

THE BOLYAI UNIVERSITY AND MINORITY ELITE RECRUITMENT: 1944–1959

ANDREW LUDANYI

Ohio Northern University, Ada, OH
USA

The Bolyai University was the Hungarian half of the current Babeş-Bolyai University in Cluj/Kolozsvár, Transylvania. It was an independent Hungarian University until its merger with the Babeş University in 1959. This merged institution is one of the most important centers of higher education in present-day Romania. However, it has a past that can be traced back to the 16th century within the context of the independent Transylvania of John Sigismund and Stephen Báthory. It later evolved into a Habsburg institution, then a Hungarian and a Romanian University. Finally, during World War II it operated as two separate institutions with Hungarian and Romanian faculties respectively. The two were merged by the Gheorghiu-Dej communist government in 1959. Ever since, Hungarian minority intellectuals have called for the restoration of the independent Bolyai University. The current paper focuses on the independent Bolyai University between 1944 and 1959. It reflects on its role as the premier institution for the recruitment and training of the Hungarian minority's cultural and educational elite. The paper links the fate of this institution to the communist transformation of Romania and its consequences for the Hungarians of Transylvania.

Keywords: Bolyai University, Babeş-Bolyai University, Cluj, Kolozsvár, Transylvania, Gheorghiu-Dej, educational policy, assimilation, minority, nationalism, 1956

Since the overthrow of the Nicolae Ceauşescu dictatorship of Romania in December 1989, a constant refrain of the Hungarian minority in that country has been the re-establishment of an independent Hungarian language University in Cluj/Kolozsvár.¹ After decades of Romanian assimilationist pressure, the leaders of the Hungarian minority, including their most important organization, the RMDSZ (Hungarian Democratic Federation of Romania), see the guarantee of their survival as a national community mainly in the establishment of some form of autonomy (political-territorial, cultural, or personal) within the Romanian state

E-mail: a-ludanyi@onu.edu

and in the re-establishment of their own institution of higher education along the pattern that existed between 1944 and 1959.

The present study will focus on the Bolyai University and its role in providing leadership and direction to the ca. 1.5 million Hungarian national community of Romania. The Bolyai University was an important institution which provided instruction for a generation of leaders. It was a research center that also documented the past and the present (to the end of the 1950s) of the Hungarians in Romania, particularly in the region of Transylvania. As such, to what extent did it contribute to "elite" education in Romania, and what was its influence on tolerance and peaceful co-existence between the majority Romanian and the minority Hungarian populations?

The answer to this question is important, because the University was destroyed, merged with the Romanian Babeş University, in 1959 with the argument that it had become a stronghold of nationalist parochialism and separatism and thereby an obstacle to the effective integration and assimilation of Hungarians into Romanian life and society. *Ipsa facto* the University also held back the minority from social progress and the task of building Socialism in Romania.

Was this really the case? Had the Bolyai University really become the obstacle to progress and inter-ethnic, inter-nationality peace? To answer this question we will reflect on the history of the Bolyai University in relation to the institution's relations with its host city Cluj (Kolozsvár, Klausenburg) and to the service role it was to have for the peoples of historical Transylvania as well as Hungary and Romania respectively.

Background

The fate of the Bolyai University reflects in a microcosm the fate of Transylvanian Hungarians as a whole. Thus, in terms of emotional and general psychological effects, its fate parallels Romanian–Hungarian relations from the end of the Second World War to the end of the 1950s. However, if we are to analyze these relations with minimum distortion, it is important first to summarize the history of formal higher education in Cluj (Kolozsvár), from its beginnings to the end of the Second World War. The first attempt to organize an institution of higher education in Kolozsvár is tied to the rule of János Zsigmond (John Sigismund). In 1565 the Transylvanian Diet accepted a plan for the establishment of a college. However, the unstable political conditions and the religious tensions between the major denominations kept the plan from being realized until 1581. (János Zsigmond was Unitarian.) In that year István Báthory (Catholic) opened a college under Jesuit direction. Its academic rank was officially recognized by Pope Gregory XIII

the following year. It evolved out of monastic roots and instruction was provided in Latin by Hungarian, German, and Polish Jesuits.²

When the Catholic Báthory family was replaced by Calvinist rulers, the role of the college was eclipsed by a Protestant College established at Gyulafehérvár (Alba Iulia) in 1622 by Gábor Bethlen. This lasted until the Tatar incursion of 1658, when the institution's library was destroyed in the fighting. Thus, it was only in 1693 that a third attempt succeeded in establishing a college at Kolozsvár, this time with a strengthened curriculum in the natural sciences. It underwent major reorganization under Maria Theresa in 1773 when Pope Clement XIV dissolved the Jesuit order. By 1776 the Piarist fathers were responsible for instruction and the institution acquired the title "Universitas". However, the rule of the "enlightened" monarch Joseph II reduced the role of this institution by making German the language of instruction in 1781 and re-classifying it as a Lyceum in 1784. Thus, we can say that from 1784 to 1872 college and university instruction was non-existent in Transylvania. In this time period intellectual life was guided primarily by scientific and cultural associations.³

The immediate forerunner of the present Babeş-Bolyai institution was established in 1872 after the Compromise of 1867 and the "union of the two Hungarian homelands". The Hungarian Parliament established it with the XIX and XX laws passed in 1872. It was named the University of Francis Joseph I in 1881.⁴ Instruction at this institution was in Hungarian, with German and Romanian language and literature taught in one department for each. In 1872 it had 258 students, a number that grew to 2,570 by the 1918–1919 academic year. At this time 83% of the student body was Hungarian.⁵

On May 12, 1919 Romanian troops occupied the University and named a Romanian professor as the new provost. In the fall of 1919 a Romanian University replaced the Hungarian institution and it was renamed the University of King Ferdinand I. Hungarian language and literature was now taught solely in one department, as was German. The language of instruction became Romanian. By the end of the 1919–1920 academic year it had 2,552 students with a student body that was mainly Romanian. The Hungarians were not allowed to organize their own University. Thus, Hungarian intellectual life was restricted primarily to scientific and cultural associations and their activities.⁶

The Second World War and the Vienna Award of 1940 changed all this. With the return of Northern Transylvania to Hungary in August of that year, it was possible to re-establish a Hungarian University in Kolozsvár. From 1940 to 1944 Transylvania acquired two universities. In Kolozsvár the University of Francis Joseph I was re-established with Hungarian language instruction, reoccupying the buildings it had had to vacate in 1919. Now the Romanian University of King Ferdinand I had to relocate to Sibiu (Nagyszeben, Hermannstadt) in Southern Transylvania.⁷ This dualism lasted until 1944, when Romania switched sides on

August 23rd and joined the Allies in fighting Germany and the remnants of the Axis Powers.

