

László Szarka

Changes in the Number of the Hungarian Urban Population in Hungary's Neighbouring Countries (1910–2000)*

Historical demographic studies examining the Hungarian minorities usually lay a great emphasis upon mentioning the fact that according to census figures and local analyses, the Hungarian communities of the neighbouring countries lessened in the cities to the greatest extent. For example, Károly Kocsi summarized this process recently in the following way: 'Although the number of Hungarians living in cities has increased in the past decade in every country of the Carpathian basin, this lagging far behind the urban growth rate—given a natural and increasingly fast-paced assimilation—of the majority population of the State (e.g. in the cities of Transylvania: +4,2% Hungarian, +33,9% Romanian between 1977–1989; in the cities of Transcarpathia: +0,2% Hungarian, +24% Ukrainian between 1979–1989). As a result of this, the disappearance of the Hungarians has been continuous to the present day in the overwhelming majority of the cities of the neighbouring countries.'¹

For a Hungarian minority of 2,7–2,8 million persons in the seven neighbouring countries, not more than 31 cities of the Carpathian Basin were of Hungarian majority of those 344 that are beyond the borders. (see Table 1)

A local Hungarian community of more than 5000 inhabitants was present at 72 settlements of the Carpathian Basin, among which six were large villages. These are administrative units but do not have the status of a city. 43% of the Hungarians, 1,2 million persons were living in these localities.

In Slovakia, there were 14 cities of Hungarian majority in 1991. At the same time, the number of Hungarians exceeded the 5000 persons at 18 urban settlements (Pozsony, Somorja, Dunaszerdahely, Nagymegyér, Galánta, Vágsellye, Gúta, Komárom, Érsekújvár, Léva, Ipolyság, Fülek, Rimaszombat, Tornalja, Rozsnyó, Kassa, Nagykapos, Királyhelmece).

In Transcarpathia, only three such cities and one large village were found at the time of the last census. These were: Ungvár, Munkács, Beregszász, and Nagydobrony. Among the cities, the Hungarian population constituted the majority only in Beregszász.

A Hungarian community of more than 5000 inhabitants was counted in 38 cities of Transylvania. These are: Máramarosziget, Nagybánya, Szatmárnémeti, *Nagykároly*,

* Edited version of the lecture held at the V. International Congress on Hungarology (Jyväskylä, August 6–10, 2001).

¹ Kocsis, Károly, *Magyar kisebbségek a Kárpát-medencében* [Hungarian minorities in the Carpathian Basin]. In: *Magyarok a világban. Kárpát-medence. Kézikönyv a Kárpát-medencében, Magyarország határain kívül élő magyarságról* [Handbook on the Hungarians living in the Carpathian Basin outside the borders of Hungary]. CEBA Kiadó, Budapest, 2000. p. 26.

Conditions of Minorities

Érmihályfalva, Margita, Nagyvárada, *Nagyszalonta*, Arad, Zilah, Dés, Beszterce, Szászrégen, *Marosvásárhely*, Torda, Dicsőszentmárton, Medgyes, Segesvár, Nagyenyed, *Székelykeresztúr*, *Székelyudvarhely*, *Szentegyháza*, *Szováta*, Gyergyóremete, *Gyergyószentmiklós*, *Csikszereda*, *Kézdivásárhely*, *Kovászna*, *Sepsiszentgyörgy*, *Barót*, Brassó, Hosszúfalva, Petrozsény, Vajdahunyad, Déva, Lugos, Temesvár. Back in 1990, there was a Hungarian majority in 17 of the Transylvanian cities, indicated with italics in the enumeration. We can find also Tusnádfürdő, Borszék, and Szilágycsehi among the cities, which have a Hungarian majority but altogether less than 5000 Hungarian inhabitants.

