

concept of nation to such Yugoslavism. Several of its members held high posts in the province's political and institutional leadership.<sup>43</sup> In this way they managed for a time to win the sympathy and support of the Yugoslav reform communists. But when they began, in line with literary tradition, to criticize the negative aspects of society, the authorities clamped down and the initiatives were banned, along with the existing institutions.<sup>44</sup>

The roots of Vojvodina's autonomy reached back to the 1690s, when various privileges were granted to the Serb settlers by Emperor Leopold I, during and after the great northward migration of the Serbs. A territorially separate Crown Land known as the Serbian Vojvodship and the Banat of Temes<sup>45</sup> was established by the Habsburg government in 1849, but abolished again after ten years, when the territory was subsumed into the Hungarian county system. There was no separate administrative entity under Yugoslavia either, until Vojvodina was organized as an autonomous province of Serbia in 1945. However, that had no practical effect before the 1960s, or real significance until the 1974 constitution granted the province a status equivalent to that of a republic.

The 1953 constitution of Yugoslavia extended the system of self-management to the fields of culture and society, initiating a process of decentralization that peaked with the 1974 constitution, which effectively also broke the Communist Party up into separate territorial parties. Power in Vojvodina was taken by a group that kept an eye on local interests and included some Hungarians who identified wholly with Yugoslavism. This leadership was ousted in the autumn of 1988 by the “yoghurt revolution” of Slobodan Milošević's Federation of Serbian Communists and by the virtual abolition of Vojvodina's autonomy six months later.

### **The Soviet Union** (*Csilla Fedinec*)

The 1945–1991 period in which Transcarpathia (official name in the Soviet era: *Zakarpatskaja oblast'* [Transcarpathian Territory]) belonged to the Soviet Union is divisible from the Hungarian point

of view by the following turning points: the 1945 Soviet–Hungarian agreement on sovereignty over Transcarpathia; the Twentieth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in 1956, where cautious post-Stalinist reforms were announced, resulting in some concessions also on Hungarian affairs in Transcarpathia; the foundation of the Forrás [Source] Youth Studio in 1967, which formulated some political submissions on behalf of the Hungarian majority; finally, the foundation in 1989 of the Transcarpathian Hungarian Cultural Association as the first local body for the protection of the local Hungarian community’s interests.<sup>46</sup>

There was consternation among the inhabitants of Transcarpathia at the changes brought about by Soviet rule, which were radical and violent even by comparison with the sufferings undergone during World War II. They were intimidated by the persecution of kulaks and political show trials. Nationalization affected every branch of the economy. The peasants were herded into collective farms, and shorn of their land, tools and livestock. Each household was left with only a small plot of land for its own use, but some communities had remarkable success with some garden crops. Velyka Dobron<sup>7</sup>, for instance, became famous for its potatoes and peppers.<sup>47</sup> Petrovo became something of a model community as the center of a collective farm (*kolkhoz*), and its chairman, Andor Bíró, was the one Hungarian representative in the Supreme Soviet.<sup>48</sup> There was substantial inward migration from other parts of the Soviet Union. It was the practice throughout the country for graduates to be posted for two or three years far away from their native area. Those drafted into the army served in units beyond Ukraine. Many Transcarpathians took seasonal work in “Russia” or became security guards accompanying trains carrying produce. This earned several times their normal wages for two or three summer months.

There had never been appreciable industry in the area, and only smaller component factories were relocated there from other republics during the Soviet period. This meant that the break-up of the Soviet Union caused a further economic trauma. One big economic factor was the railway system. Rail links between Czechoslovakia and Romania, and between Hungary and Poland, had been important

geopolitical factors since 1919. Chop and Bat'ovo (along with Brest further north, now in Belarus) formed a main western gateway for Soviet goods before the break-up of COMECON, playing a vital part in passenger and freight traffic.

The official atheist ideology of the Soviet Union confined religion in Transcarpathia within the walls of the churches. No Communist Party member, teacher or state office holder could attend church, not even weddings or baptisms. Church property was also nationalized, and many churches were closed or used as atheist museums or stores. In 1949, the Uniate or Greek Catholic Church in communion with Rome was forcibly merged into the Orthodox Church. Priests who refused to make the move were deported to labor camps. Some three quarters of the Transcarpathian Hungarians belonged to the Reformed Church, while the remainder were Greek Catholic or Roman Catholic. There were difficulties with training priests, as the only Catholic seminary was in Riga, Latvia. The clergy of the Reformed Church were trained at courses in Beregovo. After 1989 it became possible for Catholic or Reformed clergy to be brought from Hungary, and somewhat later for Transcarpathians to pursue theological studies abroad.<sup>49</sup>

Hardly any great artists of old (such men as Gyula Virágh, Gyula Ijjász, Andor Novák, Sámuel Beregi or Károly Izai) survived into the Soviet period, but the first generation of the Transcarpathian school remained: Béla Erdélyi, József Boksay and Emil Grabovszky. Erdélyi failed after the war to start an artists' association, although he was made chairman of the local branch of the Ukrainian republican association. From this official position he tried to start an art college in Uzhgorod, but it closed after a few months in favor of a secondary school for industrial design. Among the early pupils of both were István Szőke, László Habda, Gyula Sztaskó, Pál Balla, Erzsébet Kremninczky, Miklós Medveczky, Edit Luták Medveczky, János Sütő, and others including the highly original Anna Horváth and the painter József Garanyi, both from Beregovo. Erdélyi was soon sidelined, although he had registered as a Ukrainian, despite not speaking the language. As he remarked, "I'm a Ukrainian of

