

LÁSZLÓ BOTOS

A GLIMPSE INTO HUNGARIAN HISTORY – Part I.

Necessary to gain a complete picture of the Sad History of the Magyars

“The duty of historical science is to represent the facts faithfully. It is now time to fit the pieces of the puzzle together to present a complete picture. Independent researchers are beginning to present unbiased research, which is slowly taking the place of the theories put forward by oppressive regimes. In the present day, the natural sciences, including genetics, micro-biology, zoology and geo-botany, begin to take on a larger role in establishing the origins of peoples and their routes of migration. In natural science, objectivity remains realistic and increasing numbers of foreign scientists (i.e. outside Hungary) have come to the conclusion that historical research which wishes to have knowledge of the past has begun to supersede that “history-writing” which intends to cover up or erase the past. In the light of this philosophy, the results of the most recent research in natural science seem to prove that the Hungarian people are the most ancient people in Europe. A group of seventeen researchers, in a recent edition of the Science Magazine, stated that the Hungarian presence in the Carpathian Basin dates back 40,000 years (Semino et al. 2000. István Mihály Szabó, 2003) The proofs of metallurgy were presented by John Dayton, in 1978. (Bizánczi 1999) Then there are the results of the research of the history of writing-systems. (Csaba Varga, Jel, Jel, Jel. 2001, Az Ősi írás könyve, 2002 The Secret of the Ancient Script) All these facts could be decisive proofs of the Hun-Magyar relationship and the knowledge of these facts cannot be withheld for much longer. All these observations put the person of Attila and his deeds into a new light. They clarify the motivation behind Attila’s actions and the true significance of Attila, himself.”^[1]

By way of introduction, I wish to bring to the attention of the reader two important misconceptions or falsifications about the Magyars. They are consistently called “barbarian” and “pagan”, even by well-established historians. First I would like to mention the term “barbarian” as applied to the Magyars and other equestrian peoples. The taming of the horse and its use in the service of Man was an important milestone in the history of mankind. Every ancient civilization was established on the banks of a river, so that the people might use the current for transportation, trade and many other reasons. The present-day historical science forgets or, I might freely state, purposefully fails to mention, that the taming of the horse was the greatest achievement in the progress of Mankind, which made possible the population of the inland territories. Without this achievement, the development of Mankind would never have been able to progress to the present level. Who were the first to recognize the significance of the horse in making the life of man easier? This is impossible to state with total accuracy. We do not know because this happened so far back in the past. What we do know with certainty is that the first equestrian people were Turanian or Magyar people.

Dr. Viktor Padányi and Dr. Gyula Szilvay both independently stated that the first people to use the horse and carriage appeared in the first century of the second millennium before Christ and the cuneiform signs call them Kassu. Hammurabi, the Semitic ruler of Akkad, imported horse-drawn chariots from the people of Kassu and defeated the ruler of Larsa. Hammurabi boasted about the large number of horse-drawn chariots in his possession. This is a proof that the use of horse-drawn chariots in war was a privilege and gave him superiority in war. This superiority was only attainable for the richest rulers. In the end the Kassites defeated Hammurabi and took over the rule of Babylon and Asia Minor. The Kassites ruled the ancient cities and the territory between the Tigris and Euphrates for more than five-hundred years. Their capital was on the shore of the Zab river and its name, Assur, in Sumerian meant “city of horses”.

In the nineteenth century, the Indo-European historians were unable to classify the ancient Kassite people as either Semitic or Indo-European.

Dr. Gyula Szilvay writes: *“Until the middle of the second millennium B.C. nowhere in the world, other than in Sumer, was horse-breeding and horse-riding practiced – not in Egypt, India, China, the Mediterranean Basin or, in the later Stone Ages, in the Aryan territories of Europe. Horse-breeding and equestrianism was a major epochal development for the people of ancient times. So the people whom we can thank for this development should not be assigned the label of “barbarian” low-ranking workmen or coachmen. If they are so called, I have no further comment.”*^[2] I agree with Dr. Szilvay that this would be absurd. In Europe the use of the horse and carriage was introduced by the Huns and Avars and became widespread with the arrival of the Magyars. This is why the Age of Chivalry was in its prime between the eleventh and fourteenth centuries.