In Serbia, there were only 17 settlements with the status of a city where the Hungarian population exceeded the 5000 persons: Szabadka, *Báczstopolya*, *Temerin*, Újvidék, Horgos, *Magyarkanizsa*, *Zenta*, *Ada*, Nagykikinda, *Óbecse*, Törökbecse, Nagybecskerek, Zombor, Csantavér, Szenttamás, *Mohol*, Kishegyes, Ómoravica, and Péterréve. We can find a local majority of Hungarians altogether at 9 settlements of city status of Vojvodina: in the 7 italicised cities, and in Palics and Csóka which have less than 5000 Hungarian inhabitants.

In Croatia, Slovenia, and Austria there were no cities ten years ago in which the number of Hungarian inhabitants was above 5000. Moreover, there were no cities present in these countries where the Hungarians would have constituted a local majority.

The scientific literature has basically come to an agreement with regard to the causes of why the urban Hungarian population has been growing less. Beyond the migration waves that took place following decisions of foreign and internal politics, war conflicts, and peace treaties, and the increasingly low level of natural growth, it is necessary to take into consideration several other but no less peculiar Central and East European phenomena in the analysis of the ethnic changes of the urban environment.

Let us see, then, what the most important factors are that transformed significantly the ethnic aspect of the cities, which passed to the neighbouring countries in the course of the 20th century.

In the following, first a few 'ethnic space-forming forces' will be examined. These all had a great influence on the developments of the ethnic composition of the cities. Subsequent to this, we will present the process, in which the Hungarian minority communities diminished in the cities, with some factual evidence. The Central and East European urbanisation processes of the short 20th century were determined essentially by the rural and urban development objectives of the nation-states and the artificially accelerated, forced urbanisation policies of the period of the communist party-state. These two particular aspects of the urban development policies of the neighbouring countries were manifest in the regions and urban settlements inhabited also by Hungarians:

1. As the most general factor of transformation, we can mention the urbanisation process, which gained momentum several times during the 20th century and was seriously deformed in the course of the communist type, voluntarist city developments of the period between 1960–1980. As a result of this, the city structure of the whole Carpathian Basin underwent a radical change. From among the dynamically developing nations of the region, the Slovaks, the Ukrainians, the Romanians, and the Serbs managed to cre-

Conditions of Minorities

1. Cities of Hungarian majority

| City | 1920 | | 1930 | | 1980 | | 1990 | | |
|-------------------|------------------|---------------------|------------------|---------------------|------------------|---------------------|------------------|---------------------|--------|
| | Inhab- itants | Hunga- rian % | Inhab- itants | Hunga- rian % | inhab- itants | Hunga- rian % | Inhab- itants | Hunga- rian % | |
| SLOVAKIA | | | | | | | | | |
| Somorja | 3.144 | 2.731 | 3.586 | 2.756 | 9.677 | 7.016 | 12.051 | 8.561 | 71,0% |
| Dunasszerdahely | 5.171 | 3.445 | 6.280 | 2.944 | 18.715 | 15.166 | 23.236 | 19.347 | 83,3% |
| Nagymegyér | 4.012 | 3.870 | 4.482 | 3.841 | 8.063 | 6.901 | 9.247 | 8.043 | 87,0% |
| Güta | 9.676 | 9.479 | 10.822 | 10.221 | 11.295 | 9.735 | 11.007 | 9.101 | 82,7% |
| Komárom | 17.715 | 13.584 | 21.158 | 12.645 | 32.520 | 20.022 | 37.346 | 23.745 | 63,6% |
| Párkány | 3.481 | 3.129 | 4.479 | 2.536 | 12.807 | 9.117 | 13.347 | 9.804 | 73,5% |
| Ipolyáság | 4.698 | 2.741 | 5.804 | 3.185 | 8.034 | 4.877 | 8.551 | 5.562 | 65,0% |
| Fülek | 3.219 | 2.157 | 4.291 | 2.551 | 10.497 | 7.320 | 10.451 | 7.064 | 67,6% |
| Tornalja | 2.195 | 1.811 | 3.469 | 1.772 | 7.021 | 4.959 | 8.185 | 5.547 | 67,8% |
| Királyhélmec | 2.853 | 2.043 | 3.274 | 1.941 | 6.358 | 4.850 | 7.963 | 6.400 | 80,4% |
| Nagykapos | 2.204 | 1.672 | 2.555 | 1.665 | 8.459 | 4.729 | 9.421 | 6.007 | 63,8% |
| UKRAINE | | | | | | | | | |
| Beregszász | | | 19.007 | 9.190 | | | 29.221 | 15.125 | 51,70% |
| YUGOSLAVIA | | | | | | | | | |
| Zenta | | | 31.965 | 25.924 | 23.175 | 18.378 | 22.816 | 17.888 | 78,40% |
| Óbecse | | | 20.525 | 12.459 | 27.187 | 14.763 | 26.608 | 13.464 | 50,60% |