Soviet and Romanian military advances into Northern Transylvania did not bring this dualism to an end immediately. In fact only after the 1956 Hungarian Revolution did the Romanian leadership decide to move against Hungarian University-level instruction. During the last days of the Second World War the Hungarian University survived for a number of reasons. The most important reasons were: One, the Hungarian instructional staff did not flee and delayed the evacuation of University facilities until it was too late; two, the Romanian Maniu Guardists carried out atrocities against Hungarian civilians, which convinced the Soviet authorities not to let the Romanians reoccupy Northern Transylvania until hostilities ceased; and three, because Soviet occupation authorities wanted to avoid disruption of services in their sector of occupation. This enabled the Hungarian university to continue functioning during the 1944–1945 academic year.⁸

Cluj/Kolozsvár/Klausenburg

The Bolyai University was a direct successor to the Hungarian University that was re-established in Kolozsvár after the Second Vienna Award in 1940. While Northern Transylvania was part of Hungary it operated in that city until the end of the war, and was officially transformed into the Bolyai University only in 1946.⁹ At this time the city was still predominantly Hungarian. In fact, the city continued to have a Hungarian majority to the very moment when the Bolyai University was absorbed by the Babeş University.

Parallel to this “merger” of the two institutions the city of Cluj was itself undergoing a process of Romanianization. From the 1910 population census, when Hungarians still constituted 83.4% of the population and Romanians only 12.3%, the nationality profile was systematically changed to 50.3% and 48.2% by 1956 and 22.7% and 75.6 by 1992. (See *Table 1* on the “nationality profile” of the city.) In part this reduction of the Hungarian ratio was planned and implemented by both the Romanian leadership of the interwar years and the Communist leadership after the Second World War. Cluj was targeted for this Romanianization because it was a symbol of the Hungarian presence in Transylvania. The university was seen as a major instrument of Romanianization. Already in the interwar period Romanian professors, administrators, and students moved in large numbers into the city.¹⁰ It provided the new Romanian administrators of the city, county and region with an important base of support and became the institutional core of the Romanian effort to transform the nationality profile of the city.

The effort to make Cluj the center of Romanianization was evident in the reduction of the educational opportunities for the Hungarian population.¹¹ They

Table 1. Population of Cluj/Kolozsvár by Nationality, 1880–1992

census year	total	no. of Hungarians	no. of Romanians	no. of Germans	others*	% of Hungarians	% of Romanians	% of Germans	% of others
1880	29,923	22,761	3,855	1,423	1,884	76.1	12.9	4.8	6.2
1890	32,736	27,514	6,039	1,336	660	84.0	9.9	4.1	2.0
1900	49,295	40,845	6,039	1,784	627	82.9	12.3	3.6	1.2
1910	60,808	50,704	7,562	1,676	866	83.4	12.4	2.8	1.4
1920	83,542	41,583	28,274	2,073	11,612	49.8	33.8	2.5	13.8
1930	100,844	54,776	34,836	2,702	8,530	54.2	34.5	2.7	8.4
1941	110,956	97,698	10,029	1,825	1,404	88.0	9.0	1.7	1.2
1956	154,723	77,839	74,628	1,115	1,141	50.3	48.2	0.7	0.7
1966	185,663	76,934	104,914	n.a.	3,815	41.4	56.5	n.a.	2.0
1977	262,853	86,215	173,003	n.a.	3,635	32.7	65.8	n.a.	1.3
1992	328,602	74,871	248,572	n.a.	5,159	22.7	75.6	n.a.	1.5

Based on "Statistical Studies on the Last Hundred Years in Central Europe", Mid-European Center, New York, 1968; Árpád E. Varga, *Fejezetek a jelenkori Erdély népesedéstörténetéből*. Budapest: Püski, 1998, 262–263.

were left only with the possibility of attending the Romanian-language Ferdinand I. University, but not in proportion to their numbers in the overall population, much less in the population of Cluj. (See *Table 2* for the nationality profile of the Ferdinand I. University of Cluj from 1919 to 1939.)

Table 2. The Hungarian Student Body of the Romanian Ferdinand I. University of Cluj

Academic Year	Total number of students	number of Hungarian students	% of Hungarian students of student body
1919–20	3793	n.a.	n.a.
1921–22	2447	32	1.3
1923–24	1967	n.a.	n.a.
1925–26	2357	n.a.	n.a.
1927–28	2741	n.a.	n.a.
1929–30	3757	753	20.2
1931–32	4124	935	22.6
1933–34	4072	1127	27.6
1935–36	3690	753	20.4
1937–38	3155	566	17.9
1938–39	4094	553	13.5

Based on *Erdély magyar egyeteme*. Kolozsvár: Az Erdélyi Tudományos Intézet kiadása, 1941, 332.

Political Transformation

The Soviet occupation of Northern Transylvania lasted from October 1944 to March 1945. On March 6th of 1945 the Petru Groza administration came to power, assuring the Soviet Union of a friendly government in Bucharest.¹² On April 11th and 12th a delegation representing the Romanian University of Sibiu came to Cluj to discuss the future of the University facilities. By May 29th a formal decision had been rendered to move the Romanian University back to Cluj. At the same time a new charter was issued creating a separate Hungarian University. However, the Romanian University would get all the facilities in Cluj and the Hungarian University would have to make do with whatever other facilities could be found, including the buildings of a girl's high school and a reformatory. There were no buildings that would be adequate for the Medical College.¹³

Still, the Hungarian University was not abolished. It officially became the *Universitatea Bolyai din Cluj* (The Bolyai University of Cluj) in 1946. It survived because it was in the interest of the Petru Groza administration to placate the Hungarian minority. In this way he could assure their support for his administration. At the same time it was useful to demonstrate to the outside world that Romania was pursuing a tolerant policy toward its minorities. The negotiations in Paris leading to the Peace Treaty were concerned in part with the future fate of Northern Transylvania.¹⁴ Would it remain part of Romania or would part of it be returned to Hungary? Apparently the retention of the Bolyai University was a convincing argument, used by Foreign Minister Tatarescu, to allow Romania to retain all of Transylvania.

Unfortunately the Bolyai University did not last long following the signing of the Paris Peace Treaty. Within a decade it was divided, reduced and finally by 1959 absorbed by the Romanian Babeş University. This process was carried out in a series of campaigns that culminated in the institution's Romanianization.