It is not accidental that the use of the horse and carriage was spread throughout Europe by the Magyars. The West adopted this means of transportation, together with its Hungarian name, “kocsi”. In German the carriage is “Kutsche”, in French “coche”, in English “coach” and in Italian “coccio”.^[3] Therefore, the use of the word “barbarian” in its present meaning, applied to the Magyars, is totally incorrect. “Barbarian” indicates ignorance and a lack of knowledge. It is almost unbelievable that this expression is still constantly used by knowledgeable historians to denigrate the Magyars. Its original meaning was “outsider” or “someone living outside one Empire or another.”

The second derogatory adjective describing the Magyars is “pagan” and it is still used to denigrate them. This word is the greatest falsification, which the biased historians and the Roman Catholic Church like to use to describe the Magyars. Dr. Ferenc Badiny-Jós presents the best proofs that the Magyars were not “pagan”, in his article *“The Godly Conquerors”* (Az Istenes Honfoglalok)^[4].

In the introduction, I quoted Endre and Attila Grandpierre: *“All these observations put the person of Attila and his deeds into a new light. They clarify the motivation behind Attila’s actions and the true significance of Attila, himself.”*

I intend to describe the greatness of Attila, who he was and what he accomplished, how his goals and actions were motivated by his religious beliefs. The Roman Empire was the real “pagan” and from the point of view of the “pagan” Rome, Attila was “barbarian” because he lived outside the Empire.

Attila, in the periods he spent in the Roman Empire as a hostage, learned all about the government of the Empire, which was sinful and exploited the people. It intended to conquer every nation and caused enormous harm and pain to the people. All the people it conquered became slaves. Attila saw their suffering and he learned the Roman laws which did not even give hope for the conquered peoples that their suffering would be alleviated. He compared this merciless inhumane system with the just Scythian-Hun laws, which allowed every man to be free, and even the conquered peoples lived under their own kings and their own laws, if they accepted that they had to pay homage to the Scythian-Huns. In this way, many nations declared themselves to be Huns, for example the Goths. This huge difference between the idea of State of the two World Powers was Attila’s motivation for the wars against the Romans. This is why he became known among nations as the Sword of God (Isten ostora) to punish Rome for its sins.

Attila was assassinated by his bride, Brunhilda, by forcing a knitting needle up his nose into his brain, causing instant death. To cover up this murder, the lie was circulated that Attila was blind-drunk on his wedding-night and that he suffered a nose-bleed and choked to death. This devious lie is simply laughable because, on the wedding night, nobody becomes dead-drunk. This is especially unlikely to happen to Attila, whom contemporary writers describe as moderate in dressing, drinking and eating.

This assassination must have been well-planned by the Goths (Germans). If this were not so, then Onegesius, who was second-in-command after Atilla, immediately after getting the news of Atilla's death, would not have become one of the Huns' most-hated enemies. He immediately made a volte-face and became the leader of the Goth insurrection which attacked the Huns who were still celebrating the wedding of Atilla. The Goths defeated the Huns and took away their power. It is notable that Onegesius was not a Hun, but judged by his behavior, he could have been a Goth or a Goth sympathizer.

Most recently, Wess Roberts, writing of Atilla says: "*Atilla was less savage than the Romans, who cast thousands of Christians to wild animals for mere entertainment. In comparison, he was less cruel than Ivan the Terrible, Cortes or Pizarro.*" He goes on to say: "*In his sparing of Rome, he showed more mercy than did Denserich, Belizar, the Norsemen, the Germans and the Spanish mercenaries who all pillaged it without regard.*"^[5]

Again, Roberts says: "*Atilla's legacy is generally unfamiliar to us in the Western World. We are naïve about his historical importance as a genius civilizer, his open-mindedness and richness of views, in all of which he far exceeded Alexander the Great or Caesar.*"^[6]

The physical description of the Huns, as sub-human monsters, found in the writings of Ammianus and Jordanes, reflects their intense hatred of their enemies. The Germans and Italians, enemies of the Magyars, called them "a monstrous nation, a horrid tribe, a tribe more cruel than a wild beast." In the Chinese Annals, the Huns are described as tall, with light brown hair, suntanned skin and large noses. Of course, this is from the standpoint of another culture. Otto of Friesing called the Magyars "monsters" but Gardisi, a disinterested observer, called the Magyars "handsome and pleasant-looking."^[7]

György Zászlos-Zsóka states that Atilla never annihilated a nation entirely as did the Romans when they overcame the Carthaginians and the Etruscans.^[8] Atilla listened to the pleas of Saint Genevieve and spared Paris. He spared Rome at the pleading of Pope Leo.

