turkey, a group of Turkish members of parliament visited Budapest in May. In return, a group consisting of Hungarian bureaucrats came to Ankara to the point of attending the 10th anniversary of the foundation of the Turkish Republic in October. Gyula Gömbös received a group of Turkish members of parliament. These Turkish visitors were being hosted in the Hungarian parliament. During these accommodations, good conversations were held. In these conversations, subjects like heroism and that the two countries fought together in the World War I, friendship spirit and motives took place. Turkish spokesmen replied Hungarian spokesmen with the brotherhood and friendship feelings. However, Turks listened with serenity and left unanswered the words "Equal victims of unjust peace" (PRO.FO, 1935, cited by Özgiray, 1997, p.77).

The commercial and clearing agreement between Turkey and Hungary was signed in Ankara on April 18th and the validity of the agreement was prolonged until the end of 1934.

The Turkish Grand National Assembly approved the protocol prolonging the Objectivity, reconciliation and Arbitration Agreements signed in 1929 and the treaty of extradition signed on May 29th, 1932 between Turkey and Hungary on March 6th 1934 (Be, know, do: Düstur, 2006, pp.1908-1922). According to this, the Neutrality, Reconciliation and Arbitration Agreement signed in Budapest on January 5, 1929 and the enforcement of the same dated protocol accommodating the reconciliation

and arbitration procedure was prolonged for the next five years after the expiration date.

However, if one of the contracting parties does not announce its desire about the dissolving of the agreement one year before the expiration date, this agreement will be automatically prolonged for next five years and it will repeat. Because there was no sensational event about political relation between the two countries in 1936, the relations went on well. There was an agreement between Turkey and Hungary about objectivity, not supporting the attacker and political opinion exchange. Apart from these, the two countries agreed to give up their intents and attempts in order not to revitalize Austro-Hungarian Monarchy and Ottoman Empire (PRO.FO, 1937, cited by Özgiray, 1997, p.79).

The prime minister of Turkish republic emphasized that Turkey was in good relations with every country by saying that “A harmonious stability and development about the relationships with the neighbors Government of the republic, big and small states draw attention.” (Ataturk, 2006, p.308). He adopted peace as the best way to get nations reach prosperity and happiness in order to increase the life standards of Turkish Republic and tried to coddle it. According to this statement, he managed to arrange relationships, friendships, alliances with overseas countries as much as the neighboring countries and by this means, he relied the country’s foreign policy on a steady basis.

Although Turanism was introduced to the Hungarian public by Ármín Vámbery, a Jewish orientalist, the Turanian idea became increasingly associated with "anti-Semitic nationalism during and after World War I. This may be linked in part to the post-World War II regime led by Mátyás Rákosi and anti-nationalist activities of Jews in the upper ranks of the government during Hungary’s first Communist regime (led by Béla Kun), which briefly held power after World War I. The emerging bourgeois class included a considerable number of Hungarian Jews and this class outgrew the existing political framework, threatening the monopoly of Hungarian nobles and upper classes is another explanation. Therefore the Jews were seen as infiltrating the core of the Hungarian nation and compromising its cultural characteristics with their liberal mindset and money market practices. Consequently the threat that they on the surface posed to the Hungarian nation fit well with the entire post-Trianon conceptual framework that the Magyars were an errant people of

Turan unwanted in the European continent. In this vein, the Turanists called for an end to the age of servility to the West, and unification of all Turanians against the dual evils of Semitic corruption and Aryan decadence (Akçalı & Korkut, 2012, p.604).

Turanism became an extremist political ideology after World War One. After the First World War, political Turanism played a role in the formation of Hungarian far-right ideologies because of its ethnic nationalist nature. It tried to show the "existence and superiority of a unified Hungarian race (Csernyei, 2013, pp.5-8). Especially in the interwar period historians, sociologists or physical anthropologists intended to follow their work governed by scientific objectivity and in this way they served political expectations. In the early day of Turanism its promoters attempted to argue its aims scientifically but the truth was that political Turanism did not need a scientific goal. Turanism is usually evaluated according to one-sided knowledge resulting in simple definitions and the multidimensional character of the subject is ignored.

In the 19th and 20th centuries Hungarian nationalists and intellectuals (but also so-called intellectual) contributed to the growth of Turanism and stressed an ideology of the unity of all Turkic peoples.

The emergence of Italian fascism in the 20th century was also significant for the turning point for Hungarian Turanists. The Turanists appreciated Benito Mussolini, considering him as the leader of a bloodless revolution and admiring his resistance to socialist irrationality, anarchy, as well as his struggle to build up the rule of law. During this period there were remarkable efforts to put into practice fascism in Hungary and looking beyond Italy, the Hungarian Turanists also sought ways to cooperate with their Turkish counterparts. The Turanist discourse ebbed away and the alleged Scythian-Hunnish roots of Hungarians became at best marginalized, in the aftermath of the catastrophic World War II and the construction of a communist regime in Hungary. In this way, Turanism remained mostly a self-serving prophecy unable to retain its prominence when confronting the forces of internationalism, regardless of the political and economic goals of the Turanist thinkers and their prospects to acquire international distinctiveness for Hungary (Akçalı & Korkut, 2012, pp.604, 605).

During the 1930s, the tide of Nazism exerted a powerful ideological effect on right-wing movements in Hungary. A crucial by-product of this effect was the unexpected change of Turanist revisionist character, as was representative of Turanian storm. The new group was, however, at odds with the Turanist Union and was even publically rejected by the conservative Turanian Society. Upon the favorable turn in the fortunes of Hungary during the post-Munich years (1938-1941), the ultra radical Turanist trend became lighter and finally all but disappeared (Kessler, 1967, pp.263-264).

Turanism became part of the extreme right's official ideology, falling into disrepute after the Second World War. It was denied and demonized as a Nazi ideology, being eliminated from popular knowledge during the time of communism. The Turanic thought have been revived in certain extreme-right circles, remaining, nevertheless, voiceless in mainstream politics and the academia, afterwards the fall of Communism (Moreh, 2013).

The two notions of Turanism (Pan-Turkism) and Turkish Nationalism growing around the same time found few efficient ties. During WWI, the Ottoman intellectuals followed the ideals of Turkish nationalism but the leading Committee of Union and Progress (Ittihat ve Terakki Partisi) could not afford to clearly act as it was pursuing the conservation of the older of the empire. According to political goals, managing to win the support of both the Turkic and the Muslim world, it was pragmatically juggling often contradictory ideas of Pan-Turkism, Turkism and Pan-Islamism. With regard to regional alliances it turned its focus to Asian Turks, instead of lost Balkan dominions inhabited by culturally and religiously alien peoples. It was possible that with the fall of the Ottoman Empire, Turkish Nationalism formed really and Turkey would pose as a protector Hinterland of Oriental Turks. Then Tatars who represented almost half of all Turkic population took courage to be the main propagators of the Pan-Turkic. The concept of Turan was included into Pan-Turkism under the influence of Russian Tatar intelligentsia and Young Turks indicating the homeland of all Turks, but the idea was left by Mustafa Kemal after the war as politically unreal. It is known that Turkish language reform was regulated by Mustafa Kemal and sundry historical studies were accomplished by himself in close contact with international and Hungarian Turkology. The forming of the Department of Hungarian Studies in Ankara and the increasing interest in Oriental and ancient

Middle Eastern civilizations all sign the same domain to show the prehistory of Turks. But these domains never reached too much in a political sense. In the same way, in Hungarian Turanism is today widely appreciated for the past success carried out under its aegis in the field of culture and science, though seen unrealistic for its political aims (Csernyei, 2013, pp.10-11).

It is known that Mustafa Kemal always followed the studies of foreign turcologists, especially Hungarian linguists, historians. Atatürk, the creator of scientific life of Turkish culture, knew well the history of the development of the Hungarian language and he thought that this culture was similar to ancient Turkish culture. Atatürk studied the work of many Turcologists such as Ármin Vámbéry, Zoltán Gombocz, Gyula Németh (Çolak, 2010, pp.377-378).

On September 2, 1932 reception given in Gellért Hotel in Budapest, in honor of the Ambassador of the Republic of Turkey and representative of Turkish History Institution Mr. Reşit Saffet, many members of the Association of Hungarian Turan, many elite face of the Hungarian science formed a view on the clarification of Turkey and Hungarian cultural relationship (Çolak, 2010, pp.383-384). Hundreds of Turkish students studied in Hungary. Hungarology Institute, was a fine example of institutionalization in Turkey in this area, was opened with Atatürk's initiative for the development of the Turkey-Hungarian cultural relations in Ankara in 1935.

According to Hungarian Turanists the new conception (Çolak, 2010, pp.386-387) of history is as follows:

No place in the history books written for schools seems that Turan or Turanlı word not found. Where we did mention about our Turanlı peoples or peoples, Turkish writers use Turkish word as adjective instead of naming Turan. This surely will be the subject of the debate. Except this until here anymore, with great initiative of Gazi we need to know Turkish history author surprisingly manage the great work for the benefit of nation. Because they put the Turks in the historic center of culture, we have identified that great interest have aroused all over the world toward the new Turkish historiography movement. Now everything in Turkey is almost suddenly.

3.1.3. World War II period

After its borders diminished with the Treaty of Trianon in 1920, in Hungary (Çolak, 2005, p.4), the 1930s were shaped by solicitations conservationist within, and revisionist out of the country (Önen, 2005, p.237). While Gyula Gömbös (Bethlen, 1988, pp. 123) was supporting revision of Treaty of Trianon as a government policy,

who came to power after Gyula Károlyi resigned in the Fall of 1932, he supported German-Italian alliance, which were known as “Axis Powers” (Bethlen, 1988, p. 129). On the other hand, the 1920s meant to be a duration in which Hungarian Turan movement both made a great advancement, and became subject to internal competence and even to separation with controversial movements within the movement. In the same same period, while Hungarian domestic policy inclined to be right-winged, in foreign policy revisionist solicitations came forward (Önen, 2005, pp.237-238).

The report prepared by Turkish Embassy of Budapest in 1933 is an indicator of gradual German influence on Hungary. It was denoted within the report as below:

Even though Hitler-imitation deputy Mesko and his supporters are of no importance, they achieved to set off a great deal of anti-Semitism. These are the results of demonstrations made by student of Dar-ul Fünun (Ottoman university).