French culture and German native language [both parents were Swabians], who speaks Hungarian best.”<sup>50</sup>

The local press was communist-run: the daily *Kárpáti Igaz Szó*, *Kárpátontúli Ifjúság* for the young, translated word for word from a Ukrainian original, *Vörös Zászló* in Beregovo, *Kommunizmus Zászlaja* in Vinogradovo, and *Kommunizmus Fényei* in Uzhgorod. The first three especially had literature columns, but the state publisher issued only one or two Hungarian books a year. The other chance of publication was in the literary supplement of the popular annual *Kárpáti Kalendárium*, which appeared for forty years from 1957. Almost the whole of all these papers except *Kárpáti Igaz Szó* was translated, but their literary sections printed original Hungarian work. Chances of publication abroad were very rare.

Books in Hungarian appeared from the Hungarian department at the textbook publisher and from the publishing house Karpaty. Schools in Ukraine followed the pre-war Soviet curriculum until 1947, with slight adjustments to party resolutions that appeared. The ban on “foreign-language” textbooks at the end of 1944 covered not only Hungarian ones, but also those issued earlier for the Slav population by the Prosvita society, the Subcarpathian Scientific Society, and other associations closed after the war. All local history content was withdrawn, with the result that a whole generation grew up unaware of its own history. Another purge came in 1956, when all language and literature textbooks, including the Hungarian ones, had to be cleansed of references to Stalin and praise of him. The textbooks for schools teaching in Moldavian could be imported from the Moldavian SSR, but those used in Hungarian-taught schools had to be translated from Russian, except those for Hungarian language and literature. The very first Hungarian literature textbook for Transcarpathia, which appeared in 1950, was written by Antal Hidas, who lived in Moscow, but the rest were written by locals (Dezső Csengeri, Gizella Drávai, László Balla, Erzsébet Gortvay, and others).<sup>51</sup>

The local state publishing house Karpaty was not specifically for the Hungarian minority, but it had a Hungarian department and it began in 1959 also to publish jointly with firms in Hungary. By

1970 it had issued 1,800 titles in a total of 20 million copies, some of them sold in Hungary. Only one or two single-author works of prose or poetry per year appeared in Transcarpathia, but the almanacs and anthologies provided authors with broader publishing possibilities. From 1945 to 1983, the only scope for Hungarian writers anywhere between Tyachevo (Ukrainian: Tyachiv) and Uzhgorod was the literature studio attached to the Beregovo paper *Vörös Zászló*. In 1971, László Balla, editor-in-chief of the *Kárpáti Igaz Szó*, published an article (anonymously) accusing the Forrás [Source] Literary Studio in Uzhgorod of spreading bourgeois ideas and of being apolitical and anti-Soviet. At that time, the Beregovo studio provided the only refuge. Later the daily *Kárpáti Igaz Szó*, still with Balla at the helm, also gave chances for writers to see their work in print on a page labeled “Momentum.” In 1988, this gave way for a year and a half to a separate cultural magazine supplement called “New Shoot.”<sup>52</sup> Another substitute for book publication in 1979–1986 took the form of 14 verse booklets published as part of the paper (which had its print run of 40,000), along with an anthology of one verse each from 15 poets. A traditional Transcarpathian almanac or “calendar” was published by Karpaty throughout the period under various titles.<sup>53</sup>

The promise of the Twentieth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in 1956 was belied by arrests in response to a wave of sympathy for the Hungarian Revolution, but in 1957 it became possible to buy books and subscribe to periodicals from Hungary. Hungarian radio and television programs could be picked up in most of the Hungarian-inhabited areas of Transcarpathia. The short programs in Hungarian made at the Uzhgorod studios of the Soviet state channel RTV were popular mainly in the Upper Tisa district, where Hungarian stations could not be picked up until the advent of satellite broadcasting in the 1990s. Although the international border sealed Transcarpathia off from Hungary – foreign travel was allowed only after lengthy procedures, once every two years, for the purpose of visiting close relatives – the broadcasts, books and periodicals kept the Hungarians of Transcarpathia relatively well informed.

Foremost among the many folksong and dance ensembles was the Hungarian Melodies Chamber Ensemble, the Tisza Song and Dance Ensemble, and the People's Theater in Beregovo (headed by Ottó Schober), which opened in 1952 and operated for 40 years. Prominent among the musicians were Dezső Zádor, who had been a pupil of Bartók's in the 1930s, István Márton, and the critic Tibor Boniszlavszky.<sup>54</sup>

The Hungarians had no separate political or civil organization at that time, and the vacuum was filled by literary societies. Most of the writers, poets and journalists had graduated in Hungarian from the Uzhgorod State University. There worked Sándor Fodó, seen as the leading intellectual, who would become founding president of the Transcarpathian Hungarian Cultural Association in 1989. But the university department and its role were equivocal, as its teaching and research did not receive sufficient recognition, although it sufficed to provide common ground and encourage common thinking among young Hungarian intellectuals.