Wess Roberts writes of the Huns: "*Their guilelessness and naïve faith in human goodness frequently caused them to fall prey to the intricacies of more skilled practitioners of diplomacy.*"^[9] The Magyars inherited this same characteristic. The Germans, however, lacked this sensitivity and were more practiced in cunning and diplomacy. This naïveté was reflected in Atilla's action in appointing the foreigner, Onegesius, to a position of trust.

Now let us examine the Scythian-Hun and later Hungarian laws which were initiated by Atilla to try to change the Roman mentality of that era. The Scythian-Hun-Magyar laws were always designed to act in the interest of the nation and the people, and they were always legislated by the National Assembly. Nobody had the power to change the law once the National Assembly had passed it. It was a capital crime for someone not to take part in the negotiations on a matter of public interest and it was regarded as treason. Every single Hungarian, able to bear arms, had the duty of taking part in the National Assembly. The Scythian-Magyars lived according to the Scythian laws. If anyone doubts that the Scythians were Huns, I suggest that they read the writings of Priscos Rhetor, who called Atilla "*the ruler of the Scythians*".

In the following segment I will present information from the studies of Endre Grandpierre, without actual quotations and in some parts I will add information from other researchers. (B.L.)^[10]

The ancient National Assembly was in fact an assembly of the whole nation and was held in the open air. It was a true representation of the nation. This is where the whole nation came together to make decisions about its own fate. They discussed all matters concerning the national interest and in case of necessity, they even made judgments.

1. The leader, the chief justice and the judges of the land were all answerable to the National Assembly.
2. Everyone in a position of leadership, every public servant received his authority from the National Assembly.
3. The National Assembly – as Kézai^[11] informs us – could even nullify the decision of the chief-justice, if they considered it to be an erroneous decision.
4. The chief-leader or rather, the Council of Leaders, in the case of war, was regarded as the nation's Defense Ministry – and, in the case of war, made life-death decisions, but this power could not be in conflict with the freedom of the people or against the national interest.
5. At the National Assembly the most senior person of a village represented the village, and so even the smallest village was represented.
6. Every single person was able to take part in the discussion of public business and state business, in the government of the state. Everyone was obliged to take part in the National Assembly.

According to historians, the county system was established by Saint István. However, the disintegration of the county system began when he outfitted the ancient Hungarian castles, which up to his time were invincible, with foreign armies. Where it was possible, instead of castles, he had shrines and monasteries built. The ancient defense system of the Avars, the castles, around which the counties were formed, started to disintegrate during the reign of Saint István and continued until the time of Maria Teresa.

The Law which allowed the leaders to be relieved of office.

According to the ancient beliefs, a public office was not a prerogative which could be inherited, but was a public service in the interest of the people. Therefore the people had the right to relieve of office anyone who did not perform his public duties wholeheartedly, or who became too comfortable and neglected his job. The people demanded that he do the job he was expected to do. Any government that does not conform to these standards makes a mockery of the ancient customs.

It is gross ignorance to state that the law, which allowed the people to relieve public servants of their office, was brought into effect during the feudal system. We have to note that it was just under the feudal system that this ancient custom ceased to exist.

So we can see that this law and others like it were milestones in ancient statehood. The disappearance of these laws is a denial of the idea of representation of the people because, without them, those who sit in a position of power can take advantage of the power in their hands, which they received by unknown means. Without these laws, they cannot be removed from their positions, even if the state collapses around them. The law which provided for the removal of untrustworthy or corrupt public servants was the basic prerogative of the people in the Scythian-Hun society.

According to the Scythian-Hun laws, every public servant, from the lowest to the highest, could be directly elected by the will of the people. Every public servant, from the highest to the lowest, from the ruler to lowest functionary could be recalled if the public willed it, if his decisions were not in the interest of the people, his behavior was questionable, he made mistakes or showed partiality.

The ancient law stated that only a person, whose conduct was exemplary, who could prove that he worked in the interest of the people, and that he deserved the position, should be elected to public service.

The basic demands placed on those who wish to represent the people.

Public servants should be better than others, more honorable and show example in service and honesty. Public service demands honesty and moral integrity. It is obvious that it is not the people or the nations which should serve the leaders, but the leaders who should serve the people. Whoever

disagrees with this, or who breaks this trust, should no longer be a leader. He should no longer hold public office.

The leader who misleads the people, who tricks them, and intends to silence the voice of the people, should be brought before a judge.

The ancient rights.

