

SZÉCHENYI ISTVÁN UNIVERSITY
DOCTORAL SCHOOL FOR REGIONAL AND ECONOMIC SCIENCES

Andrea Miklósné Zakar

**INTERETHNIC DISCOURSES OF INTELLECTUALS
ON THE AUTONOMY OF TRANSYLVANIA**

PHD THESIS

Consultant:
Dr. Károly Grúber PhD
Associate Professor
Széchenyi István University

Győr
September 2010

Table of contents

Theme and aim of the dissertation.....	3.
Research questions and hypotheses.....	6.
Research methodology.....	8.
Structure of the dissertation.....	11.
Thesis and conclusions.....	14.
The Author's related publications.....	18.
The Author's related scientific conference presentations.....	20.

THEME AND AIM OF THE DISSERTATION

Transylvania is a definite and special region owing to its historical, cultural and other peculiarities. The autonomy-possibilities of Transylvania has been analysed and discussed several times by experts, intellectuals and politicians. However this issue is very complex and it can not be analysed in its entirety. Neither the present dissertation can give an entire examination of this problem, but it tries to outline a well-defined analysis.

The research attempts to study the above mentioned issue within special confines, through which this examination seems to be unique and fills a gap: we wish to analyse the autonomy of Transylvania in connection with the interethnic (Hungarian-Romanian-German) discourse of intellectuals evolving in this issue. The interethnic approach is indispensable because the future of Transylvania can not be imagined without the consensus and discourse of the ethnic groups living together there: the autonomy of the region should be important for each constituent ethnic group in Transylvania. The German group had a limited contribution to the analysed discourse, but their presence is important to understand the Transylvanian interpretation attempts.

The dissertation analyses the interethnic discourse of intellectuals regarding an approximately fifteen years period between 1995-2010 highlighting the importance of a so called “main period” between 2000 and 2002, when the periodical Provincia was issued and the Provincia group was present in the public life of Transylvania. However before the appearance of Provincia there were other scenes where the interethnic discourses took place, for example the periodical Altera issued by Pro Europe League between 1995 and 2007. This periodical and the different dialogues organized by the League not only introduced but also continued the discourses after the disappearance of Provincia. Besides the dissertation tries to sum up the autonomy plans which have been conceived from the establishment of Great Romania up to nowadays. These plans provided good base and different models for the analysed discourse demonstrating that the issue of autonomy of Transylvania has deep roots in the history.

The analysis of the interethnic debates seems to be indispensable because it can disperse the misunderstanding that the idea of autonomy lives only in the Hungarians’ dreams. The presence of Romanian intellectuals in the discourse shows clearly that the will of Romanians in Transylvania does not definitely confront the Hungarians’ ideas about the future of Transylvania. Therefore we can not speak about a Hungarian-Romanian confrontation in this context, but probably about other tension generated and maintained by the politics.

The novelty of the dissertation resides in the approach through which the study tries to analyse the unrevealed aspects of this topic contributing to disperse some misunderstandings and to adopt new ideas in the already existing system.

The analysed region, Transylvania had a kind of separate character in the historic past, but it could be interpreted as an organic unity with the Hungarian history. The quasi-independent Transylvanian Principality was born in 1541, when the Ottoman Empire occupied Buda. Its independence lasted up to 150 years, but this separation was in danger during this period: the world-power countries wanted to limit (or to terminate) the independence of Transylvania.

The I. and II. Diploma Leopoldium finally attached Transylvania to the Habsburg Empire terminating the separation of the region. During the Rákóczi war of independence Ferenc Rákóczi was elected suzerain by the Transylvanian Diet. With this act the Diet wanted Transylvania to be independent again (before it Rákóczi got the suzerain of Hungary appointment from the Diet of Szécsény). Rákóczi needed this double appointment in order to enter into an alliance with Louis XIV. After the failure of war of independence Transylvania was attached again to the Habsburg Empire, but during the reign of Josef II. Kaiser Transylvania got regency with the seat in Nagyszeben (Hermannstadt). With this the Habsburg Empire wanted to break away Transylvania from Hungary. The so called “Twelve Points” formulated on 15 March 1713 declared the union with Transylvania, namely the fact that Transylvania was the part of Hungary.

