Negotiating Post-Imperial Transitions: Local Societies and Nationalizing States in East Central Europe*

Gábor Egry

Scholars typically attribute the demise of empires in the wake of World War I to their struggle with emerging nation-states.[1] Yet making the nation into the primary subject of analysis often obscures crucial differences within the new political entities. Of course, this is not to overlook the important scholarship that tackles local and regional issues either directly or as part of a larger narrative. This includes studies of transitional events in Upper Silesia; a collection of local stories from Austria-Hungary; new work on postwar violence throughout East-Central Europe; and even more targeted studies of such ethnic groups as the Mazurians and the Budweisers.[2] All these works depict important episodes in the broader history of the crystallization of sometimes rather heterogeneous nations around their new nation-states.[3]

However, what is generally lacking in the historiographical literature are comprehensive comparative studies of local level transitions. We know surprisingly little, for example, about how the various revolutions assumed administrative and political power in individual localities; to what extent the old elite was replaced; and whether there was a period of revolutionary or counter-revolutionary cooperation across ethnic boundaries (and if so, how long it lasted). Similarly under-researched topics include the installation of local governments in the new nation-states; the nature and extent of local measures; personnel changes in local institutions, and the reconfiguration of politics, social roles, and public practices. Not even the top-down nationalizing efforts have been thoroughly surveyed at the local level. Indeed, most studies simply assume—on

the basis of randomly selected examples and the not necessarily unbiased reports collected by state officials—that central orders and regulations were implemented "seamlessly."[4]

This chapter operates from the opposite assumption—that is, once the Habsburg Empire and its political institutions had collapsed, local elites and ordinary citizens, although their role in state affairs had grown markedly in the preceding decades,[5] were confronted with daunting tasks that previously had been left to the state, and for which they had little, if any, experience.[6] Regardless of whether local leaders had been revolutionaries, they were forced to govern during this transitional period in unfamiliar roles and, largely, without effective support from central organs. Additionally, in the struggle to determine the territorial extent of the successor states, those people living in areas occupied and claimed by the new sovereigns had to face the emerging state and its homogenizing visions on their own. This led to the creation of what may be considered a new state space at the local level—one which directly affected the outcome of the state-building process itself, not least of all due to the limited capacity and efficiency of the new states but also, as we will see, the perseverance of local structures and institutions.[7]

In this chapter, I address these issues through the state-building processes in regions that had belonged to Hungary and came under Czechoslovak and Romanian rule in 1919— Slovakia (or Upper Hungary, as it was called in the dualist era) and Transylvania, respectively. These were diverse, multi-ethnic areas with predominantly Hungarian and German urban populations despite an overall higher proportion of Slovaks and Romanians. While the majority of inhabitants spoke the language of their new rulers, the border zones contained Hungarian-speaking majorities even in the countryside. And some areas further from the new frontiers (the Saxon settlements in Southern Transylvania, the Banat, the Szeklerland, Maramureș, and the Spiš) were characterized by a strong Hungarian and German presence, often constituting the regional majority.

Nor was diversity limited to language or nationality. Some of these areas were industrial zones (most notably the mining towns in the Banat or Jiu Valley) with large working-class populations. Others were home to sizable groups of religious minorities such as Jews and Greek Catholics in Northern Transylvania and Carpatho-Ukraine. These regions had distinct social, cultural, and administrative traditions as well.[8] How they would confront state-building efforts based on different and even foreign practices remained to be seen.

In order to highlight the important ways in which a local perspective can change our understanding of state formation, this chapter begins by discussing the different faces—social, national, and democratic—of the revolutions in 1918. It then examines the process of establishing a political administration, with an emphasis on the peculiar linguistic and symbolic features of the new local regimes and landscapes. The last part assesses how the different regions expressed themselves politically and socially in this early state-building period.

The Three Faces of One Revolution

The revolutions that took place in Eastern Europe between 1917 and 1919 strove to reconfigure politics, economics, and society such that more people would be enfranchised and national development would go hand-in-hand with greater economic equality. Of course, revolutionary elites were typically more interested in preserving their prerogatives than in acceding to the demands of ordinary people, who often made their own, local revolutions. But the leaders of the new nation-states promised to solve their problems together.

Hungary was a prominent case with respect both to the national and social aspects of revolutionary state-building. When the Hungarian National Council, the interim legislative body of the country, declared independence from Austria-Hungary, it not only extended political rights through universal suffrage, but also created integrating institutions like workers' and soldiers'

councils; promised minority rights and proper representation for nationalities; and offered to alleviate social ills by redistributing wealth (mainly through agrarian reform and the introduction of extensive social benefits). But these efforts confronted the similar goals of the Slovak, Czech, and Romanian National Councils, which sought to implement change on their own terms and in their own, respective national frameworks. From this perspective, then, national initiatives were crucial in the early phases of nation-state building in that they prevented cross-ethnic cooperation at the highest government levels.

Rather than simply accepting historical Hungary's existence and reform efforts, the Czech, Slovak, and Romanian National Councils envisioned their own independent nation-states. Thus, the national/political aspect of state-building overshadowed the social/economic one already by late October 1918. Unsurprisingly, differing political visions were the main sources for rivalry between revolutionary bodies, often disrupting interethnic cooperation among administrative elites. An oft-cited example is the negotiations between Oszkár Jászi, the Hungarian Minister for National Minorities, and representatives of the Romanian National Council at Arad. The stakes of these negotiations in late November 1918 were no less than the territorial consolidation of Hungary, as the Romanian National Council was demanding the immediate takeover of twenty-three counties with Romanian populations (thereby extending its rule to the Eastern zone of the Great Plain and the whole of the Banat). Despite the wide-ranging concessions offered by Jászi, who proposed establishing a system of national cantons with broad autonomy, the Romanian politicians insisted upon having full sovereignty over all Romanian inhabited territories.[9]

A similar scenario played out in Upper Hungary. On 6 December, Milan Hodža, a former member of the Hungarian Parliament and a representative of the Slovak National Council, came to terms with the Hungarian government over a demarcation line that left most of the contested territories with predominantly Hungarian populations under Hungarian control. However, he was

soon denounced by the Czechoslovak government, which had been working with delegates to the Paris Peace Conference in order to establish a new border that put the disputed zone in its hands. As it happens, this border runs very close to the present one.

At the local level, by contrast, cross-ethnic cooperation was more common, thus making it harder to distinguish the political and social aspects of the revolution. Moreover, local revolutions were often truly local in that they did not simply replicate what happened in the centers of national power. Instead, their main drivers were the social discontent of their respective populations, as well as the violence engendered by returning soldiers. Unsurprisingly, then, local leaders were often less concerned with national, state-building issues than material problems at home, which likewise meant that their construction of enemies did not straightforwardly fall along ethnic lines.

Transylvania, a new province of Romania that was approximately thirty percent ethnic Hungarian and ten percent German, is a case in point. There, the local revolution and violence targeted everything associated with the old order. Not only did returning soldiers loot rampantly, but the local population took advantage of the breakdown in authority, which in any case was more often concerned with disarming the returning veterans than pursuing the local bands.[10] People in multi-ethnic regions often attacked state authorities regardless of their ethnicity, and looting was by no means confined to Hungarian property. The Romanian National party politician Ilie Lăzar learned this first-hand when, as a *Honvéd* (Hungarian military) officer, he travelled to Máramarossziget (Sighetu Marmației) in order to establish Romanian rule in the county. Instead, he was robbed clean by a band of returning Romanian soldiers who had come to "rescue" the Orthodox priest with whom Lăzar was lodging, and who were not deterred by the fact that the "Hungarian" officer also happened to be an ethnic Romanian.[11]

Faced with such violence, state authorities often had to rely on National Councils to regain control. A circular from the Hungarian Interior Ministry admitted as much in December 1918: "During those unforgettable days, when the people's will broke centuries of forced servitude, the National Councils provided an invaluable service for the true cause of liberty. […] Hungary's liberated people owe their eternal gratitude to them."[12] The Councils had the capacity to run local administrations, organize armed national guards, and distribute provisions as part of their larger effort to reorganize society along national lines. But to what extent were local Councils the true embodiment of grassroots demands for a national order? At least three aspects of their activities indicate that the situation was more complex than the Councils typically presented it.