As we mentioned above, the actual Romanianization of the Bolyai University followed (or led) in some cases the overall pattern of Romanianization in Transylvania. The process went through a series of phases, including the immediate post-war period until the abdication of King Michael (1944–1947), the Stalinist consolidation of Pauker–Luka–Gheorghiu-Dej (1948–1951), the purging of the Party's "foreign" cadres (1952–1956) and the Gheorghiu-Dej era of Romanian "national" re-assertion (1957–1965).

One could argue that Romania under both Gheorghiu-Dej and Ceauşescu perfected the "salami tactics" system of Mátyás Rákosi, at least in the way in which it systematically undermined Hungarian instruction at the University level. As we have shown above, the nationality policy of the 1944–1947 years corresponded primarily to Romania's desire to retain all of Transylvania. With this in mind all kinds of temporary concessions were made to the minorities. The nationality pol-

icy also responded to Soviet hegemonial demands to assure that a communist government would come to power in Romania. Playing on the insecurities of the minorities helped the Communists to power. This required concessions such as the "Nationality Statute" and the protection of minority-language institutions, including the Bolyai University.¹⁵

The relative enlightenment in minority-majority relations was also due to two other factors. One was the role of Petru Groza, the other was the over-representation of the minorities in the Party organization at higher levels of the hierarchy. At least this was the case in 1946–1947, and also to a more limited extent from 1947 to 1952. While Groza was influential in policymaking, the minorities fared much better. His outlook was colored by tolerance for diversity and respect for the cultural contributions of all nationalities. In relation to the Bolyai University this was clearly demonstrated by his support in 1945 of the retention of thirty instructors who had Hungarian rather than Romanian citizenship prior to 1940.¹⁶ However, as Groza lost his influence and the Party apparatchiks around Gheorghiu-Dej gained influence, he was less able to stem the tide of Romanian ethnocentrism.

The most dramatic development having long-range effects on the position of the country's ethnic minorities and on the resurgence of nationalism was the rapid growth of the Party following the seizure of power. This growth, particularly in the years up to 1948, drastically altered its ethnic make-up. It relegated the ethnic minority Party members, who in the past composed the bulk of the Rumanian Communist Party (RCP), to a secondary position as Party ranks were swelled by ethnic Romanians who had seen the "handwriting on the wall".¹⁷

This rapid post-war growth of the Party was the first major step toward its "nationalization". After 1948, however, the RCP stabilized its membership and carried out purges among elements it regarded as "unhealthy". Even these purges, however, caused greatest damage not in the ranks of the newly recruited ethnic Romanians, but in the ranks of the veteran ethnic minority Communists.¹⁸ Thus, both the growth and the purges of the Party contributed to the strengthening of the ethnic Romanian sectors of the RCP. The most recent increases in Party membership under Ceaușescu further accentuated this trend.¹⁹ The regime's search for popularity among the masses led to lowering its standards for membership. This enabled many to join who were ignorant of, if not hostile to the tenets of "proletarian internationalism" and the traditional policies of "minority tolerance" which had prevailed prior to this rapid growth in Party membership. This change took place on all levels of the Party hierarchy, from the Politburo down to the local cell organizations. This change brought about a real "nationalization" of the Party along ethnic Romanian lines.²⁰

The changed complexion of the leadership in the Romanian power-structure set the stage for the "salami tactics" that characterized the Romanianization of all aspects of minority life. This process of planned corrosion began almost at the

moment that the regime issued the charter for the Bolyai University's right to exist. It could be argued, perhaps, that this first stage was not a consequence of Party planning, but the result of the passive resistance of the Romanian academicians who did not want to see a Hungarian University in Cluj. The most direct result of this resistance is that the University buildings were *not* shared. Because the Hungarians had to move out they could not find facilities large enough to house their institution. This forced them to divide the institution, leaving the legal, humanities, and social science sections in Cluj, while the Medical and Pharmaceutical sections moved to Tîrgu-Mureş.²¹ This initial forced division of the University was made official in 1948 when the Medical and Pharmaceutical college was made independent of the Bolyai University by political decree.²²

Parallel to this development, the university-level instruction of the institution was also undermined. Under the pretext of paying greater heed to ideological commitments, the instructors who did not have Romanian citizenship prior to 1940, were now terminated by non-renewal of their contracts. This meant that some of the most well-known scholars could no longer teach at the Bolyai University. A similar process of "weeding" or "purging" also took its toll among the Hungarian instructors with Romanian citizenship. Some of the finest instructors were charged with being "clerical reactionaries". While most were purged in this fashion during the early 1950s, some had already suffered termination as early as 1947.²³

It is true that the instructors of the Romanian Babeş University also suffered during these Stalinist purges. However, a close comparison of the effects of these purges shows that the damage done to the Bolyai University was much more severe. It disrupted continuity of instruction and undermined the quality of education. It also instilled a constant sense of insecurity among the students, not just in terms of their personal existence, but in terms of the survival of the Bolyai University. This was accentuated by the recruitment of "politically reliable" replacements who were not competent in the areas or courses they were supposed to teach.²⁴

The Impact of the 1956 Revolution

Of all the Hungarian minorities in East Central Europe, the Transylvanian Hungarians were perhaps most adversely affected by the 1956 Revolution, both immediately and in the long run.²⁵ Until 1956–1958, they had had an extensive network of cultural and educational institutions. From this time onward these institutions and associated opportunities became the target of cutbacks, outright abolition, or gradual erosion. For the Transylvanian Hungarians, 1956 was the be-

ginning of extensive discrimination and even repression based on their national origin and sense of solidarity with the Hungarians of Hungary.

During the next two years the Romanian leadership undertook a systematic propaganda campaign to discredit the Revolution and its Transylvanian sympathizers. The Revolution was presented as a throwback to the “Horthyist”, “Fascist” past that would have become a threat to the territorial integrity of Romania.²⁶ Again, the mood that was activated related more to the knee-jerk reactions of the Little Entente than to the quest for “socialist solidarity”. This campaign came to a head a week before the first anniversary of the Hungarian Revolution, when the Party held a meeting of intellectuals at Cluj.²⁷ At this meeting the Hungarian intellectuals, headed by Lajos Jordáky, engaged in self-criticism of their behavior during the previous October. They admitted having succumbed to nationalism and having sympathized with the actions of Imre Nagy and other leaders of the “counterrevolution”.²⁸ In effect, this meeting documented the “nationalism” and “isolationism” of the Transylvanian Hungarians even at the highest levels.