1. The right of the sovereignty of the people
2. The right to public liberties
3. The right to take part in public matters
4. The right to learn the truth and speak the truth
5. The right to belong to a nation and the right to belong to a commonwealth
6. The right to a national identity
7. The right to belong to a national community and to know how the community lives
8. The right to learn about the history of the nation
9. The right to education
10. The right to defend oneself, his community and his freedom

The National Public Liberty in Hungary at the time of Anonymus (Twelfth century)

What kind of thoughts could the notes of Anonymus have hidden? *“If we listen to the false stories of the peasants or the songs of the bards, relating the heroic deeds of the noble Hungarian nation, at the beginning of its origin, as if we hear them in a dream, they are not pretty or proper things.”* (The Roman Catholic Church did not believe in the ancient heritage of the Magyars and this is why they called it “false”.) It is exciting that we can learn of the pre-history of the Hungarians from the stories and songs of the peasants of the time of Anonymus. These and other similar observations of Anonymus, are of great importance for us to learn about the ancient history and origin of the Hungarians. Anonymus, in the above quotation, unknowingly reveals that the Hungarian peasantry, at that time, was pure Hungarian. We know this because Anonymus simply calls them peasants and does not specify any particular ethnicity. This means that this peasantry valued the ancient Hungarian heritage and protected it.

THE PEASANTS SPEAK OF THE SCYTHIAN ORIGIN OF THE MAGYARS

- THE PEASANTS SPEAK OF MÉNRÓT (NIMROD).
- THE PEASANTS SPEAK OF HUNOR AND MAGOR.
- THE PEASANTS SPEAK OF THE ENCHANTED STAG.
- THE PEASANTS SPEAK OF THE LEGEND OF THE WHITE HORSE.
- THE PEASANTS SPEAK OF LEL AND BULCSU.
- THE PEASANTS SPEAK OF BOTOND WITH A CLUB (MACE).

All these points prove that the peasantry of the Carpathian Basin was purely Hungarian and autochthonous. They also prove that in Hungary, in the tenth century, before Christianity was forced upon the nation, there existed a government by the people (democracy) which at that time was unknown in Europe. The surrounding countries simply did not understand the system of government by the people. Here we should mention the confusion between “the first Hungarian King” and “the first Magyar Prince”. Our historians talk of Saint István as “the first Hungarian King”.

“The Turks (Magyars) were made up of seven tribes.” writes Constantine Porphyrogenitus, *“They were never ruled by their own king or any other king, but there were “Vajdas” among them.”* (*Vajda was voivode*) Other sources also state that they had no leaders: *“They lived without a king or a prince.”* Some historians are unable to place Gordias, Mauger, Álmos or the ancient Scythian kings. This is a puzzle that they cannot solve. They ask how it was possible to live without a ruler. Who understands this? If they had rulers, how could the people govern? For the western nations, the notion of public liberty or people’s rule, a philosophy by which the ancestors of the Hungarians lived, was very difficult to understand. At the same time, undeniable data exists that the Magyars had kings and princes. How can these two contradictory views be reconciled? Sovereignty and public liberty? King and people’s power?

The Right of the Sovereignty of the People and the Law of National Public Power

The Right of the Sovereignty of the People is the most ancient right of the Hungarian people’s freedom. This is none other than the people’s freedom to have unlimited power and freedom over itself, which means that there is no power to place an obstacle on the freedom of the people to exist.

The Western peoples rose from the slavery of Rome and established the feudal system which was semi-slavery. The Hungarians experienced the exact opposite. From freedom, they sank into the semi-slavery of feudalism. We must keep this in mind, so that we can understand the frantic freedom fights of the Magyars in the tenth and the thirteenth centuries and their subsequent fate.

The differences between the two societies, Western and Eastern made it necessary for the Western feudalistic states to conquer Hungary by any possible means, before the Hungarian idea of the right of the sovereignty of the people could spread to the West, where the people were in semi-slavery. The feudal lords could not allow this to happen because they feared that they would lose their own power.

Since they were unable to achieve this by military means, because at the Battle of Pozsony, the Magyars had defeated the united armies of Europe, there was only one possibility – to convert the Magyars to Western Christianity through foreign intervention. At that time, to accept the supremacy of the Pope was to lose one’s independence. In spite of the all-out efforts of the Germans, it was not possible to accomplish this completely, because there were some strong Hungarian kings like Saint László, King Kálmán the Booklover and King Lajos the Great, who prevented it.

The Enforcement of the People’s Representation in the Self-government of Society

Every nation’s ancient right is to govern itself. It has to make sure that the will of the people is enforced by the representatives. The evasion of the right of the sovereignty of the people is a grave failure on the part of the government which, if the government tolerates it, is false representation.

