

**ZATHURECZKY**

**TRANSYLVANIA**

**CITADEL OF THE WEST**

**Second Edition**

**Translated and Edited by  
A. WASS de CZEGE  
University of Florida**

**Copyright by The Danubian Press, Inc.  
Astor Park, Florida 32002**

**Documentation checked and approved by the  
DANUBIAN RESEARCH CENTER**

The internationally used name "Transylvania" is the Latin translation of the Hungarian name "Erdely" or "Erdoelve", as it was used and spelled in the 10th, 11th, and 12th centuries, meaning "Beyond the Forest". The word "Transylvania" appeared for the first time in the 17th century, when the official language of Hungarian public life and administration became the Latin. The Romans called the same territory the "Province of Dacia", after the previous inhabitants, the Daks, who were almost completely exterminated by the Roman Legions.

Officially, the Roumanians are using the name "Transylvania". However, in their own native tongue, they still refer to it as "Ardeal", which word derives phonetically from the Hungarian "Erdely". The Germans, who were settled there during the 13th century by Hungarian kings, call it "Siebenburgen", due to the seven administrative districts with a centrally located fortification, "Burg", in each.

Today, when we talk of Transylvania, we understand the entire territory of 103,903 square kilometers, which was taken from Hungary and annexed by Roumania after World War I. The historical Transylvania, east of the Bihar Mountains and enclosed on the South and East by the bend of the Carpathians, was much smaller, no more than 57,804 square kilometers, and it was called for centuries in the Hungarian and literary language, the "Land of Transylvania".

## INTRODUCTION

If you had been born in Transylvania, you would not yet have to be fifty years of age and your citizenship status would have already been changed three times, without your ever leaving the town or village of your birth. You have been "liberated" under different flags, or different party slogans, five times and each time under the pressure of an outside power which knew nothing about your problems and couldn't care less.

If in addition to all this you happened to belong by birth to the almost two-million Hungarian minority group of that land you have had it even worse. You were forbidden to use your own language in public places. You were discriminated against in every phase of your life. You were treated by government agencies as some sort of inferior type of human being, with no rights, only duties. In time of elections, you were intimidated by gendarme brutality and kept away from the polls with bayonets.

Today, according to the reports reaching us from behind the Iron Curtain, if you were an Hungarian, you would be carrying a double load of suffering compared to those of other nationalities. For in addition to the over-all communist terror and domination, you would have against you the organized efforts of the Roumanian government to eliminate the so-called "Transylvanian Problem", through the total extermination of the Hungarian ethnic group, which according to Roumanian doctrine, is the cause of this problem.

Mr. Zathureczky, the author of "The Transylvanian Dispute", tries to point out in his book that the extermination of large masses of people, whether Jews, Hungarians or any other, is not the way problems should be solved on this earth. Other ways can and must be found through the use of vision and good will. For these problems are not isolated cases, involving only a few millions of people here and a few millions there. We are all involved in them, for every injustice that creates bitterness and hate, and every hate that creates new injustices, must be regarded as an universal problem of the entire human society. These situations create danger spots on the face of this globe from where the sparks of new World conflicts can originate and blow up our entire civilization. Therefore, it is not only our ethical and moral obligation to search for just solutions of these problems, but wisdom also dictates the necessity, if we are to

try to make the world a better place in which to live, not only for ourselves, but for all mankind.

In this condensed edition of Mr. Zathureczky's book, we are trying to present a clear and unbiased picture of the facts concerning the Transylvanian problem and the reasons and causes for these conflicts. Carefully examining these reasons and causes, we shall attempt to point out the only workable solution which can bring peace and justice, not only to this particular geographical location, but which can be used as a guide-line in solving similar problems in many different parts of the world. However, in order to be able to reach such solutions, we must first accept as individuals and as nations, the collective responsibility for the life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness of every group of human beings within our organized human society. This must be done even if it means changing our concepts of certain established systems which may be useful to us, but harmful to others.

## THE FACTS OF THE PROBLEM

After World War I, the three great powers, the United States of America, Great Britain and France, re-shaped the face of South-Eastern Europe. The Austro-Hungarian Monarchy, and with it, the unity of the Danubian Basin, was dismantled and broken into small national states. This re-organization took place through the application of the two main ideas of our age: the democratic principle of the majority rule and the people's right to self-determination. In practice, however, only the first was put into effect. The question of self-determination has never been probed.

Transylvania, an integral part of Hungary for almost one thousand years, was given to Roumania, in accordance with the principle of majority, (53.8%). A territory as large as Portugal, and two and a half times as large as Switzerland, with a population of 5,257,467, of which 2,838,454 were Roumanians, (53.8%), 1,661,805 were Hungarians, (31.6%), 564,789 were Germans, (10.7%), and the remaining 3.9% were Jews, Gypsies, Bulgarians and other nationalities.

Due to the ever increasing pressure and discrimination imposed by the Kingdom of Great-Roumania against the Hungarian minority, the situation between Hungary and Roumania became more and more dangerous. In 1940, after the deliberations between the two countries failed to bring any results, the Royal Roumanian Government asked the two ruling powers of Central Europe, Germany and Italy, for an arbitration. These two powers decided on August 31, 1940 to divide Transylvania between the two litigants. The Axis-powers, already being at war, could not tolerate the development of a serious crisis in South-Eastern Europe. In their decision, they were led by the same view-points of power-policy as had been the Entente Powers twenty years before.

Finally, the last dictatorial changes in the status of Transylvania were accomplished by Stalin, who declared the Vienna arbitration void and gave the entire territory back to Roumania. With this decision he was trying on the one hand to compensate Roumania for the Eastern territories annexed by the Soviet Union, while on the other hand, the cause of Bolshevism in

South-Eastern Europe seemed to be served more effectively by this decision.

Since the first ruling of the Western Powers which gave the Roumanian Kingdom jurisdiction over Transylvania after World War I, the population of the country increased by approximately 1 million, and the distribution of the nationality figures shifted somewhat in favor of the Roumanians.

It seemed strange that while this population increase between the years 1910 and 1941 totalled only 665,717, (increasing the ratio of the Roumanians from 53.8% to 55.8% (464,529 souls), and decreasing the ratio of Hungarians to 29.5%), the new statistics of the Roumanian People's Republic in 1956 show only 1,618,246 Hungarians, compared to 4,192,506 Roumanians.

These few figures clearly prove the justification for a deeper look into the Transylvanian problem. Disregarding completely those two-hundred thousand Hungarians, (mostly from the middle class), who were forced by the Roumanian Government to leave their country right after World War I, no other mass exodus has ever taken place. Therefore, it is very unlikely that during the last 46 years the Hungarian population of Transylvania has only increased by 57,441 souls, while the Roumanian population has increased by 1,353,052.

Even with reservation and doubts of the reliability of the statistical data produced by the Roumanian People's Republic, it is unquestionable that there appears a very considerable shift today in the ratio of the Transylvanian nationality groups for the benefits of the Roumanians. Such a shift cannot be explained by natural reproduction. It can only occur in countries where the ethnic minorities are exposed to the most cruel discrimination and brutality, while on the other hand, the increase of the majority group is being aided by government-organized colonization.

The discrimination against the Hungarian minority in Transylvania during the last decade reached the level of intellectual and economic genocide. Not only have Western newspapermen travelling through Transylvania rendered documented accounts of this, but even the letter of the American Legation in Bucharest, addressed to the American Transylvanian Federation, verifies it.

It is positively documented that since 1945, the Roumanian government has killed and deported, under different pretexts, approximately 278,000 Hungarians. Some of those who were deported died under the most inhumane conditions in labor

**camps, either within the borders of Roumania or in the Soviet Union. The others are maintaining an incredibly primitive existence in the swamps of Dobrudja and other places, restricted in their desire to return to their native land. The terror and brutality exhibited by the Roumanian government in its effort to reduce the Hungarian population of Transylvania is increasing day by day. The extermination of the urban middle class is almost completely accomplished. The liquidation of the large masses of Hungarian peasantry is being carefully planned.**

**As long as the Iron Curtain prevents the West from exercising its influence in the Danubian Basin, there is not much we can do to bring peace and justice into this part of the world. But sooner or later, the time will come when the equalizing effect of a fast shrinking world will overcome the barbed-wire fences and artificial barriers and bring the different fractions of human society closer to each other. When this time arrives, Western Democracy must be ready to solve this problem, with many other problems waiting for wise and fair solutions.**

## II

### THE ESSENCE OF THE PROBLEM

Until now, the big powers ruling our world have always been inclined to regard the problems of smaller nations as unimportant, best solved by dictatorial measures. However, history has proved again and again, that such dictatorial solutions are only of a temporary nature and create political danger-spots for new world conflagrations.

For almost a half-century the Western World regarded the Transylvanian problem as a mere border dispute between Hungary and Roumania. From this view-point, it was settled and re-settled three times, without success. It is obvious that behind each settlement there were foreign power-interests in the background. However, the main reason for the apparent insolubility of this acute problem lies much deeper. It can be found in part in the political system of our age and its practices, and in part in the complete disregard of the natural, historical and spiritual laws which co-ordinate the evolution of human society.

After World War I, in the place of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy which had kept order in the Danubian Basin, small nationalistic countries were left facing each other, with large groups of ethnic minorities in every one of them. The place of a liberal, international and constitutional State-system, which had stood above narrow national horizons, was taken over by small nationalistic democracies.

Since the Monarchy did not exercise its balancing role in the Danubian Basin any longer, neither was there a protecting wall toward the East, nor any serious power standing in the way of German expansion. First Hitler took over, then Stalin. Both needed these territories for a base of operations. One against the East, the other against the West. The universal European importance of South-Eastern Europe, and within its range, the importance of the Transylvanian problem, was clearly documented again.

Transylvania has been in all times, the fortress of Western Europe and the Western Christian culture-circle. Its frontiers, the two-thousand meter high ridges of the Eastern and Southern Carpathians have always been the Eastern frontiers of Western Europe. Beyond them lay the East: an entirely different

culture, different in its way of thinking, different in its way of life. The re-organization which followed World War I abolished this frontier and terminated thereby the West-European role of Transylvania.

The resolutions passed by the Roumanian National Council in Gyulafehervar (Alba Julia), were accepted as the voice of the people, in spite of the fact that neither one of the two other Transylvanian national groups were represented at that convention. The first point of that resolution declared, "the unification of all Roumanians and the territories inhabited by them with the Kingdom of Roumania."

From this situation arose the Transylvanian problem. Since the reasons for the controversy are not solely political, but are deeply rooted in principles and ideas of the all-European background, the cause of Transylvania must be regarded, par excellence, as a European problem.

From the point of view of fair play, principles of democracy based on the majority rule can only be successfully applied in the governments of homogeneous societies, where the chance to become a majority is always open to the minority groups. Ethnic minorities, however, do not have this opportunity. Let us not forget that "because the majority rule is the strict consequence of democracy, democracy is always inclined to become an oppressive domination toward those elements of society which, due to some conditions originating in their very nature, are of a permanent minority status." (L. Ottlik: "The Minority Problem Yesterday and Today", Szemle, page 106.)

Exactly this happened in Roumania and the ever-increasing discrimination against the almost two-million Hungarian minority in Transylvania became the source of conflicts between Hungary and Roumania. The anti-minority attitude of the Roumanians "finds its explanation in the modern doctrine of nationalism, the essence of which can be expressed by saying that it upsets the former relations between the two definitions 'country' and 'people'. Originally, the word 'people' meant the inhabitants of the 'country' as a historic-geographical unit. Today, the word 'country' means the space in which one 'people', meaning ethnic unit, lives." (L. Ottlik: "Pax Hungarica", Szemle 1934, page 87.)

This doctrine of nationalism prevails today in all the national states of Europe, in opposition to the former imperial State-Concept, based on the co-existence of several nationalities. The goal today is to create a homogeneous society, an indivis-

ible national state, and for this reason, the ethnic groups caught inside of the borders are being treated as foreign elements which must be eliminated.

It is also a weakness of democracy in relation to ethnic problems, that its practice of government is highly centralistic. Therefore, it would come in direct conflict with its own self in case it should try to apply the only solution concerning the problem of ethnic groups, namely, the introduction of self-government for the minorities. Which, of course, is still not a final solution, but at least a *modus vivendi* between the majority and the minority groups. Since "government on the local level is not only the best protection against the transgressions of national egotism, but also the best medicine for local differences." (Lyon Blease: "Short History of English Liberalism", page 17.)

It is obvious that the main reason for the apparent insolvability of the Transylvanian problem can be found in the political system of our age and its practices. The rejecting attitude of the big powers, which they evidence in connection with this problem, exhibits a great measure of hypocrisy and is in complete opposition to the substantial interests of Europe. Nevertheless, by pointing out that the questions involved here are not a mere border dispute between two nations, we have exposed only one side of the problem. The roots of the controversy go much deeper. Its bearings are potentially more of a continental nature, and are closely interwoven into the life of entire Europe. In order to understand and solve this problem, we must closely examine the relations, causes and effects of these factors, to which our world, of late seeming to turn more and more materialistic in its view-points, has paid little attention.

Salvador de Madariaga, the famous Spanish writer and philosopher, described Europe as the "unity of diversities". (S. de Madariaga: "Portrait of Europe", 1952). By "Diversity", he means the multitude of the colorful living units, which all together form the continent of Europe. Under "unity", he means harmony, the most important law of nature, to which the entire Universe is subordinated.

The living units of our human world are the regions and the people inhabiting these regions. The more marked such a unit is and the more crystallized its individuality appears to be, the more able it becomes in creating harmony by its functions. Because "there is no harmony without diversity . . . and without

the concept of delimitation, harmony cannot be achieved." (Raul H. France: "Lebenslehre fur Jedermann", Berlin, 1952).

When any such unit is prevented by outside force in exercising its natural functions, which give reason for and meaning to its existence, the harmony becomes disrupted and catastrophe sets in. This cannot be avoided by any means of power and brutality.

The essence of the Transylvanian problem can be formulated therefore, in the following two questions:

- I. How can the problem of government be solved in such a way that satisfaction to every interested group would come?
- II. How can the undisturbed and productive co-existence of the three Transylvanian nations best be achieved?