First, many of these National Councils were organized following external initiatives, often by the delegates of county or even regional Councils.[13] In these cases, the delegates brought with them a blueprint for action, describing whom to mobilize and how to legitimize the takeover. The scripted nature of these events in many localities suggests that the vision of a spontaneous revolution generating new institutions along national lines found much less support at the local level than it did among urban intellectuals and political elites. Moreover, the sequence of events was surprisingly similar in such disparate regions as the Barcaság (Burzenland, Țară Bârsei) around Brassó (Kronstadt, Brașov); the Nagy-Küküllő (Târnava Mare) river zone; and Szászrégen (Sächisch Reen, Reghin), especially north and south. First, the Councils established in the major regional cities (Brassó, Nagyszeben [Hermannstadt, Sibiu], and Szászrégen) all declared some form of national autonomy. A few days or weeks later, after securing the cooperation of county administrators, they sent representatives to villages in which the National Council had less presence. These representatives sought out influential local figures; instructed them on how to set up their own councils; and participated in the festivities for newly elected officials tasked with "initiating" the council. Control over the local councils could be quite strict

as well. A memorandum adopted by the inaugural session of the Maroslaka (Huduc, today Maiorești) Romanian National Council, for example, contained a verbatim paragraph on the rejection of false compromises from a memo issued by the Reghin National Council.[14]

Secondly, most of the National Councils prioritized material issues over national ones. Some were eager to reopen old conflicts over property rights irrespective of their opponents' nationality. The Romanian communities in the Görgény Valley (Ghurghiul) offer a telling example. In the village of Görgényhodák (Hodac), the first session of the Romanian National Council adopted a resolution demanding that the Great Council (*sfatul cel mare*), which would discuss the rightful demands of oppressed nations, include the village's claim to the surrounding forests they had lost in 1848.[15] In the nearby village of Görgényorsova (Orșova), the National Council met on 1 December 1918, the same day as the Great Assembly of Alba Iulia, which declared the union of Transylvania with Romania. The participants decided to increase defense of the community forests and to send delegates to neighboring villages to warn them not to enter without permission.[16] The deliberate timing of the Görgényorsova "Great National Assembly" illustrates the extent to which locals went to manipulate national politics for their material aims, in this case drawing upon the legitimacy conferred by events in Alba Iulia.

Finally, despite numerous references to "the nation" in histories of this transformational period, there is evidence to suggest that, at least during the initial phase of the revolution, the concept of Romanian nationhood was less clear-cut than contemporaries claimed and historians and politicians have largely accepted since.[17] Indeed, Romanian exertions in favor of self-determination appear ambiguous if we examine some National Councils' declarations in the immediate aftermath of the regime change. On 10 November in Erdőidecs (Idicel Pădure), for example, the Council referred to Romanian self-determination from Hungary and Transylvania, without mentioning union with the Old Kingdom of Romania. Yet more astoundingly, on 8

November 1918 the National Council from Görgénynádas (Nădașa Româna) announced and greeted the formation of the Hungarian National Council in Budapest, as well as the nomination of Mihály Károlyi as Prime Minister. It then declared its adherence to the program of the Budapest Hungarian National Council. Another passage from this declaration asserted that the Romanians had gained their right for self-government "in this country" [i.e., Hungary], which would be realized through the Romanian National Council in Arad.[18] This Council thus viewed its legitimacy as derived from the Hungarian national revolution rather than the Romanian one.

These organizational and ideological aspects of the local National Councils can also be found on the territory of present-day Slovakia, where the revolution unfolded in similar ways at the local level in terms of the collapse of administrations, the influence of National Councils, and the predominance of material issues over national ones.[19] In the case of Nyitra (Nitra), the seat of a Catholic bishopric, the National Council was initially formed by representatives of the Social Democrats, the Christian Socialists, and the Hungarian opposition parties. They were soon joined by ethnic Slovaks from the ranks of the Catholic clergy (like Josef Tiso) and the Christian Socialist association, though many, including Tiso, initially referred to themselves as Hungarians. With the advent of political events in Prague and Budapest, however, more ethnically narrow National Councils were formed.[20]

In the Slovakian capital Pozsony (Pressburg, Bratislava), studied by Pieter van Duin, organized labor also became a factor in the local administration, in sharp contrast to its minimal role in mainly agrarian Transylvania.[21] The Social Democrats in particular—including Germans, Hungarians, and Slovaks—dominated the transitional period in Pozsony, acting as a stabilizing force through their exceptional organization and connections to Budapest and, to a lesser extent, Vienna. Although not necessarily indifferent to nationality, the Social Democrats' admirable ethnic tolerance lasted through the mid-1920s, when the new Czechoslovak state began

undermining their position with nationalizing policies that favored Czechs and Slovaks even among the ranks of organized labor. These policies eventually led to the dissolution of the Hungarian-German Social Democratic Party. Romanian regions with similar social fabrics, such as mining districts and industrial Temesvár (Temeschwar, Timișoara), underwent comparable transitions: initially, organized workers and their parties fended off nationalizing efforts, only to be pushed aside by the state administrations appointed by the military authorities in early January 1919.[22]

These relatively exceptional cases of industrial areas raise the broader question of interethnic cooperation. The very purpose of National Councils was to dissociate national communities, despite the fact that local, everyday social and political life was well-entwined nationally. For this reason, local level cooperation among National Councils tended to be the norm. Common bodies were established to oversee food and firewood provisions, collect local taxes and fees, and to distribute the confiscated property. Different national guards coordinated security measures and patrols.[23] And at least in one case, in Nagymoha (Grănări, Mukendorf), the Hungarian National Council refused to begin operations until its Romanian counterpart was established and they could run the locality together.[24]

In county seats, most National Councils initially operated in an ethnically mixed manner.[25] Josef Tiso was not the only politician who came to prominence as the leader of a nation-state (i.e., the Slovak Republic formed under the tutelage of Nazi Germany), but started his political career in a National Council that sustained peaceful, interethnic cooperation.[26] The Romanian National Council in Deva was headed by the future Romanian Prime Minister Petru Groza, who despite the intransigent position of the general Romanian National Council concerning sovereignty over eastern Hungary and Transylvania, waited until early December 1918 to order the removal of ethnic Romanians from the local Hungarian National Council.[27]

In addition to these individual cases, the overall composition of the National Councils had a lasting political impact in the interwar period. The first few weeks featured (partial) elite replacement in which centrally appointed officials often departed, while representatives from the hitherto dominant Hungarian political parties were sidelined (especially István Tisza's Party of National Labor). Those acceding to power through the National Councils either represented the parliamentary opposition or parties that still lacked institutional influence, such as the Social Democrats and Bourgeois Radicals. These parties formed a new ruling class even when the representatives of the traditional opposition, such as the Catholic People's Party in Upper Hungary, already had a strong presence in local communities. The National Councils thus served as nodes in a newly emerging social network, enabling hitherto peripheral groups and personalities to access power at the local, regional and, often, national levels.[28]

Groza, who maintained ties with the Hungarian elite throughout his life, is a good example of this. Although many of his contacts stemmed from his privileged high school years in Szászváros (Broos, Orașție), Groza nurtured these relationships to the extent that he even participated in a class reunion in Budapest during his tenure as President of (socialist) Romania in the 1950s. But in the 1920s, Groza was a regional leader of General Alexandru Averescu's People's Party, in which capacity he served as an interlocutor between the Hungarian minority party and Averescu, with whom the Hungarians concluded an agreement on electoral and political cooperation in 1923.[29] Jozef Tiso also profited from his membership in the Nitra (Nyitra) National Council through his contact with fellow member Jenő Lelley, who went on to become chairman of the Christian Socialist Party in Slovakia. This supposedly trans-ethnic organization was on Budapest's payroll and often toyed with Hungarian revisionism. Nevertheless, after Lelley was ousted as party chairman in 1925, he founded another party (the Christian Socialist Party of Western Slovakia) with a pro-Czechoslovak platform, an apparent volte-face only until

one considers the personal connections Lelley established during the revolutionary period, and the overtures made around 1925 towards reconciling the Slovak People's Party and the Czechoslovak government. The party, which Tiso also helped to found, eventually entered the government and became part of the ruling coalition from 1927 to 1929.

The revolutionary period was short and transitory. Overlooking it, however, would be to lose sight of the extent to which state rule had collapsed. During these first few weeks, the "national interest" and the common weal of the nation were defined differently in different places (at least at the local level), and they often deviated from the ideals and interests advocated by the central National Councils.[30] It was only the presence of the conquering states' representatives that ended this practice, which could not have happened without first eliminating the Councils themselves.

Administering the Bitter Pills

Extending state power to the newly acquired regions was complicated by the fact that the new states were often a patchwork of legal systems and administrative cultures. Greater Romania inherited provinces from Cisleithania, Russia, and Hungary, while Czechoslovakia tried to combine Hungarian, Austrian, and provincial legal systems. The transition to a new, unified legal framework supervised by a new administration was thus bound to be a protracted one. Indeed, some important pieces of legislation were never entirely replaced.[31]

The idiosyncrasies of provincial legal traditions required first-hand knowledge, which made employing transferred or newly recruited personnel more problematic. The takeover of the administration and public services typically lasted for months, while new administrative laws were not passed until the mid-1920s. Moreover, despite similarities in the takeover processes, the

outcomes in Czechoslovakia and Romania differed significantly in terms of minority participation in the administration and the continuity of pre-1918 personnel.

Initially, the goal was similar in both countries: secure an oath of loyalty from officials in the existing institutions, if necessary by threat of dismissal. The responses, however, differed considerably. In the territories under Czechoslovak rule, officials only pledged their loyalty after receiving permission to do so from Budapest, whereas in Transylvania they were instructed by Budapest authorities to reject the oath.[32] Many officials actually fled to Budapest, causing serious political and social problems, though a large number of public servants remained at their posts.[33] Ultimately, the fate of those who stayed was not decided by the formal oath, but rather by the human resources available to the new states.