This short historical overview also confirms the opinion of the Transylvanian intellectuals after 1919. They emphasized the following idea: the so called transylvanism should have been redefined. As a consequence the ideological stream of transylvanism was born which determined the Transylvanian Hungarians’ cultural-literary and ideological-political movements for a long time. *The redefinition of transylvanism has also been the main purpose of the interethnic-intercultural discourse analysed in the present dissertation. At the same time we wish to examine the impact of this discourse on the regionalisation process of Romania.*

In Transylvania the bottom-up regionalist processes are based on several pillars. They build upon the historic, ethnic and cultural uniqueness and the economic leader role of the region. The historical past of Transylvania has actually been supporting the argument according to which the region should be treated as a special entity. The ethnic map of Transylvania is also a good basis for regionalism however this peculiarity has been undergone through important

changes during and after the Second World War. The proportion of Romanian-Hungarian-German-Jewish ethnic groups varied because of the deportation of Jews during the world war, then owing to the modifications made in the Ceaușescu epoch which transformed the ethnic map of the country and especially the ethnic balance in Transylvania. The main part of the German group moved to West Germany by the "help" of the Romanian government which sold the German people to West Germany. The relocation of Romanians en masse from the Regat to the industrial areas of Transylvania served both the migration of labour and the destruction of ethnic proportions in the region.

Nowadays the ethnic groups in Transylvania do not live in high proportions in any part of the region only in the special area called Székelyföld where the proportion of Hungarians is still dominant. This fact queries the existence of an ethnic-cultural confine between Transylvania and the rest of the country, but there is a regional confine in this sense.

Anyway the multicultural variegation of Transylvania is unique and specific in East-Central Europe. The Transylvanian regionalism can build both upon this peculiarity and upon the economic development of the region, because the GDP per capita is higher than in other areas in the country not taking into account the capital and its agglomeration.

The specific situation and characteristics of Transylvania are the starting points of the analysed discourse. The present dissertation is a novum because it tries to analyse the issue of autonomy from a new approach. The interethnic discourse of intellectuals regarding the autonomy of Transylvania has not been analysed and summarised before. In the dissertation we concentrate on autonomy models which affected the whole territory of Transylvania and/or were included in the regional restructuring of the whole country. The aim of the interethnic dispute was to develop a new regional system which could be satisfactory for each ethnic group in the country. In this sense the plans concerning only the autonomy of Székelyföld are present in the dissertation but we do not focus especially on them.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND HYPOTHESES:

Research questions of the dissertation:

During the analyses and research we formulated a lot of questions. The thematic system of these questions is the following:

1. Were there historic antecedent models of the autonomy of Transylvania?
2. What kind of terminology system was introduced by the analysed discourse into the context of Transylvania?
3. What kind of regionalism, regionalisation and decentralisation models were outlined in the case of Romania in which the autonomy of Transylvania could come true?
4. How was the issue of regional identity treated in the discourse and how did the intellectuals interpret transethnicity in this context?
5. Can we talk about the possibilities of consociated democracy in Transylvania? What are its conditions?
6. How did the intellectuals conceive the federal structure of the country? What are the bases for a federal structure in Romania?
7. What kind of autonomy models were outlined in the discourse?
8. Was there any important clear-cut line between the Romanian and Hungarian viewpoints? How can we interpret interethnicity in this topic? Was there any consensus?
9. Is it possible to bridge the gap and tension between the political sphere and the intellectuals of the analysed discourse regarding the status of Transylvania? What would be the role of a regional party in this sense?
10. Could the analysed interethnic discourse change anything in Romania regarding the issue of autonomy of Transylvania?

Hypotheses:

In accordance with the research questions mentioned above the dissertation formulates the following system of hypotheses:

H1: It supposes that the analysed interethnic discourse on the autonomy of Transylvania produced a change of paradigm in many aspects.

