

Introduction

Our research tried to shed new and important light on the relationship between geography and the Trianon Treaty signed in 1920. We used a broad-based, integrated approach, one that we divided into two main avenues of research. The first centred around a survey of the theoretical approaches that geographers in Hungary and abroad developed in their attempts to illustrate either the illegality of the Trianon borders (at least from a Hungarian perspective), or the legality of the new borders from the point of view of the newly-created successor states. Important part of this research was the biographical examination of Ferenc Fodor, a Hungarian geographer whose case provides unique insight into the way in which the trauma of Trianon transformed the professional values, worldviews, and even personalities of geographers engaged in geographical work between the wars. The second avenue of research explored the geographical consequences of the new borders that were created as a result of Trianon, and focused in particular on the regions that were divided and the cities that were separated from their natural hinterlands, as well as on the spatially-determined economic connections and social networks that were ruptured because of the treaty.

Our original research plan had to be modified due to COVID-19 pandemic: we applied successfully for deadline extensions. The continued disruption caused by pandemic meant that some of our archival research plans were put on hold in 2020, 2021 and 2022. Because conferences were also cancelled, we were only able to deliver in-person conference papers in 2022 and 2023 and at on-line virtual conferences.

Geographers on the new border of Hungary

We examined the reaction of Hungarian geographers to Hungary's dramatic and extensive loss of territory and much-reduced national sovereignty and compared the Hungarian argument with the British geographical thinking (Győri – Withers, 2019, 2020a, 2020b). To Hungary's geographers, Trianon ruptured historical associations between nature and nation: boundaries previously formed upon the Carpathians' natural geography and the hydrography of the Great Hungarian Plain were now replaced by ethnic considerations, even though these proved difficult to effect in practice as the basis to the new boundaries. We examined the maps produced, notably Pál Teleki's 'Ethnographical Map of Hungary' (1919) – the so-called 'Carte Rouge' – through which Hungary's ethnic identity and territorial integrity were revealed. We considered two works by British geographers, Marion Newbiggin (in 1920) and Alan Ogilvie (in 1922), which attempted to explain Hungary's situation following the Treaty. Marion Newbiggin's *Aftermath* (1920) and Ogilvie's *Boundary Settlement* (1922) were examined as two of Britain's geographers who tried to explain and to justify Trianon in terms of post-War geo-politics, ethnic diversity, and linguistic difference. For Newbiggin, Hungary's ethnic delimitation post-Trianon was largely dictated by the Western powers (principally by the American Delegation to the 1919 Paris Peace Conference). In his *Boundary Settlement*, Ogilvie (a member of the British geographical delegation in Paris) shows that the principles on which Trianon was determined were often compromised in practice. Our research showed

how the new geography of Europe and Hungary dictated by Trianon was responded to differently and by different geographical communities.

We also examined the work of the British geographical delegation in Paris as it advised on Trianon. Particular attention was paid to the work of Alan Ogilvie, and to Ogilvie's relationships with Isaiah Bowman, effective head of the American delegation. We examined Ogilvie's diaries and correspondence to provide detailed insight into how ethnic identity, linguistic difference and other criteria were used (or not) to define and map the new Hungary and the new Europe. We showed how questions to do with the complexity of Hungary's ethnic diversity were known to British geographers and map makers as early as 1915. We proved, too, that no single view was held over how to map boundaries: some British geographers favoured delimitation based upon physiographic divides, such as river and drainage basins. Others favoured ethnic difference based on use of the mother tongue. For yet others, attention was paid to lines of communication and to economic market area. Because such differences were apparent in the British geographical community during World War One, notably between prominent members of the Royal Geographical Society, British geographers offered no consistent view upon Hungary's delimitation and 'dismemberment' following Trianon. British geographers turned to the meetings of the British Association for the Advancement of Science in order to debate these differences and to review Hungary's position in the new Europe after 1920.

At the end of World War I, peace treaties wiped the Austro-Hungarian Empire off the map, and as a result of the Treaty of Trianon on 4 June 1920, the Kingdom of Hungary was dismembered. As a part of this process, a thin band of mainly German-speaking territory of some 4000 km², West-Hungary, became a part of Austria. Our research investigated both the arguments used by Hungarian geographers in defence of that country's territorial unity, notably those aimed at retaining and potentially recovering West-Hungary, and the arguments used by Austrian and German geographers to justify the annexation of that area (Jankó – Győri 2020, Győri – Jankó 2021). Analysing published and unpublished sources (articles, books, maps, propaganda material, and popular science literature), we showed that scholars from both sides of the new border based their detailed arguments on similar theories, and used the same methods and mapping technologies for their own causes. We demonstrated that geographical arguments and analyses cannot be divorced from their political context, and that the politics of the new Europe that emerged after 1918 were profoundly geographical in nature.