With the beginning of the 1930s, fascism, and fascism of Mussolini in particular, started to pervade among Hungarian Turanists. In that period, Turanism did not defend only racism, but also totalitarian methods of new national nascence beside racism. On the eve of II. World War, being markedly affected by Hitler, Hungarian Turanists felt a need to centralize anti-Semitism as their policy.

In 1938, being a Hungarian was defined in a brochure with words below (Demirkan, 2000, p.35):

Everybody who have a Hungarian race and consciousness and who are not Jewish, who don't have characteristics of Northern people, and who are not from Mediterranean race, but everybody who consciously accept themselves as Hungarian.

It can be said that in the origin of anti-Semitism lies Jewish capitalism (Önen, 2005, p.238). With the realization of *Anschluss* (Annexation) during the time of Kálman Darányi power, who was commissioned to form a new government after Gyula Gömbös' death, extremist right-wing inclinations became more salient in Hungary, Germany's neighbouring country. Unlike previous actions, this time Darányi started to safeguard extremist Hungarian Nazis. It is supposed that the number of members of different groups named as Hungarian Nazis was about 75.000 in 1938.

In this environment, in 1938, the first Jewish law came into question. Being proposed in favour of providing continuity of social and economic life balance, this law was projecting several restrictions for Jews. Even though left-wing and Hungarian Nazis

were clamped down after Admiral Miklós Horthy casted out Darányi from premiership and removed him with Béla Imrédy on May 10, 1938, first Jewish act was accepted in Hungarian parliament, on May 29 (Önen, 2005, pp.238-240).

The *Tan* Newspaper, which acquainted about “*Jewish issue in Hungary*”, reported that “it is thought to reduce the %20 allowance for Jewish integrity into public life as denoted within the act.” (Tan, 1938, p. 5).

Citing news of Hungarian newspaper *Új Nemzet* with the title “New act in Hungary”, the newspapers *Tan* and *Cumhuriyet* express that commission which was responsible for law amendment about Jews made these alterations (Tan, 1938, p. 9):

The first act about fixed as five and 20 years in different particular parts of social life is shortened. Relativeness between Christians and Jews will be fixed for particular industries which were not mentioned up to now. Jewish integration into particular active sections of public life will be less than %20.

The article of *Holnap* newspaper which appeared in 1939 and titled as “Magyarság és Zsidóság, A Zsidóság Gazdasági és Szellemi Hegemóniájának Kialakulása” (“Hungarians and Jews, Formation of Economic and Intellectual Hegemony of Jews”) can be accepted as a reaction to this 20% role of Jewish integrity in economic life.

In this case, it is understood that Béla Imrédy’s coming to power caused no deceleration in inclination to fascism. Now, Nazi movements in Hungary were increasing. German Nazis and Hungarian Nazis raised anti-Semitism inwardly with villagers who want to be landowners. On the other hand, Germany’s gaining too much strength, Hitler’s direct personal support for revision of Treaty of Trianon, existence of very much active German minority in Hungary and Germany’s being a large market for agricultural products of Hungary were supports for extremist right-winged parties (Trelat, 1976, p.11). According to Tarık Demirkan (2000, p. 33), previously being perceived as a geographical term and supported economical association of people on a common geography, Turanism now became an ideology not only embracing racism, but also racist annihilation. In order to shake off the Treaty of Trianon and take again possession of the area named as Historical Kingdom of Hungary, Hungary’s inclination since Gömbös for partnership with Italy and Germany in foreign policy continued with passing 12.103 km of land to Hungary (which had a population of 1.050.000 people with %86.5 Hungarian) including the cities of Komárom, Érsekújvár, Rozsnyó, Kassa, Ungvár, Munkács by means of

German Foreign Affairs Minister Ribbentrop and Italian Foreign Affairs Minister Ciano's decisions in First Vienna Arbitration, on November 2, 1938, and taking possession of Kárpatalja area when Count Pál Teleki became Prime Minister for a second time, and emerging of Jewish act (Önen, 2005, pp.238-241).

After II. World War's outbreak with German troops' exceeding borders of Poland on September 1, 1939, and Hungary's annexation of lands with II. Vienna Arbitration on August 30, 1940, Hungary entered into war on 20 November of 1940 (Önen, 2005, pp.239-241), with Count Teleki's disallowance for German troops of Hitler to pass over Hungary, and also not submitting to proposal for Hungarian armies to attack Yugoslavia and his suicide (Önen, 2005, p.241; Trelat, 1976, p.11). Many Hungarian people, as Pál Teleki did (Erkun, 1999, p.102), objected to admission of Hitler's armies into Hungary and did not approve Jewish genocide. Fethi Vecdet Erkun (1999, p. 53) denotes that "many Hungarians say that Teleki followed a brave policy and Hungarians do not want to take part in war, yet Nazi supporters push the country to the war." During the war, Hungarian youth, too, were exposed to Hitler and Mussolini propaganda and college students divided into groups such as Nazi supporters and against Nazi supporters (Erkun, 1999, p.93). The news of the *Tan* newspaper titled as "Attacks in Hungary Against Jews", which discussed student demonstrations indicates that these incidents appeared even on the eve of war (Tan, 1938, p.5).

Erkun (1999, p.90) tells in his memoirs that he hosted a Jewish woman and her child for a day, upon a friend's request, in an environment where II. World War and Nazi Germany got their impact felt with anti-Semitist acts.

On March 17, 1944, Hungarian Prime Minister Admiral Horthy was called to Germany and he went to the presence of Hitler, and in that meeting, Hitler asked Horthy to keep strict measures against Jewish people, but Horthy rejected this request (Trelat, 1976, p.12). Also Hitler informed that German troops would exceed in Hungary and in 19 March 1944, first German troops began to occupy Hungary. Being against Germany's policy of total annihilation of Jews before occupation, Horthy government had no chance but to look on Jews' being sent to concentration camps under German control during occupation, and until the end of June, 1944, a sheer number of 440.000 Hungarian Jews were sent to concentration camps (Önen, 2005, pp.241-242).

To summarize, the vicissitudes of Hungarian domestic policy in the Interwar era led to the establishing of close links between Turkey and Hungary from the mid-1920s. Not only political, but also cultural relations were improved in that period, with the continuity of Turcological researches and Turanian societies. This contributed to the adoption of a public opinion attitude, both in Hungary and Turkey, that was favorable towards the amelioration of bilateral relations between Hungary and Turkey. has affected positively by these events. However, the rise of the Nazi treat was a major obstacle that resulted in the destabilization of Hungarian politics and society during the Second World War.

3.2. Second Half of the Twentieth Century

3.2.1. Hungary in the Cold War

Peace treaty signed in Paris on February 10, 1947, reinforces the borderlines which were determined with the unjust Treaty of Trianon. Bullets cease lastly in Budapest, too, thus wars in Hungary comes to an end after Budapest falls. Moscow transfers the bulk of war prisoners to Siberia and these prisoners meet their families only years later. Number of victims cannot be determined until that day. Yet it is for sure that some thousands of people die on Hungarian side (Yusufoğlu, 2006, p.21).

After the II. World War, it is again Hungary to lose. Elections are held in Hungary in winter of 1945 and Communist Party comes to power. Scientists undergo problems mostly in broadcasting while Turkish-Hungarian relations come to a halt. Only after 1980s broadcasting and scientists' reciprocal visits met their original form.

On October 23, 1956, in the afternoon, slogans against government increase as young performer Imre Sinkovics reads Petofi's famous lines from the National Ballad (*Nemzeti Dal*) before the statue of the Hungarian poet Petofi and people begin to demand Soviet soldiers' departure from the country (Yusufoğlu, 2006, p. 21). The movement widens with the collapse of great Stalin statue in Városliget in the evening of that day and it is understood that the revolution succeeds as it expands all over Hungary with Soviet corps' entry in Budapest, street conflicts, Prime Minister Rákosi's and other ministers' escape to Soviet Union with a plane, and with Hungary's declaration to denounce Warsaw Pact. Yet, after agreeing to quell the revolution with blood, at dawn of November 4, 1956, tanks of Red Army start to move towards Budapest again. Since Western countries have been paying their

attention to the crisis broke out at Suez Canal, they do not protest against Moscow (Yusufoğlu, 2006, p.21). President of USA only sends his message to Fighters of Pest Street that he “would pray for them”. Nations watch Revolution of Hungary holding their breath. Revealing his opposition against revolution via Szolnok Radio, János Kádár forms a new party named “Hungarian Revolutionary Worker-Peasant Government” with communists supporting Moscow Party. Kádár and his minister comrades enter in Budapest on Russian tanks with escorts of 200 thousand Russian soldiers. Prime Minister Imre Nagy asks help of Yugoslavian diplomats and takes refuge in Yugoslavian Embassy with other ministers. And the Bishop of Esztergom Mindszenty takes refuge in Embassy of USA (Yusufoğlu, 2006, p.21).

Conflicts, strikes and demonstrations continue for 10 more days and results fruitless. Kádár and his circle try to give an end to resistance with promises and negotiations at first, but begin to use force with the help of occupying soldiers. Arrests start. Since Hungarian people know that revolution will be followed by pogrom and dictatorship, approximately 250 thousand Hungarian take refuge in Free World. In the beginning of 1957 Trials of Revenge start. Kádár and his supporters execute approximately 400 revolutionist (Yusufoğlu, 2006, p. 21; Oba, 1995, pp.141-144). They persuade Imre Nagy and his circle to leave Yugoslavian Embassy with fake promises. They sentence Imre Nagy and his circle to death in June of 1958. Prime Minister Imre Nagy does not ask for forgiveness and his sentence is applied. Hungarian Revolution is quelled with blood but defender “Pest Youth” affects the world deeply. Europe realizes the value of democracy and freedom again. We see that Hungarian Revolution of 1956 affected Turkish people and Turkish youth deeply. Demonstrations during the revolution, density of demands to fight for Hungarians and publications show this sensitivity (Yusufoğlu, 2006, pp.21-22).

Compared with other countries which took place in Socialist bloc with Hungary before Iron Curtain collapsed, Hungary owes being the most unrestricted and the freest country to Revolution of 1956. Because, in the beginnings of 1960s, many famous intellectuals were freed from prisons, and in 1963, many revolutionists were back their home. After the revolution, Kádár and his circle wanted prove to strangers, Western Europe and America that 1956 incidents had occurred by coincidence. To be able to represent the convenient atmosphere within this period, no direct terrorism was applied as had been applied in the power of Rákosi (Yusufoğlu, 2006, p.22).