It must be clearly understood that neither of these problems is of a local nature, and cannot be solved by border discussion. The problem of government and statehood can find its solution only in the spirit and within the framework of a new European unity, through the evolution of Europe as a whole. On the other hand, the symbiosis of the three Transylvanian nations can be promoted only through a complete revision of the today's prevailing concepts and practices concerning the treatment of ethnic minorities.

In order to reach any workable solution, two main issues must be clarified:

- I Just how far can Transylvania be regarded as a "living unit" on its own right, and
- II What are its functions within the European community?

In order to answer these questions, we must examine the geographical, historical and cultural-spiritual framework in which Transylvania maintains its existence, built into the unity of the past, present and future.

## TRANSYLVANIA: THE SPECIFIC UNIT WITHIN THE DANUBIAN BASIN

Geographical units are living units all over the world, having their own individuality in space and time. In space, because they are different from all other regions. In time, because their inhabitants adapt themselves to the land and natural endowments of the geographical location and create thereby the historical individuality of the region. The limitations and possibilities of the location determine the way of life and all its manifestations, and these manifestations build up into tradition under the influence of time. The economy and structural development of human society is determined by the unchangeable laws of nature, - climate, flora and fauna. People inhabiting the prairies have an entirely different way of life than those who are settled in mountain regions or on the seashore. Thus, the borderlines of geographical units automatically turn into the borderlines of human society also, dividing races, languages, and administrative organizations such as countries and states.

Geographical units coexist in a functional symbiosis within the greater units of the Continents. Wooded mountains regulate the water supply of the plains. Plain and mountain therefore climatically complete one another. Our human world, rooted into geographical regions, adapts itself to this great harmony of nature. As time makes history, the political and cultural manifestations of human societies follow closely the dividing and connecting laws of geography, creating thereby the historical individualities of the different regional units.

One of the most delimited and firmly outlined living units of Europe is the Danubian Basin, with its particular and specific historical individuality. Surrounded on the North, East and South-East by the chain of the Carpathian Mountains, the Danubian Basin stands leaning with its Western elbow on the Alps like a fortress facing the vast plain of Russia, which has been through all history the highway of barbaric invasions. In that Basin, which is open toward the West, though separated from the Balkan Peninsula by the lower course of the Danubian River and by the bare, rocky ridges of the Karst, was the meeting place of the different climatic zones of Europe. The deep humus of the Central Hungarian Plain served for centuries as

the grainery of Europe. The treasures of the mountain regions, which are rich in gold, silver, iron, salt and wood are equally balanced by the oil wells, bauxite and uranium mines of the fertile hill-country West of the Danube. The natural water system of the Basin is centralized: - all the rivers, except the Olt, run toward the central plain. The diversity of the Danubian regions makes every production possible. The Basin is a closed, compact living unit, not only geographically, but economically also. Its separate regions cannot survive without one another, but as one living unit, the entire Danubian Basin fits into a perfect economic balance. Consequently all through history, it was a firm cultural, spiritual and political unit also.

Through centuries it was the melting pot of the great opposing spiritual and intellectual currents of the European continent. Roman Catholicism, Northern Protestantism, and Oriental Orthodoxism reached hands here, to build the foothold of religious freedom and tolerance in Europe. Here was where nomadic traditions and the Western way of life first mixed, in order to create a new and specific Danubian culture, spiritually and politically in the same time. It is the Danubian Basin which separates the Slavic bloc from the Germanic, serving as a bridge between the four great cultures: - the Latin, the German, the Byzantine and the Slavic.

None of the nationalities living in this geographical unit was ever able to withdraw itself from the influences of this synthesis. The Danubian German is different from the Austrian or the North German. The Serbian, settled on the Southern plain is different from the Serbs in Serbia, and the Transylvanian Roumanian is of an entirely different background and mentality than those from Moldova or Muntenia, across the Carpathians. Even the Transylvanian Hungarian seems different from the other Hungarians who inhabit the Central plain or Transdanubia. For within the Danubian Basin, Transylvania is the region with the most individuality.

A single glance at the map of Transylvania gives the feeling of an advanced fortress nesting in the bend of the Carpathians, guarding the Danubian Basin from the East. In such a frontier position, everything happens under heat and pressure. The crystallization of historical individualities is accelerated. If we accept the concept that the Danubian Basin is the fortress of Western Europe and in the same time the bridge between the East and the West, we can also say that Transylvania has

been, and still should be, the transmitting antenna of Western culture toward the East.

Such is the location, the geographical framework which determines the European functions of the Danubian Basin, and also of Transylvania, as an integral part of this unit. History, as the recorded chain of events, actions and re-actions performed by human society, proves the validity of this natural law.

## HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF THE DANUBIAN BASIN

The recorded history of the Danubian Basin begins with the continental conquests of the Roman Empire. In 50 B.C., the borders of the Empire were drawn from the River Rhine down to the Italian Alps. The South-Eastern part of Europe, from the Bohemian Basin down to the Black Sea was in the hands of the Barbarians. Thus, the frontiers of Julius Caesar's Empire were almost identical to the Iron Curtain of today.

Rome recognized the danger which threatened the Empire from this direction, and as a preventive measure, the Emperors Augustus and Trajanus took possession of Bohemia, Moravia, Pannonia, (today's Hungary) and Dacia, (today's Transylvania). Dacia, however, was used only as an outpost, while the main defense line was established at the banks of the Danube River.

The wars involving the possession of these territories were extremely bloody. The Roman Legions, drafted from all parts of the Empire, destroyed the Markomanns in the Bohemian Basin and almost completely exterminated the Daks of Dacia.

The historical significance of these conquests lies, first of all, in the fact that Rome outlined and determined for all time the boundary between the Greek and Latin culture circles on the Eastern ridges of the Carpathians. Thus, the Danubian Basin became integrated into the Empire as the provinces of Pannonia and Dacia, establishing thereby the Western political status of this territory. During the two thousand years which have passed, the Danube River remained the main defense line of the West throughout a very lively history. Just as Transylvania, intended to become an outpost of the West, kept this role through all the centuries, and developed it into a unique historical individuality within the Danubian Basin.

After the fall of the Roman Empire, the Danubian Basin became the bridgehead of Eastern invaders for several centuries. From the South-East, huge waves of nomadic nations broke into the area, mostly through the Focsani gate. Sweeping across the unprotected basin they invaded the West, in order to melt by and by into the Latin and Germanic culture circles, and, after mixing with the original inhabitants, create the nations of today's Europe.

The first serious danger which threatened the entire West with total destruction was the appearance of the Huns in the Danubian Basin. King Attila, the "Whip of God", as he was called by Rome, established his headquarters on the wide plain between the Danube and the Tisza Rivers. His empire, however, stretched out from the Alps to the Baltic Sea, from the Rhone to the Aral Sea. When Attila died in 453, his empire fell apart. Around 480, the rest of the Huns merged into the Bulgarian-Turk tribal federation, to which the Hungarians also belonged. According to folk legend, one of the Hun tribes under the leadership of Attila's youngest son took refuge in the bend of the Eastern Carpathians. The "Szekely" nation, still inhabiting the Eastern part of Transylvania and speaking a dialect of the Hungarian language, are supposed to be the descendants of these Huns.

In the middle of the sixth century, the Avars, a nation closely related to the Huns, moved into the Danubian Basin and organized a new empire which reached from the Black Sea to the Baltic Sea, from the Enns to the Don. After two and a half centuries their empire fell under the pressures of Charles the Great from the West and the Bulgarians from the East. For more than a century, no one was able to occupy the Danubian Basin and organize it into a stable unit. Until at the end of the ninth century, the Hungarians appeared.

When they crossed the Carpathians in 896, they had behind them as a rear-guard, a closely related nomadic nation, the Kazars, whose huge empire included today's Russia and Poland. The invasion of the equistic and bellicose Hungarians into the Danubian Basin caused panic in the West. The Christian World declared their lightning-fast attacks the "end of the world", and the Pope, himself, saw in them the executors of the "last judgment".

The Hungarians undertook several ravaging incursions into the West, crossing the Alps seven times on horseback, and twice reaching clear to the shores of the Atlantic. These incursions served three purposes, looting, reconnoitering, and preventing the formation of a united Western front. Nevertheless, it was due to these attacks that the German unity became consolidated and the West Roman Empire of German Nations rose to the peak of its power.

German historians like to claim the credit for the Christianization of the Hungarians as a result of the defeat they suffered in 955 near Augsburg from the united German armies. The

truth is that from the eight Hungarian tribes, only two were involved in that battle, and therefore the loss they suffered was not serious enough to justify the abandonment of their former political concept. This came as a result of other causes. One was the inner dissention between the Hungarian tribes. The other, and even more important, the fall of the Kazar Empire on the East, who were beaten and destroyed by Szjatoslav, Normann-Russian Archduke, in 969. He became the ruler of today's European Russia. With this, the nomadic culture disappeared from Eastern Europe, and the Hungarians became isolated in the Danubian Basin. They had no other choice but to compensate for the lost connections with new connections in the West. Thus, the Christian Hungarian Kingdom, joining the Western culture-circle, came into existence as a political necessity for survival.

We shall not enter here into the detailed history of the medieval Hungarian Kingdom. Nevertheless, we must point out the factors which made it possible for the Hungarian nation to survive until now in the Danubian Basin, in spite of the complete isolation through language, habits, mental attitude and spiritual values, while all the other nations which had entered the same territory before disappeared in a very short time.

The conversion to the Christian faith, and through it, the acceptance of Western civilization, does not furnish sufficient answer for that. It would also be a mistake to claim that the Hungarian nation possessed such extraordinary qualities which enabled them to organize and maintain statehood and national life against the will of the entire Europe and in opposition to the interests of bigger powers. But if we look at the European role of the Danubian Basin, which we have discussed before, it follows automatically, that the functions of the geographical location could be fulfilled only by certain qualities. In other words, in that certain time when Europe took its permanent shape and form, only such nation was able to meet the need of the geographical location, which had its own particular individuality delimiting it from any other nation, thus making its absorption impossible into any other European culture-circle or any other nation, yet still enabling it to become exclusively and universally European.

The medieval Hungarian statehood and social system resulted from the mixture of Eastern nomadic traditions and Western influences.

The Hungarian kings did not inherit the throne as the right

of the first-born as was the practice in the West. They were elected. This unwritten law of early nomadic tradition became a written law in 1222, when the Hungarian Constitution was formulated. The legitimacy of the royal power was invested into the Hungarian Royal Crown, (Stephen's Crown), and during the entire existence of the Hungarian Kingdom, up to 1918, only those kings were regarded as legal rulers who were crowned according to the regulations prescribed in the Constitution.

The country belonged to the Crown, and constitutional dialectic called the annexed territories in all times, "countries of the Holy Crown". In case the king disregarded or violated the Constitution, the people had the right to resist with the use of weapons. (*Jus armis resistendi*). This clause of the 1222 Constitution, together with the free elections of the king, was repealed arbitrarily by the Habsburgs at the end of the 17th century.

The Hungarian king did not have the power to send troops into foreign soil or to start war without the consent of the nation. The medieval term "nation", included the entire political nation, in other words, all the voters. Just as before, in the nomadic society, the power of the elected chief was based upon the whole society of free warriors, so the power of the Hungarian kings was established on a wide base of free men and small nobility, and was not wobbling at the top of a pyramid-like social structure like the power of the Western kings.

While the tribal structure of the early Hungarian society was demolished by the formation of a Christian Kingdom, the clan-system survived with its patriarchal order of succession, based on bloodline. This ancestral system proved to be stronger than the Western "*jus regium*", and for centuries prevented the development of the feudalistic system and the formation of a privileged aristocracy, separate from the nation. These Western ways were introduced into Hungary only under the foreign rulers of later centuries.

The administrative and political organizations of the Hungarian statehood, based on autonomy and self-government, was also the inherited legal system of the nomadic tribal life. While the nomadic tribes included all the free warriors of the clans, so were the nomadic nations formed by the federation of free tribes. The association of free nations, created through the federation of free tribes, built the huge nomadic empires, like that of the Huns or the Mongols. This association was usually forced upon the smaller nations by a stronger one. However,

the submission of the weak did not touch its social system, religion, legal customs or administrative procedures, and in most cases, the weaker nation forced into a nomadic empire did not even have to change its leaders. Thus, the nomadic empires were built on autonomy and self-government, and the concept of discrimination against different racial or language groups was unknown.

This principle of self-government and tolerance toward foreign groups, together with the respect for the liberty of others, prevailed in the same way within the Christian Hungarian Kingdom. It became expressed in the autonom district-system, in the self-government of the "free royal cities", and later in the territorial, political and cultural autonomy given to those ethnic groups which came to find refuge under the Holy Crown. The constitutional relationship between the "countries of the Holy Crown" were similar to the structure of the British Commonwealth.

These were the reasons which made the Hungarian State-concept suited to fulfill the role of a bridge between the East and the West in the Danubian Basin. Other nomadic nations, pushing from the East, clear up to the 13th century, were just as able to fit into this State-concept as the German and Vallon settlers, or members of certain royal escorts entering the country with royal brides from Western and Northern Dynasties and deciding to stay in the country. With them the different national cultures of Europe entered Hungary. From London to Moscow, from Lithuania to Byzance, from Rome to Paris, this lively cultural exchange between the Danubian Basin and the rest of Europe went on for centuries. Hungarian students could be found in great numbers at every European University. (The first officially registered student in Oxford was an Hungarian.) The first Hungarian University opened its doors in the 14th century to accommodate thousands of foreign students.

During the two and a half centuries following the millenium, a unity of diversities came into existence in Europe, from the Atalantic to the Urals, from Scandinavia to the Mediterranean. Races, nations, languages, countries and empires divided this Europe into living units, but they all met in the synthesis of Christianity. They were all built on the spiritual heritages of Rome and Byzance.

In South-Central Europe, two great powers were facing each other, as the representatives of racial and religious differences: the orthodox Byzantine Empire, representing the Eastern Slavs

on one side and on the other the German Holy Empire. Between these two powers arose in the Danubian Basin the Hungarian Kingdom as a dividing and, in the same time, a balancing power between the Latin-German and the Greek-Slavic worlds. In order to fully understand the importance of this role, one must keep in mind that the medieval Hungary belonged among the great powers of Europe. The wealth and prestige of the Hungarian Royal House was equal to that of France and England. There were only  $\frac{2}{3}$  more Germans than Hungarians and up to the 16th century there were just as many Hungarians as there were English on this earth. It is understandable therefore, that the Hungarian Kingdom was able to block German and Byzantine expansion, either by diplomacy or by the use of arms.