The People’s Right to Justice is an ancient Right

This is an inalienable right for every human being and every nation. This includes the freedom to speak the truth, the protection of justice and the application of justice. Justice and Truth are of equal strength and not, as the enemies state, relative, accidental or dependent on the opinion of the individual.

Whoever opposes the truth, or who suppresses the freedom to speak the truth, opposes God Himself. He betrays his fellow man. This is the worst offense against freedom of speech and opinion. Only the truth can stand against the sinful groups which are trying to suppress the freedom of speech and opinion. If the people are defenseless then the nation is defenseless. The disclosure of sins and sinful tendencies is essential if we are to speak the truth.

Secrets hidden in the Hungarian Chronicles of the Middle Ages

All the Hungarian Chronicles state: "*Atilla carried on his shield the emblem of a bird with a crown on its head. The Hungarian village regiments carried this shield into war for as long as the communities governed themselves, up to the time of Prince Géza, the son of Taksony.*"

What does this statement hide? Why did they give up this custom in the time of Prince Géza? Here the continuity is broken. The Chronicles indicate that there was some kind of a breach in the life of the nation, a secret breach which was not talked about, not even by historians. Yet it is the nation's interest to find out about it, otherwise it will destroy our national identity. Let us try to find out what secrets are hidden in the Chronicles.

1. The law which gave the opportunity to relieve public servants of their office, from the lowest to the highest, was lost. One of the most important rights, the right of the sovereignty of the people, which kept the nation's leaders subservient to the people's power, disappeared. Since this happened, the right of the people to supervise what their representatives were doing, also disappeared.
2. Under the government pressure, the National Assembly no longer continued to be called to meet.
3. The victorious Hungarian campaigns abroad, in the first third of the tenth century were abandoned.
4. The armies of the Hungarian Kingdom no longer carried Atilla's emblem of the Turul Bird on their shield or on their flags.
5. There was a final break. The highest power, the king, turned against the people. So the people, in their own home, lost their rights and became defenseless.
6. Under secret historical circumstances, unknown powers overthrew the ancient right of sovereignty of the Hungarian people.
7. This means that hostile powers took over the rule of the Hungarian people.

How could this have happened?

The Hungarian poet, Kölcsey, could not have known that this was the real reason for the downfall of the nation, when he wrote in his poem:

*"Nemzeti nagylétiünk
Nagytemetője Mohács."*

"The cemetery of our nation's greatness is Mohács". (Mohács was where the Turks defeated the Hungarian, in 1526.)

This tragedy of Mohács was just a consequence of Géza's divisive policy which set the king against the people. At Quedlinburg, the Hungarians gave up all national security.

András Zakar and Endre K. Grandpierre explain what caused the sudden fall of the Magyars at the beginning of the tenth century.^[12] German history teaches that the Battle of Lechfeld in A.D. 955 was the final victory of the West over the Magyars, that after the battle the Magyars were forced to turn to a peaceful life and that they begged to receive the Christian religion. German historians write that the Germans forgave the Hungarian atrocities and sent Christian missionaries to convert the Magyars to the only true religion. They insist that, after the Battle of Lechfeld, the Magyars lost all their power. They were so weak that they could not even retaliate. This version has been taught throughout the world.

This is not true. The Magyar retaliation after the Battle of Lechfeld was three times as devastating as their defeat at Lechfeld. In their warring campaigns, the Magyars always deployed three separate armies. Two were always on the offensive and the third was the defending army. Historians, writing about the Battle of Lechfeld, for some reason do not mention the third Magyar army. They only mention the armies of Bulcsu and Lehel, yet Anonymus, in two complete chapters, clearly describes the role of the third army under the leadership of Botond. Botond fulfilled his duty with great success. It is true that he was unable to intervene in time to save his comrades but afterwards he took a severe revenge. Anonymus states: "The remaining Magyar warriors, when they saw their comrades fall into a difficult situation because of the cunning of their enemies, bravely and heroically stayed at their posts. They did not abandon each other but did all in their power to help those who were in trouble. Like injured lions, they ran shouting between the weapons and they put down the enemy with horrifying killings. Although, the armies of Bulcsu and Lehel were defeated, the Magyars of Botond ran down those who had defeated Bulcsu and Lehel and killed them all in a horrifying manner." "The larger part of the German army which was headed towards the river Rhine, was followed by Botond's army. When the Magyar army caught up with them on the plains, the Germans closed ranks like a swarm of bees because the Magyars, with their arrows would not allow them either to retreat or to advance. The Germans, frightened to death, surrendered to the Magyars. When the Magyars captured them, they decapitated them all."