We wish to find those characteristics of the discourse which seemed to denote something new in the context of the autonomy of Transylvania. We want to look for new terminology in the dispute which was introduced into this topic. At the same time the analysis tries to discover the changes generated and provoked by the interethnic discourse on the autonomy.

H2: It supposes the analysed discourse was a relevant form of the Transylvanian regionalism.

After outlining the theoretical basis of regionalism we wish to find the characteristics of regionalism in the discourse. The Transylvanian regionalism is a specific one, so we have to look for special features in accordance with the Transylvanian context. The interethnic approach is very important because the specific ethnic composition of the region makes the consensus of the relevant ethnic groups indispensable.

H3: It supposes that there was no relevant dividing line between the opinions of the different ethnic groups of intellectuals.

Analysing an interethnic discourse it is very important to study the approaches, opinions and ideas of the different ethnic groups in order to find the differences, the analogies and their consonance. We presume that there was no relevant ethnic dividing line in the discourse.

H4: It supposes that a special Transylvanian autonomy model can be outlined on the grounds of the analysed discourse.

We presume that a specific autonomy model can be outlined based on the opinions and ideas of intellectuals. This specific model would respect the Transylvanian economic, social and cultural peculiarities as well as the rights of minorities.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY:

During this present theoretic research we used mainly interpretative methods together with empiric research using interviews. Several interviews were made with some of the intellectuals of the analysed discourse.

A. Review of specialized literature:

The deductive theoretic frame of the dissertation starts from the challenges which nation states have to face nowadays and ends with the issue of autonomy. In order to understand and investigate our research problem we tried to review the specialized literature published in this issue in Hungarian, Romanian and English languages.

The literature about nation state, regions and region-forming processes worked up in the dissertation are mainly the works of Hungarian experts like: András A. Gergely, György Éger, Ferenc Gereben, Károly Grüber, Róbert Győri Szabó, Tamás Hardi, Gyula Horváth, Rudolf Joó, Imre Lengyel, József Nemes Nagy, Ilona Pálné Kovács, János Rechnitzer, Katalin Sipos, Elek Szokoly and Balázs Vizi. At the same time we consulted the works of foreign experts issued in English and Romanian. These specialists are: Robert Agranoff, George Brunner, Daniel J. Elazar, Peter Haslinger, Guy Héraud, Will Kymlicka, Brigid Laffan, Claudio Scarpulla and Frans Schrijver.

Insomuch as the right to autonomy was derived from the right to self-determination we laid stress upon the literature concerning the principle and right of self-determination. Besides the international documents we consulted the books and studies of the following experts: Gáspár Bíró, Csaba Lőrincz, Benyamin Neuberger and Kinga Tibori Szabó in Hungarian language; Rudolf Bernhardt, Hurst Hannum, Hans-Joachim Heintze, David Raič and the work of the group formed by Morton Halperin, David Scheffer, Patricia Small in English. Dealing with the practice of self-determination we entered into the details of consociated democracy with the help of the works written by Arend Lijphart, Zoltán Szász Alpár and Michael Wintle. Connected to this topic we also studied those state structures which gave free vent to internal self-determination analysing the works of Robert Agranoff, Daniel J. Elazar, Károly Grüber, Róbert Győri Szabó, Guy Héraud, Ilona Pálné Kovács and Katalin Sipos.

The issue of autonomy represents the central topic of the dissertation. Studying this important question we had to review several books and studies published in English language. We tried to sum up the experts' opinions prevailing the second half of the 20th century. The Hungarian

sources were written by Zoltán Bognár, Balázs Majtényi, Balázs Vizi, while the literature in English language covered the works of the following specialists: Rudolf Bernhardt, Iñigo Bullain, Wolfgang Danspeckgruber, Yoram Dinstein, Asbjorn Eide, Yash Ghai, Lauri Hannikainen, Hurst Hannum, Hans-Joachim Heintze, Ruth Lapidoth, Siân Lewis-Antony, Richard Lindley, Kjell-Åke Nordquist, Louis Sohn, Markku Suksi, Patrick Thornberry, Matti Wiberg and the work of Stefan Wolff and Marc Weller.