The literary society that wrote history, so to speak, in that period was the Forrás Youth Studio, formed in 1967 by Hungarian majors at Uzhgorod State University, having previously issued a typewritten samizdat entitled *Együtt* [Together] in the autumn of 1966. The leading light was the poet Vilmos Kovács. After this was banned, they found a chance to publish in the periodical *Kárpátontúli Ifjúság*, under whose auspices the studio came into being. Its members – József Zselicki, Gyula Balla, András S. Benedek, László Györke, and others, with some help from Kovács and Fodó – went beyond literary activity to draw up two petitions (in the autumn of 1971 and the spring of 1972) for collective rights for the Hungarians, addressed to the district party committee and to the top party and state leadership in Moscow. That precipitated an official campaign against “manifestations of Hungarian bourgeois nationalism” and military conscription of some students from the university, although they were able to complete their studies later. Forrás was replaced in 1971 on ideological grounds by the Attila József Literary Studio, to act as a spokesman for Soviet literary

ideas. This group gathered around the newspaper *Kárpáti Igaz Szó*, whose editor-in-chief László Balla cooperated actively in quelling the dissidents, with the result that the former Forrás activists were left with nowhere to publish. Those years gave rise to a dominant sense of grievance in the Transcarpathian Hungarian writers. In 1975 Balla used *Kárpáti Igaz Szó* to publish a series of articles entitled “Soviet Hungarians,” the name that he coined for an ostensible “new category of men” on the ethnic map of Europe. It became official policy to treat the Moscow émigré writers – Máté Zalka, Béla Illés, Antal Hidas, Sándor Gergely, and so on – as the literary classics, rather than seeking tradition in Hungarian literature as a whole or in local Hungarian writing.

The Attila József Literary Studio was steadily sidelined. When it was revived in 1988, it was as the Attila József Creative Community, for all creative Transcarpathian Hungarians, not just writers and poets, with Károly D. Balla, György Dupka and Sándor Horváth as its co-chairmen. However, it dwindled in the 1990s without officially dissolving.

As for the one series of literary pamphlets bound up with the *Kárpáti Igaz Szó*, archived in its Uzhgorod offices, it was pulped in the 1990s, ostensibly by accident. This fittingly symbolized the end of the Soviet period.

### **Austria** (*Gerhard Baumgartner*)

The Hungarian Revolution in the autumn of 1956 posed a huge challenge to Austria, as the Soviet military intervention sent a flood of refugees into the country. About 180,000 Hungarian refugees arrived in Burgenland in the next three months, including the whole teaching staff of Sopron’s College of Mining and Forestry, which moved on as a group to Canada in 1957, where the government founded for them a new college at Powell River, near Vancouver. Austria set up several large transit camps, from which the Hungarians were sent to Vienna and onward to a number of Western countries. Also set up in 1956 was the great refugee camp at Traiskirchen. On

December 19, the refugee camp at Eisenstadt received a visit from the US vice-president, Richard Nixon. Most of the refugees later left Austria for other countries: only 18,000 remained by the beginning of 1959. In Vienna, the United Nations built new apartment blocks to house them.<sup>55</sup> The 1956 refugees brought a considerable change in the structure of the Hungarian-speaking community in Vienna. For several decades there were two groups divided by their attitude to the Hungarian state. The 1956-ers would have nothing to do with it, but the established Hungarian cultural associations in Vienna kept up relations with the Kádár regime. The Austrian state set up a separate secondary education system for Hungarian refugees, under which 746 Hungarian students studied in five separate, Hungarian-taught gymnasia. The last school-leaving exams for 1956-er Hungarian students was held in 1963, after which the gymnasia were closed.<sup>56</sup>

The economic and social structure of the Burgenland villages changed fundamentally in the 1960s. Land ownership patterns several centuries old had ensured that dwarf holdings and smallholdings existed side by side with the great estates, but these smallholders became obliged in the 1960s to commute as workers to earn their living, to the industrial areas of Vienna, Lower Austria and Styria.<sup>57</sup> A good example was Andau: this was Austria's biggest cattle-breeding community in 1959, with over 2,000 head, but the last cow was sold in 1969. The people of Andau began commuting the 100 kilometers to Vienna in special trains. Meanwhile, mechanization reduced the demand for farm labor on the manorial farm centers. The laborers moved first to nearby villages and then to the cities.<sup>58</sup> The farm centers with purely Hungarian inhabitants became totally depopulated, and the former laborers were rapidly assimilated, as Hungarian had only been a "servants' language" in their eyes. The want of a complete Hungarian education system in Burgenland meant that there had been no Hungarian minority elite. This function was assumed in the 1960s by 1956-ers or other immigrant members of the intelligentsia from Hungary. In the Upper Wart at the end of the 1960s, the Catholic congregation in Unterwart, the Reformed congregation in Oberwart, and the Evangelical congregation in Siget