We also explored the role that geographical knowledge production played in the post-World War I "discovery" of Austrian Burgenland, focusing in particular on the relationship between geographical discourse and the politics of identity formation in the 1920s and 1930s (Jankó – Jobbitt 2017, 2019; Jankó 2021a, 2021b, 2022, forthcoming). The primary task was to offer insight into this knowledge-making process by highlighting the discursive strategies employed in a variety of scholarly and popular texts, and by shedding critical light on the various actors and epistemic communities responsible for the imagining of Burgenland from its annexation to Austria in 1921 to the dissolution of the region and its subsequent re-invention as a Greater German border zone after the Nazi *Anschluss* of 1938. We argued that Burgenland's discovery between the wars was both figurative and literal. Whether the "discoverers" were Austrian or German, national or local, Burgenland was as much a

discursive concept as it was a physical reality. Its emergent identity as a region, therefore, much like its actual borders, was fluid and often contested.

We argued that one of the cornerstones of the Czechoslovak delegation's territorial claims against Hungary was to secure the new state's „Danube border” at the Paris peace talks (Farkas 2021a, 2021b). Viktor Dvorský, a geographical expert of the Czechoslovak delegation, played a key role in the founding of the geographical background of the arguments used to support the claim. Years later, Gyula Prinz evaluated Dvorský's argument system in a peculiarly original approach. Although the two young geographers only played a minor role in the course of the events of 1918/19, their professional knowledge in some cases, although in different ways, had a decisive influence on the processes, and both are mentioned in contemporary documents. By presenting and analysing the documents in detail, their role in the development of events at that time can be better illuminated and clarified. By comparing the careers of the two leading Czech and Hungarian geographers of the decades after the First World War and presenting in more detail the major stages of their lives, parallels can be drawn that can provide a framework for further necessary analyses that can clarify and specify to what extent and in what way the positions of Hungarian and Slovak geography differ on the treatment of the problem and its interpretation on this important issue of common history.

Ferenc Fodor, one of the most prolific Hungarian geographers of the first half of the twentieth century, played more important role in the Hungarian peace preparations than Gyula Prinz (Jobbitt – Győri forthcoming). Having published his first serious scholarly studies during the First World War, Fodor was part of the inner circle of Teleki for much of the interwar period, and made a name for himself as a scholar, teacher, and editor in the 1920s and 1930s. Demoted from his university teaching position in 1939 when he was sent to Pécs as a school district superintendent, Fodor nevertheless continued to write and publish scholarly works, and, despite being socially and politically marginalized after the war, he tried to remain academically relevant during the communist period. After the Second World War Fodor worked on several large manuscripts that he knew would never appear in print in his lifetime. However, he trusted that communism would not last for ever, and hoped there would come a time when researchers, and Hungarians more generally, might discover and appreciate his unpublished work. Though the general public remains largely oblivious of Fodor and his voluminous output, the post-1989 rediscovery of Fodor's work by academics, and especially of his unpublished manuscripts and autobiographical documents, has been like opening a scholarly time-capsule, one whose contents continue to provide raw material for researchers, and especially for historical geographers, ethnographers, political historians, and historians of geography. Fodor's writings and his memory have had no influence on post-communist Hungarian politics, and in contrast to conservative-nationalist figures like Teleki, interest in him has remained purely scholarly. The rediscovery of Fodor's academic work has contributed to the revitalization of the history of geography in Hungary, while critical commentaries on his scholarship have the potential to spark new research into topics such as identity formation, nationalism, and the colonial mindset in Hungary at the fin-de-siècle.

One new question that we began to examine near the end of the project was the deeper colonial and imperial context within which many Hungarian geographers framed their thinking not only regarding the maintenance of Hungary's borders after the First World War,

but also in respect to their understanding of Hungary as a colonial-imperial state on Europe's semi-periphery. We explore this deeper historical context in a forthcoming article and in a forthcoming book chapter (Gyuris – Jobbitt – Győri forthcoming, Győri – Gyuris forthcoming).