They killed them in revenge for their comrades who were killed by the Germans. The German soldiers and the standard-bearers numbered eight thousand.^[13] That was not enough. Under the leadership of Botond, they devastated the German states. The Hungarian chronicler, Simon Kézai, states "... they crossed the river Danube at Ulm and when they reached the Monastery at Fulda, they took enormous treasures and destroyed the entire Schwabenland. At the city of Worms, they crossed the river Rhine. There they met two armies, the armies of the Prince of Lotharingia and the Prince of the Schwabs. After defeating and routing these armies, the Magyars entered the land of France and made enormous destruction among the Christians and the monks. From here, they went to the river Rhône as far as Raguza. They destroyed two cities, Susa and Turin and opened the route to Italy. When they came to the flatlands of Lotharingia, they crossed them on horseback at a fast speed and took large booty with them. After this, they returned home." ^[14] The Magyars still could not overcome the loss of the battle of Lechfeld. It was not that losing a battle caused them great distress, but the reason that they were so upset was that Lehel and Bulcsu were hanged. This was not a fitting execution for courageous soldiers. "Prince Zolta and his men were extremely upset by the dishonorable execution of Lehel and Bulcsu and the other Magyar soldiers and they became real enemies of the Germans. Prince Zolta and his knights, because of the offense caused by the enemy, wanted to take revenge and they did not make a secret of the methods they wanted to use in revenge."^[15]

The Hungarian Prince Zolta organized a second revenge after the Hungarian defeat at Lechfeld. "Prince Zolta, fired with anger and supported financially by some Germans who asked his help, and because he was so upset by the death of Lehel and Bulcsu, sent a huge army against King Otto. He named Botond the captain of one army, Szabolcs as captain of the second army and Orkony as captain of the third."^[16] This is another example of the Magyar custom of always sending three armies to a campaign.

It is obvious that the Magyars were still a formidable enemy after their defeat at Lechfeld but, shortly after that, their power began to decline. If it was not the Lechfeld defeat which caused their decline, what caused them to lose their power? Unfortunately there are no written documents to give us this information. If there were a secret conspiracy in the West to annihilate the Magyars, there would obviously be no record of it, so we would look for it in vain. If there had been any mention made of it by Magyar historians, it would have been erased by the Church, the fanatical advocates of the Finno-Ugric theory or the followers of the Hapsburg absolutism. Because the Magyars have no written history of

this time period, and because the chronicles of Anonymus and Kézai were disregarded by Western historians, the Hungarian historians simply accepted the record of the Germans, that stated that the power of the Magyars was broken after the defeat at Lechfeld. Later Hungarian historians also disregarded these two sources because the actions of Botond belied their account of the peaceful Christianization of Hungary. Shortly after his second successful campaign, the apparently healthy Botond mysteriously lost all his strength and suddenly died. Hungarian history makes little mention of him.

Foreign sources state that the Magyars, at that time, desired peace so much that, in the interest of peace, they gave up all their national interests, their religion, their freedom and their invincibility. Peace at any price was the goal.

Who could believe this?, asks Grandpierre.

A nation is not able to change its societal customs from one day to the other. It is just a fabrication, on the part of historians, that our ancestors were begging for peace at any price. With this statement, the historians wish to make the world believe that the Magyars became a weak nation, and the only way to save their nation was to accept Western Christianity.

Bishop Pilgrim in his letter to Pope Benedict VII., in AD. 974, says: "According to the alliance between the Germans and the Hungarians, we started to spread Christianity as the peace prevailed."^[17]

According to this letter, the Magyars and the Germans made an alliance. This alliance meant that the Germans secretly occupied Hungary. An interesting fact about the Quedlinburg agreement is that every written document, that has survived, mentions only the spreading of Christianity. This was the beginning of Hungary's loss of independence. Otto I was the one who created the great power of Germany. He was the one who first determined the politics of "Drang nach Osten". He was the one who dictated the terms of the Quedlinburg agreement. He announced many times that his first task was to break the power of Hungary. Otto I. was not the Pope or a Patriarch. He was Emperor. Therefore, writes Grandpierre, his goal could not be a religious goal but purely a political goal. Regardless how well it was camouflaged, his only goal was to conquer the Magyars. Otto I., at the time of the writing of the Quedlinburg agreement, was the representative of an anti-Hungarian power. Spreading Christianity in Hungary was just a camouflage to cover his goal.