in der Wart all had clergy born in Hungary. The Austrian government of Bruno Kreisky, having signed with Italy an agreement on the status of South Tyrol (Alto Adige/Südtirol), sought also to settle the position of Austria's minorities. The first step was a secret native-language census, in which all inhabitants were invited to state their native language anonymously. More important was the 1976 act on ethnic groups,<sup>59</sup> which granted five indigenous minorities certain language rights, official Chancellery representation, and state financial support. However, the rights of the Carinthian Slovenes, the Burgenland Croats and the Vienna Czechoslovaks had been guaranteed by interstate treaty, and so they refused to recognize the new act or delegate representatives to the new Ethnic Group Councils. The Burgenland Hungarians were the only community to form, in 1959, such an Ethnic Group Council, whose inaugural meeting Kreisky also attended. However, the act recognized as indigenous only the Burgenland Hungarians, not the migrant groups in Vienna and other cities.<sup>60</sup> In 1980, the Burgenland Hungarian Cultural Association submitted a memorandum to the Austrian government calling for the development of Hungarian secondary and higher education institutions, the erection of bilingual place-name signs, and recognition of Hungarian as an official language.<sup>61</sup> It became apparent within a few years that the Ethnic Group Council was not capable of pursuing the Hungarian minority's aspirations, and so the Cultural Association declared in 1983 that it was demanding the same minority rights for Hungarians as the Croats and Slovenes had received under the State Treaty in 1955.<sup>62</sup>

The first boost in cross-border links came in 1974: the Iron Curtain opened at least from one direction and it became possible for Austrians to visit Hungary without a visa. The value of Hungarian for communication in Austria increased only in 1988, when Hungary waived most passport restrictions for its citizens and tens of thousands of shoppers flooded into Burgenland and Vienna. Then Otto von Habsburg, deputy speaker of the European Parliament and son of Hungary's last king, joined Imre Pozsgay, a leading reform communist and state minister, in making a symbolic first cut in the

barbed wire across the frontier at Sopron on August 19, 1989, and a mass of waiting East German tourists seized the chance to flee to the West.<sup>63</sup> This Pan-European Picnic marked an important breach in the division of Europe. By Christmas the Eastern European communist dictatorships were falling successively and the change of system had begun. The rest of the barbed wire dividing the Hungarians of Burgenland from Hungary was removed in the summer of 1990, after 45 years.

The villages of southern Burgenland had been closed communities until the mid-1960s. Not until then did people start commuting from them to neighboring towns and to cities such as Vienna and Graz. Hitherto every aspect of daily village life had been tied to the home village, in a form of village life that provided a basis and framework for various distinct dialects to flourish as the natural means of communication. Hitherto it had been expected that those marrying into a Hungarian-speaking village would learn the dialect, and most of them did. Every Burgenland village contained some people who had mastered the local language alongside their own, and that new language would be the local dialect, not literary Hungarian.

The survival of the village dialects was assisted by strong ties to local cultural traditions. Each dialect was linked with verses for Luca<sup>64</sup> or for the best man at weddings, with beating out winter, with Carnival, with traditional village frolics, and with traditional songs sung on such occasions, so that the dialects acted as a cultural and social bond, producing in Burgenland a kind of village ethnicity.<sup>65</sup>

By the mid-1970s, social modernization was breaking this traditional world up. The commuting workers left the village each morning and returned at night, or returned only at weekends. Also breaking up was the extended family structure, for several generations were decreasingly likely to live under one roof. While households still included three generations, the commuting did not affect language use greatly, as the grandparents stood in for the parents and taught the children the local speech. But if a young couple lived separately or moved to another village, there was no way to

transmit the minority dialect. It may not have been coincidental that this was when the first Burgenland Hungarian cultural association was formed, as if in response to these developments. The trends were noted by the rural clergy, who prompted the formation of institutions whose forms and demands were intended to offset the damage to the old village framework. This was successful to some extent through the financial and political support received after the 1976 minority act came into force and the Burgenland Hungarians received official recognition.

### Notes

- 1 *Magyar Népi Szövetség.*
- 2 Vladimir Tismăneanu, Dorin Dobrinu and Cristian Vasile, eds. *Comisia prezidențială pentru Analiza Dictaturii Comuniste din România. Raport final* [The Presidential Commission for the Analysis of the Communist Dictatorship in Romania. Final Report] (Bukarest, 2007), pp. 332–351.
- 3 Changes in the ethnic structure of Transylvania’s urban population, as a percentage:

	Population	Romanian	Hungarian	German	Jewish
<b>1930</b>	936,418	34.9	37.9	13.2	10.4
<b>1948</b>	1,118,904	50.2	39.0	7.2	2.0
<b>1956</b>	1,753,844	56.2	31.6	8.3	0.4
<b>1977</b>	3,558,651	69.3	23.8	4.8	0.2

Detailed analysis: Árpád E. Varga, “Városodás, vándorlás, nemzetiség. Adatok és szempontok az erdélyi városi térségek etnikai arculatváltásának vizsgálatához” [Urbanization, Migration, Affiliation. Data and Criteria for Examining Change in the Ethnic Complexion of Transylvanian Urban Areas], in Árpád E. Varga, *Fejezetek a jelenkori Erdély népesedéstörténetéből. Tanulmányok* [Chapters from the Population History of Present-Day Transylvania. Studies] (Budapest, 1998), pp. 180–217.