Regions divided by the new border

We explored how Burgenland became integrated into the Austrian society and economy, how its regional inequalities and rural character changed in comparison to the neighbouring Austrian and Hungarian areas, under the influence of Vienna's major role (Győri – Jankó 2017, Jankó – Bottlik – Győri 2022). Our analysis was based on the census data of 1910, 1960/61, 2001 and 2011, and on the mapping of different social and economic indicators. Our data revealed that one hundred years ago, the northern, more prosperous area of Western Hungary was an integral part of the rural hinterland of the imperial capital, Vienna, in stark contrast to the region's southern periphery. After World War II, however, a steep west-east gradient emerged in the borderland along the Iron Curtain, while the traditional north-south disparity continued to exist on both sides of the new border. During the political transformation in the early 1990s, and even more after Hungary's EU accession (2004), the former hard border ceased to exist in this region, while Vienna regained its former economic importance and influence. After 1990, the patterns of regional disparities changed rapidly in Hungary, and the western part achieved a leading position within Hungary in every dimension of economic prosperity. In line with this, while the Austrian rural regions in Burgenland and between Vienna and Graz showed remarkable infrastructural progress, Southern Burgenland remained peripheral regarding economic activity.

We also examined the impact of the new border on the population dynamics, and urban and rural processes of the Great Hungarian Plain (Szilágyi 2018). Using GIS visualisations, we reconstructed the migration in the Great Hungarian Plain at the level of communities. According to our results, three major target areas can be distinguished: the agglomerations of Budapest and Miskolc, and the areas between the Danube and Tisza rivers. At the same time, along a line connecting Nyíregyháza, Debrecen and Békéscsaba east of the Tisza, and Szeged and Baja in the south, a wide, mosaic-like migration zone had also developed along the borders by the 1920s. Finally, it is demonstrated beyond doubt that the villages in the north-eastern regions of the Great Plain were emitting part of their population as early as the beginning of the twentieth century, suffering a considerable demographic loss that was probably caused by the relative over-population of the area.

Papers at academic conferences

2017–2018

We organized two separate panels at two different international conferences in which we explored the relationship between geography and Trianon. The following papers were given by members of our research team:

1. Canadian Congress of the Humanities and Social Sciences, 2018. 33rd Annual Conference of the Hungarian Studies Association of Canada, University of Regina, Regina, 2018. May 26. – June 1.

Session: “A Desperate Community: Geography and the Nation After Trianon”, Chair: Steven Jobbitt

1.1. Steven Jobbitt: Conservation and the Nation: Watershed Management and the Irredentist Arguments Against Trianon.

1.2. Győri Róbert: Geography after Trianon: The Geographical Foundations of Interwar Hungarian Revisionism.

1.3. Jankó Ferenc: „The Market Garden of Vienna” Geographical Work of Legitimation, Region Building and Policy of Hungarian Heritage in Burgenland, 1919-1938.

2. 17th International Conference of Historical Geographers. University of Warsaw, Institute of History, Polish Academy of Sciences, Warsaw, 2018. July 15–20.

Session: “Geography and the Nation After World War I: The Case of Hungary and Its Neighbours”, Chair: Charles W. J. Withers

2.1. Steven Jobbitt – Győri Róbert: Geographers and the Trianon Question: The Geographical and Ecological Foundations of Interwar Hungarian Revisionism

2.2. Jankó Ferenc: Inventing a Geographical Identity for Post-WWI Burgenland: Personal Motives and the Pursuit of Scholarship

2.3. Farkas György: Geographic „Facts” and Scientific „Reasoning”: the Development of Expert Czechoslovak Thinking from the Viewpoint of the History of Science

3. Other Conference Presentations:

3.1. Steven Jobbitt: “Nation, Empire, and the Taming of Waterways: Hungarian Hydrological Engineers and the Reclamation of the Tisza Valley in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries,” Association for Slavic, East European, and Eurasian Studies 46th Annual Convention, Chicago IL, United States, Nov. 9, 2017.

3.2. Szilágyi Zsolt: A trianoni Magyarország egy alternatív kontextusa: a gazdaság és a társadalom térbeli egyenlőtlenségei a 20. század első harmadában. Új Nemzeti Kiválóság Intézményi Konferencia. Debreceni Egyetem, Debrecen, 2018. June 18.