The historic section of the dissertation presents the review of the literature which depicted authentically the historic background of the analysed period. In order to describe the era between the two world wars and the autonomy models of this epoch we consulted the books and studies of Zsolt K. Lengyel, Ignác Romsics and László Szarka.

B. The analysis of primary sources:

We also looked for the presence of autonomy and self-determination in different documents, suggestions and declarations of the international organisations founded after the Second World War. Accordingly we systematized the notions, principles and rights connected to these issues in the documents of Council of Europe, United Nations, Organisation for Security and Co-operation in Europe and the European Union.

We analysed several autonomy plans, bills and statute plans designed from the First World War until now and published in different reviews and on the internet.

The exploration and analysis of the periodicals which were the scene of the interethnic discourse constitutes the main section of the dissertation. Two periodicals were in our focus: Provincia, published in two (Hungarian and Romanian) languages and Altera, issued in Romanian by the Pro Europe League. We obtained the issues of Altera directly from the League resident in Marosvásárhely (Targu Mures).

C. Comparison:

The method of comparison was used in many ways in the dissertation. We compared on the one hand the ideas and models formulated in the analysed discourse, on the other hand the opinions of the two relevant ethnic groups (Hungarians and Romanians). At the same time we analysed if there was any difference between the viewpoints of these groups.

D. Interviews:

Interviewing was the main empiric method of data collection in the dissertation. We made interviews with the outstanding Hungarian and Romanian personages of the discourse. In this way we could collect some inside information which could not be read in the different books, studies or articles. It is worth mentioning that we contacted more than ten personalities but we could make interview only with seven of them. Some of the intellectuals did not respond to our interview request or they did not want to express their view on this topic. But fortunately there were some personages who were glad to talk about their experiences and opinion connected to the analysed periodicals, articles and about their role in the interethnic discourse. The interviews were made in four towns: Kolozsvár (Cluj-Napoca), Marosvásárhely (Targu Mures), Temesvar (Timisoara) and Budapest. We also visited the Pro Europe League in Marosvásárhely and the Intercultural Institute in Temesvár.

The interviewees were:

Smaranda Enache, the co-president of Pro Europe League, the organisation which published the periodical Altera between 1995 and 2007. Her name was inseparable from Romania's democratisation processes.

Miklós Bakk, political scientist, associate professor, head of Political Sciences Department (Hungarian Section) at the Babeş-Bolyai University, one of the editors of Provincia, the creator of many autonomy and statute plans.

Alexandru Cistelecan, critic of literature, the author of several articles, university professor at University Petru Maior, the co-editor of Provincia.

Ovidiu Pecican, historian, writer, journalist, university professor at Babeş-Bolyai University Faculty of European Studies, one of the editors of Provincia.

Barna Bodó, political scientist, journalist, scientific director of Diaspora Foundation, the member of several autonomy committees.

Zoltán Kántor, sociologist, the researcher of Hungarian Institute of International Affairs, assistant professor at Pázmány Péter Catholic University, one of the intellectuals of the discourse.

Călin Rus, director of Intercultural Institute in Temesvár (Timisoara).

E. Time Limitation:

It was necessary to restrict the research to some specific periods of the historic events. We focused on two specific intervals:

- the issue of Transylvanian autonomy was analysed in a wider time context from the birth of Great Romania (1918) until now;
- the study of periodicals covered the appearance of the issues between 1995-2007.

STRUCTURE OF THE DISSERTATION:

The dissertation is composed of six chapters which can be divided into three (theoretic, historic and analytical) thematic groups. Two theoretic chapters (I. and II.) form the theoretic system of the concepts, namely these chapters include the conceptualisation of the dissertation. The historic parts (III. and IV.) were indispensable in order to sum up the antecedents of the autonomy plans from 1918 up to now. In the analytical chapter V. we made an attempt to reconstruct a special interethnic regionalism and autonomy concept. The analysed periodicals, Provincia and Altera, and the background events gave the bases of these concepts. Chapter VI. comprises the results of the reconstruction attempt and the conclusions formulated in the thesis.