To be continued!

Conditions of Minorities

| City | 1920 | | 1930 | | 1980 | | 1990 | |
|--------------------|------------------|---------------------|------------------|---------------------|------------------|---------------------|------------------|---------------------|
| | Inhab- itants | Hunga- rian % | Inhab- itants | Hunga- rian % | inhab- itants | Hunga- rian % | Inhab- itants | Hunga- rian % |
| Topolya | 15,051 | 85,30% | 12,839 | 85,30% | 17,259 | 73,20% | 16,705 | 66,90% |
| Magyarokaniza | 21,862 | 87,40% | 19,108 | 87,40% | 11,696 | 89% | 11,545 | 88,20% |
| Ada | 13,097 | 10,308 | 78,70% | 12,342 | 10,294 | 83,40% | 12,342 | 83,40% |
| Temerin | 11,292 | 8,718 | 77,20% | 15,609 | 9,803 | 62,80% | 16,985 | 55,90% |
| ROMANIA* | | | | | | | | |
| Nagykároly | 16,042 | 5,637 | 35,1% | 24,050 | 10,495 | 43,6% | 26,372 | 52,4% |
| Erményfalva | 8,085 | 5,314 | 65,7% | 11,099 | 9,109 | 82,1% | 10,505 | 85,0% |
| Nagyszalonta | 15,297 | 12,267 | 80,2% | 19,746 | 13,612 | 68,9% | 20,660 | 61,1% |
| Marosvásárhely | 40,058 | 22,898 | 57,2% | 130,076 | 82,200 | 63,2% | 164,445 | 51,4% |
| Szekelykeresztúr | 5,025 | 4,365 | 86,9% | 7,197 | 6,841 | 95,1% | 10,611 | 94,9% |
| Szekelyudvarhely | 9,981 | 8,331 | 83,5% | 28,378 | 27,688 | 97,6% | 39,959 | 97,4% |
| Csikszereда | 8,306 | 7,134 | 85,9% | 30,936 | 25,822 | 83,5% | 46,228 | 83,0% |
| Szentgyörgyfalva | 2,628 | 2,577 | 98,1% | 6,636 | 6,347 | 95,6% | 7,667 | 98,7% |
| Szováta | 5,244 | 4,383 | 83,6% | 10,482 | 9,636 | 91,9% | 12,112 | 89,1% |
| Gyergyószentmiklós | 10,355 | 8,912 | 86,1% | 17,748 | 15,682 | 88,4% | 21,433 | 86,4% |
| Kézdivásárhely | 7,364 | 6,826 | 92,7% | 16,329 | 15,041 | 92,1% | 22,912 | 91,6% |
| Barót | 7,538 | 6,901 | 91,5% | 9,235 | 8,805 | 95,3% | 10,493 | 96,2% |
| Kovácszna | 6,207 | 4,516 | 72,8% | 9,308 | 6,890 | 74,0% | 12,515 | 67,5% |

* The census was held in 1977.

4 MINORITIES RESEARCH

Conditions of Minorities

ate major urban centres due to their natural growth and the consciously controlled internal migrations, which served also national colonisation purposes in the regions of Hungarian majority.