In the 1960s, it is understood that economy, which was applied according to quinquennially development until that year, could not be elongated without any change. Experts propose to return partially to Western competitive economy. Yet, old-fashioned communists maintain dominance after quelling Prague Spring in 1968 (Akyüz, 2011, pp.178-190). Only a small part of economic reforms are applied. Since they fear that a new revolution can break out in Hungary as a result of lowered life standards, deficiencies are satisfied with debts taken from Western countries. Thus, welfare is created partially. Many people abroad name the regime of Hungary as “Goulash Communism”. Hungary and intellectuals of other countries believe that Hungary is less oppressive compared to other Socialist countries. On the other hand, opponents of dictatorship, followers of democracy or people subjected to imputation of this kind are continued to be kept tabs on. Opponents cannot have passports and cannot travel to the West. Priests and monks who claim that they do not have religion freedom are sued (Akyüz, 2011, pp.170-183).

In the mid-1980s, it is understood that previous economic policy does not take country’s real capacity into account. External loans grow too much. Life standards begin to decline again. Workers try to work too hard or find a second work to avoid growing poor. People die or collapse in their early forties (Müftüoğlu, 1987, pp.49-53). Gradually, fewer families can take the responsibility of giving birth. Country’s population starts to be old and decrease. Many people try to find a way to go abroad again. In the late 80s, Hungarians understand that it is time country’s policy until then changed and new reforms were applied.

Hungarians, who migrated to Western Europe and other free countries of world, generally try to preserve their native language and homeland affection and take care to transmit it to their children (Müftüoğlu, 1987, pp.49-53). In this case, nothing but being far from Hungary can hinder them. Neighbouring countries’ Hungarian population are completely different.

Men and women who were taken to labour camps can return to Czechoslovakia only at the expense of admitting themselves as Slovaks. Even speaking their native language on street is not suggested until 1948 (Yusufoğlu, 2006, p.22). Even though it is allowed to establish cultural communities for Hungarians, despite primary and secondary schools are opened, Slovakizing and identity pressure never ends completely.

Only after Stalin's death, Hungarians can gradually return to Subcarpathian Area, which was previously annexed by Soviet Union. With majority of Russians but having a great number of Hungarian congregations, too, Greek Catholic Church is obliged to hold its activities secretly under continuous pressures of government. Roman Catholic Sect can achieve religion freedom only after collapse of Communism (Yusufoğlu, 2006, p.22). Even though Hungarian society of this area gained some cultural rights, Communist Party tries to prevent Hungarian minority to have their own intelligentsia. Doctors, engineers, teachers who were born in Subcarpathia can find works only in distant parts of Soviet Union.

Hungarian minority comes across with the strictest pressure in Transylvania, Romania. The leader of Romanian Communist Party Gheorghiu-Dej and his successor cruel dictator Nicolae Ceaușescu hate Hungarians. In the 70s and 80s, Ceaușescu establishes "one man authority" as of Hungarian Rákosi. Ceaușescu deifies himself as "The Genius of the Carpathians". He accuses minorities, and Hungarians in the first place, for the declining life standards and economic problems (Özgiray, 1997, p.75). He stops the activities of Hungarian University in Kolozsvár and shuts down many active Hungarian schools in Székelyföld. Bishop Aron Marton's attitude keeps Hungarian people alive. Actually, Romanians free Aron Marton from prison in 1955, but later on keep him in house confinement for more than 10 years. He is asked to denounce his devotion to Roman Church and collaborate with communist leaders. Yet, the bishop stands out against threats and promises. Also, he encourages his rivals. After his death in 1980, his grave becomes a common place of pilgrimage for especially Catholic and Protestant Hungarians (Yusufoğlu, 2006, pp.22-23).

Pressure increases after 1980. Ceaușescu decides to purge Székelyföld and hamlets in Transylvania and make them migrate to bigger settlements mixed with Romanians. It is clearly understood that Hungarian will not be able to take any help from anywhere. Governments of Western democracies support Ceaușescu for so-called Soviet opposition. János Kádár speaks of "Romanian citizens who speak Hungarian" in his visit to Bucharest in 1977. With his these words, he demonstrates his rejection to sharing a common fate with Transylvanian Hungarians. Hungarian border guards send Hungarian fugitives back to Romania, even though they know that tens of years of imprisonment wait them (Yusufoğlu, 2006, p.23).

Contrary to other countries, in some degree Hungarians live peacefully in Yugoslavia, and especially after 1956, when relations between Belgrade and Budapest begin to go smoothly. Marshal Tito wants to prove to West that there is nothing as a minority pressure in his country with examples of Hungarians and Albanians.

3.2.2. Collapse of the Walls

In the end of the 1980s, it is understood that continuation of socialism would cause Hungary's breakdown. Therefore, newspapers are published and meetings are kept secretly at the expense of police raid. Among these, Budapest-Lakitelek meeting is noticeable held in 1987. Many people attend to this meeting, including individuals from members and leaders of the Hungarian Socialist Party (MSZP), who thinks to sever relations with the socialism format of then. But Kádár does not accept virtuous changes. Premiership office is held by Károly Grósz (Yusufoğlu, 2006, p.23).

Growing discontent turns into demonstration in 1988 on Heroes' Square, Budapest. Public demonstrates against anti-Hungarian policy and burning hamlets in Romania. Grósz threatens the country with using armed worker guardian union. However, many organizations take shape against Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party. The most important of them are these: Hungarian Democratic Forum (MDP), Alliance of Young Democrats (FIDESZ), and Alliance of Free Democrats (SZDSZ). After a short period of time, many parties begin to function which were closed in 1948. Among these there are *The Independent Smallholders, Agrarian Workers and Civic Party* (FKGP) and Christian Democratic People's Party (KDNP) (Yusufoğlu, 2006, p.23).

In the beginnings of 1989, Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party, too, is obliged to accept multi-party system. Kádár is made retired and Miklós Németh becomes Prime Minister, who is more flexible than Grósz. Temporary Prime Minister Matyas Szurös again establishes Republic of Hungary, instead of People's Republic of Hungary. Substructure of free election takes shape as a requirement of democracy (Yusufoğlu, 1995, p. 23). All these occur thanks to the changes taking place in Soviet Union and as a result of reform age and political softening atmosphere which are identified with Gorbachev, Secretary-General of the party.

Collapse of Kádár regime, unjustly murdered Imre Nagy's and 1956 martyrs' reburials make a great impact on the summer of 1989 (Yusufoğlu, 2006, p.23). Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party changes its name and soon attends to elections with the name Hungarian Socialist Party (MSZP).

Forces which sing national and democratic slogans, earns victory in the first free elections for parliament, in the spring of 1990. Yesterday's masters of the country, namely Hungarian Socialist Party, experience a great amazement with hardly having one tenth of all votes.

Having the great majority of all votes, historian József Antall, leader of Hungarian Democratic Forum takes the chair for premiership. Árpád Göncz becomes President. He is the nominee of the second biggest party, Alliance of Free Democrats. During his selection, it is seen that opposition parties oppose each other, which were previously united.

Formation of democratic constitutional state takes start after the establishment of Antall Government. Supreme Court and Government Accounting Bureau are constituted. Negotiations are held for departure of Moscow and Soviet soldiers (Communist Party leader talks of "temporary Russian deployment in the country" even though Soviet soldiers were in the country for more than 40 years). In the end of negotiations, the last Soviet soldier leaves Hungarian lands on June 19, 1991. Within the frame of their foreign policy, Antall Government, for the first time since 1945, make efforts for the validation of Hungarians who live abroad (Yusufoğlu, 2006, p.23).

Antall Government raises economy partially, gives way to many workers of institutions after privatization. Many unemployed and poor people think that they lived in better conditions under Kádár administration. Only a few people can recognize the unavoidability of paying the results of previous decades provided with external loans. Political powers and the press opposing the government boost dissatisfaction (Yusufoğlu, 2006, pp.23-24). Street demonstrations start after oil product prices go up, which had never been so high up to that time. Taxi and truck drivers who are afraid to lose their works enclose their cities. Government is forced to withdraw its weakly planned bill. Prime Minister of "regime change" Antall passes away as a result of a deadly illness on December 12, 1993.

If we look at neighbouring countries of Hungary, it is pretty soon understood dictatorship could not be continued in these countries, too. Communist Party is defeated in the 1990 elections in Czechoslovakia, and later on, in 1993, the country is divided into two different countries as Czech Republic and Slovakia. Slovakian Prime Minister Mesiar does not like Hungarians and does everything to clear off minority institutions. Though the new government chosen in the 1998 elections signed alliance with the Party of Hungarian Coalition, they did not answered to their demands such as higher education in Hungarian language and to establish a province with Hungarian majority (Yusufoğlu, 2006, p.24).

In the Christmas of 1989 in Romania, communist power is demolished not with peaceful ways, but with gunfights. Hungarians the most important spiritual leader in Timișoara then, László Tokés, plays a big role on the outbreak of revolution. Soldiers capture Ceaușescu with his wife and kill them. New government follows a negative attitude towards Hungarians. A great anti-Hungarian movement appears in Marosvásárhely, but the atmosphere of fear is loosened after the 1994 elections, yet many problems stay unsolved. Especially, Csángó Hungarians' destinies living in Moldova continue to sorrow us, Turks. Hungarians in that region gradually forget their native language since they have no schools and priests (Yusufoğlu, 2006, p.24).

In the south, during the painful war in Yugoslavia, many Hungarians who escape Hungary so as to avoid conflicts take refuge in the country. Despite a peace treaty is signed, it does not solve problems. Hungarians of southern areas continue their lives today becoming poorer. Between 1994-98, a government consisted of socialists and liberals are in power in Hungary. In the 1998 elections, majority of people vote for Alliance of Young Democrats (FIDESZ) which is established by mostly young people. Viktor Orbán becomes Prime Minister (Yusufoğlu, 2006, p.24). Economy starts to grow even though many problems such as Eastern Hungary's underdevelopment and gypsies' conditions are only partially solved. Government plans "Status Law" to help Hungarians who live beyond the borders. After the 2002 parliamentary elections, socialist-liberal coalition is established under the leadership of Péter Medgyessy (Yusufoğlu, 2006, p.24). By the time, Hungary becomes a member of European Union in 2004. Péter Medgyessy resigns on August 25, 2004. The parliament chooses Ferenc Gyurcsany from Alliance of Free Democrats (SZDSZ) as prime minister on September 29. Taking the power on 4 October, 2004,

Gyurcsany immediately changes 7 ministers from 17. Being an assiduous jurist, László Sólyom carries out presidency of Hungarian Republic from 5 August 2005 to 6 August 2010.