Census data on changes in the language and national-group relations in three major cities:

	All	Romanian	Hungarian
	<b>1948</b>		
<b>1</b>	47,043	11,007	34,943
<b>2</b>	82,282	26,998	52,540
<b>3</b>	117,791	47,321	67,977
	<b>1956</b>		
<b>1</b>	65,194	14,623	48,077
<b>2</b>	99,663	35,644	59,072
<b>3</b>	154,723	74,033	74,155
	<b>1977</b>		
<b>1</b>	127,783	44,491	81,234
<b>2</b>	170,531	91,925	75,125
<b>3</b>	262,858	173,003	86,215

1 = Târgu Mureș, 2 = Oradea, 3 = Cluj-Napoca

- 4 Emigration of the indigenous German population became widespread in the late 1960s and early 1970s. The figures were 16,019 in 1950–1966, 440 in 1967, 614 in 1968, 2,675 in 1969, 6,519 in 1970, 2,848 in 1971, 4,374 in 1972, and 7,577 in 1973. For more detail, see the following: Tismăneanu, Dobrinu and Vasile, eds., *Comisia prezidențială*, p. 361; Dennis Deletant, *Ceaușescu și Securitatea. Constrângere și disidență în România anilor 1965–1989* (Bucharest, 1998) = *Ceausescu and the Securitate: Coercion and Dissent in Romania, 1965–89* (Armonk, NY, 1995), p. 125; Georg Weber, *Emigration der Siebenbürger Sachsen. Studien zu Ost-West-Wanderung im 20. Jahrhundert* (Wiesbaden, 2003), p. 444. Emigration of Romanian Jews peaked in the 1950s and 1960s.

- Sample figures: 47,071 in 1950, 40,625 in 1951, 21,269 in 1961, and 25,926 in 1964. For more on this, see the following: Carol Bines, *Din istoria imigrărilor în Israel* [The History of Migration to Israel] (Bucharest, 1998), pp. 92–94; Radu Ioanid, *Răscumpărarea evreilor. Istoria aordurilor secrete dintre România și Israel* [The Ransom of the Jews: The Story of an Extraordinary Secret Bargain between Romania and Israel] (Bucharest, 2005); Liviu Rotman, *Evreii din România în perioada comunistă 1944–1965* [Jews in Romania during the Communist Period 1944–1965] (Iasi, 2004).
- 5 Tismăneanu, Dobrinicu and Vasile, eds., *Comisia prezidențială*, pp. 332–354.
  - 6 Mihály Zoltán Nagy and Ágoston Olti, eds., *Érdekképviselőlet vagy pártpolitika? Iratok a Magyar Népi Szövetség történetéhez 1944–1953* [Representation of Interests or Party Politics? Documents from the History of the Hungarian People’s Association 1944–1953] (Csíkszereda, 2009); Tamás Lönhárt, *Uniunea Populară Maghiară în perioada instaurării regimului comunist în România (1944–1948)* [The Hungarian Popular Union during the Communist Takeover in Romania (1944–1948)] (Cluj-Napoca, 2008).
  - 7 Gábor Vincze, *Illúziók és csalódások. Fejezetek a romániai magyarság második világháború utáni történetéből* [Illusions and Disillusionments. Chapters of the Post-War History of the Romanian Hungarians] (Csíkszereda, 1999), p. 196.
  - 8 *Magyar Autonóm Tartomány/Regiunea Autonomă Maghiară*.
  - 9 A full account of the Hungarian Autonomous Region: Stefano Bottoni, *Sztálin a székelyeknél. A Magyar Autonóm Tartomány története, 1952–1960* [Stalin and the Szeklers: A History of the Hungarian Autonomous Region, 1952–1960] (Csíkszereda, 2008).
  - 10 *Maros-Magyar Autonóm Tartomány/ Regiunea Mureș-Autonomă Maghiară*.
  - 11 Bottoni, *Sztálin a székelyeknél*, p. 418.
  - 12 *Ibid.*, pp. 422–424.
  - 13 Andrea Andreescu, Nastasă Lucian and Andrea Varga, eds., *Minorități etnoculturale. Mărturii documentare. Maghiarii din România (1945–1955)* [Ethnocultural Minorities. Testimonial Documentation. Hungarians in Romania (1945–1955)] (Cluj, 2002), pp. 460–482.