The number of city dwellers doubled in Vojvodina in the second part of the 20th century, between 1953 and 1991 (it went from 502.000 to 1.122.000; their ratio in relation to the total population from 29,5% to 55,7%).² The urbanisation process was even more radical and faster in Transylvania, and especially between 1960 and 1980, when the forced and voluntarist urban development policy of the Ceaușescu era prevailed. The total number of urban population of Transylvania grew by 400.000 persons in the period between the two world wars (1920-1941) and exceeded the 1 million only by 150.000 persons. As opposed to this, the number of city dwellers rose by 1,6 million between 1966 and 1985, and came close to 4,45 million.

As an example of the peculiar Central and East European phenomena, we can refer already here to the loss of importance and function of the earlier regional centres along the new borders and the revaluation of the situation of sub-centres, which were deprived of their ethnic hinterlands, as well as their cultural, economic, and political system of relations.

2. Naturally, the urbanisation of the Carpathian Basin was closely related to industrialisation and internal migration processes. While the role of industrialisation with respect to urbanisation was comparatively small between the world wars, it was rather considerable starting from the 1950s. The responsible leaders of the neighbouring countries took into account the Hungarian aspect of the cities in two ways in the development of the new industrial centres: in case part of the cities of Hungarian character that were suitable for industrialisation, they made an effort to change the ethnic aspect of the place with planned immigration waves, treating the city as a target of colonization. In other cases, those cities were favoured which were situated closer to the majority language area notwithstanding the fact that in some city of the given region, certain industrial sectors had noteworthy traditions. In case of minority ethnic groups, urbanisation connected with industrialisation can enhance—and in case of Hungarian minorities enhanced indeed—those schooling and linguistic disadvantages because of which the minorities are generally way below the national average with regard to school qualification. This intense assimilation effect, which can be traced back to several concomitant phenomena, is a characteristic of the artificially accelerated communist urbanisation. Its influence is well perceivable in the report on the cities (Table 2) where the proportion of Hungarian inhabitants fell by more than 20%.

² Kocsis, Károly and Kocsis-Hodosi, Eszter, *Ethnic Geography of the Hungarian Minorities in the Carpathian Basin*. RCES–MSP Hungarian Academy of Sciences. Budapest, 1998. pp. 158–160. – Mirnics, Károly, *A vajdasági népesség urbanizálódása nemzetiségek szerint* [The urbanization of the population of Vojvodina by ethnicities]. Manuscript, Archives of the Teleki László Institute. Kicošev, Saša, *The Development of the Urban Population of Vojvodina*. Manuscript, Manuscript Archives of the Minority Studies Institute, Hungarian Academy of Sciences. p. 6.

Conditions of Minorities

2. Decrease of the Hungarian urban population by more than 20%, 1930-1990

| City | 1930 | | 1980 | | 1990 | |
|-------------------|-------------|-------|-------------|-------|-------------|-------|
| | Inhabitants | % | Inhabitants | % | Inhabitants | % |
| SLOVAKIA | | | | | | |
| Léva | 12 576 | 39,6% | 26 132 | 15,3% | 33 991 | 15,2% |
| YUGOSLAVIA | | | | | | |
| Újvidék | 56 666 | 30,0% | 169 584 | 11,3% | 179 295 | 8,8% |
| Temerin | 11 292 | 77,2% | 15 609 | 62,8% | 16 985 | 55,9% |
| ROMANIA* | | | | | | |
| Temesvár | 102 390 | 31,0% | 269 353 | 13,6% | 334 115 | 9,5% |
| Kolozsvár | 104 359 | 46,3% | 262 858 | 32,8% | 328 602 | 22,8% |
| Brassó | 59 232 | 39,3% | 256 475 | 13,6% | 323 736 | 9,7% |
| Nagyvárad | 88 830 | 53,7% | 170 531 | 44,4% | 222 741 | 33,3% |
| Arad | 87 662 | 35,6% | 171 193 | 20,3% | 190 114 | 15,7% |
| Vajdahunyad | 7 481 | 33,8% | 79 719 | 6,67% | 81 337 | 7,1% |
| Déva | 12 158 | 37,2% | 60 334 | 12,6% | 78 438 | 9,3% |
| Zilah | 10 688 | 52,6% | 31 923 | 30,3% | 68 404 | 19,9% |
| Torda | 21 428 | 49,5% | 55 294 | 14,0% | 61 200 | 11,6% |
| Petrozsény | 18 221 | 6,08% | 40 664 | 15,0% | 52 390 | 5,68% |
| Nagyenyed | 16 823 | 33,4% | 24 620 | 21,3% | 31 894 | 17,9% |
| Dicsőszentmárton | 9 207 | 40,8% | 26 073 | 5,53% | 30 520 | 19,9% |
| Hosszúfalu | 13 570 | 59,4% | 30 551 | 32,0% | 30 226 | 27,2% |