In Transylvania, taking the oath did not necessarily determine whether one kept one's job. As a general rule, high-ranking officials who refused the oath did so as a political gesture, while those serving in less important and publicly exposed positions could more easily take it without fear of repercussions should Hungarian rule be restored or they decide to emigrate.[34] But even those who rejected the oath were not automatically removed from service. While the new rulers certainly preferred qualified Romanian applicants, in places like Târnaveni (Dicsőszentmárton) the new prefect was forced to work with an administrative team that had declared its loyalty to the Romanian National Council despite not speaking Romanian.[35] Even when the administration was totally replaced, as in the county of Solnoc-Dobăca (Szolnok-Doboka), appointments for low-level positions were not necessarily ethnically biased simply due to the shortage of suitable Romanian applicants.[36] Consequently, the ratio of minority public servants roughly corresponded with the proportion of minorities in Transylvania's population well into the mid–1930s. In many counties, there was much continuity between pre-1918 and post-1918 personnel. For example, in Caraș-Severin (Krassó-Szörény), more than sixty percent of the minority village notaries in 1934

started their careers before 1919. In Trei Scaune (Háromszék) county, two-thirds of village notaries in 1921 held a similar post before 1919, and more than half of those were in the same position before the world war. Among officials of the central county organs, only one-third belonged to this more experienced group, but fifty-nine percent of the newly hired officials were Hungarians.[37]

Administrative institutions were not the only ones faced with a shortage of qualified employees—some public services were simply too essential to function with inexperienced staff. Postal workers thus kept their jobs in Romania regardless of ethnicity and despite nationally motivated attacks.[38] This emphasis on expertise is perhaps best exemplified by the management of postal services by ethnic Hungarians in some remote, predominantly Romanian areas through the first years of the Antonescu era (1940–1944)![39] Successful outcomes often superseded ethnic prejudices to such an extent that local authorities would assign politically charged tasks to minority officials. For example, the chief magistrate of the Oradea county court assigned a Hungarian examining magistrate to investigate the murder of two Romanian intellectuals by Hungarian troops in Beiuș (Belényes) in April 1919. Fearing a biased investigation, the opposition attacked the government in parliament for this specific assignment. Yet the court upheld it on the grounds that this dutiful Hungarian magistrate was the only one who had ample time for such a case.[40] Defending state authority against perceived threats or even illegalities sometimes required the removal of self-appointed Romanian officials. In the county of Cluj (Kolozs), some Hungarian village notaries who had been expelled during the revolution and replaced by local Romanian notables (like a Greek Catholic priest), were later reinstated by the new Romanian administration.[41]

The process unfolded differently in Czechoslovakia, where Hungarian officials retained their posts until enough qualified Czech and Slovak bureaucrats could take over the

administration and public services. As a result, layoffs took place gradually depending upon local circumstances and external political events. In Bratislava (Pressburg, Pozsony), for example, the administration was re-staffed so cautiously that, in the early 1920s, most local officials still came from the pre-1918 period.[42] Eventually, however, the administration was filled with a new generation of Czech and Slovak officials and the ratio of Hungarian public servants halved between 1921 and 1930, while mainly pre-1918 public servants of Slovak nationality were retained.[43] But these so-called *magyaróns* (pro-Hungarians) had to demonstrate their new national loyalty by adhering to Slovak (or Czechoslovak) customs and social practices, thereby abandoning their earlier means of displaying middle-class status.[44]

Hungarian postal and railway workers faced a harsher fate in Czechoslovakia than in Romania when they refused to take the loyalty oath and/or engaged in strike activity. The latter was quite common due to the strength of organized labor and Social Democracy in these territories of the emerging Czechoslovak Republic. After the creation of the Hungarian Soviet Republic in March 1919, moreover, unionized minority workers became increasingly suspect as supporters of a Bolshevik Revolution. This suspicion accelerated their removal from service.[45]

Local power relations played out differently in Romania and Czechoslovakia. Czechoslovak laws entitled communities to effective self-government based upon proportional representation in local political bodies like city councils and county assemblies (and, after 1927, regional assemblies as well). In localities where minority parties had sufficient support, they could meaningfully influence decisions concerning schools, cultural and social institutions, and even street names.[46] In Romania, by contrast, such elected local bodies served only between 1926 and 1933 (and not without interruptions), and decisions about these issues were made by a centrally appointed commission composed of politicians close to the government. In this way, minority elites in these localities lacked a means for formal influence on local issues, though they

often managed to have a voice through personal and professional connections or political pacts between parties.[47] Romanian political forces competing for power often sought support from minorities by forging such informal compromises. For example, in major Saxon towns the mayors were still Saxons until the 1930s. And in most Szekler cities, local Hungarian political groups, sometimes in rivalry with each other, gained official positions by the mid-1920s. Every Romanian party had its own Hungarian members and candidates in the most important localities.[48] It was thus not only the absence of democratic elections that made such informal political settlements easier in Romania, but also the fact that minorities had a strong presence at the mid and low levels of county administration, creating an environment that directly fostered cooperation between politicians.[49]

Yet another example of the continuity of state institutions and the survival of social practices is the voluntary firefighter associations in Transylvania. Such organizations were nonexistent in the Old Kingdom of Romania, where firefighters were subordinated to the military. In Transylvanian cities like Caransebeș (Karansschebes, Karánsebes) and Brașov, by contrast, these associations flourished, assembling public officials and the middle- and lower middle-classes regardless of nationality. Their working language was either Hungarian or German, and it often remained so despite frequent attacks on the associations during the interwar period. When the Romanian General Staff banned them in the province for their alleged irredentism (the circular order claimed that these associations had only been recently founded by Hungarian irredentists), county and local administrators protested and the mayor of Caransebeș sent an emotional, eight-page letter to his superiors denying the presence of irredentist Hungarians and the use of Hungarian language, and defending the firefighter associations as wellsprings of patriotism and altruism:

> We solemnly reject the accusations; those brave people do not deserve the label of irredentist Hungarians. […] The Romanians were never excluded from the ranks of the firefighters, [and] even now 10 out of 25 are Romanians, all of them having served 20–30 years. By no means was the association founded by well-known Hungarian irredentists. Nor could it serve Hungarian propaganda and the preservation of the Hungarian spirit, as the firefighters started to work fifty years ago, when not a single Hungarian word was heard in the city. The Germans who founded the association developed it in cooperation with Romanians. […] The prefect certainly knows that every loyal son of the country ought to have a place among the voluntary firefighters, irrespective of his mother tongue.[50]

The mayor's argument reveals more than just indignation over the negligence of local traditions—it shows how the nationalizing rhetoric from below was used to fend off nationalizing policies from above. The mayor was probably telling an "official" truth, though police reports confirm that Hungarians belonged to the associations and that their language was one of the firefighters' working languages.[51]

Lands of Promise

Historians have analyzed a broad range of symbolic nationalizing efforts in terms of how they transformed cities or forced traditional public practices into the private sphere following regime change. Rituals and festive days from the dualist era that came to be regarded as expressions of Hungarian nationality, for example, were replaced by new festivities and personality cults. Likewise, monuments were destroyed, removed or relocated; and Hungarian national days were celebrated in private or semi-public spheres such as churches.[52] Yet these efforts to undermine national symbols and practices often had the opposite effect—renewing national consciousness

even among social groups that had been indifferent towards Hungarian rituals. Thus, for example, on 20 August 1920, social democratically inclined Hungarian workers in Brașov, who formerly had refrained from demonstrations of religious adherence, attended the feast of Saint Stephen and effusively sang the Hungarian national anthem with the Roman Catholic congregation.[53]

Moreover, the new cults and rituals often possessed their own attractions irrespective of national identity. In Czechoslovakia, large segments of the Hungarian and German populations took part in the Masaryk cult, sometimes to the extent of venerating the president as a benevolent figure whose gestures towards minorities promised to resolve their problems.[54] Local activist (i.e., pro-Czechoslovak) parties were often able to capitalize on Masaryk's personality cult when competing with minority Hungarian parties.[55] After all, this quasi-religious loyalty to the Czech president had direct links to the dualist era in that it constructed Masaryk as the heir to the venerable Habsburg Emperor Franz Joseph. Similarly, in Romania allegiance to the ruler (the king of Hungary) was easily transferred to the king of Romania, even by his minority subjects. Numerous royal petitions from mainly lower class Hungarians reached the royal court just as they had in dualist Hungary. Betti Juhász from Petroșani (Petrozsény), for example, asked the King for a dowry, while the Cluj (Kolozsvár) locksmith István Kun just asked for permission to baptize his son after His Majesty's Christian name. In the case of these petitions, socio-economic status was more decisive than nationality or local context.[56]

Social networks often transcended ethno-national boundaries when it came to resisting central nationalizing initiatives. The importance of these networks is well illustrated by local national markers like street names, statuary, and middle-class cultural activities. Street names in particular constituted crucial indicators of ethnic ownership and a symbolic means of occupation. Hungarian cities had been increasingly nationalized through street renaming before 1914, and the new regimes continued the practice.[57] However, the different patterns of street renaming

throughout Romania and Czechoslovakia suggest that these nationalizing initiatives could easily be sidetracked.