According to the results of the study conducted, the relationship between Hungary and Ottoman Empire had been exposed to war for many lasted years and the relations between two states could not be placed on track for centuries. However, during the founding years of the Turkish Republic, the relationship between the two countries had generally gone well.

Hungarians have changed their religion to Christianity to be integrated with Christian Europe. Conversely, Europeans excluded Hungarians from themselves and continue to exclude until present day. Thus, Hungarians left alone in Eastern Europe had felt the necessity of making alliances with other governments to cherish their state. Therefore as this reason political and economic relations were established with Turkey by Hungarians.

With the signing of Treaty of Paris Hungary lost territories obtained between 1938-1941. The basic motivation to join the war to take back this lands but after the Second World War neither the Soviet Union nor the Western supported Hungary. The US-led Western bloc and the Eastern bloc under the leadership of the Soviet Union carried out and international political and military tension between two countries continued from 1945 until 1989. The Soviets planned to place the Communist regime in Hungary. In 1945 Communist Party of Hungary was established. Between 1949-1989 Turkey Hungary relations weakened.

3.3. Hungary and Turkey at the Beginning of the 21st Century

3.3.1. The EU accession process in Hungary and Turkey

After the regime change in Hungary took place in 1989, a quick improvement in our political relations was recorded. Mutual relations have been maintained on the basis of friendship, cooperation and mutual benefits. There is no political problem in our relations.

That Hungary is affiliated with NATO and EU increased the perspective of the relations by creating a new multilateral dimension between the countries. Our country strongly supported the NATO membership of Hungary, which took place in

1999. Hungary becoming an EU member in 2004 is also supporting the EU membership status of our country as a principle.

As of the beginning of 1990s, economic liberalization and policies about overseas expansion that Hungary put into practice, liabilities carried out as a result of World Trade Organization (WTO) membership and developments such as the Association Agreement with EU made a positive impact on the development of the trade between Hungary and our country.

Turkey-EU relations historically have a long-lasting process. Turkey moves closer to and becomes more integrated with the EU. The long way and delays on the route to membership display that Turkey is faced with higher barriers to entry EU. The eligibility criteria for membership clearly rise over time. EU membership has shown a significant rise over time. One of the countries which achieved to be member of EU is Hungary. Both of countries, Turkey and Hungary, have been implemented important reforms for membership.

Although the European “Union” was formally founded on the November 1, 1993, “European integration had always had political objectives”. The idea of unity was at the top of the political agenda since foundation. The European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC), which was the basis of the EU, put the major normative principle of the unity to reach peace and stability: Equality (Şener, 2009, p.29).

In 1957, the Treaty of Rome stated the necessity “to strengthen the unity of their economies and to ensure their harmonious development by reducing the differences existing between the various regions and backwardness of the less favoured regions.” In 1986, the Single European Act “lays the basis for a genuine cohesion policy designed to offset the burden of the single market for southern countries and other less favored regions.” In 1992, with the Treaty on European Union, “cohesion policy” has become one of the most important objectives of the EU in addition to the economic and monetary union. Finally in 1997, while the Treaty of Amsterdam (Şener, 2009, p.32) confirmed the importance of cohesion policies, a Title on Employment was added to the treaty.

The EU sets democracy and human rights as preconditions for full membership. By democracy, the EU means free elections, multi-party system, control over government, separation of powers, rule of law and active civil society (Şener, 2009,

p.218). As to human rights, the EU wants to protect liberties related to language, religion and gender, freedom of expression and press, freedom of assembly, minority rights and equality before law. This framework conforms to internationally recognized conventions such as Universal Declaration of Human Rights, European Convention of Human Rights, and International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, etc.

There is not any model to be followed by the EU countries as a whole. That is why candidate countries can interpret the administrative reform as they wish under the condition that it should not be in conflict with the principles of European governance. Administrative reform is the purposeful intervention of the political power into the administrative system in line with the role of the state triggered by economic crises. The crisis is stabilized with the administrative reform itself. Therefore, the need for administrative reform stems primarily from economic crises. The EU administrative reform cannot be carried out against the prevailing role of the state. Turkish case supports this assumption. During the 1960-1980 period, the role of Turkish state was protectionist and interventionist (Şener, 2009, pp.371-372). The joint protocol, partially in 1976 and entirely in 1979, was suspended by the Turkish government. The suspension of the joint protocol demonstrates clearly that EU conditionality was only “partially” implemented due to the prevalent protectionist role of the state backed by political and bureaucratic power in Turkey during the 1970s. Only in 1980s could relations between the EU and Turkey be normalized when the dominant role of the state was changed from protectionism to non-protectionism.

A new era was reopened in 1996 with the customs union and was (Şener, 2009, p.202) further enhanced after 1999 when Turkey was granted candidate status. Economic crises occurred between 1998-2001 gave way to the new regulatory role of the state. At this point, need for administrative reform stemming from the economic crises overlapped with the need for administrative reform for EU accession. Thus, administrative reform was equalized to the EU accession process in 2001. The contradictions originating from the protectionist role of the state which had been experienced during the 1970s were no longer the case after 1999 since the regulatory role of the state has been supported and strengthened by the EU reforms. Therefore,

economic crises can be seen as the “trigger,” while the EU can be regarded as an “anchor” for administrative reforms.

Since there is no one set model to be followed, a candidate country can follow any “European” model. This is opportunity that any candidate country has; as such, Turkey chose neo-liberalism. Due to the EU, Turkey could give legitimacy to neo-liberal economic policies.

In Turkey, the regulatory role is mostly a result of the economic crisis of 1994 and 1998-2001 (Şener, 2009, pp.209-231). The EU indeed supported this role. However, it is not possible to explain this role change of the state with only reference to the EU accession. It is rather part of the globalization of Turkey with the help of the EU. Hungary and Turkey are included in the first group in which the EU played the role of “catalyst” as for the “promotion of liberalization.”

In Turkey public expenditure levels follow an increasing tendency from 1995 to 2001, and reach to 46% which is the European level. Nevertheless, after 2002 the level again decreases. Actually, a relative high public expenditure level does not prove that Turkey is a welfare state when compared to EU countries. Turkey’s repayment of interest was the highest in 2001, when crisis broke out. Turkey’s public expenditures and social expenditures are already lower than the EU average, including Hungary. It is not the EU, but the Turkish governments themselves who decide these levels. It depends on the domestic politics to decide on the size of the government in open economy conditions (Şener, 2009, p.227).

Hungary has one of the highest levels of public expenditures among new EU members (Şener, 2009, pp.203-204). General government expenditures fell sharply as of 1995 until 2000. However, the expenditure level went up again until 2002. Although the public expenditure level of Hungary has decreased in line with the neo-liberal economy policies between 1995-2000, it has never fallen below the average of the EU. It is a fact that after 2000, there was a tendency to increase in terms of Hungarian public expenditure level. Since the public expenditure level is related to domestic politics, rather than EU accession or EU membership, it is not the EU conditionality but the Hungarian governments’ policies which determines public expenditure level. Therefore, the case of Hungary breaks the direct causal relation

between public expenditure cuts, and EU accession. The post-membership process was not followed by public expenditure cut policies.

The Hungarian Public Administration reform is a continuous process which is handled by each government. Modernization of public administration was meant to establish basic institutions to put a distance to the Communist past. In that sense, modernization meant transition to democracy and a liberal market economy. After 1994, but especially after 1996, modernization intertwined with Europeanization. After 1998, modernization gained the meaning of “public service development” suggesting that what was missing was the proper functioning of institutions for sake of the management of EU accession. After 2002, with the certainty of EU membership, the term modernization gained a different meaning than it used to have. Already politically democratic and economically liberal Hungary aimed for “a nationwide renewal of public administration” and the management of post-membership. Each meaning of modernization contained the previous one while going beyond it (Şener, 2009, p.246).

Specific reform comprehension includes “homework” that should be done by every candidate country that wants to join the EU.

Administrative Reform implies two different but interrelated reform processes in Hungary. While the first one is “Europeanization as institutionalization,” which is specific reform comprehension related to the management of European accession, the second one is the generic reform understanding which is related to “Europeanization as governance.” Both of processes are part of the modernization of public administration. Both Hungary and Turkey have regional development agencies, but they structured their agencies in a different way. Therefore, institutionalization gives countries discretion to set it up as they wish. Furthermore, institutionalization may exist even without any EU model. For example, the EU urges candidate countries to establish inter-ministerial coordination mechanism and an EU-related organization without specifying the details. In this context, institutionalization is a must, but it depends on the country to decide on the details and the name of these institutions.

As to generic reform, both Turkey and Hungary shared similar reform titles such as central, regional, and local levels in addition to personnel, financial management and e-government. Indeed, both in Hungary and Turkey, generic reform has been

directed mainly adjustment to the global capitalism. Basic difference was that Hungary's goal was to transform its former system to capitalism for the sake of return to Europe comprehension. However, in Turkey, capitalism has already been the case in 1980s, but main problematic was to open Turkey's closed economy to global markets. Therefore, without official conditionality of the EU, both Hungary and Turkey carried out generic reforms in 1980s and 1990s for the sake of adjusting their systems to the global capitalism. Especially after the adoption of national programs both Hungary and Turkey carried out generic and specific reforms for the sake of EU membership. Generic reform and specific reform are intertwined as in the case of Hungary. Especially reforms related to regional level and financial control are mostly carried out on the basis of EU-related organizations such as regional development agencies and internal-external audit units. The main difference between Turkey and Hungary does not lie in establishing EU-related institutions, but rather in the content of the reforms. Unlike Hungary, public expenditure cut policies have dominated the reform agenda in Turkey even before membership (Şener, 2009, pp.244-376).

