

Promoting Tourism: Hungarian Nation-Building Policies in Northern Transylvania, 1940-1944

Balázs Ablonczy

In this study I try to present the history of the region of Transylvania that was returned to Hungary in the Second Vienna Award of 1940 from a point of view that has been quite neglected hitherto.¹ More precisely, my aim is to outline aspects of the policies of nation-building that were implemented by the region's Hungarian administration and explain how the development of tourism combined with and fitted into the policies of nation-building and on occasion, exclusions from it. I base my research on source materials that had come to light two years ago. At first glance the policies of promoting tourism and nation-building appear not to be related but as my research progressed I became increasingly convinced that I was dealing with two closely related phenomena. The subject of the build-up of Northern Transylvania's tourism by itself is worth investigating but in covering it there is the risk that the analysis deteriorates into an enumeration of plans, budgets, jurisdictional quarrels, and unfulfilled deadlines. But the whole story of how the officials involved in this enterprise, along with community leaders and people involved in tourism, envisaged the revitalization of a relatively backward (in comparison with Hungary proper)² region, tells a lot about the Hungarian government's and public's approach to nationality policies as well as concepts about modernization — and also about the Hungarian image of Transylvania. Primary sources for the study of this subject are few as the records of the ministries dealing with the promotion of tourism in Northern Transylvania of the times had been destroyed during the 1944-45 siege of Budapest.

National Pilgrimages

The number of monographs dealing with the history of tourism in Hungary is rather small, and as far as I know no one has explored the interconnection of tourism and nation-building, despite the fact that this subject is extensively covered in literature dealing with Western Europe and the New World.³ Some of the observations made in these works are relevant to our subject. One of these is the fact that tourism as a notion of economic activity is the product of the nineteenth century. In this connection we should mention the date 5 July 1841 when Thomas Cook, the father of modern tourism, sent off from one of London's railway stations the first touring group — whose members paid him one shilling each. The success of this experiment prompted Cook to establish his tourist bureau, one which by the 1880s was organizing overseas tours.⁴ His activities defined the relationship between the tourist industry and the state not only in the English-speaking world but also on the European continent: tourism became considered part of the realm of private enterprise and was treated as such. This despite the fact that the development of tourism was not unrelated to state activity such as government regulations regarding paid holidays for employees or the mandating of health insurance for them. In Central Europe, in particular in the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy, first it was some of the Austrian provinces that discovered the importance of the promotion of tourism. The province's authorities, with their limited resources, tried to foster travel for recreational purposes.⁵

The growth of European and overseas tourism had an impact beyond its immediate effects on economic activity. In Britain and France for example the existing practice of relaxation at baths and spas was expanded by the idea of recreation at seaside resorts.⁶ In France the discovery (actually, re-discovery) of the “terroir” is linked closely to the evolving of the bourgeois image of the world: it was through this that a synthesis emerged between the republican ethos and the long-standing public attachment to France's diverse regions.⁷

In searching for parallels with the development of the image of Transylvania in Hungary and its impact on tourism the following case seems relevant. In central Sweden the cult of *dalecarlia* that began emerging among city dwellers at the end of the nineteenth century signified a desire to return to one's roots. The archaic peasant world of this region (where people still wore the old folk costumes abandoned elsewhere) and its image as unspoiled wilderness, combined with the democratic traditions of the local inhabitants coincided with the liberal ideals of Swedish society and its budding cult of the national heritage. Not surprisingly, the first *skanzen* opened in Stockholm as

early as 1892. In 1909 came the first suggestion for the establishment of national parks. Visits to Dalarna, that “Valhalla of Swedish peasant life,” were facilitated by the building of the country's railways, and pilgrimages to the region became a compulsory aspect of identifying with Swedish national character. The proliferation of the bicycles in the country in the interwar period gave rise to massive bicycle touring in the region. With the accession of the Social Democrats to power in 1932, tourism became identical with modernity, and recreational travel began receiving funding from the state.⁸

Closer to the region studied in this paper, in pre-war Austria the concept of the love for ancient German lands was put in the service of tourism to promote the greater-German or all-German ideal. Tourists were expected to visit German lands that had come under foreign rule as the result of the post-war peace settlement. They were advised to seek accommodation in German-owned establishments. Their guide-books even told them which hostels were owned by non-Germans: Czechs, Slovenians, Italians, etc. In former Austrian lands attendance at religious (Roman Catholic) events had the blessing of the promoters of such tourism, even though elsewhere they cared little for the Church.⁹ In Austria, however, unlike in Transylvania of 1940-1944, the state remained neutral in the conflicts generated by such nationalist tourism.

We have only limited information about the national aims of the Hungarian movement to encourage tourism and other return to nature activities. Nevertheless a recently-published study points out that in this phenomenon too nationalist elements had appeared rather early and in time such tourism became a project to promote national interests through which “knowing your land” increasingly transmuted into “military expedition”.¹⁰ The change can be observed in the history of the organization Erdélyi Kárpát Egyesület (Carpathian Association of Transylvania). It was founded in 1873 in the ethnically mixed region (Slovak, German and Magyar) of Szepesség and confined its activities to the promotion of tourism until 1889-90 when nation-building ideas entered into its rhetoric. But, the encouragement of tourism for the sake of recreation and learning always remained an aim of this association. It was the Magyar Tanítók Turista Egylete (the Tourist Club of Hungarian Teachers), an organization established in 1896 that implemented most the idea of using tourism to promote the nation. Soon after its founding it began to sponsor tours of Transylvania for middle-class visitors from central Hungary who were given the impression that through their visits they were reclaimers of the land in face of a local population who cared little for the cause of the Magyar nation or was hostile to it.¹¹

If we have to sum up the European, and in a sense the overseas experience in tourism before the time dealt with in our paper, we can say that it

began in a natural way as an economic activity based on the increasing desire of people for recreation. It had certain historical antecedents: the tradition of the “Grand Tour” by members of the upper-classes and the ideal of the return-to-nature espoused by some writers during the Age of Enlightenment. In time, however, the aims of modern tourism would incorporate not just recreation but an assortment of ideals such as the promotion of national interests and the preservation of the simple peasant life and culture — as well as of other socio-political and economic values. These concepts of tourism varied from one region to the next as did the approach to them by various state authorities.

Tourism in Interwar Hungary

Between the two world wars Hungary's practices in the promotion of tourism stood about half-way between the Western European and the early Dual Monarchy's model of tourism sponsored by community associations (even if they didn't reject help provided by the state), and the model characterized by the totalitarian state's desire to control all aspects of the population's activities that developed in contemporary Italy and Germany.¹² The community-based tourist clubs founded before World War I were joined in the 1920s and 1930s by similarly inspired organizations as well as commercial travel bureaus. As these establishments had limited financial means, the promotion of tourism called for the intervention of the state. Such intervention was not new in Hungary. Before World War one, when tourism in Hungary consisted mainly of visits to mineral baths or spas, the state apparatus that developed in post-Compromise times (1867) tried to regulate the legal and health aspects of such activity.¹³ In 1902 the Idegforgalmi Utazási Vállalat was established in Budapest (in 1926 it became known as IBUSZ). In the mid-1920s it gained the monopoly of selling tickets for MÁV (the Hungarian state railways) and became an important player in organized tourism.¹⁴