* The census was held in 1977.

4 MINORITIES RESEARCH

Conditions of Minorities

3. In all of the countries of the region, undereducated layers endeavouring cheap unskilled employment and agrarian masses who had been deprived of their peasant livelihood and their land during the land reforms and the formation of kolkhozes, flooded the cities in an order of magnitude of millions. From the point of view of the topic, one of the most important regional characteristics of the migration processes is the so-called interregional migration. It means that the labour force needed for industrial developments is recruited from far-away areas with the prospect of various benefits and concessions (aid for settling down, flat, favourable wages, etc.).

4. Administrative policy has always been an important factor in connection to the developments of the city network in the Carpathian Basin. The constitutional changes carried out after the Trianon peace treaty, resulted also in a radical administrative reorganization. The regional centres of the former Hungary—as, for example, Pozsony, Kassa, Ungvár, Kolozsvár, Temesvár, Újvidék—were turned into the regional centres of the majority nation in the provinces annexed to the new states. The profound transformation of these regional centres into non-Hungarian national centres began between the world wars. This went hand in hand with the administrative policies of planned settlement and national transformation. The frequent modifications of the internal administrative borders, which served in all cases the interests of the majority, also took their considerable assimilation toll. The rate and pace of the diminution of the urban Hungarian population is well illustrated by the example of ten big cities. A relevant proportion of Hungarians lived in them before 1910 and even between the world wars. However, by today they have become the most important regional centres of the majority nation of the neighbouring countries with Bratislava becoming the capital city of Slovakia (Table 3).

5. Urbanisation and urban development, that is, the urbanisation process is always in a close relation to the economic power and cultural circumstances of the given societies, and, naturally, to political factors as well. This was the situation in case of the medieval city foundations and the city developments of the early modern age and modern times too. The effectiveness of the urbanisation process is the measure of the organization of the State: successful city development is the proof of the economic power and cultural maturity of a give State. Furthermore, the actual power has always tried to use the cities—which have been meeting points of adjoining ethnic groups and national communities for ancient times—for the spreading of its language and ethnicity in a conscious way. The best representatives of Hungarian liberal nationalism of the period of the Dual Monarchy trusted neither the automatic nor the planned Magyarisation power of the schools. On the other hand, they proclaimed the model role of the cities, which became Magyarised quickly. The neighbours of Hungary have used a conscious administrative and urban development policy from the beginning in seeking to transform the ethnic aspect of the cities in the regions inhabited by Hungarians. Here they used radical actions, there gradual settlement, assimilation, industrialisation, etc. schemes. This was the purpose of the Romanian 'culture zone' between the world wars which granted considerable advantages for the settlers. Czechoslovakia of the Masaryk era strove to push Pozsony and Kassa under the