Europeanization and modernization efforts overlapped just as in the case of Hungary. The Hungarian modernization in public administration began with four major attempts: The first was the reorganization of the central administration. The second was the autonomy of local governments, thus decentralization. The third point was related to civil service reforms. Hungary was the only example that introduced civil service law in the immediate post-Communist era. Finally, the government promoted the "Inter-Ministerial Committee for information Technology and the corresponding working unit within the Prime Minister's Office as early as in 1991."

In terms of employment of civil servants, Hungary is included in the countries adopting a career-based system for the majority of the civil servants (Şener, 2009, p.247). Performance related pay and a performance appraisal system were introduced via the 2001 amendment of the law on civil servants of 1992. There is no uniform system of civil service among EU countries. EU accession does not urge any candidate country to adopt a different system than it used to have to the extent that they are not in conflict with the dominant principles of the EU.

Enlargement is both a normative framework and a process whose rules were devised with the Copenhagen Summit in 1993 and the Madrid Summit in 1995 (Şener, 2009,

p.210). The European Union's norms are institutionalized within the Copenhagen criteria. This normative framework comprises political, economic and legal norms. The enlargement is the process of the adoption of this framework by candidate countries. What is expected by the enlargement is the realization of membership perspective; however, it is not a compulsory result.

Considering the Hungarian and Turkish administrative reform process and the EU accession process together, there is a strong relation between them. For Turkey after 1980 (but especially after 1994) and for Hungary after 1995, the scope of administration reform has been widened to financial management and control, regions and e-government as part of modernization (Şener, 2009, p.380). Administrative reform has been equalized to EU accession in Turkey, especially since 2001. Local government reforms are mostly absorbed by the Hungarian and Turkish governments under the existing institutions without changing the core structure. As far as regional policies are concerned, again, the core structure has not been changed, but only "patched-up." Europeanization as institutionalization is mostly related to a broader globalization perspective. For example, in Hungary, this kind of transformation has come into existence after the "peaceful revolution" of 1989. As far as Turkey is concerned, this was the outcome of 1980s economic crises.

Bearing in mind the principles included in the text of the reforms in Hungary, the existence of the principles of governance such as openness/transparency, participation, accountability, and effectiveness is clear. However, when it comes to the implementation, it may not be so. An interesting conclusion is that, the 1998-2002 period is better than 2003-2006 for Hungary. On 1 May 2004, Hungary became a full member of the EU. As far as country rank is concerned, Hungary could not reach 1998 level even in 2006, two years after full membership (Şener, 2009, pp.287-288).

Among the Central and Eastern European countries, Hungary was considered the most successful candidate country in terms of administrative capacity developmental the end of the 1990s. Once the most diligent pupil Hungary was regarded as one of the laziest pupils in the class in 2005 according to the World Bank report (Şener, 2009, p.289). The World Bank concludes that Hungary, even after full membership, is one of the worst developed countries in terms of administrative capacity. Fiscal deficit is continuing to increase, all seven new members, including Hungary, are

experiencing problems related to the absorption capacity of EU funds, it is also problematic for Hungary to have the worst rank among 8 new members with regard to doing business and corruption as a problem for business. According to the WB, the solution is a well-functioning management system, including performance management and strategic planning.

Prior to the European Commission's recommendation in October 2004 to start accession negotiations with the country, the Hungarian government had no official position on Turkish entry, solely a general policy that no country that meets the Copenhagen criteria can be denied membership. Afterwards, the government approved EU-level decisions giving Turkey a green light without any clear reservation, or in fact without any sign that the issue would (or could) be contentious for Hungary. Prime Minister Gyurcsány confirmed that Turkey could count on Hungary's support, by the occasion of the Turkish Prime Minister's May 2005 visit to Budapest (Batory, 2006, p.5).

As in the ten new member states (NMS), Hungarian public opinion was more supportive of further enlargement than the public in the EU. Considering the Euro barometer (July 2003), 66% of Hungarian respondents were in favor of this, well above the EU average at 50%, but somewhat below an average of 72% in the NMS. Hungarians were, for instance, less supportive than Poles or Slovenes (79% and 76%, respectively), but considerably more enthusiastic than the public in neighboring Austria, where less than one-third of respondents (31%) said they were in favor of further enlargement (Batory, 2006, p.3).

Just a little majority (51%) of Hungarian respondents was for Turkish accession, with 38% against and 11% undecided. This puts Hungary on par with the EU average at 52%, considerably above levels of support in the old member states (32%) and somewhat below that of the NMSs (48%). Ukraine's EU membership opposed by 40%, which are remarkably similar proportions to those expressed about Turkey, a country considerably further away from Hungary, in geographical terms, than Ukraine, and supported by 50% (Batory, 2006, p.4).

Conditionality includes elements that should be fulfilled by candidate countries to pass through the next level from accession to membership. The next level, thus membership, is not opened unless the conditions are met. Ruling governments in

Turkey preferred to fulfill EU economic criteria with IMF policies. Of these, two examples are the law of public financial management and control, and reorganization of the General Directorate of Revenues under the name of the Presidency of Revenue Administration (Şener, 2009, p.202).

It is difficult to demonstrate how knowledgeable public opinion on further enlargement and the accession of particular countries is. It is reasonable to assume that the voter is more informed about countries in Hungary's immediate geographical proximity, such as Romania, Croatia and Ukraine, in relation to which they are more possible to have personal experiences (family ties with Hungarian minorities in the neighboring countries, tourism, business contacts, etc.), than about Turkey. However, support for any of the neighboring countries' accession is also likely to have as much, or more, to do with national stereotypes, historical antagonisms, or personal commercial interests than the given country's perceived preparedness or suitability for EU membership, of which the public may not be particularly well-informed (Batory, 2006, p.4).

As regards to Turkey, even this basic information is possible to be limited. Anecdotal evidence (in the absence of suitable polling data) suggests that the public has very little information on Turkey's aspirations to join the EU, and that perceptions of whether this is desirable are accordingly far from stable.

The Hungarian government was made up of the Hungarian Socialist Party and the liberal Alliance of Free Democrats as the junior coalition partner, in office from 2002 to the end of the research period in 2005. The Socialists had a far greater weight in Parliament, and eventually influence within the coalition, than the latter, as key actors forming Hungarian EU and foreign policy also belonged to this party: the Prime Minister, the Minister for Foreign Affairs, and the Minister for European Union Affairs (Batory, 2006, p.4). The two coalition partners were strong supporters of EU membership and a policy of extending the benefits of European integration to countries of political importance to Hungary.

Handling of the management of EU affairs differentiated in Turkey and Hungary. While Hungary has chosen foreign ministry-led accession process, Turkey has chosen mixed leadership status. Unlike Turkey, Hungary had special cabinet for EU affairs.

The performance of Hungary as an EU member state presented the government as a trustworthy if somewhat passive player on the European level, one tending to rely on EU frameworks and the Europeanization of foreign policy. The apprehension was of Hungary as a medium-sized or small country, with correspondingly limited influence in the EU, at least in comparison with the ‘big players’ that were expected, and accepted, to take the lead. There was consequently a small sign, apart from a few isolated incidents, of strong governmental goals to leave a mark on the Union’s foreign policy agenda. There were some exceptions to this pattern, with regards to enlargement as a policy area. The Hungarian government had been a vocal defender of Croatia’s membership, and was also a champion of Ukraine’s European aspirations. the Hungarian government relied almost exclusively on the EU framework for the resolution of the Ukrainian electoral impasse and subsequent events culminating in the ‘Orange Revolution’ and the administration of President Viktor Yushchenko coming to power in January 2005, by contrast with Poland, which took a pro-active bilateral approach (Batory, 2006, p.5).

Turkey and Europe was an issue that seemed to have mobilized a small but vocal part of civil society that campaigns against Turkey’s membership. The Foundation for European Values was probably the most active group. Organization of the international CSO (civil society organization) coalition, formed by a small group of activists, had a website with content updated in several European languages, and launched a campaign involving a tour of several EU countries for mobilizing public support against opening accession negotiations with Turkey. The group argued that the country’s membership would ‘burst’ the EU and is therefore irresponsible, Campaigning with the general slogan ‘Be tolerant but not naïve’. At the same time, the Hungarian CSO stressed that it was not against to a ‘special partnership’ with Turkey, and that its campaign – which, according to its website, continued even after accession negotiations with Turkey were opened – was against Turkey as an EU member but not ‘Turkish people’. The group employed complicated political marketing methods and has been well-done in securing media coverage on a number of occasions, and thus influencing the public discourse perhaps more than its mere size would advise. The Foundation also had the potential to lead a wider Turkey Skeptic CSO coalition in times to come as it actively, although selectively, wanted to build contacts with like-minded organizations in Hungary. One example of such

activity was the Foundation's reliance of formal support from the Armenian Self-Government (the organization of the Armenian minority in Hungary) for a petition delivered in the name of Voice for Europe to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Until 13 July 2005, the petition was signed by 4,600 people in Hungary – a small, but not unimportant number given the limited resources at the group's disposal for engaging the voter in direct, face-to face discussions (Batory, 2006, p.6).

Other Turko-skeptic sounds are: i.e.) Movement for a Better Hungary (a small extreme-right grouping), that demanded that the foreign minister vetoes the accession of this 'Muslim Asian country' (to no avail), ii) an on-line group, 'European Women for Liberty' that claimed that the country's track record in gender equality disqualified it for EU membership, and iii) a website, 'Islam in Europe' that warned against Turkey by describing it as a so-called secular but in practice Islamic country. (Batory, 2006, p.8). To support and to reject Turkish membership many of the same facts were used by several actors in the debate.

Opponents usually discussed that Turkey was not enough democratic for EU accession. They pointed to the country's human rights record, the status of women, the Kurdish problem, and the effect of the army in the Turkish political regime. The EU's influence, on the contrary, was seen to be insufficient for counterbalancing these tendencies and keeping the Turkish government 'in line' (Batory, 2006, p.7).

Islam, in turn, was perhaps the most important – but by no means the only – factor suggesting that Turkey was culturally 'too different' from, and incompatible with, Europe. In the case of the Democratic Forum this was reinforced by the Vatican's lack of enthusiasm for Turkey's entry. The party's statement explicitly refers to Joseph Ratzinger's warning that Turkey's 'whole existence contradicts Europe' and that tying the country to 'us' – a community based on common Christian roots and cultural heritage in Europe – would be a grave mistake (Batory, 2006, p.8).