The onset of the Great Depression further deepened the Hungarian tourist industry's dependence on the state — especially in the creation and maintenance of infrastructure, and in advertising. It also led to attempts at the promotion of tourism at home. Efforts to this effect were implemented by the Országos Magyar Vendégforgalmi Szövetség or OMVESZ (National Hungarian Tourist Federation). One of OMVESZ' successful slogans was “Utazgassunk hazánk földjén” (Let's keep travelling in our native land) which resembled the “Come to Britain!” and “See America First” movements in Great Britain and the USA respectively.¹⁵

Hungary's government established the Országos Magyar Idegenforgalmi Hivatal (Hungarian National Tourist Bureau, hereafter OMIH) in 1935. This was the most influential organization created in the country for the regulation of the tourist industry. OMIH was to coordinate and oversee the promotion of tourism, the investments in infrastructure, tourist propaganda, as well as the training (starting with 1939) of tourist guides. It was also responsible for establishing guidelines for the promotion of internal and international tourism. OMIH soon established offices in various parts of Europe and even overseas, then in Hungary, and after 1938 when the country began regaining some of the territories that had been detached from it in the post-war peace settlement, in these lands as well. OMIH was headed by the politician Géza Tormay. After his death in May of 1940 the organization's scope of activities was revised.¹⁶ It became a part of the Ministry of Commerce. In the period examined in this study it functioned as section XIV of that Ministry, first under László Gál and after March 1944 under Baron Gyula Brandenstein. In 1937 the organization's budget reached almost 700,000 pengős.¹⁷

The primary task of the OMIH and its branches was propaganda. This was produced not only through the traditional means of posters and flyers but through the novel means of film (shown occasionally in movie theatres in various cities) travelling picture exhibitions, and the sponsoring of photography competitions or folk-costume shows.¹⁸ A few months before the Hungarian re-acquisition of northern Transylvania, a Hungarian tourist official by the name of István Hallóssy identified the main aim of tourist propaganda as being the fostering of a favourable attitude to travel. In a speech he called for the spreading of authenticity that is the rejection of gaudy superficiality. In its place, Hallóssy suggested the injection of that "ancient Magyar force that assimilates everything..." He called for "Hungarian national tourist propaganda" as well as the more effective presentation of the various regions' natural beauty, of their flora and fauna, as well as the folk-costumes of the local population.¹⁹

It is not possible to estimate the impact of Hallóssy's admonitions on the propaganda activities of OMIH but from the surviving official record of this institutions two facts become evident: 1. The propaganda produced in connection with Northern Transylvania concentrated on three regions: Kalotaszeg (the region around Kolozsvár [today's Cluj]), the Székelyföld, and the winter playgrounds of the Radnai and Borsai mountain ranges. 2. In this tourist propaganda emphasis was given, as it was done in connection with Hungary proper, to the theme of folk traditions: rituals, costumes etc.

From February of 1941 on, the Hungarian tourist organizations (OMIH, MÁV and IBUSZ) published the *Hungária Magazin* edited by the

popular radio announcer Lili Filotás. This glossy, illustrated monthly publication closely reflected its sponsors' philosophy of tourism. It tried to offer a picture of recreational life in wartime Hungary as well as elaborate on the folk costumes and traditions of the above listed regions of Transylvania.²⁰ The regions that fell outside of the area identified by the promoters of tourism was ignored, often in face of the protests of local officials from the communities involved. One such official complained in 1943 that “since our liberation” the Székelyföld received much help in the realm of the promotion of tourism, but Northern Transylvania “got nothing so far in this respect.”²¹

“We all have to know the eternally Hungarian Transylvania” proclaimed an OMIH publication of the times.²² The idea that travel in Transylvania was a national pilgrimage was further reinforced by the identification of that land as the Kalotaszeg and the Székelyföld. Some of the traditional products of these two regions (including the *székely pálinka*, a locally produced brandy) reminded people of pine forests and snow-capped mountains.²³ Sometimes tourist posters and publications about Transylvania were filled with pictures only of the people in Kalotaszeg and/or Székelyland costumes or buildings characteristic of only these two regions.²⁴

What confrontations these in certain cases Budapest-induced practices inspired, is aptly illustrated by the dispute that arose in 1941–42 between the OMIH leadership and Károly Kós, writer, noted architect and the custodian of the ethnographic artefact collection of the Reform Church of Kalotaszeg. At the end of 1940, OMIH made plans for the building of a bureau in the community of Kőrösőfő. The building was to house a tourist office, a museum for the Reform Church's artefact collection, a store to sell tourist memorabilia, as well as a hostel for travellers. OMIH had Győző Nagy prepare the buildings plans — he had planned many other such buildings for other places in Hungary. Then they asked Kós to modify the plans to reflect the architectural character of its surroundings; in effect he was told that he should plan a “peasant house”. This task Kós accepted, free of charge, and planned a building on land provided by the village for a nominal fee. But he could not explain to the officials in Budapest that their plan could not be implemented through building a “peasant house”.²⁵ Arguments went back and forth with OMIH officials insisting on a traditional, one-story building while Kós felt that such a structure could not accommodate all the functions planned for it.²⁶ In the end the building wasn't built. This coupling of tourism and ethnographic traditions was not the predilection of OMIH officials only. This is illustrated by a speech made in the House of Parliament in the fall of 1940 by József Varga, the minister in charge of tourism:

I have always supported and will continue to support folk-art that is significant from the point of view of tourism. I propose to build, in addition to the existing structures featuring ethnographic collections, additional such buildings in the most important regions of folk-art. These structures will be entrusted with the displaying of ethnographic artefacts as well as with their preservation.²⁷

There can be little doubt that, through its policies, OMIH had a major impact on the evolution of the image of Transylvania, or at least, on those who were creating that image for Hungarians. Through the publications inspired by it, through books, placards, a Transylvania was mirrored that reminds us of the image, still prevalent in Hungary, of that land as a idyllic “garden of fairies.”²⁸ This image was counterbalanced only by the emphasis on the Magyar (and civilized) nature of the region's cities. Unlike some other scholars I don't consider this image in itself harmful, but it leaves the question what political approaches and deeds it inspires and whether and to what extent it allows the people espousing this open to other views.

Pictures from the Tourist Guides

Before we examine the activities of the Kolozsvár office of OMIH and its role in nation-building, we should examine the “Transylvania image” promoted by contemporary Hungarian tourist guides, and the reception these got from the public. We should also survey what image of this land the above-mentioned publication *Erdély* tried to project, how this “little Hungarian world” tried to represent itself to its local readers and the outside world.

Between 1940 and 1943 no fewer than eighteen works appeared in Hungary about Transylvania. Incidentally, this is the same number that appeared about the subject between 1788 and 1940, and 1944 and 1986.²⁹ It must be stressed that these eighteen publications were not all travel guides, among them there were travelogues,³⁰ breviaries,³¹ learned essays,³² and flyers pertaining to a particular city or district.³³ Comprehensive tourist guides to Transylvania were few and varied in quality and political outlook.