The Romanian leaders began to move against this threat of “nationalism” at the first opportunity. The withdrawal of Soviet troops from Romania in the Summer of 1958 meant that the last impediment to Romanian nationalist revival had been removed.²⁹ Gheorghiu-Dej and his faction of the leadership immediately set about dismantling the Hungarians’ remaining cultural institutions. The first major blow was aimed at the Bolyai University, which was merged with the Romanian Babeş University.³⁰

Actually, the merger of the two institutions was already contemplated before the Hungarian Revolution of 1956.³¹ However, the uprising provided it with a pretext which would enable the Party leaders to speed up the process of “unification”. During the 1955–1956 academic year visits by important party leaders to Cluj and the Bolyai University, hinted that the Romanian leadership was thinking of “alternative options”. Leonte Rautu of the Executive Committee and Miron Constantinescu visited with the University’s administrators raising questions about the placement of graduates and the “excessive” time devoted to Hungarian literature in the curriculum.³² Also, during the summer of 1956 steps were taken to terminate the instruction of history in Hungarian. Although the University was able to stall implementation of this, it was not able to avoid the Party’s directives to hold round table discussions with administrators and instructors from the Romanian Babeş University, which became regular weekly occurrences at the Continental Hotel.³³

After the Revolution in Hungary broke out in October 1956, everything speeded up.³⁴ Under trumped-up charges of sympathizing with the Revolution they fired a number of instructors in the Social Studies fields (Géza Saszet, Edit Keszi Harmat, etc.) and arrested a group of students in the history department. Then a brief lull followed until March, 1958, when more arrests and trials took

place. The Dobai-Komáromi trial was followed by the arrest of talented young University instructors, including Gyula David, Elemér Lakó and János Varró. They were accused of counter-revolutionary agitation for having visited the graves of the poets Sándor Reményik and Jenő Dsida during October, 1956, singing and reciting their poems. The well known professor Lajos Jordáky was also arrested at this time as well as many students in the Department of Hungarian Studies.³⁵

Then a meeting of the Bolyai student body was called, at which representatives of the Young Communist League from Bucharest also participated. Provocative questions were asked of the students, and emotions ran high. Eight students were arrested and one of them was given a twelve-year prison sentence. A few days later the University was visited by Virgil Trofin, the Central Committee member with responsibility for youth affairs. For “weakness and indecisiveness” he had both the Dean (András Bodor) and Assistant Dean (Zoltán Náhlik) removed from their positions.³⁶

The next step was to go public with the “Hungarian problem”. This took place on February 18–22, 1959 at the Bucharest Conference of the Romanian Student Association.³⁷ A high-powered government delegation was present at the meeting including General Secretary of the Party Gheorghe Gheorghiu-Dej and Athanasie Joja, the Minister of Education. Gheorghiu-Dej denounced “isolationism” and said that steps must be taken to eradicate the remnants of “national antagonisms”. This could only be achieved by bringing all students of all nationalities together in one institution where they can build Socialism together as a united and patriotic people. All the people who spoke up favored the unification of universities and schools. Minister of Education Joja added that even beyond the classroom, it is important to give students a sense of national unity via common dormitories and other common activities.³⁸

Merger/Absorption

On February 23rd the Administration of the Bolyai University called a meeting of the University Council. The Rector presided and stated that the Assistant Rector would make a statement that could not be discussed or questioned. The Assistant Rector then stated that the Party and the Ministry of Education had decided – on the basis of the demands of students from both universities – to unite the two universities of Cluj. Pandemonium broke out in the chamber, but the Rector refused to allow anyone to speak. He simply concluded the meeting by saying that this decision is in the best interest of all concerned, it will allow for teaching of all courses in Hungarian as well as Romanian and at half the cost because it will reduce administrative and other forms of duplication. He also called on everyone to

support the Party and Government decision with their active participation in the scheduled unification meetings.³⁹

These meetings began on February 26 and continued until March 5th almost in marathon fashion. The objective of these meetings was to build public support for the Party's decision and to isolate those who were opposed to it. For this reason the Party sent many of its influential leaders to these "public sessions", including Nicolae Ceaușescu, a member of the Presidium, the Minister of Education Joja, Ion Iliescu, the president of the Romanian Student Federation (he has also been elected twice as President of post-communist Romania), and many others. Speakers followed one another in a steady stream applauding the Party's decision to "merge" the two universities. In this atmosphere only three members of the Bolyai staff dared to speak up against the unification: Edgár Balogh, István Nagy and László Szabédi.⁴⁰

The public meetings were then used to bring pressure on those who were still hesitant or noncommittal about this decision. Nicolae Ceaușescu personally guided the intimidating of the individuals who opposed the decision. He harangued those present by saying that no one should live under the illusion that a Swiss model was applicable to Romania. No such "medieval" model was acceptable in sovereign Romania, where there was no room for Ghettos, and the "isolation of nationalities". In Romania there was room only for one culture, a culture devoted to the construction of Socialism.⁴¹

László Szabédi was picked out for particular pressure, because of his stature in the community and at the University. He did not break! When called by Ceaușescu to present his own views, he presented them in Hungarian as his colleague Lajos Nagy translated them into Romanian. Ceaușescu was livid and publicly castigated him. During subsequent evenings Szabédi was called in for questioning by the Securitate. This harassment convinced him that he could not alter the decision, but he refused to become a party to it. He committed suicide. On May 5th the Assistant Rector Zoltán Csendes and his wife also followed his example.⁴²

"Unification" in this psychological sense, was then followed by joint committee discussions between the two universities for the actual implementation of this decision. While the "charter" of the Bolyai University was never annulled, no legal document was drawn up to define the rights and obligations of the two institutions in the newly created "Babeș-Bolyai University". In this way no one could be held accountable for the non-fulfillment of obligations. However, the joint committees did hammer out the future academic program in terms of language use in the classroom. Already in this "compromise" it became apparent that the Bolyai faculty and students would henceforth play second fiddle to the Babeș faculty and student body. Of all courses offered at the new unified institution, 137 would be offered in Romanian, while only 43 would be in Hungarian. In some areas Hun-

garian was totally excluded (law and economics) while in others it was reduced to a few insignificant sections, that were totally eliminated by the middle of the 1980s.⁴³ Only in the pedagogical section did Hungarian instruction survive for Hungarian literature and Hungarian language by the time of Ceaușescu's overthrow in December, 1989.