Conditions of Minorities

3. Hungarian population in ten big cities, 1930-1990

| City | 1930 | | 1980* | | 1990 | | |
|-----------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------|
| | Inhabitants | Hungarian % | Inhabitants | Hungarian % | Inhabitants | Hungarian % | |
| Pozsony | 123.844 | 15,3% | 380.259 | 18,371 | 442.197 | 20,312 | 4,6% |
| Kassa | 70.117 | 16,4% | 202.368 | 8.070 | 235.160 | 10.760 | 4,6% |
| Ungvár | 26.675 | 16,9% | | | 116.101 | 9.179 | 7,9% |
| Munkács | 26.102 | 21,3% | | | 83.308 | 6.713 | 8,0% |
| Kolozsvár | 104.359 | 46,3% | 262.858 | 86.215 | 328.602 | 74.871 | 22,8% |
| Nagyvárad | 88.830 | 47,731 | 170.531 | 75.715 | 222.741 | 74.225 | 33,3% |
| Arad | 87.662 | 31,167 | 171.193 | 34.728 | 190.114 | 29.828 | 15,7% |
| Temesvár | 102.390 | 31,773 | 269.353 | 36.724 | 334.115 | 31.785 | 9,5% |
| Újvidék | 56.666 | 17,000 | 169.584 | 19.163 | 179.295 | 15.778 | 8,8% |
| Szabadka | 100.002 | 41,401 | 100.036 | 44.016 | 99.372 | 39.749 | 39,6% |

* The Romanian census was held in 1977.

Conditions of Minorities

20% language use threshold defined by the language law as they proved to be of primary importance in terms of the unrestricted authority over Slovakia.

In the times following World War II, the urban population of the Hungarian minority suffered a loss of a magnitude of hundreds of thousands as a consequence of the renewed wave of refugees as well as Slovakisation, population exchange, *malenkij robot*, and the retribution campaign in the southern areas. Bratislava lost about four fifth of its earlier Hungarian population in that period,³ and this was when the Hungarian aspect of the city network of the border areas of Upper Hungary, Transcarpathia, and the Partium began to erode rapidly.⁴

6. The municipal policy of a given city is a factor of crucial importance of the complex task of city development. Varying local authority models prevail in the various countries. While the conformity to it can present major results even in the seemingly centralized Romanian model, not even the probably most Western-like model of Slovenia could strengthen much the positions of the Hungarians of Lendva.

Let us examine more closely the order of magnitude of the ethnic changes in the city network of those areas of the Carpathian Basin, which are outside the borders of Hungary. As an example, we will consider the figures of the urban Hungarian population of Vojvodina and Romania. Ten years ago, the Hungarians were present in 17,8% in the 109 cities of Vojvodina, even though they constituted 61% of the city dwellers at the turn of the 20th century. Thus, according to the census data of 1991, their proportion dropped to less than its third in eighty years. At the same time, the urban Serb population has grown six times the figure of the 1910 figures during the 20th century: they make up 55,2% of the total city dweller population while the Serb population within the whole of the province has increased by 300% in the examined period.⁵

The migration of the rural population into cities formed the natural basis of the growth of cities before 1991: of the more than 900.000 urban settlers, 53,1% moved in from a rural environment and 42,1% from other cities in the period between 1960 and 1990.

We can find 122 large villages of mixed character beside the 109 cities among the settlements of Vojvodina, which indicates the future possibilities of further urbanisation.

³ On the decrease of the Hungarian population in Slovak cities see Gyurgyík, László, *Magyar mérleg. A szlovákiai magyarság a népszámlálási és népmozgalmi adatok tükrében* [Hungarian Balance. Hungarians of Slovakia in the view of census and demographic figures]. Kalligram, Pozsony, 1994. pp. 23–26. With regard to Bratislava, see Salner, Peter, *Premeny Bratislavy 1939–1993. Etnologické aspekty sociálnych procesov v mestskom prostredí*. Veda, Bratislava, 1998. On the change of the ethnic aspect of cities, see Krivý, Vladimír, 49 Städte: Wandel und Kontinuität. In: Mannová, Helena (Hg.): *Bürgerum und bürgerliche Gesellschaft in der Slowakei 1900–1918*. AEP, Bratislava, 1997. pp. 37–59.

⁴ Varga E., Árpád, *Városodás, vándorlás, nemzetiség. Adatok és szempontok az erdélyi városi térségek etnikai arculatváltásának vizsgálatához* [Urbanization, migration, ethnicity. Figures and considerations for the examination of ethnic aspect changes in Transylvanian urban areas]. In: Idem, *Fejezetek a jelenkori Erdély népesedéstörténetéhez*, Püski, Budapest, 1999. pp. 188–192. – Vofkori, László, *Erdély közigazgatási és etnikai földrajza* [Administrative and ethnic geography of Transylvania]. Balaton Akadémia, Vörösbény, 1996. p. 92.