First off the mark with such a publication was the author from Nagyvárad [today's Oradea] Sándor Aba, who was no doubt aware of both the political and commercial advantages of publishing on the subject. His work appeared in the spring of 1941, and it filled 320 pages. Its author claimed that the book was designed to inform Hungarians and Transylvanians, especially young readers, about their country.³⁴ Forty-five percent of the pages covering

Transylvania were filled with ads. Although Aba claims to have visited all the regions he described, officials of the OMIH were not happy with the volume. They described it poorly organized and edited. They couldn't refrain from mentioning that the work's author was of Jewish background. They also tried to hinder the book's distribution by calling on people involved in the tourist industry not to promote the book.³⁵ Yet Aba was more fortunate than József Dávid, the author of *Székelyföld írásban és képen* [The Székelyland in writing and pictures] whose publication was banned on the initiative of OMIH and against whom court proceedings were started by the government.³⁶

Aba's book, it should be mentioned, did not use, with a few exceptions, the nationalist rhetoric of most other tourist publications. The official tourist guide of OMVESZ dealing with eastern Hungary and northern Transylvania was also neutral in language.³⁷ The nationalist discourse in this volume was represented by the introduction that was written by the noted writer Zsolt Harsányi. He did what many other authors of travel guides had done: compare the region returned to Hungary to Switzerland. He saw the task of the promoters of tourism there in stressing winter sports, travel in the countryside and the spending of time at mineral spas. He concluded his introduction with the wish that his readers will visit Transylvania with the feeling that “they are visiting the land of unbreakable racial strength where a free man [becomes] freer and the Hungarian spirit more Hungarian.”³⁸ This illustrated hardbound book contained only essential tourist information and did not get into the subject of historical analysis. Yet in this guide what is not there says a lot: this OMVESZ volume presents us with a Hungarian Transylvania in which we get a hint of the existence of other ethnic groups only when an orthodox church or a synagogue is mentioned.³⁹ Still, this book creates the impression of a tourist guide rather than a publication designed to influence the political attitudes of its readers.

The book of János Tulogy, *Erdély kis turistakalauza* [The little tourist guide of Transylvania] placed emphasis on brevity and described the main stations of a tour of Transylvania that are still most frequented today.⁴⁰ In Ödön Nagy's book about Lake Gyilkos and its vicinity the various ethnic groups of Transylvania appear — and in positive light. This dedicated tourist writes for example that on the eastern pastures of Fehérmező the pastors of three nationalities tend their flocks in peace in the “spirit of Transylvania.”⁴¹ The author Milton Oszkár Reich revised and re-published a 1910 tourist guide of his. In this he still gave the population data of the 1900 census and in discussing the history of the Székelys he endorsed the idea of their Hun descent, even though in once place declared this theory a “myth”.⁴² The new edition made use of most of the tourist guides that appeared in the two years before its

publication. The work was outdated though balanced, one that didn't offer much new for tourists. In this it resembled the work of Gyula Gáspár, *A visszatért Erdély útikönyve* [The travel guide to the returned Transylvania].⁴³

Several publications went much further than these in their analysis of the nationality problem in Transylvania. One of these was the book edited by geographer Gyula Prinz and written mainly by faculty members of the University of Kolozsvár. In his introduction to the volume Prinz deemed Transylvania, the “Switzerland of the East”, a utopia since its life didn't concentrate in one place but spread out to several centres. As such, it had no chance of becoming a political unit of its own.⁴⁴ For this reason, Prinz argued, Transylvania had to belong to Hungary. He described the years of Romanian rule as a transitory period that brought no benefits. Interestingly this work that justified Transylvania's absorption by Hungary through mythical geographic explanations got an unexpected reception by OMIH officialdom: the head of the OMIH office in Marosvásárhely likened it to Sándor Aba's supposedly inaccurate book. This official even called for radical measures to curb the proliferation of such tourist guides.⁴⁵

The Budapest office of OMIH could hardly disapprove of the tone of most of these tourist guides as it published the most stridently nationalistic of guides to Transylvania in 1941. This pamphlet-sized publication didn't have its author identified. It went beyond some of the other guides as it listed hotels and other accommodation available to tourists. On its pages there were often crude statements such as “Romanians don't belong among the historical nations of Transylvania.... They crept into the land's empty mountainous regions as sheep shepherds from the Balkans, occupying first the mountains and then the valleys. From the 17th century on, their numbers grew continuously.” Only in its introduction did the publication mention the positive aspects of centuries of peaceful coexistence among the various ethnicities. But from other parts of this work we learn that Transylvania is the home of “unalterable Magyar folk-art” where the “*temetői kopjafák*” (carved wooden head “stones” characteristic of the region's cemeteries) speak of the “uninterrupted Hungarian past”. And the publication's author or authors go on:

The Székelys speak the purest Magyar language, full of ancient phrases and spoken virtually without local accent. Their poetry... is uniquely colourful. Their music is one of the earliest products of Hungarian folk music, one that has inspired many great musicians ([among them] Bartók and Kodály). Their cities and towns are orderly, their yards and houses are exceedingly clean. Their folk-costumes are not overly elaborate... and everybody wears these....

Their architecture is ancient... their woodcarvings are world famous... Their pottery offers the best of Hungarian folk art...

Through the author's rhetoric the past and present merge while the heroes of the past enter present-day life to reinforce the idea of the continuity of national evolution while he (or she) proclaims that getting to know Transylvania is a patriotic duty for Hungarians:

Whoever travelled the land of Transylvania yearns to return there. Besides the awe-inspiring scenery, their soul becomes filled by the marvellous flavour of the unalterable ancient Magyar life. Through Transylvania we can behold the thousand-year-old Magyar past. We can understand that endless selfless struggle that our nation... had fought for Transylvania's soil. We can understand the sacrifice brought by the valiant warriors of Saint László, the heroes of Hunyadi, the soldiers of Gábor Bethlen, the [followers] of Rákoczi, the *honvéds* of Bem, and we understand the supreme sacrifice of the young Hungarian intellectual giant Sándor Petőfi... We all have to know the eternally Magyar Transylvania.⁴⁶

Not all the local OMIH officials liked this work and we have to note in their favour that some of them were not reluctant to voice their opinion to the organization's Budapest headquarters. The first draft of the publication's manuscript was in fact severely criticised by the head of OMIH's Kolozsvár bureau, but he mostly censured what was missing from the volume and not its tone.⁴⁷

The above mentioned organization, the Erdélyi Kárpát Egyesület or EKE, had been active during the last decades of the nineteenth century and indeed to the First World War, but declined in importance as a result of the war and the transfer of Transylvania to Romania. It experienced a revival in the early 1930s but in 1935 the Romanian authorities closed its offices and expropriated its collections. EKE was re-born in 1940 and its journal *Erdély* reported abundantly on the organization's life till 1944. This life included tours but also the creation of tourist infrastructure (the marking of walking paths, the building of safe stations, places where skiers could warm up, etc.) as well as the organization of folk-dance festivals and the development of folk-art collections. The editor of *Erdély* in these years was first the noted linguist Attila T. Szabó and then János Xantus. Among its authors were university teachers (including Ernő Balogh) as well as such legendary figures as Gyula Merza (1861-1943) one of the founding fathers of tourism in Transylvania.

