

Hungarians and Rumanians in the Torrents of History

Translated from a Hungarian translation of the original Rumanian text

Romani si Maghiari in Vartejul Istoriei

By
Alain Du Nay

Editura Matthias Corvinus Buffalo, Toronto 2001

Translator: Bogsányi Dénes

HUNGARIANS AND RUMANIANS IN THE TORRENTS OF HISTORY	1
ROMANI SI MAGHIARI IN VARTEJUL ISTORIEI	1
RUMANIANS AND HUNGARIANS IN THE TORRENTS OF HISTORY	5
By Alain Du Nay	5
INTRODUCTION	5
1. THE ETHNOGENESIS OF THE RUMANIAN LANGUAGE AND PEOPLE	5
The Emergence of the Rumanian Language	6
Changes to the Latin Language in the 5 th - 7 th Centuries	7
Albanian Contacts	7
Homes of the Ancestors of the Albanians	8
Rumanian Dialects	8
The Balkan Linguistic Community	8
Slav Influence on the Rumanian Language	9
Vlachs in Serbian Documents (12 th - 15 th Centuries)	9
2. HOW DID THE POPULATION OF TRANSYLVANIA DEVELOP?	10
3. THE FIRST RUMANIAN KENEZSHIPS ON THE SNOWY PLAINS	12
4. THE MONGOL INVASION	12
5. THE RUMANIANS	13
The Number of the Rumanian Population in Transylvania	14
6. FEUDALISM	14
7. THE REBELLION OF THE SERFS IN 1437 - THE PACT OF KÁPOLNA	15
8. THE TURKS	15
János Hunyadi	15
The situation of the serfs in the Rumanian principalities during the Turkish reign.	17
9. THE INDEPENDENT PRINCIPALITY OF TRANSYLVANIA	17
Mihály Vitéz in Transylvania	18
10. AFTER THE EVICTION OF THE TURKS	22
11. THE RUMANIAN PRINCIPALITIES: THE ERA OF THE FANARIOTS	22
12. RELIGIOUS UNION IN THE HABSBERG EMPIRE	22
13. THE FREEDOM FIGHT OF FERENC RÁKÓCZI II	23
The Peril of Mádéfalva	23

14. PEASANT REVOLTS	23
The Condition of the Peasants in Europe	23
The Rumanians of Transylvania in the 18 th Century	23
The Condition of the Peasants in Transylvania.	24
The Peasant Revolt led by Horea-Closca-Crisan	24
15. EMERGENCE OF NATIONALISM OF THE NOBILITY, POPULAR AWARENESS AND NATIONAL AWARENESS AMONG THE RUMANIANS.	26
16. THE TRANSYLVANIAN SCHOOL	26
17. SUPPLEX LIBELLUS VALACHORUM	27
18. THE REFORM ERA - HUNGARIAN-RUMANIAN CULTURAL COLLABORATION	27
19. THE HUNGARIAN REVOLUTION AND FREEDOM FIGHT OF 1848 IN TRANSYLVANIA	28
20. AFTER THE CRUSHING OF THE FREEDOM FIGHT	30
21. 1867-1914: TRANSYLVANIA BETWEEN THE TIME OF THE AUSTRIAN-HUNGARIAN COMPROMISE AND THE FIRST WORLD WAR	31
The economic situation of the Rumanians of Eastern Hungary and Rumania.	31
The economic conditions of the Rumanians in the Principalities	31
The Nationality Policies of the Hungarian Governments 1867-1914	33
Education Policy	34
The Situation of Rumanians living in neighbouring Countries	35
The Situation of the Nationalities in the United Principalities	35
The Success of the Attempt to reach exclusive Power by the Rumanians	36
The Role of the Rumanian News Media	36
22. THE FIRST WORLD WAR AND THE EMERGENCE OF GREATER RUMANIA	36
23. THE TREATY OF TRIANON (VERSAILLES) (4 TH JUNE 1920)	37
24. FROM THE TRIANON PEACE TREATY TO THE OUTBREAK OF THE SECOND WORD WAR	39
Economic life	40
The Use of the Mother Tongue	42
The Position of the Hungarian Churches	42
25. SECOND WORLD WAR	43
Rumania enters the War	46
Transnistria	47
26. RUMANIA LEAVES THE WAR	48
27. VOLUNTEERS FOR TRANSYLVANIA	49
28. AUTONOMOUS NORTHERN TRANSYLVANIA	50
29. THE ACCESSION OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY TO POWER.	51
30. THE HUNGARIAN ANTI-COMMUNIST REVOLUTION OF 23 RD OCTOBER 1956	53
31. CEAUSESCU ERA (1965-1989)	55

32. THE FALL OF CEAUSESCU	55
33. TOWARDS THE FUTURE, IN THE KNOWLEDGE OF THE PAST Factual history	56 56
34. BEFORE AND AFTER 1920 CONTRASTED.	57
35. CONCLUSIONS	59

RUMANIANS AND HUNGARIANS IN THE TORRENTS OF HISTORY

By Alain Du Nay

INTRODUCTION

Lucian Boia states that Rumanian historiography has described the history of the Rumanians for a considerable time, and particularly during the communist era, in a strongly biased manner and with scant regard for the facts. Boia recommends that this be changed, stating: "Nationalism in history today means that we must rebuild a historiography of European standard such that we had in the first half of the century.

Here we will discuss in greater detail those events and facts, which Rumanian historiography, criticised by the professor of History from Bucharest, generally either conceals or presents erroneously, primarily in presenting the development of the relationship between the Rumanians and Hungarians.

We continue to profess even today, quoting Sándor Bíró in the preface to his book (in 1975) dealing with the relationship between Rumanians and Hungarians: Changing the poisoned atmosphere and putting a stop to the animosity can only be achieved by a candid facing of the past. It provides an opportunity for both parties for introspection and recognition of the mistakes of the past. Facing ones faults is the prerequisite for closing off the painful past, so that we can start, spiritually cleansed towards the development of a new Rumanian-Hungarian relationship based on better understanding and mutual goodwill.

1. THE ETHNOGENESIS OF THE RUMANIAN LANGUAGE AND PEOPLE

The larger part of the Balkan Peninsula formed part of the Roman Empire for about six hundred years (until 600 A.D.) Emperor Trajan, in 106 A.D. defeated the *Dacians living north of the Lower Danube* and Oltenia and the larger part of, what is today, Transylvania was under Roman rule (*Dacia Traiana*) until 275 A.D. Archaeologists have established that *urban life ceased* in the Roman towns of Dacia about 275 A.D. The rural settlements were also vacated and burials in the cemeteries also ceased about that time.

After the Romans, free Dacians and Goths migrated to this region and were in turn expelled by the Huns about 380 A.D. Later, Gepids followed by Avars and then Slavs lived there.

Roman life however continued on the Balkan Peninsula for more than another three centuries. Towards the end of the 6th century the Slavs started migrating en masse from their habitations in the present Ukraine towards the Balkan Peninsula. The population of the Roman towns had already been changed into Slavs by the middle of the 7th century. In addition to the Greeks and Slavs there also lived in that region two peoples, the *Albanians and Vlachs*, different from them. The chroniclers of Byzantium, in the 8th century, mention *Blakho-rekhinos* around Thessaloniki and in 976 A.D., *Vlachs*, between Kastoria and Lake Prispa (middle of the Balkan peninsula). During the following centuries mention is increasingly made of Vlachs in various parts of the Balkan Peninsula.

The chronicles contain no information about where this people lived earlier, how they arrived to the region where they are first mentioned, etc. Archaeology does not have anything to say about this matter either.

Italian travellers, who recognized the similarities of the Rumanian language to their own while travelling in the Rumanian voivodships in the 15th century, provided one explanation. Aware that Oltenia and a large part of Transylvania was a Roman province for a time, they considered it natural to assume that the Rumanians living there were descendants of the Roman population of Dacia Traiana.

This, *theory of Dako-Roman continuity*, is still generally accepted in Rumania, though some historians and linguists in particular have questioned it. This theory was developed in detail by members of the *Transylvanian School* (Petru Maior, Gherorghe Sincai, Samuil Micu-Klein) in the 18th century. Rumanian archaeologists in recent decades have put a great deal of effort into uncovering material remains from the classical period and the Middle Ages over the whole of Rumania. These form *the central tenets of the theory*. The objects of Roman provincial style and Roman coins, discovered in these finds, however can also be found until the close of the 6th century in a large part of Europe, even parts never inhabited by Roman citizenry. Thus these finds do not prove the presence of a neo-Latin people north of the Danube after the 3rd century.

After the collapse of the Roman Empire, its influence on the material and spiritual culture of the other European peoples ceases. This occurred in the previously Roman Dacia also where no new material culture bearing specifically Roman or indigenous (Dacian) traits developed: Later, from the 5th century on, the Roman traditions disappear and the material culture becomes barbaric *in toto* and universal over a large area north of the Danube.

The development of the Rumanian people is actually the development of the *Rumanian language* ; the question therefore is, how and where did this language develop?

The Emergence of the Rumanian Language

Every language has kept within itself many important archaic motifs; words and expressions. These may point the way to discern with which other people the speakers of the particular language have been in contact in archaic times. Thus for instance it is the present Hungarian language, which provides evidence almost exclusively of the Finno-Ugric origins of the *Hungarian language*. Several hundred words, pertaining for instance to the most important elements of a person e.g., body parts, relationships, primitive habitation etc., show far-reaching coincidence between the Hungarian and Finnish languages.

Hungarian	Finnish
Kéz	käsi
Fej	pää
Vér	veri
Fészek	pesä etc.

The structure of the language (grammar) is also similar. These findings can only be explained by assuming common ancestry for the two peoples.

Numerous archaic Turkish words in the Hungarian language provide evidence for the later fate of this Finno-Ugric group: they lived in contact with Turkish peoples, which influenced the archaic Finno-Ugric people decisively.

Changes to the Latin Language in the 5th - 7th Centuries

Rumanian is a neo-Latin language just as Spanish, French, Italian etc., are. We have a large number of records covering a long period of time in the Latin language and the study of these has shown the changes in the language. Thus. The most common use of the past tense in the Latin languages of the present is the *past participle* (?), which developed in the later Latin, that is, in the 4th - 7th centuries. Italian words such as primavera = spring, rame = ore etc., do not occur in classical Latin. The meaning of the Latin hostis = enemy changed in the later Latin: In modern Spanish hueste, and Portuguese hoste = army. The Rumanian forms agree with the other neo-Latin ones: e.g.,

Italian	Rumanian
Hai invitato	ai invitat
Primavera	primavera
Rime	rama

And the Latin hostis has the meaning of army just as in Spanish and Portuguese. The article in Rumanian Ö developed in parallel with the later Latin article, the change of the pronoun ille to become an article passed through approximately the same stages in Rumanian as in the *whole neo-Latin linguistic region*. (author's emphasis)

There is no room here to review the other documented changes, which started in the late Latin times comprising the 4th - 7th centuries and are present in Italian and French etc., in the same way as in Rumanian proving that the ancestors of the speakers of these languages lived, in contact with each other, within the Roman empire. Such contact was no longer possible in those times with the region *north of the lower Danube*; these did not belong to the Roman empire and were separated wherefrom by a militarily defended Roman limes (boundary).

Albanian Contacts

The number of words in Rumanian descended from Latin is about 1500. There are naturally, as in every language, words of unknown origins of which about one hundred also exist in Albanian, e.g.,

Rumanian	Albanian	Meaning
Buza	buz'e	lip, edge (of something)
Copil	kopil	child
Catun	katun	hamlet, farmlet
Gard	gard	fence
Brad	bredh/brad	fir
Ghimpe	glj'imbe	thorn

High-mountain pastoral words

Baci	bać, bács	reckoning shepherd
Capusa	käpushä	tick
Cursa	kurthä	trap
Strunga	shtrung'e	corral
Tap	cap, cjap	billygoat
Tarc	cark	sheepfold (pen)
Urdä	urdha	sheep cheese

Du Nay lists a total of 89 such words of which the largest group, 24 words are ones used by herders; if we add to these words describing plants, animals, primitive habitation and geographical concepts the words used by high-mountain herders total 60.

Therefore the ancestors of the two people were herders and at some time lived together or in close contact with each other. Their language was the same or at least closely related.

Homes of the Ancestors of the Albanians

Based on locality names and other circumstances it has been established that, in Roman times, the Albanians lived in the area of Macedonia and the north of modern Albania. *Therefore the ancestors of the Rumanians lived in Macedonia and its neighbouring areas.*

Rumanian Dialects

At present *Arumanians* and *Meglano-rumanians* live on the Balkan Peninsula and *Istrio-rumanians*, in a few villages only, on the Istrian peninsula. The most widespread dialect in modern Rumania is the *northern Rumanian* (Dako-Rumanian, *daco-roman*), also spoken in Bessarabia, Bukovina, Serbia, Banat, and in the valley of the Timok River. Approximately 15,000 Rumanians live in Hungary.

Until about 1000 A.D. there were no dialects since all the Rumanian speakers lived together. We know this, among other clues, from archaic Slav elements and about 70 Slav words, which, based on their pronunciation could only have been taken over prior to 900 - 1000 A.D. and which exist in all four dialects.

The Balkan Linguistic Community

Rumanian has common elements not only with Albanian but also with other Balkan languages; Greek, Bulgarian and Serbian; e.g. there exist several hundred expressions, often translated directly from Greek.

Slav Influence on the Rumanian Language

The Slav dialect (*Experts in Slavonic generally consider that this was spoken south of the Danube*) from which the Rumanian language borrowed its first Slavonic elements was probably similar to Church Slavonic, the language known from old religious texts. (my emphasis.)

It is important to emphasise the second part of the statement: according to general agreement of experts in the field of Slavonic studies the archaic Slav influence (prior to approx., 900 - 1000 A.D.) was exerted upon the Rumanian language on the Balkan peninsula. This by itself determines where the ancestors of the Rumanians lived at that time.

However the northern Rumanian dialect contains substantially more Slav elements from a later era: from the Bulgarian language spoken in the 11th - 13th centuries. Considering only words Macrea found, out of 24,311 words, 20.7% were of Latin and 16.4% were of Slav origin. I. I. Russu studied the root words from which the derivative words were formed and found 1550 to be of Latin origin and over 2000 borrowed from the Slavonic.

The *depth* of Slavonic influence can be gauged by listing some words: obraz = face, nevasta = young woman, drag = dear, iubi = to love, bastina = fatherland, obste = community, da = yes, etc., are all Rumanian words of Slav origin. A large segment of northern Rumanian religious terminology, apart from words of Greek and Latin origins, was borrowed from Slavonic. Mihaila lists 79 such words, e.g., duh = soul, rai = paradise, sobor = council.

The question is of course, where did this huge Slav influence reach the northern Rumanian dialect? *Bulgaria* had a rich religious life; Vlach herders living in Bulgaria, who in 1187, together with the Bulgarians established the second Bulgarian empire, initiated the uprising against Byzantium. Bulgaria, in the 9th century, extended its power to the present Snowy Plains (Muntenie, Havasalföld) and southern Transylvania, but by the 10th century the Pechenegs occupied the Snowy Plains while Hungarians settled in the centre of Transylvania. The Slav influence described above could only have been exerted on the northern Rumanian dialect within the boundaries of the Bulgarian state and in the presence of its church.

Vlachs in Serbian Documents (12th - 15th Centuries)

We can read detailed references to the Vlachs living in Serbia in deeds of gift (*hrisov*) signed by kings and landowners. Silviu Dragomir described the living conditions of these herder and carter (*kjelatori*) people based on the analysis of 40 such charters. Several deeds mention that the Vlachs and Albanians lived next to each other. This population disappeared later, in the 14th - 15th centuries, but it left behind a large proportion of place names, which still exist in the Serbian and Bulgarian languages: e.g.,

Rumanian	Serbian	Meaning
Kalja	calea	road
Valje	valea	valley
Ursule	ursul	bear.

Durmitor, the highest peak in Bosnia (2528 m.) takes its origin from the Rumanian dormi = sleep, etc. Dragomir also notes that the Vlachs lived in these parts even before the migration of the Slavs there.

Their migration northwards began towards the end of the 12th century, often with Cuman help. At this time Cumans inhabited the Snowy Plains and Moldavia and Cuman words in the Rumanian language (e.g., beci = cellar, goal; toi = peak; and place names e.g., Baragan, Teleorman - teli orman- = wild, dark forest; Caracal - kara = black, kal = fortress) are the first examples of words borrowed from peoples living due north of the lower Danube.

This is not the place to analyse the Dako-Roman continuity theory in detail. We mention only by way of example supposed Dacian origins of some words: Giurescu states without any evidence that the Rumanian name of the Danube = Dunare comes from the Dacian Dunaris. If one reads this only one is not aware that the truth is written in linguistic publications *Dunaris or *Donaris is only a form supposed by modern linguists but it has never been used and never written down. Rumanian linguists have tried to demonstrate that there are words of Dacian origin but we can conclude based on analyses of O. Desusianu, I.I. Russu, A. Rosetti and C. Poghiric that there exist no words in the Rumanian language that can be proved to be of Dacian origin. (See Du Nay, which also provides a short but comprehensive review of the origins of the Rumanians.)

2. HOW DID THE POPULATION OF TRANSYLVANIA DEVELOP?

The Slavs have appeared and settled in the whole of the Carpathian Basin, including the Rumania of today. There were only a few of them in the area of Transylvania around 900-1000 A.D.; they lived mainly on the boundaries between the mountains and the grass-lands, along the large rivers and in the neighbourhood of swamps. They assimilated into the Hungarian population in most parts of Transylvania. They were a people of slaves but following the orders of Saint István that it was not permitted to keep Christian slaves they became free. In the south-west (counties of Krassó-Szörény, Hunyad) they partly assimilated into the Rumanians who arrived there after 1200 A.D.; here Rumanian names of ten rivers have been taken over directly from the Slavonic and the old Rumanian name of Gyulafehérvár: Belgrad (fehér vár) has also been taken over directly from the Slavonic.

The Hungarians lived in Etelköz, north of the Black Sea at the end of the 9th century. At the end of that century they moved north, into the Carpathian Basin. Hungarian cemeteries and graves dating from this time have been found in the eastern part of the Hungarian Plain ranging from the Nyírség through Bihar, Zaránd (named after Zerind a prince of the House of Árpád), Arad, Temes stretching to the Lower Danube and there are several dozen villages bearing the names of Hungarian tribes (Kér, Jenő, Tarján, Keszi, etc.,). In the text written by Constantinus Porphyrogenitus, Emperor of Byzantium around 950 A.D., there is the statement that Turks = Hungarians live in these parts.

There are only three settlements in Transylvania bearing Hungarian tribal names (in Doboka and Kolozs counties) and the cemeteries of Hungarian warriors dating from the 10th century have been excavated in Kolozsvár, Aranyosszék, along the middle Maros and in the southern part of the Székely region, particularly in Háromszék (renamed as Kovászna). Settlements of Hungarian Chiefs and leaders dating from the 10th century have also been excavated there and along the Küküllő rivers. Village names were formed in the Hungarian language, mainly dating from about the 11th century to the Tartar invasion, by the use of personal and ethnic names either by themselves or by adding the endings -d and -

i to them. These, mostly early, placenames occur with great frequency in the whole of the Transylvanian basin, see e.g., Popescu; (and later the Rumanians adopted them as well), e.g., ...lesd [>Rumanian Alesd], Erósd [> Ariusd], Kövesd [> Cueid, Cuiesd], Apáti [> Apatiu] németi [> Nemptiu] etc. In the 11th century one block of Hungarians of Transylvania and their political organization lived in the Szamos valley and on the middle reaches of the Maros valley around Gyulafehérvár, while the others, the Székelys lived in the valleys of the two Küküllős and of the Olt.