The fate of lower-level educational institutions followed the same pattern; they were not eliminated outright, but made subordinate parts of Romanian-language grade schools or high schools and subjected to administrative restrictions that undercut their status and standards. These considerations led many Hungarian students to take their classes in Romanian rather than in their mother tongue.⁴⁴ Thus, after 1958, the educational system became an unabashed instrument of Romanianization.

Parallelization of Form and Content

The most pronounced feature of minority education in Transylvania has been the appearance of "parallelization". Though parallelization had always played a part earlier, it became particularly important after 1956.⁴⁵ "Parallelization" means the setting-up of Romanian language classes *parallel* with the existing minority language classes. This is done even in areas where there are no Romanian students to attend them. The primary purpose is to induce minority students to leave their own schools and classes to attend the schools and classes of the majority nationality. This policy reduced, in the long-run, the existence of the nationality schools. What happened is that one minority school after another closed because there were supposedly not enough pupils to attend them.⁴⁶ The real reason, however, was that the parallel schools and sections existed to absorb the students of the minority schools, after they had been pressured into deserting the latter.⁴⁷

Parallelization has affected all levels of education, not excepting universities and higher institutions. In fact, it is on the level of higher education that this policy most clearly revealed the attempt to "Romanianize" and to assimilate. While proletarian internationalism lasted, the Hungarian minority had not only its own independent Bolyai University at Cluj, but its Medical and Pharmaceutical Institute in Tîrgu-Mureș (Marosvásárhely), and a Hungarian section in the Petru Groza Agricultural Institute and at the Gh. Dima Conservatory also at Cluj.⁴⁸ All four were "parallelized". As we have seen the Bolyai University was the first to meet this fate. This was followed by the reduction (i.e., absorption) of the Hungarian section of both the Petru Groza Agricultural Institute and the Hungarian Medical-Pharmaceutical Institute at Tîrgu Mureș in 1962. From that date all higher education for Hungarians was restricted to Romanian institutions, and to the few re-

maining Hungarian sections, which still maintained a precarious existence within such Romanian facilities.⁴⁹

The Romanianizing effects of parallelization can be seen in the academic publishing activity of the Babeş-Bolyai University. While Nicolae Ceauşescu and lesser party leaders have denied that Romanianization existed,⁵⁰ a brief analysis of the official academic journals of the Babeş-Bolyai University indicates just the opposite.

Before the Babeş and the Bolyai Universities were merged, in 1958 their learned journals were published in Romanian and Hungarian respectively.⁵¹ After the merger, the academic publications still appeared in both languages, but now the Romanian and Hungarian studies appeared together rather than in separate journals. In most cases each of these studies was followed by a brief summary of its contents in the other language.⁵² However, with the passage of time (less than seven years) the Hungarian language studies were almost completely eliminated.⁵³

As a perusal of these studies indicates, Hungarian scholars now published their studies mainly in Romanian.⁵⁴ This tendency was not a “natural process”. It was a consequence of both faculty and editorial pressure.⁵⁵ Perhaps an even more telling indicator is the “format” of these academic journals. In the years immediately after the merger, the journals were truly bilingual in appearance as well as content. The “table of contents” in each journal listed the articles according to the language in which they were written. The Hungarian article listings were even followed by Romanian translations.⁵⁶ Titles, such as “contents”, appeared in both languages. At first even the name of the place (Cluj-Kolozsvár) of publication, was provided in both languages. But, this was not to last. By 1959, the place of publication was listed only in Romanian.⁵⁷ In some journals even the bilingual designation for “contents” (Sumar-Tartalom) was replaced with the Romanian “Sumar”.⁵⁸ While this may seem trivial, it indicates that the “national form” was being eliminated for Transylvanian Hungarians in the University’s life.

A substantive analysis of these articles also indicates that the “socialist content” of higher learning, was falling more and more within a national Romanian, rather than an international Communist mold. This, of course, is discernable only in studies which fall within the Social Sciences. A comparison of the pre-merger academic journal, appearing in Hungarian, with its post-1958 successors, reveals that the earlier studies were often concerned with local Transylvanian problems and Hungarian cultural matters.⁵⁹ The later studies, on the other hand, have been concerned more with the problems, culture and history of Romania as a whole.⁶⁰

The parallelization of the Bolyai University with the Babeş University has had other consequences as well. The two most dramatic results have been the Romanianization of the teaching staff and the student body of the combined institution. Louis Takács, who was the provost of the Bolyai University at the time of

its merger, wrote a memorandum fifteen years later, to document the consequences of the merger. In this memorandum he pointed out that in the hiring practices of the new combined (parallelized) University whenever an opening occurred, in almost every instance it was filled by a Romanian instructor.⁶¹ George Schöpflin provides an excellent summary table on the consequences of this process (see *Table 3*).

Table 3. Nationality Breakdown of the Academic Staff of Certain Departments of the Babeş-Bolyai University at Cluj

		newly appointed staff		
		1958–1959	1976–1977	1958–1977
chemistry	Romanians	45	63	31
	Hungarians	36	14	1
law	Romanians	18	23	8
	Hungarians	15	4	1
economics	Romanians	23	76	n.a.
	Hungarians	15	19	n.a.
physics	Romanians	n.a.	92	n.a.
	Hungarians	n.a.	19	n.a.
mathematics	Romanians	31	51	30
	Hungarians	19	14	3
biology	Romanians	n.a.	112	n.a.
	Hungarians	n.a.	24	n.a.
history and philosophy	Romanians	29	20	Nil
	Hungarians	14	7	Nil

Source: Adapted from data in the memorandum by Lajos Takács, 1977, in samizdat.

In the process of Romanianizing the staff of the merged institution, the opportunities for Hungarian instruction were automatically reduced. Although initially, at the time of the merger – and subsequently reinforced by a party resolution of 1971 – certain subjects were to be presented also in the Hungarian language. These included philosophy, history, economics, psychology, mathematics, physics, chemistry, botany, zoology, geography, medicine and pharmacy. As George Schöpflin pointed out, this meant that Hungarian university graduates were largely restricted to medicine and teaching as career options.⁶² These observations are also reinforced by the overall reduction of the Hungarian-language instructional staff. (See *Table 4* on the “Instructional Personnel of the Babeş-Bolyai University”.)