The joy associated with northern Transylvania's return to Hungary and the regaining of the old EKE headquarters soon gave way to despair in

face of the behaviour — lack of understanding and even outright enmity — of the tourist organizations of Hungary, especially Magyar Turista Szövetség (Hungarian Tourist Federation, hereafter MTSz). As Géza Polgárdy, an influential official of this organization, pointed out:

[The Transylvanian branch of the MTSz] was inundated by its Budapest “supporters” and “well-wishers” as water floods the fields after the dykes break. Everyone was giving advice and everyone wanted to help, every tourist official visiting [northern] Transylvania felt duty-bound to shower his liberated co-workers in the tourist industry with help.... All these well-wishers... brought only chaos to the Kolozsvár EKE headquarters. In the end the local officials had to find ways to bypass the Federation. Furthermore, they even tried to set up their own tourist organization.⁴⁸

There were even disputes over jurisdiction: which tourist organization had control over the so-called Zichy Cave? And, members of EKE were not invited to a banquet in Budapest because “they were too poor and would not want to take part in any case.”⁴⁹ Further, a map produced by EKE was severely criticized in *Turista Élet* for alleged inaccuracies. And then in March 1941 MTSZ cancelled EKE's membership for “non-payment” of dues.

The situation improved later to the extent that some MTSZ officials (among them the above mentioned Géza Polgárdy) even wrote for *Erdély*, among those who previously had criticized EKE. And, by 1943 this same author took the side of this organization in one of its disputes. EKE also made concessions, possibly in response to pressure from Budapest: It agreed to the exclusion of Jews from its membership. Seventeen people were affected.⁵⁰ We have to note that militantly anti-Semitic diatribes never appeared in this periodical between 1941 and 1944. On a few occasions though, certain accommodations were identified as being owned by Christians while others were not recommended for “obvious reasons”.⁵¹ Such restraint was rare at the time and must be commended. It should be added that the coverage in *Erdély* was limited to things Hungarian. The activities of the well-organized and dynamic (at least until 1942) Siebenbürgischer Karpathenverein are not covered in the periodical.⁵² Nor are the activities of Romanian tourist organizations alluded to. Romanians, if they are mentioned at all, are noted as shepherds who might be approached for directions by tourists who had become lost. Beyond this, in the Transylvania of *Erdély*, Romanians don't exist. They were there as oppressors, as the people who persecuted EKE

before 1940, but they then disappeared: they are not friends, not enemies, not rivals — they simply did not exist.⁵³

This subconscious/conscious negating stance coexisted with the discourse, which though not overwhelming in the periodical, aimed at making tourism a Hungarian nation-building experience. The theoretical reflections of theologian Sándor Tavaszy about the subject (equating the knowledge of nature with the knowledge of one's homeland, with patriotism, with public and self-education that of necessity leads to the refinement of one's soul)⁵⁴ others simplified and took them out of their context, while still others turned them into a programme of action.⁵⁵

It would be unjust to accuse the contributors of *Erdély* of narrow-minded nationalism: they were happy about being re-united with Hungary, they became disappointed in the tourist organizations of the mother country, and they were concerned that their new-found “Hungarian” existence might come to an end. Since they were financially dependent on the various Hungarian agencies in charge of travel, tourism and even sport, they tried to meet the expectations of these through adjusting their own political discourse including the use of nationalist phraseology. It seemed that the spirit of the age demanded these dubious concessions, but if these writers had doubt about what they wrote, these dissipated with the growing flood of tourists from Hungary. Even the veteran tourist promoters among them resigned themselves to the demanding behaviour of these visitors, their boisterousness, their noisy, all-night parties, and the habit of the women from Budapest of wearing pants and heavy makeup.⁵⁶

The Economics of Nation-Building through Tourism

Tourism can be not only an instrument of spiritual nation-building,⁵⁷ it can also be — as many people at the time believed — a means of economic advancement. After the Second Vienna Award the Hungarian authorities saw in the development of tourism and small crafts the vehicle of lifting northern Transylvania, and especially the Székelyföld, from economic backwardness. Already after the re-acquisition of Sub-Carpathia Premier Pál Teleki appointed a special commissioner for tourism in the region the person of Béla Padányi-Gulyás, one of his former students. After the re-occupation of northern Transylvania the question of the economic development of these lands was discussed at a special “Transylvania conference” at which Teleki saw the future of the Székelyföld's economy in the fostering of small crafts, medium-sized industries and mining, all of which required a great deal of

investment.⁵⁸ Hungarian plans for infrastructure development included new railway lines, highways, new bus and airline services, the construction of spas, everything that was needed for the development of tourism.⁵⁹ Not all of these projects were realized, yet much was accomplished at the cost of millions of *pengő*s of investment. There was even money found for the modernization of the telephone system and the repair of bridges.⁶⁰

The Hungarian government also invested in the building of hotels and the development of spas, especially in the Székelyföld and the Radnai Mountains (today's Muntii Rodnei). The building and repair of tourist stations went on throughout Hungarian Transylvania. Ski resorts were also developed, and OMVESZ began organizing visits to Transylvania's villages. To coordinate tourist activities OMIH opened its Kolozsvár office.

It is interesting to know how Elek Horváth, the person appointed to head this office, reacted to directives from headquarters. He says little about the subject in his autobiography.⁶¹ Horváth had a good education and had a lot of experience in journalism and administration. By 1940 he was working for the Ministry of Commerce's Office of National Tourism. After the Second Vienna Award he was sent to Kolozsvár with a mandate to oversee the development of tourism in the returned territories. In the spring of 1941 his mandate was reduced and confined to four counties in central Transylvania, including the Kolozsvár area.

Horváth probably had good personal contacts in the Ministry and even the office of the prime minister. He was an exception in the management of Hungarian Transylvania's tourism. Most of the directors of the other bureaus had their training locally, mainly with EKE. Horváth, despite his relative youth, also had good contacts with many of Hungary's populist writers, including Géza Féja and Gyula Illyés — for the latter he even organized a Transylvanian holiday. Horváth also developed good relations with local writers, among them Áron Tamási and Albert Wass.⁶²

Horváth tried to create the impression that he was a determined and innovative bureaucrat, yet he failed to gain the good will of his superiors in Budapest. His office's activities and financial affairs were repeatedly investigated, and though no major breaches of regulations or lapses in duty were discovered, these procedures often led to him being reprimanded.⁶³ His monthly reports were often rejected, in September of 1942 for example, because the accounting was out a fraction of a *pengő*.

The scope of the Kolozsvár office's authority was determined by the order of the Ministry of Commerce of early 1941. This order required the bureau to gather information, respond to requests from headquarters, report to OMIH each month about its activities including its financial transactions.⁶⁴

The office's records suggest that more than this was involved: the office's staff prepared travel plans, took plans in the supervision of hotels and hostels, provided guiding for out-of-country visitors, and from February of 1942 on, was directly in charge of the management of OMIH's 120-bed youth hostel in Kolozsvár. This hostel was part of the program that was designed to provide inexpensive accommodations for students visiting the regained territories. This hostel functioned till 1944 when it was converted to an improvised hospital for victims of Allied bombing raids. And the office had still other functions: it trained tourist guides and held photo competitions. It also sponsored folk-costume festivals, such as the one organized in June of 1941 in Kőrösfő, which was attended by several hundred people as well as celebrities such as the writers János Kemény and Zsigmond Móricz, as well as the French consul of Kolozsvár.⁶⁵ The aim of holding such an event became obvious from a report on another folk-costume festival that was held two years later in Szék: "In my opinion [reported on the event Elek Horváth] the folk-costume show of Szék was a very fortunate event from the point of view of national politics as it supported the Magyar [ethnic] island in Szolnok-Doboka County with its 85% Romanian population."⁶⁶ To discharge all these functions, the Kolozsvár office had a staff of five, including a secretary and a caretaker.