Chapter I.:

On the one hand this chapter treats the special situation of nation states. According to the different national and international processes the status quo of nation states has to face several significant challenges nowadays. In the dissertation we emphasized the challenges coming from the sub-national level. For this it was necessary to define the notion of region and to outline the theoretic system of the region-forming processes (regionalism, regionalisation) standing in the focus of regional science.

These region-forming processes, the inner cohesion and those peculiarities which separate a region from the other parts of the country raise the issue of self-determination. In chapter I. we discussed the problem of the principle and right of self-determination and we elaborated the issue of those democracy models and state structures in which internal self-determination was achieved.

Chapter II.:

This chapter is devoted to the notion of autonomy which is the main topic of the dissertation. We summed up several definitions and interpretations of this concept and we analysed the relation between autonomy and other notions as: self-determination, federalism, decentralisation, self-government, human rights and the right of minorities.

It is important to examine the place of autonomy in the context of international law, therefore we collected those documents and suggestions which included or referred to the notion of autonomy. In this chapter we also mentioned the typology of autonomy trying to interpret the concept of personal and territorial autonomy forms.

Chapter III.:

This chapter is the first historical section of the dissertation in which we tried to outline the history of Transylvanian autonomy conceptions between the two world wars. We mentioned the Romanian, German and Hungarian plans treating the projects from Transylvania and Hungary separately.

Chapter IV.:

In the historic chapter IV. we summed up the autonomy conceptions from 1945 until now. We treated the peculiarities of the socialist epoch together with the case of the so called Hungarian Autonomous Region. With a short analysis we also outlined the economic, social and cultural processes of this special region. The epoch of socialism was not only the period of centralisation in Romania but also the time for an experiment through which the leaders wanted to change the regional peculiarities of the country. This chapter contains a short description of this context.

Regarding the period after 1989 we tried to sum up the reinitiated regionalist ambitions as well as the beginning and consequences of the interethnic dialogue. We wanted to situate the analysed discourse in the system of these interethnic rapprochements and to work up the autonomy plans which were made public after 1989.

This chapter is also devoted to the Romanian regionalisation processes focusing on those regionalisation conceptions which were published by Hungarian or Romanian intellectuals, the Democratic Alliance of Hungarians in Romania or by other representative organisations.

Chapter V.:

In chapter V. we analysed the Hungarian-Romanian-German interethnic discourse which treated the special status of Transylvania and the possibilities of Transylvanian autonomy. We presented the scenes of discourses, the monthly Provincia and the periodical Altera issued by the Pro Europe League. Each periodical aimed to create the common Transylvanian public space and gave place to a dialogue which tried to harmonize and link the views of different nationalities living in Transylvania. This chapter also contains the analysis of the articles of these periodicals grouping the articles in several thematic sections. The thematic system consists the following elements:

- the geopolitical peculiarities of Transylvania;
- the different perceptions of Transylvania, the Transylvanian culture and identity;
- the possibilities of consociated democracy in Transylvania;
- the discourse on different autonomy models;
- the Memorandum in 2001, as the result of the consensus of Romanian and Hungarian intellectuals.

Chapter VI.:

The last chapter sums up the answers to the research questions and contains the conclusions and results of our research.

THESIS AND CONCLUSIONS:

During the research and in the dissertation we analysed the interethnic discourse on autonomy of Transylvania by testing four hypotheses. In the following section we subsume the results and conclusions of the research formulating the theses.

T1: The analysed interethnic discourse on the autonomy of Transylvania produced a change of paradigm in many aspects.

During the research and analysis we tried to find those characteristics of the discourse which seemed to denote something new in the context of the autonomy of Transylvania and which changed the imaginary paradigm of Transylvania and its special status. In this sense the discourse fulfils the following criteria:

1. The analysed discourse *developed a specific dialogue between the main nationalities of Romania* replacing the monologues of the ethnic groups and creating a common and unique publicity. Both Provincia and Altera were forward-looking regarding the harmonization of the opinions of different nationalities living together and the consensus-making.
2. *The discourse introduced a new terminology system into this context.*

Regarding the Transylvanian regional identity the discourse introduced the issue of transethnic identity, which is beyond national identities and could take shape in multiethnic regions, helping to surpass nationalism. Some intellectuals and even the analysed Memorandum emphasised the importance of transethnic identity in the context of Transylvania.