- 14 C. Daicoviciu, Șt. Pascu *et al.*, eds., *Din istoria Transilvaniei. I–II* [History of Transylvania I–II] (Bucharest, 1960–1961). On the ideological output of the Ceausescu regime: Katherine Verdery, *National Ideology under Socialism – Identity and Cultural Politics in Ceausescu’s Romania* (Berkeley, CA, 1995).
- 15 *Declarație cu privire la poziția Partidului Muncitoresc Român în problemele mișcării comuniste și muncitorești internaționale, adoptată de Plenara lărgită a C.C. al P.M.R. din aprilie 1964* [Declaration of the Romanian Workers’ Party’s Position on Questions of the International Communist and Workers’ Movement, Adopted by the Enlarged Plenary CC of P.M.R. April 1964] (Bucharest, 1964), p. 55.
- 16 Csaba Zoltán Novák, “A ‘nyitás éve’, 1968. A romániai magyar értelmiségiek találkozója Nicolae Ceaușescuval” [1968, Year of Opening. The Romanian Hungarian Intelligentsia’s Encounter with Nicolae Ceaușescu], *Múltunk* (2008) 2: 229–266. On the relations of the intelligentsia and the authorities: Gail Kligman, *The Politics of Duplicity: Controlling Reproduction in Ceausescu’s Romania* (Los Angeles, CA, 1998); József D. Lőrincz, *Az átmenet közéleti értékei a mindennapi életben* [Public Values of the Transition in Daily Life] (Csíkszereda, 2004).
- 17 Csaba Zoltán Novák, “A megyésítés és a nemzetiségi kérdés Romániában 1968” [Division into Counties and the Minority Question in Romania 1968], in Nándor Bárdi and Attila Simon, eds., *Integrációs stratégiák a magyar kisebbségek történetében* [Integration Strategies in the History of the Hungarian Minorities] (Somorja, 2006), pp. 405–421.
- 18 *Magyar Nemzetiségű Dolgozók Tanácsa*.
- 19 Gábor Vincze, “Lăncrăjanról Lăncrăjanig. Fejezet a magyar–román kapcsolatok nyolcvanas évekbeli történetéből” [From Lăncrăjan to Lăncrăjan. Chapters from the History of 1980s Hungarian–Romanian History], *Magyar Kisebbség* (2006) 3–4: 263–352.
- 20 Vincze, *Illúziók és csalódások*, p. 219; Gábor Vincze, ed., *Történeti kényszerpályák kisebbségi reálpolitikák II. Dokumentumok a romániai magyar kisebbség történetének tanulmányozásához 1944–1989* [Historical Paths of Minority Realpolitik, II. Documents from the Study of the History of the Romanian Hungarian Minority 1944–1989] (Csíkszereda, 2003), pp. 448–450.

- 21 József Gyönyör, *Terhes örökség. A magyarság lélekszámának és sorsának alakulása Csehszlovákiában* [Difficult Heritage. Population and Destiny of the Hungarian Community in Czechoslovakia] (Pozsony, 1994), pp. 264–265.
- 22 Árpád Popély, *A (cseh)szlovákiai magyarság történeti kronológiája 1944–1992* [Historical Chronology of the (Czecho)Slovakian Hungarian Community 1944–1992] (Somorja, 2006).
- 23 Nominations had to be endorsed by a communist-controlled front, which made a single endorsement in each district. Voting was compulsory but meant ticking “yes” or “no” for the one candidate. Despite secret balloting, it was far from safe to post a “no” vote or spoil a ballot paper.
- 24 Gyönyör, *Terhes örökség*, pp. 266–268.
- 25 On Czechoslovak repercussions of the 1956 Revolution, see Edita Ivaničková and Attila Simon, eds., *Mad'arská revolúcia 1956 a Slovensko. Az 1956-os magyar forradalom és Szlovákia* [The 1956 Hungarian Revolution and Slovakia] (Šamorín/Bratislava, 2006).
- 26 *Československá socialistická republika*.
- 27 László Tóth, ed., *A (cseh)szlovákiai magyar művelődés története 1918–1998* [The History of (Czecho)Slovakian Hungarian Culture, 1918–1998], II (Budapest, 1998), pp. 236–257.
- 28 Participation by the Hungarian minority in the 1968 reform is covered in Rezső Szabó, *A Csemadok és a Prágai Tavasz* [CSEMADOK and the Prague Spring] (Pozsony, 2004); Árpád Popély, *1968 és a csehszlovákiai magyarság* [1968 and the Czechoslovakian Hungarians] (Somorja, 2008).
- 29 *Csehszlovákiai Magyar Kisebbség Jogvédő Bizottsága*.
- 30 On the committee, see Miklós Duray, ed., *Kettős elnyomásban. Dokumentumok a csehszlovákiai magyarság helyzetéről és jogvédelméről 1978–1989* [Double Pressure. Documents on the Situation and Legal Protection of the Czechoslovakian Hungarians 1978–1989] (Pozsony, 1993).
- 31 Kálmán Janics, *A hontalanság éve. A szlovákiai magyar kisebbség a második világháború után 1945–1948* [The Years of Statelessness. The Slovak Hungarians after the Second World War 1945–1948] (Munich, 1979), (Budapest, 1989); English edition: *Czechoslovak Policy and the Hungarian Minority 1945–1948* (Highland Lakes, NJ/Boulder, CO, 1982).