Earlier, I stated that the Magyars, after their defeat at Lechfeld, remained as strong as before. If they were still such a great power, how could the Magyars accept such a humiliating agreement as the Quedlinburg agreement? Amadée Thierry writes about an international coup.^[18] He says that when Otto accomplished the alliance with the Magyars at Quedlinburg, he immediately began to fulfill his plan. Close to the Hungarian borders, he created a center, in the city of Passau, where the Hungarian conversion (anti-Hungarian action) would start. The leader of this center was Bishop Pilgrim. The Pope gave Pilgrim extraordinary powers to do whatever he had to do to convert the Magyars.

Otto decided to give a German wife (Adelheid), to Prince Géza, using the old accepted weapon of marriage to effect his goal. Adelheid's goal was to open the Hungarian borders to German immigrants. That was the only way for the Germans to break the power of the Magyars. They had been unable to do that by war, but with secrecy and politics they succeeded. There are countries which are weak in war but are extraordinarily strong at the peace treaty. At Quedlinburg, only the Magyars made concessions. The Germans made none.

What did this submission cost the Hungarians?

- They gave up all their traditions (the magus were persecuted).
- They gave up their right to guard the borders.
- They gave free access to missionaries and others who intended to settle in Hungary.
- They allowed churches and parsonages to be built.
- They gave a free hand to the spreading of the Christian beliefs, without objection, even allowing them to bury people alive.
- Prince Géza was to marry Adelheid.
- They gave rich positions and land to the ten thousand German bodyguards of Adelheid.

Amadée Thierry says that this Quedlinburg agreement was an agreement, which we would make today with an undeveloped country, in order to be able to sell our manufactured goods and impose our moral standards.^[19]

Hungary opened the gates to a Western invasion into the country, not a military invasion, but a continuous peaceful occupation. It is obvious that it would soon become an economic, ideological and political oppression. The representatives of the Magyars pledged that, without any selection or regulation, the borders should be opened to anyone who wished to enter the country. They would even give them land and help them to multiply and to climb up the social ladder, by giving them titles and positions. So Hungary, in a short time, lost its nationalistic character and, if there were any objections from the Magyar people against this foreign invasion, the revolts were suppressed by foreign soldiers.

Adelheid's bodyguard of ten-thousand occupied Géza's palace and he, himself, was a prisoner in his own palace. For the Germans, this solution was better than killing him as they had Atilla.

Who was able to make such a demoralizing, humiliating, one-sided peace agreement in the name of the country? A legal government is unable to make such a treaty. Only the group which prepared the coup could do so, the people who gave gifts (bribes), promising to bring peace and convert the people to Christianity. Pilgrim, Wolfgang, and Bruno created a secret, inside power working in foreign interests. This group accomplished the task which Otto had been unable to accomplish with military means. This is the way that the Hungarian great power, without losing a major war, became subordinated to the enemy, the Germans.

Anonymus did not specify the ethnicity of the peasants he wrote about, as we have already said. According to Grandpierre, the populace of Hungary in the tenth century was purely Hungarian. This is proved by the following facts, which will enlighten the situation in Europe at that time, and will prove that the Hungarian system of agriculture was the most advanced in Europe. At the same time they will disprove the so-often emphasized theory, that the Hungarians suppressed the Slav people, and that they learned agriculture from the Slavs. This simply could not have happened, because of the Hungarian spiritual disposition. There is no example in Hungarian history that they ever suppressed any other nation and forced them to assimilate.

The Pope, the Bishop of Rome, had no more power than any other bishop. Pope Sylvester II. was brought up in the Benedictine monastery at Cluny in France. This monastery was established in A.D. 910 and became very influential in the spreading of Christianity. The Cluny program was designed to increase the power of the Papacy. The Cluny monks were missionaries who converted many people to the Roman Catholic church by teaching them agriculture.^[20] That this action was used as a means to gather converts, is proof that the Western peoples had no knowledge of agriculture. That the Cluny monks did not attempt to convert the Magyars by this method, is one proof that the Magyars already practiced agriculture. In fact, the only place from which the monks could have learned about agricultural methods at that time was Hungary, which was the only territory in Central Europe, where agriculture was established. The Magyars had already used agricultural methods in Levédia, (in Turkestan) where they were settled before they migrated to Etelköz and the Carpathian Basin.^[21] Aurel Stein, a Hungarian traveler in Turkestan, found traces of an irrigation system, dating back to the ninth century, in the territory which was called Levédia.^[22] It is obvious that the Magyars of Árpád, before they came into the Carpathian Basin, were already a civilized group, since they had

developed a system of irrigation to improve on their methods of agriculture. The Slavs who were counted among the "civilized" western peoples, were at that same time, grazing their sheep in a nomadic fashion. As time passed, they learned plowing and seeding from the Avars but, since they had no horses, they harnessed their women to the plow.^[23] The situation was the opposite of what has been propagated. The Magyars did not learn their civilization from the West, rather the West learned from the Magyars.