In terms of overall enrollment Schöpflin provides a number of other insights based on the Takács memorandum. During the last year (1957–1958) before the merger “the total number of Hungarian undergraduates following full-time courses in Romania was about 5,500. Of these 4,082 were studying... [in] the

Table 4. Instructional Personnel at Babeş-Bolyai University According to Nationality*

instructors	1958–59		1970–71		1977–78		1980–81	
	number	%	number	%	number	%	number	%
Total number	675	100	819	100	777	100	772	100
Romanians	385	55.5	564	68.9	586	75.4	601	77.8
All minorities	n.a.	n.a.	255	31.1	191	24.6	171	22.2
Hungarians	272	41.4	194	23.7	148	19.1	139	18.0
Other minorities	n.a.	n.a.	61	7.4	43	5.5	32	4.2

* Based on *A romániai magyar főiskolai oktatás: Múlt, jelen, jövő*. Cluj/Kolozsvár: Jelenlét Alkotó Társaság, 1990, 29.

Hungarian language”.⁶³ Hungarian students constituted 10.75 percent of all undergraduates in that year. By 1974–1975 their share of students had declined to 5.7 percent of the undergraduate population which had, on the other hand, grown to more than double of what it had been two decades before.⁶⁴ For all practical purposes the elimination of the autonomous Bolyai University has eliminated Hungarian language instruction at the college/university levels.

The consequences of this were more drastic in light of employment opportunities *after* graduation. Hungarian graduates were discouraged from finding employment in Hungarian inhabited parts of Romania. They were pressured to look for employment outside of Transylvania in the Regat (“Old” Kingdom, i.e., Moldavia and Wallachia).⁶⁵ This was particularly the case if the individual was highly trained or educated and therefore would occupy a leading position. The purpose of this restriction was twofold: First to disperse the Hungarian minority as much as possible, and second, to deprive those Hungarians of their leaders who were still concentrated in specific areas. Both of these objectives were much easier to achieve once the Babeş-Bolyai University was completely Romanianized.

Long-term Consequences

After the overthrow of the Ceauşescu dictatorship in Romania, the Hungarian minority finally had the opportunity to reorganize itself to defend its human and minority rights. In this struggle Hungarians brought into being their own political party called RMDSZ (UDMR), in English translation: the Democratic Federation of Hungarians in Romania. This organization became a very important component of the Romanian political system, first as a member of the opposition during the first Iliescu administration, then as part of the governing coalition during the Constantinescu administration, and most recently as a part-time critic, part-time reluctant partner, of the second Iliescu and the Traian Basescu administrations. This same Hungarian political party/interest group, also sponsored an important

self-assessment of the Hungarian minority, by compiling and editing a “Who’s Who” of the Hungarian inhabitants of Romania. This “Who’s Who” is an invaluable storehouse of information on the Hungarian “elite” in present-day Romania.⁶⁶

The “Who’s Who” was dated 1997, but the research for it was completed on October 1, 1996. It’s a compilation that is based on six thousand biographical sketches culled from 35 thousand forms that were sent out to and distributed among community leaders and church institutions as well as public officials and educational establishments.⁶⁷ These six thousand individuals represent a good cross-section of the Hungarian elite in present-day Romania. It is a compilation that profiles the active cultural, religious, economic, educational and political leadership of close to 1.5 million minority inhabitants in Romania.

On the basis of a content analysis of this volume, with the assistance of my most faithful research associate – my wife – I have been able to pinpoint how many individuals in this sample are graduates, or former students, of the Bolyai and Babeş-Bolyai University respectively.⁶⁸

The analysis leads to a number of important conclusions: first, that this elite was drawn in large part from among the students of the Bolyai University; second, that their publications and leadership represents an important segment of the Hungarian elite in Romania, and third that they have been in the forefront of democratic changes in the new post-Ceauşescu Romania. Of the six thousand individuals listed in the “Who’s Who” almost 25% were either students or employees of the Bolyai and the Babeş-Bolyai Universities respectively.

Although it is difficult to separate these graduates and faculty members from the rest of society, we can tell a lot about their impact on Romanian society through their contributions to the over-all culture and the public debate that has surrounded minority-majority relations in contemporary Romania.

Conclusion

The history of the Bolyai University demonstrates that a minority nationality educational institution is an indispensable instrument for elite and leadership training. This history also reveals that the nationalism of the majority power-structure, at least in Romania after 1956, viewed this institution as a possible threat to its control of society. Hence, it moved to weaken and to eliminate the “independent” Hungarian University by merging it with the Romanian Babeş University. As the foregoing data indicates this resulted in absorption, and the Romanianization of university education.

In retrospect it is difficult to assess the linkage of the Bolyai University for inter-ethnic/inter-nationality relations without an analysis of its curriculum and

the values and beliefs of its graduates. In the preliminary discussions leading to the absorption of the Bolyai University, Leonte Rautu had indicated that too much emphasis was given to Hungarian literature in the curriculum. As the subsequent “unification meetings” also demonstrated, the Romanian leadership wanted to eliminate the Bolyai University as a “refuge of reactionary thinking, isolationism and ghetto parochialism”. It contended, that this was a threat to progress and Socialism. In actuality the Bolyai University was viewed by Ceaușescu and the party elite as an obstacle to their own hidden agenda: the “homogenization” of the unitary Romanian nation. Did the Bolyai University really constitute a threat to the Romanian nation? Was it actually as narrow-minded as its narrow-minded destroyers claimed?

Unfortunately this research has not been able to compare the content of history lessons and their instruction at the two institutions. The only concrete items that reflect the thinking of these two institutions is their published instructional materials and/or the research and publications of their respective teaching personnel. From the published evidence – and there is plenty of it – the content analysis of works written by the graduates and instructors of the Bolyai University reflect a desire for peaceful co-existence and mutual tolerance. Unfortunately the reverse is not the case if one reads the published works of the leading academicians, like Stefan Pascu, of the Babeș-Bolyai University. However, such a detailed analysis awaits the work of future scholars.