The natural evolution of Europe was interrupted by Dshinghiz Kans invasion in the middle of the 13th century. In 1240-41, they occupied the Danubian Basin, causing terrible destruction, but in the same year they left again. There are several theories for their fast withdrawal. The most plausible seems to be that in Hungary the nomadic Mongolians met with Western-type fortifications for the first time which they were unable to surmount. Upon learning the fact that the West was fortified, Batu Kan gave up his plan for conquering the rest of Europe. Therefore, the occupation of Hungary, as a march route toward the West lost its purpose. They did not give up Russia, which remained for centuries under Mongolian rule.

Thus the nomadic social system, statehood, world concept and morality forced upon the nations East and North-East of the Carpathians, left unalterable changes in this part of the continent, destroyed the unity of Continental Europe and pushed the frontiers of the Eastern World to the Carpathian Mountain ranges, as part of the dividing line running between the Baltic Sea and the Black Sea. Hungary, a corresponding partner to Eastern Europe before, now became a solid part of the West, making the Carpathians one of the most significant cultural dividing lines of the European Continent. This situation became solidified for seven hundred years.

Following the Mongolian invasion, the formation of the medieval Hungarian Empire came as a natural reaction to the ever-present danger in the East. With the appearance of the Turks in 1358, this danger increased on the South-East corner of the continent. A chain of wars began against the Turkish invaders for the possession of the Danubian Basin, and lasted to the 18th century.

After the Hungarian Royal House of the Arpad's died out in 1305, on the constitutional right of free election, the nation chose kings from the female lines. Thus came the Anjou's to the Hungarian throne. Their empire reached from the Baltic Sea to the Black Sea and to the Adriatic, forming a bulwark against the East. Following the Anjou-line, Sigismund Luxemburg joined the Holy Crown of Hungary with the Crown of the Holy German Empire. As ruler of this enormous power, Sigismund was able to bring Western troops into constant battle against the Turkish aggression. Nevertheless, the weight of protecting Europe from the invaders fell mostly on the Hungarian nation. In 1456, Janos Hunyadi won a world-renowned battle over the Turks at Belgrade, remembrance of which is still being expressed in the Christian world by ringing the church bells at noontime.

The Turks were kept away for several decades, while Hunyadi's son, the Transylvanian-born king, Mathias Corvinus, built an empire of strength and culture in the Danubian Basin. After his death, however, the power of the Hungarian Empire began to wane. The political forces within the country turned against each other and the Jagello House, which inherited the Hungarian throne, was not able to unite the nation.

In 1526, the Turkish army, a hundred-thousand strong, broke into Hungary and defeated King Lajos II in the famous battle of Mohacs, in which the young King himself fell on the battlefield. The Western part of the country elected his brother-in-law, Ferdinand von Habsburg, to fill the throne, while the Central portion, under Turkish occupation, elected Janos Zapolya. In the East, the autonom Transylvanian Principality was formed, as the custodian and further developer of the free Hungarian Statehood.

The Turkish wars went on for one and a half century within the borders of Hungary. From the approximately five million Hungarians who made up more than 80% of the country's population in the 15th century, at the end of the century were only one and a half million. Fugitives from the East and new settlers from the West moved in, and the Hungarian National State turned into a State of nationalities.

After the end of the Turkish wars, the Habsburgs regarded Hungary as "conquered territory". They did not re-instate the unified Hungarian Kingdom, but ruled over it from Vienna, as part of the Habsburg Empire. From that time on, to speak about Hungarian Statehood and sovereign Hungarian policy is

nothing but fiction. (Andrassy: "Ungarns Ausgleich Mit Osterreich von Jahr 1867", Leipzig, 1897, page 215.)

A long series of Hungarian liberty wars tried in vain to re-establish the unity of the country and the continuity of its independent statehood. Just as one and a half thousand years before, in the days of the Roman Empire, the Danubian Basin sank to the level of a province and its functional capacities became paralyzed for centuries. It yielded completely to the policies of the German Empire, which no longer regarded it as a fortress toward the East, but only as a "no-man's land", for impending operations.

Only in 1867, after the Holy Roman Empire of German Nations disintegrated and the Habsburgs had lost their German and Italian possessions, did there come a conciliation between Crown and Nation, as the late result of the 1848-49 Kossuth uprising, in the form of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy.

## TRANSYLVANIA, IN LIGHT OF HISTORY

In order to understand the regional role of Transylvania within the Danubian Basin, we must know the conditions which created that role. As was mentioned before, the Roman Empire drew a strategic line of defense on the banks of the Danube River, using Transylvania as an outpost. After the Hungarians settled the country, Transylvania was ruled by the clan of Gyula, which pursued a separatistic policy under the influence of Byzantine Christianity. King Stephen made an end to this tendency and forced Transylvania under the royal authority. Yet its role of being an outpost of the West did not change within the Hungarian Kingdom either. Due to military, administrative and most of all communication reasons, the Hungarian kings ruled Transylvania through their agents, called "vajda" or "princeps". Often the younger brother or the son of the king carried the title and the responsibilities which went with it. This practice was in force from 1074 until 1526, the fall of the medieval Hungarian Kingdom.

This de-centralized, almost federative, form of government, lay in the very structure of the Hungarian Empire. Croatia co-existed from 1091 to 1918 in a specific form of union with the Hungarian Kingdom. The Southern belt, called "Bansag", which was originally a defensive organization, was ruled under its own administrative autonomy by a "Ban". The cities of the Dalmatian seashore joined the Kingdom as autonom cities, while the belt of subjugated principalities, encircling Hungary from the South, East and North, including today's Yugoslavia, part of Poland and Roumania, were ruled either by their own dukes or by centrally nominated royal representatives, and were attached thereby with the central power, seated in the Danubian Basin.

Thus the indirect government of Transylvania did not suggest in any way a separation, because the king could take into his own hand at any time the administration of the land. Transylvania was an integral part of the Kingdom. When, as a result of the Turkish occupation, the Kingdom itself fell apart, and in accordance with the Speyer treaty in August, 1570, the independent Transylvanian Principality was established, even the people of Transylvania regarded the situation as interim and

born of necessity. In the said treaty, Janos Zsigmond, the nationally elected king, abdicated voluntarily from the Hungarian throne for the benefit of the Emperor Maximilian, and recognizing the sovereignty of the Hungarian Crown over Transylvania, took the title of "Duke of Transylvania", (*Serenissimus Princeps Transylvaniae*.)

This Transylvanian attitude was classically expressed in the "Last Will and Testament" of the Duke Istvan Bocskay, 1604-1606, who was the creator of the authotelic policy of Transylvania, caught between two competing forces, the German and the Turk.

"As long as the Hungarian Crown shall be in the possession of the Germans, a nation more powerful than we are, the presence of a Duke in Transylvania will always be practical and needed in support of Hungary. But when God shall be willing to return the Hungarian Crown to Hungarian hands and within an Hungarian Kingdom, we urge the people of Transylvania not to secede from or turn against that Kingdom, but to aid it with all their power and in complete agreement, and render themselves under the Crown according to old customs."

The independent Transylvanian Principality came into existence under outside pressure. The regionalism, as such, has evolved out of the specific natural endowments of the region, a particular living unit of its own within the unity of the Danubian Basin. This regionalism became deeply engraved into history during the short era of independence, when Transylvania was forced to become the sole heir of the Hungarian Statehood in the Danubian Basin and to carry alone the burden of torch-bearer and developer of this concept.

The basic principle of this statehood was the "*una eademque libertas*", the same and equal liberty for all. This liberty-ideal was not only expressed by the continuous liberty wars of the Transylvanian Principality against the Habsburgs, but most of all in the very statehood of Transylvania itself, in its political system and mental attitude.

The evolution of this specific Transylvanian State-concept was determined mostly by the fact, that it was not a national State, but consisted of three nations living within the land: The Hungarian, the Szekely and the Saxon (German settlers).

Of course, contrary to today's ethnic concept of the word, "*natio*" meant exclusively a political nation. That part of society which possessed the political rights—free men and nobility. The political system of Europe was based on the two

polarities of free men and serfs. This was the era when the privileged classes (nobility, patricius) referred to in the legal language as "Status and Ordines" stood in opposition to the masses, rightfully called "misera plebs".

The fall of this social and political system was caused by the very fact that it did not include the people into the nation. However, anyone could become a member of the nation, for every member of the "misera plebs" had the free opportunity to raise himself by virtue of deeds into the privileged classes, completely disregarding his ethnic origin, language or religion. Act VI of the 1540 Law of Transylvania clearly stated that "there shall be no differences between the Hungarian members and the Roumanian members of the nobility". (*Valachus ipse nobilis cum Hungaris nobilibus et verificationem et juramenti depositionem in Judiciis facere peregrareque tenentur*". (Puscariu: "Disertatiune Despre Impartirea Politica Ardealului", Sibiu 1864, page 36.)

The three Transylvanian nations, already united in 1437 at Kapolna, agreed to aid one another and to administer their affairs jointly. This agreement of Kapolna later became the foundation of the Transylvanian Constitution.

The Szekelys, who had been detailed there by former Hungarian kings as frontier guards, and the Germans, (called Saxons), who had settled later for the same purpose "ad retinendam Coronam", lived in privileged regional, political and cultural autonomies, called "Universitas". The administrative organization of the Hungarians was the district or county-system. The Roumanians, who moved across the Carpathian Mountains in an always increasing number seeking refuge from Turkish oppression, lived under similar administrative and legal circumstances as did the Hungarians, but without the possibility of becoming a fourth nation. For their benefits were created on the pattern of the Hungarian districts, the "Universitas Nobilorum de Krasso", the "Universitas Nobilorum de Hunyad" and the "Universitas Nobilorum de Fogaras", with Roumanian nobility and serfs. The situation of the Roumanians was best expressed by two leading Roumanian politicians and historians.

"When in 1437, the three Transylvanian nations signed the first Constitutional Agreement of the Union in Kapolna, the Roumanian knesdoms had already crumbled away, and sunk into serfhood after the fall of the patrimonial Kingdom. Thus the Roumanians were not able to develop into an independent national structure and could not be taken into consideration as

an equal partner at the signing of the Agreement. Due to this reason, during the era of the Independent Transylvanian Principality, (1542-1690), the Roumanians were not able to become a Transylvanian nation, invested with large scale self-governmental rights and privileges." (Goldis: "About the Nationality Problem", Arad, 1912, page 17.)

Jean Slavici adds to this: "The only notable cultural institution of the Roumanians was the Greek-Orthodox Church, which stood however, under complete Balkan-Slavic influence. Its official language was not Roumanian, but Slavic. The era of the Roumanian national consciousness began only about 1700, when half of the Transylvanian Roumanians converted into Greek-Catholic religion, and our priests were able to study history in Rome and Vienna." (J. Slavici: "Ardealul, Studiu Istoric", 1893, Bucharest, pages 95-96).

The true state of this nomadic herdsman-people can be best evaluated from the decree of the Duke George Rakoczy I, (1631-48), sent to the Roumanian Bishop of Bihar, ordering him "to preach to those poor Wallachians in their own tongue, so they may be edified by it in the knowledge of God, and led out from the shadows of superstitious errings into the clear sunshine." Roumanian culture and civilization had its origins in Transylvania and started with the help and financial aid of Transylvanian Hungarian Dukes and noblemen.

The Constitution of the Transylvanian Principality, based on two separate legal documents, can be summed up as follows:

The country was governed by an elected duke, whose legal authority was determined by the Congress, which Congress also possessed the power to remove him from office. Each nation elected "Counselors" in equal number, to serve beside the Duke. In order to bring a Congressional Resolution, the consent of all three nations was necessary. The nations voted collectively in Congress, as a block. Later, repealing the original vote-right, the Constitution ordered that in case of grievances, the nation concerned had to turn to the other two for support, who, in their turn, had to present the case to the Duke through due process of Congress, or in case of lesser grievances, to the Counselors.

The Congress consisted of one house only. Individual representatives had only discussion-rights, while the vote went by nations in block. The majority, therefore, did not necessarily consist of the numerical majority of the members of Congress, but of the votes of the three nations as groups.

The power of the Transylvanian Principality was based on the army, jointly maintained by the three nations. Each nation provided the Duke with 7,000 men. This was the first non-mercenary army in Europe.

At the time of the Transylvanian Principality, Europe was like a boiling pot, torn by ideological wars. The Turkish Empire, commanding the most modern armies of that time, and spurred by the fanaticism of the Islam religion, made ever new and new efforts to run down the rest of Europe. Its base of military operations was the Central Plain of the Danubian Basin.

In the West, new colonial empires arose, aided by the new geographical discoveries, creating great wealth on one side and miserable poverty on the other. Thus the outlines of the later social differences began to take shape. The urge of the human mind for liberty brought forth Protestantism, Pietism, Certezianism and Puritanism. In Italy and Spain the Inquisition raged, along with devastating peasant uprisings. The Thirty-Year War decimated Central Europe.

In these wars, the Transylvanian Principality fought for the freedom of religion as a member of the Federation of Protestant States. First in the world, Transylvania declared religious freedom in 1550, and 1557 added to the Constitution the right of men to change his religion according to his belief, The Transylvanians were fighting the Turks and making pacts with them. They were fighting against the anti-Protestant, Germanizing Habsburgs, who were trying to melt Hungary into the German Empire. But their main purpose still remained—to re-establish the integrity of Hungary, and to secure the recognition of the Hungarian Constitution by the possessors of the Holy Crown.

In the meanwhile, the regional profile of Transylvania became clearly outlined. Its historical individuality developed into a realistic political and mental attitude, which kept its eye only on the final goal, clinging to solid principles. Giving place to the play of opposing forces, this attitude created a specifically collective and particularly regional mentality, known as "Transylvanianism". With the aid of this mental attitude and political flexibility, Transylvania survived as a living unit on the ruins of the Danubian Hungarian Kingdom, ground between the huge millstones of the two opposing empires, the German and the Turk. As the lone fortress of the Western Christian culture-circle, Transylvania, custodian of the Hungarian State-

Concept, kept on guarding the frontier of the West toward the East.