In contrast, proponents claimed that Turkey was a secular state and a working parliamentary democracy. The Free Democrats' most vocal spokesperson on the issue also argued that, irrespective of Turkey, the EU was evolving into a 'community of common political objectives', and has already ceased to be exclusively defined by a common past, cultural or religious traditions. Turkish membership therefore would not present a threat to the EU's cohesion. Turkey's

Islamic traditions would, on the other hand, represent a great opportunity for bridging the schism, accentuated by 11 September 2001, between 'Islam and the West' by signaling that the division is not between 'civilizations' but between 'good' and 'bad' regimes.

Advocates felt that, while the country did have problems in this respect, the government was genuinely committed to dealing with them and meeting the Copenhagen political criteria. They claimed that the EU's role would be partly to help anchor Turkish democracy rather than watch from the sidelines. The charm of membership was seen to be powerful enough to attract Turkey towards and through structural reforms (Batory, 2006, p.8).

In 2013, Prime Minister Erdoğan during his visit to Hungary complained about EU system. Erdoğan criticized EU about Cyprus that despite a no vote in 2004 referendum on the Annan plan, Cyprus was included in the EU. He asked how is this 'Pacta sunt servanda?' He emphasized the importance of EU accession process for Turkey. Erdoğan, addressing faculty members and students at Elte university in Budapest, stated that many countries, far behind hand with Turkey, have been taken to EU because of ideological approach and one of them is Cyprus. Erdoğan said that Turkey's EU membership would be alarming antidote to racism in Europe (Hürriyet, 2013, p.14).

A joint press conference was held between Prime Minister Erdoğan and Hungarian Prime Minister Victor Orban. Orban who praised to Erdogan said that: " Hungarian citizens should be able to go to Turkey without a visa. After Hirvatistan most tourists going to Turkey are Hungarian." Erdoğan regarding visa facilitation said that: " We gave our friends necessary instructions about this issue. We are making rapid preparations. We would like to raise barriers." In meeting an agreement also signed for the protection of the Ottoman monuments (Elibol, 2013, p.13).

Hungary, EU member, has good relations with Turkey and support Turkey's accession in the EU. Hungary is part of the Project to build the Nabucco gas pipeline, which aims to deliver gas from the Caspian basin through the Caucasus and Turkey to South- Eastern Europe (Zalewski & Piotr 2010, p.44).

Prime Minister Erdoğan gave important messages about EU during Central Europe trip. Prime Minister, showing a strong response to distraction of Turkey since 1959,

said that: “This is actually disrespect to Turkey. What could be more (Yuvacan, 2013, p.20) natural than that we voice.”

Prime minister is angry with EU but also not intend to give up the process and he said that: “ As government deviation from EU target is not possible (Çandar, 2013, p.15). At this point we are not in new searches, but we are sad.”

Although EU not specify clearly, Turkey's Muslim identity is a reason for discriminatory treatment. It is a controversial issue whether Turkey is ready to EU membership. Turkey in many areas such as; fundamental rights and freedoms, minority rights, human rights culture, and decentralization and the status of the judgment is under the EU standards.

As a consequence, there is no a single public administration model in the EU and candidate countries can follow large administrative law principles. EU has conditions that should be fulfilled by candidates. Even though candidate countries are seen voluntary, administration reforms implemented by countries does not conflict with EU. Administration reform is under the influence of both Europeanization and globalization. Each step of candidate countries is watched meticulously by EU.

As of the 1st May of 2004, in the frame of Hungary's EU membership, Customs Union was established between the two countries. After the Customs Union, with the removal of all the obstacles in front of the trade, a new period in which mutual bilateral trade relations gained a fresh acceleration and foreign trade volume increased rapidly came into the picture. In 2012, our export was 518 million dollar, our import was 1,184 billion dollar, namely our total foreign trade volume became 1,7 billion dollar.

3.3.2. Turanism in a new context

After 1944 all publications and agencies related to Turanism were forbidden in Hungary, thus the neutral scientific ripening of the Turanism was made completely impossible. Even so, allurements of Turanist bases survived not reduced during the decades of Communism amongst Hungarian immigrants abroad. After the abolition of Communist censorship Turanism spread over the country and new organizations, internet sites and conferences of Hungarian alternative prehistory scored (Csernyei, 2013, p.11). In 2005 there was a formal attempt for the confirmation of the Hun

minority of Hungary, but this attempt was rejected based on the advisement of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences.

Admittedly the most important Turanist institution after the collapse of Communism, the Hungarian Turan Coordination, has been included in putting on many international traditionalist events since 2007 not only at home but also abroad.

Following the Second World War, Hungary's involvement with the Soviet bloc, Turanism has been deleted from the ideologies of Hungary. In 1989, with the changes of regime, with the disappearance of the socialist regime it has re-emerged (Uslu, 2014, p.67).

Hungary became part of the 'Eastern Bloc' following its disappointment in the Second World War and after the entry in the 1960s of some free-market measures it was ironically referred to as the 'happiest barracks in the Socialist camp. In this case, its economic relations with China and other communist states were more dramatic than in the Western World. Although the different ways in which they have dealt with the crisis of communism at the end of the 1980s led to divergent political-economic paths, the link between Hungary and China have been emphasized(Moreh, 2013).

As the first Central European country, Hungary established diplomatic relations with South Korea in February 1989.

Chinese immigration exploded after 1989, when visa requirements were abolished. At that time, Hungary was the favorite country for Chinese migrants. Hungary pursues such an open policy by the great political transformation that one can get into almost anything over there (Moreh, 2013).

A speech delivered by Prime Minister Viktor Orbán on 5 November 2010 at the Hungarian Permanent Conference (MÁÉRT), an official meeting between the Hungarian government and leaders of Hungarian political organizations abroad. The expression used in the speech was 'eastern wind' (Moreh, 2013).

The formal visit to the Parliament of the representatives of various Asian 'tribes' took part in a "tribal meeting" (Kurultáj, in Turkic languages) in Hungary. The Kurultáj was a festival celebrating the "equestriannomadic" culture of nationalities "sharing a Hun-Turkic awareness", and calling a Turanian vision of the origin of the Hungarians (Moreh, 2013). The fact that the Deputy Speaker of the National

Assembly officially received the regulators and participants at the Parliament was seen as a formal acknowledgement of Turanism, which remains rejected by the Hungarian Academy of Sciences.

The idea of Turan has been defined in a very different views by its proponents and it is a question how widely it should be interpreted, and this can lead to disagreements as to whether Hungary should foster relations with China or rather raise its voice in support of Uyghur and Tibetan ‘relatives’. In spite of such discussion, the general detection of an ‘Eastern origin’ is thought to develop the policy of ‘eastward opening’, and it was added into governmental discourse (Moreh, 2013).

Jobbik, the most prominent structure advocating radical nationalist thoughts in Hungary, and became the third largest party in the parliament in general elections held in 2010. It was not said that Turanism thoughts had an important place in the party’s basic text of the 2007. In the program Turanism was located in the section entitled “Our history and our Resources”. It was recommended in this section to establish “Hungarian ancient history institute” (Uslu, 2014, p.68). The purpose of the institute was to support Hun-Magyar-Avar research on the basis of continuity.

Recently, it holds 45 seats in the Hungarian Parliament, and according to a survey in late July 2012, Jobbik was supported by 22 percent of likely voters, though receiving only 10 percent support in the all sample. On the other hand, the number of seats held by the party and votes that it commands does not give a correct account of the strength of the political views that Jobbik represents. In order to understand these views, the origins of the party needs to be explored in some detail (Akçalı&Korkut, 2012, p.598).

The origins of Jobbik date back to MIÉP (The Hungarian Justice and Life Party), which adjusted the volume of extreme right discourse in Hungary as a party of the populist rooted intellectual after its founding in 1993. It was established after its founder, István Csurka, was ousted from MDF, the main populist right wing party during Hungary’s transition from socialism, which is now none affected. The party had no representation in Parliament from 2002 to 2010, even though Csurka and MIÉP have been substantial elements of Hungarian politics since that time. Outside of parliamentary politics, however, extreme nationalist and far right opinions were expressed loudly, especially among some young radical intelligentsia. These radicals

established Jobbik in 1999 at Budapest's Eötvös Loránd University. Despite its roots in the intelligentsia, rather than following the elitist traditions of other ideological currents in Hungary (especially that of liberals), Jobbik concentrated on life in the countryside as its focal point. Its decentralized political style has demonstrated increasingly popular among young voters over the years (Akçalı&Korkut, 2012, pp.598-599).

To better comprehend the uniqueness of Jobbik, its recent adoption of Neo-Turanism must be examined, the revival of a historical ideology that desires for the unification of "Uralo-Altaic" race, including the Turks of Turkey, the Turkic peoples of Central Asia, Tatars, Hungarians, the aboriginal tribes of Siberia, and even the distant Mongols, Manchus, Koreans, and Japanese. In politically articulating such a narrative, the party seeks to put an end Hungary's alliance with the Euro-Atlantic community and replace it with an Eastward turn in order to make strong the country that has been, professedly, impoverished by its aspirational Westernism (Akçalı&Korkut, 2012, p.600).

It is emphasized by party officials that an Eastward turn is not mere soul-searching idealism, but has realistic foundations, as Jobbik's young leader Gábor Vona has stated: "Hungary stands hopelessly lonesome in the arena of world politics", is impotent to foster independent, significant economic and political relationships in the Western world, and is in urgent need of close and supportive alliances. At this stage, the East seen as a solution for the centuries long loneliness of Hungarians in Europe. Jobbik propagates that "Hungarians are the most westerly of the Eastern people, and if lies about their Finno-Ugrian origins were to be put aside and Hungarians were to profess that they were the descendents of Atilla, they "would suddenly find hundreds of millions ready to form a common basis for alliances". Further, Csanád Szegedi, former deputy chairman and MP of Jobbik, clearly defends leaving the European Union and establishing a new "Turanian" alliance with Central Asian states (Akçalı&Korkut, 2012, p.600).