This was widely visible in Czechoslovak towns and cities, where effective local self-government enabled the representatives of minority Hungarian and/or German communities to determine geographic names and nomenclature (if not in Hungarian or German, then often bilingually). As long as a specified percentage of registered minorities lived in any one locality, it was minimally required to have bilingual street signs. With enough votes in the local council, the minority elite could even choose the street names provided they did not explicitly challenge Czechoslovak symbolism.[58] The exceptions were larger, more important cities in which political exigencies and central initiatives prevailed over minority rights. Bratislava was the most flagrant example, as not only was the city re-christened with its largely invented Slovak name, but the official renaming was held just before the 15 March Remembrance Day for the 1848 Hungarian Revolution. Throughout the interwar years, such symbolic conquests gradually erased Hungarian national figures from the city's map, eventually even eliminating the neutral ones.[59]

Similarly, in the Transylvanian capital Cluj the new prefect provocatively issued his first decree on renaming twenty streets on 15 March 1919. A year later, not one Hungarian street name had been left untouched. These changes were more abrupt and arbitrary than in Czechoslovakia, since local self-government was not practiced in the region until the late 1920s. Interestingly, however, the new nomenclature was neither original nor did it represent a major municipal reinvention. On the contrary, it was the mirror image of a symbolic map in which Hungarian historical figures were replaced by their closest Romanian counterparts from the same period: Romanian military units for Hungarian military units (Dorobanților for Honvéd); heroes of anti-Ottoman wars for anti-Ottoman warriors (Ștefan cel Mare for János Hunyadi); famous

writers for famous writers (Imre Madách for Ion Heliade Rădulescu); and revolutionaries for revolutionaries from roughly the same era (Sándor Petőfi for Avram Iancu).[60]

The limited Romanian presence in pre-1918 Cluj (according to the 1910 census, just twelve percent of the population was ethnic Romanian) made it difficult to impose a preexisting, though unofficial Romanian symbolic geography on its streets, as occurred, for example, in the Romanian city of Făgăraș (Fogaras, Fogarasch). Apart from the main roads and squares, it was unclear which areas had the most political and/or cultural relevance for the Romanian community. Consequently, it was hard to determine the most appropriate street names, in which case the new rulers simply adopted what they had inherited. Cluj's obvious political importance, for example, did not permit a more partial renaming as occurred in Oradea (Nagyvárad), where fewer street names were changed and the whole process proceeded rather unsystematically. Indeed, in Oradea several street names considered Hungarian (Ferenc Deák, Kálvin, Saint Ladislaus) continued to be used officially.[61]

Another important variable in renaming patterns was adherence to or deviation from a generalized national pantheon. The former was advocated (or even instructed) from Bucharest and is well-illustrated by the city of Lugoj (Lugos, Lugosch), the seat of a Greek-Catholic diocese. The latter, which usually implied recourse to more regional symbols, was evident in Făgăraș and Caransebeș. While all three cities were home to a significant Romanian middle-class, the situation in Lugoj suggests that the presence of competing non-Romanian elites (Serbs, in this case) could adversely affect the behavior of local Romanians. Moreover, when the French had controlled Lugoj in the summer of 1919, they restored the Hungarian administration. Thus, local Romanians faced with such political uncertainty were more likely to adhere to Bucharest's nationalizing expectations than they were in other parts of the Banat.[62]

Statues and other monuments/memorials underwent a parallel fate to street names, especially in regional capitals where the new rulers acted promptly to reconfigure symbolic space. Again, in Czechoslovakia there were usually still opportunities for minorities to celebrate anti-Habsburg revolutionary traditions in line with the Republic's progressive, anti-Habsburg founding myth. In this way, statues of Hungarian heroes like Petőfi (the poet-hero of 1848) were sometimes tolerated. In 1923, the centenary of his birth was even commemorated in Bratislava.[63] Nevertheless, nationalizing pressures were stronger for monuments than they were for street names, and often despite local efforts to preserve elements of the pre-1918 symbolic space. The destruction of the Maria Theresia statue in central Bratislava during the night of 26 October 1921, for example, was a premeditated political act parallel to the city government's resolve to erect a monument to Milan Rastislav Štefánik, the Slovak pilot-hero who died mysteriously in a plane crash in 1919.[64] The new governments also took advantage of their growing differences with previously acculturated or Magyarized nationalities to weaken Hungarians by making symbolic concessions to non-Magyar organizations. Even the German-speaking and pro-Hungarian Zipsers from Slovakia established a symbolic topography in 1919, which, they boasted to Budapest, preserved the Hungarian character of the region through the revival of local traditions and the commemoration of local figures and events.[65]

In Romania, conditions on the ground also determined the authorities' attitudes towards statuary. In Oradea, at least six pre-war public memorials survived until 1934.[66] In several smaller cities, authorities tolerated statues of Hungarian national figures with local connections, and even some heroes' memorials for the First World War. One of these war memorials depicted a Turul bird, the mythic forefather of Hungarians and a controversial national symbol.[67] More intriguing yet was a professional survey and preservation project of existing statues/memorials undertaken by the new Romanian authorities in the Banat. Although it only lasted until the mid-

1920s, it signified a more relaxed official attitude toward these monuments in a region where traditionally strong dynastic loyalty had already produced protests against the removal of Franz Joseph's statue from Caransebeș (1919).[68] This emotional attachment to Habsburg symbols—viewed even by Romanians as an important component of local identity—exemplifies the commonalities of social life across ethnic boundaries. As with the aforementioned voluntary firefighter's associations, specific institutions or practices that were common to Transylvanian Romanians, Germans, and Hungarians could well have been alien to Old Kingdom Romanians.

For middle-class Transylvanians, cultural practices met with particular disapproval from authorities due largely to their alleged non-Romanian character. Gypsy music, suspicious coffee house gatherings, and Habsburg military songs could be censured as much as speaking Hungarian in public or, certainly, singing the Hungarian national anthem could. Two incidents from around 1930 glaringly illustrate this attachment to old customs. In Brașov, the military band of an elite mountain unit of the Romanian army played the Hungarian song "32-es baka vagyok én" (I'm a private from the 32nd regiment) to the widespread applause of a multi-ethnic (German, Hungarian, and Romanian) audience. And in Târgu Secuiesc (Kézdivásárhely), the Romanian director of the state lyceum slapped the leader of a gypsy band when he refused to play the Hungarian national anthem. Public officials treated both incidents as signs of Hungarian irredentism. Yet local Romanians used them to express something that was otherwise hard to integrate into the official concept of Romanian national identity.[69] Furthermore, these shared cultural practices reinforced networks and patronage systems that transcended ethnic boundaries and were beneficial in the informal world of local Transylvanian politics.

Some of these practices were also prevalent in Slovakia, but rarely as part of the cultural repertoire of ethnically mixed, socially homogeneous groups. If one exempts the demand for gypsy music (particularly from middle-class Hungarians),[70] then most multicultural social

interactions were either isolated acts of defiance from Slovak politicians (a remnant of their socialization in pre-war Hungary) or a hidden practice with an ethnic and moral stigma attached. Ferdinand (Ferdiš) Juriga, a Catholic priest and Slovak People's Party politician who served in a village near Budapest for many years before the war, often made gypsy bands play the Hungarian national anthem.[71] Despite such public demonstrations of otherness, the main social group preserving important elements of its dualist era socialization, the so-called *magyaróns*, were depicted by contemporary social researchers as being afraid to display their "Hungarian" cultural practices. Although they still listened to Budapest radio, read Hungarian books and newspapers, and sang Hungarian songs in Bratislava pubs while drinking the "*heuriger*" (seasonal wine), *magyaróns* often feared the repercussions—including conflict with Slovak nationalists, fights with students or, in the worst case, removal from office—if they did so too visibly.[72]

Paradoxically, public displays of "Hungarian-ness" were more frequently used to distance oneself from the current Hungarian regime. An alternative, lower middle- and working- class cultural scene developed, often with state assistance and the participation of avant-garde progressivist figures (sometimes from Hungary proper, like Lajos Kassák). This culture was tightly bound to a republican and pro-Czechoslovak Hungarian political current that was extremely critical of Admiral Horthy's Hungary. It thus constituted an alternative national culture from the dominant cultural expressions in mainstream minority Hungarian organizations, and was barely tolerated in Horthy-era Hungary.[73]

In Slovakia, the most striking feature of pre-war cultural traditions was thus not their survival, but the gaping hole their absence could leave in the community. This is probably why so many Hungarians misinterpreted their experiences abroad, especially the enthusiastic receptions they often received. When Géza Lakatos, the Hungarian military attaché in Prague and future Prime Minister of Hungary, accompanied President Masaryk to a military exercise in Central