Although a large gap existed between the plans for developing tourism in Transylvania and what was becoming accomplished, and the land was not turning into a "Székely Switzerland", huge sums were invested in the region by the Hungarian government, despite the country's ever increasing military expenditures. The railway-building and the start of air traffic between Budapest, Kolozsvár and Marosvásárhely (today: Tirgu Mures) both aimed at facilitating tourism. Tourist travel was often subsidized and the owners of resorts were offered loans to help finance their investments. Many tourist hostels were renovated, expanded or newly built.⁶⁷ Construction work on one of these structures continued even in September of 1944 by which time the front had reached Transylvania.⁶⁸

The influx of Hungarian tourists started in December of 1940, after the military administration of the region came to an end. This happened despite warnings from OMIH that tourist infrastructure in the region was not on a par with that in Hungary. First there were conducted tours — one of these, by IBUSZ, had been organized already in October of 1940. Individual tourists began pouring in during the first half of 1941. Local tourist offices were inundated with requests for advice regarding travel and accommodations. Such inquiries also came from travel bureaus and associations, on behalf of groups interested in visiting "our beautiful Transylvania" seeking a

vacation above all in the mountain or lake-side resorts of Székelyföld.⁶⁹ At first the local tourist offices recommended all resorts, even ones with limited resources. Later, in response to complaints, smaller places were omitted and only the ones that could accommodate larger number of visitors were publicized. Among the cities only ones that could offer “cultural treasures” (above all Kolozsvár and Marosvásárhely) were recommended.

There were a number of reasons why tourism managed to grow at a seemingly high rate in Transylvania. The war had led to higher incomes for Hungarians. At the same time the war also limited their opportunities for foreign travel. As a result, tourism grew exponentially from 1941 to 1943. We don't have complete statistics, but we can site examples. Visitors to Kolozsvár in 1943 increased by 27.5% over the previous year's number. Some 60,000 visitors spent 140,000 days in the city. In the same year even some small resorts reported 100% occupancy rates.⁷⁰ The increase in visits to rural areas was also remarkable. While in Hungary proper such activity grew by only 4%, in northern Transylvania this growth was 56%.⁷¹ The official in charge of the IBUSZ office in the resort town of Szováta (today's Sovata) remarked in the summer of 1943 that getting a room for a day was impossible there, and those who wanted a room for a week or for a month had to book it many months in advance. “Such masses are vacationing here as [we] never had before,” and that many new arrivals without reservations had to spend the night outdoors.⁷² War conditions forced even some prominent Hungarian celebrities to take their vacations in this region. Included among them was the well-known actress Gizi Bajor.

The records of the Kolozsvár tourist office indicate that the vacation season of 1944 started with the same promise and tourism suffered a decline only in the second half of the summer when Romania switched sides in the war and the front soon arrived to Transylvania. Elek Horváth's enthusiasm for his work had not been sapped by the Nazi German occupation of Hungary in March of 1944. “In the second half of the month,” he reported late in March, “[we] distributed a large number of Transylvania flyers [among the German troops].”⁷³ Horváth was soon drafted into the Hungarian army, but was allowed to return to his job later. In the early summer he was still inspecting hotels. Records of his activities become thinner for the mid- and late summer but suggest that the office's activities became curtailed. On the 14th of September the order came from OMIH in Budapest that the office with its staff should evacuate to western Hungary. By this time the guns could be heard not far from Kolozsvár. The evacuation could not take place, perhaps the required trucks could not be obtained, and the office's records remained in Kolozsvár. Horváth's last instruction to István Láposi, the staff member who

planned not to flee, was to safeguard the office's belongings and to continue wearing his OMIH uniform.⁷⁴ He was obviously oblivious to the danger that would await a uniformed man when Soviet troops arrived.

“Eminent National Interest”

How the activities of Hungary's authorities in charge of tourism fostered both the cause of recreational travel and nation-building in Hungarian Transylvania from 1940 to 1944 can be better appreciated after an examination of overall Hungarian policies in the region.

For Hungary's leaders the elimination of all traces of a Romanian past in for example Kolozsvár was a primary requirement. Even Premier Teleki made a derogatory remark about the architectural heritage of Romanian rule, especially in reference to Orthodox church buildings, at a sitting of the Transylvania conference, for which he immediately apologized. In case of government buildings he thought of the removal of Romanian ornamentation, but for church buildings he suggested not uniform treatment but case-by-case handling that left the door open to their preservation as they were, their remodelling and also their demolishing.⁷⁵ his approach was implemented first in Kolozsvár: the removal of the visible traces of Romanian rule. Romanian commercial signs in obvious places were deemed unacceptable by OMIH. The same office saw to it that preference was shown to taxi drivers who were bilingual and insisted that taxi meters be switched to the Hungarian *pengő*.⁷⁶

A delegation from Hungary visited the spas of Székelyföld to gain an idea how much investment was needed for their improvement. The people in charge came to the conclusion that, in addition to the loans that some resorts had already requested, 1,500,000 *pengős* were needed in terms of loans to finance the planned modernization. To lighten the burden on the Hungarian state, the delegation's members divided those who had already applied for loans (the total of which approached a million *pengős*) into three categories. Into the first belonged those resorts whose owners were Hungarians (95 applicants). Into the second those whose owners' ethnic status was not clear (13 applicants), and into the third those whose proprietors had left northern Transylvania either before or after the Vienna Award. The delegation also recommended the control of prices in the tourist industry since these were 30 to 50%, but sometimes 100% higher than those of Hungary — even though accommodations in the region were often not on the same standard as those in Hungary. They also urged that permits for the rental of rooms in private homes be made mandatory — they were not needed during Romanian rule. In

extending Hungarian practices to northern Transylvania the members of the delegation hoped to gain a firmer control over tourism i.e. the means of excluding “undesirable elements” from it. The delegation concluded that the prospects for improving tourism in the Székelyföld’s spas were good.⁷⁷

On April 3, 1941 the Hungarian government issued a decree concerning the fate of tourist establishments that were owned or had been abandoned by Romanians. These could be leased through the local OMIH offices, after approval by county authorities. The directives in this regard specified who could be considered for these establishments’ new managers: priority had to be given to Hungarian applicants.⁷⁸ From OMIH’s records it becomes obvious that this recommendation was closely observed by the officials in charge.⁷⁹ At the same time it occasionally happened that these officials tried to compromise in the case of Romanian-owned establishments. For example, Elek Horváth tried to convince the authorities in Budapest that a villa owned by one Marius Sturza, a Romanian University Professor, should be converted into an OMIH-run property, but was told that state sponsorship should not be used to create competition for private enterprise in a resort town.⁸⁰

The fate of Kolozsvár’s Romanian-owned Astoria Hotel deserves special attention. For a while after the change in ownership of the city, the hotel escaped harm probably because it was the headquarters of the local Hungarian army command. After the soldiers left, in January 1942 the hotel’s permit was withdrawn, yet at the end of the year the Astoria was allowed to resume business. Yet neither the local city government nor OMIH officials allowed the hotel to carry on in peace. They conducted regular inspections, demanded accounting reports monthly (which they asked for from no other establishment) and from time to time discussed the possibility of converting the building into a hospital. The hotel’s owners fended off such plans through their connections in high places and their use of resourceful Hungarian lawyers. Attempts to convert the hotel to other use had to come to an end in March of 1944 when the newly-arrived Gestapo established its local headquarters in the hotel.