The Székelys, probably a Turkic tribe, joined the Hungarians already prior to their arrival in Hungary. Their task was the defence of the borders. Thus they were found in small groups all along the borders of Hungary. The first known documents concern Székelys living along the western and north-western borders of Hungary. The earliest documents in the east are from County Bihar where a few of their placenames persist.

Incursions by the Pechenegs in the 11th century necessitated the building of cohesive defence line in which the Hungarian kings gave the Székelys, whom they eventually settled in the Székely region of modern Transylvania, a major role. The Székelys kept their original national organization. They had equal rights and their duties towards the state was limited to military service. The land was tribal rather than individual property. At the time of their settlement they were cattle breeders: they paid a Steer-tax to the king. They were organised in Seats [*szék*] rather than Counties [megye].

King Saint István [Stephen] [997 - 1038] converted the Hungarians to Christianity and established the *Kingdom of Hungary* of which Transylvania was a member from its foundation.

The naming of Transylvania: The first document in which the term *Ultra siluam* is used dates from 1075 A.D. Its meaning is over the forest. The term *Partes Transsilvaniae* [parts beyond the forest] dates from the same century and after that becomes the term used in the Latin documents of the Hungarian Kingdom [*Transsilvania*]. Instead of the Latin name the Hungarian *Erdőelve* {area beyond the forest}, of which the Latin is a literal translation, was popularly used. We can first read this in the form *Erdeuelu* in the 12th century Chronicles of Anonymus. The Hungarian name for Transylvania was translated into German as well: The names *Überwald, über Walt* (over the forest] appear in 13th and 14th century documents. Later the Germans gave their own name, *Siebenbürgen* [seven castles], to this region. The common Rumanian name, Ardeal is first known to occur in a document dated 1432 as Ardeliu. It obviously is the translation of the Hungarian. More recently the name Transilvania, the Latin name used in the Royal Hungarian documents, has been given preference.

The Saxons. The region between the lower reaches of the Küküllős, the Olt and the Maros to Szászváros as well as the Beszterce district was sparsely inhabited in the 12th century. Géza II from 1140 - 1150 onwards brought in German settlers from Flanders and the lower reaches of the Rhine. These were the ancestors of the Saxons, who were made into a unified people by Endre II through his deed of gift called *Andreanum* [1224]. They had advanced trades and industry and they established all towns in Transylvania in the Middle Ages. They had defence responsibilities in the south. They lived according to their own traditions and governed themselves, organised into Széks. *Königsboden* consisted of four

administrative districts: *Altland* [the Seben district], *Burzenland* [Barcaság, in Rumanian –ara Barsei, district of Brassó], *Weinland* [between the Küküllő rivers] and *Nösnerland* [the Beszterce district].

So developed the Three Nations of Transylvania. Prior to the Mongol invasion they had no contact with each other.

The Hungarians were nobles, both politically and legally. Later another form of nobility developed when the king organised the *Royal Counties* of Szolnok, Fejér and later Doboka, Kolozs, Torda, Küküllő and Hunyad. The county seats had royal castles and their office-bearers and castle warriors have later formed this nobility. In the Middle Ages the Church had an extraordinarily important role. It owned land and maintained soldiers, in other words it behaved as a temporal lord (as well).

Frequent incursions from the east resulted in constant battles. Those who distinguished themselves in these were ennobled. Another possibility for earning property was to help a claimant to the throne. Thus a landowner-petty king class with large holdings has developed. Nobility was inheritable.

The importance of the Royal Counties deminished in the 13th century in consequence of the king granting land to local lords and voivods. This was the origin of the upper nobility.

3. THE FIRST RUMANIAN KENEZSHIPS ON THE SNOWY PLAINS

The first mention of these in the Southern Carpathians mostly south of the divide (but partly in the Hátság also) is by King Béla IV in his diploma of 1247: Litovoi, Fărcas [Farkas] and Ioan [János] Seneslav were under the suzerainty of the Hungarian king. They had independent military administration. Royal power decreased in the 13th century. The economy of the Snowy Plains [Havasalföld] strengthened and a class of large landowners developed. It was in their interests to establish a strong centrally led army with which they can subdue their local population and defend their borders against Hungarian and Mongol suzerainty. Finally in 1324 Voivod Basarab became Great Voivod and Lord of all Muntenia with his seat at Campulung. His grandson Vladislav, liegeman of Louis the Great of Hungary, to whom the king had relinquished the Castle of Szörény and to whom he gave the properties of Fogaras and Omlás ... (Vladislav therefore, at the cost of his vassalship) together with his court, nobles, serfs and prisoners set himself up in Transylvania, the eastern part of Hungary.

In the 14th - 15th centuries strong trade ties developed between Transylvania and Havasalföld. At that time little bread grain was grown in Havaselve and the manufacture of implements was also undeveloped. These had to be imported from Transylvania while the [largely Saxon and some Székely] traders exported live animals, hides, wax, cottage cheese and salted fish to Transylvania. The efforts of the Hungarian kings to secure the Vassalship of Muntenia can be partly explained on this basis though after the appearance of the Turks the needs of defence provided further justification for these actions.

4. THE MONGOL INVASION

The Mongol Invasion has caused huge destruction in Transylvania. The Mongol army ingressed through the Verecke Pass and the Barcaság; when they returned from the Hungarian Plains through the valley of the Maros they continued their destruction of the latter. The Hungarian king Béla IV rebuilt the

country after the Mongols left; he reorganised the defence of the country and, instead of royal castles he built new ones in the mountains. To repopulate Transylvania he brought in settlers from other regions of Hungary as well as foreigners; and numerous Rumanians settled there as well (see below). King Béla can be justifiably called the „second founder” of Hungary.

King Endre III convened a Diet in Gyuafehérvár in 1291. This was the „first joint meeting of the Hungarians, Székelys and Saxons living in Transylvania.” This Diet was followed by several others e.g., the Three Nations were invited to one held in Hungary in 1298. In a document issued by Endre III in 1293 he wrote that ... with the consent of the leaders of the realm gathered here we have decided that all the Vlachs, no matter on whose property they presently live should be repatriated to our royal estate of Székas.

At that time only the king had the right to settle the Vlachs. It was also decreed that the Vlachs pay a sheep-tax of one-fiftieth. This permanent tax had already been in existence when they lived in the Balkans. It was part of the *jus valachicum*, the „rights of the Vlachs” legal system, based on tradition. Neither the landowners nor the king interfered with the dispensation of justice by the Kenéz; this *jus valachicum* was still in existence in Transylvania long after the settlement of the Rumanians there.

5. THE RUMANIANS

Rumanians in larger numbers began to migrate into Transylvania after the Mongol invasion, principally into the counties of Hunyad, Krassó-Szörény, Fogaras and Máramaros. Initially they settled only on royal estates but later, with royal permission, also on diocesan and cathedral properties. Only during the reign of Louis the Great (1342-1382) were other landowners and towns permitted to settle Vlachs on their properties. The abode of a clan was the *catun* (katun) with the kenéz as its leader. The kenéz brought in settlers and in return he was given land by the king. One of the documents of Louis the Great states: in the hope that due to our great care of our Vlach villages gain lots of settlers, we bestow the kenézship This kenezship was an inheritable office. The rank of the kenez depended on the extent of the land in his charge. If in a county there were several kenéz a voivod was elected, or the castle commander (ispán) appointed one (Hunyad, Máramaros) and in that case the voivod was in direct contact with the king.

Documents from the IXth and XVth centuries reveal that there were many among the kenéz who were high-handed in their dealing. On innumerable occasions they break into houses, burn them down and rob the inhabitants . Murder, arson and prevarication over livestock was commonplace among them. The bishop of Transylvania complained on several occasions that the kenéz living on the diocesan and chapter properties have sold tilled areas and grazing lands as if they owned them. They impose new imposts on those in their charge and even use threats to remove themselves from the authority of the landowner.

The Rumanian population of Máramaros descended from Vlachs sent to king László the Cuman by the lords of Constantinople in 1284 -1285 from the Ibar river district. They united with the Hungarian forces and defeated the Mongols ingressing along the upper reaches of the Tisza. Since they did not want to return to their homelands the king settled them in Máramaros (according to ancient Russian chronicles).

At the start of the 14th century Dragos, Voivod of Máramaros headed the newly established border defence district centred on Baia. In 1359 Bogdan voivod of Máramaros resettled to Moldavia and occupied its voivodal seat. With this the Moldavian Rumanian Principality was established, initially only in the districts adjacent to Máramaros. The Hungarian king Louis the Great was unable to prevent it becoming independent.

The Number of the Rumanian Population in Transylvania

On the Papal tithing-lists of 1332 - 1337, there were 950 parishes recorded in Transylvania. Since, according to Pascu at that time there were about 3000 settlements in Transylvania (more than 2500 settlements are mentioned in documents prior to 1350), about 2000 were non-Catholic, inhabited by orthodox Rumanians and Ruthenians. However this is a faulty deduction. Just as today, in those times most parishes had one or two attached communities. The number of settlements inhabited by Catholics can therefore be estimated at about 2550 and this equals the total number of settlements recorded in 1350.

Greek Orthodox churches were started to be built in Transylvania only towards the end of the 13th century: in Demsus (Densus and Zeykfalva (Streiu) followed by Sztrigyszentgy_rgy (Streisangeorgiu) in 1313 etc.

In 1345 Pope Clement VI has called upon the Franciscan Order to convert the Rumanians to the Catholic faith but they, led by their orthodox clerics resisted steadfastly. Later such endeavours (Pope, Hungarians kings etc.,) remained fruitless also.

6. FEUDALISM

In Hungary property law was regulated by the Golden Bull (Aranybull) of 1222 in accord with a western type of rigid codification. In the 14th century the role of the royal counties diminished since most of the land became the property of large landowners. Therefore the latter were required to provide and maintain the military forces. (This was the usage in Western Europe also). During the reign of Louis the Great, clauses on the ancestral rights of resistance were affirmed. This gave the nobility a large measure of ascendancy and independence against the king. Count Ureche admired the freedom of the Hungarian and Polish nobility („the courts of law of the Hungarians are very just”) and bitterly denounced the conditions of his homeland: In Moldavia one can disappear without being called to account, without judgement or criminal offence; the voivod is himself the judge, prosecutor and executioner of the law.

In the Rumanian Voivodships the reigning prince was the unfettered lord of his property who gave part of his land to his loyal followers for a restricted period of time. It was only later towards the end of the 15th century that property became inheritable. This was the „*uric*.” Due to a lack of strict codification of property law ratification of each act of property transfer required the consent of the reigning prince. (Generally this was difficult to achieve without the giving of presents.)

The serfs, in Moldavia the „*vecini* ” and in Havasalföld the „*rumani*,” were free until the end of the 16th century. The prince was supported by the richest boyars constituting a *great princely council*. The Church had no land and was completely subordinated to the voivod. On the other hand the voivods were the

patrons of the Church and founded numerous monasteries. There was no independent nobility in the Rumanian Voivodships and consequently *no quasi-parliamentary system, such as in Hungary and Western Europe, existed*. Another difference was that while the voivodships were inheritable the order of inheritance (e.g., primogeniture) was not codified often leading to several claimants.

7. THE REBELLION OF THE SERFS IN 1437 - THE PACT OF KÁPOLNA

There were several revolts in Europe in the 15th century against the exploitation of the landowners. The Hungarian king, Louis the Great, removed the serfs from the jurisdiction of the castle commanders (royal officials) and placed them under the landowners. The latter took away the right of free migration of the serfs. Social unrest was even greater on the diocesan properties: here the bishops insisted on the payment of tithes, which the pauperised serfs could not do. In 1437 revolt broke out among the serfs living in central Transylvania. Initially the serfs were victorious against their landlords but when the latter called on the Székelys and Saxons (among whom there were no serfs) for help the rebellion was quelled. The Three Nations formed a pact at a meeting in the town of Kápolna (County of Szolnok - Doboka) in which they pledged mutual support against both internal (serfs) and external enemies (Turks). This was the *Unio trium nationum* (Union of Three Nations) based on the political equality of the Hungarian, Székely and Saxon nations. This formed the basis of the later Public Law in Transylvania.

Rumanian history books generally discuss the revolt of the Rumanian and Hungarian Serfs. To this must be added that a large segment of the minority Rumanians lived under the overlordship of their Kenéz and Voivods and, not being Catholics paid no tithes at all. Only those few Rumanians who lived on diocesan and cathedral properties joined the revolt. The statement that the Pact of Kápolna was aimed against the Rumanians is the result of the transposition of present-day ideology to the 15th century when there was no Rumanian Nation but only a vague knowledge of belonging. The Pact of Kápolna *was aimed at all Serfs*.

8. THE TURKS

In 1389 Turkish forces defeated the armies of the Serbs and several other European nations in the Battle of Rigómező (Kosovo).

János Hunyadi

All over Europe János Hunyadi was the most renowned leader of the forces fighting the Turks. In Rumanian history books he is generally referred to as Rumanian under the name Iancu de Hunedoara. His father, Vajk was actually the son of a Rumanian kenéz, who through his service of king Sigismund (Zsigmond) received the royal property of Hunyad as a reward in 1409. His mother however was Hungarian. János Hunyadi served several lords in southern Hungary (e.g., the Bán of Macsó) and in 1428 joined the service of king Sigismund. In the same year he married Elizabeth Szilágyi de Horogszeg. (The son born of this union became the great king of Hungary, Mátyás (Matthias) 1458 - 1490). He became Bán of Szörény in 1439; later Captain of Nándorfehérvár (Belgrad) and in 1440 Voivod of Transylvania. In 1438, Szultan Murád attacked Transylvania at the head of a Turkish-Rumanian-Serbian army (with the help of Vlad Dracul, Voivod of Muntenia. He sacked Szászsebes, Gyulafehérvár and Köküllő castle.

However Hunyadi defended himself successfully against repeated attacks and this had strong reverberations throughout Europe.

János Hunyadi was the favourite of the Hungarian lower nobility and enjoyed wide popularity among the peoples of the Balkans also. In 1446 he was elected Regent of Hungary during the minority of the king. In order to pursue successfully the fight against the Turks he tried to appoint voivods to the Rumanian voivodships who were loyal to him. In this he was not always successful however. In 1448 he was defeated at the Second Battle of Rigómező (Kosovo) as a consequence of the treachery of Voivod Dan. This thwarted his plans to unite the peoples of the Balkans into an anti-Turkish alliance.

The Hungarian king rewarded Hunyadi with vast properties out of the income of which he was able to maintain a strong army. Hungarian and Székely forces provided the kernel of his army. Historical traditions and legends of the Balkan peoples attest that the Serbs, Rumanians and Bulgarians all regarded Hunyadi as the leader of the Székelys. His name, Jank Szibinyányi or János Székely in the arumun historical songs of the region is variously , Iencio Ungurul (János the Hungarian), or Iencio Secuiul (János the Székely).

Hunyadi built castles and strengthened the defence of towns; The Reformed (Calvinist) church in Farkas street in Kolozsvár, the Franciscan convent in Óvár and numerous other churches in Transylvania were constructed with his support (Alsóorbó, Marosszentimre, Tövis).

The final victory of Hunyadi was his defeat of the forces of Sultan Mohamed II besieging the fortress of Nándorfehérvár (Belgrad) in 1456. The Pope of the time decreed the ringing of the *Angelus at Midday* to commemorate this event.

The prominent Rumanian historiography of today depicts Hunyadi as aiming at uniting the Three Rumanian Nations. Transylvania is often referred to as a Rumanian Nation in other contexts also; this is completely erroneous. Transylvania was constitutionally part of the Kingdom of Hungary; historically, the Hungarians lived there for three centuries prior to the first Rumanians; in the middle of the 15th century its population was overwhelmingly Hungarian, Székely and Saxon with a Rumanian minority.

Nagy István (Stefan cel Mare) occupied the throne of Moldavia in 1457. He organised the army, supplied them with ample arms and strengthened the fortresses. The battles István fought against the Turks were mostly successful; on his deathbed (in 1504, after a reign of 47 years) he boasted that he won in 34 wars of the 36 that he waged.. He invested a great deal of effort into extending his might to Oltenia but this did not lead to lasting success.

The following must be taken into consideration for the proper understanding of the era:

„That there was **enmity between Moldavia and Wallachia** has been clearly demonstrated by both parties. Armed intrusion and plunder characterises the relations of István with the Rumanians beyond the River Milcov. István plundered the Rumanians with the same lack of patriotic sentiments as he did the Székelys. When Ureche wrote that István gave his army freedom to plunder Wallachia for three days, he did

not feel the patriotic perverseness of the matter. *On the contrary his admiration and endorsement of the action can be discerned from his words.*" (Author's emphasis.)

The situation of the serfs in the Rumanian principalities during the Turkish reign.

Village society started to disintegrate at the end of the 15th century; in order to gain new arable land the peasants started to clear forests. It was then that they converted to wheat-growing, which fetched a good price. Agriculture progressed in the 16th century to such an extent that the two Rumanian Principalities (Wallachia and Moldavia) supplied the empire of the Turks with food.

Landowners endeavoured to gain more land - by purchase or by brute force - mainly from the village commons. Ownership of vast tracts of land developed; around 1600 some boyar families owned 130 - 160 villages. These landowners, in order to enrich themselves further, raised the level of compulsory tallage of produce and socage, which, because it became unbearable led to the mass escape of peasants. This however weakened the state both economically and strategically. Consequently they developed the system of the serfs being tied to the land. Mihály Vitéz started this in Wallachia in 1595 - 96: The obligation of Mihály (Legamantul lui Mihai). The boyar had complete freedom to dispose of his serfs (rumanii legataura); he could sell, exchange or give them as gifts to other boyars.

The boyars, mostly of foreign origin, felt no commonality with the Rumanian serfs in their possession. They were called rumin, which then meant almost the same as convict.

„The fact that there existed in our midst a boyar class, which was estranged from the people and their interests, were, more responsible for the destructiveness of the fights for the throne and the moral abyss into which this swept them, than the Turkish occupation of the country or even Hungarian and Polish intrigues”.

9. THE INDEPENDENT PRINCIPALITY OF TRANSYLVANIA

In 1526 the Turkish army defeated that of the Hungarian king at Mohács. The young king, Louis II died and Hungary was without a king. In the following years the Turks occupied the central part of Hungary (Buda in 1541). The independent principality established in Transylvania became the legal successor of the Kingdom of Hungary.

This is the era of the Reformation; the princes of Transylvania were Protestants through whose clever politics Transylvania enjoyed relative independence. They were the first, at Torda in 1568 to proclaim freedom of religion. The Transylvanian Principality had its own Parliament; the Turks did not meddle in their internal affairs. Transylvania did not at any time become administratively part of the Turkish Empire. They paid taxes to the Turks; they were exposed to looting and intrusions by Turks and Tartars.

The establishment of the independent Transylvanian Principality resulted in a significant transformation in the whole of Transylvania. The economic strengths of the Hungarian kings were no longer available and consequently the three nations had to participate in the maintenance of the state to a greater extent .

The Reformation started initially among the Saxons who converted to Lutheranism. The doctrines of Calvin found followers among the Hungarians, and in the middle of the 16th century Ferenc Dávid, the son

of a boot-maker in Kolozsvár, founded the *Unitarian religion*. Its slogan was *God is One*, and, abandoning later dogmas it tried to return to the text of the Bible.