The periodical Provincia raised the possibility of introduction of the consociated democracy model into the context of Transylvania. This was a totally new approach to the Transylvanian opportunities studying the possibilities of the adaptation of a Western-European model to an East-Central-European medium. The special consociated democracy model also induces the creation of a transethnic party. This newly introduced issue generated one of the hugest disputes in the discourse. However the articles of Provincia revealed that the consociated democracy model has been inapplicable both in Romania and Transylvania owing to their special social and political peculiarities.

3. *The autonomy of Transylvania was included in the regional restructuring of the whole country.* This meant a great leap forward regarding the problem of autonomy and indicated

the influence of European processes. The paradigm focusing only on Transylvania or Székelyföld has been totally changed: the discourse emphasized the importance of the configuration of a regional model covering the whole country.

4. *The Memorandum prepared and addressed to the Parliament of Romania by the Provincia-group changed the approach of Romanian public life to the issues connected closely to regionalism.* Federalism and autonomy are not taboo concepts any more in Romania and they are getting to be used in the public life, media and even in the discourse of political sphere. Nevertheless the most outstanding impact of Provincia could be observed in the civil society: the analysed discourse has not changed the reality yet only the mentality.

Summing up the above research results we can state that the analysed discourse produced change of paradigm in many aspects.

T2: The analysed discourse was a relevant form of the Transylvanian regionalism.

The Transylvanian regionalism is a specific one, so we had to look for special features in accordance with the Transylvanian context. The interethnic approach is very important because the specific ethnic composition of the region makes the consensus of the relevant ethnic groups indispensable. Provincia aimed to establish a special regionalism, the so called “transethnic regionalism” which is beyond the ethnic ones. If we define regionalism as a bottom-up movement coming from the society of a region wanting to emphasize the peculiarities of their territory, then the work of Pro Europe League and the Provincia-group can be seen as the specific form of regionalism in Transylvania. The uniqueness of this discourse stands in its interethnic aspect.

T3: There was no relevant dividing line between the opinions of the different ethnic groups of intellectuals.

Analysing an interethnic discourse it is very important to study the approaches, opinions and ideas of the different ethnic groups in order to find the differences, the analogies and their consonance. The articles and dialogues of periodical Altera initiated and normalized the dialogue. The so called “main period” of periodical Provincia between 2000 and 2002 intensified the clash of opinions and the exchange of ideas.

During the analysis of the articles published in Provincia we could observe that the difference between the approaches was wider and the intellectuals formed two groups at the beginning of

the discourse. There were two sides: the *soft* one in which the intellectuals urged only the cultural exploration of Transylvania mapping the local peculiarities. The so called *hard* group tried to look for the possibilities of political changes and to redefine the status of Transylvania in this context. Indeed there were more Romanian intellectuals in the soft group and more Hungarians in the hard one, but we cannot talk about a relevant Hungarian-Romanian dividing line in this sense. Ovidiu Pecican and Alexandru Cistelecan were the representatives of the soft side, but Traian řtef and Marius Cosmeanu pertained to the hard group even at the beginning of the existence of Provincia. (The *soft-hard* contrast was used by Marius Cosmeanu in one of the articles of Provincia and by Miklós Bakk during the interview made with him.)

Analysing the discourse we could observe that the initial differences narrowed between the Hungarian and Romanian opinions, the ideas converged toward the consensus of the ethnic groups during the existence of periodical Provincia. The draft of the Memorandum unequivocally constituted the consensus of Provincia-group. It is important to mention that Ovidiu Pecican and Alexandru Cistelecan also subscribed the Memorandum accepting the regionalist conception mediated by the petition. So the differences between the opinions were not due to ethnic principles only to the different disciplines. In the discourse on the peculiarities of Transylvania the viewpoint of historians was that communism reduced the differences between Transylvania and the other regions of the country. At the same time sociologists and political scientists admonished that there were peculiarities in the deep structure of society which could not be eliminated even by the epoch of socialism. Therefore Transylvania remained a special entity, region of the country. This disagreement seems to be generated by the different methodology of the disciplines of science.