It is necessary to specify that in the Hungary common historiography both Asian Hun and western Hun were not examined as part of the Turkish tribes. Therefore, an emphasis on Hun-Magyar continuity in Jobbik's 2007 program even if means emphasizing Hungarian Central Asian origins (and Turan origins), this continuum hypothesis does not host an assumption that Hungarians are Turk. Jobbik won his

first success in 2009 elections by taking 14, 77 percent of the vote in the European Parliament elections in Hungary. The party entered to election with a new program named in the title of 'radical change'. Though in this program a great number of references made to Turks and internal Asia compared to the previous program it was not possible to talk about any Turanist orientation. The phrase of 'Turan or Turanism' not included in any way in the program. Hungary's policies, followed last century, were criticized and it was highlighted that country's foreign policy took in the background eastern peoples, especially the peoples of Inner Asia. Inner Asia's rapprochement with the Turk peoples took an important place in the alternative foreign policy strategy, proposed by Jobbik. Rapprochement with these people, no doubt they were relatives of Hungarian, has a solid foundation depending on the positive view of these people to Hungarian and holding of this relationship an important place in the national Hungarian consciousness. Whereas Jobbik's foreign policy strategy is not limited to central Asia and rapprochement with the Middle Eastern Countries is an important part of this strategy (Uslu, 2014, p.69).

Jobbik's rapprochement with Turkey in 2010 program takes place in two ways: In one of these Turkey is counted among the countries exporting capital together with China, India, Russia, Kazakhstan and Indonesia and it is specified that establishing economic relations with these countries break Hungary's western-oriented international economic policy. As well as this in Hungarian foreign policy substances related to the program is also highlighted the need to develop bilateral relations with Turkey but the establishment of ties between Turkey and Hungary in the framework of the 'Turan' is not first-order. According to the program the importance of Turkey is due to stable diplomatic orientation and dynamic economic growth. In this context, kinship relations between Hungary and Turkey emerge as a factor in the program that not very stressed plays a role in the development of bilateral relations together with common interests. Jobbik's sending friendly messages to justice and development party on several occasions can be understood within this context. Jobbik's ideology is discussed by the authors close to the party or members of party. It is said to be four major ideologies of Jobbik. These are traditionalism, monarchism, Turanism and Hungarianism. Turanism, is thought dealing with (Uslu, 2014, pp.69-70) political, cultural and economic opportunities built on the origin of eastern Hungarian and Turan. If there is a mismatch between

the thought currents priority would be monarchism and traditionalism. Hence Jobbik's main emphasis is on the actuality of the inheritance of the kingdom of Hungary.

Jobbik is not satisfied with a conservative religious emphasis; it is working jointing with strong religious dimension of monarchical references, ethnic nationalism including non-religious motifs. Although Turanist elements appear as ethnic nationalism that feed the inputs, they are also part of the kind of the pragmatic-realist strategy. Turanism beyond being merely part of an ethnic strategy represents a part of the 'Eastward expansion' strategy (Uslu, 2014, p.70).

Jobbik's discourse and actions expressed through historical narrative are reflected in the popular culture and symbols (Uslu, 2014, p.71). However Turanist elements used commonly by Hungarian nationalist in political symbols are less than elements associated with the kingdom of Hungary.

Turanists are able to make their voices heard more widely, and the position of Turanism seems to be changing since the great political success of the extreme-right Jobbik. The chairman of the Hungarian-Turan Foundation and main organizer of the Kurultáj, the "anthropologist and human biologist" András Zsolt Bíró, has close relations with the extremist party, taking the party's "Pongrátz Gergely Cross of Merit" in January 2013, for his scientific research (Moreh, 2013).

The revival of Turanism and its apparent distribution in Hungarian political and public discourse was supported by developments in the field of genetics. The chairman of the Hungarian-Turan Foundation, András Zsolt Bíró, has researched on genetics and ethnographics with a Kazakhstani tribe called Madjars. Although the Hungarian scientific community has been aware of the existence of the Madjars and their cultural similarities with the Magyars since 1965, thorough research it could only be undertaken in 2006. The results of the genetic research have been published in 2009 in the American Journal of Physical Anthropology, and have since become the main proof for the genetic kinship between the two peoples. According to the article, Genetic distances based on haplogroup frequencies were used to compare the Madjars with 37 other populations and showed that they were closest to the Hungarian population rather than their geographical neighbors. The result of evidence is striking and suggests that there could have been genetic contact between

the ancestors of the Madjars and Magyars, and thus that modern Hungarians may trace their ancestry to Central Asia, instead of the Eastern Uralic region as previously thought (Moreh, 2013).

As well as the biological research, Bíró has also participated in the first Kurultáj, held by the Madjars in 2007 in Kazakhstan, and twenty four tribes from thirteen regions have been present at the festival. András Zsolt Bíró stated that, “almost all nations sharing a Hun and Turk consciousness have sent their representatives. The centre of spiritual unification can be Hungary” (Moreh, 2013).

In 2007 a convention was held in Kazakhstan to investigate genetic and ethnographic similarities between people of Hungary and Madyar people living in Kazakhstan. This Turanist convention in which Jobbik has shown a significant interest and participation was expanded in the following period. In 2008, 2010, 2012 festivals was organized to strengthen its ties with Turkish people living in Turkey and Caucasus and middle Asia of Hungary. Turkey Turkish, Uzbek, Azerbaijanis, Kyrgyz, Turkmen, Uyghur, Bashkir, Tatars, Balkar, Chechen, Gagauz, Bulgarian, Mongols, Chuvash, Karakalpaks, Dagestan, Buryatia, Tuva and northern Turkish Cypriots are among the invited guests (Uslu, 2014, p.71). These caucuses are considered as important steps to bring together ‘all Turan’.

The meaning and goal of “Turanism” has changed from the past until today. During the First World War, Hungarian government was looking for alliance in the East with Turkey. Turanism’s political importance was becoming symbol of wartime. While Hungary tried to solve ethnic problems, Turkey wanted to protect its territory. Firstly, Turanism appeared for ideological purposes and later it was developed by intellectual.

4.CONCLUSION

Hungary has many important roles for Turkey. The most important of these is that Europe accepts Hungary as a country from themselves, which is the most Turkish friendly country among Europeans. There are no similar countries such as Hungary in Europe. Though Bosnia, Albania, Macedonia are fellow countries of Turkey, Western countries never counted these as from themselves and will never count so. Our relationships with Hungary should be improved regarding this fact. In this context, Hungary appears to be the most important country that we can transfer our foreign policy. Hungary is the most convenient country to be a bridge between Europe and Turkey.

Another important point; today's Hungarian government is center-right government. According to our previous observations, they pay a great attention to the relations with Turkey. Country's economic instability and political stability is an important subject to be researched in terms of Turkey. In terms of foreign policy, it is needed that Hungarian capital should be drawn to Turkey and relations should be strengthened in this direction.

Studies should be done to increase the number of Hungarian students in Universities of Turkey. Identifying and unearthing historical monuments of Turks in Hungary plays an unignorable role in terms of strengthening the cultural links between two countries.

It is inevitable to listen to and solve the problems of Turks who live abroad in terms of raising the confidence. It is needed to get them realize that their motherland will always be supporting them as long as they think that they are right. More active studies should be provided in foreign missions, employing staff who knows the language, culture, social and economic aspects of the country he is in.

External affairs don't consist merely of international relations. Now, the field of international relations is being also expanded to the level of inter-communal relations, international relations contain cultural, economic, social dimensions.

Many municipalities in Turkey are in twin town relationship with Hungary's different cities. Beside cultural relations within this context, studies to improve commercial and touristic dimensions should be applied. On this subject, a plan can be prepared with Turkish municipalities.



REFERENCES

- Agoston, G.** (2003). *1453–1826 Avrupa’da Osmanlı Savaşları”, Top, Tüfek ve Süngü Yeniçağda Savaş Sanatı, 1453–1815*, İstanbul.
- Akçalı, E & Korkut, U.** (2012). Geographical Metanarratives In East-Central Europe: Neo-Turanism İn Hungary, *Eurasian Geography and Economics*, vol.53. no.5, 596-614.
- Akgündüz, A.** (1990). *Osmanlı Kanunnâmeleri ve Hukûki Tahlilleri.*, Fey Vakfı, İstanbul.
- Akgündüz, A.** (1999). *700. Yılında Bilinmeyen Osmanlı.*, Osmanlı Araştırmaları Vakfı. İstanbul
- Akyüz, K.** (2011). *Modern Türk Edebiyatının Ana Çizgileri I (1860-1923)*, 4th edn, Mas Matbaacılık, Turkey.
- Akyüz, K.** (1994). *Modern Türk Edebiyatının Ana Çizgileri I (1860-1923)*, 6th edn, İnkılap Kitabevi, İstanbul.
- Armaoğlu, F.** (1997). *19. Yüzyıl Siyasi Tarihi (1789-1914)*, TTK Basımevi, Ankara.
- Armaoğlu, F.** (1964). *Siyasi tarihi, 1789-1960*. Sevinç Matbaası. Ankara.
- Armaoğlu, F.** (n.d.). *20. Yüzyıl siyasi tarihi, (1914-1995)*. 14th edn. Alkım Yayınevi. Ankara.
- Atatürk’ün Söylev ve Demeçleri I-III.** (1997), Atatürk Araştırma Merkezi, Ankara.
- Atatürk Kültür, Dil Ve Tarih Yüksek Kurumu.** (2006). *Atatürk’ün Söylev ve Demeçleri, 1-III (Açıklamalı Dizin İle)*, Atatürk Araştırma Merkezi, Divan Yayıncılık Ltd. Şti. Ankara.
- Atıl, E.** (1986). *Süleymannâme, The Illustrated History of Süleyman the Magnificent*, National Gallery of Art, New York.
- Batory, A.** (2006). *The European Future Of Turkey and Ukraine: The Policy Debate In Hungary*, Policy Research Repots, Center For Policy Studies, Budapest, Hungary.
- Baysun, C.** (1979). *Belgrad, İA, C. II.*, İstanbul, 475-485.
- Busbecq, O.G.**(1950). *Türkiye’yi Böyle Gördüm*, Trans. Zeynep Kurutluoğlu, Tercüman 1001 Temel Eser, No: 29.
- Celâl-zâde M.** (1937). *Tabakat’ül-Memâlik ve Derecât’ül-Mesâlik*, Pub. Emk. Binb. Sadettin Tokdemir, İstanbul Askeri Matbaa, İstanbul.
- Çandar, C** (6.2.2013), Brüksel Şanghay Sarkacında Erdoğan, *Hürriyet Newspaper*,15
- Çerçi & Faris** (2000). *Gelibolulu Mustafa Ali ve Kühü’l-ahbar’ında II. Selim, III. Murat ve III.Mehmet devirleri.*, Erciyes Üniversitesi. *Kayseri*.