Slovakia, he recalled his kingly treatment by waiters, drivers and hotel boys, who competed to oblige him.[74] Lakatos saw this as an indication of their sincere desire to be reunited with Hungary. However, it may also have suggested nostalgia for the lavish feasts and drinking bouts, not to mention the generous tips that a Hungarian uniform inspired. Meanwhile, Slovaks perceived Czechs as the bearers of a less noble culture, which sidelined such pleasurable pastimes.[75] This interpretation is supported by many contemporary accounts attesting to the lower social distinction of Czechoslovak officers when compared to *k.u.k.* or *Honvéd* officers.[76] For instance, the Czechs often flouted parts of the unwritten, pre-1918 code of conduct by refusing to duel when they were insulted.[77]

On the other hand, some minority Hungarian observers in the 1930s contrasted the democratic petty bourgeois habits and values of the Czech middle class with the "feudal" Hungarian world of the Habsburg past. The transformation of popular culture and social practices corroborated this. While in Romania gypsy bands remained popular and played Hungarian music during the interwar years, in Czechoslovakia this traditional music was gradually replaced by jazz.[78] Alongside the restaurants and coffeehouses where the Hungarian middle-classes often met, new canteens now served food in large quantities and counter service replaced table service, propelling the disappearance of "*Stammtisch*" (regulars' table) culture and entertainment.[79] New social hierarchies and a strong lower-class institutionalized culture—especially in contrast with Romania's oligarchic political structure and predominantly rural population—did more to transform urban spaces than did forced nationalization.

Ghosts From a Recent Past?

Some of the phenomena outlined above point to non-national allegiances and identifications at the regional level. For instance, institutions unfamiliar to the new rulers and social practices that

varied between Romanians and Transylvanians (or Czech[oslovak]s and Slovaks) were often part of a broader pattern of socio-cultural specificities that distinguished the center from the province. A discourse that reflected this distinctiveness thus emerged not only in the case of Slovak or Transylvanian Romanian identities (politically represented by strong regionalist parties as they were), but also around more local affinities.[80] The best examples are the small, short-lived republics that emerged during the revolutions. Often regarded by scholars as mere subterfuges to avert incorporation into the new states while still seemingly severing ties with Hungary, they had solid foundations among the local population, most notably in the Banat, in Eastern Slovakia, and in Kalotaszeg (Țară Călăției), near Cluj (Kolozsvár). In these regions of Greater Romania, social affiliations and economic imperatives trumped national ones such that organized labor (Banat) and a rural cooperative movement (Kalotaszeg) produced experiments in self-rule. These movements were not completely devoid of national content and many, in fact, were undertaken by Hungarian and German officials. But they all displayed a distinctly regional attachment—a Kalotaszeg identity as opposed to the Hungarian-ness promoted by prewar Budapest—evident in the political discourse of these localized socio-economic movements.[81]

In Eastern Slovakia, patterns of regional consciousness promoted by the Hungarian elite before 1918, had aimed to preserve a distinct form of patriotic Slavic attachment to the idea of Hungary, rather than promoting complete assimilation. The changes wrought by the First World War gave new impetus to these efforts, and Slovaks were yet more positively portrayed in the Hungarian public sphere.[82] The Eastern Slovak National Council, led by Viktor Dvorčak (Dvorcsák Győző), embodied this political current in its defiance of the Slovak National Council in Turčiansky Svätý Martin (Túrócszentmárton). Although Dvorčak and his companions emigrated (and as émigrés, they collaborated with the Hungarian government and its agents), a

group of Slovak intellectuals from the area worked with the local middle classes to preserve this identity after 1919.[83]

The two most striking examples of local identification were in the Transylvanian regions west of the Țară Moților (Motzenland, Mócvidék) and in the small District of Chioar (Kővár-vidék). Both had long traditions of separate administration, distinct local societies and, in the case of the former, lay partially outside the principality of Transylvania before it merged with Hungary in 1867. The Țară Moților region, moreover, was comprised mainly of small mining towns where local businesses had not yet been taken over by large companies. The town of Beiuș and its surroundings had thus served as a kind of "ethnic contact zone" in which cross-ethnic middle-class practices played an important role in daily life.[84] The District of Chioar was populated by Hungarians and Greek Catholic Romanians with noble status or special liberties that elevated them above serfs in the pre-1848 feudal system. Marketplaces rather than modern urban facilities served as its administrative and economic centers. Visitors often described the regions as non-Romanian and its inhabitants as alien or people of degenerate "Romanian-ness." The locals, in turn, sometimes violently attacked these "intruders" with the help of the local Romanian police or gendarmerie, who slandered the newcomers in Hungarian.[85]

These distinctions explain the reaction of local elites to plans to redraw administrative boundaries in 1919. Although their original administrative units had been abolished almost fifty years earlier, representatives of both regions asked for their reinstatement when the Ruling Council sought proposals for a new administrative territorial system in order to provide better access to public services. Despite using the well-known nationalist arguments to defend their claims (insisting that the redistricting would favor Romanians and disadvantage Hungarians), what they really wanted was to return to a past in which their social and legal status, and the specific rights and privileges associated with it, defined them more than their nationality did.

Conclusion

My aim in this chapter has been to outline aspects of the transition from Austria-Hungary to Czechoslovakia and Romania that shed light on continuities and discontinuities in the establishment of nation-states. As we have seen, most of these elements—the role of civic associations, middle-class culture, administrative personnel and their practices, regionalist politics—were rooted in the local societies of the contested territories, such that it was hardly possible to integrate them into the homogenizing, unitary framework of the nationalizing successor states. Indeed, the national governments left little room for compromise in their unitary and national visions for Czechoslovakia and Romania. Yet a combination of limited resources, executive constraints, and above all the persistence of local political and social structures often produced exceptions that challenged or even violated the nationalizing regulations.

The above examples are, of course, far from exhaustive, and thus cannot adequately answer such broad questions as how, why, and to what extent these compromises emerged and persisted. But the sheer variety of social practices, institutions, and other local factors points to the potential for further comprehensive research into the clearly crucial role played by local societies in the transition from empire to nation-state. Moreover, such local-level comparative research sheds light not only on the differences and similarities between state-building outcomes, but also on how varying conditions developed within the successor states.

Finally, by discerning patterns of transition in terms of the functioning of different local societies, we gain insight into how nationalizing, postwar successor states were established and managed in the interwar period. Although it is hard to believe that any of the phenomena mentioned above could have derailed the fast-moving train of nationalization, the findings of this study show that, for a significant period, local elites, newly emerged social groups, and their oft

reorganized institutions were strong enough to achieve concessions and compromises. This paints quite a different picture of interwar Czechoslovakia and Romania from that of national government centered studies: a patchwork of local transitions as opposed to a top-down implementation of state-building measures.

* Research for this paper was generously supported by a K 112968 research grant of the Hungarian National Research Fund.

[1] Jeremy King, "The Nationalization of East Central Europe. Ethnicism, Ethnicity and Beyond," in *Staging the Past: The Politics of Commemoration in Habsburg Central Europe, 1848 to the Present*, eds. Nancy M. Wingfield and Maria Bucur (West Lafayette, 2001), 121–23; Gary B. Cohen, "Nationalist Politics and the Dynamics of State and Civil Society in the Habsburg Monarchy, 1867–1914," *Central European History* 40 (2007), 241–78.

[2] See: T. Hunt Tooley, *National Identity in Weimar Germany: Upper Silesia and the Eastern Borders* (Lincoln, 1997); Peter Švorc and Harald Heppner, eds. *Veľká doba v malom priestore. Zlomové zmeny v mestách stredoeurópskeh priestoru a ich dôsledky (1918–1929)/Große Zeit im kleinen Raum. Umbrüche in den Städten des mitteleuropäischen Raumes 1918–1929* (Prešov–Graz, 2012); James Bjork, *Neither German nor Pole: Catholicism and National Indifference in a Central European Borderland* (Ann Arbor, 2008); Robert Gerwarth and John Horne, eds., *War in Peace: Paramilitary Violence in Europe after the Great War* (New York, 2012); John Paul Newman, "Post-imperial and Post-war Violence in the South Slav Lands, 1917–1923," *Contemporary European History* 19:3 (2010): 249–65; Julia Eichenberg, "The Dark Side of Independence: Paramilitary Violence in Ireland and Poland after the First World War," *Contemporary European History* 19:3 (2010): 231–48; and Richard Blanke, *Polish Speaking Germans? Language and National Identity among the Masurians since 1871* (Köln, 2001); Jeremy King, *Budweisers into Czechs and Germans: A Local History of Bohemian Politics* (Princeton, 2002).

[3] Irina Livezeanu, *Cultural Politics in Greater Romania: Regionalism, Nation-Building and Ethnic Struggle 1918–1930* (Ithaca and London, 1995); Mariana Hausleitner, *Die Rumänisierung der Bukowina: Durchsetzung des nationalstaatlichen Anspruchs Grossrumäniens 1918–1944* (München, 2001).