⁵ *A Délvidék településeinek nemzetiségi (anyanyelvi) adatai (1880–1941)* [Ethnic (mother tongue) figures of the settlements of the Southern regions]. Central Statistical Office, Budapest, 1998.

Conditions of Minorities

For all that, it was not urbanisation but instead the migration and emigration waves that determined the ethnic processes of Vojvodina in the last decade of war.

We can divide the sudden growth of the Transylvanian towns into four periods according to the analysis of Árpád Varga E.: the number of city dwellers in Transylvania increased by 630.000 between 1948 and 1966, 1,2 million between 1966 and 1977, and 1,5 million between 1977 and 1989. That is, their number grew by more than 3 million persons, which is a fourfold increase. There are clearly demonstrable differences in the development of the cities of North and South Transylvania. The two parts developed more or less at the same pace between the world wars. However, the population of the southern cities of Transylvania began to grow at a much faster rate after 1948 and it rose above 2,5 million in 1992 as compared to the population of 1,8 million of the northern towns. The proportion of Hungarian population—to a great extent because of the situation and the would-be consequences resulting from the Second Vienna Award of 1940—dropped from 61,8% to 35,8% in North Transylvania in about fifty years (1948–1992). In the same period, its proportion shrank from 21,4% to 8,9% in South Transylvania.⁶

With regard to the whole of Transylvania, the 64,4% proportion of Hungarians in 1910 decreased to 45,8–44,8% between 1920 and 1930; it was 39% in 1948 and became 23,8–20,3% in 1977 and 1992. In the same period, Romanian population grew from the starting value of 17,7% to 77% in 1992. One more figure for the demonstration of the actual situation: the number of the more than 800.000 Hungarian city dwellers of Transylvania increased only by 40.000 between 1977 and 1992 as opposed to the 950.000 growth of the Romanians. Everything points to the fact that this trend continued in the past decade.

At last, let us see what city types we can distinguish according to the situation of the urban communities of minority Hungarians with the utilization of the above brief analysis and the more and more comprehensive statistic databases.

1. The city type of the cities of Hungarian majority in Szeklerland, which was able to resist the Romanisation thanks to its adequate ethnic hinterland in the country. Those small and medium-sized towns, which belong to this type, did not go through megalomaniac development periods and managed to slow down the expansion of housing estates and the loss of their character. Beyond the cities of Szeklerland we can find here Dunaszerdahely and Nagymegyér of Upper-Bodroghköz, Nagykapos and Királyhelmeç in the Ung region, Érmihályfalva in the Partium, and Zenta in Vojvodina.
2. The historic regional centres that suffered quick processes of ethnicity changes belong to the second type. These are towns picked by the majority nation as its own regional sub-centres for the realisation of its nation and state building aspirations. This happened in Pozsony, Kassa, Ungvár, Szatmárnémeti, Kolozsvár, Brassó, Temesvár, and Újvidék.

⁶ Varga E., Árpád, *op. cit.* pp. 188–192.

4 MINORITIES RESEARCH

Conditions of Minorities

3. The small and medium-sized 'border cities' which cling to the borders defined in Trianon. These could preserve their Hungarian character even with the non-Hungarian population settling there. These are: Komárom, Ipolyság, Füleek, Szepesi, Beregszász, Érmihályfalva, Szabadka.
4. The two basic types of cities which 'exploded' as a result of industrialisation and the communist type urbanisation:
 - those small cities which had Hungarian roots and majority but developed into non-Hungarian industrial centres: Léva, Losonc, Munkács, Zilah, Nagybánya;
 - those non-Hungarian cities, which were situated near the Hungarian language area and absorbed a significant number of Hungarians (only a fraction is able to preserve their Hungarian identity) with the employment opportunities of big industry. These are, for example, Nagyszombat, Nyitra, Besztercebánya, Nagyszőlős, Vajdahunyad, Segesvár, Fogaras, Nagybecskere, etc.