- Çolak, M.** (2009). '*Türk-Macar İlişkileri ve Macaristan'ın Türk İnkılabına Bakışı (1919-1938)*', in Göncü (ed.), *TürkMacar Tarihi İlişkilerinden Kesitler = Fejezetek A Török - Magyar Kapcsolatok Történetéből*, TBMM Milli Saraylar Daire Başkanlığı, İstanbul, 27-44.
- Demirkan, T.** (2000). *Macar Turancıları*, Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, İstanbul.
- Düstür II. Tertip kılavuzu Osmanlı devlet mevzuatı.** (2006), Cilt:3, Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, İstanbul.
- Eckhart, F.** (1949). *Macaristan Tarihi*, Trans. İbrahim Kafesoğlu, Türk Tarih Kurumu, Ankara.
- Eckhart, F.** (2011). *Macaristan Tarihi*, Türk Tarih Kurumu, Ankara.
- Elibol, N.** (6.2.2013). Budapeşte, *Türkiye Newspaper*,13
- Erkun, FV.** (1999). *Budapeşte'den Ankara'ya*, Birinci Basım., Türk-Macar Dostluk Derneği Yayınları:2.
- Gombrich, EH.** (1997). *Genç Okurlar İçin Kısa Bir Dünya Tarihi*, Trans. Prof Dr. Ahmet Mumcu, İnkılap Yayınevi, İstanbul.
- Gökbilgin, MT.** (1976). *Rakoczi, Ferenc ve Osmanlı Devleti Himayesinde Macar Mültecileri"*, *Türk Macar Kültür Münasebetleri Işığında II. Rakoczi, Ferenc ve Macar Mültecileri Sempozyumu (31 May-3 June 1976)*, İstanbul Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi, İstanbul.
- Gökbilgin, T.** (1956). Rüstem Pasa ve Hakkındaki İthamlar, *Tarih Dergisi*, No: 11/12, İstanbul.
- Gökbilgin, T.** (1992). *Kanuni Sultan Süleyman.*, M.E.B., İstanbul.
- Gökbilgin, T.** (2001). Kanuni Sultan Süleyman'ın Macaristan ve Avrupa Siyasetinin Sebep ve Âmilleri, Geçirdiği Safhalar, *Kanuni Armağanı*, 2nd edn, Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları, Ankara, 5-40.
- Hammer, JV.** (n.d.). *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu Tarihi*, Söğüt Yayınları, İstanbul.
- Herold, RM.** (1993). *Türk Viyana*, Trans. Müjdat Kayayerli, Esra Yayınları, No: 48 Konya.
- Horvath, B.** (2007). *Anadolu 1913*, Trans. Tarık Demirkan. Türkiye Ekonomik ve Toplumsal Tarih Vakfı Yurt Pub,36., 3th edn. İstanbul.
- Hürriyet Newspaper.** (6.2. 2013). *AB'ye Sitem: Bu Nasıl Ahde Vefa*, 14
- István, B.** (1988). *Bethlen István Emlékirata 1944*, Zrínyi Kiadó, Budapest.
- İnalçık, H.** (2003). *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu Klasik Çağ (1300-1600)*, Trans. Ruşen Sezer, Yapı Kredi Pub. İstanbul.
- İpçioğlu, M.** (1989). 'Kanuni Sultan Süleyman'ın Estergon Seferi', Selçuk University Institute of Social Sciences, Unpublished Master Thesis, Konya.
- Kaldy-Nagy, G.** (1971). *Kanuni Devri Budin Tahrir Defteri*, Ankara Üniversitesi Dil ve Tarih-Coğrafya Fakültesi Pub., Ankara.
- Kessler, JA.** (1967). 'Turanism and Pan-Turanism in Hungary: 1890-1945', Ph.D.Dissertation, University of California, Berkeley.

- Macaristan'da Yahudi Aleyhtarı Tezahürat.** (26.11.1938). *Tan Newspaper*, pp.5.
- Macaristan'da Yahudi Meselesi.** (20.11.1938). *Tan Newspaper*, 9.
- Moreh, C.** (2013). *The Asianization Of National Fantasies In The West. A View From Central Europe, Where Is Home? Place, Belonging and Citizenship In The Asian Century*, Hong Kong Baptist University.
- Müftüoğlu, AH.** (1987). *Gönül Hanım*, Fethi Tevetoğlu, Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Pub.: 742, 1000 Temel Eser Dizisi: 62, Sevinç Matbaası, Vol.2, Ankara.
- Namal, Y.** (2009). *Türk- Macar İlişkileri*, İskenderiye Yayınları, İstanbul.
- Oba, AE.** (1995). *Türk Milliyetçiliğinin Doğuşu*, 1st edn, İmge Kitabevi Yayınları.
- Okay, Y.** (2012). *Macar-Türk ilişkileri üzerine makaleler : Macar Kardeşler*, Doğu Kitabevi, İstanbul.
- Önen, N.** (2005). *İki Turan, Macaristan ve Türkiye'de Turancılık*, İletişim Yayınları, Vol.: 1, İstanbul.
- Özgiray, A.** (1997). 'Türkiye Macaristan Siyasî İlişkileri (1923-1938)', *Tarih İncelemeleri Dergisi*, Vol: XII, 75-80.
- Özguven, B.** (2001). *Osmanlı Macaristan'ında Kentler ve Kaleler*, Ege Yayınları, İstanbul.
- Öztuna, Y.** (1983). *Başlangıcından Zamanımıza Kadar Büyük Türkiye Tarihi*, Ötüken, İstanbul.
- Peçevi İE.** (1992). *Tarih*, Bekir Sıtkı Baykal, Kültür Bakanlığı Yayınları, vol.1, Mersin.
- Perjes, G.** (1988). *Mohaç Meydan Muharebesi*, Trans. Serif Bastav, Türk Tarih Kurumu, Ankara.
- Rasonyi, L.** (1983). *Türk Devletinin Batıdaki Varisleri ve İlk Müslüman Türkler*, Trans. Ş. K. Seferoğlu, Adnan Müderrisoğlu, Türk Kültürünü Araştırma Enstitüsü Yayınları
- Sonyel, SR.** (1995). *Kurtuluş Savaşı Günlerinde İngiliz İstihbarat Servisinin Eylemleri*. Ankara.
- Şener, HE.** (2009). *Macaristan ve Türkiye'nin AB'ye Uyum Süreci*, Ankara.
- Trelat, VB.** (1976). *Budapeşte'de Komünistlerin Duvar Dibi İdamları*, Trans. Firuzan Tekil, Göktürk Yayınları.
- Uslu, A.** (2014). *Macaristanda Milliyetçilik ve Turancılık: Jobbik Örneği*, '21. Yüzyıl', vol. 62, 67-72
- Uzunçarşılı, İH.** (1988). *Osmanlı Tarihi*, Cilt: II, Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları, Ankara.
- Von Kral, AR.** (1938). *Kemal Atatürk's land the evolution of modern Turkey*, Trans. Kenneth Benton, Leipzig.
- Yurdaydın, HG.** (1961). *Kanuni'nin Cülusu ve İlk Seferleri*, Ankara Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Yayınları, Ankara.
- Yusufoğlu, H.** (2006). 'Tarihten Günümüze Türk-Macar İlişkileri', *2023 Dergisi*, vol. 59, 14-24.

- Yusufođlu, H.** (1995). '*Osmanlı-Macar ilişkileri : başlangıçtan Ankara Savaşı'na kadar*', Türk-Macar Dostluk Derneđi, Sam Yayınları, Ankara.
- Yuvacan, IT.** (2.6.2013). 'Budapeşte', *Vatan Newspaper*, 20

INTERNET RESOURCES:

- Csrneyi, T.** (2013). Hungarian Turanism, *Tehlikedeki Diller Dergisi*, viewed: 20 October 2014, address: <http://tehlikedekidiller.com/dergi/index.php/TDD/article/viewFile/187/114>>
- Çolak, M.** (2000). *Atatürk Döneminde kültürel, siyasi ve ekonomik bakımdan Türk-Macar ilişkileri*, Muđla Üniversitesi SBE Dergisi, viewed: 10 October 2014, address: <http://sbed.mu.edu.tr/index.php/asd/article/view/39/44>
- Çolak, M.** (2005). *Macaristan'da Revizyonizm ve Balkan Paktı Çerçevesinde Türkiye-Macaristan İlişkileri (1923-1939)*, Yakın Dönem Türkiye Araştırmaları, İstanbul Üniversitesi Atatürk İlkeleri ve İnkılap Tarihi Enstitüsü Dergisi, viewed: 15 October 2014, address: <http://www.journals.istanbul.edu.tr/iuydta/article/view/1023018895/1023018047>
- Çolak, M.** (2010). *Atatürk, Macarlar ve Türk Tarih Tezi*, Selçuk Üniversitesi Türkiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi, viewed: 15 October 2014. address: http://turkoloji.cu.edu.tr/kaynaklar_dizini/selcuk_turkiyat_list.php
- Demiređen, AK.** (2006). *Osmanlı- Avusturya Anlaşmazlığı Ve Sigetvar Seferi*, Eyüp, viewed: 2 February 2014, address: <http://www.os-ar.com/tezler/sigetvar.pdf> >
- Grammont, JLB.** (1985). Kanuni Sultan Süleyman'ın I. François'ya İki Mektubu, Trans: Refet Yinanç, *Tarih Araştırmaları Dergisi*, İstanbul, 51-52, address: <http://dergiler.ankara.edu.tr/dergiler/18/18/30.pdf>
- Ođuz, A.** (2005). *The Interplay Between Turkish and Hungarian Nationalism: Ottoman Pan-Turkism and Hungarian Turanism (1890-1918)*, address: <http://etd.lib.metu.edu.tr/upload/12606629/index.pdf>
- Zalewski, P & Balcer, A.** (2010). *Turkey and the "New Europe": A Bridge Waiting to be Built*, viewed: 15 October 2014, address: http://www.demoseuropa.eu/files/insight_turkey_2010_1_adam_balcer_piotr_zalewski.pdf

RESUME



Name Surname: Asya Altan

Place and Date of Birth: Tuzluca-1984

E-Mail: asyaaltan_01@hotmail.com

EDUCATION:

- Bachelor: 2010, Yeditepe University, Political Science and International Relations, Public Management