As the heir of the humanistic-renaissance kingdom of Matthias Corvinus, the Transylvanian Principality took over the legacy of the Hungarian European culture. The first book printed in Hungarian appeared in Transylvania in 1527. Toward the end of the same century, some 18 printing establishments were at work within the land. Together, they published 380 books, 180 in Latin, 139 in Hungarian, 15 in German, 10 in Roumanian, 9 in old Slavic and 7 in Greek language. In the 17th century, there were already 44 printing establishments at work. Besides the original encyclopedias, guide-books and school-books of Transylvanian authors, they published a large number of translations from French, English, Italian, Dutch and German writers, philosophers and clergymen.

In the same time, the specifically Transylvanian literature appeared for the first time. In 1555, Tinodi Lantos Sebestyen published in Kolozsvár his famous "Verses Kronika", (Chronicles in Verses) and in 1569, appeared the most typical literary work of that era, printed in Abrudbánya, the "Comedie about the Treason of Balassi Menyhert".

The Transylvanian culture, due to its typically Protestant nature, was not the sole property of the higher classes, but it became a popular culture, with a specifically Transylvanian taste and color, reflecting the reciprocal influences of the three national and racial cultures, tastes and mentalities. The centers of public education were "Collegiums", where side by side with young noblemen, a large number of lower class children became educated. Besides Hungarian professors who received their degrees at foreign universities, many foreign professors of great international prestige taught in these Collegiums, like Martin Opitz, John Alsted, Henry Bisterfeld and Isac Basire. Young Transylvanians visited foreign universities in increasing numbers, financed by the dukes of Transylvania.

For example, in Wittenberg, between 1586 and 1640, more than 300 Transylvanian students received their diplomas, while in Lynden, between 1620 and 1650, there were 231 Transylvanians enrolled.

While politically, the three official "natio" ruled Transylvania, culturally, the symbiosis of the three peoples prevailed—the Hungarian, German and Roumanian. The mutual influence these three cultures exercised on one another can no longer be separated.

The Transylvanian dukes and noblemen gave powerful aid to the unfoldment of Roumanian culture, civilization and education. A hundred years before the first Roumanian book was published in Roumania proper, (Moldova), in the year 1564, Benker, German Mayor, and Miklos Forro, an Hungarian nobleman, jointly published the Evangelium in Roumanian language. Duke Kristof Bathory established and maintained in Gyulafehervar, a Roumanian printing shop, where the first Roumanian book appeared printed with Latin letters in 1570. In 1582, as a donation of Ferenc Geszty, the Old Testament was printed in Roumanian, while the New Testament came out from the same printing shop some years later.

This situation did not change, even after the Independent Transylvanian Principality ceased to exist. Among the 587 Roumanian books published in the 19th century, 320 were published in Hungary. The first Roumanian newspaper, the "Gazeta Transylvania" appeared in Brasso in 1839, and Octavian Goga, the great Roumanian poet, who later became the Prime Minister of Greater Roumania, published his literary and political magazine "Luciaferul", in Budapest, 1902.

Professor Torjai-Szabo wrote in his book: "The Hungarian and German Protestantism in Transylvania exercised a decisive influence upon the cultural and political development of the entire Roumanian nation. These cultural influences, coming from the Hungarians, developed in a relatively short time, the cultural and political nationalism of the Roumanians."

The Transylvanian Germans, who enjoyed complete territorial, political and cultural autonomy, also produced a long line of scientists, writers and creative artists. In spite of the fact that through all the centuries they stayed loyal to their German origin, creating a very special branch of the universal German culture, they contributed a very particular color to the development of the Transylvanian regionalism and mentality.

Thus, the Principality of Transylvania became the continuity of the Hungarian State-Concept, which was—"to make the Carpathian Basin, as a natural living unit, into a political framework and fill this framework with the traditional Hungarian Liberty-Concept. This is the true Hungarian State-Concept and not the domination of one nation above the others". (Ottlik: "Pax Hungarica".)

The noted Roumanian historian, Nicolae Balcescu writes in his "Istoria Romanilor", page 312,—"The problem in Transylvania was not, and is not, how the Roumanians, the Hungarians,

the Germans or the Szekely must proceed in order that they alone rule this land and eliminate the others. But how to find the ways among themselves to the possibilities of harmony within the framework of a federative state, in which equal rights are being enjoyed by all individuals just as by all nations." (Published in 1902, Bucharest.)

When, finally, at the end of the 17th century and the first part of the 18th century, the Danubian Basin was liberated from the Turks by united Western efforts, the Habsburgs regarded the devastated Hungary as a "Crown Dominion". Transylvania started several liberty wars against the Habsburg oppression, but everyone of them failed. In 1691, the Emperor terminated the Transylvanian Principality and incorporated it into the Empire. While he abolished the Transylvanian Constitution, it still retained almost the same principles of "Systema unionis trium nationem".

In a new liberty war, in 1707, the Hungarian Congress of Onod declared officially the dethronement of the House of Habsburg, giving the power of "regent" to the Duke Ferenc Rakoczy, until free elections could be held. Thus the decree of Onod restored in principle the National Kingdom and the territorial unity of the country. Due to the fact that the elected Duke of Transylvania and the Regent in whom the Hungarian Congress invested the Royal Powers was the same person, in idea and in practice, the re-unification of Hungary and Transylvania became materialized.

However, with the change in political constellations in Western Europe, the Imperial forces concentrated on Hungary, and the Rakoczy Liberty War ended in defeat. With this, the fate of Hungary was determined for one and a half centuries. During this time, the Hungarian nation, and through it, the genuid forces of the Danubian Basin, was completely paralyzed by Habsburg domination, terror and persecution. Nonetheless, the Danubian Basin itself, framed now into the Great Empire of the Habsburgs, continued its European functions as the fortress of the West toward the East, and as the bridge between the two worlds. Only it was sunk down to the level of the former Roman provinces.

The Hungarian National State turned slowly into a state of nationalities, and the awakening national consciousness began in the 18th century to create conflicts among the nationalities. The centralized bureaucracy of the Habsburg absolutistic system was unable to replace the principles of the Hungarian Con-

stitution which was based on local autonomies and thereby secured the free play of political forces.

All power was in the hands of the ruler, residing in Vienna. He was the instigator and the executor of the reforms. The Emperor Joseph II, who was one of the most modern and most liberal rulers of his age, abolished the Constitution completely, and in an attempt to create a unified Empire, ordered the German language to become the official language of the administration. He tried to organize a unified national state where there was no unified nation.

The French Revolution, the American Declaration of Independence, and finally the plans of Napoleon to unify Europe under French hegemony, brought forth great changes in the life of Europe. The principles of "Egalite, Fraternite, Liberte", the desire of the peoples for a liberal parliamentary form of government and constitutional rule, aided by the increase of national feelings, stirred new unrests.

In many cases, like in Hungary and Transylvania, the nobility itself led in the proclamation of social and political reforms by voluntarily giving up out-dated privileges. A strong mental fermentation began. The initiative was given by writers, and taken over by politicians. In Hungary, this was the era of reform-meetings, which finally ended in the Liberty War of 1848-49, led by Louis Kossuth.

The Revolutionary Congress of 1848 restored the Hungarian Constitution, abolished the privileges of the nobility, created a new, parliamentary government, united officially Transylvania with Hungary and passed liberal laws concerning the nationalities. The new laws included equal taxation, freedom of press and the equality of all religions.

The Emperor Ferdinand V, sanctioned these new laws, but the Vienna government feared the reforms for the sake of the Monarchy's unity. They forced the Emperor to abdicate and replaced him with the sixteen year old Franz Joseph, who did not even let himself be crowned with the Stephen Crown, so he would not have to take the oath to uphold the Hungarian Constitution. He declared the reforms, already sanctioned by Ferdinand, as void, and sent his army into Hungary to remove the freely elected government. The greatest Hungarian Liberty War seemed for a while to succeed against the Habsburg forces, but Franz Joseph, referring to the European Holy Alliance, asked aid from the Czar of Russia. On August 13, 1849, the Hungarians surrendered to the Russian Commander.

After the surrender, the most bloody rule of terror dominated Hungary for two decades. However, in the meantime, the Habsburgs were slowly losing their dominions in Italy and Germany and were left with the Imperial Crown of Austria and the Royal Crowns of Bohemia and Hungary. In 1860, negotiations began between the Crown and the Nation, which finally led in 1867 to a compromise between the Emperor and Hungary. The Constitution was restored, Hungary and Transylvania officially united again, and the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy came into existence.

**CHANGE IN CONCEPTS WITHIN THE MONARCHY**

The Austro-Hungarian Monarchy, a liberal-constitutional state formation, created in the Danubian Basin a tremendous economic upswing and prosperity. Together with the industrial and commercial urban development, the entire social structure of the country began to change. Sadly enough, the political changes did not keep in step with the social changes.

Every citizen of the Monarchy enjoyed the same rights provided by the law. The change from a feudalistic system to a liberal-constitutional state filled everyone with enthusiasm, and turned the people's attention to legal problems. All the political activities of this era were concentrated on the discussions of constitutional questions.

The booming economy created a prosperous middle class and a tremendously large class of urban bourgeoisie. The large masses of landholding peasantry benefited also from the richness of the Monarchy, except the landless farm laborers, who began to migrate to America for higher wages.

Within the Monarchy itself three different state-concepts met in silent struggle: that of the German Holy Empire; that of the Stephen's Crown; and the Czech concept of Bohemia.

Hungary, where the regional autonomies had long been repealed by the Habsburgs, yielded to centralistic tendencies of the Monarchy, and so the districts losing their intended political roles, became solely administrative units. The effects of this change was felt most in Transylvania, where the Constitution had secured for centuries complete self-government to the different nationalities.

Before the establishment of the Monarchy, during the one and a half centuries of unlimited Habsburg domination, the Transylvanian districts were administered by German speaking Austrian officials. After 1868, the administrators were mostly local dignitaries, nominated by the Emperor, who was also the King of Hungary.

The members of the lower house, the representatives in the Parliament, were freely elected by the people. Many Roumanian politicians, who later played great roles in post World War Roumania, began their political careers as representatives of those districts where the Roumanian population was in the ma-

After the surrender, the most bloody rule of terror dominated Hungary for two decades. However, in the meantime, the Habsburgs were slowly losing their dominions in Italy and Germany and were left with the Imperial Crown of Austria and the Royal Crowns of Bohemia and Hungary. In 1860, negotiations began between the Crown and the Nation, which finally led in 1867 to a compromise between the Emperor and Hungary. The Constitution was restored, Hungary and Transylvania officially united again, and the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy came into existence.

## CHANGE IN CONCEPTS WITHIN THE MONARCHY

The Austro-Hungarian Monarchy, a liberal-constitutional state formation, created in the Danubian Basin a tremendous economic upswing and prosperity. Together with the industrial and commercial urban development, the entire social structure of the country began to change. Sadly enough, the political changes did not keep in step with the social changes.

Every citizen of the Monarchy enjoyed the same rights provided by the law. The change from a feudalistic system to a liberal-constitutional state filled everyone with enthusiasm, and turned the people's attention to legal problems. All the political activities of this era were concentrated on the discussions of constitutional questions.

The booming economy created a prosperous middle class and a tremendously large class of urban bourgeoisie. The large masses of landholding peasantry benefited also from the richness of the Monarchy, except the landless farm laborers, who began to migrate to America for higher wages.

Within the Monarchy itself three different state-concepts met in silent struggle: that of the German Holy Empire; that of the Stephen's Crown; and the Czech concept of Bohemia.

Hungary, where the regional autonomies had long been repealed by the Habsburgs, yielded to centralistic tendencies of the Monarchy, and so the districts losing their intended political roles, became solely administrative units. The effects of this change was felt most in Transylvania, where the Constitution had secured for centuries complete self-government to the different nationalities.

Before the establishment of the Monarchy, during the one and a half centuries of unlimited Habsburg domination, the Transylvanian districts were administered by German speaking Austrian officials. After 1868, the administrators were mostly local dignitaries, nominated by the Emperor, who was also the King of Hungary.

The members of the lower house, the representatives in the Parliament, were freely elected by the people. Many Roumanian politicians, who later played great roles in post World War Roumania, began their political careers as representatives of those districts where the Roumanian population was in the ma-

jority. Strangely enough, most of these politicians regarded the Austrian Empire as their homeland, and not the Hungarian Kingdom in which they lived, and of which they had enjoyed the Constitutional rights.

The explanation for this can be found in part in the social changes within the country, and in part, in foreign influences seeping across the borders from the East.

The economic development of the country gave free opportunities to everyone to climb through his own initiative, from the lower classes into the prosperous middle class, and even into the upper class, with absolute disregard to his nationality (Janos Bud, Anton Mocsonyi de Foen, Dr. Moldovan, Mr. Muntyan, etc.). But because the middle and upper classes in Transylvania were exclusively Hungarian in language, those members of the other nationalities who came up into these classes through their own efforts became rapidly assimilated into these classes, and most of them lost their national identities.

Roumanian politicians called this natural assimilation of the individuals in the group "Hungarization". The fact was, that "Hungarization" or "Magyarization", as a planned program, never existed. It would have been against the Hungarian Constitution. Nonetheless, there was a definite assimilative effect at work within the bourgeoisie and the middle class toward the new-comers into these classes. It was simply the law of assimilation exercised by a higher culture on an inferior one.

Public education was centrally organized and financed. Teachers, hired and paid by the Hungarian Government, were ordered to always teach in the native tongues of their pupils. Only higher education was exclusively Hungarian, and even that in just the public institutions. Private schools, maintained by the different churches, were free to teach in any language they desired.

All nationality groups were equally entitled to the exercise of free elections, to representation in the Parliament, to their own free press and to any other kind of cultural, economic and religious establishments. Whether this liberal attitude, deeply rooted into the Constitution and into the Freedom-Concept of the Hungarian Nation, was an asset or a liability to Hungary, can be discussed. The fact is, that through these establishments, not only allowed, but generously supported by the Hungarian Government, foreign influences moved into the country, undermining its unity and preparing its downfall.

While the Hungarian State-Concept has never changed from

its original basic principles, a shifting began to take place in the interpretation of this Concept. It was instigated by Vienna and by the increasing anti-Hungarian attitude of the nationalities.