Johannes Honterus, Mayor of Brassó, and Johann Benckner, a printer, also spread the new faith among the Rumanians and, to aid their enlightenment, printed religious books in Rumanian. Ferenc Geszti, Mayor of Déva, had the Five Books of Moses known by the title *Palia de la Orastie* (Old Testament of Szászvaros) printed at his own expense. Coresi, a Greek monk, during his activities in Brassó, had about 35 books printed in Rumanian and Church Slavonic, mostly with Saxon and Hungarian financial help. These works had a considerable effect on the development of the Rumanian literary language. The first book in Rumanian appeared in Transylvania (*Catehismul luteran*. 1544). The language of the Orthodox Divine Service, previously Church Slavonic, was changed to Rumanian in 1566. István Báthori established a Greek Orthodox diocese in Gyulafehérvár in 1571, the first incumbent of which was consecrated in Tergoviste.

Prince István Báthori (1571 - 1576) developed further the policy initiated by Fráter George (György): since the Habsburgs were unable to defend Transylvania from the Turks, he became openly a Turkish Vassal (taxpayer) Prince but secretly an ally of the Hungarian king. As King of Poland (1576 - 86) one of his principal aims was the expulsion of the Turks from the whole of Europe but the affairs of Transylvania rated high among his concerns.

Mihály Vitéz in Transylvania

The Székelys clung to their traditional prerogatives but the Parliament of 1557 pruned these and forced them to carry part of the taxation burden. Later Prince Zsigmond Báthori promised them the restitution of their privileges but transgressed his word.

It was under these conditions that Vitéz Mihály (Mihai Viteazul), Voivod of Muntenia, initiated his attack on Transylvania. He informed the Székelys that he is attacking Transylvania on behalf of King Rudolf and, if they join him, the king will restore their traditional freedoms. At this the Székelys joined the forces of Mihály *en masse* so that Székelys comprised one third of his army of 36,000 soldiers.

Mihály Vitéz defeated the forces of the Prince of Transylvania on 28th October 1599 in the Battle of Sellenberk (Schellenberg, Selimbar) near Nagyszeben and entered Gyulafehérvár. He convened a Parliament there and declared that he came to Transylvania under the mandate of King Rudolf, as his governor and Captain-in-Chief. The Estates swore allegiance to Rudolf and to Mihály as his deputy. Mihály in turn restored the Székelys' traditional privileges but did not make any changes in the position of the Rumanian serfs.

In the summer of 1600 Mihály evicted the Voivod of Moldavia and took that title. King Rudolf however did not trust Mihály and sent his general, Basta, to Transylvania as royal commissioner to occupy Transylvania. Basta, joined by the disaffected Hungarians of Transylvania, defeated Mihály in the Battle of Miriszló on 18th September 1600 and drove him out of Transylvania. After this, the Moldavian forces, helped by the Poles, drove Mihály out of both Moldavia and Wallachia. Mihály fled to Vienna. Early in 1601 the Transylvanian Estates recalled Zsigmond Báthori to the Transylvanian throne. Vienna did not want this and sent Mihály to Transylvania to join with Basta and evict him. He beat the Transylvanian forces at the battle

fought near Goroszló. Mihály, in order to keep Transylvania began to hold secret talks with the Turks. On hearing of this, Basta had Mihály assassinated in his camp near Torda on 19th August 1601. By this time the Transylvanian Estates had enough of the rule of Basta and elected Mózes Székely as Prince. Basta called in Radu, Voivod of Wallachia and together they defeated the forces of Mózes Székely in a battle near Brassó (Mózes Székely himself died there). Basta ruled in Transylvania for a further four years.

These five years between 1599 and 1604 were the saddest in the history of Transylvania. The forces of Mihály and the mercenaries of Basta destroyed everything with fire and sword; after each battle they depopulated one district after the other. „They cut strips from the backs of men; they twisted the heads of children so that their eyes fell out.”

The Hungarian peasantry of the counties of Szilágy, Szolnok-Doboka, Kolozs and Lower Fejér „were reduced from a continuous population to disjointed islands.”

On the other hand the Rumanian peasants living in the mountains were in considerable security so that even in these times new villages were founded. The number of Rumanians increased and many of them moved to the valleys to till the soil. Settlement of these was in the interests of the landowners who consequently granted them privileges. In the large part of the 17th century Rumanian escapees from the Principalities came to Transylvania. These did not settle for long but wandered from place to place resulting in a deterioration of public order.

Mihály Vitéz was an ally of the boyars but „fearing a strengthening of the centralised power”, they did not approve of the union with Transylvania. Relations with the Voivod of Moldavia were not amicable either. The one of the sub-titles of the *Istoria Romanei Compendiu*, the chapter dealing with the Middle Ages reads: „*The epoch of centralising tendency of the Rumanian principalities.*” In this chapter Stefan Pascu writes about the era and deeds of János Hunyadi, Vladtepes, István Nagy and Mihály Vitéz. This sub-title is *unfounded and is a reflection of modern thinking to a previous age*. In that age the idea of Rumanian unity and the Country of the Rumanians did not exist. *The rulers mentioned above did not think of unifying a Rumanian state.*

In Transylvania István Bocskai managed to concentrate such forces that he succeeded in evicting the army of Serban Radu Voivod of Wallachia, deputising for Basta, and occupied all of Upper Hungary including Pozsony. Elated by this victory the Székelys, in 1605, declared him Prince of Transylvania and the Parliament at Medgyes ratified this. In the Treaty of Vienna (1606) Rudolf assured the freedom of Protestant religions and confirmed that laws only be enacted with the consent of the nation.

On the death of Bocskai, (1607) Gábor Báthory, aged 19, was elected Prince of Transylvania. „He soon developed into a tyrant without regard to morals, law, duty and honour causing not only general scandal but also disaffection. The internal order of the country has disintegrated.”

The tyranny of Báthory over the Saxons is well known. He occupied and looted the town of Szeben and then promised to leave upon the payment of a considerable sum of money. „This ‚autocrat’, when the bribe was collected and paid, not only did not evacuate the town but also started to really debouch the town and behave tyrannically.”

The Parliament convened by the Turks in Kolozsvár elected Gábor Bethlen as Prince in 1613.

Europe at this time was split into the two opposing camps of Catholics and Protestants. Hostilities broke out in Bohemia. Freedom of religion and the constitution were at stake as Péter Alvinczi explained in *Querela Hungariae* (Complaint of Hungary). Bethlen led several campaigns on the side of the Protestants.

Transylvania thrived during the brief reign of Gábor Bethlen. With his wise policies he gained the support of the Saxons and Székelys, who now accepted the need for sacrifices for the support of the state of an independent Transylvania. Agriculture and - particularly in the Saxon towns - trades and commerce developed. Gábor Bethlen realising the importance of culture supported the churches and schools and founded several new ones. He founded a School of Higher Learning with the rank of an Academy at Gyulafehérvár in 1621 and invited eminent foreign scholars for its professors. Bethlen held a large court to which the legates of foreign princes, foreign scholars and artists came often.

The constitutional and administrative organization of Transylvania has developed completely during the reign of Gábor Bethlen:

Parliament consisting of a single chamber with the counties, Székely seats, districts and towns sending their legates and senior officials as counsellors; it met annually. Its role was the acceptance of the tax levy and the passing of laws initiated by the Prince. Laws were initially written in Latin but after 1565, in Hungarian and the language of debate was also Hungarian (the Saxons spoke in Hungarian also). There was a state cabinet of twelve counsellors chosen from among the members of the three legal nations (Hungarians, Székelys and Saxons) responsible to the Parliament. The principal office-bearers of the state and legates to foreign powers were appointed from among its members. The Prince was not permitted to act in matters of importance without consultation of the cabinet. The presiding officer of the cabinet was the Chancellor who was in this capacity the senior advisor to the Prince.

The commander of the armed forces was the Captain-General; the Székely armed forces had a separate commander, the Captain - in - Chief of the Székelys.

Lord Lieutenants (főispán) and sub-prefects (alispán), the shires by chief -and sub - sheriffs (főszolgabíró-alszolgabíró) administered the Hungarian counties. The Székely and Saxon Seats were administered by royal chief - and sub - administrators in accordance with their own laws, and under the supervision of the governed.

There was internal unrest following the early death of Gábor Bethlen (1629) until in 1630, when György Rákóczi was elected Prince. His policy was one of caution and he increased the prosperity both of his family and the state by, e.g., making mining and the sale of salt, honey and wax state monopolies.

The first half of the 17th century is known as the Golden Age of Transylvania. Schools were built as well as fortified town walls, churches and mansions. Jancsó writes: „The Hungarian literary language in this era strengthened under the Transylvanian influence, which emanated from the ‚Princely Court of this age‘. Under the influence of the foreign scholars teaching at the Gyulafehérvár Academy there developed a new generation of Hungarian scholars, e.g., János Apáczai Csere, who raised the reputation of the Kolozsvár

School to new heights. Zsuzsanna Lórántffy, wife of György Rákóczi I. founded the Academy of Sárospatak. (Sárospatak at that time was part of Transylvania). Comenius, Bohemian pedagogue of European reputation taught here for a time. Zsuzsanna Lórántffy *founded thirty-nine Rumanian folk-schools* on her properties in Fogaras for the children of her Rumanian serfs.

György Rákóczi I died in 1648. His son, György Rákóczi II was the opposite of his father and was characterised by daring and rash decisions. He was also a spendthrift. Worse still he replaced the wise advisors of his father with young men nearer to him in their thinking.

Having realised his aim of placing men allied to him as Voivods of Moldavia and Wallachia he seized the opportunity of the war between Charles X King of Sweden and Poland to claim the Polish throne. He did not take into account that both the Turkish Porte and the Viennese Court opposed this step János Kemény was put in charge of the forces though he himself opposed the campaign. As it is written in the *Siralmas Krónika*: „That wise man János Kemény ... wept bitter tears, recognizing that the presence of young untried and sycophantic advisors has brought on the ruination and destruction of the poor country.” Rákóczi moved on Poland with an army of 40,000, occupied Warsaw and joined up with the forces of Sweden. The campaign however proved a failure when the forces led by Kemény were scattered by the Tartars who then proceeded to break into Transylvania. The Turks and the two Rumanian Voivods also mounted incursions and the forces of these caused vast destruction in Transylvania. The palace of the Prince in Gyulafehérvár, the Academy together with its library and the church were destroyed by fire. Brassó and Szeben paid considerable sums of money in order to escape the same fate. Kolozsvár did the same but its suburbs were razed, as were most other towns in Transylvania.

According to a chronicle of the era:

„... before and after Várad paid its bribes, in the warfare over a few years (counties of Kolozs, Doboka, Inner - and Middle - Szolnok and Kraszna) were destroyed to such an extent that over five or six miles there was not even a village or a hut and no one lived there. They had been robbed, cut down and died from disease”.

The population of the Rumanian villages nearer the mountains hid in the forests. When the pestilence ended groups of Rumanians from the mountains settled in the ruined villages. Because of the extraordinarily difficult conditions in the principalities the peasants living there escaped in groups to Transylvania. Around 1700, the number of Rumanians in Transylvania reached 250,000; at a time when 150,000 Hungarians and 100,000 Saxons lived there.

Based on the tax-census of 1721 it can be calculated that of the population 48% was Rumanian, 36% Hungarian and 15.6% German; by the end of the 18th century this had changed to: 56% Rumanian, 28% Hungarian and 12% German.

The principal cause of the resettlement of the Rumanians was the inhumane misrule of the boyars of Moldavia and Wallachia so that the poor serfs escaped if they could even to the Turks. According to Rumanian historians the Rumanian serfs under Turkish rule only paid a contribution (harach) while his owner, the Spahi (landlord) paid tax, while at home under their own national Voivods they suffered the

greatest possible exploitation, demand of ever increasing quantities of produce (foodstuffs) and of money. They fled, from this national rule, over the Danube to the Turkish domains but preferably to Transylvania, which, with its peaceful and stable conditions and higher European culture was truly the final fortress on the edge of the Rumanian, Turkish and Russian tyranny.

The Princes following György Rákóczi II (_Ákos Barcsai, Mihály Apafi) gave considerable privileges to the Rumanian Popas (priests). (e.g. they were no longer required to pay tithes; In the principalities the Popas lived under the same legal conditions as the serfs^o).

Prince Apafi encouraged culture: he transferred the razed Academy of Gyulafehérvár to Enyed thereby saving it. Gábor Bethlen already started the raising of the level of culture of the Rumanians by which they gained a lot. (Religious reform - conversion of the Rumanians to Protestantism - started only later and did not achieve lasting success.)

10. AFTER THE EVICTION OF THE TURKS

After the eviction of the Turks at the end of the 17th century the Transylvanian Principality became so weak that it had to accept the suzerainty of the Austrian Emperor, who confirmed Apafi as Prince of Transylvania.

The Leopoldine Diploma (1691) governed the new legal position of Transylvania; there will be no developments concerning the accepted denominations, privileges are confirmed, decisions of Parliament, municipal rights of Saxons, administration and Parliament will be maintained as in the past. Székelys perform military service at their own cost and are consequently exempt from further community imposts. No large contingents of troops will be stationed there to torment the country.

In 1693 it was decided that the Transylvanian Chancery was to be separated from that of Hungary. On this basis the Transylvanian Chancery was transferred to Vienna and Transylvania was subsequently governed from there. Thus, the promises made in the Leopoldine Diploma were not kept.

11. THE RUMANIAN PRINCIPALITIES: THE ERA OF THE FANARIOTS

Merchants living in the Fanar (The Lighthouse district), i.e., the Greek quarter of Istanbul, since they were multilingual, therefore they acted initially as interpreters. However, many of them managed to rise to the thrones of the Rumanian Principalities. The prospective prince bought from the Porte the right to the throne for increasing amounts of money . Then he proceeded to recoup these expenses in the shortest possible time before proceeding to make more profits on the deal. This era began in 1711-1716 and lasted to 1820. The Porte at this time meddled in even the pettiest of internal affairs so that all independence was lost.

12. RELIGIOUS UNION IN THE HABSBURG EMPIRE

Prompted by the Jesuits, in 1692 Emperor Leopold I has declared that all Greek Orthodox priests in the empire who accept union with Rome would be given the same privileges as priests of the Catholic Church. While this Union was attacked from many quarters the General Synod of 1700 ratified it, at which 1563

^o Their social conditions were only legally changed by the religious reunification (see below)

priests in favour of the Union participated. . The religious union made it possible for Rumanian youths, primarily priests, to pursue further studies at foreign universities: Nagyszombat, Vienna, Rome, Padua etc.

13. THE FREEDOM FIGHT OF FERENC RÁKÓCZI II

The kuruc (pronounced: kooroots) of Rákóczi started their fight for Hungarian freedom in Hungary proper, but the struggle has soon spilt over into Transylvania. Because of the insistence on the union, Rumanians have also joined the kuruc: Gábor Nagyszeghi , who raised his voice against the union on behalf of the Greco-Rumanian population of the Transylvanian towns, kuruc-captain Dráguj, the valiant kuruc-lieutenant Vaszi Balla among others. Rákóczi succeeded in occupying a large part of Transylvania and in 1707 the Parliament convened at Marosvásárhely elected him Prince. However the Austrian army has occupied Transylvania already in the next year forcing Rákóczi to flee. In 1712 the Transylvanian Estates swore fealty to Charles III.

The Peril of Mádéfalva

In 1762 Queen Maria Theresia has appointed General Buccow as commander-in-Chief of Transylvania and gave him the task to set up a frontier defence system. This constituted serious interference in the life of the nobility and the Székelys while it meant the freeing of a large proportion of the Rumanians from their obligations as serfs. Even in the district of Besterce, where there was initially serious unrest, which Buccow quelled by putting to death by hanging and by breaking upon the wheel several Rumanians, the organization proceeded smoothly. The Székelys resisted more vehemently because the military frontier duty has meant a serious burden and the diminution of their freedoms. The military attacked the Székely legates at Mádéfalva on the night of 7th January 1764 killing 400 and leaving many wounded. This *Siculicidium* (Slaughter of the Székelys) broke the resistance; at this time many of the Székelys have fled to Moldavia.

14. PEASANT REVOLTS

The Condition of the Peasants in Europe

There were frequent peasant revolts in Europe, particularly in the 14th-18th centuries: examples are the peasant revolt led by György Dózsa in Hungary in 1514, the one in 1515 in Carinthia, the German „peasant wars” in 1525-1526, uprisings in France and in Russia in the 17th century. The cause in each case was the extent and frequent increases of the demands on the serfs.

The Rumanians of Transylvania in the 18th Century

Rumanian society was made up of three levels: serfs holding land; landless peasants and individuals without permanent abode (*vagabundus*). The latter were in majority in the previous centuries so that at the beginning of the 18th century 20-30% of Rumanians changed their abode regularly. The main cause of the translocation was the desire of individuals to escape from the work demanded of them by the landowning class. There were many gypsies among these vagabonds.

The Condition of the Peasants in Transylvania.

In *Transylvania* the nobility, comprising about 10% of the population was the landowning class. They were mostly Hungarians while the serfs working for them were Rumanians in majority. At this time Transylvania was administered by the Habsburg rulers, who demanded heavy taxes and used other (state) imposts to impoverish the country.

The Parliament of Szeben in 1714, that is, after the defeat of Rákóczi, has promulgated new regulations governing the work due to the landowner. These however were vague. One regulation of this Parliament removed the freedoms granted to serfs freed by Rákóczi. At the behest of Queen Maria Theresia, a new decree of socage was promulgated in 1769. This gave the landowner the right to determine the size of the plot of land allocated to the serf. Most landowners made these plots so small that the serf could only live on it in the greatest poverty. Naturally this raised the level of enmity of the serf against the landowner. The Rumanian serfs bore this much better than the Hungarians the majority of whom moved to the towns where they tried to make a living from trades.

The protests of the Rumanian serfs developed under the leadership of the Orthodox priests. At the time of the religious union the government in Vienna disbanded the Orthodox diocese of Gyulafehérvár. With this, *religious discontent* was added to economic discontent. This was also supported by foreign Orthodox Churches (in the Rumanian Principalities, in Serbia, and in Russia): they sent to the Rumanians of Transylvania books and preachers urging resistance. Revolts against the religious union occurred every three to four years. Buccow, the military commander of Transylvania, ordered the army to destroy the monasteries. Under the impact of these circumstances, Maria Theresia, has appointed Dionisie Novacovici diocesan administrator at Gyulafehérvár, in 1761, which meant the acceptance of the Orthodox Church.

After this, Vienna started to popularise the Habsburg rulers with the Rumanian masses. The Orthodox Church also started to move closer to Vienna and its priests started to voice the contrast between the good emperor and the evil nobility.

The nobility tried to increase its wealth in every country but it is noteworthy that compared to other countries under the rule of Austria, the Transylvanian nobility was poor.

The Peasant Revolt led by Horea-Closca-Crisan

The Rumanian population of the Transylvanian Ercgebirge (*Munti Apuseni*) lived under better economic conditions than the rest of the Rumanians. They had free use of the forest, right to sell spirits etc. The state however taxed them heavily and corruption was rife. Since the administrators, county officials etc., were Hungarian, the anger of the population was directed against the Hungarians in general.