In this sense we think that in the analysed discourse there was no relevant dividing line between the opinions of the different ethnic groups of intellectuals.

T4: A special Transylvanian autonomy model can be outlined on the grounds of the analysed discourse.

In the analysed discourse the Memorandum initiated by the Provincia-group represented a regionalisation model which was based on the historical regions of Romania. The Memorandum suggested administrative reforms in virtue of which the developed regions could have regional councils and parliaments. Regions would be based on territorial rather than ethnic/national principles, where the region itself with its historical identity would be the

political subject and not the two (or more) nations living there. These reforms were inconceivable without a reform of the constitution. In this concept Transylvania also would have the chance for autonomy respecting the special economic, social and cultural characteristics of the region. According to the Memorandum the ethnic groups in a region would dispose of special political and legal guarantees in order to protect their interests. In this sense this model also stood up for the rights of minorities. The novelty of Memorandum stood in the fact that it treated the autonomy as an element of a complex regional model covering the whole country. It was a good base for the regionalization plans issued after 2003.

In this sense the periodical Provincia and the work of the Provincia-group changed the paradigm of the Transylvanian autonomy concepts by shifting the focus from the ethnic principle to the territorial one and by treating it as a part of the complex regional restructuring of the country. The period after the end of the work of Provincia has confirmed the above statement. The Pro Europe League and their Altera publication continued this work supplying us with the Romanian translation of different international documents which supported this conception. At the same time the live conversations organized by the League generated the creation of an interethnic expert group which could be good base for the regionalist movements in the future and could also provide regionalist experts.

Summing up the conclusions we can state that the analysed interethnic discourse resulted in a new autonomy concept and the specific autonomy model represented by the intellectuals of the discourse changed the paradigm in the context of Transylvania and Romania.

THE AUTHOR'S RELATED PUBLICATIONS

A. Publications in Hungary:

I. Studies issued in different learned journals:

- 1.** *Autonómia: elmélet és gyakorlat.* Study accepted for publication in the journal Tér és Társadalom - 2010 Autumn
- 2.** „*Az erdélyiség újraszemantizálása*”: kísérlet egy interetnikus magyar-román regionalizmus-koncepció kidolgozására. Study accepted for publication in the journal Pro Minoritate - 2010 Autumn
- 3.** *Román, német és magyar modellek Erdély autonómiájának kérdéskörében a két világháború között.* Comitatus, 2009/November-December. pp. 75-92.
- 4.** *A belső önrendelkezés dilemmái.* Comitatus, 2009/October. pp. 64-75
- 5.** *Interetnikus értelmiségi diskurzusok az erdélyi autonómiáról.* Pro Minoritate 2008/Summer. pp. 76-110.
- 6.** *Magyar-román értelmiségi diskurzusok az erdélyi autonómiáról.* Pro Minoritate 2007/Summer. pp. 209-217.
- 7.** *A transzilvanizmus kultúrtörténeti jelentősége.* Kultúra és Közösség, 2007/II-III. pp. 120-123.

II. Studies issued in conference publications:

- 1.** *Az erdélyi regionalizmus és a Provincia-jelenség.* In: Benkő Péter (szerk.) Politikai régió – régiópolitika. Deák Kiadó. 2010. pp. 154-169.
- 2.** *Román és német modellek Erdély autonómiájának kérdéskörében a két világháború között.* In: Közép-, Kelet és Délkelet-Európa térfolyamatai – Integráció és dezintegráció, SZE RGDI, 2009. pp. 501-508.
- 3.** *Autonóm tér – élhető tér: az etnoregionalizmus és az általa kivívott autonómiák.* Tudományos mozaik 5/2. Tomori Pál Főiskola, Kalocsa. 2008. pp. 107-117.
- 4.** *Autonómia-útkeresések Erdélyben.* In: Erdei Ferenc IV. Tudományos Konferencia (2007. augusztus 27-28.). I. kötet. Kecskeméti Főiskola, 2007. pp. 137-140.