After the hotel had re-opened in December of 1941, Horváth had to admit, with some reluctance, that Astoria was the best hotel in the city, it filled an important function in reducing the chronic shortage of tourist accommodation, and that its owner satisfied all the regulations governing hotel management.⁸¹ In fact, the Kolozsvár OMIH office used to direct its visitors to the hotel.

Other minority-owned establishments were not so fortunate. In the review of permits the first priority of the Hungarian authorities was the exclusion of Jewish-owned businesses from the tourist industry. This was

above all the doing of the city administrations, but OMIH records suggest that the staff of this establishment went along. As a result of the re-assessments of permits of 1941 many hotels and resorts changed management or closed down. By early 1943 there remained only one Jewish-owned hotel in Kolozsvár, and only one first class, and one second class inn.⁸² By then a campaign was being prepared in Budapest for further restrictions.

Conclusions

In this study I tried to take a glance at a hitherto neglected aspect of the “little Hungarian world” of northern Transylvania that was re-united with Hungary during 1940-1944. Here the euphoria of “returning to the motherland” was soon replaced by the routine of everyday existence and the people of this region became acquainted with some of the darker aspects of life in interwar and wartime Hungary: an all-pervasive bureaucracy, a highly hierarchical social order, and a culture of political intolerance. The ambitious plans to develop the region's tourist industry had to be abandoned or scaled back because of the lack of sufficient funds, but even these revised schemes often proved difficult to achieve.

When we examine the ideology that hid behind the planned investments of millions of *pengős* we have to come to the conclusion that the ideas of nation-building through the development of tourism corresponded with the general nation-building and sometimes exclusionist ideology of official Hungary. The result was the concept of travel to Transylvania as a “patriotic pilgrimage”. The idea of a summer vacation that was part of people's patriotic duty was fostered by national propaganda and was endorsed in the over-abundant tourist literature of the times. Travel to this region was also fostered by the increasing difficulty of travel abroad in a war-torn Europe.

The policies of Hungary's agencies in charge of tourism strengthened the process that had been in existence ever since the beginning of the century that identified Transylvania as two distinct regions: the Székelyföld and Kalotaszeg (including Kolozsvár). This Transylvania was perhaps never before or since on the minds of Hungarian to the same extent as between 1940 and 1944. The tradition of travelling through Transylvania via the Nagyvárad (today: Oradea) – Kolozsvár – Marosvásárhely – Székelyföld route developed at this time and persists for Hungarian tourists even today. This image of Transylvania as consisting of these regions coincided with the vision of this land as an ethnically pure one in which Romanians, Jews and Saxons (Germans) did not exist. A cause and effect relationship should not be

implied, but this image of Transylvania probably contributed to the trend of these people, especially Romanians and Jews, becoming excluded from the tourist industry — and even deprived of their properties.

The concept of Transylvania as an archaic and folkloric — and half-modern community (where there are also ski-hills, spas and house-crafts) continues to persist even in today's Hungary. This, despite the fact that the “bastions” of Magyar culture and civilization — the cities — that were supposed to be there in 1940-44, are now devoid of any Hungarianness. Today the Magyar character of Transylvania is increasingly a rural one and the Hungarian image of this land relates less and less to the reality. It is not an image any more — it is just an illusion.

NOTES

The idea for this project came from Nándor Bárdi, who always lent a sympathetic ear when I had problems in producing this study. Indispensable help was received in my researches from the Jakabffy Elemér Foundation of Cluj (Kolozsvár) and from the Kriza János Society. Attila Gidó of Cluj helped with problems of research while József Hudi provided information and photocopies of useful material. I am also indebted to Ioan Dragan, director of the Archive Națională Direcția Județeană Cluj. Archivist Florin Mureșan of the same institution helped in my research and provided moral support for my efforts. Katalin Solymosi of the Central European University's Library, and Kinga Szálkai of the College of Social Theory of Corvinus University in Budapest, helped in the procurement of difficult-to-obtain secondary sources. The study was translated into English by Nándor Dreisziger, in consultation with the author.

¹ The bulky volume by Dániel Csatári, *Forgószélben: Magyar-román viszony, 1940-1945* [In the whirlwind: Hungarian-Romanian relations, 1940-1945] (Budapest: Akadémiai kiadó, 1969) is written mainly from the perspective of the also neglected field of Marxist labour movements, while the much more recent work of Béni L. Balogh, *A magyar-román kapcsolatok 1939-40-ben és a második bécsi döntés* [Hungarian-Romanian relations in 1939-40 and the Second Vienna Award] (Miercurea-Ciuc [Csíkszerda]: ProPrint, 2002) concentrates on the diplomatic road to the Second Vienna Award, while the same author's article, “Az erdélyi magyar menekültkérdés 1939 és 1944 között” [The Hungarian refugee question in Transylvania between 1939 and 1944], *Regio*, (Fall-Winter 1999): 243-266 deals with the refugee crises of the years 1940-44. Sándor Oláh, in his *Kivizsgálás. Írások az állam és társadalom viszonyáról a Székelyföldön, 1940-1989* [Examination. Writings on the relationship of the state and society in Székelyland] (Miercurea-Ciuc [Csíkszerda]: Pro-Print, 2008), analyzed the approaches of the Hungarian administration to economic questions, while Péter Hámori in his “Magyar társadalomszervezési kísér-

letek Észak-Erdélyben” [Hungarian attempts at organizing society in Northern Transylvania], *Korall*, 18 (Dec. 2004): 65-97, examined the socio-political impact of Hungarian rule. Gábor Egry newly published book, *Az Erdélyiség “szineváltása”* [The transformation of Transylvanianism] (Budapest: Napvilág, 2008), outlines the ideology of the Transylvanian Party. Others that might be added include: Attila Szavári, “Magyar berendezkedés Észak-Erdélyben 1940 szeptember – 1941 április” [Hungarian settling-in in Northern Transylvania...] *Magyar Kisebbség*, 2004, no. 4: 272-304; Zsuzsanna Simon, “Észak-Erdély köz és szakigazgatása a második bécsi döntés után” [The administration of Northern Transylvania after the Second Vienna Award], *Regio*, 1995 no. 4: 50-82; and Levente Benkő, “Magyar nemzetiségi politika Észak-Erdélyben 1940-1944” [Hungarian nationality policies in Northern Transylvania, 1940-1944], *Pro Minoritate*, Fall 2002: 7-41. In the historiography of wartime Northern Transylvania a significant contribution was made by a special volume of the journal *Limes* (no. 2, for 2006), especially the articles by Csaba Gidó, Márton László, Edit Csilléry, András Tóth-Bartos and Sándor Oláh. This volume, aside from listing ongoing research projects on our theme, sums up existing knowledge, which is not much. We could continue enumerating works that touch on the subject but the fact remains that there is no comprehensive monograph.

² On this subject see Csaba Gidó and Márton László's article, “Észak-Erdély és Magyarország 1940. évi fejlettségének összehasonlítása” [A comparison of the development of Hungary and Northern Transylvania in 1940], in the above mentioned special issue of *Limes*, pp. 19-41.