- 32 Nándor Bárdi, *Tény és való. A budapesti kormányzatok és a határon túli magyarok kapcsolattörténete. Problémakatalógus* [True Fact. Budapest Governments and the History of Their Contacts with Hungarians Abroad. Catalogue of Problems] (Pozsony, 2004), p. 39.
- 33 *Ibid.*
- 34 László Domonkos, *Magyarok a Délvidéken* [Hungarians in the Southern Region] (Budapest, 1992), p. 115.
- 35 *Ibid.*, p. 116.
- 36 József Botlik, Béla Csorba and Károly Dudás, *Eltévedt mezsgyekövek. Adatok a délvidéki magyarság történetéhez* [Lost Boundary Markers. Notes on the History of the Southern Region Hungarians] (Budapest, 1994), p. 290.
- 37 Károly Mirnics, *Kis-Jugoszlávia hozománya. Írások az asszimilációról és a kisebbségről* [Dowry of Little Yugoslavia. Writings on Assimilation and Minorities] (Budapest, 1996), p. 49.
- 38 Botlik, Csorba and Dudás, *Eltévedt mezsgyekövek*, p. 199.
- 39 *Vajdasági Magyar Kultúrszövetség.*
- 40 *Horvátországi Magyar Szövetség.*
- 41 Mirnics, *Kis-Jugoszlávia hozománya*, pp. 311 and 316.
- 42 The distinction between *kisebbség/manjina* and *nemzetiség/nacionalna manjina* is not easy to convey fully in English. The second underlines the idea that a minority is an integral part of the nation, not just an ethnic entity. *Ustav Socijalističke Federativne Republike Jugoslavije*, Član 43. [The Constitution of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, Article 43], at [http://sr.wikisource.org/wiki/Устав\\_Социјалистичке\\_Федеративне\\_Републике\\_Југославије\\_\(1963\)](http://sr.wikisource.org/wiki/Устав_Социјалистичке_Федеративне_Републике_Југославије_(1963)). Accessed August 11, 2010. László Rehák, *Kisebbségtől nemzetiségig* [From Minority to National Community] (Újvidék, 1979), p. 171.
- 43 Béla Csorba and János Vékás, eds., *A kultúrtanti visszavág. A Szimpózium-mozgalom krónikája 1954–1993* [Auntie Culture Strikes Back. Chronicle of the Symposium Movement 1954–1993] (Újvidék, 1994), p. 175.
- 44 It has to be said that the Hungarian-language institutional system itself took part in punitive action against the offenders, by making it impossible for them to operate and excluding them from membership. *Ibid.*
- 45 *Woiwodschaft Serbien und Temeser Banat.*
- 46 *Kárpátaljai Magyar Kulturális Szövetség.*



- 47 Kálmán Móricz, *Nagydobrony* [Velyka Dobron'] (Beregszász, 1995).
- 48 “‘Járok egyet a természetben.’ Interjú Biró Andorral” [“I Go for a Walk in Nature.” Interview with Andor Biró], *Kárpáti Igaz Szó*, June 23, 2005.
- 49 Memoirs: István Bendász, *Öt év a szögesdrót mögött: egy kárpátaljai pap a Gulag munkatáborában* [Five Years behind Barbed Wire: a Transcarpathian Priest in the Labor Camps of the Gulag] (Abaliget, 2000); Pál Forgón, *Ott voltam, ahol a legszebb virágok nyílnak: egy kárpátaljai magyar református lelkész a Gulagon* [Where the Fairest Flowers Bloom: a Subcarpathian Hungarian Reformed Pastor in the Gulag] (Budapest, 1992); József Zimányi, *Tűzszlopoddal jéghegyek között. Egy ref. lelkész életútja* [Pillar of Fire amid Hills of Ice. Life of a Reformed Pastor] (Budapest, 2006); Barna Horkay, *A Keleti Baráti Kör. Egy ref. lelkész életútja* [The Eastern Friendly Circle. Life of a Reformed Pastor] (n.p., 1998).
- 50 I. Pop, “Zakarpats’ka shkola zhyvopysu yak fenomen nacional’nogo i kul’turnogo vidrodzhennja” [The Transcarpathian School of Painting as a Phenomenon of National and Cultural Revival], in G. Pavlenko, ed., *Carpatica – Karpatyka. Aktual’ni problemy istorii’ i kul’tury Zakarpattia* [Carpatica. Current Problems of History and Culture of Transcarpathia] (Uzhhorod, 1992), pp. 181–196; László Balla, *Erdélyi Béla és kortársai. Kárpátalja képzőművészeinek három nemzedéke* [Béla Erdélyi and His Contemporaries. Three Generations of Transcarpathian Artists] (Ungvár/Budapest, 1994).
- 51 Csilla Fedinec, “A magyar irodalom a kárpátaljai oktatásban 1944-től napjainkig” [Hungarian Literature in Transcarpathian Education from 1944 to the Present Day], *Literatura* (2001) 4: 409–426.
- 52 *Lendület; Új Hajtás*.
- 53 I. Holopenkov and P. Rospopin, eds., *Knygy vydavnyctva “Karpaty” (1946–1970)* [The Books of Publishing House Karpaty (1946–1970)] (Uzhhorod, 1970); László Sándor, “Kárpátukrajnai magyar könyv- és lapkiadás, nyomdászat és könyvkereskedelem 1918–1980-ig” [Carpatho-Ukrainian Hungarian Book and Press Publication, Printing and Book Distribution 1918–1980], *Magyar Könyvszemle* (1983) 2: 186–191; László Sándor and Ferenc Botka, “A kárpátukrajnai magyar könyvkiadás irodalmi bibliográfiája 1945–1960” [Literary Bibliography of Carpatho-Ukrainian Hungarian Book Publication 1945–1960], *Irodalomtörténet* (1961) 3: 355–371; Csilla Fedinec, “Magyar könyvkiadás és képzőművészet kapcsolata