Emperor Joseph II wanted to reform the tax laws, which necessitated a general census. In order to strengthen the defence of the country, in preparation for the reinforcement of the military border guards he also directed that a census be conducted in the villages near the boundaries. The Rumanians perceived this second census as meaning that the king intended to militarise the whole population and thereby free the serfs. The nobility wanted to prevent this. It was under these tense circumstances that the revolt started on the *royal estates* of Zalatna. The royal serfs living there were initially shepherds, paying fiftieth of the sheep and wild-wine to the king, or rather, to the Prince of Transylvania. By the end of the 18th century they paid a

low tax rate to the state. However Vienna raised these taxes three-fold and removed their right to sell spirits. This resulted in unrest at the fair of Topánfalva (*Campeni*) (24th May 1782) where the casks of the leaseholders were punctured. The perpetrators were sentenced to five years jail and five of them to death. Horea and Cosca travelled to Vienna where Joseph II gave them an audience. After this Horea, Cosca and their friends travelled from village to village spreading the news that the king has ordered the freeing of the serfs. They said this on 31st October in Mesztákon (*Mesteacan*) addressing 500-600 people. Here they added that the emperor ordered the peasants to proceed to Gyulafehérvár where they would receive arms. The sub-prefect of Zarand County sent some men in order to quieten the crowd; the peasants however beat them to death in the village of Kurety (*Curechiu*). This was the start of the revolt. The enraged, bloodthirsty mob, led by Crisan, marched from there to Kristyőr (*Crisior*) where they killed 17 of the nobility. The rebels then devastated the whole of County Zarand and parts of the Counties of Hunyad and Arad. Verespatak, Offenbánya and Abrudbánya were destroyed. Joseph Held estimated the number of peasants at 4,000-5,000. They were led by about 150 brigands, soldiers and military deserters as well as some of the junior Orthodox clergy. Their arms were only useful for killing the defenceless nobility.

Nicolae Densusianu[#] in his book *Revolutia lui Horea*, writes, among others, the following concerning the killings: „In their anger [the peasants] did not spare the wives of their masters and slaughtered their feudal masters and those who had no serfs indiscriminately.” - „Where the mobs of peasants had moved through, only ashes and ruins remained. The remains of these wars of attrition, though covered by the newer ruins of 1848-49 can still be seen in County Zarand” [that is in 1884]. In total 4,000 were killed and 133 villages burned to the ground.

They killed not only the members of the nobility but Hungarian peasants and high-ranking Orthodox clergy who tried to moderate the destruction. The Orthodox and Greek-Catholic Churches were against the slaughter and acted in concert with the Austrian armed forces. Samuil Micu Klein, one of the chief members of the Transylvanian School did this also! The Austrian Army, on the orders of Emperor Joseph II, quelled the rebellion in mid-December. The leaders fled. *Joseph II offered 300 gold pieces for their capture.* They were captured and on 28th February 1785 Horea and Closca were broken on the wheel at Gyulafehérvár; Crisan hanged himself.

The main cause of the rebellion was social but with nationalist overtones. The statements, letters and submissions to the Emperor were prepared by Rumanian Orthodox clergy, who included religious and nationalist demands and even references to foreign powers (Russia) in the texts. On this basis the rebellion became a national freedom fight in the public awareness and later in the historiography.

The principal - tragic - significance of the peasant rebellion of 1784 is that in the Rumanian public awareness the idea of the „Evil Hungarian” was strengthened. In the greater scheme of things this was unjustifiable on several grounds:

[#] Nicolae Densusianu (1846-1911) ... published important historical works, based on extensive documentation, which he collected diligently in archives at home and abroad. His principal work, for which the Rumanian Academy of Sciences awarded a prize (1885) concerned the Revolt of Horea. B.P. Hasdeu writes concerning this work: „This is the first and only completely serious writing concerning the more recent history of the Rumanians. It is composed with cold objectivity and lack of bias and its components are assessed critically, - and first and foremost, it is based on the direct knowledge of all the documentation.” (A román történetírók enciklopédiája (Encyclopedia of Rumanian Historiography) Bukarest, 1978, 123.)

1. The Hungarian nobility was no worse than the nobility in the rest of Europe; (and tens of thousands of peasant families fled from the Rumanian Principalities in the mid-18th Century from merciless exploitation, see above 20, 27-8). The Rumanian peasants avenged themselves mercilessly on the nobility of Southern Transylvania as we have seen above, so that if they had any sins they atoned them a hundredfold.
2. The extension of the loathing felt against the nobility to include *all Hungarians* was baseless and misplaced. It was not the Rumanian populace but primarily the Orthodox clergy, the teachers and the emerging Rumanian intelligentsia who continued and kept this hatred alive for a long time, even into the next century.

15. EMERGENCE OF NATIONALISM OF THE NOBILITY, POPULAR AWARENESS AND NATIONAL AWARENESS AMONG THE RUMANIANS.

Inochentie Micu-Klein, Greek Catholic [Greek Uniate] bishop between 1730-1744, initiated a nationalistic basis nobility in that he demanded equal rights with that of the Three Nations for the Greek Catholic clergy and Rumanian nobility but not for the whole Rumanian population. His justification: He was informed from the work titled *Hronicul vechimei romano-moldo-valahilor* of Dimitrie Cantemir that the Rumanians are the descendants of the soldiers of Emperor Trajan and have lived in Transylvania for longer period than the members of the Three Nations. The Saxons, since their interests were at stake, achieved that the bishop be ordered to Vienna where an investigation was initiated against him. He however fled to Rome (and later died there).

Balázsfalva was the Rumanian spiritual centre where in 1740 an elementary school, after 1755 a Latin language secondary school and a seminary for the training of priests have operated. The elementary school network was developed under Joseph II. Being conscious [however erroneously] of their Roman origins the Orthodox Rumanians have awoken to a joint national awareness, which manifested itself in an anti-feudal and religious setting. The Rumanian intelligentsia, which emerged after the union, has developed this national awareness, leading, after all, to the emergence of a civic nation.

16. THE TRANSYLVANIAN SCHOOL

The Rumanian clergy studying at western universities became aware of the Latin origins of their language and also became convinced of the Dacian continuity. It was only natural that they considered the detrimental condition of their people „related to the Romans and living in Transylvania since time immemorial” to be a gross injustice. They worked out these theories, „proved” them and used them in the political battles of the Rumanians in Transylvania. This battle became the determining factor to which the objective truth was subordinated: „history and language thus became national sciences and strategic weapons”

The principal work of Sanuil Micu-Klein was his *„A dáko-román vagy vlach nyelv elemei”* [Elements of the Daco-Roman or Vlach Language] (1780), written in Latin, which traces the origins of the Rumanian language to the *classical* Latin. Petru Maior wrote the most widely read and disseminated book of the

Transylvanian School: A románok dáciai eredetünek története [The History of the Dacian Origin of the Rumanians], which was published in Buda in 1812. Its subject was the *pure Latin* origin of the Rumanians. In opposition to Micu-Klein he held (correctly) that the Rumanian language is descended from the *popular [vulgar] Latin*. Another of his theses was the continuity of the Rumanians in Roman Dacia. Maior, based on a few old documents (primarily on the *Gesta Hungarorum* of Anonymus, notary to King Béla III), invented some fantastic theories, e.g., he stated that the Huns together with King Atilla lived among the Rumanians in Moldavia and spoke Rumanian fluently (in the 5th century, when they spoke Latin only; the neo-Latin languages, Rumanian among them, only started to develop some three centuries later!). In spite of this, Maiorú writing was the most effective book of Rumanian civic nationalism in the greater part of the 19th century. Generations read it with fervour and admiration.

17. SUPPLEX LIBELLUS VALACHORUM

In the *Supplex Libellus Valachorum* the Greek Catholic and Orthodox Rumanians acted together. They sent the „Letter of Supplication” to the Austrian Emperor Leopold II in 1791. They demanded that the Rumanians - „Earliest Inhabitants of Transylvania” be given back the place that is their due based on the Diploma of Kolozsmonostor dated 1437 [they erroneously interpreted one of the statements of the diploma in this manner], that is, that the Rumanians be accepted as the Fourth Nation of Transylvania and that they be given the rights, which are part of that acceptance. Representatives of the *Transylvanian School* composed the text. The king transmitted the letter to the Parliament of Transylvania; he finally replied to the petitionary bishops in which he states among others that „it is not proven that they had received authority from the whole Rumanian people to take this step”.

18. THE REFORM ERA - HUNGARIAN-RUMANIAN CULTURAL COLLABORATION

The French Revolution demonstrated that the masses are more important than the other political factors of state-law of the time. They demanded democracy and the expression of the national interest in politics throughout Europe. These notions spread throughout Europe and initiated a general national awakening. In addition, the anti-constitutional and germanising policy of the Habsburgs spurred on the Hungarians in this. A Philosophical Society was formed, which published *Transylvanian Memoirs* and historical works; a Dramatic Society was formed at Kolozsvár. The national spirit of the Saxons awoke under Emperor Joseph II. They also formed a Philosophical Society (around the Brukenthal Museum) and German theatrical groups performed in Szeben and Brassó.

A Society was formed in 1778 with the aim of improving the cultural level of the Rumanian peasants, which planned to publish a Rumanian language „people’s daily”. The Governor General, Count György Bánffy, supported this and sent a memorandum to this effect to Vienna where, however, permission to publish was refused.

The Reform Movement started among the Hungarians after 1820, which was watched with sympathy by the Rumanian intelligentsia. They had read the writings of Széchenyi and Wesselényi too. Széchenyi has also given financial support for the publication of the first Rumanian journal. In the school at Balázsfalva the Hungarian language was „fashionable” and Orthodox clergy and Rumanian individuals often wrote to their

bishop in Hungarian. Many Orthodox Church minutes were written in Hungarian. In 1829, Orthodox Bishop Moga made the teaching of Hungarian compulsory at the seminary in Balázsfalva. Naturally, this was done without any external pressure.

This situation started to change in the 1840-s. Gheorghe Baritiu started the publication of the weekly, *Gazeta de Transilvania*. At that time Baritiu met regularly with the leaders of Wallachia e.g., Barbu Stirbei, later Voivod of Wallachia, Eliade Radulescu and Ioan Cimpineanu. This latter started the irredentist movement the aim of which was the unification of all Rumanians in a single independent Rumanian state.

19. THE HUNGARIAN REVOLUTION AND FREEDOM FIGHT OF 1848 IN TRANSYLVANIA

In the spring of 1848 revolutions broke out against absolutism all over Europe, for the liberation of serfs and for the freedom of the press. The revolution broke out in Pest on 15th March following those in Paris and Vienna.

Both parties of the Hungarians of Transylvania, the freethinkers and the conservatives worked out a common program the first point of which was union with Hungary (though many among the conservatives were against this). The Rumanians opposed this vehemently; among the Saxons some have supported this aim but in the end they too worked against it. The Parliament convened for 30th May declared for the union. At the same time they abolished the concept of serfdom (Article IV). 70-80% of the peasantry, altogether 974,846 persons, received 921,430 hectares of land, which comprised a large proportion of arable land. 80% of this land became the property of the Rumanian peasantry. This was the beginning of Rumanian national landownership.

In 1842 Stephan Ludwig Roth has published the demands of the Saxons. An Academy in Law was established in Szeben in 1844, the lecturers of which taught in a strongly German nationalist and anti-Hungarian spirit. This school played a significant part in the decision of the Saxons to turn against the Hungarians in 1848 in spite of the Saxons of Brassó, who wanted union with Hungary.

The Rumanians held a national convention at Balázsfalva on 15th May, with the bishops presiding and their deputies were Simion Barnuti and Gheorghe Baritiu. Wallachia sent numerous deputies and the peasants comprised several thousand. Barnuti summarised the demands of the meeting among which the demand that the Rumanians be recognised as a constituent nation and against the union with Hungary were the most important. They sent one deputation to Vienna, another to Kolozsvár and established a permanent committee (the later „Rumanian National Committee”).

The „union committee” of the Parliament at Kolozsvár, extended by five Rumanian members, discussed the demands of the Rumanians of Balázsfalva and those of the Saxons. The committee prepared a draft law „with regard to assuring the equality of civic rights for the Rumanian Nation”. However, this law could not be promulgated due to the events of the following year.

Several members of the committee of Balázsfalva instigated the Rumanian peasantry to unlawful resistance. The peasants have also occupied the estates of the landowners at Mihálcfalva and Koslárd. It is typical of the tactics of turning the nationalities against each other that the Austrian Command of Szeben

ordered Székely border guards to restore order, which resulted in nine deaths. The Governor-in-Council disbanded the committee, but numerous members of it settled in the area of the 1st Rumanian border guard regiment. This regiment, together with the border guard regiment of Naszod, declared that they no longer recognise the Hungarian Defence Ministry. Recruiting gave further cause for unrest. The Rumanians sabotaged this. At the second meeting at Balázsfalva Avram Iancu turned up with 6,000, armed móc [mountain shepherds]. They proceeded to work out the military organization for the Rumanians. On 2nd October Austrian General Puchner accepted the Rumanian National Committee as the lawful representative of the Rumanians and signed a treaty with it. The Hungarians armed themselves in self-defence. At this the Austrians ordered that the Hungarian volunteer forces be disarmed and ordered the members of the regular army and armed forces of the Rumanian committee to carry this out. This started the civil war in Transylvania.

A Székely National Meeting was convened at Agyagfalva on 15th October, Count Imre Mikó, chairman of the Governor-in-Council, presiding, at which 60,000 were present. The hastily gathered Székely forces were initially successful but the Imperial army defeated them at Marosvásárhely.

After this defeat no Hungarian forces remained in Transylvania and the Rumanian revolutionaries set themselves at the Hungarian population. A mob of 10,000, brought together by the National Committee murdered 130 Hungarians in Kisenyed They killed 176 Hungarian families in Magyarigen and 400 around Balázsfalva. The revolutionaries besieged Alvinc and called for its surrender. Here however the local Rumanians were not against the Hungarians and the two communities signed a peace agreement. Two Orthodox priests, Muntean and Corna, played a significant part in this: „in the course of these troubled times ... they repeatedly reminded the people of the great commandment of mutual love”. They secured the presence of a military unit in the fortress and thereby prevented it being taken over by revolutionary groups. They kept the peace agreement and at Alvinc there were no courts martial even after the arrival of General Bem.

The wildest bloodletting occurred in the district bounded by Torda, Medgyes, Szeben and Déva, which, after the departure of the imperial army, was occupied by the revolutionary forces led by Rumanian prefects. Nagyenyed was burnt to the ground; 800 murdered Hungarians were counted after the attack. The archive, library and relics of the Calvinist Diocese were destroyed. Rumanians led by Avram Iancu killed 3,000 Hungarians, men, women and children in the vicinity of Sárd. 700 were killed in Zalatna destroying the Hungarian population of Zalatna completely. Árpád Kosztin lists the villages in which these bandits burned, killed and destroyed. We only provide a few examples here of what has happened:

„In Gyulafehérvár, Megai a watchmaker, was roasted alive, the landowner of Domba after having his hands and feet sawed off was buried to his waist.

In Naszód the Hungarians were tied to the stake and killed with refined brutality. In Borbánd, Károly Baranyai had his arms and head sawed off in the presence of his wife and daughter. The robber band then forced his wife to accompany them with his head on a stake, to Balázsfalva”.

The Istoria Romaniei. Compendiu, 1973, on pages 255-265 deals with the happenings in Transylvania but makes no mention of the above. Giurescu, writing concerning the reaction of the nobility in Istoria romanilor, 1975, pp. 593-599 provides the dimensions of it: „they shot or hanged dozens [literally, tens] of peasants and numerous intellectuals, which, naturally envenomed the relations between the Hungarian and Rumanian revolutionaries”.

Therefore, when the forces of Bem occupied Transylvania his courts martial sentenced this number of Rumanian revolutionaries to death. The „dozens of peasants” (*zeci de Srani romani*) can be taken to mean forty, fifty or at most ninety! According to the data of Jancsó the number sentenced to death did not exceed fifty „and even of these a minute fraction were for political crimes while the rest were without exception arsonists robbers and common murderers.” Let us compare this with the number of Hungarians murdered - in Kisenyed alone 130 were killed! And the perpetrators, with few a exceptions, were not brought to justice, no one called them to account!

This is not the place for writing a more detailed history of the revolution of 48 in Transylvania but the peace negotiations in the spring of 1849 between Avram Iancu and the representative of the Hungarian government, Ioan Dragos, member of the Parliament at Pest, at Abrudbánya bears mention. Imre Hatvani , a young amateurish army commander broke this agreement by attacking Abrudbánya without orders. The Rumanians scattered his forces of 1,000 men and killed Dragos as a traitor after which they killed numerous innocent Hungarians in Verespatak and Abrudbánya and razed both settlements. Hatvani had Ioan Buteanu and Petru Dorban executed by way of revenge.

The defensive battles of Háromszék deserve special mention (Áron Gábor, artillery major and gunsmith, Sándor Gál, Mózsa Berde and many others and, of course, the populace). They tied down the Austrian army between November 1848 and the spring of 1849 thereby preventing their occupation of Transylvania.

The Russian forces called in by the Emperor, determined the fate of the freedom fight, which concluded with the armistice of 13th August 1849 at Világos. „The Hungarian leadership became the flag-bearer of European progress by their fight for the ideology of freedom and was beaten by, the Habsburgs and the Romanovs, the two most repressive powers of Europe, with the help of a large portion of the nationalities, the Czechs, Slovaks, Rumanians and Croatians”.

20. AFTER THE CRUSHING OF THE FREEDOM FIGHT

The revenge of the government of Vienna was directed particularly against the Székelys and generally against the Hungarians. Executions, long terms of imprisonment and censorship were the order of the day. The army units stationed in Transylvania caused considerable devastation also. In 1849-50, two-thirds of the Hungarians of Transylvania were in prison, had emigrated or were serving in the imperial army as privates.

The Rumanians managed to develop thriving estates in several regions of Transylvania in a short space of time (e.g., in the vicinity of Arad, Nagyszeben and Brassó). Slavici (*Politica nationala romana* 1915) wrote that at this time the Rumanian peasantry were strong; they did not much care for politics but

endeavoured to obtain as much land as possible and to live as well as possible. They were not universally against union with Hungary either.

21. 1867-1914: TRANSYLVANIA BETWEEN THE TIME OF THE AUSTRIAN-HUNGARIAN COMPROMISE AND THE FIRST WORLD WAR

Following the Compromise *the main thrust of Hungarian politics was liberal. Liberalism placed the freedom and rights of the individual above the absolute power of the ruler and the state. Instead of the national interest it tries to attain the equality of rights of nations.*

The economic situation of the Rumanians of Eastern Hungary and Rumania.

In this liberal spirit the Hungarian governments provided effective economic help to the Rumanians.

In 1861 Vienna expropriated the extensive *forests of Naszód* (and promptly leased them to the Rumanians). After 1867 therefore the Hungarian government could have considered these forests as belonging to the state. At the request of the local Rumanians however it *surrendered them* in 1871 in favour of the Rumanian schools of Naszód. With the funds from these, they built a secondary school there. (Gheorghe Cosbuc and later Liviu Rebreanu, two Rumanian literary greats, studied there.)

The Rumanian trades and shopkeeper strata started to develop in leaps and bounds; their sons provided the *new civic and intellectual class*.