Notes

- ¹ The city/place names in this paper will be presented in the language of the nationality that governed it at that time. The other names, in other languages, will be included in parentheses when first used.
- ² Rudolf Joó and Béla Barabás, “A kolozsvári magyar egyetem 1945-ben”, unpublished MS Prepared for Magyarorsághoz Intézet, 1988, 1 of introduction; *Erdély magyar egyeteme* (Kolozsvár: Az Erdélyi Tudományos Intézet Kiadása, 1941), 45–46; for the Romanian version of the origins see Stefan Pascu, *Universitatea “Babeș-Bolyai” din Cluj* (Cluj: Editura Dacia, 1972), 8.
- ³ *Ibid.*, 8–9; Joó and Barabás, “A kolozsvári magyar egyetem”, 2–4; *Erdély magyar egyeteme*, 54–136.
- ⁴ Joó and Barabás, 5–6.
- ⁵ *Ibid.*, 7–8; *Erdély magyar egyeteme*, 168.
- ⁶ *Ibid.*, 309–332; Pascu, *Universitatea “Babeș-Bolyai”*, 17–19; Joó and Barabás, 8–9.
- ⁷ Rudolf Joó, “Egy sorsdöntő esztendő: 1945 A kolozsvári magyar egyetem történetéből”, *Hitel*, X, No. 1 (January 3, 1989), 22; Pascu, *Universitatea “Babeș-Bolyai”*, 29–31.
- ⁸ Lajos Csögör, “Előszó” in Joó and Barabás, “A kolozsvári magyar egyetem”, 1–19, particularly 6–7; Joó, “Egy sorsdöntő esztendő”, 22–23.
- ⁹ Csögör, “Előszó” in Joó and Barabás, 10.
- ¹⁰ *Erdély magyar egyeteme*, 305–332.

- ¹¹ Árpád E. Varga, *Fejezetek a jelenkori Erdély népesedés történetéből* (Budapest: Püski, 1998), 167–178.
- ¹² Elemér Illyés, *National Minorities in Romania: Change in Transylvania* (Boulder and New York: East European Monographs, 1982), 106–111, 164–167.
- ¹³ Joó, “Egy sorsdöntő esztendő”, 23.
- ¹⁴ Csögör, “Előszó”, 11–12.
- ¹⁵ *Ibid.*: Illyés, *National Minorities*, 106–111.
- ¹⁶ Joó, “Egy sorsdöntő esztendő”, 24; Csögör, “Előszó”, 8.
- ¹⁷ Ghita Ionescu, *Communism in Rumania 1944–1962* (London: Oxford University Press, 1964), 204–208; Stephen Fischer-Galati (Ed.) *Romania* (New York: Frederick A. Praeger, Inc., 1956), 69–71; Robert R. King, *History of the Romanian Communist Party* (Stanford, CA: Hoover Press, 1980), 64. RCP stands for Communist Party of Romania. This name will be used throughout this study rather than the name adopted in 1948 at the time of the Communist “merger” with the Social Democrats. The name then adopted was Rumanian Workers’ Party (RWP). Since this study covers a longer period of time than just the post-1948 years, the older name of the Party will be used.
- ¹⁸ This is verified by the fact that in December, 1955, 79.2% of the RCP members were ethnic Romanians. By 1968, 88.43% were ethnic Romanians. Compare Ionescu, *Communism in Rumania*, 243, with “Report of Nicolae Ceaușescu on organizational measures for the steady strengthening of the moral-political unity of the working people”, *Documents, Articles and Information on Romania*, No. 27 (Oct. 28, 1968), 30.
- ¹⁹ Randolph L. Braham, “Rumania: Onto the Separate Path”, *Problems of Communism*, XIII (May-June, 1964), footnote 5, 16–17.
- ²⁰ D. A. Tomasic, “The Rumanian Communist Leadership”, *Slavic Review*, XX (October, 1961), 482, 492–494; Ionescu, *Communism in Rumania*, 204–215, 241–245, 316–321. Also see A. Ludanyi, “The Impact of 1956 on the Hungarians of Transylvania”, *Hungarian Studies*, XX, No. 1 (2006), 95–98.
- ²¹ Joó, “Egy sorsdöntő esztendő”, 23–24.
- ²² *Ibid.*, 24.
- ²³ *Ibid.*, Csögör, “Előszó”, 10–11.
- ²⁴ *Ibid.*, Joó, “Egy sorsdöntő esztendő”, 24.
- ²⁵ György Lázár, “Memorandum”, in *Witnesses to Cultural Genocide: First-Hand Reports on Rumania’s Minority Policies Today* (New York: Committee for Human Rights in Rumania, 1979), 104–105; Ludanyi, “The Impact of 1956...” 98–105.
- ²⁶ Robert R. King, *Minorities Under Communism: Nationalities as a Source of Tension Among Balkan Communist States* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1973), 84.
- ²⁷ *Ibid.*, 85.
- ²⁸ *Ibid.*
- ²⁹ Ferenc A. Vali, “Transylvania and the Hungarian Minority”, *Journal of International Affairs*, No. 20 (1966), 280.
- ³⁰ *Ibid.*, 282; István Révay, “Hungarian Minorities under Communist rule”, in *The Fight For Freedom: Facts About Hungary* (New York: Hungarian Committee, 1959), 298.
- ³¹ Kálmán Aniszi, “A Bolyai Tudományegyetem utolsó esztendeje: Beszélgetés dr. Sebestyén Kálmánnal”, *Hitel*, XII, No. 3 (March, 1999), 83; *A romániai magyar főiskolai oktatás: Múlt, jelen, jövő* (Cluj/Kolozsvár: Jelenlét Alkotó Társaság, 1990), 21.
- ³² *Ibid.*, 21–22.
- ³³ *Ibid.*, 22.
- ³⁴ Aniszi, “A Bolyai Tudományegyetem”, 83.
- ³⁵ *A romániai magyar főiskolai oktatás*, 22–23.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, 23.

³⁷ *Ibid.*

³⁸ *Ibid.*, 23–24; Aniszi, “A Bolyai Tudományegyetem utolsó esztendeje”, 86–87.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, 84–85.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 85–86; *A romániai magyar főiskolai oktatás*, 25.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*

⁴² *Ibid.*, 25–26; Aniszi, “A Bolyai Tudományegyetem utolsó esztendeje”, 86–87; Péter Cseke and Lajos Kántor (eds.) *Szabédi napjai* (Cluj-Kolozsvár: Komp-press, Korunk Baráti Társasága, 1998), 127–136.

⁴³ *A romániai magyar főiskolai oktatás*, 26–27.

⁴⁴ For this “Romanianization” process see *Rumania’s Violations of Helsinki Final Act Provisions Protecting the Rights of National, Religious, and Linguistic Minorities* (New York: Committee for Human Rights in Rumania, 1980), 20–31.

⁴⁵ “The Hungarian Minority Problem in Rumania”, *Bulletin of the International Commission of Jurists*, No. 17 (December, 1963), 76; Tamás Schreiber, “A magyar kisebbség helyzete Romániában”, *Irodalmi Újság*, July 15, 1964.