The law (Sect. 44-1868) clearly stated that "all the citizens of Hungary form one political nation, therefore every citizen of the country, no matter to which ethnic group he belongs, is an equal member of the nation." This law meant that in Hungary, not only the majority group belonged to the ruling nation, but even the smallest ethnic group was a member of it. The political structure of Hungary was not based on the rule of one people over the others, but on an idea of civilization. Namely to include the entire Carpathian Basin as a geographical unit on the frontiers of Western culture into the political framework of one Western Christian Kingdom. The style of rule, was from the beginning to end not "national" but Western Christian, therefore, international. It was not called "Hungary" because it was ruled by Hungarians, but because within its borders, up to the 18th century, Hungarians were in the majority. Just as within the Roman Empire, where Africans, Hispanians, Illirs and even Germanic Barbarians, stepped into the leading positions of the Roman patricians as the vanguard of Roman civilization, so can we see Frenchmen, Germans, Italians, Croatians and even Roumanians fighting through the centuries for Hungarian civilization and liberty.

In 1848-49, German, Serbian, Irish and Polish heroes fought for the principles of the Hungarian State-Concept. Men who never spoke the Hungarian language. Spiritual leaders of humanity like the English Matthew Arnold, the French Reclus, and the German Heine, praised with enthusiasm the Hungarian phenomenon of unity. The famous epigram for which Hungarians were so frequently accused of being over-patriotic: "Extra Hungarian non est vita, sic est vita, non est ita." (Outside of Hungary there is no life, and if there is life, it is not the same,) was created, not by an Hungarian, but by the Italian Coelius Rhodiginus in the 15th century.

The "One Hungarian People" mentioned as such in the original Constitution and later again in the 1868 law, stood for all the native inhabitants of the Carpathian Basin, framed into one unity by the Constitution of the Hungarian State-Concept.

This State-Concept, however, in the last centuries had a giant competitor—the conception of the Habsburg Empire. The Habsburg civilization embraced a much larger horizon, for it in-

cluded the entire valley of the Danubian River. It stood in opposition to the Hungarian Liberty-Concept because it was based on the idea of Dynastical rule. In other words, it carried the concept of an overall servitude of the people. From an historic-philosophical viewpoint, the many centuries-long fight of the Hungarians against the Habsburgs was, in reality, nothing less than the clash of these two opposing concepts of civilization. This fight, expressed in the many liberty wars, had a dynamic current. The peoples in the Danubian Basin saw in the Hungarians the torch-bearers of liberty against the Turk and against the Habsburg oppressions, and they were willing to fight side by side with them on the battlefields.

The Nation-Concept of the 19th century became interwoven with the ethnical and the language concepts. Because, during the feudalistic era and even after 1868, the political nation was the Hungarian, the desire became more prevalent that the member nations should speak the Hungarian language. This brought forth the false notion that those who could not speak the language could not be good Hungarians nor good patriots. "This created a big propaganda movement on behalf of the Hungarian language, called "Magyarization", which had more noise than effects and the logic of which was in direct opposition to the facts. The great masses of the nationalities never learned the language, but still retained their traditional loyalty to the Hungarian State, while their political leaders used their knowledge of the Hungarian language as a tool against the Hungarian concept of unity within the Carpathian Basin." (Ottlik: "Pax Hungarica".)

As mentioned before, the assimilation was much more effective on the social level. Except for the Germans, especially the Transylvanian Saxons, the large masses of the ethnic groups in Hungary were peasants and herdsmen. Without a certain degree of assimilation they were unable to rise into the commercial or administrative middle-class, since they had no such classes within their own ethnic groups. This lack of a leading class made it impossible for them to become organized into regional autonomies as the Germans or the Szekelys, which otherwise would have been the normal procedure, according to the Hungarian Constitution.

The leaders of the ethnic groups, mainly their priests, protested with every possible means against this assimilation, and regarded it as a manifestation of hostility against their interests. They saw the solution of their problems in the creation

of ethnic autonomies and in the federation of these autonomies. In spite of the fact that in the concept of the Habsburg Empire there was no place for such autonomies, while on the contrary, the original idea of the Hungarian State-Concept was based on regional autonomies until the Habsburgs abolished them, the leaders of the ethnic groups showed loyalty only to the Vienna court and not to the Hungarian homeland.

In their turn, the Hungarians, prompted by this hostile attitude, regarded the ethnic problem as part of the oppressive Habsburg policy against the territorial integrity and unity of Hungary. Under these mental and political conditions the Pan-Slavic, the Pan-Germanic and the Daco-Roumanian movements of the 19th century infiltrated the public life of the Monarchy. The mutual misunderstandings, local administrative transgressions, and the increasing anti-Hungarian attitude of the ethnic groups created an atmosphere of tension and mutual distrust. Thus the nationalities of the Carpathian Basin, who not only had co-existed for centuries, but had built a country for themselves in peace and harmony, now, under the influence of the new nationalistic ideas of the 19th century, turned against one another.

The faults and merits of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy have been for many decades the centers of violent discussions. It is not our aim to engage ourselves in this controversy. It will be the task of future historians to deliver an objective evaluation, for all those who are discussing it today are either witnesses or victims of that political era. This explains the mutual accusations, the extremely biased opinions and the many distortions of the truth.

Nevertheless, certain evident facts must be pinpointed here. One, that the former member nations of the Monarchy mutually accuse each other today of everything that went wrong. Second, that the small national states which took the place of the Monarchy, and which contain just as many ethnic groups as did the Monarchy, have been unable to furnish the same status of power and security, the same status of peace and prosperity to their citizens as they enjoyed before, in spite of the inner struggles. The proof of this statement is clearly documented by the ever-increasing search in people's minds for the restoration of the old unit in some other form.

The idea of a Danubian Federation or a Federation of Danubian States came up many times since the fall of the Monarchy. Its realization between the two World Wars was made impossible by the overheated political atmosphere which ex-

cluded even the thought of mutual concessions. Today, under the dictatorial pressure of the Soviet Union such an idea cannot even be mentioned. The creation of a Danubian Federation, in any form, would mean nothing less than the return of the Danubian Basin to its original historic functions as the organizing power of South-Eastern Europe, and the fortress of the Western World toward the East. But as long as the Soviet Union does not give up her plans of World-conquest, her position in the Danubian Basin will serve as her most important bridgehead against the West.

Among the historical heritages of the Monarchy are two main problem complexes remaining for solution. One is the question of statehood in the Danubian Basin, and the other is the problem of the ethnic minorities. Both problems are far from being simply regional problems, and belong to the overall synthesis of Europe. In order to deal with these problems, we have to clarify a few concepts.

Under Danubian Basin, we understand those territories around the central course of the Danubian River, which formerly belonged to the medieval Hungarian Kingdom, the "Archiregnum". The center of the Danubian Basin, however, is that certain region we call the Carpathian Basin, and the border of which coincide exactly with the borders of the Hungarian Kingdom itself. For the sake of illustrating these problems, we have discussed on previous pages the past history of the entire Danubian Basin, and the principles of a concept which was able to organize this territory into a strong and prosperous unit and to maintain it for many centuries. The objective evaluation of this past proves that the fate of the entire Danubian Basin and all its peoples depends on the functions performed by its natural center, namely the Carpathian Basin. Independent from all the other factors, the charismatic consciousness of this key position explains the stubborn devotion of the Hungarians to their Statehood and the integrity of this Statehood even in times when both were nothing more than fiction.

After the fall of the organizing power of this region, the Hungarian Kingdom, the Danubian Basin became first the Central European basis of the Turkish aggression against the West, and then was turned into a province of the German Empire. Only after the Habsburgs lost most of their powers, was the Danubian Basin re-established again, still under the Habsburg rule, as the living unit of historical individuality.

Unluckily enough, in this revived unity, the original idea

which enabled the peoples of the Danubian Basin in the previous centuries to unfold to the full their individualities harmoniously was no longer present. Instead, three completely opposing State-Concepts clashed against each other. While the Czech concept was swallowed up by the much stronger German concept, the German and the Hungarian were unable to overcome one another. Thus, neither of these concepts could fully materialize, and the State apparatus of the dual Monarchy had to operate with compromises and half-solutions. This led to the intensification and aggravation of all problems which otherwise could have either been solved by the dictatorial methods of the Habsburg absolutism or by the Constitutional framework of the Stephen's Crown.

Emil Franzel writes in his book, "Donauraum" (Francke Verlag, Bern, 1958,) "Driven out of Italy and Germany, the Habsburg Empire was forced to turn toward the South-East. Bismarck himself suggested that Austria should transfer its center of gravity to Budapest . . . The Constitution of Dec. 21, 1867 was the masterpiece of liberal ideologists. It contained the complete catalog of the basic human rights, limited the power of the government, introduced the responsibility of the cabinet, and contained directives concerning the equality of all nationalities. But exactly this point shows, that the doctrine-makers of the liberal state were unable to bring life into the laws they have created. The spirit of the constitution would have requested that a nationality-law be drawn up which could have secured national autonomies from the town councils up to the ethnic universities. But the Parliament, in spite of its own Constitution, never settled this problem. That this Constitution was a work of idealists can also be seen by the fact that in many aspects it was left in a vacuum. It was the Constitution of a state which, in reality, never came into existence. The state, to which this Constitution was given, did not even have a name. It was called until its very end in 1917 the 'Kingdoms and Countries represented in the Empirical Council.' This nameless State was not based in reality on either the Constitution or the Parliament . . . but on the legality of the Crown, on the person of the ruler and on the subordinated executive power."

In order to better understand the problems which the Monarchy was unable, or did not have time enough to solve, we must examine causes and conditions which created them.

In Europe there were always peoples of different races, different languages, different religious beliefs and different cultures

living together in the same organized framework of statehood. From the beginning of its history clear up to the 19th century, Europe recognized only two political and social units as absolute essentials: the State and the family. The relationship between these two units, State and family, was coordinated by the social system which grew out from the masses and which alone practiced politics: the nobility. In their hands lay the right and the possibility for organized action. They were the representatives of the State, and were called the "Nation". Because everyone in the "patria" (fatherland) had about the same possibility for elevating himself through his own efforts and abilities into this class, (with complete disregard to ethnic origin), the concept of "Nation" became politically sublimated, even in those countries where the nobility was filtered out of a homogenous society. Thus the system of statehood was based on the dual polarity of a leading class on one side possessing all political powers, and the masses on the other.

This situation began to change with the French Revolution, which put the "people" as the ultimate source of law and power, in the place of the absolute Royal powers. In theory, that is. In actual practice only so much changed, that the "sovereign person of the absolute monarch" became distributed among the members of the bureaucracy, who did the ruling "in the name of the people".

The sovereignty of the people, as a concept, has no basis whatsoever in the social ideologies of Europe. As Harry Pross puts it, ("Der Volksmithos . . ." Nene Zuricher Zeitung, Jan. 17, 1959.) "The people is only a subsidiary concept . . . as such it is unable to do anything, but those who act in its name can refer to it this way even more." Exactly because they were able to refer to it, and because they were able to justify their deeds with "the will of the people", those who did the acting, namely the politicians and the ideologists, surrounded the concept of the "people" with a myth, and finally identified it with the nation-concept.

Thus were the modern national States created, not based on some political or social community, but based on the people as an ethnical, linguistical and cultural unit. Under the "sovereignty of the people" in the 19th century a catastrophic requirement of our age was established on the ruins of the feudal Europe:—the united and indivisible national state-concept, corresponding with the ethnic borders. Because it was impossible to fulfill this requirement anywhere in Europe, since in every State there were

people living for centuries who belonged to another ethnic group, the concept of "ethnic minority" came into the foreground.

How clouded this entire problem is can be demonstrated by mentioning that, for example, in the legal language of the Anglo-Saxon World "nationality" means citizenship, even today, while in practice it is the name of a cultural and linguistical community, possessing historical individuality.

It must also be understood that the nationality problems of Europe cannot be compared in any way with the assimilative "melting-pot" tendencies of America, which brought forth the American Nation by blending together the sons of all the European nations. These Europeans who came into America did so with the open desire to become Americans. While most of the ethnic minorities found in the National States of Europe either ended up by conquest or by forced group-migrations in the foreign framework, and tried to preserve their own individuality in every possible way through clinging to their language, their traditions, their culture and their religion, which differed from that of the ruling majority.

Two opposing wills faced each other within each of the European National States. That of the ruling nation, trying to establish at any cost its own National State based on one unified ethnic origin, and that of the ethnic minorities struggling to preserve their own identity. The law and practice of democracy does not recognize ethnic autonomies. All it can do at best is to grant equal human rights. It does not recognize the ethnic groups as independent legal units, but it still demands from them absolute loyalty. Therefore, the ethnic minorities, even in the most tolerant States, must accept the status of second grade citizens.

Because they differ substantially from the ruling majority, the universal rights to them as a group cannot of themselves be satisfactory. In some countries, (England, France), they can take part in the legislation only as members of one of the political parties, which are organized by and for the majority nation. In countries where they are allowed to form their own political parties, their influence on the policy of the State is very weak, if felt at all, because of their permanent minority status. Therefore, they feel that the country in which they live is only their homeland in a regional and not a political sense, and while they try to find a modus vivendi in order to survive, they always nourish the secret dreams of one day joining their own National

State by moving the borders in order to fit their own geographical location.

It is understandable that during the last century a mutual distrust built up between majority and minority ethnic groups, all over Europe, which was the greatest obstacle in the way of any sensible solution. In the case of Hungary, the Hungarians have never regarded the Croatians as an "ethnic minority", but as a partner nation within the Federated personal union. The Slovaks, who lived for a thousand years in the most intimate relations with the Hungarians, were alienated from them only under the ideological influences of the 19th century, and were torn out of their traditional community by the artificial creation of a Czech-Slovak State and Nation. While the dream of a Great-Serbia for a long time haunted the horizon, the Serbs of Hungary never wanted more than their minority rights as outlined in the Constitution. So far as the Germans were concerned, the Hungarians had no serious friction with this ethnic group, except under the influence of Hitler's imperialistic aggression.

However, it was entirely different in the case of the largest ethnic group in the country, the Roumanians.