The Albina Bank was formed in 1872 to be followed by the establishment of a further 50 banks in the next 20 years. Their main aim was to help the Rumanian peasant to buy land but they also supported the Rumanian irredentist organizations (*Astra*, later the *Liga Culturala Romaneasca*). In the purchase of Hungarian estates they have received *effective* support also from the *Austro-Hungarian Central Bank* and from several banks based in Budapest, which provided the Rumanian banks with large loans at *preferential* conditions. The loans provided to some banks often reached twice the amount of their capital.. The existence of some Rumanian banks would have been questionable without this help. According to Ion Slavici, between 1850 and 1900 the extent of the area owned in Transylvania by Rumanians *increased tenfold!*

The Hungarian State helped the peasantry without regard to nationality. They taught modern farming techniques in the majority language and provided to individuals, villages and co-operatives breeding animals and plants for propagation at no cost. The proportion of day labourers, the poorest class, demonstrates how little the Hungarian governments were interested in the strengthening of the economic level of the Hungarians: In 1900 25.2% of the population of Hungary were day labourers, in Transylvania, in the Rumanian areas this proportion was only 19.7% while in the Székely region it was the highest at 30.7%!

The economic conditions of the Rumanians in the Principalities

During the same time the conditions of the peasantry in the Principalities was extremely difficult.

„In spite of the agricultural production increasing substantially (by 100% between 1886 and 1900) and the price of produce also increasing, the peasantry was in a difficult position and their living conditions were very low. The main cause was the lack of land, or rather, its improper distribution: while the 4,171 large land-owners had 3,787,192 hectares [on average 908 hectares each], 1,015,302 peasants owned only 3,319,695

hectares, on average 3 hectares each! The other agricultural estates (10-100 hectares in size) comprised 816,414 hectares of land. That is, there was a huge imbalance in the ownership of land: *over one million peasants had less land than a few large land-owners*".

A Rumanian religious leader from Nagyszeben declared: „The condition of the Rumanian peasant in Hungary is incomparably better than that of the peasant in Rumania. This is assisted by their cultural level, which cannot even be measured compared to the Rumanian peasant. At us, every peasant is literate, can write and lives under fairly good hygienic conditions.”

From a folksong:

*Decit sluga la ciocoi
Mai bine cioban la oi
Decit sluga la boiar
Mai bine rob in Ardeal**

Some land distributions took place in the Rumanian Principalities but did not improve the difficult conditions: In 1878-81 48,342 peasants were given 229,063 hectares of land and some state-owned land were also distributed but only a few few peasants received any of that.

„In addition there was the unfortunate lease system; many land-owners did not cultivate the land themselves but let it to lessees, mostly to foreigners, whose primary interest was to squeeze the largest possible profit out of the land. This led to the inhumane exploitation of the peasants who were paid poorly for their work but who were charged extortionate interest rates on the loans given to them for food. They raised the levy and not infrequently cheated with the measures. The local administration was involved and protected of the leaseholders”.

About 70% of Rumanian estates ended up in the hands of the parasitic leaseholders instead of the landowners who shunned farming. The Fischer Trust was responsible for the most inhumane exploitation. They paid 20 Lei for one hectare to the landowner and took 50-70 Lei from the peasants who tilled the land!

„Our peasants are in a state of constant hunger, which arises from their agrarian position. In the northern part of Moldavia 88% of the peasants do not have a single tail of domestic animals and cannot give their children a spoonful of milk, of whom 40-50% die before their fifth birthday because of their poor nutrition.”

The conclusion of the professor: „ ... the agrarian population of the free Rumanian Kingdom is in a condition of much greater destitution than their subjugated brethren in Hungary, Bukovina or even Bessarabia.”

This led to several peasant revolts and in 1907 a peasant uprising encompassing the whole country broke out. On the orders of the government the army quelled the uprising, murdering 11,000 persons in the

It is better to be a shepherd
Than to be the servant of a landowner;
It is better to be a convict in Transylvania
Than to be the servant of a Boyar.

process. The order was: „Cut them down with scythe and machine-guns. Do not report the numbers taken prisoners but only the deaths!”

(Liviu Rebreanu paints a realistic picture of these tragic events in his novel, *Rascoală* (1932)).

The Nationality Policies of the Hungarian Governments 1867-1914

The compromise with Austria in 1867 resulted in the Hungarians' desire to live in peace with the nationalities. At the suggestion of Ferenc Deák, the parliament therefore accepted the *law of 1868:XLIV „Concerning the Equality of Rights of the Nationalities.”* This law, in 29 points, dealt with the use of national languages. It contained legal guarantees and was based on the principle of collective rights. The official state language was Hungarian but all laws must be translated into the languages of the nationalities. Municipal officials, in their official communications with individuals and associations (towns, societies etc.) should „to the greatest extent possible use their language”. The use of their own language was guaranteed in the justice system also. According to Para. 20 towns are free to decide the language of their minutes and decision making while Para. 21 ordered that „in their communications with the inhabitants municipal officials are required to use the language of the latter.” There was complete freedom to establish schools and the filling of positions was based on personal aptitude. The government focused on having Rumanians in senior positions the result being e.g., Rumanians also being among the members of the highest court of the land.

Freedom of speech and of assembly was unfettered, censorship was abolished and juries were selected from free citizens. In counties with Rumanian ethnic majorities the minutes of the county assemblies were kept in Rumanian and town life was conducted in Rumanian.

The Rumanians of Hungary had their own printers and publishers, which produced large quantities of political, literary and scientific works. Newspapers involved themselves in political questions of interest to them and though there were a few notable court cases involving newspapers the Rumanian news media had unbelievable freedom. The several thousand Hungarians living in the *Kingdom of Rumania* were at the same time not allowed even one newspaper!

The nationality law of 1868, in which the *rights of nationalities were determined for the first time in Europe* caught the attention of even Western Europe where its democratic and liberal principles were emphasised (e.g., according to the French Eisenman „it demonstrates a magnanimous spirit and liberal character” and „is very broadminded” (*tres liberale*)).

After 1920, all Rumanian authors stated that the nationality law was a dead letter. This is not true. The fault in the law was that it has lacked no punitive measures against transgressions. According to Bíró „this can be explained by the spirit of liberalism of the time”. Thus, the extent of adherence to the law was also determined by the law abiding spirit of the individual officials and their relations with the nationalities. This depended in turn on their behaviour. The Rumanians themselves mostly disdained the law thereby lowering its value and effectiveness.

In spite of this the spirit of the minorities law ruled at this time and, since Hungary was a constitutional state, it extended its protection to all the nationalities, The economic condition of the

Rumanians of Eastern Hungary and Transylvania strengthened beyond belief. Starting from a very primitive base, they managed to develop a rich Rumanian language school system and were free to use their native tongue in public. During this whole era, the Rumanians were able to speak, in counties with a Rumanian majority population, with their superiors in their own language, who were themselves mostly of Rumanian ethnicity but even if they were Hungarians.

Education Policy

The Hungarian state guaranteed the organization of denominational schools. Based on the law 1868:XXXVIII Rumanian parishes, in the course of a few years, set up over 2,000 purely Rumanian elementary schools. The law set up requirements: it stipulated a maximum of 60 children in a room, the qualifications of the teachers etc. However the Orthodox Church did not however have the financial strength to abide by these requirements and therefore the Hungarian government could have wound up practically the whole Rumanian language school system, due to the Churches failure to abide by the law. However the Hungarian government wanted to develop the Rumanian elementary education. Around 1910 the proportion of non-compliant schools was still around 30%. In Hungary there were 2,569 Rumanians schools in 1869 and 2,901 such schools in 1914. In Hungary in 1913-14 one Rumanian language public school served 1,149 ethnic Rumanian inhabitants (the situation was worse in the Rumanian kingdom where there was one school for 1,582 inhabitants). The law of 1868 guaranteed parents, freedom in the choice of schools and this was the practice all this time. 75% of Rumanian children attended Rumanian language schools; the parents of the rest chose Hungarian or German language schools for their children. Taking advantage of this freedom of choice, parents enrolled thousands of Hungarian children in Rumanian language schools and the government did nothing.

In 1879 a law concerning the teaching of Hungarian language (as a subject) was promulgated. The practicability of this was seriously hindered by the lack of Rumanian teachers qualified to teach Hungarian. In 1880 out of about 2,300 Rumanian teachers, 1,500 did not know Hungarian at all and only about 200 knew Hungarian well enough to actually teach it as a subject. The Hungarian state organised lectures teaching Hungarian and as a result the situation improved but those who did not speak Hungarian, and these still existed in 1914, were not discriminated against in any way. They were allowed to continue as teachers and of course no Hungarian was taught in their schools. Naturally the language of tuition was Rumanian also at schools where Hungarian was taught as a subject.

There was not even a hint of such tolerance in the Kingdom of Rumania: The Parliament in Bucharest promulgated the law of public education. The law was based on the premise that the powers of the state extended not only to the maintenance of public order but also to the retention of national heritage. It is completely intolerable that there should be inhabitants who „do not know the language of the country of their birth“. In schools having public rights, independently of the birth language of the students, *they did not tolerate languages other than Rumanian.*

In Hungary, the salary level of teachers was a serious problem. This was lower than that of a servant at a bank and often they did not receive even this amount. The law of Apponyi, effective from 1907, had the

rectification of this situation as its principal aim. This law declared teachers in religious schools to be public servants and guaranteed their salary from the public purse. In 1910 the at least half of the local parishes was able to guarantee the legal level of the salary of the teachers. The majority of the rest asked for state aid. In 1915 all the Rumanian primary schools received aid to the value of *two million crowns*.

According to the propaganda, by way of this state aid, the state „has interfered in the internal affairs of the Rumanian schools.” This is not true.

The teachers and priests inculcated the spirit of Greater Rumania into the souls of the children. Nationalist songs, e.g., *Awake Rumanians from your Sleep; The Anthem of Coexistence; Rumanian Homeland* etc., were freely available. The Kingdom of Rumania supported all this effectively. The songs applauded „Rumanian unification, which we all want”. While teaching the Rumanian language and history the teachers inculcated into the children to honour Avram Iancu and Horia, who were the „valiant leaders of the noble Rumanian nation fighting against the Hungarian barbarians.” The Hungarian government accepted all this in the name of liberalism.

The situation was no different in *secondary schools*. The Rumanian schools were completely independent in the choice of internal leadership, language of instruction, syllabus, school texts and teachers. There were no barriers to the assertion of the spirit of Greater Rumania.

The propaganda throughout Western Europe concerning the „Hungarianisation” taking place in Transylvania was therefore baseless.

A textbook published in 1995 states that (after the independence of Rumania was accepted (1881)) „the government in Budapest increased the persecution of the Rumanian inhabitants and their Hungarianisation,” but only by way of generalisation and without mentioning examples. However there was plenty to write concerning Bessarabia and the book states what the *Russification* consisted of: Rumanian schools were not permitted, the emigration of Rumanians was encouraged and „many Russians, Ruthenians, Bulgarians and Germans were settled” in this province.

The Situation of Rumanians living in neighbouring Countries

About two million Rumanians, (comprising 70% of the population) lived in the Province of Bessarabia in *Russia*.

„...in 1867 the use of Rumanian was abolished in all schools in Bessarabia. From then on all schools, religious, local [maintained by the *zemstvo*] or state was a Russian school where the instruction took place in Russian and in the Russian spirit.”

Quarter of a million Rumanians lived in *Serbia*. They were not permitted to use their birth language in public, not even in church where the use of the Serbian language was compulsory. The Rumanian clergy Serbianised the names of the students and officials.

The Situation of the Nationalities in the United Principalities

Rumanian was the only language permitted in the schools and Catholic churches of the about 50,000 Csángós living in Moldavia. The authorities confiscated any Hungarian language religious works that

happened to reach a priest. The priests were forbidden to communicate with their parishioners in any language but Rumanian. Most priests did not speak Hungarian. Personal names were Rumanised and only the Rumanian form of locality names was permitted. [It is only now, in 2001, that the Catholic Church has acknowledged that the birth language of the Csángós is Hungarian and therefore Hungarian-speaking church administration should be established for them. See Pope John Paul II's statement on the visit of Hungarian president Ferenc Mádl to Rome in September 2001.]

The Success of the Attempt to reach exclusive Power by the Rumanians

The *League of Cultural Unity of all Rumanians* was established in Bucharest in 1890 by a group, consisting mostly of migrants from Transylvania. They continued their vehement anti-Hungarian propaganda in the news media of Western Europe also. This policy of „national unification“ became the official policy of the Rumanian governments until the start of the First World War.

Transylvanian locality names were determined by each nation in its own language and they were free to use that name both in official communications and in private life. By the end of the 19th century this question needed regulation since numerous settlements bearing identical names such as the Rumanian Sacel, Saliate etc., and the Hungarian Szentmihály, Szentmiklós etc., came into being, which caused problems particularly to the postal authorities. The Parliament in Budapest passed a law in 1898, which ordered each settlement to have one name only but decreed that this must take place „only after consultation with the towns and municipal authorities“... „and only in concert with the desires of the settlements involved.“ In addition to this official name, according to Para. 5, a „different name may be shown in parenthesis.“

The Rumanian language was widely used in Hungary and, if there were excesses by a few officials e.g., railway ticket clerks, these were officially persecuted and fined for a misdemeanour.

The Role of the Rumanian News Media

Press freedom was wide ranging. The Rumanian news media advertised the so-called *Rumanian racial boycott*, freely. This consisted of attacking everybody who befriended Hungarians or showed any understanding towards them in the papers. The editorial of the first issue of the weekly *Libertatea*, started at Szászváros in 1902 (1st January 1902 ‚Terorisare‘) states: „The Libertatea considers it to be one of its most important objectives to make our people capable of exerting terror.“

The *Tribuna* wrote of the humane Rumanians: „we do not give bread if he is hungry or water if he is thirsty, we lock the door in his face if he asks for shelter“. These are strong words but in practice it was not enough: I f in parliamentary elections someone voted for a deputy who was running on a government program his „house was burnt to the ground at night and his animals were taken by ‚persons unknown‘ and he was beaten to the point of death.“ The Hungarian government tolerated even this.

22. THE FIRST WORLD WAR AND THE EMERGENCE OF GREATER RUMANIA

World War I broke out in the summer of 1914. Rumania in spite of its treaties with the Central Powers remained neutral. After two years of war it became obvious that the Entente Powers were winning. In August 1916 the Entente Powers concluded a secret treaty with Rumania in which they

promised South Bukovina, Transylvania and eastern Hungary to Rumania if she attacked the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy.

The Entente Powers won the war.

In March 1919 they proclaimed the Republic of Councils. Its army could not resist the Rumanian attacks and on 4th August the Rumanian army occupied Budapest. The American general, H.H. Bandholz, member of the military mission of the Entente Powers, in his memoirs, immortalized the dismantlement of factories and unbridled looting that took place. Based on this, Miklós Horthy, in his memoirs writes: „Had he [Bandholz] not appeared in time personally at the royal castle, they would have looted it irretrievably. Rumanian trucks ready for loading had already been drawn up in front of the national museum. It was only Bandholz's action of officially sealing its doors in the name of the Entente Powers that saved it from a similar fate.”

Admiral Miklós Horthy occupied Budapest at the head of his forces on 16th November 1919. The communists in their usual mode of history falsification have proclaimed Miklós Horthy to be a fascist. Rumanian politicians have joined them in this. This statement is one of the most blatant lies that the communists have ever invented of a person. Horthy protected Hungarian interest. His relations with Hitler were far from cordial.

In Hungary the Arrowcross party led by Szálasi represented fascism. The humane attitude of Hungarians is best illustrated by the declining membership of this party during the war: there were 116,000 members in 1940, while three years later the number was less than 100,000! Few are aware of it nowadays but the fact is that Szálasi did not support the killing of Jews. According to him „Jews should be required to perform public works until the end of the war and then be forced to emigrate.”

Horthy consistently resisted fascist demands. F.L. Carsten, in his book on Fascism, writes: „Eventually, the Germans forced Horthy aside because he attempted to extricate Hungary from the war and the Germans helped Szálasi and his Arrowcross Party to power when the Red Army was already on Hungarian soil.” (On 16th October 1944 SS-forces occupied the royal castle in Budapest, took Horthy prisoner and next day interned him in Bavaria.)

In the book entitled „You can tell stories about this..” the Swedish authors write concerning the Holocaust, that after the occupation of Hungary in the summer of 1944 when the Germans wanted to start the deportations of the Jews of Budapest, Miklós Horthy, by issuing forcefully worded orders, prevented the deportation of 300,000 Jews from the country, thereby saving them.

Lucian Boia also noted that the widespread picture of Horthy in Rumanian historiography is false: „Rumanian textbooks present Hungary after the installation of Horthy, as a country governed by a fascist-type dictatorship.” (*Which, it must be noted in passing, is not true*) (author's emphasis)

23. THE TREATY OF TRIANON (VERSAILLES) (4TH JUNE 1920)

The Treaty of Trianon (Versailles) (4th June 1920) ceded Transylvania, the eastern part of Voivodina, the eastern part of the Hungarian Plain the districts of the Kőrös and Szamos River valleys and Máramaros to

Rumania. The population of this area of 102,200 sq. Km. Was 5,247,467 in 1910 ethnically distributed as follows:

Rumanians	2,829,454	53.8%
Hungarians	1,661,805	31.6%
Germans (Saxons and „Svabians“)	564,789	10.8%

(There was a significant group of Hungarians on the Rumanian side of the new frontier!)

The statement made by George Pascu that drafters of the Treaty of Trianon took into account the „will of the nationalities“ and that the „balance of their judgement favoured Hungary at the expense of Rumania“ is a crude lie.

The Rumanian National Committee convened a National Convention on 1st December 1918 at Gyulafehérvár at which, supposedly, 100,000 participants declared the secession of the above mentioned areas to the Kingdom of Rumania.

„Roderich Grósz [recte: Groos] a Saxon official of the Vienna Archives published in the Red Book of the Austrian Republic the minutes of the ministerial council, which makes it clear without any further doubt that the official representative of the Hungarian state, Count István Tisza, expressed his opposition to the declaration of war and maintained this opposition against his Austrian colleagues as well; since then our guilt in starting the war can no longer be seriously maintained; the charge by which they try to condemn us to perpetual servitude, that we started the war, is a lie.“

At the Paris Peace Conference Ionel Bratianu, the leader of the Rumanian delegation, has initially claimed historical rights, stating that the boundaries of Rumanian once extended to the Tisza and that the Hungarians settled among them by force of arms. He gave the number of Hungarians involved at a falsely low level but finally he „referred exclusively to the claims of annexation based on the secret treaty of Bucarest of 1916.“ It is clear that the decision of the Peace Conference was based on this. However there were in Western Europe some politicians who thought in a wider perspective. Thus for example, Charles Danielou, who informed the French parliament about the Trianon treaty in his report declared: „There was another option: to keep the Habsburg Monarchy in existence.“ (Naturally this would have involved granting autonomy to the nationalities and the provision of the same status to the Bohemian and Croatian areas that Hungary already had.) ... „the preservation of a centuries-old framework would have lessened the bases of antagonism in Central Europe.“ It did not take long for it to become clear: the Peace Treaty of 1920 increased the bases of antagonism in Central Europe, seriously contributed to the spread of fascism in Germany and consequently to the outbreak of the Second World War with the death of ten million people. This resulted in Europe, together with the victorious powers, forfeiting its leading role in the world.

The Gyulafehérvár Convention promised universal suffrage land reform and freedom of the press and of assembly.

„Full national autonomy ... each ethnic group organises its administration using its own language and with individuals from within its ranks ... wins representative rights on the law making bodies, in the government of the country proportionately to the numbers comprising the ethnic group.“ Similar

stipulations were written, as obligatory conditions, in point 12, Protection of Minorities, of the Paris Peace Conference. However none of this found its way into the Rumanian Constitution.