[4] See, for example, Gheorghe Iancu, *The Ruling Council. The Integration of Transylvania in Romania 1918–1919* (Cluj-Napoca, 1995); Idem, *Justiţie românească în Transilvania (1919)* (Cluj-Napoca, 2006); Marián Hronský, *Boj o Slovensko a Trianon 1918–1920* (Bratislava, 1998). Somewhat paradoxically, the thesis of a swift takeover and nationalization of the administration is also reflected in the Hungarian historiography, as it seemed and still seems suitable to highlight the injustice suffered by Hungarians in the successor states. See: Nándor Bárdi, Csilla Fedinec, and László Szarka, eds., *Minority Hungarian Communities in the Twentieth Century* (Boulder, 2011), esp. 52–69, 164–77, 192–218.

[5] See: Cohen, "Nationalist Politics".

[6] Recent research suggests that a shift in roles between state and society occurred much earlier, mainly due to the limited capacity of the state to manage the war effort and cope with the new social tasks and challenges. See, for example, Joshua Sanborn, *Imperial Apocalypse: The Great War and the Destruction of the Russian Empire* (Oxford, 2014).

[7] Manu Goswami, *Producing India: From Colonial Economy to National Space* (Chicago, 2004).

[8] Cohen, "Nationalist Politics". See also: Béatrice von Hirschhausen, Hannes Grandits, Claudia Kraft, Dietmar Müller, and Thomas Serrier, eds., *Phantomgrenzen. Räume und Akteure in der Zeit neuzudenken* (Göttingen, 2015).

[9] See: Peter Haslinger, *Arad, November 1918. Oszkár Jászi und die Rumänen in Ungarn bis 1918* (Wien, 1993).

[10] The reports of the lord lieutenant (county chief administrator) of Maros-Torda (Mureș-Turda) county tell this story in much detail. See: Arhivele Naționale Secția Județeană Mureș (Mureș County Section of the Romanian National Archives, ANSJM) Colecție Manuscrise, inventar 75, dosar 256, 111, 120f (folio).

[11] Ilie Lăzar, *Amințiri* (Sighetu Marmației, 2000), 55–58.

[12] Arhivele Naționale Istorice Centrale, Bucharest, (Central Historical Archives. ANIC) Consiliul Dirigent Anul 1918, dosar 67/1918, 289f.

[13] ANIC, Consiliul Dirigent Anul 1918, dosar 55/1918; ANSJM, Colecție Manuscrise, inventar 75, dosar 256, 15–17, 20f.

[14] Ibid. dosar 255. 20f. See also the case of Hodac (4–9f), Turcheș (ANIC Consiliul Dirigent, Anul 1918, dosar 20/1918, 1–2f.

[15] ANSJM, Colecție Manuscrise, inventar 75, dosar 256, 38–39f. The expression "sfatul cel mare" is not entirely clear, and could even refer to the upcoming peace conference.

[16] Ibid., 89–90f.

[17] See, for example, Ion Popescu-Puțuri, Augustin Deac, eds., *Unirea Transilvaniei cu Romania. 1 Decembrie 1918* (București, 1970), 595–96.

[18] ANSJM, Colecție Manuscrise, inventar 75, dosar 255, 22–23, 28f.

[19] See: Tibor Hajdu, *The Hungarian Soviet Republic* (Budapest, 1968); Politikatörténeti és Szakszervezeti Levéltár, Budapest (Archives of the Trade Unions and for Political History, PIL), 658 fond, 6/87. ő.e.

[20] The list of members was compiled by James M. Ward, who kindly disclosed this material to me. See also: Ján Mrva, *Paberky k dejinám štátneho prevratu v Nitre* (Nitra, 1933); James M. Ward, *Priest, Politician, Collaborator: Jozef Tiso and the Making of Fascist Slovakia* (Ithaca, 2013), 39–63.

[21] Pieter C. van Duin, *Central European Crossroads: Social Democracy and National Revolution in Bratislava (Pressburg) 1867–1921* (New York, 2009).

[22] PIL, 658 fond, 5/56. ő.e.

[23] Gábor Egry, "Közvetlen demokrácia, nemzeti forradalom. Hatalomváltás, átmenet és a helyi nemzeti tanácsok Erdélyben, 1918–1919," *Múltunk* 55:3 (2010): 92–108.

[24] ANIC, Consiliul Dirigent Anul 1918, dosar 45/1918, 14, 17f.

[25] Ibid., dosar 55/1918, Minutes of meeting 19 December 1918.

[26] Balázs Kiss, "Államfordulat Nyitrán 1918–1923," *Kisebbségkutatás* 18:2 (2008): 161–66; Béla Angyal, *Érdekvédelem és önszerveződés. Fejezetek a csehszlovákiai magyar pártpolitika történetéből* (Somorja – Dunaszerdahely, 2002), 17; Ward, *Priest, Politician, Collaborator*, 39–63; Thomas A. Lorman, "The Christian Social Roots of Jozef Tiso's Radicalism," in *In the Shadow of Hitler: Personalities of the Right in Central and Eastern Europe*, eds. Rebecca Haynes and Martin Rady (London, 2011), 245–60.

[27] ANIC, Consiliul Dirigent Anul 1918, dosar 30/1918, 4–5f.

[28] Immediately after the National Council was formed in Sighetul Marmației (Máramarosziget), a sizeable portion of its members delegated by the Independence Party (one of the traditional opposition parties) seceded, forming a new local branch of the Bourgeois Radical Party and declaring their allegiance to Minister Oszkár Jászi. Its significance was that the Bourgeois Radicals were an extra-parliamentary fringe opposition organization before 1918, treated by the political mainstream as dangerous delusionals without significant following in "backward" zones such as Sighetul Marmației. See György Litván, *A Twentieth Century Prophet: Oszkár Jászi 1875–1957* (Budapest, 2006).

[29] The so-called Pact of Ciucea. See Nándor Bárdi, *Otthon és haza. Tanulmányok a romániai magyarság történetéből* (Csíkszereda, 2013), 114–27.

[30] See, for example, the short existence of an Eastern Slovak National Council in contrast to the Martin one, in László Szarka, "A szlovák autonómia alternatívája 1918 őszén," in *"... ahol a határ elválaszt". Trianon és következményei a Kárpát-medencében*, ed. Cecília Pásztor (Balassagyarmat Várpalota, 2012), 176–80.

[31] For example, the Austrian Civic Code of 1852 was never abolished and remained the basis of private legal relations in Transylvania, even though by the 1930s it was the last region in Europe where this piece of legislation was still in effect. See: Magyar Nemzeti Levéltár, Országos Levéltára, Budapest (Hungarian National Achives, MNLOL), P 1077, vol. 5, 421–445; M. M. Vallasek, "Az 1918. évi egyesülést követő jogegyesítés kérdése Romániában," *Magyar Kisebbség* 15:1–2 (2004): 584–85.

[32] Angyal, *Érdekvédelem és önszerveződés*, 17–19.

[33] István Mócsy, *The Effects of World War I. The Uprooted: Hungarian Refugees and Their Impact on Hungary's Domestic Politics, 1918–1921* (Boulder, CO, 1983). Mócsy cites on pp. 13 and 54 the official figures for the number of refugees between 1918 and 1924 from the Országos Menekültügyi Hivatal (National Office of Refugees). This set of data gave an overall figure of almost 107,000 persons from Czechoslovakia and 197,000 from Romania. However, these detailed statistics should be questioned, as the number of public officials allegedly fleeing from Eastern Hungary and Transylvania (2843 state officials, 1406 county officials) is higher than the number of Hungarians in the same professional category who actually lived there (2728 out of 2949 state officials, 1252 out of 1464 county officials) according to the prewar the official statistics: *A Magyar Szent Korona országainak 1910. évi népszámlálása*. Vol. IV. *Magyar Statisztikai Közlemények* 56 (Budapest, 1915), 722.

[34] See the case of Máramaros (Maramureș) and Zilah (Zălău), in: I. Scurtu and L. Boar, eds., *Minoritățile naționale în România 1918–1925* (București, 1995), 267–68, 487–88.

[35] ANIC, Consiliul Dirigent Administrația Județeană și Comunală, dosar 79/1919, 111–114f.

[36] See the appointments from 17 July 1919 onward in County Caraș-Severin, Arhivele Naționale Secția Județeană Timiș, Timișoara (Timiș County Section of the Romanian National Archives, ANSJTM), fond 223, Prefectură Județului Severin, dosar 38/1919, 162–69f.

[37] ANSJTM, fond 223, Pref. Jud. Severin dosar 34/1934, 140–46f.; ANIC, Ministerul de Interne, inventar 754, dosar 27/1937, 18f. ANSJCV, fond 9, vols. 10, 48, 49. I am grateful to Botond Nagy for sharing this data from his own research.

[38] Gábor Egry, "Navigating the Straits: Changing Borders, Changing Rules and Practices of Ethnicity and Loyalty in Romania after 1918," *Hungarian Historical Review* 2:3 (2013): 466–68.