3.3. Szilágyi Zsolt: „Újraértelmezett Trianon: a gazdaság- és társadalomtörténeti jelentésadás kontextusai”. MRTT – MFT, Debreceni Egyetem Földtudományi Intézete, Debrecen, 2018. April 10.

1. Farkas György: Elfeledett ösvények a közép-európai geopolitika „erdejében” II.: „Kárpát-medence-előtti” csehszlovákiai közelítések mai tanulságai. Kárpát-medencei geopolitikai konferencia, Komárom, Selye János Egyetem, 2019. June 27–29.
2. Jobbitt, Steven: Complicating the Story: Empire, Identity, and the Shaping of Nationalist Aspirations in Fin-de- Siècle Hungary. Canadian Congress of the Humanities and Social Sciences, 2019. 34th Annual Conference of the Hungarian Studies Association of Canada, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, 2019. June 2.
3. Jobbitt, Steven: Hungarian Geographers and the Revolutions of 1919, Canadian Congress of the Humanities and Social Sciences, 2019. 34th Annual Conference of the Hungarian Studies Association of Canada, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, 2019. June 3.
4. Jobbitt, Steven: The Geographer as Public Intellectual: Jenő Cholnoky and the Re-Mapping of Hungary, 1920-1947. ELTE Eötvös Collegium, Geography Research Seminar Series, Budapest, 2019. June 18.
5. Győri Róbert: The geographical argumentation for Greater Hungary: Pál Teleki as geographer, chief negotiator and prime minister. – Wissenschaft im Dienste der Diplomatie und (Außen-)Politik. Universität Wien, Institut für Osteuropäische Geschichte, Vienna. 2019. November 28–29.

Public lectures:

1. Farkas György: A Kárpát-medence mint egységes társadalmi-gazdasági tér koncepciója. Rákóczi Szövetség Kárpát-medencei pedagógus tábora, Sátoraljaújhely, 2019. July 23.
1. Győri Róbert: Békeszerződés, 1920 - a földrajztudomány és a trianoni határmegvonás. Tiszazugi Földrajzi Múzeum, Tiszaföldvár, 2019. March 13.
2. Győri Róbert: A trianoni békekötés földrajza: a magyar földrajztudomány érvrendszere Nagy-Magyarország mellett. Magyar Földrajzi Társaság, Körös-vidéki Osztály, Békéscsaba, 2019. March 21.
3. Győri Róbert: A trianoni békeszerződés és a földrajztudomány. VIII. Eötvös Természettudományos Tábor, ELTE, Budapest, 2019. July 22.
4. Győri Róbert: Geography and Trianon. Tiszazugi Földrajzi Múzeum, Tiszaföldvár, 2019. August 01.
5. Győri Róbert: Geography and the dismemberment of Hungary, 1920. Lakehead University, Thunder Bay, Canada. 2019. October 22.
6. Jobbitt, Steven: Refugee geographers: Gyula Prinz, Ferenc Fodor, Jenő Cholnoky. Lakehead University, Thunder Bay, Canada. 2019. October 22.

1. Jankó Ferenc – Győri Róbert: Burgenland vagy Nyugat-Magyarország: az osztrák és a magyar földrajztudomány érvei. – Zűrzavaros évek, 1919–1921. Brenner János Hittudományi Főiskola, Győr. 2020. September 30.
2. Jankó Ferenc: Burgenland képeink. – A jobbágytól az elitig. A történeti vidék és lehetséges megközelítései. ELKH BTK, Budapest. 2020. October 20.
3. Jobbitt, Steven: A Watershed Crisis: Hydrology and the Politics of Revisionism in Post-Trianon Hungary, 1920-1939. Association for Slavic, East European, and Eurasian Studies 49th Annual Convention (online virtual conference). 2020. November 7.

Public lectures:

1. Jobbitt, Steven: Hungary, Trianon, and Historical Memory in the 21st Century. Lakehead University, 20/20 Vision: Historical Insights for the next Decade. 2020. January 17.