## THE ROUMANIAN IMMIGRATION

Through the entire history that narrow flatland between the lower Danube and the Southern Carpathians served as the highway of Eastern aggression against the Carpathian Basin. This strategically important region was called for centuries the "Focsani Gate". Huns, Avars, Bulgarians, Turks and finally the Red Army, used this gateway in order to enter the Carpathian Basin.

For this reason, King Bela IV organized in 1235 a large Hungarian settlement on this territory, for the protection of the Focsani Gate. This autonom Hungarian settlement was called the "Bansag of Szoreny". Even today, more than 200 town and village names remind us in this area of their Hungarian origin. Thousands of Hungarian family names prove that an assimilation process took place and the Hungarians became absorbed into the Roumanians, who migrated centuries later into this area. (Radu Rosetti: "Despre Unguri si Episcopiile Catolic din Moldova", 1905, Bucuresti, pages 2-7 and Siculus: "A Moldovai Magyarok . . ." 1942, University of Pecs, Chapter 14.)

The Roumanians, or their original name, the "Vlach"-s, a Balkanian herds-people moved slowly from the Albanian mountains toward the East, and their appearance was first noticed in the 11th century, south of the lower Danube. The first scattered Roumanian settlements on the North Bank of the Danube, in the Hungarian "Bansag of Szoreny" was reported in 1247. In the district Fogaras, their appearance was mentioned for the first time in a document dated 1206. At the end of the same century, two Vlach "voievodines" were established by the Hungarian Kingdom, called "Havasalfold", (today Muntenia), and Moldova. Through their contacts with the Hungarians, these people soon came under the influence of Western culture, in spite of their Slavic-Orthodox religion. This influence, of course, left its mark only upon the ruling circles, who learned Western habits and manners through their contacts with the Hungarian nobility. The mass of the Roumanians, being nomadic herds-people, could not be organized by force and kept on moving up and down along the Southern and Eastern slopes of the Carpathians. It took several centuries until they finally settled down to agriculture.

The endless wars which ravaged their country, and the des-

otic tendencies of their own rulers, forced them to be on constant alert and move into the mountains whenever danger arose. To escape danger and persecution by their own chieftains, they began to move in groups across the Carpathians, seeking refuge and protection in the Hungarian Kingdom, where they were organized into regular districts under their own selected leaders.

Both Roumanian voievodines came under Turkish influence and domination in the 14th century and their land served as a base of operation against the West. After the downfall of the medieval Hungarian Empire, these two Roumanian Provinces did not see any hope for resistance, and turning their back to the West, they became an active part of the Balkan. The Slavic-Greek influence of their religion proved to be stronger than their short affiliation with the West, especially after their own nobility died out during the wars and their place was taken over by Greeks. This Greek upper-class, called "Fanariotes", introduced Byzantine corruption in the state affairs, and in their greed, they degraded the people to the status of working animals. To escape this situation, more and more Roumanians began to migrate into Transylvania, where they were able to enjoy the privileges and the safety of a Constitutional State organization.

Lupu Vazul, Voevod of Moldova, reported in a letter to Istanbul in 1643, that  $\frac{1}{3}$  of the population of Transylvania was Roumanian. According to the census made by the Jesuits between 1658 and 1662, Transylvania had a total population of a half million people, of which about 240,000 was Roumanian. The exodus kept on. According to the reports of Engel, the population of Muntenia in 1739 included 147,000 families, while in 1757 there were only 35,000 left. In the same time, from the 60,000 population of the city of Bucharest, 17,000 left the country bound for the West.

In Transylvania, the 1857 census found 1,089,854 Roumanians, and in the next fifty years, this figure increased almost three-fold. The 1910 census showed 2,839,454 Roumanians, which made up 53.8% of the population. These figures clearly prove that the big "Magyarization" drive, claimed by the Roumanian politicians, was nothing but fiction.

As a result of the 1806 Russian-Turkish War, Russia annexed Bessarabia and the Eastern part of Moldova. The two voievodines united in 1859 under Alexander Cuza, who was forced to resign in 1866 under the charge of being a "Russian hireling". His successor, the Prinz Carl Hohenzollern-Siegmaringen, de-

clared in 1877 the independence of the United Voievodines and in 1881, the Roumanian Kingdom was proclaimed. This is the point where the history of Roumania, as such, actually begins.

The political, economic and cultural situation of the Transylvanian Roumanians within the Hungarian Kingdom has already been treated in another chapter. It was also mentioned that the Diploma Leopoldicum terminated the Transylvanian Principality in 1691 and revoked its Constitution. However, the status of the Province of Transylvania under Habsburg rule was still based on the same principles of the "union of three nations". Roumanian politicians in their separatistic efforts always referred back to the Diploma Leopoldicum, in spite of the fact that the Roumanians were not even mentioned in this document, because the Diploma Leopoldicum was not based on the national (ethnic) concept, but on the concept of the feudal organization, in which the word "nation" (Hungari: nobiles, siculi et saxones) meant the organized groups and not the ethnic groups. The right concerning the use of the Hungarian language was not expressed in the document either, because in Transylvania, as in Hungary proper, the language of the administration and public life was the Latin. (Puscariu: *Disertatiune despre impartirea politica Ardealului*", 1864, Page 36).

The identity of the political nation must not be confused with the identity of the ethnic nation. These two are not the same.

Toward the end of the 18th century and the first part of the 19th century, the social hatred of the Roumanians, who had been degraded into the status of serfhood by their own leaders, became transferred against the Hungarians, in spite of the fact that the Hungarian serf carried the same burdens on his shoulders. After 1848, when the serfs were freed, 1,615,574 acres of land was handed over to them. 80% of this land went to Roumanians. Toward the end of the 19th century, due to the operations of the Albina Bank, financed by the Roumanian Kingdom, the land possessions of the Roumanians of Transylvania increased in great measure. In spite of the fact that the freedom and the prosperity of the Roumanians in Transylvania was safe-guarded by the Hungarian and not the Austrian Constitution, the leaders of the Roumanians declared their loyalty to the House of Habsburg and not to their Hungarian homeland. They tried to advance their future in a federated Habsburg Empire, in "The United States of Great Austria", (Aurel Popovici).

Dr. Vajda-Voevod, Hungarian nobleman and Roumanian political leader, who later became Prime Minister of Great-Rou-

mania, wrote in 1913 in the "Osterreichische Rundschau":—"We, leaders of the Transylvanian Roumanians, can support only such policy, which keeps in view the future of all Roumanians. Without the presence of a strong Austria-Hungary, Roumanians on both sides of the Carpathians would be easy prey for Russian Imperialism."

In 1861, the Roumanian Cultural Society, the ASTRA, was created in Transylvania, which became the strongest tool of the Roumanian political movement. In 1881, the year of the Proclamation of the Roumanian Kingdom across the Carpathians, the Roumanian National Party was formed in Transylvania and worked hand in hand with the Liga Culturala in Bucharest on the common goal, that is, to undermine the Monarchy and to unite all Roumanians in a "Great-Roumania".

However, not all the Roumanian political leaders were in favor of this policy. Many of them felt a deep distrust toward the Roumanian Kingdom, where the Balkan-type corruption was in evidence at the highest administrative level. After World War I, when Transylvania became a part of Roumania, these politicians often expressed their displeasure. Stephen Pop Csicso said in an interview: "We are worse now, than ever before." (Adeverul, 1929, Febr. 4.) and Vajda-Voievod admitted that—"law and justice was more respected in Hungary than in Roumania". (Patria, Oct. 26, 1928)

This did not change the overall Roumanian policy to disrupt the unity of the Carpathian Basin. The campaign toward this direction went on with an increasing speed and emotion, and finally resulted in the liquidation of Hungary after World War I.

For the sake of objectivity, it must be mentioned here that the oppression of the Hungarian minority in Transylvania did not come as an act of revenge from the Transylvanian Roumanians. On the contrary, the efforts of the Hungarians to keep their identity within the Roumanian Kingdom was regarded with sympathy by the Transylvanian Roumanians, who themselves had to fight sometimes for their rights against their own government.

The tendency of oppression came from Roumania-proper, as a long-range policy with the aim to eliminate as rapidly as possible the danger of ever having to give up Transylvania, the richest territory in South-Eastern Europe, which became nothing but a Province, ruthlessly exploited by its present conqueror, the Trans-Carpathian Roumania.

## VIII

### TRANSYLVANIA, PROVINCE OF THE KINGDOM OF GREAT-ROUMANIA

The peace treaties, forced upon Europe after World War I, paralyzed the historic and economic functions of the Danubian Basin. On top of this, they did not even serve their alleged purpose, that is, to solve the nationality problems. Only the roles changed, with this difference, that while the many different nationality groups of the Danubian Basin were able to co-exist successfully and in a constructive manner within the framework of the previous liberal Constitutional State, the new minority groups, created by the treaties, were mercilessly exposed to the most chauvinistic discriminations by the new national States.

From the 325,411 square kilometer of territory of the Hungarian Kingdom, 232,448 square kilometers were divided up among these States, and from a population of 20,886,487 of which 54.5% were Hungarians, 13,271,370 were placed under foreign domination, including 3,319,579 Hungarians. Out of these, 1,704,851 became the subjects of the Kingdom of Great-Roumania. What this meant, can be clearly realized from an editorial which appeared in the Roumanian newspaper, "Adeverrul", in Dec. 10, 1912. "Our Roumanian State is not organized in such a manner that it could assimilate civilized countries like Transylvania or Bucovina. Those Roumanians who live in those countries would not put up with our Roumanian administration for six months."

The Peace Treaty included carefully outlined instructions for the protection of the ethnic minorities. Nevertheless, these instructions were completely disregarded by Roumania, and there was no place for the Hungarians to present their grievances but the League of Nations, which lent a sympathetic ear, but was unable to enforce the respect for the so-called "minority rights."

Immediately after the take-over, the Roumanian Government launched a large-scale attack against the Transylvanian Hungarians. On the administrative level, all the Hungarian public officials were replaced with Roumanians, more than 90% of whom were not even Transylvanians, but were sent out from Roumania proper to colonize the new territory. Since the darkest days of the Habsburg oppression, there was no precedent in

the thousand-year old history of Transylvania for such colonial-type administration.

On the economic level, Hungarian business enterprises were cut off from supplies and forced out of business by every possible means, even police brutality. The land-reform, executed by the Roumanian Government, took 2,718,146 acres of land from Hungarians, (mostly small landowners) and handed this over to the Roumanian population and the Roumanian churches. The owners of these properties were recompensed with valueless government bonds.

This action, which was directed only against the Hungarians, was camouflaged as a reform aimed against the big landowners. The truth was, that even according to Roumanian statistics, from the 5,461,200 acres of agricultural land in Transylvania, only 1,904,635 acres were owned by farmers possessing more than 100 acres. About 487,000 of this belonged to the Roumanian churches and was never touched by the land-reform. Therefore, almost half of the land confiscated from the Hungarians was taken from small farmers with less than 100 acres. (M. Constantinescu: "L' evolution de la reforme agraire en Roumanie." 1925, page 247)

Parallel with the economic persecution, the Roumanian Government undertook an allout offensive against the Hungarian schools. Public education was completely in the hands of the State, and the Hungarian language was abolished and its use forbidden in all the public schools. In many cases, children were cruelly beaten for using their language among themselves during the recess.

Parochial schools, Protestant and Catholic, some of them established in the 15th and 16th centuries, were closed down and expropriated one after the other under different pretexts. While in 1918 there were eight parochial type colleges in Transylvania, in 1927, there were none. From seventy parochial high schools there were only 51 left, and from 1,088 elementary schools, only 830 survived the first ten years of Roumanian oppression.

The American Committee for the Rights of Religious Minorities gave the following report of the situation: "The administrative oppression, the violent enforcing of the Roumanian language, the closing down of the schools, the many interferences, the aggressive hostility by which the school problems are being treated, all these are aimed for the total destruction of the minority school system. The laws of 1925 serve as oppressive

political and nationalistic tools against the minorities." (The Religious Minorities in Transylvania, 1925, and Roumania, ten Years after, 1928" The Bacon Press, Inc. Boston).

While in 1911, under Hungary, there were 2,813 public schools in Transylvania in which the language of instruction was Roumanian, in 1926 there were no schools left at all for the use of the Hungarian language. In a region where the population was 100% Hungarian, the public school situation was vividly illustrated in a report of the newspaper, "Brassoi Lapok", Dec. 14, 1925. "The new teacher, Mr. Clemens Tratiu, who was sent recently by the government to the village of Csikjenofalva, in his efforts to enforce the new language regulations of the Government handed out such beatings to his pupils, that on the first day the parents had to carry home twenty-four badly beaten children from the schoolhouse, who were unable to walk."

The violent Roumanianization-program found other ways, also, to change the statistical figures. The registrars, when registering the birth of a Hungarian child, translated the names into Roumanian. Later, these names were referred to as Roumanians. After 1930, in certain areas, where the Hungarian population was in an overwhelming majority, the parents' choice in first names was limited to those, which were not specifically Hungarian and could be translated easily.

A group of medical doctors, under the leadership of Dr. Peter Ramusatu, took blood samples of 20,092 Hungarian children. Some of these children, having their names changed by the registrations, were declared Roumanians, and because their blood-types were similar to the others, the group drew the conclusion and the theory, that the Transylvanian Hungarians are in reality assimilated Roumanians. The report handed in by this group received the award of the Roumanian Academy.

By the beginning of the 1930s, the two main strongholds of the Transylvanian Hungarians had fallen:— the schools and the wealth. The nation, which was used for centuries to lead and organize, was turned into an ethnic minority and forced to survive in a new, hostile, morally and mentally inferior political and administrative framework. There was no place where the grievances could have been taken, since the State itself was the transgressor, by exercising discrimination under the law.

In this desperate situation, the Transylvanian Hungarians were forced to search for strength and resources within their own selves in order to survive. As a reaction to the increasing pressure a new attitude, a new national pride and consciousness

became more and more evident within the Hungarian community of Transylvania.

The foundation of this new attitude of self-reliance was the large mass of the Transylvanian peasantry. The Transylvanian Agricultural Society, created by the big landowners before the war, became now the organization of the small farmers. Through intense education, the standard of production of Hungarian farm-lands in Roumania increased by 200% above the average production of the country. The Transylvanian Agricultural Society provided the small farmers with registered breeding stock and improved seeds, and organized a network of producer's and consumer's co-operatives, credit co-operatives and homecraft product co-operatives. With the help of these organizations, in spite of the pressures and the burdens of unequal taxation, the Transylvanian Hungarian farmers began to develop and prosper.