³ A brand-new book on the history of tourism in Hungary is by Márta Jusztin, *A turizmus története a két világháború között* [The history of tourism between the two world wars], a doctoral dissertation, Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest, 2002. Also, the same author's “Utazgassunk hazánk földjén!” [Let's travel in our native land], *Korall* 26 (Nov. 2006): 185-208; and, Lajos Kudar, *Turizmusunk története dióhéjban* [The history of our tourism in a nutshell] (Budapest: Tinta, 2003), 19-30. On the interconnection between tourism and nation-building see John K. Walton, ed., *Histories of Tourism: Representation, Identity and Conflict* (Cleveland: Multilingual Matters Limited, 2005), especially the studies by Shelley Baranowski, Kristin Semmels and John M. MacKenzie. Also, Katherine Haldane Grenier, *Tourism and Identity in Scotland, 1770-1914: Creating Caledonia* (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2005).

⁴ Piers Brendon, *Thomas Cook. 150 Years of Popular Tourism* (London: Secker and Warburg, 1991).

⁵ Jill Steward, “Tourism in Late Imperial Austria,” in *Being Elsewhere: Tourism, Consumer Culture and Identity in Modern Europe and North America*, ed. Shelley Baranowski and Ellen Furlough (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2001), 114-115.

⁶ Alain Corbin, *Le territoire du vide. L'Occident et le désir du rivage, 1750-1840* (Paris: Flammarion, 1990). For an English-language summation of the subject see John Urry, *The Tourist Gaze. Leisure and Travel in Contemporary Societies* (London: Sage, 1990), 17-27.

⁷ Patrick Young, “La Vieille France as Object of Bourgeois Desire: The Touring Club de France and the French Regions, 1890-1918,” in *Histories of Leisure*, ed. Rudy Koshar (Oxford–New York: Berg, 2002), 183-184.

⁸ Orvar Löfgren, “Know your country,” in Baranowski and Furlough, *op. cit.*, pp. 138-148. Similarly motivated tourism developed in Holland and in Quebec, Canada. See Jane Nadel and Klein, *Fishing for Heritage: Modernity and Loss Along the Scottish Coast* (Oxford-New York: Berg, 2003), pp. 175-176.

⁹ Pieter Judson, “Every German Visitor has a *Völkisch* Obligation he must Fulfill,” in Koshar, ed., *Nationalist Tourism*, pp. 151-158.

¹⁰ Alexander Vari, “From Friends of Nature to Tourist Soldiers: Nation-Building and Tourism in Hungary, 1873-1914,” in *Tourism. The Russian and East European Tourist under Capitalism and Socialism*, ed. Anne E. Gorus and Diane P. Koenker (Ithaca-London: Cornell University Press, 2006), 64-81.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, especially pp. 74-75 and 80-81.

¹² On the German model see Shelley Baranowski, *Strength Through Joy. Consumerism and Mass Tourism in the Third Reich* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), especially pp. 118-151; and on the Italian one, Victoria de Grazia, *The Culture of Consent. Mass Organization and Leisure in Fascist Italy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981, second ed. in 2001).

¹³ László Kósa, *Füüdőélet a Monrchiában* [Life at the baths in the Monarchy] (Budapest: Holnap, 1999), 39-42.

¹⁴ Kudar, *op. cit.*, 20.

¹⁵ John Beckerson, “Marketing British Tourism. Government Approaches to the Stimulation of a Service Sector,” in *The Making of Modern Tourism. The Cultural History of the British Experience*, ed. Hartmut Berghoff, Barbara Korte, Ralf Schneider and Christopher Harvie (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2002); and Marguerite S. Shafer, “Seeing the Nature in America,” in Baranowski and Furlough, *op. cit.*, pp. 155-184; also, Michael Berkowitz, “A New Deal for Leisure,” in the same volume, pp. 185-212.

¹⁶ Minutes of Cabinet Meeting, 24 May 1940, Record Group K 27, Magyar Országos Levéltár (National Archives of Hungary, hereafter MOL).

¹⁷ Jusztin, *op. cit.*, pp. 143-144.

¹⁸ A 45-minute film by the OMIH about Transylvania was severely criticized at the time, mainly because of its omissions, by one Miklós Fogolyán. His letter of 10 June 1941 can be found in fond 830, dossier 70, 19. f. at the Archive Națională Direcția Județeană Cluj (hereafter ANDJC).

¹⁹ István Hallóssy, *Az idegenforgalmi propaganda új irányai* [New directions of foreign tourist propaganda] (Budapest, [1940]), p. 15 and *in passim*.

²⁰ The first issue devoted to Transylvania was published in Sept. 1940. The last appeared in September of 1944, after parts of the land became a battle-ground.

²¹ A letter by Baron János Jósika to an unknown addressee, 22 April 1943, Zilah. Fond 830, dossier 119, 95. f. ANDJC. Other documents, containing similar complains, can also be found in this dossier.

²² *Erdély északi része és a Székelyföld* [The northern part of Transylvania and the land of the Székelys] (a travel guide) (Budapest: OMIH, 1941), not paginated.

²³ Aprónyomtatványtár [collection of small publications] items 16/1942, A21/1941, A16/1941. Országos Széchényi Könyvtár [National Széchényi Library, hereafter OSZK].

²⁴ *Idem.*, items 289/1941, 288/1941, 225/1941.

²⁵ Károly Kós's letter to an OMIH official, 25 Jan. 1941. Fond 830, dossier 21, 25-27 f. ANDJC.

²⁶ The letter of László Gál, OMIH's president, to the OMIH office in Kolozsvár, 17 Jan. 1941. *idem*, dossier 30 f.

²⁷ Varga's speech of 15 Oct. 1940. *Az 1939. június 10-re hirdetett országgyűlés képviselőházának napója* [Proceedings of the House of Representatives of the Parliament called for 10 June 1939] (Budapest: Athenaum, 1941). vol. VII, p. 450.

²⁸ The expression is that of Nándor Bárdi. See his *Tény és való. A budapesti kormányok és a határon túli magyarság kapcsolattörténete* [Fact and reality. The history of relations between the Budapest governments and Hungarians beyond the border] (Bratislava: Kalligram, 2004), 133.

²⁹ Adrienne Sebestyén, "Erdélybe utazni más'. A magyar turisztikai irodalom Erdély-képe" ["Travel in Transylvania is different.' The image of Transylvania in Hungarian travel literature] in *Erdély-(de)konstrukciók* [Transylvania (de)constructed], ed. Margit Feischmidt (Budapest: Néprajzi Múzeum [Museum of Ethnography], 2005), 54.

³⁰ For example, Sefket Széfeddin, *A hét vár országa* [The land of the seven fortresses] (Budapest: Stadium, 1942).

³¹ Lajos Lévai, *Székelyföldi Kis Tükör* [The little mirror of Székelyföld] (Budapest: Kókai, 1942).

³² László Cs. Szábó, *Erdélyben* [In Transylvania] (Budapest: Nyugat, 1940).

³³ József Biró, *Kolozsvári képeskönyv* [Picture book of Kolozsvár] (Budapest: Officina, 1940).

³⁴ Sándor Aba, *Erdélyi útikalauz és a magyar városok ismertetése* [A Transylvanian tourist guide and description of Hungarian cities] (Nagyvárad: Nemzeti könyv és Papírkereskedés, n.d.).

³⁵ An OMIH circular dated 30 Sept. 1941, fond 830, dossier 79, ANDJC.

³⁶ The letter of Elek Horváth to OMIH [Dec. 1941], fond 830, dossier 32 2-3, ANDJC.