2021

1. Farkas György: Meg nem vívott „hídfőcsaták” Néhány mozzanat a „dunai határ” kialakulásának háttér-történetéből. – X. Magyar Földrajzi Konferencia, ELTE, Budapest. 2021. September 24.
2. Jankó Ferenc: Austrian and German Geography at the Birth of Burgenland. – Der Weg zu einer post-imperialen Ordnung: der ungarisch-österreichische Grenzraum nach dem Ersten Weltkrieg. Universität Wien – Collegium Hungaricum, Vienna. 2021. September 22-24.
3. Jankó Ferenc: Vidéki átalakulás az osztrák–magyar határtérségben, 1910–2011. Struktúrák és reprezentációk: elitek és területi egyenlőtlenségek Magyarországon a 18–20. században. ELKH BTK TTI, Budapest. October 12, 2021
4. Jankó Ferenc: Burgenland és Sopron az osztrák–német földrajzi gondolkodásban a két világháború között. Haza-Szeretet-Hűség. A soproni népszavazás elő- és utótörténete. Sopron MJV, November 24, 2021
5. Jobbitt, Steven: ‘The Cradle of Our Race’: Nationalist Visions of the Tisza Valley Watershed, 1846–1989. Hungarian Studies Association of Canada annual conference (online virtual conference). 2021. May 31.

Public lectures:

1. Farkas György: Hol vagyunk? A "Kárpát-medence" koncepció és története dióhéjban. – ELTE Kárpát-medencei Nyári Egyetem 2021. Budapest, 2021. July 7.
2. Győri Róbert: Földrajztudomány és Trianon: a brit geográfusok álláspontja. – ELTE Kárpát-medencei Nyári Egyetem 2021. Budapest, 2021. July 7.

3. Jankó Ferenc: Trianon és Burgenland létrehozása: földrajz, identitás, geopolitika. – ELTE Kárpát-medencei Nyári Egyetem 2021. Budapest, 2021. July 7.

2022

1. Győri Róbert: Imperial dreams and Hungarian geography, 1867–1918. 36th Annual Conference of the Hungarian Studies Association of Canada (online virtual conference), May 14-16, 2022

2. Jankó Ferenc: A kultúrsarok gondjai – Sopron vármegye fejlődése Bécs déli hátszágában. Tradíció és megújulás az egykori Sopron vármegye területén 1767–1989. MNL GYMSM Soproni Levéltár June 13, 2022

3. Jobbitt, Steven: Interwar Assessments of Hungary’s Modernization Project: Hydrological Science and the Question of Water Management, 1920-1938. Modernization by the State and its Ecological Consequences in East-Central Europe (Online Workshop), Centre for Economic and Social History, University of Ostrava, Czech Republic, May 6, 2022

4. Jobbitt, Steven: Hydrology and Empire: River Regulation as a Colonial Project in pre-World War I Hungary. 36th Annual Conference of the Hungarian Studies Association of Canada (online virtual conference), May 14-16, 2022

5. Jobbitt, Steven: “Hydrology and the Historical Imagination in Nineteenth-Century Hungary” presented at Association for Slavic, East European, and Eurasian Studies 51st Annual Convention, Chicago IL, Nov. 11, 2022

Public lecture:

1. Jankó Ferenc: Burgenland születése. Amiről a térképek mesélnek. – Soproni TIT Magyar Tudomány Ünnepe, November 11, 2022

2023

We organized a workshop with Czech colleagues in Prague as a closing event of the project: “Geography and post-First-World-War boundary making in Central Europe.” Historický ústav Akademie věd České republiky. Prague, Prosecká 809/76. 19. June 2023

The following papers were given by members of our research team:

1. Győri Róbert: Hungarian geography and the question of Greater Hungary, 1918-1938.

2. Jankó Ferenc: The geographical invention of Burgenland.

3. Farkas György: Unfought bridgehead battles. Contributions to the history of the Czechoslovak-Hungarian Danube border.

4. Jobbitt, Steven: Hydrology and the politics of revisionism in post-Trianon Hungary.

Other Conference Presentations:

1. Győri Róbert: Geographers and the post-First-World-War boundary making: the case of the Austrian-Hungarian border. “Neue Forschungen zur österreichisch-ungarischen Grenzregion, vom Mittelalter bis zum 20. Jahrhundert.” Collegium Hungaricum, Wien, 15. June 2023

2. Jankó Ferenc: Inventing Burgenland: Austrian, German and Hungarian geography in the interwar period. “Neue Forschungen zur österreichisch-ungarischen Grenzregion, vom Mittelalter bis zum 20. Jahrhundert.” Collegium Hungaricum, Wien, 15. June 2023

Public lecture:

1. Jankó Ferenc: Tudományos Burgenland-kép a két világháború között Magyarországon. – Soproni Múzeum, Szabadegyetem, Sopron, 23, March, 2022