In sum, we would like to emphasize three important conclusions on the basis of the brief comparative observations and the statistical analysis forming their basis. The demographic changes—with the exception of the periods after the two Vienna Awards and the re-annexation of Transcarpathia and Bácska—reveal a continuing negative trend in the 20th century. This can be explained primarily by the unfavourable demographic developments from the point of view of the Hungarians; the settlement of masses of non-Hungarians, which enhanced the growth of cities; and the intensive assimilation processes.

Due to the changes between the two wars, the greatest diminution of Hungarians came about in the towns of the regions of Slovakia, Transcarpathia, and the Bánság. However, the proportion and cultural presence of Hungarians had not dropped in any of the regions to such an extent as it did after World War II, and first of all between 1960 and 1980. The losses of Hungarian urban population caused by assimilation and migration are in a close connection with the forced socialist industrialization, the formation of districts, and the negative concomitant phenomena of urbanisation: the disruption and, in cases, liquidation of the Hungarian cultural and educational institutional framework, and the ousting of the Hungarian language usage from the cities.

The urban assimilation processes resulting in a decreasing number of minority Hungarian communities intensified to the greatest extent in the years between 1960 and 1980. According to the predictions of the last censuses and their preliminary partial results, the past decade could slow down this trend only to a very small degree.

Literature

A Felvidék településeinek nemzetiségi (anyanyelvi) adatai. (1880–1941) [Ethnic (mother tongue) figures of the settlements of Upper Hungary. (1880–1941)]. Central Statistical Office, Budapest, 1995.

A Délvidék településeinek nemzetiségi (anyanyelvi) adatai. (1880–1941) [Ethnic (mother tongue) figures of the settlements of the Southern regions. (1880–1941)]. Central Statistical Office, Budapest, 1998.

Conditions of Minorities

- Erdély településeinek nemzetiségi (anyanyelvi) adatai százalékos megoszlásban (1850–1941)* [Ethnic (mother tongue) figures of the Transylvanian settlements in percentile distribution]. Central Statistical Office, Budapest, 1996.
- Az erdélyi települések népessége nemzetiség szerint (1930–1992)* [Population of Transylvanian settlements by ethnicity]. Central Statistical Office, Budapest, 1996.
- Csernicskó, István, *A magyar nyelv Ukrajnában (Kárpátalján)*. [The Hungarian language in Ukraine (in Transcarpathia)] Osiris Kiadó–MTA Kisebbségkutató Műhely. Budapest–Újvidék, 1998.
- Göncz, Lajos, *A magyar nyelv Jugoszláviában (Vajdaságban)* [The Hungarian language in Yugoslavia (in Vojvodina)] Osiris Kiadó–Fórum Könyvkiadó–MTA Kisebbségkutató Műhely. Budapest–Újvidék, 1999.
- Gyurgyík, László, *Magyar mérleg. A szlovákiai magyarság a népszámlálási és népmozgalmi adatok tükrében* [Hungarian Balance. Hungarians of Slovakia in the view of census and demographic figures]. Kalligram, Pozsony, 1994.
- Kocsis, Károly–Kocsis-Hodosi, Eszter, *Ethnic Geography of the Hungarian Minorities in the Carpathian Basin*. Geographical Research Institute RCES and Minority Studies Programme of HAS, Budapest, 1998.
- Lanstyák, István, *A magyar nyelv Szlovákiában* [The Hungarian language in Slovakia]. Osiris–Kalligram–MTA Kisebbségkutató Műhely, Budapest–Pozsony, 2000.
- Magyarország nemzetiségeinek és a szomszédos államok magyarságának statisztikája (1910–1990)* [Statistics on the minorities in Hungary and Hungarians in the neighbouring countries]. Central Statistical Office, Budapest, 1994.
- Varga E., Árpád, *Fejezetek a jelenkori Erdély népeseledéstörténetéből* [Chapters from the history of population increase in contemporary Transylvania]. Püski, Budapest, 1998.