- Kárpátalján (1918-tól napjainkig)” [Connection of Hungarian Book Publishing and Fine Art in Transcarpathia (from 1918 to the Present Day)], in Idem, ed., *Az elsüllyedt jelek. I. A 20. századi magyar könyvillusztráció Magyarország határain kívül 1918-tól napjainkig* [Sunken Signs I. 20th-Century Hungarian Book Illustration beyond Hungary’s Borders from 1918 to the Present Day] (Budapest, 2003), pp. 138–171; Csilla Fedinec, “A Kárpáti Kiadó Kalendáriuma (40 év címszavakban)” [The Almanac of Publishing House Karpaty (Forty Years in Titles)], in *Kalendárium ’96–’97* [Almanac 1996–1997] (Uzhhorod, 1996), pp. 153–167.
- 54 Ljuba Siselina, “A volt Szovjetunió nemzeti politikája és a kárpátaljai magyarság” [The National Policy of the Former Soviet Union and the Hungarians of Transcarpathia], *Regio* 3 (1992) 2: 166–174; János Penckőfer, *Tettben a jellem. A magyar irodalom sajátos kezdeményei Kárpátalján a XX. század második felében* [Character in Deed. The Specific Initiatives of Hungarian Literature in Transcarpathia in the Second Half of the 20th Century] (Budapest, 2003); György Csanádi, *Régi beregszásziak* [Old People of Beregovo] (Beregszász, 2001); György Csanádi, *Sorsfordító évek sodrában. Fejezetek Beregvidék történelmi múltjából* [In the Current of Fateful Years. Chapters of Bereg District History] (Ungvár, 2004); Ottó Schober, *Színfalak előtt, mögött, nélkül. Epizódok a Beregszászi Népszínház történetéből* [Before, behind, without the Scenes. Episodes from the History of the People’s Theater of Beregovo] (Ungvár/Budapest, 1995); Balázs Keresztyén, *Kárpátaljai művelődéstörténeti kislexikon* [Pocket Dictionary of Transcarpathian Cultural History] (Budapest, 2001); Károly D. Balla, *Kis(ebbségi) magyar skizofrénia* [A Minor/Minority Hungarian Schizophrenia] (Ungvár/Budapest, 1993).
- 55 Csaba Békés, Malcolm Byrne and János M. Rainer, eds., *The 1956 Hungarian Revolution. A History in Documents* (Budapest, 2003); György Litván, János Bak and Lyman H. Letgres, eds., *The Hungarian Revolution of 1956. Reform, Revolt and Repression 1953–1963* (London, 1996); Tibor Méray, *Thirteen Days that Shook the Kremlin* (New York, 1959); James A. Michener, *The Bridge at Andau. The Story of the Hungarian Revolution* (London, 1957); Ibolya Murber and Zoltán Fónagy, eds., *Die Ungarische Revolution und Österreich 1956* (Vienna, 2006).
- 56 Ernő Deák, *Ungarische Mittelschulen in Österreich nach 1956* (Vienna, 2006).

- 57 Heinrich Wedral, “Pendelwanderung, Abwanderung und die Situation auf dem burgenländischen Arbeitsmarkt,” in Traude Horvath and Rainer Münz, eds., *Migration und Arbeitsmarkt* (Eisenstadt, 1987), pp. 18–34; Günter Karner, “Pendeln: Schicksal oder Chance,” in Horvath and Münz, eds., *Migration und Arbeitsmarkt*, pp. 35–44.
- 58 Gerhard Baumgartner, Eva Kovács and András Vári, *Entfernte Nachbarn – Jánossmorja und Andau 1990–2000 / Távoli Rokonok – Jánossmorja és Andau 1990–2000* (Budapest, 2002).
- 59 Imre Gyenge, “Die Wandlungen der burgenländischen Ungarn. Ein Augenzeugenbericht,” *Integratio* 11–12 (1979): 23–33.
- 60 Ernő Deák, “Die Ungarn in Wien: eine unsichtbare Volksgruppe?,” *Integratio* 15 (1982): 115–132.
- 61 Ludwig Szeberényi, *Die ungarische Volksgruppe im Burgenland und ihr Volksgruppenbeirat* (Vienna, 1986), pp. 35–36.
- 62 *Maideklaration des Burgenländisch-Ungarischen Kulturvereins*. See Szeberényi, *Die ungarische Volksgruppe*, p. 37.
- 63 Andreas Oplatka, *Der Riss in der Mauer – September 1989. Ungarn öffnet die Grenze* (Vienna, 2009).
- 64 St. Lucy’s Day (December 13).
- 65 Gerhard Baumgartner, “Der nationale Differenzierungsprozess in den ländlichen Gemeinden des südlichen Burgenlandes,” in Andreas Moritsch, ed., *Vom Ethnos zur Nationalität: Der nationale Differenzierungsprozess am Beispiel ausgewählter Orte in Kärnten und im Burgenland* (Vienna/Munich, 1991), pp. 93–155.