In this tight-knit Hungarian community, any service to the culture became a patriotic deed. The Transylvanian press, suffering under heavy censorship, lost its provincial character and rose to a European level. The Transylvanian Literary Guild and the Transylvanian Helicon gathered the writers and established a Hungarian Publishing Co-operative. A new and specifically Transylvanian literature was born, different from any other literature, imbedded deep in the history of the land and the realities of life. Struggling with poverty and with the Roumanian authorities, the Transylvanian Hungarian stage reached an unprecedented peak against all odds. Many Hungarian actors started their career of world fame on the creaky boards of that old building the Roumanian Government graciously allowed to be used by Hungarians.

Just as it was in the days of the independent Transylvanian Principality of the 16th and 17th centuries, the Transylvanian Hungarian culture, separated from the mother-country, unfolded into a unique phenomenon of regional and national individuality, and reaching across the borders of Roumania joined the West, from which it became separated artificially. The Western connections became re-vitalized and intensified under the pressure. The Transylvanian Unitarian Church clung more than ever to its connections with England, and the Transylvanian youth movements joined hands with the Protestant Youth organizations of the Western World.

In spite of the Peace Treaties, which handed Transylvania over as a colony to the East, the Transylvanian Hungarian soul

proved again, as so many times in history, that its choice and destiny is unalterably with the West.

The Transylvanian Jews took a great part in carrying the burdens of the Transylvanian Hungarian culture. Not only through money, but by giving noted writers and artists who were willing to carry the double load of minority status of being Jews and Hungarians in the same time.

The Transylvanian Germans, on the other hand, failed to establish any cultural or economic relations with the Hungarians and thus promote the formation of a unified front of ethnic minorities. It was the policy of the Roumanian Government to prevent the formation of such unified front by granting special privileges to the small German minority and keeping them alienated from the Hungarians. Also, after Hitlers' influence began to be felt, the Roumanians tried every possible way to obtain good relations with Germany.

While the revisionist tendency of the German policy toward the Versailles Treaties aroused opposition in Roumania, the other aspect of that policy, namely the ideology of discrimination against the Jews and other nationalities was greeted with sympathy and understanding. Anti-Semitism had deep roots in Roumania. The so-called "emancipation law", which granted equal rights to the Jews, was pushed through the Roumanian Parliament only in 1881, when the European nations at the Berlin Congress stipulated that the Roumanian Kingdom would receive recognition only on this condition. After 1920, the Goga-Cuza anti-Semitic Ligue became a serious political factor. C. Z. Codreanu formed a terrorist group called the "Legion of Archangel Michael" which a few years later became the nucleus of the ill-famed political party called the "Iron Guard".

Surrounded by a national myth, the Iron Guard gained prestige rapidly in Roumania, and in 1937, the party had 66 members in the Parliament. While King Carol II dissolved the Iron Guard and Codreanu was killed, still the government was formed by the leader of the anti-Semitic Ligue, Octavianu Goga, which marked the beginning of the Fascist dictatorship in Roumania. Not only the Jews, but all the other ethnic groups suffered under this terrorist regime, with the exception of the Germans.

A book could be written on the most cruel and barbarian methods used by the Roumanian Government against the Hungarians in Transylvania. However, it is not our purpose to dwell on the past, but to find a way for the future.

While it is useless to search for scapegoats in order to blame

them for the many mistakes of the past, it is worthwhile for the sake of the future to ponder the reasons which led to those mistakes.

Before World War I, the nationalistic movement of the Transylvanian Roumanians demanded autonomy. Not an autonomy within a Federated Hungary, but an autonomy within a Federated Habsburg Empire. Understandably, the Hungarians clung to the integrity of the Hungarian homeland, for which they had fought long and hard against the Habsburgs. Nevertheless, it is an open question whether or not they made a mistake in refusing the demands of the Roumanians. Giving in to these demands would have meant the disintegration of the Constitutional Statehood of Hungary, and the unlimited extension of the Habsburg rule, against which the Hungarians had fought for centuries.

As Silviu Dragomir, Roumanian writer and politician wisely observed, there was another problem involved, that many seem to forget today. "The nationality groups (meaning Roumanian, Serb and Ruthenian) would not be able to furnish any political leadership which could match that of the Hungarians. Therefore, even if territorial autonomies would have been established for the ethnic groups, the leadership within these autonomies would have shifted sooner or later back to the Hungarians. Just as it happened previously under the district system, where the majority of the voters were non-Hungarian, but reluctant to cast their votes for their own kin." ("Un proces istoric" *Tara Noastra*, Oct. 1928, page 1375.)

Considering these facts, we can be justified in assuming that another fifty years of peace and prosperity in the Danubian Basin could have solved these problems in the normal way of social and political evolution. One more generation would have provided the Transylvanian Roumanians with adequate leadership in order to assume their rightful place in the Transylvanian community of nations, without force or violence.

However, World War I, (which was not started by Hungary, but by the Emperor of Austria), and a long line of misunderstandings and misinterpretations, put an end to the unity of the Danubian Basin, as well as to the peace and the constructive and harmonious co-existence of the different nationalities, who for centuries shared the responsibilities of this living unit and built together its historic individuality.

The catastrophe of the war created a chaos and this chaos was ruthlessly exploited by Balkan politicians of an entirely different

moral fiber and set of values. A corrupt administration came across the Carpathians and exercised a most destructive influence on the Transylvanian community. This corruption, and the extreme chauvinism which was expressed by that administration, filled even the Transylvanian Roumanians with disgust. Their leaders frequently admitted publicly their regret for the loss of their former status under the protection of the Stephen's Crown, which was the symbol of order, Constitutional legality and honesty. "No one in Transylvania has gained anything by the annexation to Roumania. Everyone lost. It is much worse now, than ever before." (Stephen Pop-Csicsco, *Adeverul*, 1928). Many outstanding Transylvanian Roumanians stood up boldly for the protection of the oppressed Hungarians, as did Ghita Pop, who wrote in the newspaper *Adeverul* on Nov. 16, 1928: "The rights of the minorities, as outlined in the resolutions, are based on many centuries old experience and thought, and are identical with our own demands under the former Hungarian rule. These rights must prevail, openly and without any ulterior motives. They must be granted to the minorities, not as a compensation for their votes, but as their natural and inalienable rights."

Toward the end of the 1930s, the position of the Hungarian minority became increasingly intolerable. The government of Hungary, in an effort to render aid, insisted on the revision of the Peace Treaties. The deliberations between the two governments failed to accomplish anything. The Roumanians, already affiliated with the Axis powers, turned to them for arbitration.

The Axis Powers brought their decision on Aug. 30, 1940, dividing Transylvania between Roumania and Hungary. According to the Roumanian census, the Northern part, which returned to Hungary, had a population of 1,007,170 Hungarians; 1,166,434 Roumanians; 60,046 Germans; and 160,234 other nationalities, (mostly Hungarian-speaking people with non-Hungarian sounding names.) While in the Southern part still under Roumania, there were 473,551 Hungarians left; 2,067,723 Roumanians; 481,128 Germans; and 133,000 other nationalities.

Neither Hungary nor Roumania was satisfied with the Vienna Arbitration. They both expected another settlement after the war. The many reasons for the mutual dissatisfaction prove again that the Transylvanian problem cannot be solved by the shifting of borders.

The new border, cutting lengthwise across the middle of the country, with complete disregard to geographical, economic and administrative endowments, caused severe complications on both

sides. Even so, there was very soon a great difference between the progress of re-organization on the two sides of the new border, which must be seriously evaluated and considered for future decisions.

The Southern part, filled with the overflow of the Roumanian bureaucratic apparatus which had to evacuate the North, was paralyzed by confusion, and absolutely unable to establish a normal administrative, economic and social order. In the same time the Northern part was re-organized by the Hungarians in a matter of weeks. Roads, railroads and other communication lines cut by the border, were replaced and new roads, even new railroads, built to fit the new situation. Towns and cities, where it took the Roumanian administration 22 years to force its nationalistic blue-print upon the exterior looks of the streets, changed back to their original Hungarian individuality, within a few days. The inspired labor and the creative power of the Transylvanian Hungarians, free again to be expressed, improved the country to European standards.

A few isolated cases of local transgressions excluded, which were immediately punished by law, there were no reprisals of any kind against the Roumanian population. While in the same time, in the Southern part of the country, the Hungarian minority was harassed in a most brutal manner by the angered Roumanian administration. Ministers, Protestant and Catholic alike, were arrested and beaten. Any manifestations of the Hungarian minority group, whether agricultural, commercial, or cultural, were severely repressed. Beatings of Hungarians in public places, and even in their own homes, were not only encouraged by the police, but in many cases carried out by them.

Even Germany knew that the Transylvanian problem was only solved on a temporary basis and set the date of final arrangements after "the victorious ending of the war." The representatives of the German Government promised the entire territory of Transylvania one day to Hungary, the next day to Roumania, using it as a whip, to force these two countries into giving more contributions and assistance in the war against Russia.

In this difficult situation, Hungary and Roumania followed two different paths. The Hungarian Government, knowing well that open defiance would bring German occupation and the fate of Poland, tried to get involved as little as possible in the war. Even so, the reluctance of Hungary brought on the occupation of the country by German troops in March 19, 1944, followed by the deportation of the Jews into Germany. The energetic inter-

vention of Governor Horthy before his arrest saved only the Jews of Budapest.

During this time, the Hungarian Government tried to establish secret diplomatic connections with the Allied Forces, in the hope that aid could arrive from the Balkan Front. However, the fate of South-Eastern Europe had already been decided in Yalta and Teheran, and the negotiations could not change anything.

Roumania, under the leadership of General Antonescu, from the very beginning stood unconditionally and with full strength on the side of the Germans. But when, in the fall of 1944, the advancing Red Army reached the historic "Focsani Gate", where the Germans had decided to establish permanent defense, Roumania suddenly changed sides and opened the way for the Soviet Union into the Carpathian Basin.

## IX

### TRANSYLVANIA UNDER THE ROUMANIAN PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC

In the fall of 1944, the Russian Army moved across Transylvania. They were followed by regular Roumanian troop units and Roumanian guerilla bands, which terrorized the Hungarian population by murdering men, women and children and carrying out medieval type executions in the Hungarian villages.

The new leftist leaders of the Transylvanian Hungarians turned to the Russians for protection. The Roumanian troops were ordered back to the border, outlined by the Vienna arbitration, and the barbaric bloodshed was stopped.

The Soviet Army introduced military administration in Northern Transylvania, which was succeeded in the spring of 1945 by Roumanian administration. With this step, Stalin gave Transylvania back to Roumania even before the peace negotiations began. On one hand, he compensated Roumania for the re-annexation of Bessarabia and Northern Bucovina, but on the other hand there were also political reasons behind his decision. It is the usual practice of Bolshevism to prepare the introduction of communism by seemingly serving certain national interests.

In giving military protection against the Roumanian transgressions, the Soviet Union put the leftist leaders of the Hungarian minority under obligation to them. Stalin gave back North Transylvania to the Roumanians under the condition that they would respect the rights of the ethnic groups. With this step, he introduced into Transylvania the Stalinist National Policy. This policy consisted of the recognition of ethnic autonomies and is based on the federation of these autonomies. These autonomies are "nationalistic in form, socialistic in substance." Which means that the nationality groups are Bolshevized in their own language and with respect to their national customs, but under the strict supervision of the almighty Party. Thus the nationality groups are held in tight dependency on the political, economic and ideological levels. Communism is nothing but State-Capitalism, where the State uses its executive power to arbitrarily determine the labor relations between itself and the citizens.

The other Soviet precept prescribes the following formula:—"first socialization, then self-government." This means, that

the nationality groups receive their autonomy only after the Central Party leadership decides that they are completely socialized, in other words, when they are loyal communists who will carry out orders without objection.

The history of communism is full of examples that show what happens to nationality groups who refuse to obey. They are either exterminated or deported. Socialism on ethnic territories was built by Russian Party Organizations and they succeeded so well in "Russianizing" these territories that the Party Congress of 1961 was able to boast in their report that the administrative and public language had finally become Russian in every part of the Soviet Union.

At the Peace Conference of 1946, the communist members of the Hungarian delegation, in the name of "Socialist Brotherhood" prevented the official presentation of the Hungarian plans concerning the status of Transylvania. Thus the conference could do nothing but confirm Stalin's decision and give Transylvania officially to the Roumanians.

While Hungary showed great resistance against the introduction of communism, and was turned by brute-force into a communist state only after 1948, Roumania became a "people's Democracy" immediately, without hesitation. Only Transylvania resisted, led by the Bourgeois Party of Gyula Maniu, called the Roumanian National Party. On the 1945 elections, for the first time in history, the Transylvanian Hungarians cast their votes for a Roumanian Party, (the Maniu Party), instead of for their own, which was under the new communist leadership. But the party of Maniu was soon outlawed and Maniu himself ended his life in prison.

On the cultural level, the Roumanians fulfilled for a time the demands of Stalin. Hungarian education was authorized in the lower and higher levels. The Hungarian University of Kolozsvár, (Cluj), was allowed to continue its functions, with an Hungarian Medical School in Marosvasarhely, (Tragu Mures). On the surface it seemed that the nationality problem was successfully solved. Nevertheless, the schools and all cultural institutions, newspapers, publishing houses, theaters, etc., were under the immediate direction of the Party. The Hungarian cultural life became "nationalistic in form, socialistic in substance." Everything was subordinated to the indoctrination and de-nationalization of the Central Communist Party's plans.

The Roumanian People's Democracy progressed with great speed toward the socialization of the country. The purpose was

served by the nationalization of private property, the establishment of the colchos system, the subordination of the trade unions to the Communist Party, the introduction of the one-party-system, and the effective liquidation of the "Bourgeois elements" by murder, imprisonment and deportation.