⁴⁶ In contradiction to the above contention it is possible to show that the total number of minority students in 4-year schools increased to 131,773 in 1956–1957 from 127,634 in 1955–1956. Yet in this same space of time the number of minority schools decreased from 1,416 to 1,343 in these same 4-year schools. This pattern is also apparent on the higher levels of education. See Randolph Braham, *Education in the Rumanian People’s Republic* (U.S. Dept. of Health, Education, and Welfare; Washington, D.C.: U.S. Govt. Printing Office, 1963), 75, table 13. While the decreases of the years prior to the above seem more natural, the decrease in later years certainly does not. Now the decrease of minority schools is followed by the decrease of minority students rather than the other way around.

⁴⁷ These pressures are of various kinds, some direct and some indirect. See in this regard “The Hungarian Minority Problem in Rumania”, 76; Schreiber, “A magyar kisebbség helyzete Romániában.” F. K., “Románia szüntesse meg az erdélyi magyarok üldözését”, *Katolikus Magyarok Vasárnapja*, 71 (June 21, 1964), 1.

⁴⁸ “Cluj Regiune” according to *Faalia*, Feb. 6, 1958, in “Comprehensive Regiune Summaries”, *Weekly Summary of the Rumanian Provincial Press*, 4–9 Feb. 1958 (JPRS/Washington, D.C. – April 22, 1958), 3.

⁴⁹ Besides this formal pattern of “integration” there is also an informal trend along similar lines which is stressed and fostered by the Romanian regime. The most recent example of this policy has been the sharing of rooms in student hostels and dormitories by Romanians and Hungarians. The pretext for this is that the Hungarian students will more easily learn Romanian if they share rooms with Romanian students. See “The Hungarian Minority Problem in Rumania.” This policy received its inception soon after the Hungarian Revolution of 1956. A. Rosca, “The Party Organizations and the Patriotic Education of the Youth”, *Lupta de Clasa* (Nov., 1957), 87–96 in *Selected Translations from East European Political Journals and Papers* (JPRS/Washington, D.C. Feb. 28, 1958), 126.

⁵⁰ Nicolae Ceaușescu, “A Romániai társadalom szerkezetében végbemenő mélyreható társadalmi-politikai változások” (Speech delivered on Oct. 24, 1968; Bukarest: Politikai Könyvkiadó, 1968), 28–41, and “Speech by János Fazekas at Odorhei Meeting”, *Documents, Articles and Information on Romania*, No. 21 (Aug. 27, 1968), 36–38, provide the best two examples of such denials.

⁵¹ Compare *Buletinul: Universitatilor V. “Babeș” si “Bolyai”*, Vol. I, Nr. 1–2, (1957), and V. “Babeș si Bolyai”, Vol. I, Nr. 1–2, and V. *Babeș és Bolyai Egyetemek Közleményei*, I. évf., 1–2. sz. (1956).

- 52 *Ibid.*, *Buletinul: Universitatilor V. "Babeş" si "Bolyai"*, Vol. I, Nr. 1–2 (1957).
- 53 In 1956–1957 it was still possible to find scholarly works in Hungarian. In *V. Babeş és Bolyai Egyetem Közleményei*, I évf., 1–2. sz. (1956), there were fourteen Hungarian language studies and five Rumanian Language studies followed by the Hungarian summaries of seven Rumanian studies. By 1960 it was evident that Hungarian language studies declined in numbers. In *Studia: Universitatis Babeş-Bolyai Series 1, Fasciculus 2, Anul 5* (1960), there are 26 items, articles and studies of which only one appears in Hungarian, while 21 of the contributors are Hungarian. By 1965 the situation became even worse. *Studia: Universitatis Babeş-Bolyai (Series Philosophia et Oeconomica, Anul X, 1965)*, contains seventeen items, articles and studies of which none appear in Hungarian in spite of the fact that five of the contributors are Hungarian.
- 54 *Ibid.*
- 55 That such faculty and editorial pressure existed is hard to substantiate. This contention is based on the observations of two scholars, a Pole and an American, who spent extended periods of time doing research at the Babeş-Bolyai University in Cluj (Kolozsvár) during 1967 and 1968 respectively. Both maintained, in personal conversations, that the pressure was evident in the language used by the Hungarian faculty members. They never spoke to one another in Hungarian, if even one Romanian faculty member was present.
- 56 *V. Babeş és Bolyai Egyetem Közleményei*, I. évf., 1–2. sz. (1956).
- 57 Compare *Ibid.*, and *Studia: Universitatis Babeş-Bolyai, Series 1, Fasciculus 1, Anul 4* (1959).
- 58 *Studia: Universitatis Babeş-Bolyai, Series 1, Fasciculus 1, Anul 5* (1960); *Studia: Universitatis Babeş-Bolyai, Series 3, Fasciculus 1, Anul 4* (1959); *Studia: Universitatis Babeş-Bolyai, Series Psychologia Paedagogia, Anul 9* (1964).
- 59 *A kolozsvári Bolyai tudományegyetem (1945–1955)* (Cluj, Transylvania: Állami Tanügyi és Pedagógiai Könyvkiadó, 1956), contains some of these studies. Also representative are: Emil Petrovici, "A Roman oris, orsia, orasa, orasani, oraseni magyar varjas", 223–226, Attila T. Szabó, "A gyermeklő és rokonsága", 235–251, and Mózes Gálffy and Gyula Márton, "A Bolyai-Egyetem magyar nyelvészeti tanszékének nyelvjáráskutató tevékenysége a Magyar Autonóm Tartományban", 253–279, in *V. Babeş és Bolyai Egyetem Közleményei*, I évf., 1–2. sz. (1956).
- 60 Some examples are: A. Bodor, "Adalékok a helyi elem fennmaradásának kérdéséhez a római kori Daciában: A Liber es a Libera kultusz", *Studia: Universitatis Babeş-Bolyai, Series 4, Fasciculus 1* (1960), 25–58; Zoltán Farkas, "Állam, nemzet és szuverenitás a szocializmusban", *Studia: Universitatis Babeş-Bolyai, Series Philosophia, Anul XI* (1966), 19–27. "Memorandum of Lajos Takács" in *Witnesses to Cultural Genocide*, 151–153.
- 61 *Ibid.*
- 62 *Ibid.*
- 63 *Ibid.*
- 64 *Ibid.*
- 65 *Ibid.*, 13.
- 66 István Stanik (Ed.) *Romániai magyar ki kicsoda 1997* (Cluj/Kolozsvár: RMD Sz and Scripta Kiadó, 1997).
- 67 *Ibid.*, 10.
- 68 *Ibid.*, perusal of entire listing.