5. *A regionális szemléletmód minőségi változásai Romániában.* Tudományos mozaik 3. Tomori Pál Főiskola, Kalocsa. 2006. pp. 124-129.
6. *Nagyhatalmi etika vagy társadalmi iniciatíva? Az erdélyi Magyar Autonóm Tartomány esete.* Tudományos mozaik 2. Tomori Pál Főiskola, Kalocsa. 2005. pp. 63-69.

B. Studies issued in foreign conference publications:

1. *Interethnic Discourses on Transylvania in the Periodical „Provincia”.* In: (Young Scientists Forum conference publication, Institute for the Danube Region and Central Europe, Vienna). Der Donauraum, Jahrgang 49, Heft 1-2/2009. pp. 75-81.
2. *EU Regions Facing Old and New Challenges.* (Elena Tonea as co-author) In: Lucrări științifice, Seria I, Vol XI (1) – Management agricol (International Scientific Symposium, May 14, 2009), Banat's University, Temesvár, 2009. pp. 131-136.
3. *Interetnikus értelmezégi disputa Erdély kontextusában a Provincia hasábjain (2000-2002).* In. Valorile multiculturalității (Lucrări prezentate la Simpozionul Internațional „Valorile multiculturalității” 16-18 noiembrie 2007). Státus Kiadó, Csíkszereda. 2007. pp. 153- 161.

THE AUTHOR'S RELATED SCIENTIFIC CONFERENCE PRESENTATIONS

1. *Az erdélyi regionalizmus és a Provincia-jelenség.* Presented at the conference: *Politikai régió – régiópolitika.* Organisers: MTA Regionális Tudományos Bizottságának Területpolitikai Albizottsága and Széchenyi István Egyetem Regionális- és Gazdaságtudományi Doktori Iskola. Győr, March 5. 2010.
2. *Román és német modellek Erdély autonómiájának kérdéskörében a két világháború között.* Presented at the conference: *Közép-, Kelet és Délkelet-Európa térfolyamatai – Integráció és dezintegráció - Fiatal Regionalisták VI. Országos Találkozója.* Organiser: Széchenyi István Egyetem Regionális- és Gazdaságtudományi Doktori Iskola. Győr, June 4-5. 2009.
3. *EU Regions Facing Old and New Challenges.* Presented at the conference: *Management of Durable Rural Development International Scientific Symposium.* Organiser: Banat University. Temesvár, May 14. 2009.
4. *Interethnic Discourses on Transylvania in the Periodical „Provincia”.* Presented at the conference: *1st Young Scientists Forum.* Organiser: Institute for the Danube Region and Central Europe. Vienna, December 4-5. 2008.
5. *Autonóm tér – élhető tér: az etnoregionalizmus és az általa kivívott autonómiák.* Presented at the conference: Magyar Tudomány Ünnepe. Organiser: Tomori Pál Főiskola. Kalocsa, November 2008.
6. *Interetnikus értelmiségi disputa Erdély kontextusában a Provincia hasábjain (2000-2002).* Presented at the conference: *Valorile multiculturalității Simpozion Internațional.* Organiser: Alteris Multicultural Association. Sepsiszentgyörgy, November 16-18. 2007.
7. *Autonómia-útkeresések Erdélyben.* Presented at the conference: Erdei Ferenc IV. Tudomány Konferencia. Organiser: Kecskeméti Főiskola, August 27-28. 2007.
8. *A regionális szemléletmód minőségi változásai Romániában.* Presented at the conference: Magyar Tudomány Ünnepe. Organiser: Tomori Pál Főiskola. Kalocsa, November 2006.
9. *Nagyhatalmi etika vagy társadalmi iniciatíva? Az erdélyi Magyar Autonóm Tartomány esete.* Presented at the conference: Magyar Tudomány Ünnepe. Organiser: Tomori Pál Főiskola. Kalocsa, November 2005.