According to the figures not completely evaluated as yet, about 200,000 Hungarians were killed, imprisoned and deported so far under the pretext of being "war criminals" and later, "conspirators", or simply "unwanted elements". Urban Hungarians were evacuated with only one suitcase and their homes, together with all their belongings were given to Roumanian colonists, mostly refugees from Russian-occupied Bessarabia. The Greek-Catholic Church was liquidated by law. The leaders of the Roman Catholic, Presbyterian, Lutheran and Unitarian Churches were imprisoned or sent to forced labor camps. Aron Marton, the Roman Catholic Bishop of Transylvania was kidnaped by the Communist State Police on the open highway while visiting one of the church districts. After several years in prison, he is now being kept under house arrest in his residence. While all these persecutions against the Hungarians in Transylvania went on, the Hungarian and Roumanian Governments assured each other with enthusiastic words of the "Socialist Brotherhood" and the "indivisible unity of the Socialist camp".

In 1952, a new step was made in the direction of the Stalinist policy toward ethnic minorities, which might have great effect upon the developments of an unforeseeable future. Under Soviet pressure, the Roumanian Government organized an "Autonom Hungarian Province" in the Eastern part of Transylvania. While in a Western sense it was not a real self-government, it did mean the end of a certain fiction labelled the "unified and indivisible national State of Great-Roumania." The population of the Autonom Hungarian Province included, according to the 1956 Roumanian census, 731,361 people, of which 79.38% were Hungarians and 20.62% Roumanians.

The 1956 Hungarian uprising, which caused a great loss of prestige to the Soviet Union and disrupted the unity of the communist world movement, had its direct effect on Transylvania. We know positively today, that not only the Eastern European nations, but the youth of the Soviet Union itself, were sympathetic toward the Hungarians in their fight for freedom and were greatly influenced by this spontaneous outburst. However, due to the procrastination of the West, the Soviet Union, after having pulled out its troops once from Hungary, was able

to return and localize the outburst by crushing the uprising. Roumania stood on the side of the Soviet Union in those feverish days and immediately used the Hungarian uprising as a pretext for large scale terror-actions against the Transylvanian Hungarians. Mass arrests, executions and deportations were carried out and the prisons and forced labor camps were overcrowded again with thousands of Hungarians. The Roumanian Government received a free hand from the Kremlin in regard to its policy of terror against the Transylvanian Hungarians. This was mainly because in the Carpatho-Ukraine, annexed by the Soviet Union after World War II, there was still a population of 200,000 "unreliable" Hungarians, whose intimidation was in the interest of the Kremlin.

The Soviet policy toward Hungary after 1956 can be defined in the following three points:— 1. To make the Hungarians realize by every possible means, that the West had given Eastern Europe up completely, and that there could be no hope for aid against communism; 2. To establish an example by the most cruel retaliation which would teach, not only the Hungarians, but others, too, that there can be no revolt against the communist system; 3. To create through small concessions (which could be revoked at any time), an atmosphere which would take the wind out of the sail of future revolutions.

This policy of Nikita Hrucsov was successful. It stabilized again the communist rule over Eastern Europe and in the same time, exhibited the signs of "liberalization" for the benefit of the West, which led to many false conclusions and softened anti-communist public feelings created by the aftermath of the Hungarian uprising.

Gheorghiu-Dej, first Secretary of the Roumanian Communist Party gave the following directives on the policy toward the minorities after his return from Moscow in Feb. 19, 1959: "The basic principles of the Marxist-Leninist Party recognizes the equal rights of the ethnic minorities which must be expressed in the unity and fraternity of all the workers of Roumania." With this phrase, Gheorghiu-Dej launched the last chapter of his de-nationalization program against the Transylvanian Hungarians.

On that very day, a student meeting was called at the Hungarian University of Kolozsvár, where the speakers of the Party declared that "the higher interests of socialism demand that the ethnic minorities learn the Roumanian language and learn to appreciate the Roumanian culture of the homeland." Two

weeks later, it was pointed out that "the maintenance of a bilingual university is in opposition to the interests of socialism, and national isolationism in culture and science, just like any other manifestation of nationalism is a poisoned weapon in the hands of the enemies of the people." A few days later, the student unions accepted a resolution which pronounced the fusion of the Hungarian and Roumanian Universities.

After this, the outlined de-Hungarization policy of the Roumanian Government advanced with great speed. Today, in 1965, there are no more Hungarian schools left in Transylvania. The axe also fell upon the publishing houses, press, theatre and all the other cultural institutions. The use of the Hungarian language is not only forbidden in public offices, but everywhere, as we can read in the report of Mr. Bailey, published in the "Reporter", Nov. 19, 1964.

On December 24, 1960, the Roumanian Parliament passed a resolution in which two districts were removed from the Autonom Hungarian Province and attached to a Roumanian-populated territorial district. The population of these two districts was 92% Hungarian. In the same time, another large area was added to the Autonom Hungarian Province on the other side, with an 88% Roumanian population. The name was changed from "Autonom Hungarian Province" to "Autonom Hungarian-Mures Territory" and the population of this new administrative unit changed in the following way:— the Hungarian population was reduced from 79.38% to 63.97% and the number of Roumanians increased from 20.62% to 36.03%.

When, in Sept. 13, 1963, Gheorghiu-Dej visited the Autonom Territory, the newspaper "Elore" reported the names of those leading officials who were responsible for the well-being of the people on that territory. There was not one Hungarian name among them.

Reports received lately from Western newspapermen visiting Roumania agree that the present popularity of the communist government in Roumania is not based so much on its slightly anti-Russian attitude, but mostly on its oppressive and discriminative policy against the ethnic minorities. Recently this policy led to some tension in the relationship between Hungary and Roumania. The explosion of this tension, just as in the days of Hitler, is being prevented only by the Kremlin. Just like the Third Reich, the Soviet Union tries to keep Roumania in line, and force Hungary into a more eager co-operation by constant threats of drastic changes in the status of Transylvania.

## CONCLUSION

When some catastrophe destroys long established geographical units and successfully proven concepts of human co-existence, chaos sets in. To overcome this chaos, one must study the causes which led to it. This book has tried to fulfill this task in the most objective manner.

There are two opposing political and philosophical views in connection with the problem of Transylvania. Hungary claims Transylvania on the basis of historic rights. This right does not derive merely from a thousand-year-long possession, but from the fact that Transylvania created its own historic individuality and fulfilled an important European mission within the framework of the Hungarian State-Concept.

In opposition to this point of view, Roumania claims the land on the basis of the simple mathematical fact that the majority of the population is Roumanian.

The differences between these two viewpoints are irreconcilable, and therefore the Transylvanian problem cannot be solved permanently by the dictatorial assertion of the one or the other. Either way, the loser will keep on claiming his rights to Transylvania.

In order to find a suitable solution, we must recognize two cardinal laws, as the evident conclusions drawn from history:—

- I. There can be no lasting peace in South-Eastern Europe until the unity of the Danubian Basin is restored.
- II. Transylvania is an individual part of this unit, with well-determined specific functions. Therefore, it must rejoin this geographical and cultural unit.

The problem itself, as demonstrated in this book, has two equally important elements. One is the problem of the nationalities. The other is the problem of the political and administrative statehood.

The problem of the minorities can only be solved in an all-European framework. It shows the complexity of the problem that not yet has an international formula been found for its solution. Professor Ermacora sums up the activities of the United Nations in this subject with the following words:—  
“The attempts to include directives and regulations concerning the protection of ethnic minorities into the Declaration of

Human Rights, failed. However, it was possible to include some such regulations into a draft dealing with civil and political rights. The United Nations prepared a whole series of studies and text-collections on this question. Finally, the General Assembly effectuated some concrete measures in the protection of some ethnic minorities." (Felix Ermacora: "Der Minderheitenschutz vor der Vereinigten Nationen," Europa Ethnica, 1961, No. 3.)

Neither the Charter of the United Nations, nor the 1948 Declaration of Human Rights contains clear provisions for the protection of ethnic minorities, but treats them in the spirit, and within the framework of the general and individual human rights. On the other hand, history has proved that the value of those obligations which are included into peace treaties or mutual agreements, depends always and everywhere upon the good will of the majority nation.

It is clear therefore, that all those problems which were allegedly the reasons for the fall of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy, are not only still unsolved, but have increased to such proportions that it became necessary to bring international penal sanctions against government-organized genocide. (Prof. Ermacora: "Der Minderheitenschutz . . .")

To solve this problem, the evolution of international law and in the same time, the evolution of public opinion must reach the point where the ruling nation does not see any more "foreign elements" in the minorities, and on the other hand, the ethnic groups take full responsibility for the well-being of the country and do not isolate themselves as minorities. Today, the integrationist movements of Europe seem to point in this direction. History shows that where ethnic minorities were treated without discrimination, a slow and steady assimilation has taken place. Persecution draws resistance and increases the national feelings. However, the thought of assimilation should not even enter the question. It should be recognized as man's inalienable right to speak the language he wishes to speak, to worship God in the manner he wishes to worship, and to belong to any cultural circle to which he wishes to belong, in his pursuit of happiness.

Insofar as the administrative and territorial part of this problem is concerned, that is, to which country Transylvania should belong, we have seen that the different arbitrary decisions made in our century have been unable to create a situation acceptable and reassuring to both sides. In this question, just

as in the question of the minority problem, an intermediary solution must be found. Today, under the given conditions, this cannot be done successfully in any other way than through national autonomies given to all three existing nations, the Hungarian, the Roumanian, and the German. Finally, to avoid any further territorial discussions, through the union of these three autonom nations, the plan of a federated autonom Transylvania must be worked out with extreme care.

In spite of the fact that up to 1918, this was the main demand of the Roumanians, today this solution would certainly be met by them with sharp opposition. In the same time, it would also raise protest from those Hungarians whose viewpoint is imbedded in the historical principles, and therefore does not recognize the fact that today, Transylvania belongs to Roumania.

However, until the time arrives through the afore-mentioned evolution of Europe itself, when national and territorial questions will be of only secondary importance, this is the only safe way to attain justice and liberty for all the three Transylvanian nations. Such an arrangement would open the door again for Transylvania to continue to fulfill its European mission, outlined for it by the unchangeable laws of history. Namely, to again become the Citadel of the West, and the Bridge toward the East, culturally and politically, instead of being an exploited province and the powder-keg of South-Eastern Europe.

When making long-range historic decisions which will affect the lives of millions, one must carefully consider all the details involved. There can be no question of the fact that Transylvania is an independent living unit in itself, with a long-time historical individuality, which individuality has no counterpart on the globe. It is also clear that culturally, mentally and spiritually, Transylvania belongs to the West, while politically and geographically to the Carpathian Basin, which unit is again the Central and most important part of the larger unit, called the Danubian Basin.

Therefore, the Transylvanian problem is in itself, preexcellence, a problem of survival to the Carpathian Basin, an acute problem to the Danubian Basin, and also the problem of the Western culture community. By no means can it be regarded as a Balkan problem or the problem of any other unit East of the Carpathians.

The final solution for Transylvania must be, in a long-range historic program, to find its way back where it belongs, where

it has its roots in the past and its traditional mission for the future, that is, into the cultural, historical and geographical unit of the Danubian Basin.

Those who still stubbornly cling to the so-called "realistic policy" built on facts accomplished, should bear in mind that facts do change as time moves on. Only principles stand and the unchangeable laws of life which have molded those principles. It is much wiser to be guided in an ever-changing world by these laws and principles, than by temporary "facts" created by the hazardous whims of political intrigues. This is the only way we can hope for a better future, with "Liberty and justice for all", including the people of Transylvania, no matter what language they may speak.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### Hungarian:

- M. Ferdinandy: Hungarian History, Kossuth, Buenos Aires, 1957.  
Homan-Szekfü: Hungarian History, Budapest, 1938.  
Torjai-Szabo: Centuries of Transylvania, Munich, 1956.  
Goldis: About the nationality problem, Arad, 1912.  
Kovach: Hungarian History, Munich, 1951.  
Mester: Autonom Transylvania, Budapest, 1937.  
Siculus: Hungarians in Moldova, Univ. of Pecs, 1942.  
Galdi-Makkai: History of Transylvania, Budapest, 1934.  
Papp: Complaints of the Szekelys in Csik, M. Szemle, 1928.  
Zathureczky: Hungarian minorities in Roumania, M. Szemle, 1934.  
Barabas: Hungarian Schools under Roumanian Rule, M. Szemle, 1928.  
Endre Jonas: Trianon a European Problem, Munich, 1960.

### Roumanian:

- Sincai: Chronica Romanilor.  
Onisifor Ghibu: Viata si Organizatia Bisericeasca si Scolara in Transylvania si Ungaria, Bucharest, 1915.  
Activitatea Ministerul Instructiunii, 1922-26, Bucharest.  
Breviar Statistic al Republica Populara Romana, 1964.

### International:

- Oberschall: Die Sankt Stephans Krone, Herold, Wien, 1961.  
E. Franzel: Der Donauraum, Francke Verlag, Bern, 1958.  
Annuaire de la Societé des Nations, Geneva, Volume I.  
Transylvania under the rule of Roumania, Bacon Press, Boston, 1920.  
Religious Minorities in Transylvania, Bacon Press, Boston, 1925.  
Roumania ten years after, Bacon Press, Boston, 1928.  
Sidney Herbert: Nationalities and Problems.  
C. A. Macartney: October Fifteenth, Univ. of Edinburg, 1956.  
A. Francé-Harrar: Die letzte Chance für eine Zukunft, Bayerische Landwirtschaftsverlag, München, 1950.  
Raul H. Francé: Lebenslehre für Jedermann, Telos, Berlin, 1962.

Salvador de Madariaga: Portrait of Europe, 1952.

The Honorable Clayborne Pell, senator of Rhode-Island: Senate speech, May 11, 1964.

Robert M. MacKisson, State Dept. Head of European Section: Letter to the American Transylvanian Federation, June 4, 1963.

Edward Crankshaw: THE OBSERVER, Aug. 4, 1963.

Federalist Union of European Nationalities /FUEN/: Memorandum to the Roumanian prime-minister J. G. Maurer, Nov. 2, 1964. Ref. No. 1-11-14-64.

George Bailey: THE REPORTER, Nov. 19, 1964.

Felix Ermacora: Der Minderheitenschutz vor den Vereinigten Nationen, Europa Ethnica, 1961. No. 3.

The Reviews of Reviews: 1927, No. 455. Page 494.

Fortnightly Review: November 1928.