³⁷ Károly Kaffka ed., *Az utas könyve. Magyar utazási kézikönyv és útmutató* [The book of the traveller. Hungarian tourist handbook and guide] ([Budapest]: OMVESZ, 1940. Third edition (containing the new sections on eastern Hungary and northern Transylvania) (Budapest: OMVESZ, 1941).

³⁸ Harsányi's introduction to Kaffka's book.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 61-111 *in passim*.

⁴⁰ The volume was published in Budapest by *Magyar Turista Élet* in 1940.

⁴¹ Ödön Nagy, *Gyilkostó. Részletes útikalauz* [Lake Gyilkos. Detailed travel guide] (Marosvásárhely: Kiss Ernő Könyvnyomda, 1943), 55.

⁴² M. O. Reich, *Erdély* [Transylvania] (Budapest: Eggenberger, 1942), 10 and 18. The new addition of the book also dealt with southern, in 1942 Romanian Transylvania.

⁴³ Budapest: Franklin, n.d.

⁴⁴ Gyula Prinz ed., *Erdély — Útmutató Erdély vendégei számára* [Transylvania — guide for visitors to Transylvania] (Pécs, n.d.). On this see the study of Róbert Keményfi, “Kulturális hatóerőnk' mítikus történeti földrajz háttere” [‘Our cultural prowess’ background to mythical historical geography] *Korall* vol. 31 (April, 2008): 101-131.

⁴⁵ The letter of József Zsák to OMIH, 12 Aug. 1941. Fond 32, dossier 32, 30. f. ANDJC.

⁴⁶ *OMIH-kalauz cit.* no pagination. It is analysed by Sebestyén, *op. cit.* pp. 56-57.

⁴⁷ The letter of Elek Horváth, Kolozsvár, 8 March 1941, fond 830, dossier 18. 13-15 f. ANDJC.

⁴⁸ Quoted in Géza Polgárdy, *Harcok, munkák és küzdelmek. Tíz esztendő a magyar turista közéletben (1934-1944)* [Conflicts, projects and struggles. Ten years in the public life of Hungarian tourism] ([Budapest?]: Magyar Hegymászástörténeti Társaság, 1998), 47-48.

⁴⁹ *Egyesületi élet*, vol. 1 no. 1 (1941): 10-11.

⁵⁰ See the issues of *Erdély*, 1941 no. 12; and 1942 nos. 3, 7 and 12.

⁵¹ Károly Czirják, *A Horthy-csúcson* [On the Horthy peak], *Erdély*, 1943, no. 9, 138-140.

⁵² Dietlinde and Rudolf Rösner, “Zur Geschichte des Sektionens des Siebenbürgerische Karpathenvereins im Nösnergau und im Reener Ländchen” in *Der Siebenbürgische Karpatenverein 1880-1945*, ed. Heinz Heltmann-Helmut Roth (Innsbruck: Wort und Welt Verlag, 1990): 128-134.

⁵³ Nevertheless the editor of *Erdély* missed the Romanian laws protecting the environment. János Xantus, “Természtvédelmet, de sürgősen” [‘We want’ environmental protection and soon], *Erdély*, 1942, no. 1, pp. 1-5.

⁵⁴ Sándor Tavaszy, “A természetjárás a nemzetnevelés szolgálatában” [The exploration of nature in the service of educating the nation], *Erdély*, 1942, no. 1, pp. 1-5.

⁵⁵ *Erdély*, 1943, no. 2, p. 31; also in the same periodical, 1942, no. 12, pp. 190-191.

⁵⁶ Ernő Balogh, “Tanulságul” [As a lesson], *Erdély*, 1944, no. 6, pp. 81-82. Czirják, *op. cit.*, pp. 138-140.

⁵⁷ The subject of tourism as spiritual nation-building in contemporary Vichy France is described in Anne-Marie Thiesse, *Ils apprenaient la France. L'exaltation des régions dans le discours patriotique* (Paris: Editions de la maison des Sciences de l'Homme, 1997), 95-102.

⁵⁸ Erdélyi értekezlet jegyzőkönyve [Proceedings of the Transylvania conference], record group K 28 267. cs, pp. 183-184 f. Magyar Országos Levéltár (Hungarian National Archives, hereafter MOL).

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 71-72.

⁶⁰ See the report of Minister József Varga, printed in *A magyar idegenforgalom évkönyvéből* [From the Yearbook of Hungarian Tourism] (Budapest: Idegenforgalmi Újágírók Egyesülete, 1942), 13-20. On railway development see Mihály Kubinszky and Ferenc Horváth, *Magyar vasúti építkezések Erdélyben* [Hungarian railway constructions in Transylvania] (Budapest: MÁV, 1998), 224-238.

⁶¹ Autobiography, typed mss., in the Papers of Elek Horváth, manuscript group XIV, 44. Archives of Veszprém County.

⁶² Some of his correspondence with these authors can be found in fond 830, dossiers 59, 83 and 97, ANDJC.

⁶³ Three such investigations were carried out in 1941, two in 1942, and one in 1944.

⁶⁴ *Az Országos Magyar Idegenforgalmi Hivatal szervezeti szabályzata* [The regulations of national Hungarian Tourist Office] (Budapest: Stádium, 1941), 23-36.

⁶⁵ Fond 830, dossier 71, ANDJC.

⁶⁶ Horváth's report to OMIH in Budapest, 25 May 1943, in the same records, dossier 112. 82. f.

⁶⁷ *Erdély*, 13 Jan. 1943.

⁶⁸ *Erdély*, 1944, no. 9, pp. 125-128.

⁶⁹ This is documented in fond 830, dossier 9, ANDJC.

⁷⁰ Reports by resorts about the 1943 season, fond 830, dossier 119, ANDJC.

⁷¹ Data provided by OMVESZ, in the same fond, dossier 120, 17. f.

⁷² Report of Árpád Záborszky to Elek Horváth, 10 July 1943, in the above cited fond, dossier 118, 65. f.

⁷³ This was Horváth's only comment regarding the coming of the Germans. Report for March, 1944, in the same fond, dossier 140.

⁷⁴ Horváth's directions to Láposi, 19 Sept. 1944. In the same fond, dossier 150. Horváth survived the war, left Hungary in 1948 and emigrated to the United States. There he worked in libraries and took active part in the life of the Hungarian-American community. He died in 1994. István Láposi's post-1944 fate is not known.

⁷⁵ Proceedings of the of the Transylvania seminar, pp. 139f. K 28, 267. cs. MOL.

⁷⁶ For documentation see fond 830, dossiers 44, 53 and 129, ANDJC.

⁷⁷ For the delegation's report see fond 830, dossier 153, ANDJC.

⁷⁸ See the report of "Gál" to the Kolozsvár office of OMIH, April 1941. In the above fond, dossier 64.

⁷⁹ Letter, Elek Horváth to Hermann Müller, 10 Oct. 1941. Fond 830, Dossier 78, AMDJC.

⁸⁰ Gál's letter to Horváth, 11 Feb. 1941. Fond 830, dossier 63. AMDJC.

⁸¹ Letter, Elek Horváth to OMIH, 15 Dec. 1942. Fond 830, dossier 118. 166-167. f. AMDJC.

⁸² Enclosure in letter, Gál to Horváth, 5 Jan. 1943. Fond 830, dossier 118. 126. f. AMDJC.