concept of nation to such Yugoslavism. Several of its members held high posts in the province’s political and institutional leadership. 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.

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 Vojvodeship and the Banat of Temes 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.46

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’, for instance, became famous for its potatoes and peppers.47 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.48 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.49

Hardly any great artists of old (such men as Gyula Virágh, Gyula Ijjász, Andor Novák, Sáúmel 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 Kremniczky, 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.”

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).

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.”

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.

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.54

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.\textsuperscript{55} 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.\textsuperscript{56}

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.\textsuperscript{57} 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.\textsuperscript{58} 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, 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. 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. 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.

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. 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 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 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.

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.
3 Changes in the ethnic structure of Transylvania’s urban population, as a percentage:

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

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

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

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


8 *Magyar Autonóm Tartomány/Regiunea Autonomă Maghiară.*


10 *Maros-Magyar Autonóm Tartomány/ Regiunea Mureș-Autonomă Maghiară.*


Minority Hungarian Communities in the 20th Century


18 *Magyar Nemzetiségű Dolgozók Tanácsa.*


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.


26 Československá socialistická republika.


29 *Csehszlovákiai Magyar Kisebbség Jogvédő Bizottsága.*


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.

*Woiwodschaft Serbien und Temeser Banat.*

*Kárpátaljai Magyar Kulturális Szövetség.*
Kálmán Móricz, *Nagydobrony* [Velyka Dobron’] (Beregyszász, 1995).


Ernő Deák, Ungarische Mittelschulen in Österreich nach 1956 (Vienna, 2006).
64  St. Lucy’s Day (December 13).