[39] For example, in Abrud (Abrudbánya). ANSJCJ, fond 209, inventar 399, dosar 31/II, 243f., dosar 463, 2f., dosar 29. 1f.

[40] ANIC, Ministerul Justiției Direcția Judiciară, Moldvași Țară Românească, dosar 78/1920, 21–23f.

[41] ANIC, Consiliul Dirigent Direcția Administrația Generală, dosar 19/1919, 6–8f.

[42] Van Duin, *Central European Crossroads*, 341–94.; Tamás Gusztáv Filep, "Kormánypárton vagy ellenzében? A pozsonyi magyar polgár és az 1925–ös választások," in *A humanista voksa. Írások a csehszlovákiai magyar kisebbség történetének köréből 1918–1945*, ed. Tamás Gusztáv Filep (Pozsony, 2007): 32, note #12.

[43] László Pukkai, *Mátyusföld 1. A galántai járás társadalmi és gazdasági változásai 1945–2000* (Somorja–Dunaszerdahely, 2002).

[44] Sándor Vájlok, "Szlovákok és magyarok," in *Magyarok Csehszlovákiában*, ed. István Borsody (Budapest, 1938), 191–94.

[45] Attila Simon, *Egy rövid esztendő krónikája. A szlovákiai magyarok 1938–ban* (Somorja, 2010) 30–31.

[46] Elena Mannová, "'Sie wollen keine Loyalität lernen!': Identitätsdiskurse und lokale Lebenswelten in der Südslowakei 1918–1938," in *Staat, Loyalität und Minderheiten im Ostmittel- und Südosteuropa 1918–1941*, eds. Joachim von Puttkamer and Peter Haslinger (München, 2007), 58.

[47] Bárdi, *Otthon és haza*, 106–67.

[48] See, for example, ANSJBV, fond 2, inventar 342, Prefectură Județului Brasov, Serviciul Administrativ, dosar 19/1926, 3–4f; ANIC, Direcția Generală a Poliției (General Police Directorate, DGP), dosar 19/1919, 104f.

[49] Andrei Florin Sora, *Servir l'État roumain, Le corps préfectoral, 1866–1944* (Bucharest, 2011), 130–52; Andrei Florin Sora, "Être fonctionnaire 'minoritaire' en Roumanie. Idéologie de la nation et pratiques d'État (1918–1940)," in *New Europe College Ștefan Odobleja Program Yearbook 2009–2010*, ed. Irina Vainovski-Mihai (Bucharest, 2011): 212–14.

[50] ANSJTM Prefectură Județului Severin, dosar 24/1924, 190–91f.

[51] Ibid., 172–91f., dosar 40/1932, 1f., dosar 41/1934, 1f., and Legiunea Jandarmilor Severin, dosar 2/1932, 22f.; Arhivele Naționale Secția Județeană Brașov (Brașov County Section of the Romanian National Archives, ANSJBV), Prefectură Județului Brașov Serviciul Administrativ, dosar 551/1940, 125–26f.

[52] Ľubomír Lipták, "Transformations politiques des monuments ou monuments des changements politiques," in *Miroirs brisés. Récits régionaux et imaginaires croisés sur le territoire slovaque*, eds. Étienne Boisserie and Clara Royer (Paris, 2011), 53–82; Miroslav Michela, "'A Home Should Be Home to All Its Sons': Cultural Representations of Saint Stephen in Slovakia During the Interwar Period," in *Overcoming the Old Borders. Beyond the Paradigm of Slovak National History*, ed. Adam Hudek (Bratislava, 2013), 97–110; Zuzana Motajová, "'Apuskánk' születésnapjai. A személyi kultusz a két világháború közötti Csehszlovákiában," *Sic itur ad astra*

20:3–4 (2006): 303–16; Mannová, “Sie wollen keine,” 59; Maria Bucur, *Heroes and Victims: Remembering War in Twentieth Century Romania* (Bloomington, 2008).

[53] ANIC DGP dosar 4/1920, 157f.

[54] Elena Mannová, “‘...de most már jó szlovák’ A nemzeti identitás variációi két dél-szlovákiai kisváros egyesületi életében, 1918–1938,” *Regio* 11:4 (2000): 98.

[55] Attila Agócs, “Hulita Vilmos a füleki gyár változó életlehetőségekhez alkalmazkodni tudó igazgatója,” *Neograd. A Nógrád Megyei Múzeumok Évkönyve* 32 (2008): 16.

[56] ANIC, Președinția Consiliului de Miniștri, dosar 12/1934, 31–35f., ANIC, DGP, dosar 18/1934, 167f.

[57] Peter Stachel, “Stadtpläne als politische Zeichensysteme. Symbolische Einschreibungen in den öffentlichen Raum,” in *Die Besetzung des öffentlichen Raumes. Politische Plätze, Denkmäler und Straßennamen in europäischen Vergleich*, eds. Rudolf Jaworski, Peter Stachel (Berlin, 2007), 13–60; Lipták, “Transformations politiques”.

[58] Mannová, “Sie wollen keine Loyalität lernen!,” 58. In practice, it meant the use of a progressivist, revolutionary, and localized nomenclature, and the abandonment of the typical political street names of dualist and interwar Hungary.

[59] Elena Mannová, “Von Maria Theresia zum Schönen Náci. Kollektive Gedächtnisse und Denkmalkultur in Bratislava,” in *Die Besetzung des öffentlichen Raumes*, 203–16; Júlia Lovisek, “Pozsony utcaneveinek politikai indíttatású névváltoztatásai az első Csehszlovák Köztársaság megalakulása után,” *Fórum Társadalomtudományi Szemle* 9:2 (2007): 127–36. Peter Bugge, “The naming of a Slovak City: The Czechoslovak Renaming of Pressburg/Pozsony/Prešporok in 1918–19,” *Austrian History Yearbook* 35 (2004): 205–27.

[60] ANIC, Consiliul Dirigent Secția Administrația Județeană și Comunală, dosar 66/1920, 44f, 221–27f. There was likely even deliberate mockery in one case, when the street previously

named after the fiction writer Mór Jókai, who often drew upon historical subject matter, was renamed for Nicolae Iorga.

[61] ANIC, Consiliul Dirigent Secția Administrația Județeană şi Comunală, dosar 46/1920, 130–35f.

[62] Egry, "Navigating the Straits," 462–64.

[63] Lipták, "Transformations politiques."

[64] Ibid.; Tamás Gusztáv Filep, *Főhatalomváltás Pozsonyban 1918–1920* (Pozsony: Kalligram, 2010), 131, 137.

[65] MNLOL, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, K64, 27.csomó, 7. tétel, 74–88f. 258/res/1928.

[66] ANIC, DGP, dosar 56/1921, 311f.

[67] Ibid.

[68] ANIC, DGP, dosar 8/1919, 240. Veterans of the border regiments and their descendants highly valued the statue. Its unveiling had already caused a political demonstration in favor of the Emperor and against Hungarian politics. See Alexandru Vaida Voevod's report to Franz Ferdinand from December 1908, in Keith Hitchins, *The Nationality Problem in Austria-Hungary: The Reports of Alexandru Vaida to Archduke Franz Ferdinand's Chancellery* (Leiden, 1974), 45.

[69] ANIC, DGP, dosar 56/1921 200f. ANSJMS Directia Regională Ministerului de Afacerilor Interne Mures Autonomă Maghiară, inventar 1235, dosar 2899, 23f.

[70] MNLOL, Department for Minority and Nationality Issues, K28, 168. csomó, 300. tétel, ME1926–P–125, 5–8f.

[71] MNLOL, Department for Minority and Nationality Issues, K28, 168. csomó 300. tétel, 1934–P–15314.

[72] Vájlok, "Szlovákok és magyarok," 191–94; Mannová, "Sie wollen keine," 63–64.

[73] Balázs Ablonczy, "A csehszlovák minta. A masaryki demokrácia és szimpatizánsai a két világháború közti Magyarországon," in *Nyombiztosítás. Letűnt magyarok. Kisebbség- és művelődéstörténeti tanulmányok,* ed. Balázs Ablonczy (Pozsony, 2011), 177–98; Attila Simon, *Az elfeledett aktivisták. Kormánypárti politika az első Csehszlovák Köztársaságban* (Somorja, 2013).

[74] MNLOL, K64, 37. csomó, 7. tétel, 245/pol–1930, 587/re/1930.

[75] Ablonczy, "A csehszlovák minta," 177–78.

[76] Wenzel Ruzicka, *Nordböhmisches Tagebuch. Chronik einer sudetendeutschen Familie 1926–1946* (Bad Reichenhall, 1995), 15–16.

[77] MNLOL, K28, 17. csomó, 59. tétel, 1929–P–332.

[78] Mannová, "…de most már jó szlovák ő," 98.

[79] József Liszka, "A szlovákiai magyarok populáris kultúrája a 20. században (Korszakok és az impériumválásokból eredő hatások)," *Fórum Társadalomtudományi Szemle* 2:3 (2000): 67–80.