According to the Chronicles of the Middle Ages, divine power influenced the religious beliefs of the ancient Hungarian people.

Before the Hungarians were converted to Christianity, Kézai informs us, the heralds called the Hungarian regiments with the following words: *"THE WORD OF GOD AND THE WORD OF THE MAGYAR PEOPLE: ON A CERTAIN DAY, IN A CERTAIN PLACE, EVERYBODY IS OBLIGED TO APPEAR WITH ARMS IN HAND, IN ORDER TO HEAR THE DISCUSSIONS AND DECISIONS OF THE ASSEMBLY."*

Grandpierre writes: *"Later, the secret military occupation of the country, camouflaged by the spreading of Christianity, underwent an alarming change in the way they called the people to bear arms. The heralds were no longer able to call the people to bear arms by entreating them to follow the word of God and the word of the Magyars. After the accession of King István I., they could do this only in secret, against the will of King István. Before this, they freely heralded the call throughout the country. As soon as István took over the power, they could do this only at night, in secret, risking their lives to do so."*

We can see that, at this time, the Concept of the Holy Crown was replaced by the Doctrine of the Holy Crown which caused the people to abandon the Old God, the God of the Magyars, and sentenced to death anyone who worshipped Him. In this way the Doctrine of the Holy Crown caused the nation to abandon its roots and it forced the people to accept the ancient history of a foreign people, the Torah, as an example to be followed.

[1] Grandpierre K. Endre: *Attila és a Hunok*, Kapú, 2004, február, XVII. évfolyam

[2] Dr. Szilvay Gyula: *A Besenyők Története*, Buenos Aires, 1976

[3] Padányi, Viktor: *Történelmi Tanulmányok*, Munich, 1959, p. 58

[4] Badiny-Jós Ferenc: *Az Istenes Honfoglalók*, Ősi Gyökér, May-June and July-Aug. 1986, *The Godly Conquerors*, translated by László and Margaret Botos, Canberra, 1987

[5] Roberts, Wess: *The Leadership Secrets of Attila the Hun*, Warner Books, 1989. p.12, 13

[6] Ibid. p. 13.

[7] Maenchen-Helfen, Otto: *The World of the Huns*. University of California Press, 1973, pp. Op. Cit. p. 363.

[8] Zászlos-Zsóka, György: *Toszkánai Harangok*, Astor Park, Florida, 1983.

[9] Roberts, Wess: *Leadership secrets of Attila the Hun*, Warner Books, 1985, p.30

[10] Kolozsváry Grandpierre Endre: *Történelmünk központi Titkai*. (Sorozat IV. Öskutatás)

[11] Kézai Simon, 12th century Magyar Chronicler.

[12] Grandpierre, K. Endre: *Magyarok Istenének Elrablása*, Budapest, 1993

[13] Anonymus: *Gesta Hungarorum*, translated by Dezső Pais, Budapest, 1975

[14] Kézai, Simon: *Magyar Krónika*, translated by Kiraly Szabó quoted by Endre K. Grandpierre, Op.Cit. pp. 138-139

[15] Anonymus, Op.Cit.

[16] Ibid.

[17] Endlicher, Monumenta Ápádina, p. 131. (Grandpierre)

[18] 24. Thierry, Amadée: *Atilla Mondák*, p. 99.

[19] 25. Thierry, Amadée: Op.Cit. p.98

[20] Rudnay, Egyed: Op. Cit. Champly: *Histoire de l'Abbaye de Cluny*, Paris 1879 and Sackur.

[21] Homán, Bálint: *Ostörténelmünk keleti forrásai*. Budapest 1938; Bendefy, László: *A magyarság kaukázusi őshazája*. Budapest 1942: (Macartney, C.A.: *The Magyars in the Ninth Century*, Cambridge, 1930. p. 207.

[22] Stein, Aurél: *Középázsiai utam*.

[23] Thierry, M. Amadée: *Histoire d'Attila et de ses Successeurs*. 1866