The people of the country were not consulted. Referenda concerning the new boundaries were held in only very few places. The statement is often found in Rumanian historiography that the majority of the population of Transylvania desired union with Rumania (e.g., Pascu, in the English translation of his History of Transylvania, New York, 1990, 287-288: „over 80%“). This is misleading: Lansing, USA Secretary of State, has also thrown doubt on the legal validity of the decisions of the Gyulafehérvár Convention since these were made by only a small group of the population. USA representative Andrew, in a confidential report considered the demand of the Rumanian government for the annexation of Transylvania to be baseless since „while the proportion of Rumanians in the population of Transylvania comprises 60-65% only one third or at most half of them desire union with Rumania.“ Therefore if we accept the data of Andrew and consider half the Rumanians pro-union then 30% of the total population were anti-union. If we then add to this the Hungarians, comprising 32% of the population, we find that 62% of the population was against the union with Rumania. However the acceptance of the union by the Germans was made partly under duress, in the hope (and under the condition!) that the promises made by the Gyulafehérvár Convention would be kept. „They would never have done that [declared their intentions for acceptance of the union] but for the best of hopes leading them.“ „The decisions of Gyulafehérvár form the basis of our politics. We know that the genesis, existence and future of the state is bound to us inseparably. Sometimes we have to watch impotently while our most obvious rights are trampled in the mud but we are convinced that they will become reality.“ In truth, at least two-thirds of the population of Transylvania did not want to belong to Rumania.

24. FROM THE TRIANON PEACE TREATY TO THE OUTBREAK OF THE SECOND WORD WAR

The first point of the constitution promulgated in 1923: „The Kingdom of Rumania is a unified and indivisible national state.“ [In 1920 30% of the population was non-Rumanian!] Point 3 prescribes: „No individuals of foreign ethnicity are allowed to be settled on the territory of Rumania.“ In 1924 the law of state primary education stated (5th point): „Primary education shall be uniform in the whole country.“ According to the 7th point: „In state schools the language of instruction at primary school level shall take place in Rumanian.“

Rumanian economy improved in the third decade of the 20th century: Aided by the introduction of new modern technology, industrial production increased by 56% between 1923 and 1928.

1929-1933 was the time of the Great Depression. By 1932, in Rumania the value of both large industrial and agricultural production shrank to less than half. The number of unemployed was put at several hundred thousand. The governments obtained foreign loans; the budget in 1932 was in deficit to the value of ten billion Lei. GDP between 1928 and 1932 decreased from 293 billion Lei to 171 billion Lei.

Strike movements began at the start of the 1930-s particularly in the oil industry and among the railway workers, the centre of which was the Grivita railway workshop in Bucarest. The strike of the miners of Lupény against the lowering of wages and dismissals was put down by armed intervention, causing 30 deaths.

Foreign policy of Rumania: Rumania, together with both Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia, both created by the peace treaties at Versailles, was one of the states of the Little Entente and this cooperation was extended and strengthened in 1930.

Internal policy: Rumania was a constitutional monarchy with a multi-party system, but because of its economic and social backwardness this did not fully function. In the second decade of the century the National Liberal Party was in government. The Transylvanians supported the national Party of Iuliu Maniu, which fused with the Peasant Party in 1926 thus forming the second largest party of the state, the National Peasant Party (*Partidul National-Taranesc*). Basing itself on the peasantry, it promised honourable government but on acceding to power (after 1928) it did not fulfil this promise. The Transylvanian Maniu showed some understanding towards the Hungarians but was not able to carry it through in the general chauvinistic atmosphere of the times. A Pro-fascist faction calling itself the „Rumanian Front“, has split from the Peasant Party. The strength of the fascist groups was shown by the formation of the „League of Christian National Defence“ under the leadership of A.C. Cuza and Corneliu Codreanu in 1935. Codreanu split from this in 1927 [?] and formed the „Legion of Archangel Michael“, which three years later, took on the new name of „Iron Guard“ (*Garda de Fier*). The principles of the „Iron Guard“, apart from its fascist ideology, included religious mysticism. At the elections of 1937 the „Iron Guard“ received 16% of the votes thereby becoming the third largest party of the land.

Economic life

The fate of the Hungarians living in the areas ceded to Rumania diverged completely from that of the Rumanians living in Hungary. The leader of economic life in Greater Rumania was the National Liberal Party the material interests of which were served, under the leadership of the National Bank, by a large number of firms and factories. Vintila Bratianu drafted the economic slogan of the party: „*Prin noi insime*“ (By ourselves), which on the one hand wanted to free the country from its dependence on foreign capital whilst on the other meant that the state plays an active role in the economic leadership of the country and uses its power to help the Rumanian element by preferential treatment to material benefits. According to one of his declarations: „We .. pursue the policy of placing both the economy and finance on a national basis.“

One of the consequences of this policy was that there was a wide divergence in the level of economic development between the different parts of the country.

In the Old Kingdom [Regat] there was need for land reform to eliminate class differences. However the land reforms carried out at the start of the 1920-s smote primarily the Hungarian peasantry of Transylvania. In the Regat the law allowed the expropriation of at most two million hectares of land. They did not provide for similar restrictions in Transylvania. To this day no data has been published concerning the ethnic composition of the landowners from whom the land was taken and that of the individuals to whom the land was given. Only in Northern Transylvania, after 1940 were the Hungarian administrators able to gather such data. In total, 288,609 landless peasants received land. Of these 78.1% were Rumanians while only 14.8% were Hungarian. At the same time 31.2% of the population were Hungarians and 58.7% Rumanian. Barely 27% of the Hungarian proletariat received land.

After 1867, the government returned with full title the communal estates known as the „Csíki Magánjavak” [Community Estates of County Csík] in perpetuity to the Székely nation. As we have seen after 1867 the government did not expropriate the Rumanian community owned or public estates of Naszód and Karánsebes. The Rumanian Land Law ordered the expropriation of public estates but made an exception with those of Naszód and Karánsebes. However they expropriated the „Community Estates of Csík”. The management of the Csík estates complained against this to the government and later to the League of Nations, which, in 1932, accepted the legality of the complaint and the illegality of the action of the Rumanian government. The procedures dragged on interminably until in 1936 the Rumanian government took this property away from the Székelys. This resulted in the descendants of the Székely frontier guards, nearly 100,000 individuals, losing 36,100 hectares of land. (The land was given, in the main, to Rumanian cooperatives, the Greek [Rumanian] Orthodox Church and to thousands of individuals. In the interests of greater profits they then cut down the trees). According to Bíró’s calculations, including the Csík estates, over 150,000 Hungarian landless peasants and dwarf- or small holders suffered grievous material loss or disadvantage as a result of the Rumanian land reform.

The Rumanian land reform has deprived the Hungarian Churches [from their property]. Land formed the primary financial basis of the Churches. The Rumanian state expropriated the bulk of their land (85%) comprising 149,000 acres. This did not concern the Orthodox Church, on the contrary, she had land allotted from the expropriated Hungarian lands.

In 1938 they set up a military frontier district in the north-west. Here, according to the law, land could be expropriated without restitution and since here the bulk of the population consisted of Hungarians it again smote the Hungarians. The expropriated areas were then settled with Rumanians. They asserted this openly as the policy of the state.¹

According to Jinga, on the basis of the above, 111 Rumanian settlements were established along the Hungarian-Rumanian border with 4,973 Rumanian families, each family on average receiving 13.9 acres land.

Hungarians were also subject to prejudicial discrimination as a result of the execution of the debt consolidation law of 1934.

The Hungarian peasant cheated by the unjust laws was also discriminated against despite the law, which the administration has acknowledged. But when the time arrived to rectify the unlawful expropriation of the land, the Rumanian peasants prevented the execution of these orders by force, assaulting and on occasion murdering those sent to discharge these duties! It even occurred (e.g., in the village of Haró) that the Minister of Justice accepted such use of force („the execution of the orders were rendered impossible due to technical causes” because an armed band of Rumanians assaulted the peasants who were sent to survey the land, murdering one of them.) The „Snow Meadow estate comprising 15,000 acres of the ős Marosszéki Vagyonközösség” [Ancestral Commons of Marosszék], was expropriated unlawfully from the 127 Székely

¹ Victor Jinga, „Migratinuile demografice si problema colonizarii in Romania” [A telepítések és a kolonizáció kérdése Romániában [the question of settlement and colonisation in Rumania], *Analele Academiei de Inalte Studii Comerciale si Industriale din Cluj*, I, (1939-1940); quoted by Bíró. 1989, 324

villages that owned it in common, by handing over its administration to the county council of Maros. The members of this council were largely appointed Rumanians who then used the profits to further Rumanian aims.

Citizens of non-Rumanian ethnic groups were discriminated against even during the collection of taxes. The Land of the Székelys became impoverished, e.g., in County Udvahely the number of cattle decreased by 23% in the decade (to 1935) and in County Háromszék by 30% at a time when Rumania ranked fifth in cattle production in the world. By this means they encouraged the increased migration of the Székelys to the Regat. The Rumanian notaries and teachers who formed the majority of the local councils forced the local peasants, despite their impoverishment, to build orthodox churches and state schools.

The Rumanians of Transylvania suffered discrimination at the hand of the powers of the Regat also. Differences existed in the economic and administrative traditions, the moral norms of public life and the ways of everyday life. They introduced the humiliating use of the cane, not previously used in Hungary. Large numbers of officials were transferred from the Regat, which, of course, was not favourable to the locals. The Greek Catholic [Uniate] Church with 1.4 million adherents (while the Orthodox church had 1.9 million adherents) was placed at a disadvantage in 1930 and its institutions were expropriated.

The Use of the Mother Tongue

The census of 1930 showed the population of Rumania comprised:

Hungarians	7.9%
Germans	4.1%
Jews	4%

At the same time the total population of Transylvania, 5,548,363 was distributed as follows:

Hungarians	24.4%
Germans	9.8%
Jews	3.2%

Already in 1921 they started to proscribe the use of the mother tongue in official communications. Notices appeared in offices: „Only Rumanian may be spoken here!“ There was no regulation of the use of minority languages in the Rumanian constitution promulgated in 1923. According to section 126: „the official language of the Rumanian state is Rumanian.“ Thereafter the use of the Hungarian language in offices became increasingly difficult and in 1938 was already considered to be a crime. The renewal of the law concerning the unification of administration in 1925 meant the rejection of the use of minority languages. Maniu and the Saxons protested against this, quoting the Hungarian law of minorities of 1868, but without result.

The Position of the Hungarian Churches

The Rumanian census of 1930 showed that there were:

Reformed (Calvinist)	710,706
Catholic	645,544
Unitarian	69,257
Hungarian Evangelical (Lutheran)	30,000

adherents. (See above, concerning the effects of land reform).

Since the Vatican hoped that the members of the Orthodox Church would convert to the Roman Catholic denomination it signed a concordat with the Rumanian government thereby accepting its desire that the Catholic dioceses in Transylvania along the Rumanian-Hungarian border be placed under the jurisdiction of the Roman Catholic bishop [archbishop?] of Bucarest. The Greek Catholic and Roman Catholic bishops formed a national conference in which the Rumanians were in the majority thereby the assets of the Catholic Church came under Rumanian control. In Hungarian times, prior to 1918, the Orthodox Church was independent.

The language of teaching in state schools was exclusively Rumanian while in denominational schools it was bilingual. Its stated purpose was the assimilation of the ethnic groups. (The laws of Angheliescu of 1924-5 forced 75% of Hungarian children into Rumanian language schools etc.) Even Nicolae Iorga protested in parliament against some particularly unjust regulations! A Rumanian secondary school teacher declared his attitude on the pages of the *Adevarul* against these draft laws stating: „they contain regulations previously unknown in Transylvanian schools even during olden [Hungarian] times”.. „the use of some regulations .. results in the spiritual torture of children belonging to national minorities”. In 1920 there were 1,184 Hungarian denominational schools in Rumania. By 1940 they closed 600 of them.

In the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy there was wide-ranging local (town and county) government; this meant that the local population participated in the management of the towns and counties. The Rumanian government abolished this in its first year of office. The Rumanians of Transylvania, naturally felt its lack and several Rumanian newspapers regularly demanded the restoration of local government. The *Lupta* in 1923 drew attention to the difficulties caused by the centralisation of administration to Bucarest. Even the pettiest request had to be sent to the capital for action. From the Hungarian standpoint an added difficulty was that Hungarian towns and cities with Hungarian majorities were governed by appointed (interimar = provisional) councils, in which there were very few Hungarians.

25. SECOND WORLD WAR

During the second half of the thirties the power of Germany extended over the larger part of Middle and Eastern Europe. Consequently Rumania moved from its heretofore francophile and anglophile orientation and sought the friendship of Germany. The Hungarian government sought a resolution for improving the position of the Hungarians of Transylvania and even the initiation of military action against Rumania was discussed. Finally however a German-Italian tribunal was set up to arbitrate on the Hungarian demands resulting in Northern Transylvania being returned to Hungary. (2nd Vienna Award 31st August 1940) According to the census of 1941, this region comprising 43,492 square kilometres had a population of 2,460,000 of which 52.1% was Hungarian, 41.5% was Rumanian and 1.8% Saxon. About half a million Hungarians remained in Rumania.

Numerous anti-Rumanian abuses occurred during the military administration of Northern Transylvania, often contrary to the policies of the Hungarian government. (e.g., the expulsion of Rumanian intellectuals whom Teleki [Hungarian prime minister] wanted to invite as parliamentary representatives of

the region). Shots were fired from hiding at the Hungarian army marching into the region in the villages of Ippen and Ördöggút, which the military avenged severely with, according to Rumanian data, 157 fatalities. Every army avenges itself severely if fired upon from hiding as e.g., occurred in the case of the Rumanian army: the presidium of the Rumanian ministerial council issued a memo dated 2nd July 1940 in which it states that if the Rumanian and German soldiers come under fire „we will execute 50 Jews-communists for the killing of every German or Rumanian soldier ” ; 500 Jews were indeed executed for this reason in June 1941.

Unfortunately lots of people came to Northern Transylvania from Hungary as defined by the Treaty of Trianon, who have not been sufficiently aware of the local situation. Their condescending and humiliating treatment of the locals - including the local Hungarians - caused huge damage. This applied particularly to the bureaucrats of the military administration whom the populace dubbed „parachutists” (ejtő-ernyősök). They did not contribute in any way to a spiritual re-approachment and empathy between Hungarians living in the two parts of the country [Hungary as defined by Trianon and Northern Transylvania]. Unjust imprisonment and internment are included on their list of sins. (On the other hand e.g., pensioners received their payments starting from September, much to their own surprise.)²

At the same time, the Hungarian civil administration sought reconciliation with the Rumanians and expressed it even in statute form. Thus, a statute enacted in April 1941 states: „Anyone found guilty of using humiliating words against any nationality living within the boundaries of the state may be punished by imprisonment for six months”. The Erdélyi Magyar Párt [Hungarian Party of Transylvania] particularly encouraged reconciliation with Rumanians (as well as withdrawal from the war.)

After the Second Vienna Award, Hungarian Prime Minister Pál Teleki warned Hungarians „against viewing the nationalities returned to the bosom of the country through spectacles of the past”.

It is of interest that in the schools of Northern Transylvania, *during the time of Hungarian administration, Rumanian was a compulsory subject!* Rumanian was considered in the same light as any other subject; even more, parents of children living in Northern Transylvania requested that the number of hours devoted to Rumanian be raised - either personally or through the principals of their schools - and that extra tuition be provided for children having difficulty with this subject.

In Southern Transylvania [under Rumanian administration] Hungarians by the hundreds were imprisoned under conditions reminiscent of medieval times. Use of Hungarian was proscribed in public offices and on the telephone. Religious programmes were forbidden. A Central Rumanising Bureau was in existence, which sacked a large number of Hungarian postal, railways etc., employees and prevented their re-employment in the region. Hungarian men were called up for military service *en masse* in the autumn of 1942. They were then herded together with convicts to the front or into labour camps where they were starved. The Hungarian peasantry of Southern Transylvania were afflicted by requisitions of grain and land. According to the minutes of the Hungarian Ministerial Council dated 7th January 1943, since 30th August 1940, 150,000

² Translator’s Note: Due to their refusal to be drafted into the Hungarian army, members of some religious sects were imprisoned. This law applied to all citizens of the truncated Hungary and was also extended together with the rest of the criminal code to Northern Transylvania.

Hungarians were harassed into leaving Southern Transylvania. The Történelmi Atlasz (Historical Atlas) provides data in more detail. According to this, 200,000 Hungarians translocated from Southern to Northern Transylvania in 1940 whence 80,000 Hungarians left for pre-Vienna Award Hungary. Between 1945 and 1952, after the Boundaries set by the treaty of Trianon were reinstated, a further 200,000 Hungarians resettled in Hungary, as defined by the Treaty of Paris of 1947, the majority between 1945 and 1947. To these must be added the masses of Hungarians who left the country as dependents of non-Hungarian minorities including even Rumanians. There is no data extant of the number of Hungarians who left Rumania under Ceausescu, (*en masse* after about 1975) but it can be estimated at between 32,000 and 35,000 families or between 80,000 and 85,000 individuals at least.

Concerning the four years of Hungarian administration of Northern Transylvania, a huge quantity of fraudulent data has been disseminated in the press, television and in books as propaganda already during the reign of Ceausescu and since. For the sake of completeness, we summarise the report of the German-Italian Joint Commission from the beginning of 1943. The commission heard the complaints of the Rumanian and the Hungarian, population of the whole of Transylvania. Dánile Csátári published its summary in the book entitled *Forgószélben*. The more important complaints of the Rumanians of Northern Transylvania were:

- Representatives to guard their rights are missing;
- Sacking of officials and other employees;
- [...] discrimination in the position of conscripts;
- Detrimental discrimination in the economy and in the allocation of provisions, expropriation of capital and the hindrance of the work of intellectuals;
- Unjust tax system;
- Expropriations based on Executive Order M.E. 1440/1941.

The commission recommended that the Hungarian government raise the number of Rumanian schools to make it correspond to the number of the Rumanian population and thought it necessary that the two governments hold talks in order to resolve outstanding problems.

In Southern Transylvania they were:

- Political pressure on the Hungarians; discrimination in the position of conscripts;
- .. persecution of Hungarians by a whole series of requisitions and other reasons;
- Bodily abuse;
- Rendering of their cultural position impossible;
- Mass emigration.

Pacurariu mentions that the population was afraid to tell the committee the whole truth, however this applied equally to Northern (Hungarian) Transylvania and Southern (Rumanian) Transylvania.

Knowing the facts we add, for the sake of completeness, the following to the report of the committee on the state of the Rumanians in Northern Transylvania:

1.The lawyer Imre Mikó, secretary to CASBI (the foundation responsible for the preservation of abandoned Rumanian property in Northern Transylvania) made sure, often personally, that the houses of Rumanians who left for Southern Transylvania were locked and preserved in good condition; He did this more conscientiously than any Rumanian state employee!

2.In the repair shops of the Máv (Hungarian State Railways) at Kolozsvár for example, every Rumanian who stayed was kept in his job in spite of the works having been declared a „war factory” and the workers were required to work there as mobilized personnel.

3.Between 1940 and 1944 had two state Grammar Schools, in which the language of instruction was exclusively Rumanian, operating: the Gheorghe Baritiu Grammar School (principal, the late Dr. János Józsa) and the C. Anghelescu Grammar School; in Naszód, until 1943, the old Grammar School of the Rumanian Border Guards (principal, the late Dr. Endre Pálffy).