[80] Ward, *Priest, Politician*; Florian Kührer-Wielach, *Siebenbürgen ohne Siebenbürger? Staatliche Integration und neue Identifikationsangebote zwischen Regionalismus und nationalem Einheitsdogma im Diskurs der Siebenbürger Rumänen 1919–1933* (München, 2014); Livezeanu, *Cultural Politics*.

[81] Zsolt K. Lengyel, *Auf der Suche nach dem Kompromiß. Ursprünge und Gestalten des frühen Transsilvanismus* (München, 1993), 1–67.

[82] László Vörös, "Premeny obrázu Slovákov v maďarskej regionálnej tlači v odobí rokov 1914–1918," *Historický časopis* 54:3 (2006): 419–53.

[83] Szarka, "A szlovák autonómia"; Balázs Ablonczy, "A magyar revíziós politika szlovák ágensei a két világháború között," in *Nyombiztosítás. Letűnt magyarok. Kisebbség- és művelõdéstörténeti tanulmányok*, ed. Balázs Ablonczy (Pozsony, 2011), 69–87.

[84] Robert Nemes, "Obstacles to Nationalization on the Hungarian-Romanian Language Frontier," *Austrian History Yearbook* 43 (2012): 28–44.

[85] A youth from Craiova fared poorly when he arrived at this border zone in order to make a career. He failed to establish himself in the county seat Carei (Nagykároly), and when he moved to Sieni (Szinérváralja), in the center of the District of Chioar, he faced violent abuse from the locals and gendarmes. In a petition to Queen Maria, the youth described the locals as degenerated, magyarized Romanians. See: ANIC, Ministerul Justiției Ministerul Justiţiei Direcţia Judiciară, inventar 1116, dosar 103/1923, 6–7f. On national degeneration, see Nicolae Iorga, *Neamul Românesc în Ardeal și Țară Românească* (București, 1906), vol. 2, 591–642.

Bibliography

King, Jeremy. "The Nationalization of East Central Europe. Ethnicism, Ethnicity and Beyond," In *Staging the Past: The Politics of Commemoration in Habsburg Central Europe, 1848 to the Present*, edied by Nancy M. Wingfield and Maria Bucur, 121–23. West Lafayette: Purdue University Press, 2001.

Cohen, Gary B. "Nationalist Politics and the Dynamics of State and Civil Society in the Habsburg Monarchy, 1867–1914," *Central European History* 40 (2007): 241–78.

Švorc, Peter and Heppner, Harald eds. *Veľká doba v malom priestore. Zlomové zmeny v mestách stredoeurópskeh priestoru a ich dôsledky (1918–1929)/Große Zeit im kleinen Raum. Umbrüche in den Städten des mitteleuropäischen Raumes 1918–1929.* Prešov–Graz: Universum, 2012

Gerwarth, Robert and Horne, John eds., *War in Peace: Paramilitary Violence in Europe after the Great War*. New York: Oxford UP, 2012.

Livezeanu, Irina. *Cultural Politics in Greater Romania: Regionalism, Nation-Building and Ethnic Struggle 1918–1930*, Ithaca and London: Cornell UP, 1995.

Hausleitner, Mariana. *Die Rumänisierung der Bukowina: Durchsetzung des nationalstaatlichen Anspruchs Grossrumäniens 1918–1944.* München: Oldenbour, 2001.

Iancu, Gheorghe. *The Ruling Council. The Integration of Transylvania in Romania 1918–1919.* Cluj-Napoca: Center for Transylvanian Studies, 1995.

Bárdi, Nándor, Fedinec, Csilla and Szarka, László eds., *Minority Hungarian Communities in the Twentieth Century*.. Boulder, Co.: Social Sciences Monographs, 2011.

Hirschhausen, Béatrice von, Grandits, Hannes, Kraft, Claudia, Müller, Dietmar and Serrier, Thomas eds., *Phantomgrenzen. Räume und Akteure in der Zeit neuzudenken*. Göttingen: Wallstein Verlag, 2015.

Haslinger, Peter. *Arad, November 1918. Oszkár Jászi und die Rumänen in Ungarn bis 1918*. Wien: Böhlau, 1993.

Hajdu. Tibor. *The Hungarian Soviet Republic*. Budapest: Akadémiai, 1968.

Ward, James M. *Priest, Politician, Collaborator: Jozef Tiso and the Making of Fascist Slovakia*. Ithaca and London: Cornell UP, 2013.

Duin, Pieter C. van. *Central European Crossroads: Social Democracy and National Revolution in Bratislava (Pressburg) 1867–1921*. New York: Berghahn, 2009.

Angyal, Béla. *Érdekvédelem és önszerveződés. Fejezetek a csehszlovákiai magyar pártpolitika történetéből*. Somorja – Dunaszerdahely: Lilium Aurum, 2002.

Lorman, Thomas A. "The Christian Social Roots of Jozef Tiso's Radicalism," in *In the Shadow of Hitler: Personalities of the Right in Central and Eastern Europe*, edited by Rebecca Haynes and Martin Rady, 245-60. London: I. B. Tauris, 2011.

Litván, György *A Twentieth Century Prophet: Oszkár Jászi 1875–1957*. Budapest: CEU Press, 2006).

Bárdi, Nándor. *Otthon és haza. Tanulmányok a romániai magyarság történetéből*. Csíkszereda: Pro Print, 2013.

Mócsy, István M. *The Effects of World War I. The Uprooted: Hungarian Refugees and Their Impact on Hungary's Domestic Politics, 1918–1921*. Boulder, CO: Social Science Monographs, 1983.

Simon, Attila. *Egy rövid esztendő krónikája. A szlovákiai magyarok 1938–ban*. Somorja: Fórum Intézet, 2010.

Sora, Andrei Florin. *Servir l'État roumain, Le corps préfectoral, 1866–1944*. Bucharest: Editura Universităţii din Bucureşti, 2011.

Lipták, Ľubomír. "Transformations politiques des monuments ou monuments des changements politiques." In *Miroirs brisés. Récits régionaux et imaginaires croisés sur le territoire slovaque*, edited by Étienne Boisserie and Clara Royer, 53–82. Paris: Inst. d'Études Slaves, 2011.

Bucur, Maria. *Heroes and Victims: Remembering War in Twentieth Century Romania*. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 2008.

Filep, Tamás Gusztáv. *Főhatalomváltás Pozsonyban 1918–1920*. Pozsony: Kalligram, 2010.

Simon, Attila. *Az elfeledett aktivisták. Kormánypárti politika az első Csehszlovák Köztársaságban*. Somorja: Fórum Intézet, 2013.

Kührer-Wielach, Florian. *Siebenbürgen ohne Siebenbürger? Staatliche Integration und neue Identifikationsangebote zwischen Regionalismus und nationalem Einheitsdogma im Diskurs der Siebenbürger Rumänen 1919–1933*. München: Oldenbourg, 2014.

Lengyel, Zsolt K. *Auf der Suche nach dem Kompromiß. Ursprünge und Gestalten des frühen Transsilvanismus*. München: Verlag Ungarisches Institut, 1993.

Egry, Gábor. "Közvetlen demokrácia, nemzeti forradalom. Hatalomváltás, átmenet és a helyi nemzeti tanácsok Erdélyben, 1918–1919," *Múltunk* 55:3 (2010): 92–108.

Kiss, Balázs. "Államfordulat Nyitrán 1918–1923," *Kisebbségkutatás* 18:2 (2008): 161–66.

Egry, Gábor "Navigating the Straits: Changing Borders, Changing Rules and Practices of Ethnicity and Loyalty in Romania after 1918," *Hungarian Historical Review* 2:3 (2013):

Filep, Tamás Gusztáv "Kormánypárton vagy ellenzékben? A pozsonyi magyar polgár és az 1925–ös választások," In *A humanista voksa. Írások a csehszlovákiai magyar kisebbség történetének köréből 1918–1945*, edited by Tamás Gusztáv Filep, 26–55. Pozsony: Kalligram 2007.

Michela, Miroslav. "'A Home Should Be Home to All Its Sons': Cultural Representations of Saint Stephen in Slovakia During the Interwar Period." In *Overcoming the Old Borders. Beyond the Paradigm of Slovak National History*, edited by Adam Hudek, 97–110. Bratislava: Institute of History, Slovak Academy of Sciences, 2013.

Mannová, Elena. "'Sie wollen keine Loyalität lernen!': Identitätsdiskurse und lokale Lebenswelten in der Südslowakei 1918–1938." In *Staat, Loyalität und Minderheiten im Ostmittel- und Südosteuropa 1918–1941*, edited by Joachim von Puttkamer and Peter Haslinger, 45–67. München: Oldenbourg, 2007.

Bugge, Peter. "The naming of a Slovak City: The Czechoslovak Renaming of Pressburg/Pozsony/Prešporok in 1918–19," *Austrian History Yearbook* 35 (2004): 205–27.