According to the conclusion of the unbiased foreign commission therefore between 1940 and 1944 the position of the Hungarians was considerably worse in Southern Transylvania than that of the Rumanians under Hungarian rule .

The Jewish population of Northern Transylvania lived unmolested until March 1944; in that month the German army occupied Hungary and it was only after this, in May, that the deportations commenced. Several Hungarian politicians as well as the Catholic bishop, Áron Márton, protested publicly against this action.

Rumania enters the War

In June 1941, in Munich, Antonescu made an agreement with the Germans concerning the entry into the war by Rumania: („Soldati romani! Treceti linia Prutului!”), which they did not even demand at that time! While the German army was victorious in the war the Rumanian state poured a huge effort into the fight against the Soviet Union. They captured Northern Bukovina, Bessarabia and Transnistria where, on the orders of Antonescu, they murdered several thousand Jews, without German help (see below). In 1942, 26 Rumanian divisions fought on the Eastern Front of which 16 perished in the battles around Stalingrad and the larger part of a further six divisions perished in the Caucasus.

„The part taken by the Rumanian army in the operations on the territory of the Soviet Union - which was decided on by Marshal Antonescu alone - caused great suffering to the country”.

The Extermination of the Jews ordered by Marshal Antonescu and the Rumanian Authorities (based on a *Martiriul evreilor din Romania*, 1991).

The first pogrom occurred on 1st July 1940 in the town of Dorohoi where the soldiers of the 3rd Frontier Regiment guided by local Rumanian civilians and police shot 52 local Jews . After the legionaries came to power they robbed, harassed and murdered thousands of Jews and wrecked their homes, schools and cemeteries.

The Pogrom of Jászváros: On 29th June 1941 the police prefect of Iasi reported to the central police office and the county prefect reported to the minister of the interior that shots had been fired during the night from private dwellings, at German and Rumanian forces in transit through the town and at some buildings.

On the same night German and Rumanian soldiers killed several Jews in retaliation. The murders committed on the streets were „greatly aided by local Rumanians as well, who were convinced that communists and Jews shot [at the soldiers] and revealed their hiding places” (from the statement of the police prefect of Iasi, V. Leahu).

According to a report appearing in the Universul of 2nd July 1941: „500 Jewish communists, who shot at German and Rumanian soldiers from private dwellings, were executed in Iasi”.

The conclusion of the investigation ordered by the Ministry of the Interior: The Rumanian forces did not suffer a single casualty, dead or wounded. According to Hoffman, the German commander „there were about 20 German dead and wounded”, however he did not permit the verification of this. The authors of the report surmised on this basis that the shots fired by legionaries were blank rounds by way of provocation (police prefect Leoveanu).

Marshal Antonescu, on 8th July 1941 made a speech to the Ministerial Council from which we quote: „I suggest that the Jews of Bessarabia and Bukovina as a whole should be forced to emigrate; they should be thrown over the border. Similarly I suggest that we should force the Ukrainians out since there is no place for them here.” „I don't care if history records us as barbarians. The Roman Empire committed a whole series of atrocities yet was regarded as the greatest political entity.” „There is no more favourable time in our history.” „If necessary shoot them down with machine-guns.”

Transnistria

From one of many official records: „Today, 9th August 1941, I, Sub- Lieutenant Heinrich Frölich .. on duty in the Cetatea Alba region went to the village of Tatareati to a camp containing 451 Jews under the command of Gendarme Captain Ioan Gh. Vetu and transmitted to him the orders of marshal Antonescu to execute them immediately.

I, Captain Ioan Vetu, whose signature appears below, received the abovementioned orders. I referred these orders to the commander of the Legionaries who ordered me to carry them out and prepare a report confirming that.

I prepared this report as part of these orders.

Signed: Untersturmführer (Sub-Lieutenant) Frölich, Captain Ioan Gh Vetu.”

The American diplomat Gunther Mott Franklin, in a letter from the Embassy of the USA dated 19th August 1941 also noted that Antonescu gave the first orders for the persecution of Jews. „...the fact is that he gave the first orders for these [these refer to the bloody actions against the Jews]”. While it is not manifest in the Rumanian translation of the English-language letter appearing in Martiriul, it is quite clear in the original English-language letter published in the same place that the American diplomat is not writing about the government of Antonescu but about the person of Ion Antonescu himself: „General Antonescu”. We quote

further from this letter: „They say here that the Hungarian newspapers are planning a publicity campaign against Rumania in this matter. At least that will lead to the conditions becoming noticed by the West since there are no American reporters in Rumania”.

Report of a German SS Hauptsturmführer [First Lieutenant]: „As Director-General [Generaldirector] Lecca informed me, they plan to bring 110,000 Jews from Bukovina and Bessarabia into the two forests in the region of the Bug River. According to his information the action is the result of the orders of Marshal Antonescu and the aim is the liquidation of these Jews. Bucharest 17th October 1941, illegible signature, SS Hauptsturmführer.” (Director-General Lecca was the government official entrusted with matters pertaining the Jews).

Lecca's papers contain among others the following notes concerning Jews:

„In Odessa, burnt alive in the barracks: 10,000; in Odessa hanged by way of retaliation after the robbery of the house of the German commander of Odessa: 25,000.”

The number of Jews shot, hanged or burnt in the abovementioned territory in total: 333,600.

Rumanian losses as a result of the hostilities and deportation to Russian camps were huge. Several hundred thousand persons, primarily from Bessarabia, were deported to the Soviet Union and the majority of these perished there. Cristescu provides the following data: „Rumania lost 1,100,000 men - soldiers and civilians - of whom 794,562 were front-line soldiers: 92,620 dead, 333,966 wounded and 367,976 missing.” In fact the losses were greater by at least about half-a million. The fate of about 400,000 men, the majority of whom were probably civilians, deported to Soviet camps is not known. Most probably the rest of the data mentioned above needs correction based on further research. The Rumanian Association of the Victims of Stalinist Oppression provided the following data: In June 1940, after the Soviet Union occupied Bessaraba, the northern part of Bukovina and the Herta region, „they murdered 4,300 civilians and disarmed and handed over to the Soviet authorities 32,000 Rumanian officers and other ranks.” „In June 1941 they transported over 300,000 Rumanians and other nationalities to the Soviet Gulags.” „The conditions were inhumane, 70-100 men were herded into a cattle-truck, without food or water. The old and the sick died on the way and at the stations the dead were thrown out, to be buried in mass-graves or simply left on the bare ground.” „During 1944-1945 they organised a second wave of deportations during which they transported a further 250,000 to camps. Between 1950 and 1964 a further 300,000 persons were translocated and in 1965 380,000 Rumanians were forced to leave Bessarabia, their place being taken by Slav colonists”.

26. RUMANIA LEAVES THE WAR

On the 23rd August 1944 the young king Michael arrested Marshal Antonescu and his whole government. A new government was formed under the leadership of General Sanatescu in which all the historical parties were represented. At this time the Rumanian Communist Party had only 1150 members, of whom, however over half were underground operatives. The army ceased all resistance against the Russians and turned against the German army. On 12th September they signed a Ceasefire Agreement in Moscow according to which the Rumanian army is required to take part in the hostilities against the Germans (with

about 15 divisions, their losses being estimated at 179,000). They promised Northern Transylvania „or the larger part thereof“ to the Rumanians.

27. VOLUNTEERS FOR TRANSYLVANIA

Already on 23rd August the Chief of Staff ordered the immediate mobilization of the battalions stationed at the regional centres of Transylvania (*batalioanele fixe regionale pentru Transilvania*). At the same time their commanders ordered the organization of operative units equipped with rifles, heavy armaments and artillery.

On 30th August the Rumanian army together with the Soviet army set out towards Northern Transylvania. At the same time the media conducted the wildest propaganda about the „Hungarian blood-letting“. All the dailies have regularly reported the most fantastic numbers of Rumanians killed by the Hungarians between 1940 and 1944 and their lies had been extended to reporting that Hungarian civilians, moving with the front-line, murdered dozens of the peaceful Rumanian population and the soldiers entering the territory. Thus they debited the death of soldiers killed on the front to the account of the Hungarian civilian population! The Peasants' Party took a leading part in this propaganda: One of its leaders, Mihai Popovici, at a public meeting in Bassó declared: „They dismissed Rumanians from their jobs, killed women and children and turned the utter baseness of their souls against the Rumanians who were defenceless. *Today we settle our account with them.*“ (Author's emphasis)

On 12th September over 50,000 volunteers started from Bucharest for Transylvania. Before leaving, they held festivities in the capital in which the leaders of the Peasants' Party, Iuliu Maniu, Corneliu Coposu etc., took part. All this was detailed in the newspapers, which have also made public that the forces were going to Transylvania as dealers of death: „The Volunteer cohorts of death are going to go through the villages of Transylvania meting out punishment, healing wounds and fighting against the partisans“.

Stefan Pascu, who after the death of Constantin Daicoviciu (1973) became the first („official“) historian of Rumania, was the commander of a volunteer unit in Szeben in 1944. In 8th September 1944 issue of the daily Romania Noua (Nagyszeben) carried the following advertisement titled „Volunteers for Transylvania“: „Volunteers to the Jósikafalva-Nagyszeben unit must report to Dr. Stefan Pascu, at 20 Egyetem street daily between the hours 8-12 and 4-7. Mr. Stefan Pascu is the only officially recognised commander of the Volunteers of Szeben and no one else is allowed to occupy this post“. Pascu has also collected money for the volunteers, for the party of Maniu and for the Maniu guards.

In the 20th September 1944 issue of the daily, Desrobirea, published in Sepsiszentgyörgy, the commander of the volunteer Maniu Guards unit, Gavril Olteanu published a proclamation in which he incites the readers against Hungarians; he also disclosed that the volunteer forces collaborate with the army and the authorities and that Maniu was the instigator of the volunteer forces movement. Members of the Guards have herded the bulk of the civilian population, arraigned them before summary military courts where the commander pronounced sentence, which was carried out by his subordinates.

From the recollections of an inhabitant of Szárazajta:

„The picture remains with me to this day how the son of Albert Szép came with his mother and father in the body of the cart. The boy may have been 15-16 years old. The cart was drawn by two small cows and his dead mother and father were in it. He came towards us, wiping his nose and tears streaming down his face.. He was taking his parents for burial, because the it was decreed that, without tolling the bell, the priest was not even at home, they must be cleared from the face of the earth”.

The innocent population of countless Hungarian villages were the subject of similar barbarities; thousands of Hungarians were murdered.

In addition to the murders several thousand Hungarians were transported to internment camps where the prisoners died in their hundreds under inhumane conditions. The worst conditions were at the internment camp located at Földvár (north of Brassó); Tg.Jiu, Focsani, Belényes, Temesvár Kishalmágy and Lugos were the locations of other internment camps. The Rumanian authorities handed a large number of Hungarian men over to the Soviet army on the grounds that they were „partisans”. Most of these ended up in soviet death-camps. According to the minutes of the Hungarian Folk Association, in the autumn of 1944 they arrested 40,000 Hungarian men in Transylvania most of whom perished during their deportation or internment. However This number was in fact considerably higher; those preparing the minutes were unable to obtain information of every atrocity.

On 12th November the Soviet military command has ordered the Rumanian military administration to leave Northern Transylvania. In the expulsion order mention was also made of the bloodletting some units of the (Maniu)- Guards, but the main reason was that the administration and the volunteer forces have entered Transylvania without the permission of the Soviet authorities. The Ceasefire Agreement has prescribed a Rumanian civilian administration.

On 16th November the Rumanian government disbanded the Maniu Guards. Maniu made the decision public at a public meeting in Bucharest declaring in his speech „his thanks” to these military units which „fulfilled their patriotic duty”. The pillaging activity of the „Volunteers for Transylvania” was a revenge on the unprotected Hungarian civilian populace for „the disannexation of Northern Transylvania lasting four years.”

28. AUTONOMOUS NORTHERN TRANSYLVANIA

Between 14th November 1944 and 13th March 1945 a system of autonomy developed in Northern Transylvania, which secured equality for the Rumanian and Hungarian population in the exercise of political power. The Advisory Council of Northern Transylvania functioned as a coalition government in this system. In this the Democratic Association of Rumanians of Transylvania was represented by 12 members, the Communists, the Social Democrats, the Hungarian Folk Association and the unions by six members each, the Plowman’s Front (Ekésfront =Frontul Plugarilor) by four members while the Patriotic Association, The Jewish Democratic Folk Association and the Folk-Protection Union by two members each.

Ágoston Bernád, a member of the Legal Committee formulated the aims as follows:

Securing the administrative self-government of the region;

Enforcing the numerical relationship of the nationalities and

The free use of the Rumanian, Hungarian and German languages as languages of the state.

29. THE ACCESSION OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY TO POWER.

Stalin authorised the introduction of Rumanian administration in Northern Transylvania effective from 9th March 1945 subject to the condition that the king accepts a leftist government. This government was headed by Petru Groza, a lawyer from Déva, who was considered pro-Hungarian. He promised all rights to the ethnic minorities even the „vaporisation of the boundaries”

The *Hungarian University* was started at Kolozsvár though the medical faculty was set up at Marosvásárhely. At this time relative freedom prevailed to such an extent that the Hungarian papers were permitted to write about the grievances of the Hungarians even of the bloodletting of the members of the Maniu Guards.

The Soviet Union treated Rumania as a conquered country. They disbanded large military contingents, including ten infantry divisions because Marshall Malinovski „considered the Rumanian army unreliable”. (According to the declaration of General Gheorghe Mihail on 15th October 1944; quoted by Cristescu.) In the spring of 1945 they disarmed the officers and soldiers guarding military and other public buildings in Bucharest.

At this time land reform was initiated; all land holdings exceeding 50 Hectares, in all 1,468,000 Hectares, were expropriated. Since Germans were held to be an ethnic group collectively and *as a whole*, criminally responsible for starting the war, all their land was expropriated.

The Communist Party, of which Gheorghe Gheorghiu-Dej became the secretary in October 1945 increased its influence progressively on the affairs of the nation. At the „grossly fraudulent” elections of 16th November the FND (*Frontul National-Democrat* = National Democratic Front) received 68.12% of the votes while the Peasant Party of Maniu, 12.62%. The *Hungarian Popular Union* was allowed to send 29 representatives to the parliament.

The **peace treaty** was signed on 10th February 1947 in Paris. The re-annexation of the whole of Northern Transylvania to Rumania was the will of Stalin since it was to his advantage. He wanted to compensate Rumania for the loss of Bessarabia and thereby ease the introduction of communism into the country. Though the western powers considered the revision of the state boundaries to more nearly correspond to the ethnic boundaries they were not prepared to counter the will of Stalin.

The *Hungarian Popular Union* (Magyar Népi Szövetség MNSz) with 400,000 members was one of the main pillars of the Groza-government. Initially at least, there were probably many who indeed believed that socialism (communism) will provide a solution to the Hungarian-Rumanian antagonism. The leadership was chosen not from among men of backbone and principles such as Gyárfás Kurkó and Imre Mikó but from among opportunist elements. Gyárfás Kurkó was a tradesman from Brassó, who, though he considered himself to be a communist, remained true to the Catholic Church to such an extent that he accepted the position of principal curator of the Parish of Brassó. He convened the national economic conference of the

MNSz in Brassó for 10th May 1946 with the aim of rebuilding the disrupted and ravished Hungarian economy of Transylvania. Here he proclaimed: „What makes a people great is its moral purity, political self-esteem and economic strength”.

In May 1946 „the chief war criminals” with Mihai Antonescu at their head were sentenced to death and they were executed on 1st June 1946. In 1947 the Peasant Party was disbanded and its leader, Iuliu Maniu was imprisoned. At the end of that year King Michael was forced to abdicate and allowed to leave the country. The Communist Party achieved total power in Rumania and they proclaimed the Rumanian Peopleú Republic (*Republica Populara Romana*)

After all the same occurred in all the nations within the Soviet Block though initially these took place at a greater rate in Rumania: The Social Democratic Party was merged with the Communist Party; the new parliament, the greater national assembly adopted the new soviet-type constitution (including the obligatory formal guarantee of minority rights); nationalisation of banks and factories (later many private dwellings were nationalised as well); establishment of the national planning bureau; educational reform: nationalisation of schools, disbandment of church schools and the atrophying of minority education; the „unification” of the Greek Uniate (Catholic) Church and the Greek (Rumanian) Orthodox (in reality the liquidation of the former); establishment of huge industrial centres, which were financed to a large degree from the wealth expropriated from the peasants (and were not justified on economic grounds); ideological brain-washing aimed principally at the youth. The state security authority (*Securitate*) was established.

Áron Márton, the catholic bishop protested to the Groza-government against the atrophying of the Hungarian school system in Transylvania. He was condemned to jail for this as „the chief representative of clerical reaction in our country”. Inside the communist party the minister for justice, Lucretiu Patrascanu was dismissed his office (he was murdered in 1954 on orders from Gheorghiu-Dej). In 1952 they dismissed the party and jailed Ana Pauker and Vasile Luka (László Luka) thereby freeing themselves from the Muscovite faction. Gyárfás Kurkó, as a result of the torture became insane already prior to his conviction. He was released in 1965 but died shortly thereafter.

The collectivisation of agriculture („socialist transformation”) started at the beginning of the 1950’s with agitation against the kulaks. In principle, kulaks were those who owned 25 acres or more of land and who employed wages labourers to work it. In practice the local activists determined who was a kulak arbitrarily.

We quote from a recollection: „We were good husbandmen - that was our crime.” „At home they announced class warfare.” „Work-shirkers travelled to the villages, they were the new leading cadres.”

These work-shirkers, (in the guise of „activists”) took over the leadership of the villages. They informed the ones they put on the list of kulaks that they were outside the law. They used the most varied methods for their persecution and intimidation. The „kulak-tax” was higher than the normal tax rate; the delivery obligation was set similarly, often at an impossible level. Members of the special police generally came at night and took the head of the household away for questioning, which more often than not, consisted of beatings and torture. Many had to perform forced labour, others were jailed and from there many did not

return. According to Cristescu in the first period of collectivisation 80,000 peasants were jailed. The families of the „kulaks“ were often expelled from their homes. They used this method to achieve collectivisation against which the bulk of the peasants (not only the „kulaks“) protested.

„Citizens rights laid down in the constitution did not prevent the communists from organising the most frightful oppression of which later 500,000 persons became victims.“

„Terror directed at opposition from any quarter led to the setting up of a few work settlements, which developed into concentration and extermination camps in practice, e.g., the Danube - Black Sea Canal (where tens of thousands of detainees were kept) as well as the experiments at forced re-education at Piteati.“

Naturally, collectivisation smote the peasantry of the whole of Eastern Europe. Here we must remind ourselves that at the start of the 1930's, in order to force them into kolkhozes, Stalin deported masses of Ukrainian peasants to the northern parts of the soviet Union where, in the cold and due to starvation most died; In the Ukraine he deliberately caused starvation. After the demise of the Soviet Union historians have determined that the number of peasants murdered in this manner was between 9 and 11 million.

Every citizen of Rumania suffered as a result of Soviet tyranny. They attacked the traditions and culture of the Rumanian nation as well.

„Acceptance of Soviet text-books meant the repudiation of Rumanian national treasures and cultural traditions e.g., the writing of the History of the Rumanian Peoples' Republic edited by M. Roller, which was completely falsified with Slavonic and Soviet elements.“ - „The old structure of Rumanian intellectual life was annihilated and many scientific disciplines, particularly sociology, economics and statistics but philosophy and historiography as well, which at other times bloomed richly, were simplified to become the adherents of politics and ideology.“

In the spring of 1955 Rumania signed the Warsaw Pact with the Soviet Union and the other Eastern block countries. It became a member of UNESCO in June 1956.

After the death of Stalin in March 1953, huge changes started in the Eastern Block countries. The Political atmosphere eased in Rumania also though no serious changes occurred in the leadership of the state.

30. THE HUNGARIAN ANTI-COMMUNIST REVOLUTION OF 23RD OCTOBER 1956

The whole nation was transfixed by the events of the Hungarian anti-communist revolution of 23rd October 1956. Rumanian students demonstrated their solidarity with the Hungarian revolutionaries. As a result several hundred students of the technical university of Temesvár were called in for questioning and over fifty were convicted; The students of the University of Bucharest „agreed to meet in front of the statue of Vitéz Mihály (Michael the Brave) wearing black armbands as a sign of mourning.“ The writer Paul Gorma was detained for the first time because of his solidarity with the Hungarians. From his recollections: The events in Hungary were openly discussed on the streets, in shops and on the trams. ... Questions such as the following were heard with increasing frequency: „And what about us? Are we not in a similar situation to the Hungarians?“ Hungarian students of the Bólyai University of Kolozsvár and the Medical Faculty of Marosvásárhely demonstrated also.

After the crushing of the Hungarian Revolution, the Rumanian state initiated a Hungarian persecution lasting years. Their extent must raise the possibility that the aim was the annihilation of Hungarian intellectual life. The first wave concerned about 10,000 persons on the pretext of „their sympathy with the Hungarian Revolution”, their activities during the critical days or expression of opinion. The leading members of Hungarian intellectual life in Transylvania, university professors, writers, artists, actors and journalists were sentenced to many years in jail or to forced labour on the Danube - Black Sea Canal; many died there under the inhumane conditions prevailing.

Árpád Kosztin, in his book, published in 1998, makes the data known in detail with names. There is room only for a few examples here:

- In Temesvár, in 1958, nine Hungarians and one Rumanian were charged with „conspiracy against the state”, found guilty and executed.
- On 15th March 1957 the EMISz (Erdélyi Magyar Ifjak Szövetsége = Society of Hungarian Youth of Transylvania) placed a wreath at the stone of remembrance of the 1848 freedom fight at Fehéregyháza. 5 chief defendants were sentenced to 25 years in jail, 22 defendants to 20 years, 14 persons to 18 years with hard labour and 40 persons to 5-15 years jail.
- Fully half of the Unitarian ministers of forestland and Homorod valley, together with their families were found guilty of „conspiracy and supporting enemy elements and sentenced to several years jail.”

Naturally there were some among the Rumanians who were prepared to voice their opinions in public. Ioan Popa, an employee of the enterprise at Balanta declared publicly that he agreed with the aims of the Hungarian Revolution and Freedom Fight. For this he was jailed for several years. After he was freed he continued to declare the necessity of Hungarian-Rumanian-German friendship. Finally .. he disappeared without trace. Forever!”

According to Ferenc Bartis, the number of „Hungarians from Rumania and Transylvania detained and found guilty, jailed and executed” was around 37,000.

The Hungarian University of Kolozsvár was closed in 1959.

We can only mention in passing that the members of the Jewish community in Rumania, a large number of whom had already emigrated previously, from this time on left the country *en masse* so that at present their number is considerably below 10,000.

A large number of the Saxons and Swabians (Germans) of the Bánát had already been expelled or sent to the death camp of the Soviet Union. Their emigration *en masse* to Germany started after about 1965. Ceausescu gave his „permission” in return for huge sums of money from the German government. (As they left they sang „Siebenbürgen, süße Heimat” = Transylvania, sweet Home. Their ancestors had lived in Transylvania for the previous 700 years.) **Transylvania was smote with catastrophic losses in every department - economic, social and cultural aspect of life as a result of the emigration of the Saxons.** In 1990 there were some politicians who wanted to ask the Saxons to return but in practice nothing came of it.

31. CEAUSESCU ERA (1965-1989)

During the Ceausescu era (1965-1989) the whole population of Rumania lived under an increasing level of trials, privation and a cruel tyranny. In addition the lives of the minorities were embittered by a constantly strengthening chauvinist pressure. Rumanians from the Regat settled in increasing numbers in the towns of Transylvania with a hitherto Hungarian majority population. Ordinances against Hungarian schools forced an increasing number of Hungarian students into Rumanian schools. Censorship was active and in the later years the names of all towns and villages, even in Hungarian texts, in books and newspapers were required to be printed in Rumanian only. The list could be continued much further. Many Hungarians left the country, particularly in the years after 1975.

32. THE FALL OF CEAUSESCU

The fall of Ceausescu in December 1989 meant relief from an inhumane regime. After 22nd December declaration *on the part of Rumanian politicians stressed the need for friendship with ethnic minorities and true equality of rights for all citizens*. Doubtless this was the belief of the majority of the Rumanian people and in particular of the Rumanians of Transylvania. The leadership in Bucharest, however, had another agenda. As has happened so often before in history incitement against ethnic minorities - primarily against the Hungarians - was directed from above. The Hungarians of Marosvásárhely were attacked on 21st March 1990 by Rumanian peasants plied with drink and misled by clumsy lies. It is clear by now that they attacked with the knowledge of Iliescu, the president at the time. Responsibility rests with the new holders of power.

Falsification of history continues. In describing the fall of Ceausescu the official historiography *leaves out* the reasons triggering the revolt without which Ceausescu would not have fallen. Thus for example from a textbook published in 1995 (and reprinted in 1997); the following facts are missing:

- On 24th June 1989, László Tökés spelled out on Hungarian television that the Hungarians of Transylvania are exposed to forcible Rumanisation and are in danger of cultural annihilation. Consequently the Securitate watches and harasses him constantly. However foreign countries begin to take notice.

- **Temesvár, 12th September:** Ernő Ujvárosi, one of the leading lights of the Reformed Church of Temesvár is murdered; thereby a death threat is indirectly issued to Tökés.

- **15th December:** The Securitate prepares to remove Tökés forcibly from his home. His congregation masses around the building. During the evening Rumanians join the crowd belonging to the Reformed Church. The first cries of *Down with Ceausescu! Freedom! Democracy!* are heard.

- **17th December:** In the early morning the Securitate removes László Tökés and his family from their home. New demonstrations with even bigger crowds erupt. The army is called out. Volleys of shots ring out all afternoon and late into the night resulting in several hundred dead and wounded.

- **20th December:** Martial law is declared but the workers from several factories of Temesvár, under flags stripped of the communist emblem, march onto the streets. Disobeying orders, the army transfers its loyalty.

▪ **Bucharest, 22nd December:** The crowd, called to a meeting by Ceasescu, instead of applause greeted the conductor with cries of „**Timisoara! Timisoara!**”

This was how Ceasescu fell. In Rumania, with this - 23 years later - the political and economic system of the „existing socialism” showed the same elements of dissolution as they did in Hungary in 1956.

33. TOWARDS THE FUTURE, IN THE KNOWLEDGE OF THE PAST

Factual history

We have compiled our survey based on trustworthy sources. Due to its brevity we have not been able to paint a comprehensive picture. However the reader can readily check on the individual problems using the bibliography provided. We have presented the *falseness of the historiography determined by political considerations* that was official during communist times and that is still in power to the present time. This historiography falsifies basic facts such as the origins of the Rumanian people and its continuity north of the Danube (and in Transylvania) since the times of Roman Dacia. Starting from this premise, Hungarians are depicted as a „foreign, intruding and repressive element”.

We stress that this slant was not always all-pervasive in Rumania and is still not so today (see below!). The Rumanian people must sooner or later face the facts:

- The Daks were not their ancestors.
- The Rumanian language came about through a pastoral people living on the Balkan Peninsula for 600 years under Roman rule taking up the Latin language.
- The speakers of this language began to move into the area north of the Danube about 1100 A.D.
- Hungarians began to settle in Transylvania, primarily in the Transylvanian Basin and the river valleys around 900 A.D.
- Saint Steven (Steven I) founded the Kingdom of Hungary, of which Transylvania was an integral part, in 1000 A.D.
- The Hungarian kings settled the Saxons in Transylvania in 1150-1250 A.D.
- Rumanians started to settle in significant numbers, initially in the Southern Carpathians and later in the district of the *Érchegeység* in the second half of the 13th century. They then moved during the following several centuries from Wallachia and Moldavia. The first Rumanian political units formed at the beginning of the 13th century.

The false historiography *projects back the new ideas of Rumanian state unity to the 15-16th century* and does not consider the fact that the history of the two Rumanian Principalities was very different since they developed under dissimilar cultural influences, which led to the development of significant differences. They fought against the Turkish invaders but against each other as well.

Historiography influenced by modern political considerations presents the *antagonism between noble and serf as a national, Rumanian-Hungarian antagonism*, which is misleading. In the Middle Ages and extending to

the 19th century, it was not language and nationality that was the social determinant but social class. In Transylvania, whether initially under the rule of the Kingdom of Hungary or later during its independence, the Hungarian, Székely and Saxon German *nobility* was the state-creating element. *The serfs under the feudal system were subject to the nobility (in the whole of Europe)*. Hungarians and Rumanians, who were not ennobled, belonged to this class. Those Rumanians who were ennobled shared the same rights with the other nobility.

In the course of history the exploitation of the serfs in the Rumanian Principalities was of a high degree, particularly during Turkish overlordship. It was more extreme than in Transylvania for example or in the rest of Europe. Consequently during the long centuries large numbers migrated to the neighbouring countries primarily to Transylvania. Rumanian majority [in Transylvania] evolved in this manner resulting in half the population being Rumanian by about the year 1700.

Contrary to the statements of long-standing propaganda the condition of the Rumanians of Transylvania during the time of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy (1867-1918), thanks to the liberal politics of the Hungarian governments, was good. Compared to the conditions prevailing for the Rumanians in both Serbia and Russia and the conditions of the minorities in the Kingdom of Rumania (Regat) it was very much better.

On the other hand after 1920 the *economical, educational and cultural institutions of the Hungarians of Transylvania were subjected to serious repression* with the not completely kept secret aim of Rumanisation. This forced Rumanisation only increased during the communist era and particularly during the time of Ceausescu. Present-day Rumanian historiography *hushes up* all this.

The propaganda, on the part of influential circles and institutions, continues to this day that „Hungarians killed Rumanians” e.g., in the years 1940-1944 in Northern Transylvania and most recently after the 1989 transfer of power while in the following months in the Székely-inhabited areas „they assaulted and expelled numerous innocent Rumanian inhabitants”. The facts are that in the former case the angry citizens killed not only Rumanians but the nationally despised Securitate officers (including Hungarians) while the Har-Cov Report was based on the testimony imagined grievances of false witnesses.

They do not mention the mass-killings among the defenceless Hungarian civilian population carried out by the „volunteer formations” entering Transylvania in the autumn of 1944, to mention just one example.

34. BEFORE AND AFTER 1920 CONTRASTED.

Placing historiography in the service of politics falls under a different moral judgement as long as it served the fight for Rumanian emancipation in Hungary (the activities of the *Transylvanian School*). At that time the aim was to achieve equality of rights.

The situation is completely different after 1920; the claim of Daco-roman origin, that Rumanians are autochthonous in Transylvania was used, after the founding of Greater Rumania, as justification for the fight against non-Rumanian minorities. Propaganda showing the Hungarians as an incursionist people and

baseless accusations serve the same purpose. The proclamation of the unity of all Rumanians is a useful propaganda-weapon in the hands of Bucharest for the justification of its power over the whole state.

The distortion of history has brought disrepute to Rumanian historians as a whole. In the souls of the Rumanian people, on the other hand, the trumped-up lies ignited hatred against innocent people. In Western Europe such propaganda is punishable by law. („Incitement against a national group“).

One-sided historiography is not the only one that exists in Rumania.

Historiography, which is subservient to politics, does not like to talk about the fact *that there were always Rumanian academics, who, in their work, sought the truth regardless of political considerations*. We mention first of all the basic work of Ovid Densusianu (1873-1938) concerning the origins of the language (and the Daco-Roman continuity). In his *Histoire de la langue roumaine* (History of the Rumanian language) he presents the Balkan origin of the language. Alexandru Philippide (1859-1933) in his monumental work „*Originea rominilor*“ denied the continuity of Rumanians on the territory of the former Dacia. From among the ranks of historians, we must bring to mind the monumental labours of Petre P. Panaitescu (1900-1967). „the breadth of his horizons, striving after objectivity and his writing ability all lift him above his contemporaries“ [this sentence is also quoted by the Encyclopedia of Rumanian Historiography!]. Already at the beginning of his career he realised that the only path to the true understanding of Rumanian history lay in immersion in the history of the neighbouring peoples and he spent several years in the study of Polish-Rumanian connections. We mentioned above the work of Panaitescu on the historical significance of *vitéz Mihály* (Michael the Brave). In 1929, at the congress of Historians at Nagyszeben, Panaitescu, „could say in the name of his contemporaries that ,relieved of the duty of popularising the idea of national unity, which thankfully has been achieved, historians could now immerse themselves in what is their *raison d’être*, the study of our cultural, economic and social life, to the exclusion of all considerations other than the seeking of truth““. (Author’s emphasis). The *Revista istorica Romana* (Review of Rumanian History), which appeared two years later, took a new direction, condemning, among others the labours of Iorga, pointing to the numerous inaccuracies, contradictions, concealment, untruthful statements and the passing off of suppositions as facts and because he did not take into account the Hungarian influence on the Rumanian people.

Nearly seventy years had to pass before a Rumanian historian publicly determines again that the search for truth be the methodology of historical research and historiography. **Lucian Boia, Professor of History at the University of Bucharest**, *suggests the return to the high level of Rumanian historical research by means of historians researching the past of the Rumanian people should do so without political considerations and constraints*. To show what this means we list only a few examples from the views of Professor Boia:

1. We do not know the Dacian language, therefore the origin of the Rumanians is questionable.
2. The material culture excavated by archaeology does not prove the existence of „Daco-Rumanians“ after the Romans left Dacia.
3. The Orthodox Church and Slavonic culture is of far greater importance for the Rumanians of today than the (assumed) Dacian origin.
4. The formation of the Rumanian people is really the formation of the Rumanian language.

5. Even the much-touted Rumanian unity is not factual; for example in 1916 a large part of the Rumanian elite opposed declaration of hostilities against the Central Powers. After ascertaining that, among others, two writers, Ion Slavici and George Cosbuc* did not take part in the battle for political unity, Boia summarises the situation: „It was not a question of the views of a small group and certainly not of ‚traitors‘ and not even of ‚neutralists‘. The Rumanian elite simply viewed the national interest in a different light.” In considering earlier times we may add for example that Moldavia was primarily under Polish and Russian influence while the influences on Wallachia came from the south and the two principalities fought against each other just as bitterly as for example against the Turks. At the same time the Rumanian population of Transylvania lived in contact with Hungarian, Székely and Saxon peoples and took over its culture from them and particular elements that distinguished them.

Lucian Boia proved that among historians there is a readiness to research Rumanian history objectively. At the same time the Rumanian people has the right to be aware of their history. It depends on the politicians whether this can come to fruition at last. However the politicians must today listen to their constituents so that in the end it will be the Rumanian people who will decide the question.

35. CONCLUSIONS

The fact that the Rumanians are not autochthonous in Transylvania does not mean that they have no right to live in Transylvania. Lucian Boia put the question: What would happen if it became obvious that e.g., Slavs lived prior to the Rumanians in Moldavia? And he provides the correct answer: „Nothing!” Because it is not history but their presence and numerical majority which proves their rights. (Naturally, in addition to the numerical majority one must place the memories of material and intellectual culture, which the Rumanian people left behind in the course of centuries.) The same applies in the case of Transylvania: „the rights of the Rumanians only seem to depend on the Dacians and Daco-Rumanians.”

In the light of the facts of history we can state that the Rumanians have no cause for hatred of Hungarians; their ancestors did not oppress the ancestors of the Rumanians, instead they let them in. They did not murder them, contrarywise in 1789, 1848-1849 and the autumn of 1944 the Rumanians murdered masses of Hungarians, not to mention the persecution of Hungarians after 1920. As between two peoples, the Hungarians of Transylvania have suffered the more.

There is a lot of talk about entry into the European Union. Though this is important, in this era of economic globalisation there are a series of serious tasks and severe problems awaiting solution – even in the advanced Western European countries. How much more difficult will it be for the Eastern European countries, such as Rumania also, to compete successfully against the whole world! It will require the exertion and pulling together of every citizen of the state and that in a short time, *not historically but in an absolute sense!* In this situation the repression of the Hungarian minority, numbering two million, and the distraction of the majority from the real problems by instigation against the Hungarians, borders on self-

* It is not by chance that both are from Transylvania.

mutilation. The Hungarian national group in Rumania on the one hand is a cultural asset for the whole country and on the other hand can contribute to the increase of wealth of Rumania, among others because of its mental calibre, erudition, moral level and the natural contacts with the Hungarian economy. There is the prospect of a wealthy Rumania in which all citizens can feel at home.

There are considerable differences among the provinces of Rumania, which are rooted in their history. *Their interests in some respects diverge also.* In the 1990's Transylvania produced more than Wallachia. Bucharest, taking advantage of its unbridled power used a disproportionate part of this production for its own purposes. Sabin Gherman, together with numerous Rumanians from Transylvania, rightly demanded some autonomy for Transylvania.

The natural development of Rumania must therefore be in the direction of decentralisation and self-government of the provinces. This principle coincides with the newer progression seen in a large part of Western Europe in that since the 1970's regional self-government develops within the boundaries of the national states. This is a natural progress since the people have their roots in the traditions of their past and particular culture. Local communities can best nurse and develop these rather than the representatives of a central and more-or-less foreign power, which has grown more-or-less over their heads.

It seemed impossible not very long ago, but it happened recently: The Scots were allowed to have a referendum resulting in their independence within the lands of the British Crown. The wide autonomy of the Swiss Cantons or the German states is well known; Italy's regions are guaranteed by its constitution. In more recent times, in France, for example the emphasis of the historically based individuality and traditions has increased.

Referring to these, they have demanded greater autonomy from Paris, and they have got it. The situation is similar in Belgium and Spain. This tendency, naturally in a more attenuated form, has also appeared in the otherwise relatively unified Sweden. The southern region (Skane) three centuries ago was still part of Denmark. The question is not that it should be transferred there, but they demand greater autonomy in economic affairs, their interest being that their closer homeland should be an active member of the Öresund region and they want to develop further their cultural peculiarities as well, which have developed over time.

Differences in economics, social and cultural conditions and way of life and traditions based on the differences of their history among Moldavia, Wallachia, Transylvania, Voivodina (and some smaller disatrics such as for example the land of the Csángós) is still a living fact today. The general tendency throughout Europe coincides therefore with the interests of the Rumanian people and of Rumania itself. *The introduction of regional autonomy* instead of the exclusive power of Wallachia (Bucharest) would be in the interests of the whole country.

In the end, this was the cause of the dissolution of Yugoslavia and Czechoslovakia as well. Disproportionality in production and consumption between regions cannot be maintained indefinitely by the dictates of a central power.

The ,neo-Phanariot' concept, which preferred quantity must be replaced by the concept of quality. The traditional Rumanian political concept of looking into the past is incompatible with the equal rights of regions and states of a United Europe. The leadership of a New Rumania must recognise this and since subjective elements are involved as well, the human factor must also be considered.